Characteristics of Community Organizations
that Develop Positive Ties with Juvenile
Misdemeanants: Implications for
Implementing and Replicating the
Community Arbitration Program

Merry Morash
Research Consultant
June 30, 1977

Data for this study was collected by
Bob Dreschler and Evelyn Rockenback.
Taped interviews were transcribed by
Joan Boyle, a volunteer.

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS THAT DEVELOP POSITIVE TIES WITH JUVENILE MISDEMEANANTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING AND REPLICATING THE COMMUNITY ARBITRATION PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This research was conducted as a part of the evaluation of the Community Arbitration Program (Larom, 1976), in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. The design of the Community Arbitration Program rested on the assumption that most misdemeanant youths could be referred to community agencies for counseling, or to community organizations and groups that would provide the youths with a work assignment. The counseling was intended to correct the youths' involvement in misdemeanant behavior. The work assignment was viewed as social restitution that the youths would pay for their damages to individuals or to society. The program staff diverted a majority of youths arrested for misdemeanors from juvenile court to the counseling or work-side organizations.

Rosenheim's (1976:44) description of the juvenile nuisances fits the population that was included as the clientele of the Community Arbitration Program:

> Best defined by exclusion, they are minors who are
> neither seriously criminal nor seriously disturbed.
> They include petty thieves, playground assailants,
> raucous loiterers, runaways and truants, and many
> more. Their proportionate representation in the
> caseloads of juvenile justice agencies appears to
> vary somewhat by location and circumstance (that is,
> by race, socioeconomic status, density of population,
> specific public targets of concern), but whoever they
> are exactly, they are ubiquitous. They probably com-
> prise the majority of all children dealt with by the
> juvenile justice agencies of most communities.

Youths who were referred to Community Arbitration had been arrested by police for misdemeanors of the types mentioned by Rosenheim. They did not, however, include status offenders, i.e., runaways and truants.

A critical issue in assessing the Community Arbitration Program as a model for delivering justice to misdemeanant youths was whether the intervention strategy could be implemented and replicated. Implementation depended upon identification of community organizations that had the capacity to respond positively to referred juvenile nuisances. A positive response was viewed as one which resulted in a youth developing ties to members of the community organization. The choice of youth-organization ties as a criterion to evaluate organizations' response to the youth rested on research (Hirschi, 1968; Hindelang, 1973) which has provided evidence that such ties are determinants of delinquency.

The specific objective of the study reported here was to identify organizational characteristics, and qualities of referred misdemeanant youths, that were related to the development of youth-organization ties. Findings could be used to set guidelines for choosing referral resources for juvenile nuisances. Additionally, identification of the types of community groups and agencies that work best with misdemeanants would have implications for whether the Community Arbitration Program could be readily replicated. If "successful" community organizations were rare, that would place serious constraints on the replicability of the Community Arbitration Program's model for intervention.

RELATED RESEARCH

The Difficulties of Increasing the Ties of Lawbreaking Youths in Their Communities

Despite a growing recognition that the agencies and groups in a community have importance to a youth's development as a lawabiding person, there has not been much study of variations in community organizations' reactions to youthful offenders. The lack of research has been noted by Spergel (1976:88-89), who wrote that the widely accepted strategy of diverting youths from the juvenile justice system "...emphasizes a return of the delinquent to the community with insufficient reference to what capacity the particular community has to rehabilitate the delinquent, and how that capacity may be increased." In a similar vein, Rosenheim (1976:52) has suggested that "questions about helping services should be asked before a role is given them....The demands being made of them betray ignorance of what specialists employed in these agencies can, and most like to, do."

There are reasons to take the cautions offered by Rosenheim and Spergel seriously. Involving lawbreaking youths with organizations in their own communities appears to be more easily said than done. In contrast to the policies promoting increased youth-community agency interactions, Sarri and Vinter (1976:167) concluded from the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections that there may be "...collusion among influential community elements to send more and more youths into the justice system: [or] at best, the evidence can be read as revealing a slow

drift toward more formal handling and processing of youth rather than _serving_ them through basic social institutions."

Coates, _et. al._ (1976) have studied the linkages that youths in a new system of community-based programs in Massachusetts have developed with members of the community. Their (1976:29-30) analysis revealed that:

> ...while on the whole the new system is more community based than the old training school system... the current system still limits considerably the contact between youth and the community.

At least in the group of youths who have been placed in programs by the state agency, the Massachusetts Division of Youth Services, the extent of community contact envisioned by some proponents of a community corrections policy has not been realized.

A number of studies have shown that many delinquent youths are consistently screened from community services. Hasenfeld (1976:95) summarized his study of the juvenile court and its environment, which was a part of the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, with the following statement:

> ...once children enter the court's orbit, they are less likely to benefit from the services of other youth-serving agencies. The court itself is unlikely to call upon these agencies or to challenge their response to adjudicated juveniles. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that such agencies are willing to serve such youth; rather, it seems that they prefer the court to assume responsibility for them. Children under court jurisdiction are likely to be thrust into a very narrow and limited pool of court services and be excluded from a wide variety of community youth services just at the time they need access to as many services as possible.

In another study, Teele and Levine (1968a) found that "emo-
tionally disturbed" youths who were referred by juvenile courts
to psychiatric clinics were unlikely to actually receive ser-
vices, despite a stated policy of giving court-involved youths
priority. The failure in service delivery could not be at-
tributed to any lack of responsiveness on the part of referred
families (Teele and Levine, 1968b).

Characteristics of Community Organizations that Predispose them to Involvement with Referred Lawbreakers

Research has given us little more than a rudimentary under-
standing of the effect that organizations' structures and prac-
tices have on their capacity to become involved with law-
breaking youths. Studies of social work practice have pointed
to a lack of fit between adolescents' interests and program con-
tent. (Shwartz [1971] has summarized these studies.)

Program evaluators have found that "to the extent that
neighborhoods have been subdivided and local outlets provided...
people get to ...[services] more readily" (Kahn, 1976:26). Kahn's
(1976:33,34,36) review of research included evidence that ef-
fective service delivery systems are characterized by: staff
who are local residents, but who are supervised by professionals;
the existence of stable funding, administrative protection of
staff, and staff stability; the provision of the authority to
deliver a large range of services to some staff member; parti-
cipation of clients in organizational decisions; and, the
separation of social action functions from services to indi-
viduals.

Many of the studies mentioned above have not focused on delivering services to either adolescents or delinquents. Also, they all were concerned with social service organizations, and thus findings may not be pertinent to other elements in the community that are called upon to react to lawbreaking youths.

Besides empirical research, there are popular beliefs about agency characteristics that lead to service delivery. Schulberg and Baker (1976:10) have summarized the current "service delivery ideology" as the beliefs that effective service delivery is related to systematic integration, fiscal and geographic accessibility, the definition of the client's problems as problems in living rather than personal dysfunction, the use of generalists as staff, and agency accountability to clients.

It would seem that formal statements of agency goals, the organization's level of resources, and external incentives would influence agency staff to establish connections with youthful offenders. These factors are relatively unstudied.

Characteristics of Youths that Predispose them to Involvement with Community Organizations

There is concern that traditional social services will not or cannot meet the needs of many lawbreaking youths in the community. The former Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, Jerome Miller, has expressed his view: "The social workers want to work with the motivated middle-class

client and we haven't had a motivated middle-class client here for a long time" (Serrill, 1975:5). Along the same lines, Serrill (1975:8) described a phenomenon of "skimming", "where the private programs are becoming much more cautious and selective...and the pool of delinquents who are very difficult to place is becoming larger and larger."

Coates, et. al. (1976) have analyzed the relationship between characteristics of youths who are committed or referred to the Massachusetts Division of Youth Services and the type of placement that they receive. Programs were judged as better than others if they produced a relatively normal atmosphere and frequent, high quality contacts within the community. Coates, et. al. (1976) found that minority status, an unstable family structure, the youths' good relationships with significant individuals in the community, a history of having run away from previous placements, and no history of having been detained, were related to his receiving a good placement. The nature of the youths' delinquent behavior, school history, aspirations and expectations, age, sex, and placement of residence were not related.

It is uncertain whether findings reported in the literature by various criminal justice practitioners and researchers can be generalized to all types of delinquents, and to all types of community programs. At the very least, however, they suggest that some delinquents may be difficult to place in "good" community-based programs, and that these delinquents can be distinguished from others.

METHODOLOGY

The study was qualitative and exploratory. It was intended to provide evidence for the Arbitration staff and for individuals who were interested in replicating the model used by the Arbitration Program. The study was conducted with limited resources that precluded a systematic sampling of a large number of organizations or staff members of those organizations. The limited amount of research that has been conducted of community organizations to which lawbreakers are referred, and our own needs for information, stimulated us to undertake the study regardless of its limitations. However, study results should be reviewed within the constraints of our sampling approach, and the size of the sample.

Twelve of the organizations to which Arbitration staff members had referred youths were included in the study. Six of these were agencies that typically offered counseling services. The other six programs offered work placements for youths.

The organizations to be studied were selected so that the extremes of variation in the organizations' abilities to provide a relationship to referred youths were represented. Field site supervisors provided the measure of the organizations' capacity to develop ties with youths. Field site supervisors, who worked for the Community Arbitration Program, monitored organizations to which youths were referred. First, the three field site supervisors were asked to list the five counseling agencies and the five work-sites that they felt were the best and the worst in developing ties with referred youths. Then, for each category (i.e., counseling agencies and work-site organizations),

each field site supervisor ranked the total number of organi-
zations that had been named from the best to the worst. The
field site supervisors did not know whether the organization
had been initially named as good or poor. An average rank
was calculated for every counseling agency and work-site.

The three highest-ranked work-sites and the three highest-
ranked agencies were included in the initial sample. Staff
members from all of these organizations were interviewed.
Similarly, the three lowest-ranked agencies and work-sites
were included. Staff members from just three of these six low-
ranked organizations were interviewed. One work-site was ex-
cluded because the director would not allow us to tape record
the interviews; two low-ranked work-sites were excluded because
their staff members indicated that they did not have time to be
interviewed. Three other low-ranked work-sites were substituted
for those that were the lowest-ranked.

The initial plan was to interview the director and a staff
person who worked directly with the youths at each organization.
For two of the three high-ranked and two of the three low-ranked
counseling agencies, the program director was the only staff
member, so just he was interviewed. At one of the high-ranked
work-sites, only one staff person had time to participate in an
interview. At one of the low-ranked work-sites, only one mem-
ber was familiar with the program. Thus, in approximately half
of the cases, two people were interviewed.

Staff that were interviewed were asked a series of multi-
ple choice and open-ended questions about the goals and functions
of their organizations in working with youths, the type of re-

lationship that was formed between adults and youths, the
level of the organization's resources, the degree to which the
organizations provided different types of youths access to their
programs, and incentives and disincentives for organizations to
become involved with lawbreaking youths. These particular
areas were suggested by the review of the literature and by
practical concerns.

The data analysis consisted of a search for patterns of
answers that could be related to the organizations' rank of
high or low. In cases where it was logical, whenever two people
had been interviewed at one organization, their responses were
averaged. Some questions were aimed towards identifying a range
of factors, such as naming the services that the agency or group
offered. In these cases, the two responses were combined.

FINDINGS

Agency Goals and Functions, and Styles of Relating To Youths

Staff members from low-ranked counseling agencies differed
from those from the high-ranked agencies in that they: placed
less importance on providing entertainment to youths and more
on preventing crime (Chart A); tended to offer recreational
services less often and to offer drug, alcohol, and medical
services more often (Chart B); less frequently included the
delivery of non-counseling services in their list of goals
(Appendix B1); and, less frequently described their relation-
ships with youths as a "friendship" rather than "therapeutic"

or "counselor-client" (Chart C).[1]

The respondents from low-ranked work sites differed from those from high-ranked sites in the following ways: they were more likely to view crime prevention, and entertainment of their own members, as relatively important organizational goals (Chart A); they were less likely to place priority on job, occupation, and education related objectives (Chart A); they less frequently named vocational training, sex education, and inter-agency coordination as services that they provided (Chart B); they placed less emphasis on the importance of a youth's ability to accomplish his assigned job well (Appendix B2); and, they placed more emphasis on the need to control and punish referred youths (Appendix B2). Individuals from the low-ranked work sites were less likely to include the development of a close personal friendship (Chart C), and helping youths with personal problems (Chart A), as among their functions.[2]

The Capacity and Willingness of Organizations to Work with Referred Juvenile Nuisances

Intake Procedures. Formal intake procedures were explored through questions about waiting lists, intake criteria, and source of referrals. Differences were found in the criteria that were used to select youths for program participation and in sources of organizations' referrals.

The respondents from the high-ranked counseling agencies received the smallest proportion of referrals from the Courts, and they estimated that a small proportion of their total

clientele had experienced court contact (Chart D).

Respondents from high-ranked work sites also received few referrals from the Courts (Chart D). They were more than twice as likely than those from low-ranked sites to screen out a youth based on his being described as: suicidal, violent, promiscuous, having a history of detentions, having a history of being runaway from home, unable to attend public school, frequently fighting, being illiterate, having a history of heroin use, being described as "borderline-retarded", or having uncooperative parents (Chart E).

Characteristics of Youths who are Successfully Involved in Programs. Open-ended questions were asked about the qualities of a youth that would help him to "fit" into a program, and the characteristics of successful and unsuccessful referred youths. All of the individuals from counseling agencies stressed that youths would have to be motivated to help themselves, and did best if they recognized their own problems. Also regardless of whether their agencies were low- or high-ranked, respondents at the counseling agencies felt that they most often failed in working with youths who had no parental support to participate in the program, who "do not have any other support," who have "been through the system," and, as one person put it, who have a "Ph.D. from the street university."

Low- and high-ranked work site respondents differed in the type of youth that they described as a successful referral. People from the high-ranked work sites mentioned characteristics

of: "kindness", "sense of humor", "cooperation", "unpre-
judiced". The characteristics that the representatives of
low-ranked work-sites reported as conducive to a youth's ad-
justment to the program were that the youth: "realizes that
he better get himself straightened out", "doesn't get into
trouble", and have "cooperative parents". Cooperativeness of
the youth was also mentioned by all respondents from low-ranked
work sites.

Characteristics of Organizations that are Successfully
Involved with Referred Youths. The availability of voluntary,
as opposed to required, counseling services was related to a
high rank for counseling agencies. Two of the three high-ranked
counseling agencies were described as places where counseling
was never a prerequisite for participation in other activities.
The informal and voluntary atmosphere in which counseling is of-
fered in high-ranked agencies is shown by one respondent's statement:

> I feel that an advantage that I have in this community
> is that with the minimal recreational activities that
> I'm involved in--the drop-in program, taking kids on
> camping trips or hiking trips, or whatever--I have the
> opportunity to make contact with a large group of kids
> that are [in a] non-problem oriented environment, atmos-
> phere, whatever. The young person has had an opportunity
> to be in contact with me and does not necessarily see me
> solely as an agent of [the referring]...agency...and I can
> start out on an even basis with each side of the concern....
> I know that there are young people that I deal with, for
> instance, that will not call me and ask for an appoint-
> ment, will not just drop into my office, but they will
> come to a drop-in program and they will say "hey", I
> need to rap with you sometime..."

Counseling agencies which were low-ranked, on the other hand,
did not have informal activities through which counselors could

come in contact with youths. A result of this was that according to one respondent, youths were "sort of serving time."

Respondents from the low- and high-ranked work sites differed in their view of referred youths as "normal". The three high-ranked sites had a primary goal of providing a service to a group with special needs (e.g., retarded people). In these settings, the youths referred from Arbitration were viewed as valuable volunteers because they were "normal". In contrast, at low-ranked work sites, the respondents described instances in which referred youths were separated from "normal children" so as not to influence them (Appendix B3).

Another difference between high- and low-ranked work sites was that none of the people interviewed from low-ranked work sites indicated that a youth had become a regular member; all of the people from high-ranked sites described instances where a youth had become a "regular volunteer" or a part-time staff member (Appendix B4).

There were few differences in the amount of contact that respondents reported between their high- or low-ranked counseling organizations and other community agencies (Chart F). High-ranked counseling agencies were reported as more frequently in contact with the recreation department than were the low-ranked; this is consistent with the relative emphasis that high-ranked agencies placed on providing recreation to clients. Data was insufficient for an analysis of differences in frequencies of interagency contacts as reported by respondents at work-sites, for several respondents indicated that they did know the answer to the questions.

The high-ranked counseling agencies were described as experiencing more conflict with individuals in the community than those that were low-ranked. Much of the conflict was centered around disruption that the youths who attended the program caused within the community (Chart G). There was not a similar tendency for high-ranked work sites to be portrayed as experiencing more conflict than the low-ranked sites.

The remaining differences between low- and high-ranked organizations were: staff had more training at the high-ranked work sites than at the low-ranked sites; and, high-ranked organizations appeared to have more sources of funding than did the low-ranked.

There were no clear differences in organizations' rank as high or low related to annual funding level or number of years the agency had been in the community. Data was incomplete to the extent that analysis was not possible for responses about the amount of disruption caused by youths that was usual in an agency or the target area served by the program.

Incentives and Disincentives to Becoming Involved with the Youthful Nuisance. The final set of questions focused on the activities of Arbitration staff in facilitating organization's involvement with referred youths. All but one of the staff from the six counseling agencies stated that a statement of Community Arbitration's expectations of them, and an evaluation of what the youth needed, was lacking. The individuals from work sites also requested more information on youths, particularly factors related to work placement, like special abilities

and whether the youth gets along with people. Many youths were being screened out by one agency because they might abuse drugs; the agency representative emphasized that this would not be necessary if Arbitration staff would forward information indicating that the youth had no history of drug abuse.

The type of difficulties that respondents had had in working with youths referred by Arbitration were not related to the group's ranking, though low-ranked groups mentioned more problems. Work site groups needed a steady and relatively large number of referrals so they could plan activities and sustain the interest of volunteer adult work supervisors. Youths who had been referred for a second time were described as difficult to work with.

DISCUSSION: THE VIABILITY OF THE COMMUNITY ARBITRATION APPROACH

The Choice of Referral Resources for Nuisance Offenders

A theme that runs through our findings was that non-conventional counseling agencies, and work sites that emphasized the work activity rather than special problems of delinquents, were viewed by Arbitration staff as best able to offer referred youths a positive relationship. The high-ranked counseling agencies provided many activities besides counseling. They emphasized recreation, which may be especially important to involving youths in programs since adolescents have a great deal of leisure time. This inability of delinquency-correction

oriented work sites and formal counseling programs to develop

ties with youths is consistent with Rosenheim's (1976:54) as-

sertion that referral of nuisance offenders to "helping ser-

vices" is inappropriate. Community involvement appears to be

directly related to referral to non-stigmatizing programs,

that do not concentrate on working with Court-referred youths.

The availability of highly trained staff at work sites

was related to their being ranked high. This may indicate that

the potential for <u>voluntary</u> counseling in a non-counseling

oriented setting does facilitate the development of youth-

organization ties. Staff's ability to structure the work experi-

ence to stimulate job performance could also be a result of

their training.

At the successful work sites, there was an interesting

tendency for the referred youth to be defined as "normal".

This resulted from a number of circumstances. There were pro-

fessional people and other "specialists" who stressed the value

of the work. There was frequently an ongoing volunteer program,

with no association with the justice system, that youths could

and did join. And, not least of all, other people served by

the program were stigmatized, which served to counteract any

tendency to label the referred youths as abnormal.

Many of the findings summarized above point to the value

of referring juvenile nuisances to informal, alternative

service-type counseling agencies, and to work sites where

volunteerism is stressed and the atmosphere is not punitive.

Such creative dispositions do appear to lead to increased positive community-youth interaction.

Feasibility of Program Replication and Expansion

Whether or not the Community Arbitration Program can be expanded and replicated depends on whether or not referral resources are available to work with nuisance offenders. There are some limitations on whether a community will have such resources. These limitations are indicated by the findings that the work sites that were most conducive to youth-organization ties had the most stringent screening standards, and the best counseling agencies were those most often opposed by other community groups.

In communities where appropriate resources are not available, it may be necessary for the Arbitration Program model to include resources for the development and operation of counseling services or work programs. Another strategy that might be used with work sites is to provide special incentives to them if they accept some youths who are difficult to place. These might include support services like supervision of the youths by Arbitration staff, or training programs for the youths. For all of these strategies, steps should be taken to protect against starting a special, and therefore stigmatizing, program for delinquents.

Despite some constraints on the availability of referral resources, it does appear that many communities would have the community organizations which are necessary for replicating the

Arbitration model. These characteristics of good work sites are not rare: some professional staff; few clients referred by the courts; a priority placed on job-related rather than correctional objectives; a goal of providing services to some disadvantaged population; and, a volunteer program that is unrelated to the justice system. And, the informal recreation and youth programs that were best as counseling resources for the juvenile nuisance are not uncommon in most communities.

CONCLUSION

The Community Arbitration Program's strategy of referring nuisance offenders to work sites as a form of social restitution, and to community counseling agencies, does seem to be replicable. This conclusion is based on the finding that with a few limitations, agency and youth characteristics related to the development of youth-agency ties are not likely to prohibit the use of this approach in many counties and cities.

Energy to develop new resources to be used for referrals would most profitably be concentrated on expanding the number of good work sites available, and on cultivating the alternative types of counseling resources in the community. Some special attention might be given to developing referral resources for hard to place youths by either offering incentives to existing resources, or developing new resources, with the desirable characteristics that the study has identified.

Chart A: Ranking of Organizational Objectives*

Rank		Low-ranked groups		High-ranked groups	
		Counseling	Work	Counseling	Work
Most important	1	Assist with personal problems	Prevent crime	Assist with personal problems	Interest in an occupation
	2	Educate	Provide entertainment	Educate	Educate
	3	Interest in an occupation	Interest in an occupation	Provide entertainment	Assist with personal problems
	4	Prevent crime	Assist with personal problems	Interest in an occupation	Find paying jobs
	5	Place in paying jobs	Educate	Place in paying jobs	Provide entertainment
	6	Provide entertainment	Place in paying jobs	Prevent crime	Prevent crime
Least important	7	Provide material assistance	Provide material assistance	Provide material assistance	Provide material assistance

*For organizations in which two people were interviewed, average
ranks were calculated.

Chart B: The Variety of Services Provided by Organizations

Service

	Multipurpose center	Counseling	Medical	Educational	Recreational	Drug or Alcohol	Vocational Training	Work Experience	Interagency Coordination	Political Action	Neighborhood Improvement	Birth Control or Sex Education	Other
Low-Ranked Groups													
Counseling	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no
	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	no
	yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no
Work	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no
	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no
	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
High-Ranked Groups													
Counseling	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no
Work	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no
	no	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no

Chart C: The Type of Relationship that Might
be Formed with Youths in High-
and Low-Ranked Organizations

Type of Relationship

		Help with Family Problems	Help with Police Problems	Teach Basic Values	Help with School work	Help Find- ing Jobs	Form a Close Relationship	Recreation for Youths	Crisis Help
Low-Ranked Groups									
Counseling		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes
		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes
Work		yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
		no	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	no
		no	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no
High-Ranked Groups									
Counseling		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Work		yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes
		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
		yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes

Chart D: Proportion of Clients Initially Contacted
Through Five Means, and Estimated Proportion
of Clients with at Least One Court Contact

Means of Initial Contact

	Walk-in	Agency Referral	Outreach Staff	Court Referral	Community Arbitration Program Referral	Estimated Proportion of Youths With At Least One Court Contact
Low-Ranked Groups						
Counseling*	—	—	—	—	—	—
	10%	20%	0	40%	30%	70%
	99%	0	0	0	1%	80%
Work	95%	4%	0	0	1%	10%
	0	5%	0	0	95%	95%
	0	0	0	50%	50%	50%
High-Ranked Groups						
Counseling	15%	80%			5%	50%
	75%	10%		10%	5%	30%
		99%	1%			50%
Work*	0	99%	0	0	1%	1%
	—	—	—	—	—	—
	20%	10%			70%	80%

*One of the respondents answered "I don't know."

Chart E: Factors That Would Automatically Disqualify
Youths For Services*

Possible Disqualifying Factors

	Suicidal	History of Violence	Homicidal	Extreme Pro-mescuity	Runaway History	Cannot Attend Public School	Constant Fighting	Will not keep Appointments	Cannot Read	History of Heroin Use	Parents Won't Cooperate	Borderline Retarded	Long History of deten-tions/place-ments
Low-Ranked Groups													
Counseling	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	mb.	no
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no
	no	no	no	no -	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no
Work	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	no	no	no
	yes	mb.	mb.	mb.	no	no	no	no	no	mb.	mb.	no	mb.
	yes	yes	yes	mb.	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	no
High-Ranked Groups													
Counseling	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	mb.	no	no	no	no	no
	no	no	mb.	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	mb.	mb.
Work	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
	yes	no	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	no
	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no

*If one person in an agency answered yes and the other answered no,
"maybe" (mb) is noted on the chart.

Chart F: Frequency of Contacts Between Counseling Agencies and Other Community Organizations

Rank Reflecting Frequency of Contact with Community Organization*

Organization	Juvenile Probation	Police Dept. of Judge	Juvenile Court	Public School	Welfare Dept.	Recreation Department	Employment Agency	Family & Children's Counseling Agency	Teen Center(s)	Youth Service Bureau	Neigh. Assoc.	Small Business
Low Ranked Groups	5	4	3	1	3	5	5	5	6	—	3	3
	1	2	3.5	3	3	5	2	2	3.5	3.5	3	4.5
	3	4	4	5	5	6	5	6	5	4.5	6	6
Average Rank:	3	3.5	3.5	2.67	3.67	5.33	4	4.33	4.83	4	4	4.5
High Ranked Groups	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	5	—	1	1	5
	4	2	6	4	3	3	5	5	2	—	3	3
	6	5	6	6	5	3	6	6	6	5	6	6
Average Rank:	3.67	2.67	4.33	3.67	3	3	4	5.33	4	3	3.33	4.67

1 - almost every day
2 - at least every week
3 - several times a year
4 - less than once a month
5 - one or two times a year
6 - rarely or never

Chart G: Reports of Interagency Conflict

Type of Conflict Against Organization

Organization	Attempts to Stop Program	Derogatory Public Statements	Competition for Funds	Tried to Have Staff Fired	Tried to Influence Decisions	Refused to Help
Low-Ranked Groups						
Counseling	no	no	yes	no	no	no
	no	no	yes	no	no	no
	no	no	no	no	no	no
Work	no	no	no	no	no	no
	some	no	no	no	no	no
	no	no	no	no	yes	yes
High-Ranked Groups						
Counseling	no	no	no	no	no	yes
	yes	no	no	no	yes	no
	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes
Work	no	no	no	no	no	no
	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
	no	no	some	no	yes	no

Footnotes

[1]Respondents were also asked to differentiate between three primary styles of working with youths: advocacy, assisting the youth in adjusting to reality, and arranging a compromise between the youth and other people. The responses were not used because in nearly all cases, all three activities were checked as the organization's most usual activity in working with youths.

[2]Respondents' statements about their own goals, as opposed to the agency goals, reflected their agreement with organizational goals. This may reflect either actual agreement, or the respondents' tendency to view their goals as the organizational goals.

References

Coates, Robert B., Alden D. Miller and Lloyd E. Ohlin. 1976. "Social Climate, Extent of Community Linkages, and Quality of Community Linkages: The Institutionalization-Normalization Continuum. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Center for Criminal Justice. Mimeo.

Hazenfeld, Yeheskal. 1976. "The Juvenile Court and its Environment." Pp. 72-95 in Rosemary Sarri and Yeheskal Hasenfeld (eds.). Brought to Justice? Juveniles, The Courts, and the Law. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan.

Hindelang, Michael J. 1973. "Causes of Delinquency: A Partial Replication and Extension." Social Problems 20 (Spring): pp. 471-487.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. Causes of Delinquency. Berkely: University of California Press.

Kahn, Alfred J. 1976. "Service Delivery at the Neighborhood Level: Experience, Theory, and Fads." Social Service Review 50 (March): pp. 23-56.

Larom, David. 1976. "The Arbitration Experience." Juvenile Justice 27 (Feb.): pp. 13-17.

Rosenheim, Margaret K. 1976. "Notes on Helping Juvenile Nuisances." Pp. 43-66 in Margaret K. Rosenheim (ed.). Pursuing Justice for the Child. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sarri, Rosemary C. and Robert D. Vinter. 1976. "Justice for Whom? Varieties of Juvenile Correctional Approaches." Pp. 161-200 in Malcolm W. Klein (ed.). The Juvenile Justice System. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Schulberg, Herbert C. and Frank Baker. 1975. Developments in Human Services. New York: Behavioral Publications.

Schwartz, William. 1971. "Neighborhood Centers and Group Work." Pp. 130-191 in Henry S. Maas (ed.). Research in the Social Services: A Five-Year Review. New York: National Association of Social Workers.

Serrill, Michael S. (ed.). Deinstitutionalization. Corrections Magazine 2 (November/December).

Spergel, Irving A. 1976. "Interactions Between Community Structure, Delinquency, and Social Policy in the Inner City." Pp. 55-100 in M. Klein (ed.). The Juvenile Justice System. Sage Criminal Justice System Annals 5. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Teele, James E. and Sol Levine. 1968a. "The Acceptance of Emotionally Disturbed Children by Psychiatric Agencies." Pp. 103-126 in S. Wheeler (ed.). Controlling Delinquents. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Teele, James E. and Sol Levine. 1968b. "Experiences of Unsuccessful Applicants to Child Psychiatric Agencies." Pp. 127-151 in S. Wheeler (ed.). Controlling Delinquents. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

We are doing a study of the agencies and groups that we refer youths to. The purpose of the study is to get a clear picture of the many kinds of help that different groups have given to kids. Also, we want to know how our referring kids has affected you here, and how we could help other agencies and groups in their work with youth who have broken the law.

The answers to these questions will not be given to anybody outside of the research staff.

We will write a report of our finding, but will not name any agency or group in the report.

Thank you for taking the time to answer our questions.

1.) First, I'd like some general information about this agency (or group).

Name:

Your position:

2.) What services does this agency (or group) provide?

    1.) Multi-purpose, runs several programs
    2.) primarily individual, group or family counseling
    3.) medical or health
    4.) educational
    5.) recreational
    6.) drug or alcohol services
    7.) vocational training
    8.) work experience
    9.) inter agency coordination group.
  10.) political action group
  11.) informal neighborhood association
  12.) Birth Control &/or Sex Education Services
  13.) Other (write in)

3.) How many years has this agency (or group) been in this community?

4.) Who funds this agency (or group)?

    1.) members only
    2.) private funding, foundation money
    3.) city funding
    4.) federal funding
    5.) state funding
    6.) reimbursement funding

5.) What area does this agency (or group) cover?

    1.) a small neighborhood (about 100 people or families)
    2.) several neighborhoods
    3.) an entire town
    4.) several towns
    5.) the county
    6.) the state

6.) What is the annual budget for this agency (or group) (approximate)?

7.) How much of this budget is for youth-oriented programs?

8.) How many of your staff are full-time? (for agencies)

9.) What kind of education and training do most of the program staff have? (get exceptions)

10.) How many of the staff who work with youth in your program grew up in this community?

11.) Do you ever do any of these things with youths?

    1.) help them with family problems
    2.) help them with problems with the police
    3.) try to teach them basic values (what's right & wrong)
    4.) help them with school work
    5.) find them paying jobs
    6.) try to form a close friendship
    7.) provide recreational activities for youth
    8.) be able to help with crises

12.) For each of the situations where you sometimes help youth, would you describe what you usually do as:

    1.) being an advocate for the child (protecting his rights)
    2.) helping the child accept reality and adjust to the situation.
    3.) Working out a "middle ground" solution between the child and the other person.

13.) Of the youth who we have referred to you, or who come to your agency or group for other reasons do these things ever happen?

    1.) Youth come in "high" on drugs or alcohol
    2.) Youth starts fights with other kids
    3.) Youth starts fights with staff members
    4.) Youth become violent, breaking things, and/or shouting threats.
    5.) Youth use loud and obscene language
    6.) Youth steal from you

13b.) If yes, how often in the past year?

14.) We'd like to know which agencies and groups you work with most clearly on youth services and problems?

In this list of agencies and groups, how often would you normally have some contact.
The choices are:

    1.) almost every day
    2.) at least every week
    3.) several times a year
    4.) less than once every week but more than several times a year.
    5.) one or two times a year
    6.) less than once a year or never

        a.) the Juvenile Court & the Dept. of Juvenile Services
        b.) Family & Childrens Agency
        c.) Police Dept. & the judges
        d.) Public Schools
        e.) Dept. of Social Services
        f.) Neighborhood Associations
        g.) Recreation Dept. & Programs
        h.) Teen Lounges, Teen Centers
        i.) Small Business Owners
        j.) Fraternal Associations
        k.) The Jaycees
        l.) Youth Service Bureau
        m.) The Employment Agency

15.) What proportion of the youth in your programs get in by:

    a.) just walking in on their own, or with friends
    b.) are referred from other agencies
    c.) are brought in by your out reach staff
    d.) are referred by the courts
    e.) specifically referred by community arbitration

16.) What proportion of youth in your programs have had some court contact at some point in their lives?

17.) Do you have a waiting list? If yes, how long does it take for a youth on the list to get into your program?

egin
tape:

18.) Most agencies (or groups) have many goals. In this list of goals, please give the one that you <u>think people here view</u> as <u>most important</u> in working with kids and rank the rest down to the least important that is down to 7.
*try to answer this for the agency in general:

    1.) find paying jobs for people
    2.) get people interested in an occupation - some type of career.
    3.) help people get an education
    4.) prevent crime
    5.) help people with personal problems, like family disagreements, emergency situations or medical needs.
    6.) provide entertainment or leisure time activities
    7.) give people material things that they need, or help them get money to buy things.

19.) Do you <u>personally</u> disagree with the way the agency ranks the goals?
If yes:
In the list of goals, how would you like to see them arranged from most to least important/in working with kids?

<center><u>Goal</u></center>

                                        (most important)

1.) _____

2.) _____

3.) _____

4.) _____

5.) _____

6.) _____

7.) _____

                                        (least important)

20.) What do most people in this agency (or group) see as the most important priorities - or purposes?

20b.) *If appropriate:
(Try to get some idea of the relative importance of working with kids, specifically, delinquents.)

21.) How does your group or agency work with delinquent youth referred by Community Arbitration?

22.) Following is a list of decisions that are made in most agencies and groups. For each, who make them here, how long does it take to make them, and describe how they are made.

a.) a youth is accepted into the program
b.) new equipment needs to be purchased for the program
c.) a youth is taken out of a program
d.) a new program is started
e.) a new person is hired to work with kids, or a new group member gets involved working with kids.

22b.) (probes regarding how are they made: who gets the idea; whose approval do they need to work on it; who does the planning; how often is it possible to get the outcome they want?)

23.) a. Sometimes programs and groups get into conflict with each other. We would like to know about conflicts that have something to do with your work with youth. As a result of your work with youth have any of these things happened?

1.) people tried to stop a program you were trying to start
2.) public statements were made against you in person or in the paper
3.) agencies or groups tried to compete with you for funds
4.) agencies or groups tried to have somebody fired
5.) other people tried to influence how you worked
6.) other people refused to help you in your planning and working with kids
7.) other (probe)_____
8.) Have the schools done any of these things?

b.) If there have been indicators that others are in conflict with you, or that you have been in conflict with other groups and agencies over youth services, describe the conflict. (probe for what it was over, what did each party want, what did each party do, and what was the outcome.)

c.) Can you think of conflicts in the community over youth services that have not involved you?
If yes: (probe for what it was over, who was in it, what did each party want, what did each party do, and what was the outcome.)

24.) Which of the following things would automatically disqualify a youth from your program? (or group)

1.) suicidal
2.) record of violence against others
3.) homicidal
4.) extremely promiscuous
5.) runaway history
6.) cannot attend public school
7.) constant fighting
8.) will not keep appointments
9.) cannot read
CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

10.) history of heroin
11.) parents won't cooperate with program
12.) retarded - borderline
13.) long history of detentions & placements

25.) What kinds of things would make it difficult for an agency or group like yours to get started working with the type of youths that we refer to you?

26.) Which of these things were a problem for your agency (group)?

27.) What are the qualities in a youth that would make you think he would fit into your program or group? (probe once for others)

28.) Describe the youth whom we referred to you that you see as your greatest success. (probe for: type of youth, type of person who worked with him, how you tried to help him, what happened.)

29.) Describe the youth whom we referred to you that you see as your greatest failure. (probe for: type of youth, type of person who worked with him, how you tried to help him, what happened.)

30.) Has anyone here ever had one of these experiences with a youth we referred:

a.) formed a close personal relationship with a staff or group member which involved such things as visits to each others homes or spending leisure time together. (if yes: how many youth, what kind of youth)
b.) You had one contact with the youth and then you never heard from him again. (if yes: how many youth, what kind of youth)
c.) The youth joined your group as a regular member or joined your staff, or became a regular volunteer. (if yes: how many youth, what kind of youth)

31.) What do people here usually do if:

a.) a youth who has been here once fails to return
b.) a youth who has been referred never contacts you
c.) a youth comes but does not participate
d.) a youth completes his counseling or work and isn't heard from again (probe to determine if any efforts to contact youth is made, do you call on phone, visit, how many times do you try?)

32.) What are the most helpful things that people at Arbitration could do to assist an agency or group like yours start to work with the kind of kids we refer to you?

33.) Which of these things did our staff do to help your agency (or group)?

34.) Are there any things that you wish the Arbitration staff would do that they don't do now?

		def. imp.	prob. imp.	prob. not imp.	def. not imp.
1.)	Give kids responsibility	( )	( )	( )	( )
2.)	Emphasize one-to-one relationship with kids	( )	( )	( )	( )
3.)	Have things planned for kids to do when they arrive	( )	( )	( )	( )
4.)	Try to see things from kids point of view	( )	( )	( )	( )
5.)	Teach kids about structure of agency	( )	( )	( )	( )
6.)	Treat kids as equals	( )	( )	( )	( )
7.)	Set clear consistent limits for kids	( )	( )	( )	( )
8.)	Set aside a place for private discussions	( )	( )	( )	( )
9.)	Prevent kids from getting involved with day to day work of running agency	( )	( )	( )	( )
10.)	Help staff remain objective & keep from getting involved with kids	( )	( )	( )	( )
11.)	Take precautions so youth will not steal things	( )	( )	( )	( )
12.)	Make sure kids don't interfere with smooth operation of agency	( )	( )	( )	( )
13.)	Develop special projects for youth	( )	( )	( )	( )
14.)	Spend a lot of time talking with kids	( )	( )	( )	( )
15.)	Know a lot about how kids think	( )	( )	( )	( )
16.)	Give a lot of time to each kid	( )	( )	( )	( )
17.)	Make sure all group members feel comfortable and can control them	( )	( )	( )	( )
18.)	Invite kids to "hang around" in their spare time	( )	( )	( )	( )
19.)	Make sure the kids work hard	( )	( )	( )	( )
20.)	Find out why kid broke law in first place	( )	( )	( )	( )
21.)	Keep after kid who doesn't participate	( )	( )	( )	( )

	def. imp.	prob. imp.	prob. not imp.	def. not imp.

APPENDIX B: EXCERPTS FROM INTERVIEWS

1.   The Range of Goals Listed by Personnel at Counseling
     Agencies

Objectives listed by staff members of high-ranked counsel-
ing agencies included: "I try to make it clear that I'm not an
arm of Community Arbitration"; "finding useful jobs that need to
be done"; and, "use the resources of all the other programs for
placing youth". People at low-ranked counseling agencies men-
tioned the objectives: "group therapy"; "establishing communi-
cation between youth and their parents and between youth and
other authority figures in their lives"; and, "providing a place
where youths can congregate, can feel accepted, and where a youth
can sit down and spend ten hours talking with me about what it
is that's bothering him, why is he acting the way he did, what
direction would he like to go into".

2.   Priorities in Working with Youths at Work-Sites

At high-ranked work sites, there was an emphasis on, for
example, "job productivity" and a person's ability to "pull his
weight". Priorities in working with delinquent youths centered
around the development of a youth's "pride in a job well done",
a "purpose in the delinquent's life", and "rewarding people for
appropriate good behavior [on the job]".

Of the respondents at low-ranked work sites, only one
touched on the importance of a youth's doing a good job; he said
that "kids could see what they accomplished". Other objectives
of people at low-ranked work sites included: exposing youths to

"a different type of set up as far as punishment goes",

"working with them more closely than is usual with volunteers",

and, "providing them with more supervision than other volunteers".

Even at the high-ranked work-sites where the respondents

described a helping relationship, that relationship was de-

scribed as developing in the context of the work activity. The

following responses illustrated this:

> They would be somewhat of a cross between getting a
> person interested in an occupation and something to
> do with helping them with their personal problems.
> But it would have to be more the emphasis of their
> job productivity.

> They work closely with supervisors such as M. and my-
> self. Most of the time it is odd jobs outside that,
> they're involved with, cutting grass, raking leaves,
> filling in potholes in the driveway. The somehow
> through this hard work, if you want to call it hard
> work, we try to build up some kind of relationship
> with them, an adult type person and most likely the
> juvenile offender. Hopefully through the process
> they're going to learn that what they've done is
> wrong, why they did it. And this does teach them
> responsibility for later on in life.

3. The View of Referred Youths as Normal

A difference that stood out between good and poor work-

sites involved the definition of youths referred by Arbitration

as "normal." The three high-ranked agencies had the primary

goal of providing a service to a group with special needs (e.g.,

retarded people). Their staff viewed youths from Arbitration

as "normal." In contrast, a representative of a low-ranked work

site reported that:

We have a Christmas charity program where we feed underprivileged people, children, and adults. And, there was a suggestion at one time to have one of the (Arbitration) kids come up and help a little bit and decorate the hall and so forth and so on. Some of the...members felt it wouldn't be conducive to have these children in that atmosphere with smaller kids.

4. Continued Involvement of Youths as Volunteers at Work-sites

At high-ranked work-sites, success was pictured as involving the youth's continued work as a volunteer in two of the three settings. Respondents explained that the youths had formed new ties at the work-sites. For example, one said:

I would consider her a success because she has completed her hours and continued to be a volunteer working on a once a week basis here. She seems to find a lot of things here that she likes to do, people she likes to be with. Previously, she didn't have too many friends. They were the wrong kind of people. She did not have much love and attention at home. She had plenty of money, she had found the love and attention here that she doesn't get at home. I would consider her a definite success. I've been able to talk with her at times; I work with the school counselor too and we communicate back and forth simply because I am able to say things to this person that the counselor is not able to get across. I am also in touch with her parents. This girl trusts me which is a good start.

END