

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Theses

Theses & Dissertations

1987

St. Charles County Juvenile Court Diversion Programs

Charles W. Hortmeier

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/theses>



Part of the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

ABSTRACT

It has been theorized that the less formal and penetrating a youngster's contact with the Juvenile Justice System, the smaller his or her likelihood of continued delinquency. Based on this premise, known as labeling theory, the Juvenile Court of St. Charles County established several "diversion" programs to curb delinquent conduct among juvenile offenders.

This thesis is an in-depth study of these programs' effects on recidivism rates among juvenile delinquents. Court records spanning a period of 3 years were reviewed, providing the data for this research. The subjects studied were 15-year-old delinquents treated in one of three diversion programs in 1985, along with a control group.

Results showed that though most juveniles

An Abstract Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Lindenwood College in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts associated with escalating delinquency in those who did reoffend, whereas more intensive treatment was associated with lower rates of recidivism.

1987

112517
H7885
1988

ABSTRACT

It has been theorized that the less formal and penetrating a youngster's contact with the Juvenile Justice System, the smaller his or her likelihood of continued delinquency. Based on this premise, known as labeling theory, the Juvenile Court of St. Charles County established several "diversion" programs to curb delinquent conduct among juvenile offenders.

This thesis was an in-depth study of these programs' effects on recidivism rates among juvenile delinquents. Court records spanning a period of 3 years were reviewed, providing the data for this research. The subjects studied were 15-year-old delinquents treated in one of three diversion programs in 1985, along with a control group.

Results showed that though most juvenile offenders did not reoffend regardless of their treatment, minimal involvement by the Court was associated with escalating delinquency in those who did reoffend, whereas more intensive treatment was associated with lower rates of recidivism.

ST. CHARLES COUNTY JUVENILE COURT
DIVERSION PROGRAMS

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Member: Assistant Professor Nancy Higgins

Member: ~~Chairperson and Advisor~~
CHARLES W. HORSTMEIER, B.S.

Member: Professor James D. Evans

Member: Craig Voorhees, Ph.D.

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of Lindenwood College in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts

1987

Table of Contents	
	page
Table 1. Delinquency Theories	8
Table 2. Accepted Correctional Interventions	10
Table 3. Street Law Group: Number and Type of Offenses	35
Table 4. Street Law Group: Severity of Offenses	38
Table of Contents	
Table 5. Street Law Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	40
Table 6. Community Service Group: Number and Type of Offenses	42
Table 7. Community Service Group: Severity of Offenses	page
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Table 8. Community Service Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	40
Chapter II: Literature Review	4
Chapter III: Method	26
Table 9. Family Therapy Group: Number and Type of Offenses	26
Chapter IV: Results	34
Table 10. Family Therapy Group: Severity of Offenses	34
Chapter V: Discussion	69
References	84
Table 11. Family Therapy Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	84
Appendix A: Community Service/Restitution	87
Table 12. Control Group: Number and Type of Offenses	87
Appendix B: Street Law	92
Table 13. Control Group: Severity of Offenses	92
Table 14. Control Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	92
Table 15. Group Comparison: Number of Offenses per Subject	95
Table 16. Group Comparison: Severity of Offenses	96

Table 17. Group List of Tables Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses		page
Table 1.	Delinquency Theories	8
Table 2.	Accepted Correctional Interventions	10
Table 3.	Street Law Group: Number and Type of Offenses	35
Table 4.	Street Law Group: Severity of Offenses	38
Table 5.	Street Law Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	40
Table 6.	Community Service Group: Number and Type of Offenses	42
Table 7.	Community Service Group: Severity of Offenses	45
Table 8.	Community Service Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	48
Table 9.	Family Therapy Group: Number and Type of Offenses	51
Table 10.	Family Therapy Group: Severity of Offenses	53
Table 11.	Family Therapy Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	54
Table 12.	Control Group: Number and Type of Offenses	56
Table 13.	Control Group: Severity of Offenses	60
Table 14.	Control Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses	62
Table 15.	Group Comparison: Number of Offenses per Subject	65
Table 16.	Group Comparison: Severity of Offenses	66

Table 17. Group Comparison: Combined
Frequency and Severity of Offenses

68

INTRODUCTION

It has been theorized that the less formal and penetrating a youngster's contact with the juvenile justice system, the smaller his or her likelihood of continued delinquency (Binder & Binder, 1983; Bry, 1982; Johnson, Bird & Little, 1979; Fu & Blew, 1977). In an effort to divert juveniles away from formal processing and commitment to state institutions, juvenile authorities have attempted to develop alternative programs that stress treatment within the community and utilization of community resources. This trend follows in large part passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, which authorized the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice to fund and give technical assistance to local governments for the creation and operation of "delinquency prevention programs." Section 102.(b) of this act states,

It is therefore the further declared policy of Congress to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination; (1) to develop and implement effective methods of preventing

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

and reducing juvenile delinquency, including methods of special focus on maintaining and strengthening the family unit so that juveniles be retained in their homes; (2) to develop and conduct delinquency, to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system, the smaller his or her likelihood of continued delinquency (Binder & Binder, 1983; Bry, 1982; Johnson, Bird & Little, 1979; Ku & Blew, 1977). In an effort to divert juveniles away from formal processing and the commitment to state institutions, juvenile authorities have attempted to develop alternative programs that stress treatment within the community and utilization of community resources. This trend follows in large part passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, which authorized the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice to fund and give technical assistance to local governments for the creation and operation of "delinquency prevention programs." Section 102.(b) of this act states, It is therefore the further declared policy of Congress to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination; (1) to develop and implement effective methods of preventing

and reducing juvenile delinquency, at least a including methods with a special focus on maintaining and strengthening the family unit so that juveniles may be retained in their homes; (2) to develop and conduct effective programs to prevent delinquency, to divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system and to provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization; (3) to improve the quality of juvenile justice in the United States; and (4) to increase the capacity of state and local governments and public and private agencies to conduct effective juvenile justice and the delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs and to provide research, evaluation, and training services in the field of juvenile delinquency prevention. the (p. 1268)

Since 1983, three diversion programs have been in use by the Juvenile Court of St. Charles County, Missouri. These include the Street Law program, the Community Service/Restitution program, and a family therapy program. The intent of each of these programs was to prevent any further delinquency by the juveniles who took part in them.

These programs are designed to make certain changes in the family of the juvenile or in the juvenile himself or herself. These changes are intended to reduce further delinquency by correcting some existing condition that is

believed to have been the cause of, or at least a contributing factor in, the particular act of delinquency which brought the juvenile delinquent to the attention of the Court. To date, there has been no evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs.

The purpose of this study was to take a critical look at each of these programs and the program participants in an effort to determine if there has been any reduction in delinquency on the part of the youths who participated in the programs. The study reported herein was done through a review of Juvenile Court records, spanning a period of three years, and through measuring delinquency as a function of reported and substantial violations of the Missouri Juvenile Code, Section 211.031, subsections 2 and 3 (1978). These sections are concerned with behavior that constitutes violations of criminal statutes and other behavior that is deemed to be injurious to the welfare of the juvenile.

on the one hand and program development, practice, and evaluation on the other (J. V. Flackensauer, personal communication, July 29, 1986). Most

evaluation done to CHAPTER II
policy rather than LITERATURE REVIEW extent that
theory Corrections: Theory and Practice knowledge of
these The field of juvenile delinquency correction
is relatively rich in theory. The various
theories of delinquency attempt to define just
what it is that causes delinquent behavior (Hall,
1982; Hawkins, Pastor, Bell & Morrison, 1980;
Johnson et al., 1979). But not surprisingly,
despite all the theoretical work, no simple
definitive answers to explain what causes
delinquency have emerged. In addition, the
research needed to test the theories has been very
limited.
Despite these failures to refine or enhance
our understanding of this phenomenon, the juvenile
justice field is overflowing with programs
intended to prevent or control the incidence of
delinquency and to treat or correct the youthful
offenders. Unfortunately, there has been a great
gulf between delinquency theory and research on
the one hand and program development, practice,
and evaluation on the other (J. O. Finckenauer,
personal communication, July 29, 1986). Most the

evaluation done to date looks at practice or policy rather than theory. To the extent that theory is not consciously tested, our knowledge of theory and practice must remain limited. This lack of research is due in part to a lack of funds and to the confidentiality of the Juvenile Courts (Missouri Juvenile Code, 1978). Sadly, it is also due in part to the lack of a perceived need for evaluation and possibly even fear of evaluation. Most juvenile correction is done under the authority of state or local governmental agencies. Whether these agencies work under the authority of a Governor or under a judicial officer, politics can not be separated from corrections. By this I mean that in general the delinquency programs that are being funded and staffed are those that are "politically popular." An example in point is the popular "scared straight" programs now in operation from coast to coast. Though these have been shown to have no lasting correctional effect (J. O. Finckenauer, personal communication, July 29, 1986), they remain in place. The reason for this is that they are politically popular. To the

layman, scared straight just sounds like a good idea. (Johnson et al., 1979). Though not
exhaustive, as often as not, treatment programs evolve from some folksy notion of delinquency rather than any accepted theory of delinquency. These programs generally do not specify which causes of delinquency they address in order to accomplish their objectives. Causal assumptions about why a particular approach is supposed to work are either totally absent or are only implicit. This absence of linkage to any theory may also account, in part, for many agencies' ready acceptance of simplistic, punitive solutions to the problem of juvenile corrections (Traitel, 1974).
Admittedly, the relationship between theory and practice is complex and difficult to assess. Evaluation is essential, however. Without evaluation, the field of juvenile corrections will remain ignorant not only of why unsuccessful programs fail, but of why successful programs succeed (Hepburn, 1977).
Delinquency causation theories are generally divided into two categories. These are theories pertaining to individual factors and theories

pertaining to social factors (Hawkins et al., 1980; Johnson et al., 1979). Though not exhaustive, Table 1 lists many current delinquency causation theories.

One would think that logical interventions could be derived from these theories in an effort to prevent or treat delinquency. The law and the Courts, however, do not generally follow scientific principles, but the demands of the public. "Treatment" must also consider the best interests of the victim and the state. Consider for example the mainstay of adult corrections, fines and incarceration. There is no question that these are intended to punish. Yet, learning theory states punishment is seldom effective as a behavior modifier, and only so when it is immediate and severe (Rossner, 1984). These punishments are seldom severe and never immediate.

Interventions then should follow whatever theory or theories of correction to which the practitioner ascribes. If we believe that delinquency is genetically determined, then we should treat it with chemotherapy. If we believe the cultural deviance theory we should create a

Table 1 illustrates society, equally distributing the
Delinquency Causation Theories society. Table 2
 illustrates some accepted interactions associated
 with Individual Factors and Social Factors table.

-
- Genetic or impossible Differential
 - Hormonesory. For exampl Association/Symbolic
 - Structural Brain (ety)? Interactionismall
 - Pathology institutions Control as equality
 - Ecological Factors Cultural Deviance
 - Learning Disabilities Strain/Opportunity
 - Behavioral learning Labeling
 - Criminal Personality Family Dysfunction
 - Psychoanalytic
 - Moral Development

Adolescent Diversion Project, University of
 Illinois, Urbana and Champaign, was given the
 label of "Exemplary" by the National Institute of
 Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Elliott et al.,
 1977). This project spanned a three-year period
 in which it was run by the University of Illinois.
 This project represents one of the few that has
 had an experimental design. Delinquents were

socialistic society, equally distributing the wealth among all members of the society. Table 2 illustrates some accepted interventions associated with the theories listed in the previous table. Many of these accepted interventions are impractical or impossible, and often contradictory. For example, should we treat the individual or society? Should we close all correctional institutions? Is human equality possible?

Following are some formalized interventions aimed at correcting delinquent behavior. These represent a small fraction of the many hundreds of programs found in the United States.

Diversion Programs Based on Labeling Theory

The Adolescent Diversion Project. The Adolescent Diversion Project of the University of Illinois, Urbana and Champaign, was given the label of "Exemplary" by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Ku et al., 1977). This project spanned a three year period in which it was run by the University of Illinois. This project represents one of the few that has had an experimental design. Delinquents were

Table 2 Accepted Correctional InterventionsAccepted Correctional Interventions

Theories	Interventions
Genetic	Chemotherapy
Hormones	None
Structural Brain Pathology	None
Ecological Factors	Chemotherapy, Diet, Megavitamin Therapy
Learning Disabilities	Special Education
Behavioral Learning	Behavior Contracting
Criminal Personality	Intensive Individual & Group Therapies
Psychoanalytic	Psychoanalysis
Moral Development	Moral Education
Differential Association/ Symbolic Interaction	Group Therapy
Control	Strengthen Social Bonds
Cultural Deviance	Integrate Social Classes
Strain/Opportunity	"War on Poverty"

(table continues)

Theories the project by Interventions

Chicago Police Department and 1000 divorced

Labeling and court process Deinstitutionalization,
randomly assigned to experimental Minimum Involvement

Family Dysfunction and Family Therapy. In year

3, no specific intervention was given members of

the experimental group. In year 3, one of two

"specific strategies" was assigned by members of

the experimental group. In an effort to assess

the impact of the project on divorced youngsters,

a non-treated control group was being created

three groups in all. Members of the control group

received no services and were left in the

community (Ku et al., 1977).

In year 3, members of the experimental group

were paired with student volunteers. Each pair

spent several weeks together to develop a

relationship. The volunteer then assessed the

needs and problems of the juvenile and developed a

treatment program for her or him using one or a

combination of techniques (specific strategies)

known as behavioral contracting and child advocacy

(Ku et al., 1977).

Cooperative data were collected before,

referred to the project by the Urbana and Champaign Police Departments and thus diverted from normal court processing. These youths were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups in years 2 and 3 of this project. In year 2, no specific intervention was given members of the experimental group. In year 3, one of two "specific strategies" was assigned to members of the experimental group. In an effort to assess the impact of the project on diverted youngsters, a non-treated control group was used, creating three groups in all. Members of the control group received no services and were released to the community (Ku et al., 1977). In year 3, members of the experimental group were paired with student volunteers. Each pair spent several weeks together to establish a relationship. The volunteer then assessed the needs and problems of the juvenile and developed a treatment program for her or him using one or a combination of techniques (specific strategies) known as behavioral contracting and child advocacy (Ku et al., 1977).

Comparative data were collected before,

during, and after, each intervention. Results showed a significant decrease in delinquent conduct in the experimental group as compared with the control group (Ku et al., 1977). The second year data showed significant improvement by the experimental group even though no specific intervention was given. Implicit in this study is labeling theory. That is, the youths' behavior improved simply because they were removed from the correctional system and thus not labeled delinquent (Clarke, 1985; Vinter, 1976; Wink, 1974). In year 3, some combination of behavioral contracting and child advocacy was the treatment given the experimental group. One or more of these treatments were given to members of the treatment group. Treatment assignment was not systematic, however, and which subject got what treatment and why was unclear. These treatments would seem to follow the behavioral learning and control theories respectively as shown previously in Table 2 (Clarke, 1985; Vinter, 1976; Wink, 1974). Though the results were clear, the treatment

interventions responsible for the improved conduct were not. There was no clear linkage to any of theory of delinquency and no clear treatment. of The Key Tracking Plus Program. The Key Tracking Plus program, located in Springfield, on (Armstrong Massachusetts, could be said to have come about as a result of labeling theory (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982). Taking the concept of labeling theory to its limit, the state of Massachusetts closed all of its training schools for delinquents. This move drastically limited the states resources for dealing with serious juvenile offenders. Key Tracking Plus was one response to the newly created need for control of serious juvenile offenders. Key Tracking Plus combines intensive community tracking and broad supportive services with periods of highly restrictive residential confinement. So there is no confusion, the term "community tracking" is synonymous with surveillance (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982). Juvenile delinquents referred to this program are initially confined for a period of weeks, for the purpose of orientation, assessment, treatment

plan development, formulation of the community tracking behavioral contract, and initiation of needed services. Treatment during this phase of the program includes individual casework, family treatment, group therapy, and education (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982).
Following release from the facility, each youth is required to participate in structured group activities, weekly group therapy, and program-sponsored recreational and cultural activities. Additionally, he is required to attend school, job training, or work, and must comply with a curfew (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982).
Tracking accountability is based on multiple daily telephone calls regarding the juvenile's whereabouts, advanced scheduling for each 24-hour period, seven days a week, and unannounced spot checks by workers at any time and in any place. Additional supportive services and advocacy are offered to facilitate the personal growth of the juvenile, including psychiatric, psychological, educational, and vocational services. Success or failure of this program as shown through the

subjects' recidivism was not reported in this study (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982). In contrast to the Adolescent Diversion Project, this program seems to encompass nearly all theories of delinquency except labeling. It seems such a program, regardless of its success, would give us no more insight into delinquency causation than a program endorsing no theory of delinquency.

Street Law Programs

Street Law diversion programs are simple in concept and based on a cognitive theory of delinquency. Akin to moral development theories, these programs simply state that kids will obey the rules of society if they know what the rules are. National studies suggest that law related education does reduce a student's tendency to engage in delinquent behavior (U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985). Law in a Free Society project. Law in a Free Society is a project of the Center for Civic Education (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of

subjects' recidivism was not reported in this study (Armstrong & Altschuler, 1982). In contrast to the Adolescent Diversion Project, this program seems to encompass nearly all theories of delinquency except labeling. It seems such a program, regardless of its success, would give us no more insight into delinquency causation than a program endorsing no theory of delinquency.

Street Law Programs

Street Law diversion programs are simple in concept and based on a cognitive theory of delinquency. Akin to moral development theories, these programs simply state that kids will obey the rules of society if they know what the rules are. National studies suggest that law related education does reduce a student's tendency to engage in delinquent behavior (U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985). Law in a Free Society project. Law in a Free Society is a project of the Center for Civic Education (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985). This project is intended to help students develop (a) an increased understanding of the institutions of our constitutional democracy and the fundamental principles and values upon which they were founded, (b) the skills necessary to participate as responsible citizens, and (c) an understanding of and a willingness to use democratic processes when making decisions and managing conflict.

The curriculum, which is used in grades kindergarten through 12, is based on eight concepts fundamental to understanding our constitutional democracy. These are: authority, privacy, justice, responsibility, participation, property, diversity, and freedom (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985).

This project is not geared solely for the delinquent and is not truly a diversion program as it is presented in the public schools to all students. No effort has been made to assess its value in reducing delinquency. Some argue that such programs siphon the juvenile court's

National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law. The National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law is a non-profit organization dedicated to fostering understanding of the law and our legal system (U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985).

Among many other programs, this institute has developed a model program for the diversion of juvenile offenders from formal prosecution through a twelve week "Street Law" course. This program originated in the District of Columbia, where juvenile participants were shown to have a lower rate of recidivism than similar juveniles not enrolled.

Community Service/Restitution Programs

Like the Street Law programs, community service/restitution programs are based on a simple concept. This concept is that the juvenile offenders should pay their debt to society for their misdeeds. In short, they must be accountable for their actions (Maloney, Gilbean, Hoffard, Remington, & Steensan, 1983). Some argue that such programs slant the juvenile court's

purpose too much toward the best interest of the community at the expense of the best interest of the child (Rubin, 1986). A closer look at restitutive programs shows that they are more complex theoretically than they appear and are not geared toward effective treatment of the child. The juvenile who successfully completes assigned community service work may gain greater feelings of self-worth by making a positive contribution to society (cultural deviance model). This juvenile may work alongside a positive role model (control theory) and learn that responsible actions are rewarded by society and thus are preferable to irresponsible actions (behavioral learning theory) (Romig, 1983).

The 1987 National Directory of Juvenile Restitution Programs lists restitution programs found in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 279. This gives some indication of this concept's widespread use (Warner & Burke, 1987).

This directory shows that of the programs listed, 10% offer only monetary restitution, 15% offer only community services, and 75% offer both

financial and community service restitution (Warner & Burke, 1987). Rubin (1986) states that juvenile offenders performing restitution requirements tend to reoffend less frequently than juveniles who do not perform restitution. He further outlines what he feels to be the eight important stages relating to monetary restitution. These stages are as follows:

1. Notification of victim.
2. Receipt of victim claims.
3. Review of victim claims.
4. Recommendation of restitution amount.
5. Establishment of the restitution requirement.
6. Facilitating payments by juveniles.
7. Enforcement of juvenile defaults.
8. Disbursement to victims.

These stages, he states, must be presented in a formal and consistent manner for the effective operation of a restitution program.

The Operation Payback program of Cape Girardeau, Missouri. The Cape Girardeau County Juvenile Court instituted a community

services/restitution program in 1983, in response to a need for providing juvenile offenders with a constructive experience for accepting the information was given by the authors in this study

consequences of inappropriate behavior (Warner & Burke, 1987). Overseen by the Cape Girardeau County Juvenile Center's Probation Program, "Operation Payback" utilizes community agencies and private businesses as worksites for youth enrolled in the program. From January 1, 1985 to July 31, 1986, 121 offenders paid back to crime victims \$2,605.48 in actual money and performed 1,384 hours of community service. The authors gave no information on offender recidivism in this study.

The Payback restitution program of St. Louis, Missouri. The Junior League of St. Louis and the St. Louis County Juvenile Court jointly operate "Payback," a juvenile restitution program in St. Louis County (Warner & Burke, 1987). Since 1983, of the 120 juveniles placed at job sites, 83% have completed their restitution requirements. All of their earnings of \$16,110 were forwarded to the victims of their crimes.

There is presently no community service component to the program, but such is being sought for future operation. Again, no recidivism information was given by the authors in this study

(Warner & Burke, 1987). The community service and restitution program of Dayton, Ohio. The Montgomery County Juvenile Court's Community Service/Restitution Program was established in 1979 (Warner & Burke, 1987). This program targets 12- to 17-year-old youths. Reburn adjudicated delinquent for property, personal injury, or theft offenses. In fiscal year 1984-1985, the project received 464 referrals for restitution and community service. Over 250 victims of juvenile crime received \$36,415 in monetary compensation, while 10,451 hours of community service were performed. While community benefit is seen, client benefit is only speculative. Again, no rates of recidivism were given by the authors in this study (Warner & Burke, 1987).

Family Therapy

Family therapy has long been recognized as an effective change agent in human behavior (Minuchin, 1974). More recently, family therapy has proven to be an effective measure for reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency (Guarna, 1983). The theory is that the acting out juvenile

is only a symptom of a dysfunctional family system (Guarna, 1983; Minuchin, 1974), and if we can fix the family system, we will halt the child's acting out behavior.

A study by Hepburn (1977) looks at a number of theories of delinquency. Specifically, Hepburn examines alternative explanations of the causal structure between four variables: lack of family support, delinquent definitions, delinquent associates, and delinquent behavior. Depending on which of these precedes which, we can find evidence in support of the differential association theory, the social control theory, or the family dysfunction theory of delinquency. For example, if lack of family support precedes delinquent behavior, we have evidence for the family dysfunction theory. If, on the other hand, delinquent associates precedes the other variables, we find evidence supporting the social control theory. The study concludes that strong ties to the family tend to limit the extent of delinquent behavior, indicating support of the family dysfunction theory.

counseling with delinquents and their families.

The Sacramento County, California, Diversion Program. After two years of testing, the Sacramento County Diversion Program was accepted for use in that county in 1972. In 1974, the program was selected as an Exemplary Project by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Baron & Feeny, 1976).

This project concentrated originally on the status offenders (runaways, truants, etc.) referred to that Court. The program stressed early and immediate intervention and family counseling. Later, the program was expanded to include delinquent offenders. A study of this program found that for both status and delinquent offenders, recidivism was lower than for control groups (Baron & Feeny, 1976)

The family therapy program of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The Montgomery County and Juvenile Court established a family therapy program for delinquent youths referred to that Court in 1980 (Guarna, 1983). In the previous year probation officers from that court were trained in the utilization of family counseling with delinquents and their families.

The intent of this program, among other things, was to reduce recidivism. A study of program effectiveness showed that 83% of the project youth had a decreased rate of involvement with the Juvenile Justice System both during and within one year following participation in the program (Guarna, 1983).

Research of the Hypothesis
The St. Charles County Juvenile Court operates three diversion programs for delinquent youth. The three programs relate to three different theories of delinquency. The assumption in this thesis was that there is no one correct theory of delinquency, but that delinquency has many causes and will respond to many different treatments. The hypothesis, therefore, was that each of the treatments, community service, street law, and family therapy, would be effective in reducing recidivism among delinquent youth, when compared to a control condition involving no formal treatment. Experimental and control groups for this study were created from this pool of subjects.

selected for participation. CHAPTER III The study had to meet the following criteria: METHOD

1. The subjects Subjects 15 years of age at the time. A total of 71 subjects were used in the study. Of these, 153 were male and 18 were female. All subjects were 15 years of age and all subjects were white. Research of the St. Charles County Juvenile Court files showed that for the calendar year of 1985, 1435 delinquency referrals were disposed of. Referrals were defined as reported and substantiated incidents of law violations. This reveals an average of 1.63 law violations per reported juvenile in that year.

Of the 1127 juveniles referred to the County Juvenile Office in 1985, 63 were placed in the street law program, 161 were placed in the community service program, and 26 were given family therapy. Additionally, a control group was developed from the 82 juveniles referred to the Court in 1985 who received no treatment beyond a 30 minute interview at the Juvenile Office. Experimental and control groups for this study were created from this pool of subjects. Subjects

selected for participation in the study had to have meet the following criteria: in the calendar year 1985. 1. The subjects had to be 15 years of age at the time of participation in the treatment study program. Fifteen-year-olds were selected as they account for a large portion of juvenile court cases and as their behavior could be monitored for a full year following treatment. Older subjects would be lost to the adult correctional system during the follow-up, as juvenile court records cease at age 17. Younger subjects would allow for a longer follow-up period, but are generally less delinquent and less often involved in the of the programs. family counselling by the Deputy Juvenile Office. 2. The subjects had to reside in the County of St. Charles continuously for a period of 1 year prior to treatment through 1 year following treatment. Any subjects removed from the County for any significant period of time were removed from the study. Court records, school records, and personal contacts were used to assure that all subjects remained in the county for the 2-year period. and the parents of the youth must have 3. All subjects had to have participated in

only one of the treatment programs and had to have participated in that program in the calendar year 1985. Juveniles participating in more than one treatment program were excluded from the study.

4. All subjects were delinquents who had been referred to the juvenile court for treatment.

Additionally, subjects had to qualify to get into the three treatment groups. Eligibility for inclusion in each of the groups was as follows.

Family Therapy Group Participation was

All juveniles referred for family therapy were accepted for treatment. Referrals for family therapy were made based on the perception of the need for family counseling by the Deputy Juvenile Officer initially interviewing the family.

Community Service/Restitution Group For conduct in

the For acceptance into the Community Service/Restitution program, the juvenile must have had an unsophisticated referral history, meaning he or she must have had no serious felony offenses and no offenses against persons. All participants must have willingly volunteered for the program, and the parents of the youth must have approved of his or her participation. Any

juvenile deemed to be emotionally disturbed, assaultive, or highly sophisticated in delinquent behavior was excluded. Generally, this group of subjects was of lesser offenders. Inclusion as Street Law Group study. Of the 71 subjects used in the Target groups for the Street Law program included first time offenders, both those for committing felonies and those committing misdemeanors. Frequently, multiple offenders were accepted into this program. Participation was mandatory for those referred.

Control Group subjects' individual contributions were. In addition to the three treatment groups, a fourth group was studied. This group was made up of subjects 15 years of age who were referred to the Juvenile Court for some delinquent conduct in the calendar year 1985. This group of subjects was given none of the three treatments and typically received no other ongoing services from the court, excluding a 30 minute interview with an officer at the Juvenile Office. Generally, these subjects were lesser offenders whose amount of pre-Missouri treatment delinquent conduct was roughly similar to that of the Community Service/Restitution or to

treatment group. year following treatment, giving each subject a pre-Procedure and post-treatment delin Court files were reviewed to identify juveniles who met the criteria for inclusion as subjects in the study. Of the 71 subjects used in the study, 12 met the criteria for inclusion in the street law group, 24 met the criteria for inclusion in the community service group, 4 met the criteria for inclusion in the family therapy group, and 31 met the criteria for inclusion in the control group. Duration of treatment

These subjects' individual court files were researched to determine the frequency and severity of the delinquent conduct of each of the subjects.

Measures of delinquency and recidivism were obtained by adding the reported and substantiated offenses contained in each subject's juvenile court file. Numerical values were systematically assigned to the various offenses. A value of 1 was given to all status offenses, a value of 2 was given to all misdemeanor violations, and a value of 3 was given to all felony violations (Missouri Criminal Code, 1978). These were totaled for all subjects for time periods of both 1 year prior to

treatment and 1 year following treatment, giving each subject a pretreatment and posttreatment delinquency score. Delinquency scores were compared between the groups, as well as within subjects, to determine program effectiveness through recidivism.

Treatments

Family Therapy

The family therapy treatment consisted of one to ten 60-minute family therapy sessions with a trained family therapist. Duration of treatment was determined jointly by the therapist and the family.

Community Service Restitution

The Community Service/Restitution program involved completion of an assigned number of hours of community service work. The number of hours assigned was determined by the subject's offense history and age, with more serious offenses and older subjects being assigned more hours of work. Responsibility was stressed in this program. It was the juvenile's responsibility to contact the program coordinator for orientation and to complete the assigned work in a timely manner.

Also, the juvenile was to complete a program evaluation form following completion of the work and to satisfactorily complete a 3-month probationary period following completion of the community service hours. (See Appendix A for complete Community Service Restitution Program description.)

Street Law

The Street Law program is a 10-week educational program designed to allow the juvenile an opportunity to learn more about the law, our society, and himself or herself. Classes were held at a local police station one evening per week and were 2 hours in length. Classes included lectures and exercises surrounding various law-related topics. Experts lectured as guest speakers on many topics including legal rights, communication skills, and self-concepts.

Following attendance at the 10 classes, subjects were required to complete a 3-month probationary period. Additionally, subjects were given pretests and posttests to determine the extent of learning that took place. (See Appendix B for a complete Street Law Program description.)

CHAPTER IV

Statistical Analysis

Both correlated and independent t tests were used to measure and compare program effectiveness in reducing recidivism. For all t tests performed, a significance level of .01 was used.

Both correlated and independent t tests were used to measure and compare program effectiveness in reducing recidivism. For all t tests performed, a significance level of .01 was used.

As can be seen in Table 3, the Street Law group committed a total of 34 offenses, or 2.83 offenses per subject, in the 12 months preceding treatment. Of these 34 offenses, 2 were status offenses, 18 were misdemeanor offenses, and 14 were felony offenses.

In the 12 months following treatment, this group committed a total of 7 offenses, or .58 offenses per subject. Of these 7 offenses, 1 were status offenses, 3 were misdemeanor offenses, and 2 were felony offenses. This represents a 78.41% reduction in the total number of offenses reported and substantiated for this group following treatment.

The most significant reductions were seen in misdemeanor and felony offenses, each being

Table 3. ~~Pre-treatment~~ CHAPTER IV

Street Law Group: RESULTS Type of Offenses

Street Law Group

Data were obtained for 12 subjects who participated in the Street Law program. The coded delinquency histories of these subjects are listed in Table 3. Table 3 shows both pretreatment and posttreatment delinquency rates.

As can be seen in Table 3, the Street Law group committed a total of 34 offenses, or 2.83 offenses per subject, in the 12 months preceding treatment. Of these 34 offenses, 4 were status offenses, 18 were misdemeanor offenses, and 12 were felony offenses.

In the 12 months following treatment, this group committed a total of 7 offenses, or .58 offenses per subject. Of these 7 offenses, 2 were status offenses, 3 were misdemeanor offenses, and 2 were felony offenses. This was a 79.41% reduction in the total number of offenses reported and substantiated for this group following treatment.

The most significant reductions were seen in misdemeanor and felony offenses, each being

Table 3. Pretreatment PosttreatmentStreet Law Group: Number and Type of OffensesMean scores 2.811 1.246 581S.D. scores Delinquency Rates 1.246Note: Posttreatment PosttreatmentFelony offenses

Subject	Pretreatment			Posttreatment		
	S	M	F	S	M	F
1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	4	0	0	0
3	0	4	0	1	2	1
4	0	2	2	0	1	0
5	0	0	1	0	0	0
6	0	1	0	0	0	0
7	3	2	1	0	0	0
8	0	1	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	2	0	0	0
10	0	1	1	0	0	0
11	0	3	0	0	0	0
12	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
subtotal	<u>4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>
total		34			7	

(table continues)

reduced ~~Pre~~treatment ~~spres~~ Posttreatment effect on
~~status offenses with only a 55% reduction of~~
 Mean status of 2.833rs, one subject .583 no change
 S.D. his status 1.749nding. Another 1.240ct
~~increased his status offending. The one female~~

Note: S=status offense; M=misdemeanor offense; F=felony offense.
 ending following treatment.

A correlated t test showed a statistically significant reduction in the frequency of offending following treatment in the Street Law program by this group, $t(31) = 4.7$, $p < .01$.

Table 4 shows the seriousness of the offenses committed by the Street Law group, both 12 months before and 12 months after treatment. This measure is an average of the offenses committed using the assigned values of 1, 2, and 3 for status, misdemeanor, and felony offenses respectively. This table shows that following treatment the Street Law group went from an average pretreatment score of 2.3 to an average of 2 as a measure of the seriousness of their offenses, indicating a decrease in the seriousness of this group's offenses following treatment.

A correlated t test showed a statistically

reduced 83.33%. Less impressive was the effect on status offenses, with only a 50% reduction. Of the status offenders, one subject made no change in his status offending. Another subject increased his status offending. The one female subject was the only subject who had a decrease in her status offending following treatment.

A correlated t test showed a statistically significant reduction in the frequency of offending following treatment in the Street Law program by this group, $t(11) = 4.7$, $p < .01$.

Table 4 shows the seriousness of the offenses committed by the Street Law group, both 12 months before and 12 months after treatment. This measure is an average of the offenses committed using the assigned values of 1, 2, and 3 for status, misdemeanor, and felony offenses respectively. This table shows that following treatment the Street Law group went from an average pretreatment score of 2.3 to an average of 2 as a measure of the seriousness of their offenses, indicating a decrease in the seriousness of this group's offenses following treatment.

A correlated t test showed a statistically

significant reduction in the severity of offenses committed by this group following treatment, $t(11) = 5.720; p < .001.$

Table 4 Table 5 shows a combined measure of the Street Law Group: Severity of Offenses committed by the Street Law group both before and after treatment. This score Delinquency is the weighted sum of the offenses, where the weights were the

Subject	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
1 Law group had a	2 pretreatment score of 4.33.	0
2 This same group	3 had a mean posttreatment score of	0
3 1.17. This indic	4 at an average delinquency of 52.5 per subject	2
4 delinquency of	5 2.5 per subject	2
5 treatment. The	6 53.7 figure roughly corresponds to	0
6 5 status offense	7 2.3 violations	0
7 (or some combina	8 1.67 of these offenses	0
8 subject per year	9 2 These figures represent	0
9 an 82% total red	10 3 uction in delinquency for this	0
10 treatment group	11 2.5 the first year following	0
11 treatment.	12 2	0
12 A correlate	13 2 1 test proved statistically	2
Mean significant red	14 2.3 uction is overall of 1.5 (2)	0
S.D. is group follow	15 1.475 treatment in 1.905	0
	16 Street Law	

significant reduction in the severity of offenses committed by this group following treatment, $t(11) = 5.720, p < .001$.

Table 5 shows a combined measure of the frequency and severity of offenses committed by the Street Law group both before and after treatment. This score represents the weighted sum of the offenses, where the weights were the offense-severity ratings (1,2,3) described previously. As is shown in this table, the Street Law group had a pretreatment mean score of 6.33. This same group had a mean posttreatment score of 1.17. This indicates an average reduction in delinquency of 5.17 per subject following treatment. The 5.17 figure roughly translates to 5 status offenses, 2.5 misdemeanors, 1.7 felonies (or some combination of these offenses) per subject per year. These figures also represent an 82% total reduction in delinquency for this treatment group in the first year following treatment.

A correlated t test showed a statistically significant reduction in overall offending by this group following treatment in the Street Law

Table 5. $t(11) = 4.987, p < .01.$

Street Law Group: Combined Frequency and

Severity of Offenses for 24 subjects who

~~participated in the Community Service program.~~

These 24 subjects are Delinquency Table 6, along

~~with their delinquency histories. Table 8 shows~~

Subject: Pretreatment Posttreatment

~~The total number of offenses committed by~~

1 this group in the 212 months prior to treatment

2 was 37, or 1.54 offenses per subject. This number

3 closely approximates the average of 8.63 offenses

4 per juvenile for 1011 juveniles referred to the

5 Court in 1985. In the 12 months following

6 treatment this group committed a total of 44

7 offenses, or 1.81 offenses per subject. These

8 figures represent a 19% increase in the number of

9 offenses committed following treatment in the

10 Community Service program. Most dramatic was the

11 40% increase in felony offenses by this group

12 following treatment.

4

Mean Table 6 shows that four of the 1.167 subjects in

S.D. in group had 3.627 offenses totaling 2.480 prior to

~~inclusion in this treatment program. As the~~

~~official guidelines for this program exclude~~

program, $t(11) = 4.987$, $p < .01$.

Community Service Group Number and Type

Data were obtained for 24 subjects who participated in the Community Service program. These 24 subjects are listed in Table 6, along with their delinquency histories. Table 6 shows both pre- and posttreatment delinquency rates.

The total number of offenses committed by this group in the 12 months prior to treatment was 37, or 1.54 offenses per subject. This number closely approximates the average of 1.63 offenses per juvenile for all juveniles referred to the Court in 1985. In the 12 months following treatment this group committed a total of 44 offenses, or 1.83 offenses per subject. These figures represent a 19% increase in the number of offenses committed following treatment in the Community Service program. Most dramatic was the 240% increase in felony offenses by this group following treatment.

Table 6 shows that four of the subjects in this group had committed felony offenses prior to inclusion in this treatment program. As the official guidelines for this program exclude

Table 6 Pretreatment Posttreatment
 Community Service Group: Number and Type
 of Offenses

Subject	Pretreatment			Posttreatment		
	S	M	F	S	M	F
1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	0	0	0
3	0	1	0	0	0	0
4	0	1	0	0	3	0
5	0	1	0	0	0	0
6 Subtotals	0	31	0	0	0	0
7 Totals	0	31	0	0	1	0
8 Adjusted subtotals	0	1	0	0	0	0
9 adjusted	0	1	2	3	4	2
10 Totals	1	21	0	1	0	0
11 Adjusted	0	1	0	0	0	0
12 Adjusted	0	1	0	0	0	0
13 Adjusted	0	1	0	0	0	0

offenders: S=status. M=months (table continues)

Subjects of Pretreatment and Posttreatment have

participated in this treatment program. The

adjusted totals of Misdemeanors, Felonies, and Offenses

committed by these felony offenders. These

adjusted figures show that the pretreatment group

committed a total of 07 offenses or 0.30 per

subject. Following treatment, this group

committed a total of 03 offenses or 0.10 offenses

per subject. This represents a 67% reduction in

delinquency of this group following treatment.

Though this may seem to be a substantial

reduction in the number of offenses committed by

this group following treatment, a statistical

test showed no reduction to be significant.

$t(18) = 2.354$ $p < .05$ $d = .00$ 0 0 0

subtotals 7 6 26 15 9 18 17

totals 37 by this group 44 12 months

adjusted and 12 months following treatment. Again

subtotals 5 22 0 4 6 3

seriousness was measured with the previously

adjusted

totals 27 13 2 3

Mean status 1.318, and felony .636

S.D. respectively. $F(1,78) = 1.432$

Note. Adjusted totals exclude pretreatment felony

offenders. S=status, M=misdemeanor, F=felony.

serious offenders, these subjects should not have participated in this treatment program. The adjusted totals in Table 6 exclude all offenses committed by these felony offenders. These adjusted figures show that the pretreatment group committed a total of 27 offenses or 1.35 per subject. Following treatment, this group committed a total of 13 offenses, or .65 offenses per subject. This represents a 52% reduction in delinquency by this group following treatment.

Though this may seem to be a substantial reduction in the number of offenses committed by this group following treatment, a correlated t test showed the reduction to be nonsignificant, $t(19) = 2.354$, $p > .540$.

Table 7 shows the seriousness of the offenses committed by this group both 12 months before and 12 months following treatment. Again seriousness was measured with the previously described scale assigning values of 1, 2, and 3 to status, misdemeanor, and felony offenses respectively. Figures given are the average severity of all offenses committed by this group. On the average, this group went from a

Table 7 Pretreatment - Posttreatment

Community Service Group: Severity of Offenses

Subject	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
1	2	0
2	1.5	0
3	2	0
4	2.04	2.409 (1.33)
5	2.91	0.456 (1.26)
6	2.332	0.422
7	2	2
8	2	0
9	2.67	1.89
10	1.5	1
11	2	0
12	2	0
13	2	0
14	3	0
15	2	0
16	2	0

(table continues)

Subject Pretreatment to a Posttreatment

17	subsequent offenses	1.25	are less severe	1.25	we again
18	exclude the felon	2	offenders from the	0	group we
19	find a pretreatment	2	offense severity	2.45	of
20	.91 and a posttreatment	2	offense severity	2.75	score
21	of 1.8, indicating	2	a slight decrease	0	in severity
22	of offenses,	2		0	
23	A correlated	3	t test showed the	0	reduction in
24	severity of offenses	2	to be statistically	0	significant.
	Mean	192.04	(1.91)	3.409	(1.91)
	Adjusted mean	1.91	is due only to	1.450	(1.80)
	S.D. subjects who	com.	382	no offenses	.829

their offenses were only minimally less severe.

Table 8 shows a combined measure of the frequency and severity of offenses committed by this treatment group both 12 months before and 12 months following treatment. These scores are the weighted sum of the offenses previously described. The mean scores in this table show a 32% increase in the frequency and severity of delinquency among the subjects in this group following treatment.

pretreatment score of 2.04 to a posttreatment score of .56, indicating that on the average subsequent offenses were less severe. If we again exclude the felony offenders from this group we find a pretreatment offense severity score of 1.91 and a posttreatment offense severity score of 1.8, indicating a slight decrease in severity of offenses.

A correlated t test showed the reduction in severity of offending to be statistically significant, $t(19) = 7.591$, $p < .001$. It should be noted though that this is due only to the number of subjects who committed no offenses following treatment. Of those that continued to offend, their offenses were only minimally less severe.

Table 8 shows a combined measure of the frequency and severity of offenses committed by this treatment group both 12 months before and 12 months following treatment. These scores are the weighted sums of the offenses previously described. The mean scores in this table show a 32% increase in the frequency and severity of delinquency among the subjects in this group following treatment. (table continues)

Table 8 Community Service Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses

Subject	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
12	2	0
20	3	0
34	2	0
4	2	6
5	2	6
6	2	0
7	2	2
8	2	0
9	8	17
10	3	1
11	6	0
12	2	0
13	2	0
14	3	0
15	2	0

(table continues)

Subject Pre-treatment Post-treatment

~~this group, however, there is a 44% reduction in~~
 16 the frequency and severity of delinquency, as
 17 shown by the adjusted means. 5
 18 A correlated t test did not show this
 19 reduction to be statistically significant, $t(19)$
 20 $1.456, p > .3182$ 11
 21 Family Therapy Group 0
 22 Data were obtained for 4 subjects who
 23 participated in family therapy. The 4 subjects
 24 are listed in Table 9 along with their
 Mean frequency histories 3.04 12 months prior to 4.00 and 17
 Adjusted mean being 2.45 months prior to 1.25 months
 S.D. of offenses in the 1.078 months prior to 2.977 months



~~and 6 offenses in the 17 months following~~
 treatment. This is a 54% reduction in the total
 number of offenses following family therapy
 treatment.

The family therapy group averaged 3.25
 offenses per subject prior to treatment and 1.5
 offenses per subject following treatment. Though
 this was greater than a 50% reduction in the
 number of offenses committed, it was not
 statistically significant due to the small sample

Table When the felony offenders are removed from this group, however, there is a 49% reduction in the frequency and severity of delinquency, as shown by the adjusted means.

A correlated t test did not show this reduction to be statistically significant, $t(19) = 1.456$, $p > .318$.

Family Therapy Group

Data were obtained for 4 subjects who participated in family therapy. These 4 subjects are listed in Table 9 along with their delinquency histories 12 months prior to and 12 months following treatment. This group committed 13 offenses in the 12 months preceding treatment and 6 offenses in the 12 months following treatment. This is a 54% reduction in the total number of offenses following family therapy treatment.

The family therapy group averaged 3.25 offenses per subject prior to treatment and 1.5 offenses per subject following treatment. Though this was greater than a 50% reduction in the number of offenses committed, it was not statistically significant due to the small sample

Table 9 (3) = 1.4, $p > .516$.

Family Therapy Group: Number and Type of Offenses

committed by this treatment group both before and following treatment. Delinquency is the average severity using the three-point scale previously described. Pretreatment and Posttreatment average.

Subject followed S M F Family therapy M F Element. A

Subject	S	M	F	Family therapy	M	F	Element
1	0	2	1	0	0	1	
2	1	0	0	3	1	0	
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	
4	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal	4	2	1	4	1	1	
Total	13	6	6				
Mean less delinq	3.25			1.5			
S.D.	1.258			1.732			

Note. S=status, M=misdemeanor, F=felony.

statistically significant reduction in the combined frequency and severity of this group's offending following treatment, $t(3) = 1.6, p > .416$. Again, even though there was a greater than 50% reduction in offenses committed, the

size, $t(3) = 1.4, p > .518$.

Family Table 10 shows the severity of the offenses committed by this treatment group both before and following treatment. Again this is the average severity using the three-point scale previously described. This table indicates that on the average, the severity of offenses committed increased following family therapy treatment. A correlated t test showed this increase to be nonsignificant, $t(3) = .394, p > .999$.

Table 11 shows a combined measure of the frequency and severity of delinquency by this group 12 months before and 12 months following treatment, using the sum of offenses on the three point scale. The family therapy group committed 53% less delinquency in the 12 months following treatment than in the preceding 12 months when viewed in this combined measure.

A correlated t test did not show a statistically significant reduction in the combined frequency and severity of this group's offending following treatment, $t(3) = 1.6, p > .416$. Again, even though there was a greater than 50% reduction in offenses committed, the

Table 10

Family Therapy Group: Severity of Offenses

<u>Severity of Offenses</u>		
Delinquency		
Subject	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
1	2.33	3
2	1.33	1.25
3	1	1
4	1.2	0
Mean	1.47	1.75
S.D.	1.592	1.248

Table 11 is not statistically significant, due
Family Therapy Group: Combined Frequency and
Severity of Offenses

Data were obtained from Delinquency Control group
 subjects. Table 11 lists the 21 subjects making

Subject	Control	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
1	7	3	4
2	14	5	9
3	2	1	1
4	6	0	6
Mean	4.75	2.25	2.50
S.D.	2.217	2.217	2.217

offenses per subject. This is slightly higher than the number committed by the typical 15-year-old delinquent referred to the Juvenile Court in 1985. This group had a total of 74 offenses in the 12 months following their referral to the Court in 1985, or .77 offenses per subject. This represents a 56% reduction in delinquency by subjects in this group with no treatment.

A correlated t test showed this to be a statistically significant reduction in the

reduction is not statistically significant, due to the small sample size limiting the power of the t test.

Control Group

Delinquency

Data were obtained for 31 control group subjects. Table 12 lists the 31 subjects making up the control group, along with their delinquency histories. These histories include offenses occurring in the 12 months prior to the 1985 referral, plus that referral, and offenses occurring in the 12 months following the 1985 referral.

As is shown in this table, the control group had a total of 55 pre-1985 offenses, or 1.77 offenses per subject. This is slightly higher than the number committed by the typical 15-year-old delinquent referred to the Juvenile Court in 1985. This group had a total of 24 offenses in the 12 months following their referral to the Court in 1985, or 1.77 offenses per subject. This represents a 56% reduction in delinquency by subjects in this group with no treatment.

A correlated t test showed this to be a statistically significant reduction in the

Table 12 Pre-1985 offenses Post-1985 offenses

Control Group: Number and Type of Offenses

Delinquency							
	Pre-1985 Offenses			Post-1985 Offenses			
Subject	S	M	F	S	M	F	
1	1	1	0	0	2	1	
2	1	0	0	0	0	0	
3	3	1	0	0	0	0	
4	0	2	0	0	0	0	
5	1	1	1	0	0	0	
6	1	1	0	0	0	0	
7	0	3	1	0	0	0	
8	0	1	0	0	0	0	
9	1	0	0	0	0	0	
10	2	1	0	1	1	0	
11	0	1	0	0	0	0	
12	0	3	0	0	1	0	
13 total	20	11	0	0	0	0	
14 total	4	0	0	1	1	0	

(table continues)

Subject	Pre-1985 offenses			Post-1985 offenses		
	S	M	F	S	M	F
15	1	0	0	0	0	0
16	2	0	0	3	1	4
17	2	0	0	0	0	0
18	0	1	0	1	0	0
19	0	1	0	0	0	0
20	0	2	0	2	1	0
21	1	0	0	0	0	0
22	0	1	0	0	0	0
23	0	2	0	0	0	0
24	0	1	0	0	0	0
25	1	0	0	1	2	0
26	0	1	0	0	1	0
27	1	1	0	0	0	0
28	1	0	0	0	0	0
29	0	1	0	0	0	0
30	2	0	0	0	0	0
31	1	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	26	27	2	9	10	5
Total		55			24	

(table continues)

frequency Pre-1985 offenses Post-1985 offenses
 treatment $t(10) = 1.081, p < .05$
 Mean Table 13 = 1.774 the seriousness .774 the
 S.D. offenses committ. 990 the control 1.668 both

Note. S=status, M=misdemeanor, F=felony. usly
 described three-point scale. This group showed an
 increase in the severity of offenses committed
 among those of the group committing new offenses,
 but remained less serious than any of the
 treatment groups.

This increase is seen among those subjects
 who reoffended, but again as with the other
 groups, a correlated t test showed a significant
 reduction in severity due to the same subjects
 who had no subsequent offenses, $t(30) = 4.886, p$
 $< .001$.

Table 14 shows a combined measure of the
 frequency and severity of delinquency committed
 by the control group, both 12 months before and
 after their 1985 referral. This score, again, is
 the sum of their offenses as measured on the
 three point scale. The reduction in frequency and
 severity of delinquency from a score of 2.77 to

frequency of offending by this group following treatment, $t(30) = 3.081, p < .01.$

Table 13 shows the seriousness of the offenses committed by the control group both before and after their 1985 referral. Offense severity is again measured on the previously described three-point scale. This group showed an increase in the severity of offenses committed among those of the group committing new offenses, but remained less serious than any of the treatment groups.

This increase is seen among those subjects who reoffended, but again as with the other groups, a correlated t test showed a significant reduction in severity due to the many subjects who had no subsequent offenses, $t(30) = 6.084, p < .001.$

Table 14 shows a combined measure of the frequency and severity of delinquency committed by the control group, both 12 months before and after their 1985 referral. This score, again, is the sum of their offenses as measured on the three point scale. The reduction in frequency and severity of delinquency from a score of 2.77 to

Table 13 Pre-1985 offenses Post-1985 offenses

Control Group: Severity of Offenses

Subject	Pre-1985 Offenses	Post-1985 Offenses
1	1.5	2.3
2	1	0
3	1.25	0
4	2	0
5	2	0
6	1.5	0
7	2.25	0
8	2	0
9	1	0
10	1.33	1.5
11 an	2.559	0.18 (1.77)
12 D.	2.576	2.11
13	2	0
14	1	1.5
15	1	0
16	1	2.13

(table continues)

Subject	Pre-1985 offenses	Post-1985 offenses
17	1	0
18	2	1
19	2	0
20	2	1.33
21	1	0
22	2	0
23	2	0
24	2	0
25	1	1.67
26	2	2
27	1.5	0
28	1	0
29	2	0
30	1	0
31	1	0
Mean	1.559	.498 (1.77)
S.D.	2.576	.821
13	2	0
14	4	3
15	1	0

(table continues)

Table 14 Pre-1985 offenses Post-1985 offenses

Control Group: Combined Frequency and Severity of Delinquency

Subject	Pre-1985 Offenses	Post-1985 Offenses
1	3	7
2	1	0
3	5	0
4	4	0
5	6	0
6	3	0
7	9	0
8	2	0
9	1	0
10	4	3
11	2	0
12	6	2
13	2	0
14	4	3
15	1	0

(table continues)

Subject: Pre-1985 offenses Post-1985 offenses

16 A correlated t test does not show this
 17 reduction in delinquency to be statistically
 18 significant, $t(302) = 1.941$, $p > .05$.
 19 Table 15 shows a comparison of the four test
 20 groups in their frequency of delinquency both
 21 before and after treatment. As can be
 22 seen, all groups reduced their frequency of
 23 offending following the treatment period, even
 24 the group with no treatment. Independent t tests
 25 showed that the reductions in offending of the
 26 treatment groups were nonsignificant when
 27 compared to the control group.
 28 Table 16 shows a comparison of the four
 29 groups in the severity of their offenses both
 30 before and after treatment. As can be seen, two
 31 groups, Street Law and Community Service,
 Mean committed slightly more severe offenses following
 S.D. treatment, and two, Family Therapy and
 Control, committed slightly more severe offenses
 following treatment. Independent t tests showed
 no statistically significant changes in the
 severity of offenses committed following

1.42 indicates an overall reduction in delinquency of 49% for this control group.

A correlated t test does not show this reduction in delinquency to be statistically significant, $t(30) = 1.941, p > .118$.

Table 15 shows a comparison of the four test groups in their frequency of delinquency both 12 months before and after treatment. As can be seen, all groups reduced their frequency of offending following the treatment period, even the group with no treatment. Independent t tests showed that the reductions in offending of the treatment groups were nonsignificant when compared to the control group.

Table 16 shows a comparison of the four groups in the severity of their offenses both before and after treatment. As can be seen, two groups, Street Law and Community Service, committed slightly less severe offenses following treatment, and two groups, Family Therapy and Control, committed slightly more severe offenses following treatment. Independent t tests showed no statistically significant changes in the severity of offenses committed following

Table 15

Group Comparison: Mean Number of Offenses per

Subject

Group	Pretreatment	Posttreatment	(%)
Street Law	2.83/year	.58/year	(-80%)
Community Service	1.35/year	.65/year	(-52%)
Family Therapy	3.25/year	1.50/year	(-54%)
Control	1.77/year	.77/year	(-56%)

Note. Community Service figures have been adjusted to exclude felony offenders.

treatment by any of these groups.

Table 16 shows a comparison of the four
Group Comparison: Severity of Offenses measured on
 the three-point scale, controlling both frequency
 and severity of offenses. Mean Score this table,
 all groups reduced their overall offending

Group	Pretreatment	Posttreatment
Street Law	2.30	2.00
Community Service	1.91	1.80
Family Therapy	1.47	1.75
Control	1.56	1.71

Note. Community Service figures have been
 adjusted to exclude felony offenders.

treatment by any of these groups.

Table 17 shows a comparison of the four groups before and after treatment as measured on the three-point scale, combining both frequency and severity of offenses. As shown in this table, all groups reduced their overall offending following treatment. Only the Street Law group, however, had a statistically significant reduction in delinquency following treatment when compared to the control group, $t(22) = 3.051, p < .01$.

Group	Pre-treatment	Post-treatment	t-value	p-value
Law	6.33	1.37	(-4.96)	<.001
Community Service	3.45	1.95	(-1.50)	>.05
Family Therapy	4.75	2.15	(-2.60)	>.05
Control	2.77	1.42	(-1.35)	>.05

Note: Community service figures have been adjusted to exclude felony offenders.

Table 17

Group Comparison: Combined Frequency and Severity of Offenses

Mean Score

Group	Pretreatment	Posttreatment	(%)
Street Law	6.33	1.17	(-82%)
Community Service	2.45	1.25	(-49%)
Family Therapy	4.75	2.25	(-53%)
Control	2.77	1.42	(-49%)

Note. Community service figures have been adjusted to exclude felony offenders.

following arrest, and the threat of the court appearance itself, then we must conclude that little or no benefit was gained through treatment in either family therapy or community service. Likewise, though the street law group showed a such greater reduction in recidivism (82%) than the control group, only a 53% reduction can be

attributed to treatment. CHAPTER V the remaining 49% resulting from the DISCUSSION court appearance and What then, do the findings discussed in the previous chapter tell us about delinquency prevention? First, it seems that much correction of the juvenile delinquent is done outside of the Juvenile Court. The control group, which received no treatment other than a thirty-minute conference with a juvenile officer, reduced its delinquency by 49%. This is the same percentage reduction as was shown by the community service group and only 4% less than the percentage of delinquency reduction shown in the family therapy group.

If we attribute the control group's reduction in delinquency to such factors as the trauma of police arrest, parental sanctions following arrest, and the trauma of the court appearance itself, then we must conclude that little or no benefit was gained through treatment in either family therapy or community service.

Likewise, though the street law group showed a much greater reduction in recidivism (82%) than the control group, only a 33% reduction can be

attributed to treatment, with the remaining 49% resulting from the arrest, the court appearance and parental sanctions. This would be an oversimplification of a very complex set of factors requiring a much more in-depth assessment. Subjects were not randomly assigned to the four groups, but were placed in specific treatment programs for specific reasons. While there were general guidelines regarding the acceptance of juveniles into the three treatment programs, many of the factors in the decision regarding treatment planning were intuitive. The officer in charge of each case made an assessment of the youth's needs and problems through investigation of many areas. These areas of least investigation included:

1. The child's actions in the current offense, including any premeditation or violence;
2. The child's history of delinquency;
3. The child's family and home environment;
4. The child's school performance;
5. The child's social functioning, including:
 - a. drug or alcohol abuse,
 - b. hospitalizations,
 - c. psychiatric or psychological problems,
 - d. employment,
 - e. attitude,
 - f. peer relationships,

frequent g. adult or authority relationships, and
h. hobbies, interests, or activities.
of the subjects caused the group's overall

delin. This investigation was done with the
intention of making a determination as to the
likelihood of success in a particular treatment
program and the likelihood of the child
reoffending, as well as identifying the child's
treatment needs. Consequently the four groups
studied contained distinctly different subjects
due to this systematic assignment to the four
treatment alternatives. Examination of the data
in this context gives a more complete picture of
the effects of the treatments on recidivism.

Control Group This group had the greatest amount
of. This group was made up of those subjects
determined by the Juvenile Office to be the least
likely to reoffend and therefore needing no
treatment. The data showed this judgment to be
accurate 71% of the time, with only 9 of the 31
subjects reoffending. Of those that continued to
offend, however, the delinquency that did occur
within this group was more frequent and the
offenses more serious than the offenses committed
prior to being seen at the Court. This increased

frequency and severity of offending by a minority of the subjects caused the group's overall delinquency to decrease by only 49%.

As this group was not predicted to reoffend and as the subjects were lesser offenders, the 49% reduction seems far less than satisfactory. While only nine of this group reoffended, their offending escalated following their appearance at the Juvenile Court. This might be indicative of the need for better screening and for more intrusive early intervention, as was concluded by Murry and Cox (1979.)

Street Law Group

The Street Law group had the greatest amount of pretreatment delinquency and the lowest amount of posttreatment delinquency of all of the groups studied. While the nine subjects from this group who had no posttreatment offenses represent only 75% of the group, this reduction in delinquency is enhanced by the fact that those of this group who did reoffend, did so to a lesser degree than they did prior to treatment. This fact accounts for the 82% overall reduction in delinquency by this group. This treatment appears by far the

most effective of the treatments studied in preventing further delinquency. Due to this group's high pretreatment delinquency scores, regression toward the mean was considered as a possible factor in the group's large reduction in delinquency. This was ruled out, however, due to the group's posttreatment score dropping lower than any of the other groups' posttreatment scores. Also, the high pretreatment scores suggest that the subjects were more habituated to delinquent conduct and thus more difficult to correct.

Community Service Group

The community service group was made up of very low risk subjects, that is, subjects felt by the Juvenile Office to have little likelihood of reoffending. Their pretreatment delinquency scores, in fact, were numerically lower than those of the control group, with the felony offenders excluded. This means they were, on the average, slightly less delinquent than those subjects who received no treatment. However, this difference was not statistically reliable. As stated earlier, four subjects in this group

were felony offenders, and were excluded for purposes of this study, as their inclusion in the community service program was contrary to program guidelines. If we include these four felony offenders, this group becomes slightly more delinquent than the control group in a numerical sense, but still less delinquent than the other treatment groups. We found a 44% reduction in delinquency. With the felony offenders included, 71% of the subjects in this group had no offenses following treatment. Without the felony offenders that figure increases to 75%, the same as the street law group.

Again with this group, the minority of these subjects who continued to offend following treatment did so more frequently than prior to treatment. With the felony offenders included, the total number of offenses actually increased by 19% following treatment. With the felony offenders excluded we found a 52% reduction in the total number of posttreatment offenses. Both with and without the felony offenders included we found a slight but not significant decrease in the seriousness of the offenses committed.

following treatment. ~~delinquency without these~~
~~part~~ When we combined the severity and frequency of offending we again found an increase in total delinquency following treatment when the felony offenders were included. This group's offending increased 32% following treatment in the ~~service~~ community service program. With the felony ~~at~~ offenders excluded we found a 49% reduction in delinquency following treatment. This figure is identical to the control group's reduction in delinquency, though the community service group, on the average, was slightly less delinquent both prior to and following treatment. ~~less~~

~~part~~ Several conclusions may be drawn from these figures. It is clear that felony offenders should be excluded from the community service program since their participation caused an ~~for~~ overall increase in the group's delinquency score following treatment. Moreover, since this program is operated in the community, serious offenders may pose a potential threat to others. Though two of the four felony offenders did not reoffend, the other two increased their ~~not law~~ delinquent behavior drastically. In addition, ~~for~~

the 49% decrease in delinquency without these serious offenders is less than satisfactory, as this group did no better than the group with no treatment. There were, however, many positive aspects to this program. Many of the community service participants continued doing volunteer work at their assigned work site past their assigned number of hours. Many more were hired as regular employees following their community service volunteer work. The Court's community relations benefited due to this program. All of these factors show benefit to the juveniles participating in the community service program, the Court, and the community.

Family Therapy Group

With only four subjects, figures given for the family therapy group were not viewed as reliable. In this group, only 25% of the subjects did not reoffend following treatment. The combined measure of the frequency and severity of delinquency showed this group to be numerically less delinquent than the Street Law group but more so than the other two groups prior

to treatment. In terms of the number of offenses, however, this group was the most delinquent of the four in that on the average the Family Therapy group committed more offenses prior to treatment than any of the other groups.

Using the combined measure of the frequency and severity of delinquency, the Family Therapy group had a 53% reduction in delinquent conduct following treatment. This is only slightly superior numerically to the control group's 49% reduction in delinquency.

Though the percentage reduction is only minimally higher than the control group, reduction in actual offenses is more so due to the much greater number of offenses committed by the Family Therapy group prior to treatment. If a subject having two pretreatment offenses reduced his or her offending by 50%, one less offense is committed. If, on the other hand, a subject having four pretreatment offenses reduces his or her offending by 50%, two less offenses are committed. Again it should be noted that with only four subjects included in the Family Therapy group, the outcome cannot be viewed as

reliable. Recidivism and Success

In the preceding group comparisons we are comparing apples and oranges. We ask ourselves, "Is the assassin who shoplifts following treatment a success or a failure?" He is undeniably a recidivist, yet he is unquestionably a success. As stated by Rutherford and Bingur (1976), "Measures of recidivism are clearly important, but they should not be used as the sole determinants of correctional policy" (p.30).

As the frequency and severity of the juvenile delinquent's offending increases, so does the likelihood of his or her reoffending, or recidivism. The goal of corrections is, of course, no recidivism. Finding ourselves short of this goal must not be considered failure, however. Just as the successes in medicine do not guarantee the patient everlasting good health, the work of juvenile corrections can not be expected to eliminate delinquency.

Since the groups examined in this study vary in types of offenders and types of offenses committed, they are not easily compared.

Likewise, as what is measured and how it is measured varies from study to study, comparisons are not easily made with other studies or with national "averages." While Bosarge (1987) states 70% of young parolees reoffend and 49% are returned to prisons, the U.S. Department of Justice (1983) states only 24% are returned to prison.

Murry and Cox (1979), on the other hand, show figures similar to those found in the present study. In their study of many varying interventions with juvenile delinquents, they found rates of decrease of reoffending ranging from approximately 36% to 81%, with the more intrusive interventions showing the highest decreases in reoffending. Also, rather than speaking in terms of success or failure when discussing recidivism, they refer to the

Two significant findings emerged from the present study. First, of the prevention programs analyzed, the Street Law program was by far the most effective in suppressing delinquent behavior; second, more drastic interventions (institutionalization) produce greater effects than less drastic interventions; and, not holding for all delinquents, but would seem to hold for many, escalating the level of intervention is less effective than using the most

1. correctional interventions effectively suppress delinquent behavior;
2. more drastic interventions (institutionalization) produce greater effects than less drastic interventions; and
3. escalating the level of intervention is less effective than using the most

as for "drastic" intervention initially, was the size in the present study.

The suppression effect referred to by Murry and Cox (1979) is the percentage reduction in arrests of participants following various treatments ranging from unintrusive in-home Community Service group did so with greater frequency and severity than those in the other two groups. This suggests that when treatment is needed, failure to treat may result in an increase with the increase in intrusiveness of the escalation of delinquent behavior. This further intervention.

These findings would seem to corroborate the screening of juvenile offenders so that appropriate treatment may be given to them. Strategic correctional involvement is superior to minimal involvement, as suggested by labeling theory, is indicated in the greater decrease in reoffending found in the Street Law group than in any of the other groups.

Two significant findings emerged from the present study. First, of the prevention programs generalized to other populations is questionable. Since adolescents mature physically, emotionally, and intellectually at a very rapid pace, most effective in reducing delinquent conduct among 15-year-old juvenile delinquents. This may not hold true for all delinquents, but would seem delinquent conduct of a 15-year-old may not be

so for those appropriately screened, as was the case in the present study. Secondly, though approximately three out of four of the juveniles studied did not reoffend, those who did so from the control group and the Community Service group did so with greater frequency and severity than those in the other two groups. This suggests that when treatment is needed, failure to treat may result in an escalation of delinquent behavior. This further indicates the importance of and need for better screening of juvenile offenders so that the appropriate treatment may be given to them.

Limitations

The present study was of the effect of three treatments on 15-year-old juvenile delinquents from a predominantly white middle class area, none of whom were habitual offenders. The degree to which the findings of this study may be generalized to other populations is questionable. Since adolescents mature physically, emotionally, and intellectually at a very rapid pace, treatment that is effective in curbing the delinquent conduct of a 15-year-old may not be

effective for the 13-year-old or the 17-year-old. Also treatment shown to be effective with middle class delinquent youths may not be so with lower class or upper class delinquents.

In addition to population variance, variance within the judicial system may have a bearing on the measured effectiveness of the treatments studied. As the definition of delinquency varies from state to state and court to court, behaviors constituting delinquency or recidivism may vary. This in turn would vary the measured rates of recidivism indicating the relative success of the treatments. histories of delinquency were often give The fact that this study replicates the findings in studies of similar treatments, and however, would tend to suggest that these and treatments would be effective in curbing the delinquent conduct of adolescents in varying populations and in varying judicial systems (Rubin, 1986; Guarna, 1983; U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1985).

As previously stated, the present study of the effectiveness of family therapy on curbing

the delinquent conduct of juveniles is further

limited due to the small number of subjects

studied. *Family-based program interventions for the*

serious juvenile offender. *Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice*

Suggestions for Future Research

Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to

A question present throughout this study was

what factors led to the subjects' selection for inclusion in any one of the treatment groups

beyond the general program guidelines. A review of the delinquency histories of the subjects as

shown in this study indicates that subjects with similar offense histories were often given

different treatments, and subjects with dissimilar histories of delinquency were often given the same treatment. What factors

determined this treatment group assignment and how this decision was made is of interest and

could lead to more effective screening and treatment of juvenile offenders.

delinquent offenders. Paper presented at the meeting of the National College of Juvenile Justice, Chicago, IL.

Hall, E. (1982). *Child psychology today*. New York: Random House.

Hawkins, D. J., Foster, P. A., Bell, M., & Morrison, S. (1980). *A typology of cause-focused strategies of delinquency prevention*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

- REFERENCES
- Armstrong, T. L. & Altschuler, D. M. (in press). Community-based program interventions for the serious juvenile offender, targeting, strategies and issues. Chicago: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing.
- Baron, R. & Feeney, F. (1976). Juvenile diversion through family counseling. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Binder, A. & Binder, V. L. (1983). Juvenile diversion. Counseling Psychologist, 11 (2), 69-77.
- Bosarge, B. B. (Ed.). (1987, June). Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. Juvenile Justice Digest, 15, 8-9.
- Bry, B. H. (1982). Reducing the incidence of adolescent problems through preventive intervention: One- and five-year follow-up. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10, 265-276.
- Clarke, R. V. (1985). Delinquency, environment and intervention. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines, 26, 505-523.
- Guarna, A. (1983, April). Family counselling does succeed with serious juvenile delinquent offenders. Paper presented at the meeting of the National College of Juvenile Justice, Chicago, IL.
- Hall, E. (1982). Child psychology today, New York: Random House.
- Hawkins, D. J., Pastor, P. A., Bell, M., & Morrison, S. (1980). A typology of cause-focused strategies of delinquency prevention. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

- Hepburn, J. R. (1977). Criminology, testing alternative models of delinquency causation, The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 67 (4), 450-460.
- Johnson, G., Bird, T., & Little, J. W. (1979). Delinquency prevention: Theories & strategies. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, 42 U.S.C. section 5601 (1982).
- Ku, R. & Blew, C. H. (1977). The adolescent diversion project. A university approach to delinquency prevention. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Maloney, D., Gilbean, D., Hoffard, M., Remington, U.S. C., & Steensan, D. (1983, April). Juvenile restitution: Combining common sense and solid research to build an effective program. Paper presented at the meeting of the National College of Juvenile Justice, U.S. Chicago, IL.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge: Harvard Univeristy Press.
- Missouri Criminal Code, RSMo. section 556.016 (1978).
- Missouri Juvenile Code, RSMo. Section 211.011-211.031 (1978).
- Murry, C. A. & Cox, L. A. (1979). Beyond probation: Juvenile corrections and the chronic delinquent. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Romig, D.A. (1983, April). Juvenile restitution's relationship with delinquency causation. Paper presented at the meeting of the National College of Juvenile Justice, Chicago, IL.
- Rosser, R. A. & Nicholson, G. I. (1984). Educational Psychology. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Rubin, H. T. (1986). Community service restitution by juveniles: Also in need of guidance. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 37, 1-8.
- Rubin, H. T. (1986). Juvenile restitution and the prosecutor. Journal of National District Attorneys Association, 20, 41-45.
- Rutherford, A. & Bingur, O. (1976). Community-based alternatives to juvenile incarceration. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Traitel, R. B. (1974). Dispositional alternatives in juvenile justice. Reno: The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1983). Report to the nation on crime and justice. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1985). Law related education: Making A difference. (Grant #85-JS. CX-0003). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Vinter, R. D. (Ed.). (1976). Time out, a national study of juvenile correction programs. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, Institute of Continuing Legal Education, School of Social Work.
- Warner, J. S., & Burke, V. (Ed.). (1987). National directory of juvenile restitution programs, 1987. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Wenk, E. A. (1974). Schools and delinquency prevention. Davis, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Community Service/Restitution
St. Charles County Juvenile Court

Philosophy

The philosophical basis for the Community Service/Restitution Program is that juveniles should be held accountable for their actions as they are capable of making their own decisions.

Purpose

The purpose of this program is to provide the Court with alternatives for disposition of juvenile referrals with emphasis on accountability/responsibility.

Objectives Shall Include, But Not Be Limited To

Appendix A

1. To provide at least partial pay back to the victim.
2. To teach juveniles they are accountable and responsible for their actions.
3. To create advocates for an accountable model of justice in the community.
4. To provide opportunities for juveniles to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will help them become responsible and productive adults.
5. To provide alternative options at the Court's intake level for disposition in contrast to the traditional options, i.e. warnings, informal supervision and court action.
6. To provide "treatment" options to the Court's service unit by which juveniles might more effectively be helped.
7. To reduce the recidivism rate of juveniles referred to Juvenile Court.

Community Service/Restitution
St. Charles County Juvenile Court

Philosophy

The philosophical basis for the Community Service/Restitution Program is that juveniles should be held accountable for their actions as they are capable of making their own decisions.

Purpose

The purpose of this program is to provide the Court with alternatives for disposition of juvenile referrals with emphasis on accountability/responsibility.

Objectives Shall Include, But Not Be Limited To

1. To provide at least partial pay back to the victim.
2. To teach juveniles they are accountable and responsible for their actions.
3. To create advocates for an accountable model of justice in the community.
4. To provide opportunities for juveniles to develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will help them become responsible and productive adults.
5. To provide alternative options at the Court's intake level for disposition in contrast to the traditional options, i.e. warnings, informal supervision and court action.
6. To provide "treatment" options to the Court's service unit by which juveniles might more effectively be helped.
7. To reduce the recidivism rate of juveniles referred to Juvenile Court.

Program Participants and Responsibilities

1. The juvenile must volunteer to be a participant and must be responsive to the demands of the program.
2. Parents must give their permission and support the program's purpose and objectives.
3. Juvenile Officers will utilize the program to the fullest extent possible.
4. Coordinator of Program will secure work sites, screen juveniles for eligibility and perform such other tasks consistent with the program's objectives.
5. Work site Supervisor(s) will ensure compliance with the program's contract.

Program Eligibility (criteria design to maximize the opportunity to succeed)

1. Non-sophisticated referral history.
2. Willingness to participate must be determined (only candidates who willingly volunteer will be accepted).
3. Parents/guardians must approve of juvenile's participation.
4. All appropriate forms must be completed before being accepted into program.
5. Damage/loss must not exceed \$200.00 to participate in Restitution Program.

Non-eligibility

1. Juveniles who are highly sophisticated or who have committed a serious law violation.
 2. Juveniles who are emotionally disturbed or otherwise deemed incapable of participating.
-

Loss Assessment (Component of Restitution)

1. All loss shall be verified by police report, insurance claim, medical records or similar record.
 - a. stolen or damaged property shall not exceed \$200.00 in value
 - b. medical cost, if occurring as a direct result of property loss or damage, shall not exceed \$200.00
 - c. insurance - victim will be reimbursed for the amount of deductible only.
2. Restitution payment shall not exceed \$200.00 per juvenile per incident.

Community Service/Restitution Placement Procedures

1. All eligible juveniles will be assessed for their skills, abilities, and interests.
2. A juvenile's qualifications will be matched as best as possible with the needs of a particular work site.
3. A juvenile's placement at a work site will be contingent upon work site supervisor's approval.
4. A contract will be signed by all involved parties.
5. In the case of restitution, direct payments will be arranged on a case by case basis.

Project Completion/Termination

1. When restitution has been paid in full, the contract will be deemed satisfied.
2. A work site supervisor may dismiss a juvenile for failure to perform designated tasks, failure to report for work or for noncompliance with contract.

Incentives for Juvenile Participation

1. The juvenile realizes his/her wrongful actions and volunteers to take responsibility for this behavior.
2. The juvenile who participates and successfully satisfies conditions of contract may gain dismissal of court action or early termination of probation period.

Sanctions for Noncompletion of Program

1. Contract shall be terminated and juvenile referred back to intake unit for formal court processing.
 2. Contract shall be terminated and juvenile returned to court for modification of disposition.
 3. Contract shall be terminated and juvenile's probation shall be extended by _____ months.
-

Street Law Diversion Program
St. Charles County Juvenile Court

Purpose: To provide the Court with dispositional alternatives with emphasis on law-related education.

Objectives: Shall include, but not be limited to:

- Reduce the recidivism rate of juveniles referred to the Juvenile Office and/or Court.
- Provide juveniles with a positive experience concerning law and education.
- Increase juveniles' knowledge of basic legal rights and responsibilities.
- Help juveniles develop more responsible attitudes towards the rights of others and assume responsibility for their own actions.
- Help juveniles develop problem solving skills.
- Provide juveniles with knowledge of community resources and the use of these resources.

Memo of Understanding

This program is developed for 10-15 juveniles ages 12-16 who have had minimal involvement with the juvenile justice system. This is an educational approach to a diversion program designed to emphasize the use of law-related education.

Appendix B

The philosophy of this program is based on the belief that if juveniles are given the opportunity to learn about law and our legal system, they will be able to make more responsible choices. This program allows 15 juveniles interact in a classroom setting where peer pressure can be realized.

Target Groups

- First time offenders
 - a. misdemeanors
 - b. felony
- Participation is mandatory
 - a. informal adjustments disposition
 - b. Court ordered
 - c. terms of supervision.

Enrollment Procedure

- Referral sent to program coordinator
- Coordinator will assess data
- If juvenile is accepted into the program, an appointment will be set up between the coordinator, parent, and juvenile.
- A follow-up letter will be immediately sent out by the coordinator to the parent and juvenile explaining the program.
- All lesson plans will be independent of each other allowing the program to be opened permitting new students to be cycled in regardless of the current class.

Street Law Diversion Program
St. Charles County Juvenile Court

Purpose: To provide the Court with dispositional alternatives with emphasis on law-related education.

Objectives: Shall Include, But Not Be Limited To:

- Reduce the recidivism rate of juveniles referred to the Juvenile Office an/or Court.
- Provide juveniles with a positive experience concerning law and education.
- Increase juveniles' knowledge of basic legal rights and responsibilities.
- Help juveniles develop more responsible attitudes towards the the rights of others and assume responsibility for their own actions.
- Help juveniles develop problem solving skills.
- Provide juveniles with knowledge of community resources and the use of these resources.

Memo of Understanding

This program is developed for 10-15 juveniles ages 12-16 who have had minimal involvement with the juvenile justice system. This is an educational approach to a diversion program designed to emphasize the use of law-related curriculum.

The philosophy of this program is based on the belief that if juveniles are informed in a positive manner on how law and our legal system will affect them, they will be able to make more responsible decisions. Also, by having 10-15 juveniles interact in a positive law-related program, positive peer pressure can be realized.

Target Groups

- First time offenders
 - a. misdemeanors
 - b. felony
- Participation is mandatory
 - a. informal adjustments disposition
 - b. Court ordered
 - c. terms of supervision.

Enrollment Procedure

- Referral sent to program coordinator
- Coordinator will assess data
- If juvenile is accepted into the program, an appointment will be set up between the coordinator, parent, and juvenile.
- A follow-up letter will be immediately sent out by the coordinator to the parent and juvenile explaining the program.
- All lesson plans will be independent of each other allowing the program to be opened permitting new students to be cycled in regardless of the current class.

Page #2
Street Law Diversion Program
St. Charles County Juvenile Court

Implementation:

The classes will be taught by the program teacher. The curriculum will consist of law related materials with emphasis on the text, Juvenile Problems and Law. Various guest speakers will be utilized to enhance the program. Each guest speaker will bring his/her own area of expertise and teaching techniques with lessons being oriented to emphasize student participation.

The program will consist of 10 classes, held on a weekly basis. Each class will last approximately 2 hours. The classes will be held at St. Charles County Courthouse, Third and Jefferson.

Orientation:

An initial orientation should be conducted prior to starting the first lesson plan. The purpose of the orientation is to familiarize each participant with the guidelines of the class, the purpose of the course, and the rules concerning attendance. Parents or a relative (18 years or older) are to attend the orientation and the following lesson plan with each program participant. Also, the parent or relative should be made as comfortable as possible and encouraged to attend the following classes. Orientation for new students entering this program will take place prior to the first class attended.

The following materials are to be given out during the orientation meeting.

Pre-test - a pre and post test will be developed from the 10 lesson plans. The pre-test will be administered to each participant prior to when he/she begins his/her first lesson plan. This test will be read to each student; this will help standardize the test, ease the tension for those students who do not like taking tests, and will not discriminate against poor readers. A post-test will be given in the same manner as the pre-test, after all 10 lessons have been completed.

Memo of Understanding - will be given to each parent or relative to explain the program.

Syllabus - is included to describe the subject matter in each lesson plan. During the orientation the parents can review the memo of understanding and syllabus while the juveniles are taking the pre-test

Rules - a copy of the rules will be passed out to explain the attendance guidelines.



ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUVENILE COURT

Main Office: 205 N. Second Street Room 200 St. Charles, Mo. 63301 Phone: 724-8840 or 946-3115
 Branch Office: Pike County Court House Bowling Green, Mo. 63334 Phone: 324-3510
 Branch Office: Lincoln County Court House Troy, Mo. 63379 Phone: 528-4332

The Street Law Diversion Program

The Street Law Diversion Program has been designed to allow you an opportunity to learn more about the law and yourself while you satisfy the terms of your supervision agreement. In order for this to occur, the following requirements have to be fulfilled.

1. You must attend all 10 Street Law classes.
2. After attending all 10 classes, you will be on unsupervised probation for months. This means you will not have to report to class or your Juvenile Officer (unless otherwise stated) but you must continue to stay out of trouble.
3. If an absence occurs and is considered excused by the program coordinator, you will still be required to attend the class missed at a later date. (It is your responsibility to contact the program coordinator in advance of the class you may miss for it to count as an excused absence.)
4. Any unexcused absence indicates non-compliance with your supervision agreement and may result in court action being taken.
5. Class participation is extremely important to gain the full value of this program. Disruptive behaviors will only diminish the potential value and will not be tolerated. Inappropriate behaviors (tardies, acting out, lack of participation, etc...) could result in your not receiving credit for attending that particular class and, a) you would have to take the class over at a later date; or, b) you could be expelled from the program thereby necessitating court action for non-compliance with your supervision agreement.

Classroom Guidelines

You must arrive to class on time.

No smoking will be allowed in the classroom.

No eating, drinking, or chewing gum in the classroom.



ELEVENTH CIRCUIT JUVENILE COURT

Main Office: 205 N. Second Street Room 200 St. Charles, Mo. 63301 Phone: 724-8840 or 946-3115
 Branch Office: Pike County Court House Bowling Green, Mo. 63334 Phone: 324-3510
 Branch Office: Lincoln County Court House Troy, Mo. 63379 Phone: 528-4332

The Street Law Diversion Program

Memo of Understanding

The Street Law Diversion Program is a 10 week course designed to assist juveniles when they first become involved with the court system. It is hoped that by diverting juveniles from this system and exposing them to a positive experience of law and education, no further contact will occur between them and the court system.

This diversion program will not only teach juveniles about law and how it affects them, but also who they are and why they do the things they do. The philosophy of this program is based upon the belief that if juveniles are informed in a positive manner on topics such as law, authority, problem solving and self concepts, they will be able to understand themselves better and make more responsible decisions.

STREET LAW SYLLABUSWho am I and why do I do the things I do?

(One's self concept has everything to do with how one acts. This session offers ways of assessing one's self concept, changing it positively and the benefits of doing so.)

It's a problem not facing problems!

(Problems invariably get bigger when not faced or dealt with poorly. This session offers a step by step approach to facing and resolving one's problems.)

Who says I have an attitude problem and why grown-ups get to rule the roost.

(Young people and adults in authority are destined for conflict. This session will explore the roles and responsibilities related thereto of people in authority as well as constructive ways of dealing with conflict coming out of these relationships.)

What says you can do that?

(Breaking the law invokes consequences. This session will examine crime and its consequences from arrest for the individual to its impact on others and the community.)

This "man in blue", what he does for and to you.

(Performing the duties of a police officer is no simple task. This session will explore the functions of the police and the relationship they need with the community.)

What happens when THEY gotcha?

(A juvenile who violates the law is processed by the Juvenile Court. This session will examine the underlying philosophy of the Juvenile Court, its resources for working with juvenile and their families and the factors considered in making decisions.)

The real lows after the false highs.

(The use of drugs, both substance and alcohol, is considered by some a "high", by others a "downer". This session will offer a candid examination of the "whys" and "wherefores" of drug abuse.

_____ Me and the world around me. (Part I)

(Young people must learn to relate to parents and school officials and sometime to police and courts. This session will explore some of the legal ramifications of these relationships.)

_____ Me and the world around me. (Part II)

(Relating to others is based upon those expectations, both parties in the relationship have for the other. This session will delve into the nature of relationships, genuine vs. artificial expectations and the obligations created thereby.)

_____ Looking back, looking forward.

(It's good to take "stock" once in awhile, that is to examine where you've been/what you've done. This session will for some offer the opportunity to look back at what has been accomplished, for others what there is to look forward to.)
