FY 1985 Annual Report
Research and Program Development Division

The National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is established by section 241 of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 1984 (Public Law 98-473). It is the purpose of the Institute, through the Research and Program Development Division, to:

1. Conduct, encourage, and coordinate research and evaluation into any aspect of juvenile delinquency, particularly with regard to new programs and methods which seek to strengthen and maintain the family unit or which show promise of making a contribution toward the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

2. Encourage the development of demonstration projects in new, innovative techniques and methods to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency;

3. Provide for the evaluation of all juvenile delinquency programs assisted under this title in order to determine the results and effectiveness of such programs;

4. Provide for the evaluation of any other Federal, State, or local juvenile delinquency program upon the request of the Deputy Administrator; and

5. Prepare, in cooperation with educational institutions, with Federal, State, and local agencies, and with appropriate individuals and private agencies, such studies as it considers to be necessary with respect to the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and related matters, including -- (a)

recommendations designed to promote effective prevention and treatment, particularly by strengthening and maintaining the family unit; (b) assessments regarding the role of family violence, sexual abuse or exploitation, media violence, the improper handling of youth placed in one State by another State, the possible ameliorating roles of familial relationships, special education, remedial education, and recreation, and the extent to which youth in the juvenile system are treated differently on the basis of sex, race, or family income and the ramifications of such treatment; (c) examinations of the treatment of juveniles processed in the criminal justice system; and (d) recommendations as to effective means for deterring involvement in illegal activities or promoting involvement in lawful activities on the part of gangs whose membership is substantially composed of juveniles.

The Research and Program Development Division of the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is also charged with the responsibility to design and facilitate major research as specified in the Missing Children's Assistance Act (Title IV) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended. It is the purpose of the Research and Program Development Division to:

1. Collect detailed data from selected states or localities on the actual investigative practices utilized by law enforcement agencies in missing children's cases;

2. Increase knowledge of, and develop effective treatment pertaining to the psychological consequences, for both parents and children, of abduction and sexual exploitation;

3. Address the particular needs of missing children by minimizing the negative impact of judicial and law enforcement on children who are victims of abuse or sexual exploitation and by promoting the active participation of children and their families in cases involving abuse or sexual exploitation of children.

Given this broad congressional mandate, the Research and Program Development Division has organized research into three major areas:

1. Prevention of Delinquent Behavior and Child Exploitation,

2. Improvement of the Juvenile Justice System, and

3. Development of Alternatives to the Traditional Juvenile Justice System.

In 1984, consistent with the 1980 amendments, the majority of available resources in each area were focused on serious juvenile crime and child victimization. The goal was to develop sound information to guide Federal, State and local policy makers and practitioners in allocating resources in the most advantageous way. This report is a synopsis of interim and final results of research and program development projects produced during Fiscal Year 1985.

Prevention of Delinquent Behavior and Child Victimization

This area includes four major types of research: (1) analyses of national trends in juvenile delinquency; (2) examination of the causes and correlates of delinquency and the development of delinquent career patterns; (3) integration of research on causes and correlates of delinquency with prevention program development; and (4) assessment of child victimization, particularly, physical abuse, sexual exploitation, and abduction, and missing children.

Investigation of National Trends in Juvenile Delinquency. Recognizing the limitations of any single data source on juvenile delinquency, NIJJDP utilizes multiple sources to monitor national trends in the volume, distribution, and patterns of juvenile involvement in delinquent activities. The three major sources of national data are Uniform Crime Reports (arrests), National Crime Survey (victimization), and self-report surveys. While juvenile involvement in serious crime increased from 1970 to 1975 (based on UCR data), the three national data sources corroborate a subsequent steady or declining pattern of juvenile involvement in serious crime since 1975. The extent of juvenile involvement in serious crime may still be considered to be unacceptably high, as juveniles account for approximately 31% of all 1984 arrests for Part I index offenses (property and violent combined). Although violent juvenile crime constitutes a relatively small percentage (4.2%) of all 1984 juvenile arrests, such crime poses a substantial threat

to public safety and ensures social and economic costs that are proportionately greater than the prevalence of violent juvenile crime in the total crime picture.

Highlights of Results. During Fiscal Year 1984, NIJJDP updated the delinquency trends analysis utilizing the UCR arrest data through 1984 and the NCS victimization data through 1982.

First, the Uniform Crime Reporting Program provided calculations of age-specific arrest rates by sex for the years 1974, 1979, and 1983, as reported in Crime in the United States: 1983. Age/sex specific arrests rates refer to the number of arrests per 100,000 inhabitants belonging to a prescribed age/sex group in each of these years. Arrest trends reported for these years indicate a continuous decline in the rate for each juvenile age group for total crime index offenses. In 1983, seventeen year old males exhibited the highest arrest rate for any given age/sex group with a rate of 7,141 arrests per 100,000 males 17 years old. In both 1974 and 1979, the sixteen year old male population was the group with the highest arrest rates of 8,605 and 8,087 per 100,000 respectively.

The 12 and under age group, both male and female, represented the only exception to the decline in the juvenile arrest rates for Part I, violent index offenses. There was a slight increase from 14.84 to 15.42 per 100,000, for this age group from 1979 to 1983. In comparison, 18 year old males had the highest arrest rate of any group with 1,231 arrests for violent offenses per 100,000 in 1983. Within each of the age groups between 25-49, all age categories for males showed an increase; and most

age groups for females aged 19-35 also experienced increases in the rate of violent crime.

Arson is the only index offense category for which juveniles account for close to half of all such arrest - 42% in 1984. Of the juvenile arson arrests 80% are 15 years of age or younger. While the number of arrests of juveniles age of 15 years and under increased by 11% between 1983 and 1984, the arrest rates for age groups 15, 13-14 and 12 and under have declined an average of 22% from 1979 to 1983 for this offense.

Analysis of arrest for drug abuse violations, a Part II offense, also indicates that although there was an increase in the numbers of juveniles arrested for drug abuse violations between 1983 and 1984 that the rate has been steadily declining among the juvenile population since 1974.

In 1984, a total of 1,537,688 arrests were made of persons under the age of 18. Ninety percent of these arrests were of juveniles 13 through 17 years of age.

Regarding the proportion of all arrests in 1984, juveniles (between the ages of 13 and 17 inclusive) accounted for 14% while their composition in the general population in 1984 was 8%. For all UCR index offenses, juveniles comprised 27% of all arrests, and for violent and property index crimes, juveniles in this age group accounted for 15.5% and 30%, respectively. These figures reflect a continued decline since 1974 in which the juvenile percentages were 38% for all UCR Index Offenses, 20% for violent offenses and 42% for property offenses.

In 1984, of all arrests of persons under the age of 18, 75% of those arrests were classified as Whites, 23% as Blacks and 2% other. Classification of arrestees by Hispanic origin resulted in a distribution of 13%. This overall distribution remained fairly stable for each of the subsequent categories of offenses. Of the total index offense arrests, Whites represented 70%; Blacks 28%; and Other 1%. Arrests for index property offense reflected a similar breakdown of 73%, 25% and 2%, respectively. The racial breakdown for violent index offenses yields a different distribution with Blacks representing 53% of arrests; Whites 46% and Other 2%.

Regarding police disposition of juvenile offenders taken into custody in 1984, 60% were referred to juvenile court, 5% were referred to criminal or adult court, 31% were handled within the department and released, and the remainder were referred to other welfare or police agencies.

Second, preliminary findings were made available from the Analysis of Juvenile Offending and Victimization Using the National Crime Survey Data - Phase III. Specifically, NCS victimization data were used to examine 1973-1982 national trends in the criminal behavior of juveniles (ages 12 through 17), youthful offenders (ages 18 through 20), and adults (21 or older) for the personal crimes of rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny (purse snatching and pocket picking). NCS data did not support the contention that juvenile crime has risen dramatically in seriousness and prevalence from 1973 to 1982; rather, for the personal crimes reported in this household victimization survey, the juvenile crime rate has remained stable or has declined. The rate of personal crimes committed by

juveniles was consistently highest in large metropolitan areas. Over the ten year study period, the NCS data indicate that juveniles and youthful offenders consistently commit a substantial proportion of personal larcenies, while adults commit the vast majority of rapes. From 1973 to 1982, juveniles have consistently used weapons in the commission of personal crimes less frequently than the youthful or adult offenders. There is no evidence of juvenile weapon use increasing from 1973 through 1982, in fact, the proportion of juvenile personal crimes involving weapon use has remained fairly constant, averaging 27%. Although juveniles and youthful offenders were more likely than adults to commit crimes in groups of three or more offenders, for the ten year study period this group offending phenomenon appears to have decreased substantially. Over the 1973 through 1982 period, juvenile crime remained demonstrably less serious than adult crime in terms of weapon use, injury, and loss.

There are three study components included in Phase III of this research which will be completed in Fiscal Year 1986. In Part I, the researchers will update their analysis of serious juvenile offending to include 1973 through 1983 NCS data. In Part II, NCS data will be utilized to conduct a comprehensive, descriptive analysis of personal crimes involving juveniles as victims compared with victimization of persons in other age groups. In Part III, the researchers will conduct preliminary investigations of the characteristics of youth who are crime victims as well as offenders.

The NIJJDP plans to conduct an assessment of national data collection efforts which will include statistical projects related to delinquency trends. The following is a brief overview of the issues related to the use of existing data sources.

There are several major caveats to be aware of when using the UCR arrest data as a measure of the extent of juvenile delinquency. First, arrest statistics in general are always an under-representation of the extent of actual criminal involvement, due to the exclusion of those crimes unreported to the police as well as those reported crimes which are not cleared by arrest. Second, juvenile offenders are more likely than adults to engage in crime in a group. UCR arrest statistics do not distinguish between individual versus group commissions. Third, a given arrest may result in clearance of one or more separate offenses, which is not reflected in the UCR data base. Caveats such as these limit our ability to utilize UCR arrest data for the purpose of depicting the volume of juvenile crime.

Therefore, while UCR arrests provide a general measure of the extent to which juveniles are responsible for crime, these data must be supplemented with other data sources to more accurately portray the extent and nature of juvenile delinquency. The NCS is a useful supplemental source, but by definition, it is limited to those personal crimes in which the victim observes the offender. Among other limitations is the survey's necessary reliance upon the accuracy of the victim's perception of the age of the offender.

Another means to measure the nature and extent of juvenile delinquency is youth surveys of self-reported delinquency. Such surveys typically disclose more frequent

and widespread delinquent behavior among youth than is evidenced by police arrest reports. In those instances where longitudinal designs were followed, researchers could also probe the nature of an individual's onset and progression or desistance in delinquent behavior. In the past, researchers have encountered serious obstacles in maintaining a nationally representative sample of youth for longitudinal surveys of self-reported delinquency.

During the course of Fiscal Year 1986, NIJJDP will develop a plan of action for increasing the availability and utility of delinquent behavior statistical data bases.

Examination of the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency and Delinquent Career Patterns

A variety of studies has been conducted that inform our understanding of the correlates and causes of the onset, duration, and intensity of juvenile involvement in delinquent activity. Overall, this research supports the conclusion that no single cause accounts for all delinquency, and no single pathway or developmental progress leads to a life of crime.

Certain studies focused on the identification of early behavioral problems which might indicate that a child is especially "high risk" for subsequent delinquency. In the family setting, high risk children challenged parental authority or were difficult to control at home. In the school setting, high risk children displayed what might be considered nonadaptive or nonconforming behavior patterns in the elementary classroom. While such early problem behavior may not have had origins of hostility

and defiance, if these disruptive behavior patterns produce negative peer and angry adult reactions, anti-social and delinquent behaviors were likely to emerge with increasing age.

Other researchers have targeted for investigation those youth entering adolescence. At this stage of a youth's socialization, examples of delinquency risk factors include association with delinquent peers, alienation from parents and school authorities, disrespect for the law, lack of educational achievement, residence in a high crime neighborhood, and experimentation with alcohol and drugs.

Several long-term studies have been supported to identify factors related to substantial serious and violent delinquency. These studies have been conducted in a variety of jurisdictions -- Los Angeles, California; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Racine, Wisconsin; and Columbus, Ohio -- to identify correlates and causes of delinquency and the development of serious delinquent careers. Researchers consistently found evidence of the concentration of serious delinquency. For example, in the 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort study, 982 chronic delinquents (who represented 7.5% of the total cohort and 23% of the delinquents) accounted for 61% of all offenses, including 68% of all UCR index offenses. Factors such as violence in the family, involvement in law-violating gangs and groups, use of alcohol and other drugs, and residence in a high crime neighborhood all seem to contribute to chronic involvement of a small proportion of offenders in serious crime.

Even though we know that a small proportion of youth are serious, chronic offenders, our ability to predict an individual's future involvement in crime remains limited. The strongest predictor is past delinquent behavior, particularly when such behavior begins early, occurs frequently, and involves serious offenses. However, this information is still not adequate to allow us to predict, with a socially acceptable degree of accuracy, who will continue to be involved in crime.

The most common pattern of delinquent behavior appears to be one of declining seriousness and discontinuation after the teen-age period. However, it is apparent that many of those juvenile offenders characterized by frequent police contacts and numerous court referrals will not readily desist from committing criminal acts as adults. A number of our long-term delinquency career studies are continuing to track study youth into adulthood in order to examine the relationship between juvenile delinquency and adult criminal careers. For instance, in Columbus, Ohio, the study of juvenile arrested as adults were more likely to be male, to have been first arrested at a younger age, to have been chronic offenders as juveniles, to have committed more serious violent offenses as juveniles, and to have been committed to a state juvenile correctional facility. Research on delinquency careers has highlighted the need for concentrating justice system resources on those few individuals who repeatedly victimize the community.

Highlights of Results

During Fiscal Year 1985, NIJJDP continued several research projects which focused on the serious and violent delinquent career. An overview of these ongoing studies and preliminary findings, when available, are presented below.

The project entitled The Delinquent Careers of the Serious Juvenile Offenders was designed to study the juvenile court histories of youth referred to court charged with a violent and/or serious property offense. The goal of this research is to develop a detailed portrait of the court careers of the violent and serious property offenders in the hope that patterns will develop to aid in the early identification of these youth so that the courts can focus their attention on those who need it most.

Two historical data sets housed in the National Juvenile Court Data Archive were selected for this analysis. These data sets were generated by the automated court information systems in Maricopa County (Phoenix, Arizona) and the state of Utah, and contain the complete court histories of more than 87,000 youth born between 1962 and 1965. Preliminary analyses show that 7% of these youth (9% of all males and 2% of all females) were charged with a violent offense during their court careers. Eighteen percent of those charged once with a violent offense were referred again for a second violent offense before they reached their eighteenth birthday. Forty-five percent of those whose first referral was for violent offense recidivated, compared to 40% whose first offense was a serious property offense and 33% of those charged with a status offense. Youth whose first referral was for a violent offense were the most likely to be referred again for a violent offense,

especially those charged with robbery. The earlier the age at onset of a court career, the more likely it was that the career contained a referral for a violent offense. To combine these career characteristics, prediction models are being developed and should yield risk factors which are intended to aid in the early identification of serious juvenile offenders.

In a second delinquent career study, researchers also are seeking to enhance our ability to predict Early Correlates of Violent Offense Careers. This study consists of a 30-year data base analysis (from 1950 to 1980) of the criminal careers of a cohort of 7,100 juvenile offenders petitioned to the Los Angeles County Juvenile Court during an 18-month period, centering on the 1950 census date. Violence prone juvenile offenders who continue to exhibit a young adult criminal history characterized by violent offenses will be identified and compared with juveniles who did not persist in violent and serious adult crime. The objective of this research (to be concluded in Fiscal Year 1986) is to aid in the early identification of personal, social, economic and offense pattern factors which characterize the serious and violent juvenile offenders who continue criminal activity as adults.

In a third study, researchers are conducting A Six Year Follow-up of Formerly Incarcerated Violent Juveniles. A purpose of the initial study was to identify the psychiatric, neurological and family characteristics of incarcerated juvenile offenders for the purposes of program planning, treatment and disposition. Data collected from the original sample of 119 adolescents (who were incarcerated in Connecticut during an 18-month period in the late 1970's) have been contrasted with a comparison sample of 40 non-delinquent boys and girls.

The incarcerated youth were significantly more psychiatrically impaired as evidenced by: auditory hallucinations (38% of delinquents, 13% of comparisons, p< .003); paranoid ideation (61% of delinquents, 22% of comparisons, p<.0001); loose, illogical thought processes (38% of delinquents, 5% of comparisons, p<.0001); and a history of psychiatric hospitalization (28% of delinquents, none of comparisons, p< .001). Cognitive functioning among many of the delinquents was significantly impaired as was seen in their inability to perform simple arithmetic and short-term memory tasks.

Neurological impairments and psychomotor difficulties were significantly more prevalent in the incarcerated sample as shown in the following: presence of major neurological impairment (38% of delinquents, 17% of comparisons, p<.023); documentation of seizure disorder (20% of delinquents, 5% of comparisons, p<.029); presence of minor neurological impairment (92% of delinquents, 68% of comparisons, p<.001); inability to skip (31% of delinquents, 3% of comparisons, p< .001).

The researchers determined that incarcerated youth were much more likely than their nondelinquent counterparts to have been abused by parents, to have witnessed family violence, to have had an alcoholic parent, and to have been placed outside of the home.

These findings, while based on a fairly limited sample of a single state's incarcerated youth, point to the need to carefully consider psychiatric, neurological and family characteristics in planning for appropriate treatment.

The researchers are presently conducting a follow-up study of the incarcerated youth to determine which of them have persisted in criminal activity by examining adult arrest records. The major purpose of the follow-up study is to determine those medical, psychiatric, educational, and family factors of incarcerated serious delinquents that are associated with positive adult adaptation, and those associated with continued antisocial behavior and violence.

The study of Violent Delinquents and the Child Welfare System is based on a cohort of juveniles born between 1956 and 1960 who were arrested at least once by the Columbus, Ohio, police department for a violent offense. The researchers are tracking this cohort retrospectively through the welfare system to explore the relationship between involvement with the child welfare system and violent juvenile delinquency.

In addition to the above research which is focused on serious and violent delinquent careers, NIJJDP is sponsoring or planning to initiate the following studies which investigate the causes and correlates of delinquency from a variety of theoretical perspectives.

For example, the Delinquency in a Birth Cohort Follow-up study builds upon the existing data base collected on the 27,160 males and females born in Philadelphia in

1958. In the past, researchers restricted their data collection to school, police, and court records. In the follow-up study, researchers are interviewing a non-proportional stratified random sample of 2,000 of the original 1950 birth cohort. Interviews will be focused on such theoretically relevant topic areas as socialization, community/neighborhood factors, socioeconomic status, family background, gang influences, situational contingencies, child abuse and neglect, stressful events, drug involvement, self-concept, personality, and psychopathy.

The Effects of Foster Care on Delinquency: An Administrative Study is a pilot effort to determine which experiences in foster care contribute to delinquency and which arrangements appear to effectively prevent or reduce delinquency. Before finalizing the research design, the investigator conducted a literature review of empirical research conducted to date on the relationship of foster care and delinquency. Few studies were identified that looked at foster children after discharge from care. Even fewer studies examined simultaneously the relationships among pre-foster care experiences, in-care experiences, and post-foster care experiences. Findings from the relevant studies could not be considered conclusive due to apparent methodological constraints such as small sample size, no adequate comparison group, questionable accuracy of data sources, omission of relevant factors, and absence of longitudinal designs. The findings across studies were frequently contradictory, particularly regarding the comparative benefits of foster care placement versus remaining at the family home.

The research design for this study is an attempt to overcome some of the shortcomings of previous investigations. The sample will be selected from the

universe of petitions for foster care placement that were filed in the Washington, D.C., Superior Court on behalf of children from birth to 17 years of age. The treatment group will comprise a random sample of 200 black males who were considered but ordered placed in foster care; and the cmparison group will comprise a random sample of 200 black males who were not ordered placed in foster care. Utilizing administrative records, the data collections will extract pertinent information on foster care, delinquency, police contact and school performance. This research has important implications for policy-makers in their efforts to shift referrals to those foster care facilities that have demonstrated success in preventing crime among at-risk youth. Also, these findings should be informative for those judges responsible for determining if a child's needs can best be met in the "natural" family or a foster placement.

Indeed, a very critical issue facing the juvenile justice system is how to support and strengthen the family in order to increase the family's capability to provide individual children and youth with a positive socialization experience. The Executive Sessions on Juvenile Justice with Special Sessions Focused on Role of Family create a forum for public and private experts at the federal, state and local levels to discuss this topic. Previous executive sessions have consistently identified the family as the institution which perhaps has the most decisive effects on the volume and nature of the workload of the juvenile justice system. The planned products of these special sessions are a series of papers on family research, promising strategies for strengthening families, and government policies and programs which impact on families.

When we discuss a child's socialization, it is useful to conceptualize this process not only in the context of the family but also from the perspective of the individual and his community. Under NIJJDP's proposed Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency, interdisciplinary research teams will seek to improve our understanding of the development of prosocial and antisocial behavior patterns. The program has five major objectives: (1) to examine the etiology of delinquency in the context of the high crime community, family and individual differences; (2) to identify the sequential ordering of different developmental processes and life experiences which lead to either positive socialization or adaptation of a delinquent lifestyle; (3) to identify those predisposing factors which characterize a child at risk for involvement in antisocial behavior and delinquency; (4) to enhance our ability for early identification and intervention with high risk youth for the prevention of delinquency; and (5) to advance the development of a sound theoretical framework for the development of effective strategies for delinquency prevention and justice system intervention. Emphasis will be placed on the development of longitudinal designs and innovative techniques for prospective measurement of those delinquency risk factors which offer the greatest utility in terms of being suitable targets for change through prevention and intervention strategies.

The final new area of investigation presently planned for Fiscal Year 1986 is Research on Juvenile Drug Abuse in Inner City, High Crime Communities. To date, the majority of research on the extent, patterns and prevention of juvenile drug abuse has been conducted in low to middle class communities with small non-white populations and relatively low levels of crime. This research will be conducted in

inner city communities which vary in terms of such factors as ethnic minority composition, nature of the drug problem, and the nature of the systems for responding to drug problems.

The program will consist of two phases. The first phase will focus on an analysis of the scope and patterns of drug abuse, and the availability and use of prevention/intervention strategies and ethnic minority youth. The information gained from this research phase with be applied to the development of strategies for drug abuse prevention and intervention programs in inner city communities. Phase two of this program will be a multisite test of the efficacy of the strategies developed under phase one.

In closing, as we proceed to conduct research on the causes and correlates of delinquency, we are cognizant of the need to channel our energies toward the identification and investigation of those delinquency risk factors which offer the greatest promise for prevention and intervention strategy development.

Delinquency Prevention. Research on the causes and correlates of delinquency serves to identify key factors to be considered in the development of effective delinquency prevention strategies. In 1980, The Assessment Center on Delinquent Behavior and Prevention completed a national assessment of the state-of-the-art of delinquency prevention research and practices. In this report, the social development of youth was conceptualized as a growth process influenced by a variety of environmental factors (e.g., family, education, peers, religion, recreation, community, employment, drugs and alcohol, and prevalence of crime).

The results of this assessment have been applied to the design of research and development programs in schools and communities to test the social development approach to delinquency prevention.

Several evaluations of specific school-based delinquency prevention programs have been conducted. Various research studies have demonstrated that experiencing academic success is strongly associated with adoption of a nondelinquent lifestyle, while academic failure is strongly association with delinquency. The overall purpose of school-based delinquency prevention strategies is to maximize each student's intellectual, social, and personal potential by providing him or her with the opportunity to experience success and rewards, rather than failure and punishment.

Delinquency prevention programs were specifically designed to establish a school climate conducive to academic excellence. The term "school climate" encompasses a broad range of environmental factors including school crime, student-teacher victimization, fear of crime, disciplinary procedures, opportunities for reward, alternative approaches to education, classroom management, and community involvement. Improvement of the classroom learning environment has been demonstrated through the utilization of techniques for proactive classroom management. This discipline strategy requires teachers: (1) to set clear behavioral expectations at the outset, (2) to structure a learning environment which actively involves all students at all times, and (3) to handle discipline problems in a manner least disruptive to the instructional process. Other techniques for engaging

students in academic pursuits include increasing the relevance of course curricula and involving representatives of the community in the learning process.

Research findings support what might be considered a commonsense notion that a school experiencing constant disruption will not be conducive to the task of education. In those school settings where students and teachers fear for their personal safety, a reasonable level of order must be established before even the semblance of a learning community can be reached. Efforts by individual teachers to maintain order in the classroom need to be complemented by implementation of school-wide strategies for reduction of disruptive behavior and school crime. Reduction of school crime has been demonstrated in schools which assembled work groups (drawn from the staff of the school) to improve organizational effectiveness. Success was greater in those schools where teacher teams worked together for a longer period of time, obtained the full support of the school administration, and involved students and parents in solving school problems.

In keeping with the theoretical framework of the social development approach, comprehensive prevention efforts should not only focus on the school setting, but also other key youth socializing forces such as the family, social services, juvenile justice agencies and the employment sector. Advocates for delinquency prevention have demonstrated success in their efforts to influence changes in the policies, practices, and procedures of youth-serving systems. Local community residents appear to have a viable role in identifying the needs of their youth and striving to hold institutions accountable for the delivery of quality services.

Promising preliminary results from various prevention initiatives support the premise that delinquency prevention can be accomplished with carefully developed program strategies, sound evaluation designs, and clear measurement of program impact on the reduction of the factors that place youth at risk of committing delinquent acts. The refinement of delinquency prevention technologies is critical to ultimately reducing the number of individual citizens victimized by juvenile offenders.

Highlights of Results

It is evident that juvenile crime is not equally dispersed throughout the United States. For the purposes of testing the efficacy of delinquency prevention strategies, NIJJDP has chosen to select for investigation those neighborhoods and schools which have documented severe juvenile crime problems. In Fiscal Year 1985, work proceeded on two major delinquency prevention program evaluations, and development activities commenced on a program to reduce school crime and improve disciplinary practices.

First, work is continuing on the Evaluation Component of the Violent Juvenile Offender Research and Development Program: Part II. This R&D effort was designed to answer the following three major questions: (1) can resident mobilization around highly specified juvenile crime prevention issues lead to a reduction of violent juvenile crime within a pre-selected, target neighborhood; (2) can neighborhood residents influence or bring about a change in institutional responses to youth in a target neighborhood; and (3) can neighborhood residents

influence or bring about changes in youth attachments and bonds, and how are these changes related to neighborhood violent juvenile crime.

The research design for Part II includes an investigation of the development, process and impacts of the funded projects located in six high-crime neighborhoods of New York City, New Orleans, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, and San Diego. A primary function of the national evaluator is to assist the target neighborhoods in the implementation of their Crime Analysis System which is an ongoing cycle of data collection, analysis and feedback. The CAS is designed to determine the nature and extent of violent crime in the neighborhood, to identify and target for change crime producing conditions, and to inform the development of action plans for implementation of the program strategies to prevent violent juvenile crime. The Part II research design also entails the concurrent study of comparison neighborhoods in three sites to provide a stronger empirical data base for determining whether changes in juvenile crime rates can be attributed to Part II model intervention.

Part II program neighborhoods were specifically selected on the basis of the prevalence of violent juvenile crime and the desire of residents to strive to combat this problem. Half of the Part II sites are experiencing major difficulties with youth gang activities. Evaluation feedback from the CAS confirms the magnitude of the violent juvenile crime problem in the project sites.

Interim findings from the surveys of school attending youth, dropouts, and gang members at these sites depict an interesting pattern of self-reported delinquency.

Among the three groups, students self-report the lowest rate of delinquency and gang members report the highest rate. In these neighborhoods, remaining in school appears to have a holding effect on nondelinquent behaviors. The delinquency patterns among in-school youth show that 9th and 10th graders self-report the highest levels of delinquent behavior and 12th graders report the lowest levels. In those neighborhoods with active youth gangs, the drug cultures seem to be largely controlled by gang members.

Interim findings from the household victimization surveys indicate fairly high levels of victimization and very high levels of unreported crime (upwards of 70% in certain neighborhoods). Sites have attempted mediation activities with the local police to enhance service delivery and to improve police community relations. While it is premature at this stage of program implementation to draw conclusions about the efficacy of the police mediation components, several sites have shown improvements in the residents' rating of police promptness, courtesy and competence with each survey iteration (three surveys conducted thus far).

A second study is the Evaluation of Programs for Delinquency Prevention Through Alternative Education. Findings indicated that participating schools showed overall improvement in measures of school safety from the 1981 school year to the 1983 school year, and these patterns are highly unlikely to have arisen by chance alone. Teachers reported being victimized less ($p < .01$), experiencing fewer classroom disruptions ($p < .01$), and perceiving the school environment to be a safer place ($p < .05$). Students reported significantly ($p < .01$) less gang activity at school, less crime in the community, and more safety in the school. Two of the schools in the

initiative (Milwood Jr. High School in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and St. Johns High School in Charleston, South Carolina) both produced credible evidence of reductions in delinquent behavior.

The alternative education project conducted in Charleston, South Carolina appears to have been very effective. It was a school-based delinquency prevention program that combined an organizational change approach with direct intervention for high-risk youths to reduce delinquent behavior and improve educational experiences. Evaluation results imply that the direct student services, as implemented, produced no dependable effects on delinquent behavior, but they did increase commitment to education as indicated by lower rates of dropout and retention in grade and higher graduation rates and standardized achievement test scores. Some evidence suggests that these services might have been effective for reducing delinquent behavior if strengthened. The project was effective in improving school climate. Students in the project's schools grew more attached to school, perceived an increase in the fairness of school rules and in the extent to which their schools were characterized by planning and action. Students also developed more positive self-concepts, reported more belief in conventional social rules, fewer suspensions, and lower levels of alienation. They also reported their schools to be safer. The evidence supports the conclusion that the program is an effective model for reducing several risk factors for delinquent behavior for the school population as a whole, and for increasing educational outcomes for high-risk individuals. The program, if further developed, should have promise for reducing delinquent behavior and drug use for the school population as a whole.

The researchers have indicated that school safety and orderliness is related to the clarity, fairness, and firmness of school rules. School administrators may attempt to work with teachers in drafting disciplinary practices but subsequently encounter obstacles in the implementation process. Some of the nation's most disorderly schools are characterized by a lack of systematic planning. The researchers urge school practitioners to collaborate with researchers to plan and implement programs to produce better and safer schools.

In Fiscal Year 1986, NIJJDP plans to initiate the School Crime and Discipline Research and Development Program. This program is designed to develop and test the efficacy of improved disciplinary policies and procedures for the reduction of school crime and disorder in secondary schools. It calls for the development of policies and procedures based on a careful analysis of relevant legislation, case law and discipline-related litigation against the schools. The research should also include an assessment of the perceived effects of previous lawsuits on discipline and crime control practices. Building upon the experience of the Alternative Education Evaluation, this initiative requires a collaborative effort at each site among researchers, program planners, school administrators, faculty, and law enforcement personnel, as appropriate.

Missing and Victimized Children

In recent years, NIJJDP supported a number of projects which served to clarify issues of research, treatment and justice system response regarding child abuse, sexual exploitation of children, and family violence.

There is general consensus that research conducted to date substantiates the commonly held opinion that negative childhood experiences, such as physical abuse, sexual exploitation, and exposure to family violence, have a deleterious effect on a child's developmental process. While the extent of the trauma and long-term consequences of abuse vary from child to child, the empirical evidence suggests that victimized children are at greater risk for involvement in delinquent behavior. Researchers consistently emphasized the need to sensitize the criminal justice system to the special concerns of victimized children and their families.

With the passage of the Missing Children's Assistance Act, NIJJDP initiated program planning to fully address the research concerns specified in that Act.

Highlights of Results

The following provides a brief discussion of ongoing research in the area of child sexual exploitation and planned research on missing and victimized children.

The study of Possible Linkages Between Sexual Abuse and Exploitation of Children and Juvenile Delinquency, Violence and Criminal Activity is currently underway. The research design calls for an examination of two separate groups: (1) child victims of sexual exploitation and (2) juvenile and adult victimizers, including serial rapists, pedophiles and murderers. The researchers seek to profile those child victims who break the victimization cycle and adapt to age-appropriate activities, those who are at risk for chronic exploitation/victimization, and those who identify

with the victimizer and continue a pattern of increasingly violent behavior. This study is scheduled for completion in Fiscal Year 1986.

Researchers are continuing to investigate the Role of Pornography in Family Violence, Child Sexual Exploitation and Juvenile Delinquency. This study serves to initiate a systematic examination of the hypothesized link between pornography and exploitation of children and crime. It consists of a content analysis of mainstream pornography focused on children and violent crime. This study is also scheduled for completion in Fiscal Year 1986.

Five new areas of research have been initiated under in the Missing Children's Program. NIJJDP is attempting to overcome some of the prevalent problems facing national efforts of law enforcement, citizen groups and private organizations in responding to the problem. The following impediments present significant challenges in understanding the nature and extent of the problem itself and identification of effective strategies to respond to it: (1) fragmented and incomplete sources of information on missing children nationwide; (2) lack of uniformity in defining "missing children" for purposes of law enforcement intervention; (3) inconsistencies within and across jurisdictions in terms of follow-up of particular missing children cases such as parental kidnapping, runaways and homeless youth; and (4) lack of profiles on the types of missing children themselves, the circumstances of their disappearance, and their experiences while missing.

First, NIJJDP will sponsor a National Study of Law Enforcement Agencies' Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth. The goals of this

three phase national study are to systematically describe the role of law enforcement agencies both in responding to reports of missing children and in the identification and recovery of these children. This comprehensive national study will focus primarily on local law enforcement agencies' practices including their utilization of state and federal information resources such as the National Crime Information Center/ Missing Persons File (NCIC/MPF) and the Unidentified Deceased File (UDF). The scope of the study includes law enforcement's handling of all categories of missing children as well as homeless youth. It is expected that the knowledge gained from this study will contribute to our understanding of the extent and nature of the problem of missing children nationwide and help identify effective responses at the federal, state and local level to missing children and homeless youth.

Second, a National Incidence Study to Determine the Actual Numbers of Missing Children will be conducted. This study will determine for a given year the number of children under the age of 18 who are reported missing, including the numbers of such children who are victims of abductions by strangers, parental kidnappings and the number of children who are recovered each year. It will also determine the number of children whose whereabouts are unknown to their legal custodians because they are runaways, or missing for other reasons. It is anticipated that this effort, which will survey households, will gather important data regarding the numbers and characteristics of all incidents of missing children both those reported and unreported -- and should provide valuable information on the circumstances and the duration of the absences, the child's experience, and assistance to the youth and family.

Third, The Relationship Between Missing and Abducted Children and Sexual Exploitation will be examined. Following an assessment of the literature on sexual exploitation of children, a research project will be undertaken to gather more factual information of the correlation between missing children and their risk of sexual exploitation and its consequences.

Fourth, The Psychological Consequences of Abduction and Sexual Exploitation of Children will be assessed from a clinical perspective. Research is needed in this are to identify effective methods for treating children who have been victims of abduction and sexual exploitation and for helping the parents and child return to normal after the event.

Fifth, a study will be conducted on The Child Victim as Witness. Children are serving more frequently as witnesses in trials of their accused abductors and abusers. Research is needed on the effectiveness of children as witnesses, the negative effects of the proceeding on children, and the effects of court strategies to reduce stress for child witnesses.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

This area includes projects designed to develop national data on caseflow through the juvenile justice system, to analyze the organization, policies, and practices of police, court, and correctional systems, and to analyze the effects of juvenile delinquency related legislation.

A major goal of research on the juvenile justice system is to develop four areas of inquiry: studies of contact patterns of chronic offenders to identify the most propitious intervention points; research on the organizational policy and political determinants of how cases are processed, including the impact of race on police processing and court decisions; evaluation of the effectiveness of specific interventions; and the philosophy and role of the juvenile justice system. Ultimately, the results will be integrated to inform juvenile justice agencies of the most efficient ways to process juvenile offenders effectively.

Juvenile Court Statistics

OJJDP continues to monitor juvenile justice system case handling through the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System and the Children in Custody Survey. NUJJRS provides national estimates of the caseloads and processing of youth through the juvenile court system..

Highlights of Results

The following is a summary of findings from the reports prepared under the National Uniform Juvenile Justice Reporting System (NUJJRS) Program maintained by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ). One of the purposes of this research program is to compile and summarize data which has been voluntarily submitted to the NCJJ on the number and types of cases handled by juvenile and family courts with jurisdiction over delinquency and dependency/neglect cases. In

addition to reporting the actual caseloads handled by reporting jurisdictions, data from a sample of these courts meeting specific data requirements for coverage were used to derive national estimates of the workload of the nation's juvenile court.

For the most part, the county was the reporting unit. A case disposed of by the court was the unit of analysis. In 1982, of the possible 3,097 counties in the nation, 2,188 provided data on delinquency cases and 1,695 on dependency/neglect caseloads.

National estimates for delinquency cases were based on reporting jurisdictions which served approximately 50 percent of the at risk population in the U.S.; dependency/neglect estimates were based on 25 percent of the risk population. Due to the voluntariness of the sample, it is not possible to determine the exact representativeness of this sample of jurisdictions because the characteristics of nonreporting jurisdictions are not known. Delinquency case rates reported here are based on the number of children ages 10 through 17 in this sample and the general population. Dependency/neglect case rates are based on population of children from 0 through 17 years of age.

Statistics reported here reflect the national estimates of those cases handled by courts and should not be interpreted as a measure of the volume of juvenile crime or extent of abuse and neglect occuring in the United States. As reported in the 1982 Uniform Crime Reports, Crime in the United States, 59% of the individuals arrested under the age of 18 were referred to the juvenile courts. Similarly, for

dependency and neglect, these statistics do not reflect those cases handled outside the purview of the court.

Dependency/Neglect Cases: Dependency/neglect cases are defined as those involving charges of neglect or inadequate care against parents or guardians, abandonment, or desertion, abuse or cruel treatment, or improper or inadequate conditions in the home. In 1982, an estimated 172,500 dependency/neglect cases were disposed of by courts having jurisdiction. This number, when compared to the child population under the age of 18 yield a rate of 2.7 per 1,000. This represents a slight decline from 2.9 cases per 1,000 youth in 1981, but a 23% increase in the rate since 1974. Almost three out of four dependency/neglect cases were handled officially by the court through filing a petition for a judicial hearing. Since 1974, there has been a steady increase in both the numbers of dependency and neglect cases as well as the proportion of cases disposed of by urban (72%) courts as opposed to semi-urban (21%) and rural (7%). Correspondingly, the rates of dependency/neglect cases per 1,000 youth at risk (ages 0-17) for urban, semi-urban and rural counties were as follows: 3.1, 2.2 and 1.8 per 1,000 respectively.

Delinquency Cases: In 1982, an estimated 1,296,000 delinquency cases were disposed of by courts with juvenile jurisdiction, which is the lowest number of cases since 1975. The estimated rate of delinquency cases per 1,000 at risk youth in the population (10 through 17 years of age) was 43 per 1,000, compared to the UCR arrest rate of 81 per 1,000 youth in this age range. (For more detailed discussion of juvenile arrest data, refer to the preceding section on "Investigation of National Trends in Juvenile Delinquency"). The 1982 delinquency case rate is equal to the

average of the years from 1975 through 1981 during which there was some fluctuation of the rate up to as high as 46 per 1,000 in 1980.

Detailed data on delinquency case processing is reported in the Delinquency in the United States 1982 report, which is compiled by NCJJ in the National Juvenile Court Data Archive. These data fall into one of two general categories: automated case-level data containing approximately 478,000 cases and non-automated court-level statistics containing an additional 183,000 cases. Therefore, court level statistics (including case level data) compatible with the reporting requirements of the series were available from courts having jurisdiction over 53 percent of the nation's juvenile population: and detailed case level data from jurisdictions containing 38 percent of the juvenile population. Together these sources provide information on sources of referral, reasons for referral, intake decisions, secure detention, dispositions of the case and characteristics of the youth processed.

Of the estimated 1,296,000 delinquency and status offense cases disposed of by juvenile courts, 77% were referred to the courts by law enforcement. Referral sources varied by the nature of the presenting offense with police referrals being the highest source for delinquency, whereas only half of the runaway cases and less than one-forth of the ungovernable and truancy offenses were referred by law enforcement. Property offenses represented the highest proportion of delinquency cases, 48% followed by 18% for public order, 17% status offenses, 12% personal offenses, and 5% drug offenses.

Of those cases referred to court, 20% were held in detention prior to the court's disposition. It was estimated that over half of the cases (54%) did not result in a formal petition for adjudication by the juvenile court. Of those non-petitioned cases, juveniles were either released (68%), or referred to other agencies (14%), probation (13%), a residential placement (1%) or for some other reason not formally petitioned. Of those petitioned 64% of the cases were adjudicated. Of those adjudicated 233,000 received a disposition of probation, 111,000 received a juvenile placement and 1,000 received a combined juvenile/adult disposition. This represents a total of 26.7% of all referrals having received a court-ordered sanction for their offenses. In addition, a total of 13,000 referrals to juvenile (1%) were waived or direct-filed for prosecution of the cases in criminal court.

Regarding selected characteristics of juveniles referred to court, 77% of the delinquency cases in 1982 were males. For every 1,000 males aged 10 through 17 in the population, the juvenile court handled 66 male cases, compared to 20 female delinquency cases for every 1,000 females in that age range. Males were involved in more than 70 percent of all liquor law and curfew violations and 57 percent of all truancy cases and about half of all the ungovernability cases. In only one status offense category, runaway, did the majority of cases (63%) involve females.

Overall, male delinquency case rates increased continuously with age, while female case rates peaked at age 15, decreased for 16 year olds and by the age of 17 the rates were approximately those at 14. The larger decline in the rate of female, and not male, status offense cases after the age of 15 is particularly striking and, unlike

the delinquency offense categories for female. The rates of male and female status offense cases up to the 15 year old age group were nearly equal.

Males were more likely than females to have been referred to court intake by law enforcement agencies (as opposed to other referral sources) and more likely to be securely detained. Male cases were also more likely to be petitioned, and once petitioned more likely than female cases to be formally adjudicated and placed out of home. Male cases were also more likely to be transferred to adult court for prosecution. These findings generally reflect the more serious nature of both the presenting offenses and delinquent histories of males compared to females.

Youth below the age of 16 were responsible for 57% of all delinquency cases processed by juvenile courts. Compared to offenders aged 16 and above, young offenders were more likely to be referred to intake by other referrals source than law enforcement; were less likely to be detained or petitioned, but if petitioned were as likely to be adjudicated and placed on formal probation or out of home as were older juveniles whose cases were petitioned.

National estimates on characteristics such as race and ethnicity of the cases disposed of by juvenile court are not calculated because of the lack of interim census data on age, race, sex-specific estimates/projections of populations at the county level for inter census periods. Therefore, the data on these factors are derived from the summary and case-level data from only those reporting jurisdiction and do not reflect national estimates.

Demographic profiles of cases referred to juvenile courts (based on 398,000 cases with sufficient detail for inclusion) indicated racial composition of all court referrals as follows: 74 percent white, 23% black and 3% other. For violent index offenses 52% of the referrals were White; 45% Black and 3% other; for property index offenses 70% of the cases were White; 27% were Black and 3% other.

Using only the case-level sample data and examining within group characteristics and not volume of cases, NCJJ compared characteristics of a typical 1,000 Black and 1,000 White cases processed by juvenile courts. As a group, Black cases were more likely than Whites to be referred to court for involvement in offenses against persons (183 per 1,000 cases vs. 96 per 1,000 cases) and property offenses (523 vs. 468), while White cases were more likely to be referred for charges having to do with public order offenses (192 vs. 150); status offenses (190 vs. 115) and drugs (54 vs. 30). Racial differences in case processing were also observed; 51% of all cases involving Blacks were petitioned compared to 41% for whites. Except in the status offense category, Blacks were more likely to be formally petitioned than Whites. In all offense categories Blacks were more likely to be detained (24% vs. 19%), and more likely to be placed out of home (11% vs. 8%).

Data briefs on special topics will be presented in the final published report and researchers are encouraged to utilized the data tapes made available through the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan.

In Fiscal Year 1986 the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention plans to conduct a comprehensive assessment of all federally-supported, national scope statistical data collection efforts that relate to all youth populations covered by the JJDP Act. The purpose of this assessment is to evaluate the extent to which 1) existing statistical data collection efforts funded by the Office might be improved; and 2) other data collection efforts sponsored by other federal agencies could be better utilized to supplement our knowledge regarding the subjects of interest to this Office and the field.

The assessment will identify significant gaps in information regarding both special populations and significant issues regarding how various systems process these cases. Particular attention will be paid to examining limitations and potential of these data sets for addressing major issues in terms of definitions, unit of analysis, coverage, and frequency of these efforts. It is anticipated that recommendations from this assessment will include: maintaining existing series without modification; changing some aspects of the survey design, or methodology; modifying data analysis or dissemination strategies; identifying opportunities to supplement to other surveys for specific purposes such as the addition of question items or the preparation of specific data tabulations and analysis; the use of follow-up surveys to build upon existing data sets; replicating previous studies; and undertaking new data collection efforts.

The assessment will be jointly undertaken by OJJDP and the Bureau of Justice Statistics with the assistance of a panel representative of the users and suppliers of data. It will include methodologists as well as policy makers and researchers from

state and Federal agencies, grantee organizations and academics. The panel will meet and discuss papers on selected topics and issues and make recommendations for consideration by the Office.

SYSTEM PROCESSING OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

OJJDP is continuing to assist the field in evaluating new strategies for more effective handling of juvenile offender, with special attention to the serious and chronic offender. Studies are focused on assessing intensified law enforcement efforts to identifying serious habitual juvenile offenders involved in drug trafficking; demonstrating specialized prosecutorial units to concentrate on serious habitual juvenile offenders; the differences between juvenile and criminal court handling of serious youthful offenders; testing the impact of various levels of probation supervision on juvenile recidivism; and assessing the impact of various determinate and indeterminate "sentencing" models on institutional commitment and release decisionmaking.

Highlights of Results

In Fiscal Year 1985, the evaluation of the Serious, Habitual Juvenile Offender/Drug Involved (SHO/DI) Program was continued. The OJJDP SHO/DI program applies the Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP) model, particularly its crime analysis component, to identify serious drug-involved juvenile offenders (also adult street pushers who deal with juveniles), and to organize justice system activities for more effective control of these offenders.

The SHO/DI program focuses on serious, habitual juvenile offenders, drug abuse, and related offenses, and interagency cooperation (including school and community support) in the suppression of drug-related juvenile/adult criminality, adds new dimensions to the ICAP model.

The evaluation covers all five SHO/DI sites (Portsmouth, Virginia; Colorado Springs, Colorado; Jacksonville, Florida; Oxnard, California; and San Jose, California). Its essential purpose is to measure and assess the major thrust of the program which is to assure swift and certain control of serious, habitual, drug involved juvenile offenders. This strategy requires the establishment of cooperative relationships between police, courts, corrections, schools and other agencies. The process evaluation consists of an assessment of the extent to which the organization developments have taken place and their impact on the projects' overall goals.

The significant program accomplishments to date include: 1) development of cooperative relationships among agencies involved with SHO/DI program; 2) identification of sources of juvenile criminal history information; 3) collection and analysis of offense data; 4) development of program selection and criteria, and systematic case processing of SHO/DI's in accordance with program guidelines. Preliminary data indicates that severe sanctions are being applied to SHO/DI's and that removal of several of these offenders from a neighborhood may affect juvenile crime in that area.

The Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Program (HSVJOP) focuses on alternative methods of handling serious juvenile offenders. This program has four major strategy areas: prosecution, courts, victim/witness assistance, and corrections. The national evaluation of this program has the following objectives which are considered most critical:

1. to assess the degree to which the prosecutors consistently: identify target cases in accordance with selection criteria; assign experienced prosecutors to handle target cases; utilize vertical prosecution of target cases; reduce the number of decisions made without knowledge of the juvenile's delinquent history; and restrict or eliminate charge or sentence bargaining;

2. to determine whether the courts reduce pretrial, trial and dispositional delays;

3. to evaluate how consistently prosecutors implement specified program services for the victims of target youth crimes;

4. to document efforts to enhance the rehabilitative approach for project youth, particularly in terms of utilization of individualized needs assessment, goal-oriented treatment plans, and continuous case management; and

5. to develop and institutionalize a Management Information System capacity to enhance identification, record management, processing and follow-up of target youth throughout their involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice system.

According to the UCR arrest statistics, juveniles account for approximately one third of arrests for serious property and violent crimes in the United States today. Various studies have shown, however, that a very small percentage of the juvenile population is responsible for the majority of serious juvenile crime.

What is needed is a clearer understanding of the habitual serious juvenile offender. That is, why do these youth (who are repeatedly involved in serious crime, referred to the justice system, subjected to the adjudication process, and provided with correctional/probation interventions) continue to engage in serious criminal activity? The primary question to be addressed by this evaluation is how justice system could more effectively identify, prosecute and rehabilitate these repeat offenders.

The Comparative Dispositions Study: Handling Dangerous Juveniles was completed in fiscal year 1985. This study was designed to provide information on court processing procedures of youth tried in juvenile court and youth tried in adult court for similar offenses; and to explore the public policies inherent in social responses to dangerous juvenile offenders. The study produced a series of reports including a comprehensive statutory summary volume for every state, the United States (federal) code, and the District of Columbia; a policy volume which offers an array of perspectives on different aspects of the issue, ranging from whether to remove the dangerous juvenile offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction to the question of the most appropriate mechanism for getting dangerous juvenile offenders into adult court. These reports are intended to further a basic understanding about how states

and federal agencies respond to the phenomenon of dangerous crimes committed by juveniles.

This study was a follow up to earlier exploratory research entitled "Youth in Adult Courts" which consisted of a nationwide survey of the extent of the practice of trying youth as adults in criminal courts, and of the legal procedures used to transfer them. The findings suggested that the widespread belief that youth who are tried and convicted as adults receive more severe sentences than those tried in juvenile court may be erroneous.

Records from over 28,000 offenders whose cases were disposed of during 1980-1981 in the nine jurisdictions were incorporated into a data base to analyze the comparative dispositions of juvenile and adult courts for three samples: juveniles who were charged with murder, non-negligent manslaughter, aggravated assault, rape, robbery, and burglary, who were tried in juvenile court (less than 18 years of age), or in adult courts (those under 18 years of age but whose original jurisdiction was criminal court). Both groups of juveniles were then compared to young adults offenders (18-26 years) tried in adult courts in terms of sentencing, confinement, and length of confinement.

The results show that the percentage of youth waived to adult court varied extensively across sites. Overall, the percentage found guilty was comparable across jurisdictions, but there were major differences in confinement: nearly three in four juveniles in the criminal courts were confined, compared to less than 3 in 10 in the juvenile court. Similarly, juveniles spent less time in confinement: nearly

twice as many youth were released at the end of the data collection period as were confined offenders from the adult court.

In terms of seriousness, juveniles in juvenile court had committed less serious offenses (within the felony categories included in the study) than had the youth in adult court or the young adults in court. This is not surprising since seriousness of the immediate offense undoubtedly is one of the reasons youth are waived to adult court. It was also clear that controlling for the instant offense, more serious juvenile cases are tried in adult courts than in juvenile courts and adult courts were more apt to incarcerate youth. Under the auspices of the Habitual Serious Violent Offender Program and the Evaluation of Serious, Habitual Juvenile Offender/Drug Involved Program we are investigating the extent to which prior offenses influence the decision to retain youth or transfer youth to the adult system.

Continued support was provided for The Impact of Juvenile Court Intervention on Delinquency Careers. This project involves an examination of the various levels of court intervention on delinquent behavior, attitudes of juvenile offenders and juvenile justice costs. This study also provides an opportunity to replicate an earlier study which documented notable effects on recidivism of a range of correctional interventions.

Both official records and self-report data are being collected to determine factors that may predict recidivism among probationers (i.e., age, sex, ethnicity, offense, prior arrests, and family characteristics). This study should provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of various levels of probation and other correctional

programs on various types of offenders. In particular, it will provide guidance for the intensity of supervision and level of services required to reduce recidivism by different types of offenders. This study also provides an opportunity to replicate an earlier study which documented notable effects on recidivism of a range of correctional inventions.

Work was completed on The National Study of Institutional Commitment and Release Decision Making for Juvenile Delinquents. This is a study that focuses on the final decisions affecting a juvenile in the juvenile justice system. However, the scope of the investigation involves nearly all components of juvenile justice system from parole boards, juvenile corrections officials, probation and diagnostic staff, judges, prosecutors and legislators. This three phase study examined the legislative and administrative frameworks under which correctional release decisions are made with particular attention to the variation based on "sentencing" structure in five states. These case studies are of states representative of a wide range of models which fall somewhere on the continuum from the more traditional indeterminate sentence to determinate dispositions.

Final Products from this study include a cross-state analysis and five separate case studies assessing the release decision-making process in Washington, Nevada, Illinois, Georgia and Pennsylvania. The following is a discussion of the major findings.

The terms "determinate" and "indeterminate" are not precisely defined in the area of juvenile justice practice. Rather, both terms are descriptive of general

approaches to commitment and release decision-making which emphasize either "just deserts" concepts (i.e., determinate) or "individual rehabilitation" concepts, (i.e., indeterminate). In practice, most state approaches to commitment and release decision-making combine elements of determinacy. Conceptually, commitment and release decision-making systems can be seen as falling on a continuum ranging from absolute individualized decision-making to fixed sentences based on offense and age variables. In practice, all states lie somewhere between these two extremes. Determinate approaches have taken a variety of forms, including: administratively developed length of stay (LOS) guidelines; judicial guidelines for dispositions, including sentencing; and legislatively mandated sentencing schedules. Indeterminate approaches in juvenile justice also demonstrate a wide variety in form, including approaches which assign primary discretion to juvenile corrections agencies, to judges, or to independent parole boards. More and more, the release decision-makers are involving judges, prosecutors, police and probation in the release decision.

Looking at a sample of adjudicated burglars only, the average length of stay in the five states ranged from six months to ten months, with the higher ranges seen in those states with determinate characteristics. Average LOS for a sample of robbers showed a wider range, from 7.4 months to 17.2 months, with the longer stays again in the determinate states. Offense-related variables are more likely to be related to release in determinate than within indeterminated states.

Determinate states showed greater proportionality in terms of robbers (more serious) receiving longer LOS than burglars (less serious). The difference in average

LOS for these two classes ranged from one week in Pennsylvania (one of the most indeterminate of our states) to 8.4 months in Washington (one of our most determinate states).

Contrary to the notion that determinate approaches lead to "warehousing" of youth, individualized treatment and rehabilitation remain a major focus in determinate states. In these states, more attention is focused on release planning and a continuum of care, in which treatment and social control are not viewed as the sole responsibility of the juvenile corrections agency.

The debate over sentencing in the juvenile system has caused even those agencies in indeterminate states to implement formal or informal policies that increase proportionality based on offense variables and provide more accountability safeguards while at the same time remaining committed to rehabilitation.

Youths' disciplinary records while in institutional custody were significantly related to LOS in both determinate and indeterminate states. However, a move toward determinacy does not appear to be associated with increased disciplinary problems in the juvenile institutions.

The reduction of discretion in release decision-making which is associated with determinate sentencing leads to an increase in the importance of discretionary decision-making at other points in the juvenile justice system. A dramatic example is the increased importance of prosecutorial charging and plea bargaining practices in Washington state. Whereas administrators in indeterminate states expressed

concern about the rigidity of determinate sentencing, the determinate states in our study were characterized by formal overrides or other discretionary options which gave flexibility to the imposition of fixed sentences.

The support for determinate guidelines within a state system seemed greater in those states where a multi-agency task force or commission approach was utilized, or at least where representatives from various components of the juvenile justice system were consulted in their development.

Evidence is mixed regarding the proposition that determinate sentencing leads eventually to increases in the scheduled sentences. While LOS guidelines have been extended in some instances, other states have revised their guidelines downward, in part as a result of overcrowding. Indeed, institutional population pressures are major concerns within determinate states. Therefore sentence ranges must be set with both proportionality and resource availability in mind.

Determinate sentencing approaches which include short institutional length of stays are problematic. While some judges use them for "shock value," most juvenile agency staff oppose them based on their belief that little meaningful treatment or intervention can occur where the maximum LOS is three or four months.

In Fiscal Year 1985, OJJDP initiated a project designed to provide technical assistance and support to OJJDP/NIJJDP to gain a better understanding of how legal issues affect the juvenile justice system on national and local levels. And how they affect development of effective prevention and control policies and strategies.

OJJDP also initiated a "Private Sector Probation" Program designed to demonstrate the effectiveness of private sector involvement in the delivery of probation services which are currently being provided by the public sector.

ALTERNATIVES TO JUVENILE JUSTICE PROCESSING

NIJJDP has sponsored a broad program of research and assessment work on alternatives to juvenile justice system processing. Those assessments which focused on diversion and deinstitutionalization were designed to determine the feasibility of removing less serious offenders from the juvenile justice system, thus allowing the system to concentrate on the more serious juvenile offenders. More recent projects in this area are designed to develop information on effective composition and organization of State and local juvenile justice systems for handling serious and violent offenders, and to identify programs that are designed to ensure public safety as well as deal more effectively with the serious juvenile offender. By encouraging the development of secure and community-based alternatives to traditional juvenile justice programming, local jurisdictions need not rely exclusively on the use of secure detention, jails, training schools and other large correctional facilities.

The research program has focused on the effectiveness of a diverse range of programs ranging from comprehensive nonresidential treatment alternatives to intensive secure residential treatment modalities which promote continuous case management and community integration. More recently, projects have been

designed to examine the effects of program auspices (public vs. private) on quality of services, as well as the impact on youth. Of particular concern are those programs that offer innovative treatment strategies for the most serious juvenile offenders.

Highlights of Results

A comprehensive review of over seventy evaluation reports and an examination of national data sources on juvenile and adult correctional facilities was conducted to determine the Impact of Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders on Recidivism and the Use of Secure Confinement. Deinstitutionalization was expected to reduce the number of status offenders held in secure confinement and it was hoped that removing these youngsters from confinement would have a positive impact on recidivism, reduce the costs of the juvenile system, and permit more attention to be given to the serious and violent juvenile offenders.

The impact of deinstitutionalization on recidivism can be summarized very briefly: there does not appear to be any. There has not, however, been a definitive test due to such confounding factors as changes in charging policies or criteria and inappropriate net widening prior to and after the implementation of various DSO strategies.

Secure commitment and detention of youths for misbehavior designated as status offenses clearly has significantly declined in the aftermath of the federal legislation, but it has not been ended. Further, the significance of the increase in

commitments to private institutions is not clear at this point. If the increase reflects the availability of resources, utilized on a voluntary basis by status offenders and their families, then most would agree the increase is appropriate. If it simply represents a shift from one type of secure and involuntary confinement to another, or relabelling behavior for such purposes, then the goals of deinstitutionalization are being thwarted by shifts to the private sector. While there are no definitive answers, available data on the juvenile justice system suggest a continued recognition of the need to provide services to juveniles whose behavior is troublesome, though noncriminal, but that these services should be provided in less restrictive environments than was common a decade ago.

The impact of deinstitutionalization on jailing juvenile status offenders has been more pronounced perhaps due to the additional efforts of the federal government to effect the removal of all juveniles from adult jails. As with the secure confinement of status offenders in secure juvenile institutions, there is still need for substantial progress.

Finally, there continues to be debate regarding the desirability of prohibiting secure confinement for status offenders under all circumstances. Particularly troublesome to some observers is the difficulty in enforcing out-of-home placements. The 1980 amendments to the JJDP Act which permit contempt of court charges to be levied against juveniles who have run away from valid out-of-home placements were a response to intense pressure generated by those who oppose the deinstitutionalization movement. These amendments, however, are in turn opposed by those who believe that individuals should not be held against their will for behavior that, no

matter how troublesome to the parents, is not a violation of any criminal code and represents no immediate danger to the individual or the community.

In FY '86 OJJDP will initiate a research project to systematically examine the variation in the levels of implementation of the deinstitutionalization of status offender policy as defined by state legislation, judicial decisions, administrative policies, etc. It will also examine the availability of resources devoted to status offenders by courts, social service agencies, schools and the private sector. Particular attention will be paid to the anticipated and unanticipated consequences of various reforms on the youth population at risk, the impact that deinstitutionalization of status offenders has had on youth, and on youth serving public institutions and private youth serving agencies.

The National Evaluation of the OJJDP Project New Pride Replication Program represents a study of an innovative alternative treatment program for youth who have been repeatly involved in the juvenile justice system for serious crimes. The vast majority of the violent juvenile offenders involved in the program were initially placed in secure facilities. Subsequently, the New Pride approach provided community-based, non-residential programming which involved comprehensive, individualized treatment for offenders. The evaluation was designed to produce information regarding client and service issues which can be used to refine the New Pride model, and to determine under what conditions the program can be implemented in different types of jurisdictions.

The specific target group was adjudicated youth from 14 to 17 years of age residing in jurisdictions with high levels of serious juvenile crime. These are juveniles who are under court supervision for a serious offense, with records of at least two prior convictions for serious misdemeanors and/or felonies within the past 24 months, who would otherwise have been confined in correctional institutions or placed on standard probation depending on their record. The New Pride model's major objectives are: increased school achievement, remediation of learning disabilities, employment and improved social functioning; reduction in the incarceration of youth adjudicated for criminal offenses; reduction in arrests; and institutionalization of comprehensive and integrated community-base treatment services for serious juvenile offenders through redirection of state and local resources into mo cost-effective community-based treatment services.

There were three components in the research design: client impact evaluation, process evaluation, and intensive system impact evaluation. The major thrust of the New Pride evaluation was to determine if there were significant differences in recidivism in the treatment group after the program when compared to matched comparison groups drawn from each site.

The findings showed that New Pride served serious multiple juvenile offenders. Clients average 11.3 prior offenses at the time of intake; overall, 64.5 percent of all prior offenses were sustained, and the overall average of sustained prior offenses per client was 6.7. This is well over the basic eligibility requirement of two priors and a presenting offense. Property offenses were the most common type of prior offense committed by clients entering New Pride.

The profiles of the New Pride clients tended to confirm both arrest and victimization data which suggest that the prototypical, and more serious delinquent is likely to be a poor, minority male who is likely to have come from a single-parent family, who has done poorly in school and who is unemployed.

There were 1,167 clients officially admitted to the program by January 1983. 49.7% of these clients completed the program with no reoffense or probation termination with no reoffense, 46% were unsuccessful, and 8.2% relocated or transferred to a more appropriate program.

The data indicate that the New Pride program can have a positive impact on the clients' educational achievement. Based on 435 post-tests on key math, the average gain score for the replication clients was 8.9 points for an average period of 26.5 weeks. The corresponding grade equivalent showed an average gained of .6 grades over the same time period. Based on 405 post-tests on the Woodcock reading test, the whole sample shows an increase of 4.9 points or one year with an average of 25.6 weeks elapsing between the pre-testing and post-testing. Another area where the New Pride replication effort seem to have successful impacts relates to school participation. The average unexcused absences from school dropped from 39% before the program to 28% during the program. The improvements in attendance continued to increase even after youth left New Pride. In their post-New Pride school experiences, youth reduced their unexcused absences to 14.7 percent of the days they were enrolled.

Approximately 52% (602) of all New Pride clients were employed. Twenty-two percent of all jobs were designated permanent, 30% temporary, 26% work experience situations, 13% on-the-job training, and 3% seasonal employment. Involvement in employment services and single jobs more than ten days ten days tended to depress recidivism rates, whereas a greater number of short term employment experiences increased them.

The outcome variables of greatest interest to the criminal justice field focus on recidivism. The results of the basic outcome model showed that neither program duration nor client success was substantially related to recidivism after New Pride. The same was true of variables related to employment, school, ethnicity, gender, and needs and services variables. The evaluator employed six different measures of recidivism in the analyses. The data revealed virtually no overall differences in recidivism, however analyses of subgroups were not conducted.

During Fiscal Year 1985, the development of innovative strategies for serious and violent offenders continued. The Violent Juvenile Offender (VJO) Research and Development Program Part I, tested the capability of the juvenile justice system to deal with the chronic serious violent offender. The research design was developed to test innovative strategies for handling and reintegrating the adjudicated violent juvenile, and to assess the effectiveness of these strategies on experimental treatment youth as compared to a control group receiving traditional justice interventions.

Preliminary evaluation findings indicate that 244 youths were randomly assigned to experimental or control groups across four test sites (Boston, Newark, Memphis, and Detroit) between February 1, 1982 and March 31, 1985. The mean age of the assigned youths was 16.4, and the youths ranged from age 14 to 18 years. The study was restricted to males only. Of the youth assigned to the program, 85.5% were Black, 12.0% were White, and 2.5% were Hispanic.

During the first phase of funding, the program consisted of a project site at Phoenix, Arizona. At that time 10% of the assigned offenders were Hispanic or Chicano with 90% being identified at Phoenix. That site has since terminated.

The youth had repeatedly been involved in violent crime and other criminal activities. Armed robbery and aggravated assault were the most common instant offense adjudications. The habitual offense patterns of the study youths included an official charge of 7.9 prior offenses, resulting in an average of 3.2 adjudications. One fourth of the youth assigned to the program had at least one prior placement in a juvenile corrections institution. While the official records showed that the youth had repeated contact with courts, the self-report data suggested the official court contacts revealed just a small percentage of the number of crimes in which the youths participated.

Nationally, VJO youths were reported by case managers as having made progress in virtually all treatment areas. The family relations area showed the greatest and most consistent progress by the youths. Activities to be completed during Fiscal Year 1986 include: data collection for the post-release Client Impact Assessment

and analysis of case flow, recidivism, and reincarceration data for the experimental and control groups.

To further provide assistance to the field in handling serious offenders, OJJDP sponsored a broad review to identify the most promising intervention strategies for chronic offenders.

The Rand Corporation completed a one year study concerned with promising intervention approaches that might be used to reduce the criminality of chronic juvenile offenders. "The Juvenile Rehabilitation Reader" is a series of ten chapters that explore questions central to the issue of why interest in and knowledge about rehabilitation of serious juvenile offenders is currently in a state of confusion and disarray. A summary report, "One More Chance - The Pursuit of Promising Intervention Strategies for Chronic Juvenile Offenders" provides an overview of the literature on correlates and predictability of chronic delinquency and summarizes specific intervention strategies that appear promising. It also presents legal and ethical constraints on state imposed interventions and compares the cost of early intervention with selective incapacitation. The report does not present original research but is rather an attempt to draw together and interpret research from several different fields. Methods used to gather and interpret data were; 1) a critical review of the prediction and treatment literature; 2) on site observations of programs; 3) interviews with practitioners and former chronic delinquents; 4) statistical modeling; 5) a review of relevant legal statutes and cases, and 6) a historical analysis of how treatment concepts have developed.

The principal conclusion of this report is that the development and management of effective rehabilitation programs for chronic juvenile offenders is an extremely demanding and difficult task because of the number of long standing behavioral, cognitive and emotional problems that these offenders typically exhibit, and the large degree of uncertainty inherent in any treatment approach. Common elements in programs that were considered successful were identified. These elements include: 1) provide of opportunities for youth to overcome adversity and experience success; 2) encourage a positive self image; 3) facilitate bonds of affection and mutual respect between juveniles and the program staff; 4) provide frequent and timely accurate feedback for both positive and negative behavior; 5) require juveniles to recognize and understand the thought processes that rationalize negative behavior; and 6) create opportunities for juveniles to discuss family matters and early experiences in a relaxed, nonjudgmental atmosphere.

In addition to its efforts to identify the most promising intervention strategies, the R&PD division initiated an evaluation to determine the effectiveness of several private sector programs when compared to conventional treatment programs they are intended to replace. In addition to program effectiveness, this initiative will assess the business, management, and programming techniques utilized by the private sector and examine the appropriateness of the state and local regulatory processes to which they are subjected. During the past year OJJDP has been negotiating the terms of the experimental programs with three selected organizations.

The basic evaluation design for each program involved the random assignment of eligible youth between the experimental and conventional control programs. Baseline data collection will include the characteristics of each youth, prior criminal record, family and school background and the exposure and performance of each youth in each phase of the program and documentation of the content of the program. Follow-up data collection will include interviews with the youth and reviews of the juvenile and criminal record after leaving the program.

Recommendations

The 1984 Amendments to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act call for emphasis on prevention and control of serious juvenile crime; and for the protection of children. Consistent with these priorities, the Research and Program Development Division recommends that future research focus on the following areas:

1) Research and development on programs to strengthen the family should be continued. Emphasis should be placed on efforts to prevent delinquency and drug use among the most disorganized, troubled families. What types of interventions are appropriate and how can these families be recruited and retained?

2) Assessment of current national statistics on juvenile delinquency; and initiation of modifications to improve the validity, reliability, and usefulness of existing

data collection activities. This should also include an effort to identify areas for interagency coordination of data collection.

3) Research on the development of correctional programs for serious offenders should be continued. Since much attention is currently focused on the content and auspices of corrections, future research should place greater emphasis on the issues of diagnosis and classification; and aftercare.

4) Evaluation asssistance to local jurisdiction. Technical manuals to assist states and communities in designing and implementing evaluations of all facets of the juvenile justice system and related services should be developed.