



1999

Voluntary versus Involuntary Runaway Youth: Basic Demographics, Characteristics and Family Relations

Darcia A. Colburn '99
Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Colburn '99, Darcia A., "Voluntary versus Involuntary Runaway Youth: Basic Demographics, Characteristics and Family Relations" (1999). *Honors Projects*. 95.
https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/psych_honproj/95

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Running Head: VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY RUNAWAYS

Voluntary versus Involuntary Runaway Youth: Basic
Demographics, Characteristics and Family Relations

Darcia A. Colburn

Illinois Wesleyan University

Abstract

There is an increased concern that youths are leaving home earlier than ever. According to the National Network for Youth, 38% of runaways are under the age of 14. Clinicians, as well as researchers, who have worked with the population of runaway youth recognize that there are two distinct groups (i.e., voluntary and involuntary). Previous research has largely neglected the difference between those youths who have left home on their own initiative (voluntary) and those youths who were forced to leave their home (involuntary).

I hypothesized that involuntary youth will predominantly be male and older in age. I examined a number of variables to assess if there are differences between these two groups of runaways. The findings support past research in that more females are voluntary runaways than males. Surprisingly, there were no significant age differences between the voluntary and involuntary runaways. The major difference that emerged was that involuntary females had a significantly higher incidence of crime, especially violent crimes, than voluntary female runaways. I also found that males were more likely to use drugs than females. These findings suggest that there may be differences between Midwestern runaways and runaways found in larger cities (i.e., New York).

Voluntary versus Involuntary runaway youth: Basic Demographics, Characteristics and Family Relations

"My mom gets home at six with my dad, so I have to take care of my sister and clean the house after school. I do it, but then my mother yells anyway that I'm lazy. There's no time for fun. I'm thinking about running away"(Isaacs, 1997).

The thought of running away goes through almost every adolescents head at some point in time. Although the runaway problem has existed for some time, there is a increased concern that youths are leaving home earlier than ever. An estimated 1 to 1.3 million youths are either living in emergency shelters or on the streets (Isaacs, 1997; Coco & Courtney, 1998; Warren, Gary, & Moorhead, 1997). According to the National Runaway Switchboard (NRS), the average age of runaway youths has dropped from 16 years old to 15 in the past decade (Isaacs, 1997). Della Hughes, executive director of the national network for youth, found that 38% of runaways are under the age of 14 years of age (Isaacs, 1997). Ninety percent of the youths that run away are between the age of 12 to 17 years old, with the majority being white (Warren et al., 1997). Increased attention has focused on the rapidly increasing number of homeless youths. In Brisbane, Australia, a city of 1.2 million people, researchers have estimated that there are over 3,000 homeless adolescents (Heir, Korboot, & Schweitzer, 1990).

A variety of terms have been used in the literature to label runaways. Of particular controversy has been attempting to identify subgroups of runaways (Ringwalt, Greene, & Robertson, 1998). The term runaways has been used generically, referring to all youths who leave home, including those who have left home voluntarily or involuntarily. Other research discriminates between those youths who voluntarily leave home (i.e., runaways); and those youths who involuntarily leave home (i.e. throwaways). To alleviate this confusion in this

paper, I will use the term “runaway” to identify the runaway population in general. Following the definition used by Hier, (1990) I classified the runaways as voluntary if they left their home on their own initiative and classified those runaways as involuntary if they reported having been forced out of the home with no other alternative. If researchers have distinguished between these subpopulations in their work, I will use the more specific term of voluntary and involuntary runaways to describe the populations.

Clinicians, as well as researchers, who have worked with the population of runaway youth recognize that these two groups (i.e., voluntary and involuntary) are quite different (Ringwalt et al., 1998) . Previous research on runaway adolescents has neglected the distinction between those who have left home on their own choice (voluntary runaway) and those who have been forced to leave their home (involuntary runaway) by their parents or guardian (Heir et al., 1990; Ringwalt et al., 1998) and assume that these youths require the same services (Levine, Metzendorf, & VanBoskirk, 1986). Adams, Gullotta, and Clancy (1985) described voluntary runaways as those youth who have left home because “family conflict, alienation, and poor social relations,” where involuntary runaways were either forced or coerced out of the home.

Prior to discussing the literature regarding voluntary and involuntary runaways, I will briefly review the historical and current trends on the runaway population.

Brief History and Current Perspectives on Runaways

In the earlier part of the century, it was believed that children left home because of economic deprivation. Historically, many theories of children running away were founded on the psychodynamic view. In the 1920's and 30's, it was assumed that there was a pathological characteristic which made the youths more

inclined to runaway (Spillane-Grieco, 1984). Running away indicated that there was a severe narcissistic disorder and that these youths were impulsive and assaultive (Reimer, 1940; cited in Miller, 1987). The idea that a runaway was a 'sick' individual was predominant until the late 50's (Miller, 1987).

During the 60's and 70's, researchers took a more social perspective and attributed runaway behavior to elements missing in the child's social environment. The focus was removed from the child's personality to the impact of situational factors on the runaway adolescent. Research was conducted that showed that runaways were enduring emotional conflict in the home and this was a causal factor in runaway behavior (Miller, 1987). Rosenwald and Mayer (1967) concluded that "running away is both a premature attempt to achieve independence and an unsuccessful attempt to resolve family conflict (Miller, 1987). Suddick (1973) placed a similar importance on familial relations: "With few exceptions, the inescapable conclusion must be drawn- the home environment, in particular the parent-child relationship, is the most important factor associated with flight of the offspring" (Miller, 1987). The Runaway, Homeless, and Youth act of 1974 helped to decriminalize and to some extent depathologize running away (White, 1986).

Research conducted in the 1980's established that there was a direct relation between runaway behavior and the type of relationship the child had with his or her parent(s) (Spillane-Grieco, 1984). Historically, runaways have been seen as being maladaptive, delinquent, and even suffering from psychopathology. But research conducted by Speck, Ginther, and Helton (1988) found that there is no material difference between runaway and non-runaway adolescents, except for the fact that runaways made a "...choice of action and their decision to demand greater control of life."

In the 1990's the consensus emerged that there is no single cause for running

away (Plass & Hotaling, 1994, Warren et al., 1997). Instead it appears that there is a cluster of personal and situational characteristics that taken together may possibly be one way to explain runaway behavior (Roberts, 1982). Some of the literature has examined the specific causes of running away. This research shows evidence for the influence of family factors (including abuse, parent-child relationship, and child stress) on an adolescent's decision to leave home (Plass & Hotaling, 1994). Runaway behavior is now being studied as a possible interaction between intrafamilial and social conflicts (Warren et al., 1997).

Many studies have examined the characteristics of runaway youth and have failed to clearly distinguish the different typologies of runaway youth. An example of a study which did not distinguish voluntary and involuntary status was Warren and colleagues (1997). In a self-report interview of 78 runaway teenagers, they found that 70% of the youths had been abused, 60% were sexually active, and 33% had been arrested. Warren and associates (1997) also found that a significant number of runaways had previous school suspensions and had a least two or more stressful life events. Fortunately a number of studies have not appeared which compares involuntary relative voluntary runaways.

Based on a review of the voluntary versus involuntary runaway literature four factors emerge: 1) School attendance status 2) Delinquency issues 3) Substance use 4) Family relations and abuse. As suggested by Adams, Gullotta, and Clancy (1985) family relations are one of the most important factors for understanding runaways. Unfortunately, there have been few studies which examined parent child differences between involuntary and voluntary runaways.

Demographics

Voluntary runaways. Voluntary runaway adolescents are most likely to be female (65%) and white (Warren et al., 1997). They are most likely to be between the

ages of 12 and 17 (90%), with 60% of the total being 16 and younger (Warren et al., 1997). One of the possible explanations for the higher number of female voluntary runaways is that females are more likely to find help, whereas males are more likely to manage the consequences by themselves (Miller, 1987). Garbarino (1984; cited in Miller, 1987) found that females are more likely to be abused as adolescents than as children. The peak age for male abuse, however, is during childhood and decreases throughout adolescence. Therefore, there may also be more voluntary female runaways because they are more likely to be abused as teens when they have more ability to runaway (Miller, 1987).

Runaways leave their home for a number of reasons. Some example of different types of runaways are those youths who are escaping a destructive situation, escaping from family conflict, escaping family crisis, leaving with a problem that they do not feel comfortable sharing (e.g., a pregnancy), or running as a cry for help (Jones, 1988).

Involuntary runaways. Involuntary runaways are less prevalent. They comprise approximately one-fifth to one-half of the overall runaway population (White, 1986; Ringwalt et al., 1998). When studies examine the typical involuntary runaways, basic demographics show that involuntary runaways tend to be predominantly white but older relative to voluntary runaways (Levine et al., 1986; Miller, 1987). It appears that parents have a lower level of acceptance when older youths exhibit behavior. The parents don't like the older youths behavior and consequently more likely to ban them from the home. The peak age for voluntary runaway youths is 15 whereas the peak age for involuntary youth is 17 years old. Adams and associates (1985) found similar trends in that 79% of their sample of involuntary runaways were between 15 and 17 years old. Adams and colleagues (1985) and Heir and colleagues (1990) found that there were fewer female

involuntary runaways than males. This could be due to parents feeling more responsible for their girls since females are considered more vulnerable and apt to be sexually abused.

Whereas most of the demographic research has focused on undifferentiated groups of runaways, there is a considerably less information available on adolescents who are involuntary runaways. Researchers have attempted to describe the typical voluntary runaway, to understand what precipitates a runaway event, as well as determine what sort of treatment or intervention helps youths and their families. However, there remains a small amount of information on runaway youth who have been thrown out or abandoned by their guardians.

During the 1980's, governmental publications began mentioning involuntary runaways but they were rarely discussed in detail. Some researchers commented about the existence of involuntary runaways, but did not separate their data from that gathered on voluntary runaways (Miller, 1987).

School

Voluntary runaways. The stereotype of a runaway is a child who gets poor grades and is truant. Truancy is defined as the "absence from school by school-age youngsters without the consent of parents, guardians, or school officials" (Levine et al., 1986). Kurtz, Jarvis and Kurtz (1991) compared undifferentiated runaway youth to non runaway youth and found that undifferentiated runaways were significantly more likely to exhibit school problems. Runaway youth, in general, were less likely to attend school regularly and more likely to be school dropouts (20% versus 13%) or attend an alternative school (7% versus 3%). Overall, the mixed-group runaway population is considered to be an academically at-risk population and can generally be described as being turned off to education (Levine et al., 1986). In general, 40% of the runaway youth interviewed by Levine and associates (1986), had dropped out of

school or did not attend regularly.

Levine and colleagues (1986) were one of the few researchers to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary runaways. In their study, youth's classified themselves as either voluntary (runaways) or involuntary (throwaway) runaways (Levine et al., 1986). Their study was designed to examine how the voluntary and involuntary runaway youth perceived their school situation, as well as their family situation. Levine and colleagues (1986) hypothesized that early intervention within the school system could result in the reduction of runaway population in general, since most runaway youth are also truant. Forty-seven percent classified themselves as voluntary runaways, 44.7% as involuntary runaways and 7.9% as both. Almost 40% of the voluntary runaway youth had dropped out of school or were not attending. Only 23.7% reported attending school on a regular basis, while 5.3% reported that they were currently suspended from school, and 44.75% of the voluntary runaways reported having been suspended from school in the past. Warren and associates (1997) examined voluntary runaway youths that were in the 8th, 9th, or 10th grade and found that more than 62% (n=28) of youths had been suspended from school at least once (with the number of suspension ranging from 0-99).

The voluntary runaway youth reported a number of rationales for not complying with the school system (i.e. teacher harassment, not liking the teacher, poor grades) (Levine et al., 1986). Voluntary runaways reported that their teachers saw them as cooperative, good, rule-complying, polite, bright, easily frustrated, impulsive, strong willed, and friendly students (Adams et al., 1985). Another source of tension in school was poor performance. Almost 24% reported having to repeat a grade and 29% reported failing 2 or more subjects. Truancy was an issue for 60.5% of the mixed-group runaways (Levine et al., 1986). The voluntary runaway adolescents

reported being truant for durations ranging from six to 400 days (Levine et al., 1986).

The major reasons the voluntary runaway youth gave for being truant were problems within themselves, the home, and school. Thirteen percent of the voluntary runaway youths reported emotional problems and 10.5% reported that they did not like school or just did not want to go. Eighteen percent of the children reported being truant to hide the signs of abuse or having to take care of their younger siblings (Levine et al., 1986).

Another issue that emerged for the voluntary runaway youths was poor peer relations (69%). These adolescents felt that they were not included in many things at school and did not have very many friends (Adams et al., 1985). When the adolescents were asked if they would like to be included, 82% said yes.

Overall, it seems that voluntary runaway youth experience an extensive range of difficulties with the educational system. Not only do the voluntary runaway youth have poor peer relations in school, but they also tend to maintain poor school attendance.

Involuntary Runaways. Levine and colleagues (1986) found that involuntary runaways were truant more frequently than voluntary runaways. Involuntary runaways reported being truant with a higher incidence (60-400 days) compared to voluntary runaways who reported an incidence of 6-120 days. This data may indicate that involuntary runaways cause more stress for their parents than voluntary runaways (Levine et al., 1986).

Gullotta and associates (1985) looked at peer-relations in school since most runaways experience problems with peer relations. When the youths were asked if the other students at school involved them in activities, involuntary runaways (63%) stated that they were infrequently asked to join in with their peers. The youths were also asked if they would like to be included more often, involuntary

(63%) runaways reported that they would like to be included more often. The youths were also asked to rate how they thought how their teachers perceived them. Involuntary runaways thought that the teachers perceived them as quick tempered and strong willed.

Delinquency

Voluntary runaways. Delinquency is another factor that is examined in studies of the runaway populations. These children by definition are delinquent because running away is considered a status offense. It has been argued that youth who runaway are more likely to enter a life of crime, but not all runaway youth commit criminal acts beyond their single status offense (Mann, 1980; cited in Hier et al., 1990).

Male voluntary runaways were found to be more aggressive than female runaways. Male voluntary runaways were also found to be more hostile and aggressive than male involuntary runaways (Hier et al., 1990). This may suggest that male runaways may be more delinquent and aggressive than any subgroup of the runaway population. Warren and associates (1997) found that 33% (n=26) of the undifferentiated runaways had criminal records 57% (n=15) of those youths were arrested for burglary or theft; 15% (n=4) for assault and battery; and 15% (n=4) for disorderly conduct). Overall, it seems that mixed-group runaways express more impulsivity (Adams et al., 1985), but that does not necessarily mean that they will be delinquent.

Involuntary runaways. The limited research to date suggests that involuntary runaways are more likely than voluntary runaways to participate in delinquent activities (Ringwalt et al., 1998). Heir and associates (1990) studied social adjustment in voluntary and involuntary runaways. In examining theoretical perspectives on delinquency, Brennan (1990; cited in Hier et al., 1990) asserted that

involuntary runaways have been rejected both from their family and the educational system. Although involuntary runaways have been found to participate in deviant activities, involuntary runaways have also been described as having many friends. Involuntary runaways have been found to have lower “self-esteem, with higher levels of normlessness, powerless, and delinquent behavior” (Hier et al., 1990). It has been hypothesized that involuntary runaways may be less socially isolated than voluntary runaways, but that involuntary runaways are more antisocial than voluntary runaways, since they are more apt to get influenced to get involved in delinquency.

Hier and colleagues (1990) also examined the differences in aggressive tendencies between voluntary and involuntary runaways. They measured hostility and aggressive tendencies using the Hostility and Direction of Hostility Questionnaire (HDHQ). They found that male voluntary runaways were significantly more hostile than female voluntary runaways, while male involuntary runaways were significantly less hostile than female involuntary runaways. Female involuntary runaways were found to be more critical than male involuntary runaways.

Substance Abuse

Voluntary runaways. Runaway youth, in general, have a considerably higher prevalence rate compared to the general population with respect drug and alcohol abuse. Many researchers have found a high rate of alcohol and drug use among runaway and homeless youth (Greene, Ennett, Ringwalt, 1997; Fisher, Wilson, & Queen, 1992; Zimet, Sobo, Zimmerman, Jackson, Mortimer, Yanda & Lazebnik, 1995). “The vulnerability of this population is due to stresses associated with daily survival and to a lifestyle characterized by high risk behavior” (Greene et al., 1997).

There are two major explanations for why runaway youth use drugs and alcohol. The first idea is that youths use drugs as a means to cope with intra- or interpersonal difficulties (e.g., self-medication). The second theory is the sociocultural view, which holds that influences such as peers, parental roles, drug availability, and community norms affect the youths decision to use drugs (Fisher, Wilson, & Queen, 1995).

Prevalence ratings of substance abuse among mixed-group runaway youth have varied enormously across studies. These variations can be accounted for by 1) the setting in which the youth were identified; 2) the geographic locations where surveys were conducted; 3) the definitions used to identify the runaways; and 4) the drug use measures employed (Greene et al., 1997). The variability of findings raises the possibility that different settings are associated with different risk for substance abuse. The majority of the studies have been conducted in big cities such as New York City and Los Angeles (Zimet et al., 1995). It can not be assumed that these are representative samples of runaway and homeless youth in other parts of the United States.

Zimet and associates (1995) conducted a study of 108 Midwestern undifferentiated runaways. They found that the levels of drug use reported by the mixed-group runaways were fairly low. Ninety percent of the youth denied using crack/cocaine, and LSD; only 9% of the youths reported using marijuana once or more a week. Another difference in results was the levels of alcohol consumption. Zimet and associates (1995) found that alcohol use was considerably higher relative to the general population, with 30% reporting that they consumed alcohol once a week. This may suggest that the runaway's locations may have an effect on their choice to use drugs.

Greene and colleagues (1997) conducted the first nationally representative

study of 660 homeless and undifferentiated runaway youth and found that there were higher rates of substance abuse with increased age. Overall, males were more likely to use drugs than females and whites more than blacks. Approximately 71% of the street youth, 46% of the shelter youth, while only 25% of the youths that resided at home had used 3 or more substances. This finding suggests that the setting in which the youth is residing may have an effect on their substance abuse.

Overall, these findings suggest that the geographic location and setting may have an effect on the prevalence rates of substance abuse. The studies conducted in big cities seem to report higher rates of substance abuse, as well as a wide variety of substances (Greene et al., 1997), as compared to those conducted in the Midwest.

Involuntary runaways. There has been no research that has examined involuntary runaway substance use. I expect both groups to have highly elevated patterns of substance use. However, involuntary runaways may have a higher incidence of substance use since they are typically older and other research that suggests that involuntary runaways are more deviant, delinquent, and truant from school more often.

Family Relations

Voluntary runaways. The bulk of research on runaways has indicated that the relationship the child has with their family plays a major factor in the developmental trajectory of a child's runaway behavior. Research into the causes of voluntarily running away has provided evidence for the influence of family factors such as abuse and parent-child conflict (Gullotta et al., 1985; Warren et al., 1997; Crespi et al., 1993). A family systems perspective, which includes an arrangement of runaway behavior within an individual and family developmental framework, may provide a way to better understand the runaway behaviors. This model focuses primarily on notions of individuation, self-differentiation, and family systems

differentiation (Crespi & Sabattelli, 1993).

There have been many studies that examined the runaway youth's motivation to runaway. Runaways, in general, report poor parent child relations, extreme family conflict, alienation from parents, and poor communication with parents as the primary factors for leaving home (Gullotta et al., 1985; Pelletier & Reid, 1993). In general, Kurtz and associates (1991) compared different family problems of non runaway youth to runaway youth. They found that runaway youth experienced more neglect by their parent figure (35%) than the non runaway group (16%). Runaway youth experienced more emotional conflict (62%) and poor communication (59%). This shows evidence that even though there is a physical separation between the parent and the runaway, there continues to be emotional connectedness.

Familial abuse is second reason why some runaways choose to leave home (Gullotta et al., 1985; Warren et al., 1997). Familial abuse and neglect is prevalent in the United States. Nearly 2.5 million reports of child abuse were filed with DCFS in 1989. Further, it is estimated that 25% of children who are physically or sexually abused have serious psychiatric problems, including chronic anxiety, depression, aggression, and antisocial behavior (Warren et al., 1997). For adolescents, maltreatment is troublesome "since they have neither the protective dependency of childhood nor the independence and maturation of adulthood to deal with abuse" (Kurtz et al., 1991). For some, running away is the only way of coping with their current living situation.

Warren and associates (1997) found that 66.7% of the undifferentiated runaway youth interviewed reported that they had been abused when asked, "Can you tell me about the abuse you experienced?" Ten runaways (23.3%) indicated that they had been sexually abused, 46.5% reported physical abuse, 2.3% reported

emotional abuse, and 27.9% indicated sexual, physical, and emotional abuse. When asked, "Who was the abuser?" 25.6% reported their father, 15.4% reported their stepfather, and 10.2% indicated their mother abused them. Overall, it seems that data support the idea that runaways live in abusive, harsh environments.

Adams and associates (1985) examined both voluntary and involuntary runaway youth's primary reason for leaving home. They found that 74% of the voluntary runaways reported leaving home because they were not getting along with their parents. Others reported that they left because of physical abuse (5%), delinquency (5%), or wanting independence (5%). They further questioned the youths and found that voluntary runaways perceived their mothers as calling them names often (55%) and providing too strict of an environment (77%). Fathers were perceived in a more negative manner. The voluntary runaways' perceived their fathers being rarely satisfied with their son or daughter (50%), infrequently helpful with hobbies (42%), and seldom talking to them (37%).

Levine and colleagues (1986) also gathered data on the reasons why youth decide to leave home. Arguments within the family were reported as a reason for leaving the home in 60.5% of the cases, with 86.9% of the voluntary runaways indicating that parental pressure was a related source of stress. The voluntary runaways also indicated that the topics that caused the most tension for them were child abuse and neglect (26.3%), arguments about chores (15.6%), and alcoholism of the parent or parent figure (10.5%). Amazingly, 64.7% of the voluntary runaways indicated that they had been victims of abuse. Collectively, these results seem to indicate that the family is the primary reason for the adolescent leaving home.

Much research shows evidence that running away is an attribute of poor family relations (Spillane-Grieco, 1984). Spillane-Grieco (1984) examined empathetic understanding and positive regard between mixed-group runaways and their

parents. Spillane-Grieco (1984) suggested that interpersonal relations between the runaway adolescent and his or her parent is influential in the youth's decision to leave home. She found that runaways and their parents reported less empathetic understanding and positive regard from each other when compared to the typical population. Adolescents, in general, are going through tremendous change and this period can be marked with much stress for both the youth as well as the parents. Many youths who have not runaway also feel that they are poorly understood by their parents, but the critical difference is that these adolescents feel loved and positively regarded.

All of this information seems to suggest that families play a very important role in being a support system for the youth. For this reason, we will explore whether these factors are implicated in runaways.

Involuntary runaways. Family relations are very important to examine since most explanations surrounding the cause of running away targets the family. There is a small literature on the differences between involuntary and voluntary reasons for running away. It seems that most runaways report a problem with their relationship with their parents. Adams and associates (1985) examined involuntary runaway's primary reasons for leaving home; 84% of the involuntary runaway's reported parent-child conflict which was higher than that of voluntary runaways (74%). Further, 22% of the involuntary runaways not only indicated that they had difficulty with their parents, but that their parents openly wanted them to leave home.

Adams and associates (1985) also found that involuntary runaways (47%) were more likely to report that their parents did not get along with each other than runaways (22%). The adolescents were also asked about their perceptions of their parent's behavior. The involuntary runaways indicated that their mothers were

perceived as saying unpleasant things about them (61%) and providing too strict care (72%). Involuntary runaways perceived their fathers as often calling them names (82%) and frequently punishing (64%) and beating (70%) them. This was significantly different from that of the voluntary runaways perception of their fathers, since involuntary runaways perceived their parents as rarely calling them names and were seldom viewed as beating or abusing them (Gullotta et al., 1985).

In an earlier study, Gullotta (1978; cited in Hier et al., 1990) found that involuntary runaways have experienced more abuse and neglect than voluntary runaways. This is an interesting finding because involuntary runaways may be in a more abusive environment since they report more negative perceptions of their parents and also report higher incidence of parent conflict within the home.

Overview of Research.

The review of the literature above illustrates how little we know about the involuntary runaways population relative to the voluntary runaways. To address this gap in the literature, self-reported data gathered from teenagers during the intake interview for a runaway intervention program, Project Oz were analyzed. Based on the report, the youths were categorized to one of two groups (either voluntary or involuntary runaways). These groups were compared based on the demographics and safety assessment included with the intake (see Appendix A and B for copies of the intake and safety assessment form).

Project Oz is a not-for-profit human service organization that was established over 20 years ago to help runaway youth return home. Project Oz provides services for youths 13-18 years of age and their parents without a fee through the Youth Initiative Program (YIP). YIP's philosophy on runaway youth is that "youth runaway from home when their problems seem too big to handle...Running away is a cry for help. Runaways go looking for someone to help them, and Project Oz is

there to answer the call any time, day or night.” These services include a 24-hour crisis line, individual, family, and group therapy; advocacy, and referral information. In addition, temporary placement is provided in situations where the youth can not be placed back into the home (if the runaway youth refuses to go home or the parent will not allow the adolescent back into the home). This is provided through host homes, which are trained, paid individuals within the community who open their home to these youths on a temporary basis. The agency also provides food and transportation, when necessary.

Hypotheses

There are a number of variables that were examined. The first group of factors are demographics. I hypothesized that involuntary runaways would be older, predominantly male, and white. I suspected that the voluntary runaways would be comprised of younger adolescents who are also predominantly white, but this group may be comprised with more females.

I also hypothesized that involuntary runaways would be involved in more truancy than voluntary runaways, as well as more delinquent acts and substance use. In addition, I hypothesized that involuntary runaways would have more family conflict and abuse than voluntary runaways. Unfortunately, I was supposed to have data included for family relations but due to some factors beyond my control, it was not included.

Methods

Subjects

The subjects for this study were runaways adolescent aged 12-17 years old, who have completed the Project Oz screening for crisis services. Data was collected by conducting a file review and analyzing existing data. Only those subjects with

complete data were used. Because data analysis was limited to anonymous file review, subject's permission was not obtained. Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Illinois Wesleyan Institutional Review Board.

Although data for the dependent measures are available dating from 1990 to 1998, the population was a sub-sample of those clients seen between January 1996 and November 1998.

Our design calls for a selection of subjects who fill the cells of a 2 x 2 matrix. Gender (male, female) is one of the factors and status (voluntary, involuntary) comprises the second. We randomly selected persons from those records completed during the time period (January 1996 through November 1998) until 26 subjects were fitted into each cell (for runaways status and gender). Only subjects for whom their status could be unambiguously determined and had complete data were used.

Overall, demographic data was collected for 252 runaway youths. The full sample was composed of 198 (78.6%) voluntary and 54 (21.4%) involuntary runaways. The results from the analysis of these descriptive data show that the average runaway is female, white, around age 15 ($X = 14.98$), and has run away more than twice. Overall, the population included whites, blacks, Asian, and Hispanics who ranged from 10-17 years of age; 82.5% of the runaways were white, 12.3% were black, 4.4% were Hispanic, and .8% were Asian.

My sub sample consisted of 54 male runaways (27 voluntary and 27 involuntary) and 52 female runaways (26 voluntary and 26 involuntary) in which a number of variables were considered (i.e., school status, juvenile delinquency, suicide). The average age of the selected sample was slightly higher than the overall population ($X = 15.1$). The majority of the runaway youths were from McLean County (77.4%), although Project Oz dealt with youths (22.6%) that were from other counties or states. The runaway youths reported that only 23.6% of them were

employed. Overall, 84% of biological mothers were in the home, whereas only 50.9% of biological fathers were in the youths home. Virtually all of these youths have had previous contact with other agencies (51.9% counseling, 18.9% rehabilitation program, 15.1% DCFS) with only 14.2% having no past agency contact.

Measures

Standard intake form and safety assessment. The standard intake was completed by all youths screened at Project Oz, during January 1996 through November 1998 (See Appendix A and B, for copy of Intake Form and Safety Assessment). Upon arrival at the police station or other public setting, all subjects receive an intake interview.

The intake form is 19 pages long and includes multiple forms that gathers information on the youth (name, address, phone number, race, height, weight), parents (are they in the home), health information (date of last physical, blood type, medications), previous agency contact, and the status youths custody (DCFS Ward, MRAI petition, Ward of the Court). The standard intake also includes the safety assessment form which identifies potential issues such as, previous runaway behavior, suicidal thoughts, homicide issues, previous abuse or neglect, drug or alcohol use, school issues, and delinquency issues. The intake also contains forms for the youth and guardian to sign for consent of release of information, temporary custody, host home placement information, and the YIP case plan which documents the clients issues and records the treatment plans.

Voluntary and Involuntary Runaways

Voluntary runaways were defined as those youth who voluntarily (without force) left the home without permission of their parents and stay away from home. Involuntary runaways, on the other hand, were defined as youths who had involuntarily left the home because of a parent or guardians formal request or

behaviors (i.e. guardian locking the teenager out of the home). The jargon used at Project Oz for involuntary runaway is 'lockout.' This information was taken from the intake form from the case note. The case note documented the situation and was used in order to make a clear distinction as to whether the youth was a voluntary or involuntary runaway. In the case that there was not a clear distinction made, coders referred to the monthly Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) report which classified a child as a runaway or a lockout. If the runaway status was still ambiguous, the youth was not included in the sample.

Coded information from intake form and safety assessment. The following variables were coded from the intake form and used in the present study (See Appendix C, for copy of coding sheet). The demographic variables that I examined were demographics such as age, race (African American, Hispanic, White, or other), and gender.

The variables from the safety assessment that I coded were school and education information; 1) was the youth currently in school (yes/no), 2) if not in school, last grade attended, 3) truant from school and if so, for how many days.

Another variable that I coded was whether the youth had previous agency contact (yes or no) and with whom (either with counseling services, rehabilitation, DCFS, or no agency involvement).

I also coded the client's family relations which includes the following variables; who was the youth living with (biological mother, biological father, step-mother, step-father, siblings, other relative, or other non-relative). The family relations variable also examined factors about abuse. For example, had the youth ever been hurt by someone in the past (yes/no) and by whom (parent, stepparent, sibling, other relative, or other nonrelative). Was the youth currently being hurt by anyone (yes/no) and by whom (parent, stepparent, sibling, other relative, or other

nonrelative). Also, had anyone ever touched the runaway in an inappropriate sexual manner (yes/no). The last question that examines family relations deals more with neglect; was the youth being provided with food, clothing, and shelter (yes/no).

I coded the youth's past history of drug use. Had the youth used in the past, or were they currently using drugs or alcohol? (yes/no). If the clients response was yes, then we also coded what the youth was using (marijuana, alcohol, crack/cocaine, or other) and how frequently they used the substance.

Another variable that was coded was whether the youth had past court and/or delinquency issues. For example, had the youth ever been involved with the juvenile court (yes/no) and if yes, in what manner (drugs or alcohol, stealing, truancy, running away, and assault).

I also coded information about previous runaway behaviors. I coded whether or not the youth had runaway before; if they had runaway before, I coded how many times the adolescent had run away previously.

Procedure

A master list of youths who have been seen by Project Oz between January 1996 and November 1998 was created. I classified the youth runaway status as voluntary or involuntary. This list was created by sorting through past files and reviewing the monthly report to assess whether the youth was classified as a voluntary or involuntary runaway. This initial list also included whether the youth is a male or female, how old they were at the time of the intake, and what race they belong. I then conducted analysis on the demographics (age, gender, runaway status, and race).

Then individuals were selected for this list to fill the cells of the two by two design (i.e. gender by runaway status). There were 26 females (voluntary and

involuntary) and 28 males (voluntary and involuntary) in each cell. All of the involuntary runaway youths were used and the voluntary youths were matched to meet age, gender and race demographics. Further data obtained for these subjects from the case record (intake information and safety assessment).

Results

The following analysis were completed using a 2 x 2 factorial ANOVA. In these analyses, gender (male, female) was one factor and runaway status (voluntary, involuntary) was the other factor. Although there were not many differences between voluntary and involuntary runaways, there were a number of significant sex differences.

Analyses of the full sample

One of the initial questions was if there was a difference between the demographics of voluntary and involuntary runaways. The runaway status for males and females was significant ($\chi^2 (1) = 6.59, p < .01$). As shown in Table 1, females were more likely than males to be voluntary runaways, whereas males were more likely than females to be involuntary runaways. There were no significant ethnicity differences for the overall population.

Contrary to my hypothesis, there were no significant age differences between the voluntary and involuntary runaways ($t (250) = .11, n.s.$). The average age for involuntary runaways was 15.2 ($SD = 1.51$) years old and the average age for voluntary runaways was slightly lower, but not significant, with the mean of 14.9 ($SD = 1.55$) years old.

Analyses of the selected sample

Within the selected sample, I found that males were older than females overall ($F (1, 102) = 6.80, p < .05$). This contrasted with the insignificant sex

differences found in the overall sample. Within the selected sample, there were no effects for runaway status and age, but that was accounted for by the matched sampling procedures that I implemented. The number of grades completed was significantly higher for males ($F(1, 102) = 4.79, p < .05$), which is likely explainable by the age difference.

School. There were few significant differences between the voluntary and involuntary runaway groups with respect to school. Although not significant, involuntary runaway males had elevated drop out of rates (10 involuntary males to 4 involuntary females). There were no significant differences in truancy rates. Elevated rates of truancy were found for all groups of runaways except for the involuntary female runaways. There was an overall trend for males to be more likely to drop of school than females (23 males compared to 15 females).

Delinquency. There was a significant difference between voluntary and involuntary runaways in their juvenile court involvement ($\chi^2(1) = 9.35, p < .05$). Involuntary runaways were more likely to commit crimes than voluntary runaways (See Table 2). Involuntary females were much more likely to be involved with the juvenile court than female voluntary runaways ($\chi^2(1) = 9.77, p < .001$). There were, however, no significant differences between the male voluntary and involuntary runaways.

Many of these court involvements occurred in the context of domestic violence charges (6 involuntary females and 3 involuntary males, whereas no voluntary runaways were involved with domestic violence charges).

Substance Use. Fifty percent of involuntary and 46.2% of voluntary runaways reported that they used drugs or alcohol. There were no significant drug use differences between voluntary and involuntary runaways.

There was, however, significant gender differences in drug and alcohol use. Males were more likely to admit to using drugs and/or alcohol ($\chi^2 (1) = 6.40, p < .05$). Males were also more likely to use drugs ($\chi^2 (1) = 6.46, p < .01$). There were not significant differences in alcohol use based on gender or runaway status.

Family Relations. I also examined the effect of parental presence on runaway status. Females were more likely to be involuntary runaways if their fathers were not present in the home ($\chi^2 (1) = 6.17, p < .05$). There were no significant values for mother being present in the home. Voluntary runaways, regardless of gender, were more likely to have their father present in their home (21 versus 13).

An interesting trend was that female involuntary runaways were 5 times more likely to be sexually abused than any other group of runaway youths ($\chi^2 (1) = 3.01, p < .08$). These effects were not statistically significant for sexual abuse. Many of these adolescents did not report any abuse in their home.

Suicide. There were no significant differences in suicide attempts based on runaway status. Females reported more attempts than male runaways ($\chi^2 (1) = 4.23, p < .05$) (8 females compared to 2 males). This finding is consistent with most of the literature on suicide (Warren et al., 1997).

Discussion

Runaway Status Differences

One of the surprising findings from this study is the lack of differences that were found between the voluntary and involuntary runaways. Perhaps, the way that Project Oz defines voluntary and involuntary runaways accounts for the limited differences that emerged. Project Oz defines involuntary runaways as those youths who are locked out of their home. One of the problems with researching the

runaway population is that there is no general consensus defining the terms for voluntary and involuntary runaways. There are many factors that may influence the definition of typologies of runaways (Levine et al., 1986). For example, age, presence or absence of parental permission, length of time away from home, and intentions of the runaway. Another way that runaways are defined is by the youths subjective self-reports as to why they left home.

As hypothesized, females in the unselected sample were more likely to be voluntary runaways than males. This finding was consistent with the results of Warren et al., (1997). They found that 65% of voluntary runaways were female. In this present study, I found that 84% of the females were considered voluntary runaways. Females are more likely to be abused when they are adolescents than males (Garbarino, 1984) which may account for more female voluntary runaways.

There are reasons to suspect sex differences between runaways because some evidence suggests that males primarily leave home due to parent child conflict, whereas females leave home due to a lack of warmth and affection and pressure from their parents to force their daughters to assume their social roles (Adams et al., 1995). Another reason that there may be more voluntary female runaways is that females may want to try 'save' their family. Mirkin, Raskin, and Antogninn (1984; cited in Coco & Courtney, 1998) described a pattern in which female runaways may be seeking to maintain or protect the parent's marriage by uniting them around their dysfunctional behavior.

Males were slightly more likely to be involuntary runaways (30%) than females (15%). This finding was not necessarily surprising and is consistent with findings from past research (Levine et al., 1986; Miller, 1987; Warren et al., 1997). I expect it is likely that males would be more likely to be "thrown out" of their home because social roles make it seem more acceptable than "throwing out" a female

youth. Traditionally, females are seen as very dependent and weak without support, whereas males are supposed to be dominant and thrive on their own.

Contrasting to much research, there were no significant differences in the age of the voluntary or involuntary runaways. This finding is incongruous with past research that reflects that involuntary runaways tend to be older than voluntary runaways (Adams et al., 1985; Warren et al., 1997). Past research indicates that 60% of the voluntary runaway youths are under the age of 16 (Warren et al., 1997), whereas 79% of the involuntary runaways are between the age of 15 and 17 (Adams et al., 1985). In my study we found that the average age of both runaway groups was about 15 years old. The lack of age differences may be accounted for by the way that Project Oz defines voluntary and involuntary runaways. Project Oz defines a throwaway as someone who is considered a 'lockout.' This occurs when a parent does not allow their child back in the home. For many of the lockouts, this is only a short term event.

The results of school attendance and truancy also revealed few significant findings. I hypothesized that both groups would have high levels of truancy. Overall, 59.3% of the runaways had truancy issues which was similar to the findings of Levine and associates (1986). In general, runaways youth are less likely to attend school and more likely to drop out than the general population (Kurtz et al., 1991). Runaway youth may experience a wide range of difficulties in the school system. They may experience poor school attendance, as well as difficulty with grades.

Although there were few significant differences between runaway status and school status, involuntary male runaways were slightly more likely to drop out of school than voluntary males. This finding is consistent with the results of Levine et al. (1986) which found that involuntary runaways are more likely drop out of school. Another reason that involuntary youths may be more likely to drop out of

school is because they feel less allegiance to social rules. If they feel that their parents do not care about them, then the youth may carry that resentment into other areas of his life, such as dropping out of school or becoming involved in delinquent activities.

There were significant differences in the amount of juvenile court involvement between voluntary and involuntary runaway. Involuntary runaways were more likely to commit crimes than voluntary, which is similar to the findings of Ringwalt and associates (1998). This may be because involuntary runaways have been rejected both from the family and the educational system. Although, involuntary runaways were exhibited problems with family and school, past research suggests that they typically have quite a few friends (Ringwalt et al., 1998). The friends, however, are apt to be involved in delinquent behaviors. Perceiving themselves as not wanted at home, it is hardly surprising that their allegiance to social norms is attenuated. It does not seem inconceivable that throwaway youths were more likely to engage in self destructive behaviors.

Another possible explanation for the increased number of involuntary runaways involved in juvenile crimes is that they may be committing these crimes before they are kicked out of their home. Their parents may feel that they have no choice but to kick their child out of the home due to thier out of control behaviors. These youths may be causing trouble long before they are being kicked out of the home.

The involuntary females were more likely to commit crimes than voluntary females. Both voluntary and involuntary males had similar rates of delinquency. The findings were unexpected and inconsistent to most past research which suggests that males have a higher rate of delinquency, with offenses committed by females usually being of a less serious offense (Hier et al., 1990). The involuntary females

were involved in more domestic violence cases as involuntary males. Voluntary runaways were not involved in any domestic violence cases. The involuntary youth are getting charged with abusing someone within their family (usually the mother). One possible explanation is that those youths that are being thrown out of their home have been causing problems within the home for a long time. The parents may feel as if they really have no choice but to kick the child out of the home.

The high rates of juvenile delinquency within the involuntary runaways status could be accounted for by biological (predisposition toward aggression and criminal behavior), psychological theories (juvenile lacks internal controls), and the drift theory (offenders are not different from those who do not offend, they choose to commit crime when they lack control). Much research supports the view that involuntary runaways are abused for more prolonged periods of time, as well as more neglected than other runaways (Hier et al., 1990). This may be why involuntary females are involved in juvenile court as the victims more often than voluntary females.

Although the runaway youth in this study reported rates above that of the general population of adolescence, this is lower than reported in prior studies of runaways. (Greene et al., 1997; Fisher et al., 1992; Zimet et al., 1995). The lower than expected frequencies could have been due to a number of different factors. I think that a primary reason that reported rates were lower was due to the fact that the youths had to report the amount of usage and may have feared getting in trouble or their parent finding out. The safety assessment is also frequently given in front of their parents. Another reason might have been that drug use in the area may be lower than in the larger cities in which most research is conducted. Zimet and associates (1995) conducted a study of Midwestern runaway drug use. They found

that the reported levels were significantly lower than exhibited in other areas of this country.

It was expected that runaways would have poor family relations. Seventy-four percent of youth's primary reason for leaving home was not getting along with their parents (Adams et al., 1985). Unfortunately, the safety assessment form that is utilized at Project Oz does not include in depth assessment about family relations.

The main concern about family relation on the safety assessment form is abuse. Overall, I found that there were very low reported rates of abuse. I am attributing these low rates to the youth choice to not divulge the information, as well as the intake counselor's choice to not probe for more information. Past research suggests that there are high rates of abuse, especially within the involuntary female runaway subgroup. Familial abuse is the second leading reason why youths choose to leave home (Gullotta et al., 1985). An unforeseen trend was that involuntary females were 5 times more likely to be sexually abused than any other group of runaways. The gender difference can be explained by the increased likelihood that females will be sexually abused than males. The runaway status difference can be explained by the differences in past abuse that the youth go through. Research suggests that involuntary runaways may go through more abuse than voluntary runaways. The involuntary youths have been rejected from their family through past abuse and then are kicked out of their home. Therefore they have been through a lot of trauma and they may be less likely to adhere to social rules. This may be why involuntary youths may have higher rates of delinquency and poor school attendance.

I found that females were more likely to be involuntary runaways if their fathers were absent in their life. Voluntary runaways, overall, were more likely to have their father present in their home. This may suggest that when both parents

are in the home there may be more conflict in the home. Adams and associates (1985) found that there was a higher percentage of family discord in homes of involuntary runaways. Adams et al. (1985) examined the youths perceptions about their parents and found that involuntary runaways perceived their fathers as being more abusive than voluntary runaways. This supports the idea that involuntary runaways may be experiencing more abuse in the home.

Gender Differences

There were many significant gender differences. School was one factor in which there was a significant gender difference. Males were more likely to have dropped out of school than females. This finding may be explained by males being more likely to break social norms than females. The males in our selected sample were older than the females. I would think that with increased age, a youth is more likely to drop out of school.

Many runaway youth use drugs and alcohol as a means to cope with their difficulties. Drug use was significantly higher in male runaways than females. These findings were similar to Greene et al. (1997), who found that males were more likely to use drugs than females. This finding may be attributed to the age difference that was found in the selected sample. Higher rates of substance abuse are found with increases in age.

Furthermore, I found that females, regardless of runaway status, are more likely to have attempted suicide than males. This finding is not surprising and is consistent with past research (Warren et al., 1997). Females are more likely to feel depressed. Statistics show that females are three times more likely to attempt suicide than males.

Discussion of the lack of differences

I was very surprised at the scarcity of differences between the two subgroups

of runaways. I think that this can be accounted for in at least two different ways. First, there is a difference between short term runaways and those runaways that are considered street kids. The population that I analyzed was mainly comprised of youths that would fall into the short term runaways category. The runaways that Project Oz typically deal with are only out of the home for a couple of days. I think that runaways that are considered 'street kids' are more likely to be involved in risky behaviors. Street kids are actually out on the street for long periods of time. The runaway adolescents in my sample are primarily youth who are dealing with issues but are also returning to the family.

I think a second reason that the findings are not as distinct is due to location of the runaway population. I am suggesting that runaway youths in a Midwestern city (i.e., short term runaways) may have a different profile than those runaways in New York, Los Angeles and San Francisco (i.e., street kids), regardless of runaway status. Zimet et al. (1985) conducted a study on Midwestern runaway prevalence of drug use and found a deficit in the use of substances, such as drugs and alcohol. Youths who runaway in the Midwest may not be engaging in the typical behaviors that runaways from larger cities are engaging in. Much of the past research has been conducted on street kids in larger cities. The research on those youths indicate high frequency of risky behaviors, such as drugs, sex, and delinquency. This may suggest that long term runaways from larger cities may engage in more risky behaviors than those runaways in my selected sample.

Implications

I think that one of the biggest implications is that we need to identify subgroups of runaways. There should be a larger study which compares Midwestern to larger city runaways. The study could look at length of time away from home.

One of the shortcomings of this study is the lack of assessment on family

relations. I think that family dynamics should be examined more closely. "The phenomenon of runaway youth is conceptualized to be a dynamic, complex, interdependent process of actions and reactions that pertain to an ongoing intrafamilial and social conflict (Stephanides, 1992; cited in Warren et al., 1997). Lappin and Covelman (1985; cited in Coco & Courtney, 1998), developed a model that examines runaways behaviors. They view running away as a symptom of the family's difficulty dealing with the adolescent's separation and individuation. I think that it is important to examine in-depth the family dynamics of these runaway youths. I think that Project Oz, as well as similar agencies, need to gather more information of family relations.

Runaway adolescents have a higher than normal drop out rate. The educational system should be better involved. The majority of the runaways youths are dropping out of school or dealing with truancy, as well as court involvement. These youths are also dealing with conflict within the family. I think that schools could play a key role in intervening in potential runaway situations. Runaway behavior of youths threatens their educational and vocational selections since they are lacking the information and support services that could provide an avenue for knowledge and possibly behavioral changes. If the school could give them some extra support then maybe the youths could change their runaway behaviors.

Limitations

There are some limitations of this study that need to be considered. First, all of the data gathered and analyzed was archival data. Therefore, I really had no control over the data or the data collection process. Some of the information may have been skewed based on the way that the intake worker asked the questions or in the way that the youth interpreted the question. I think the biggest flaw for using archival data in this study was that there were no information collected on attitudes

or beliefs. It would have been very beneficial to gather some information about their family relations and dynamics. Although, the archival data showed to be very beneficial because it allowed me to use a larger sample than I would have been able to collect on my limited time.

Also, I had to base all of my information self report data. This may have introduced limitations in information because some youths may have felt intimidated or afraid to tell the truth in fear of getting in trouble. An example of a question that may have intimidated a youth was the question that looks at drug use. Some youths may not want to admit that they are using illegal drugs or alcohol in fear of getting in trouble.

Future Research

I think that future research needs to be conducted in which short term and long term runaways are compared to see if there are differences in these groups of runaways. The data that is gathered should be retrieved through structured in-depth interviews, in order to get some information of attitudes and beliefs. I think that a study similar to this would be able to give important information on how to deal with these youths.

I think one of the most important variables that needs to be studied more extensively is family relations. It seems that from that past research, my clinical experiences, and minimal information from the intake form that most of the problems deal with long term family conflict. I think that attachment and social support should be examined, specifically within the two typologies of voluntary and involuntary runaways. It would be valuable to identify the family stressors that provoke parents to abuse their children and cause them to runaway.

In conclusion, this present research has provided evidence that these youths are coming from backgrounds of poor school attendance, delinquency, and drug use.

Although there were not many significant findings with regard to runaways status, I think that involuntary runaways may be more involved in risky behaviors than voluntary. The runaway youth are going to the streets with little or no support. As the number of runaway youth continues to increase, it is more critical than ever to make better attempts to prevent the breakdown of the family.

References

- Adams, G. R., Gullotta, T., Clancy, M. A.. (1985). Homeless adolescents: a descriptive study of similarities and differences between runaways and throwaways. Adolescence, 20, 79, 715-724.
- Armsden, G. C., Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, 5, 427-454.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: an integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), Attachment Theory and Close Relationships, pp. 46-76, New York: Guilford.
- Brennan, T., Huizinga, D., Elliott, D. (1980). The social psychology of runaways. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Coco, E. L., Courtney, L. J. (1998). A family systems perspective for preventing adolescent runaway behavior. Adolescence, 33, 130, 485-497.
- Colin, V. L. (1996). Human Attachment. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Cooper, M. L., Shaver, P. R., Collins, N. L. (1998). Attachment styles, emotional regulation, and adjustment in adolescence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 5, 1380-1396.
- Furman, W., Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of the personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 21, 6, 1016-1024.
- Greene, Jody M., Ennett, Susan T., Ringwalt, Christopher L. (1997). Substance use among runaway and homeless youth in three national samples. The American Journal of Public Health, 87, 2, 229-236.
- Hawley, E.. (1995). Sociometric status, antisocial behaviors, and deviant peer involvement as contributors to relationship quality in the relationship of adolescent

females and their same-sex best friends and boyfriends.

Hier, S. J., Korboot, P. J., Schweitzer, R. D. (Social adjustment and symptomology in tow types of homeless adolescent: runaways and throwaways. Adolescence, 25, 100, 761-771.

Isaacs, Florence. (1997). Mean streets: what makes good kids run away from home. Parents Magazine, 72, 9, 121-4.

Jones, L. P. (1988). A typology of adolescent. Child and Adolescent Social Work, 5, 1, 16-28.

Kurtz, P. D., Jarvis, S. V., Kurtz, G.. (1991). Problems of homeless youths: empirical findings and human service issues. Social Work, 36, 4, 309-316.

Kurtz, P. D., Kurtz, G. L., Jarvis, S. V. (1991). Problems of maltreated youth. Adolescence, 26, 103, 543-555.

Lappin, J. Covelman, D. W. (1985). Adolescent runaways: A structural family therapy perspective. In M.P. Mirkin & S. L. Korean (Eds.), Handbook of adolescent and family therapy. New York: Gardner Press.

Levine, R. S., Metzendorf, D., VanBoskirk, K. A. (1986). Runaway and throwaway youth: a case for early intervention with truants. Social Work in Education, 25, 93-106.

Miller, M. (1987). Runaway vs. throwaway adolescents: demographics, historical crises, and perceptions of family environment. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.

Mirkin, M. P., Raskin, P. A., Antognini, F. C. (1984). Parenting, protecting, and preserving: Mission of the adolescent female runaway. Family Process, 23, 63-74.

Peretti, P. O., Purham, C. Escapist and throwaway runaways'. Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18, 3-6.

Post, P., McCoard, D. (1994). Needs and self-concept of runaway adolescents. The School Counselor, 41, 212-220.

Ringwalt, C. L., Greene, J. M., Robertson, M. J. (1998). Familial backgrounds and risk behaviors of youth with throwaway experiences. Journal of Adolescence, 21, 3, 241-252.

Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Meyer-Bahlburg, H. F. L., Koopman, C., Rosario, M., Exner, T. M., Henderson, R., Matthieu, M., Gruen, R. S. (1992). Lifetime sexual behaviors among runaway males and females. The Journal of Sex Research, 29, 1, 15-29.

Speck, N. B., Ginther, D. W., Helton, J. R. (1988). Runaways: who will run away again? Adolescence, 23, 92, 881-8.

Spillane-Grieco, E. (1984). Characteristics of a helpful relationship: a study of empathic understanding and positive regard between runaways and their parents. Adolescence, 19, 73, 63-75.

Stefandis, N., Pennbridge, J., MacKenzie, R. G., Pottharst, K. (1991). Runaway and homeless youth: the effects of attachment history on stabilization. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62, 3, 442-6.

Warren, J. K., Gary, F. A., Moorhead, J. (1997). Runaway youths in a southern community: four critical areas of inquiry. Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 10, 2, 26-36.

White, J. L. (1989). Running away. The Troubled Adolescent (pp. 75-110). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Zimet, G. D., Sobo, E. J., Zimmerman, T., Jackson, J., Mortimer, J., Yanda, C. P., Lazebnik, R. (1995). Sexual behavior, drug use, and AIDS knowledge among Midwestern runaways. Youth and Society, 26, 4, 450-462.

Table 1

Number of Voluntary and Involuntary Runaways

	<u>Voluntary</u>	<u>Involuntary</u>
Males	65	28
Females	133	26

Table 2

Frequency of Juvenile Court Involvements for Involuntary and Voluntary Males and Females

	<u>Voluntary</u>		<u>Involuntary</u>	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Court Involvement	14	02	15	12
No Court Involvement	13	24	12	14

Appendix A

PROJECT OZ INTAKE FORM

FEE FOR SERVICE \$ _____

Client's Name _____ Case Number _____

Intake Staff _____ Date _____ Time _____

Staff Assigned _____ Date of Contact _____

Contact Person _____ Phone Number _____

Referral Agency _____ Crisis _____ Non-Crisis _____

INFORMATION ON YOUTH:

Address _____ City _____ State _____

Phone Number _____ Date of Birth _____

Age _____ Sex _____ Grade _____ Ethnicity _____

Hair Color _____ Eye Color _____ Height _____ Weight _____

Religion _____ Distinguishing Marks _____

Last/Present School _____ Transportation To/From: _____

Employed _____

Legal Guardian _____

PARENTS IN HOME:

_____ Father _____

_____ Mother _____

Address _____

Phone Number _____ Occupation _____

Family Background _____

OTHERS IN HOME:

Name	Age	Relationship
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____

Appendix B

Project Oz Youth Safety Assessment

Client Name _____ Date _____ Project Oz Staff _____

Runaway issues: Have you runaway before? _____ How many times? _____
Are you currently on run? _____ How long on run? _____

Suicide Issues: Do you currently feel like hurting yourself? _____
(if yes, consult CHS for assessment 827-5351)
If you feel like hurting yourself, do you have a plan? _____

Have you attempted suicide in the past? _____

Have you ever been hospitalized for a psychiatric issue? _____
(e.g. depression, manic/depression, etc.)

Homicide Issues: Do you feel like hurting or killing someone? _____
(if yes, consult CHS for assessment 827-5351. Also notify police, and if possible the intended victim.)

Abuse/Neglect Issues: Have you been hurt by someone in the past? _____
If yes, how? _____
Are you currently being hurt by someone? _____
If yes, how? _____
Has anyone ever inappropriately touched you in a sexual manner? _____
If yes, in what manner? _____
Do you have food, clothing, and shelter? _____

(Please note that if a client reports abuse/neglect a report to the D.C.F.S. hotline should be reported 1-800-25ABUSE. If in doubt call YIP coordinator.)

Drug/Alcohol Issues: Have you in the past, or are you now using drugs or alcohol? _____
If yes, what and how often? _____

(if client is under the influence of drugs or alcohol call Chestnut for a possible drug/alcohol assessment. 827-6026)

School Issues: Are you currently in school? _____
Have you ever been truant or suspended? _____
If not in school, last grade attended? _____

Gang Issues: Are you, or have you been gang involved? _____

Court Issues: Have you ever been involved with the Juvenile Court? _____
If yes, in what manner? _____

Appendix C

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	IWU id#	where from?	employed	mother	father	parent status	# siblings
2		1=bloomington	1= yes	1= yes	1= yes	1=married	
3		2=normal	2 =no	2 =no	2 =no	2=divorced	
4		3=Dewitt Cty		3=step	3=step		
5		4=McLean Cty		4=both	4=both		
6		5=Sangamon		5=adopted	5=adopted		
7		6=Livingston					
8		7=Other state					

	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	youth kids	agency contact	previois oz	#times	previous run	times	current on run
2	1= yes	1= yes	1= yes		1= yes		1= yes
3	2 =no	2 =no	2 =no		2 =no		2 =no
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							

	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U
1	suicide	past suicide	homicide	past abuse	how?	current abuse	how?
2	1= yes	1= yes	1= yes	1= yes	1=N/A	1= yes	1=N/A
3	2 =no	2 =no	2 =no	2 =no	2=physical	2 =no	2=physical
4					3=sexual		3=sexual
5					4=emotional		4=emotional
6							
7							
8							

	V	W	X	Y	Z	A A	A B
1	sex abuse	neglect	drugs/alcohol	drug type	school status	truant/susp	last grade
2	1= yes	1= yes	1= yes	1=drugs	1=currently in	1=yes	
3	2 =no	2 =no	2 =no	2=alcohol	2=dropped out	2=no	
4				3=both	3=expelled		
5				4=n/a	4=alternative		
6							
7							
8							

	A C	A D	A E	A F
1	gang	juv court	what?	
2	1=yes	1=yes	1=n/a	
3	2=no	2=no	2=theft	
4			3=battery	
5			4=domestic violence	
6				
7				
8				