

99813

99813

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJDP
US Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

THE IMPACT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE LEGISLATION
ON COMMUNITY SERVICE PROVIDERS

MARGARET A. GORDON

Volume V of

Implications of California's 1977 juvenile
Justice Reform Law

Prepared for

99813

REFERENCES

Guttridge, Patricia
1979 "Mental health alternatives." pp. 199 - 230
in Katherine S. Teilmann and Malcolm W. Klein,
Assessment of the Impact of California's 1977
Juvenile Justice Legislation. Los Angeles:
Social Science Research Institute.

Johns, Dennis and Jean Bottcher
1980 AB3121 Impact Evaluation: Final Report.
Sacramento, Calif.: California Youth Authority,
Research Division

Tilmann, Katherine, S. and Malcolm W. Klein
1979 Assessment of the Impact of California's 1977
Juvenile Justice Legislation. Los Angeles:
Social Science Research Institute

Weick, K. E.
1976 "Educational organizations as loosely
coupled systems." Administrative Science
Quarterly 21:1-19

Guttridge, Patricia and Carol A.B. Warren
1979 Mental Hospitalization as a Resource Alternative
in response to AB3121 volume I of
Implications of California's 1977
juvenile justice Reform Law containing
Tilmann and Malcolm W. Klein
(eds) Publisher? SSRIP?

Tilmann, Katherine S.
1980 (any - insid status offender reform bill her)
Volume III of Implications of California's
1977 juvenile justice Reform Law,
containing Tilmann and Malcolm
W. Klein (eds) Publisher? SSRIP?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

1. Introduction	1
2. An Analysis of Referrals and Placements of Juveniles By the Justice System	3
2.1 Methods	4
2.2 Changes In the Volume Of Referrals and Placements	6
2.3 The Characteristics Of the Clients Referred to Community Facilities	12
2.4 Summary Of Justice System Referrals and Placements	16
3. Survey Of Community Facilities	18
3.1 Methods	18
3.1.1 Sampling	18
3.1.2 Questionnaire Design	22
3.2 The Respondents	23
3.3 Analysis	24
3.3.1 Changes Perceived By the Facilities	24
3.3.1.1 Volume Of Clients Served	24
3.3.1.2 Referral Sources	25
3.3.1.3 Client Characteristics	26
3.3.1.4 Control Over Clients	29
3.3.1.5 Contact With Other Organizations	32
3.3.1.6 Funding Sources and Amounts	33
3.3.1.7 Summary	37
3.3.2 The Context Of AB3121	39
3.3.3 Interorganizational Processes	41
3.3.4 Reactions to AB3121	68
4. Summary	72
5. Discussion	75

References

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Appendix B: Coding Guide

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research component is to assess the impact of AB3121' on facilities outside of the juvenile justice system that provide services to juvenile offenders. Two separate analyses are carried out, each approaching the issue from a different perspective. The first is based on the law enforcement and probation records of samples of arrested juveniles in five counties and consists of an examination of the changes in the volume and the characteristics of the juveniles referred to community facilities. The second analysis involves a survey of those facilities which juveniles were referred, soliciting information about the extent and nature of changes in various aspects of the facilities, perceived by agency administrators to have resulted from AB3121.

The assessment based on the examination of justice system data indicates that with one exception virtually no change had occurred in the extent to which these facilities were used by the justice system, and suggests that little change had occurred in the characteristics of the arrested juveniles being referred. The second analysis, based on survey responses, provides evidence that the administrators of some of the facilities perceived changes to have occurred in a number of areas following AB3121. These changes were reported by less than half of the responding facilities; the amount of change reported was not great and the direction was not always consistent, but across several aspects of the facilities there was indication of at least some change. The discrepancy between the results of these two analyses is suggested to have been conditioned to an extent by the political climate surrounding the implementation of AB3121. Further examination of the survey responses suggests that the changes experienced

by the facilities resulted from a change in law enforcement's willingness to arrest status offenders (reported in another assessment of the broader impacts of AB3121) and the subsequent (and unanticipated) change in the process by which juveniles were referred to community facilities. These are also suggested as factors contributing to the discrepancy between the conclusions of our two analyses. It is also emphasized, however, that because of the small number of facilities surveyed all these findings must be considered as merely suggestive. Finally, little reaction to any of these changes was evident on the part of the facilities, according to the responses to the survey.

The conclusion of this research is that there was indeed an impact of AB3121 on community facilities, albeit weak and somewhat inconsistent. The importance of the effects for the facilities and their clients is discussed. The weaknesses and strengths of the methods for assessing impact are pointed out and suggestions made for how they might be improved in future research to be more sensitive to the unanticipated effects that were found. It is suggested that the low evidence of impact might be due in part to the small number of facilities surveyed and to the inappropriateness of the selection procedures which became evident in light of the changes which appeared to have occurred. Finally, consideration is given to the concept of "loose coupling" as a point of view to be taken into account in an assessment of the impact of an organization's environment on its structure and mechanisms.

1. Introduction

The aim of this report is to assess the impact of AB3121 on the functioning of facilities outside of the juvenile justice system that deal with juvenile offenders. "Outside" refers to those organizations, funded by either public or private money, that are not under the authority of that system or any of its branches. In many cases these types of facilities are private, non-profit organizations within the surrounding community. However public, as well as profit-making facilities might also be considered as being outside of the juvenile justice system if that system does not have authority over their administration. This research is intended as an assessment of the degree to which these facilities were affected by AB3121 and, if affected, the nature of the impact.

The thrust of AB3121, regarding referrals and placements, was aimed at decision points within the justice system, in particular law enforcement and probation, where the decisions are made regarding the handling of offenders. Although AB3121 did not directly act on community facilities, two of its provisions held important potential effects for them. Both the provision to deinstitutionalize status offenders and the provision encouraging the use of alternative services (alternative to standard justice system processing) implied the possibility of broad impact on those facilities. To the extent that the former provision was implemented, but placement and services were still required for the diverted status offenders, some of the burden presumably would fall on community facilities. Implementation of the alternative services provision also quite clearly implied an effect on those facilities by way of greater use. In addition, both provisions suggest the possibility that the facilities might have been faced with a different type of client. If deinstitutionalization results in greater reliance on these community facilities, then an increased

proportion of their referrals from the justice system might be accounted for by status offenders. For those facilities that previously dealt with other types of juveniles, whether they were delinquent offenders or dependency cases, this would reflect a substantial change in clientele, in terms of problems to be dealt with and services required. Likewise, the alternative services provision also suggests the possibility that a change would occur in the type of juvenile being referred to or placed in community facilities. Either those juveniles formerly retained in the system or those formerly released might, post-AB3121, be referred outside the system in response to this provision. In either case, the implication is for change in the type of client with which the facility must deal.

Because these two provisions posed the possibility of important changes for community facilities, the aim of this report is to determine the actual extent and substance of AB3121's impact on them. To do so, two separate analyses were made. The first used information from law enforcement and probation files, collected for two evaluations of the broader impact of AB3121 (Teilmann and Klein, 1980; Johns and Bottcher, 1980), to examine changes, within samples of juvenile offenders, in the number and type of youths being referred to these facilities. The second analysis involved a survey of community facilities, examining the effects from their perspective and the changes made, if any, to accommodate to the legislation.

2. An Analysis of Referrals and Placements of Juveniles by the Justice System

In order to carry out the first of the two analyses assessing the potential impact of AB3121 on community facilities, a comparison was made of law enforcement and probation referrals to and placements in facilities from a three-month period in the year prior to the implementation of AB3121 with referrals and placements in the same three months in the year following the implementation of the legislation. In particular, public residential, private residential, public non-residential, and private non-residential facilities were examined.

The analysis began with an examination of changes across years in the numbers of juveniles going to these facilities. Since the existence of changes in the volume of these referrals and placements might have been conditioned by changes in the use of other options open to justice system officials, an examination was also made of shifts in the numbers of juveniles handled by various types of detention facilities, those whose cases were passed on in the system without the juvenile ever being held, and those who were released or had their cases dismissed at various points in the system. Thus, the initial assessment of the impact on community facilities was in terms of changes in the volume of referrals and placements, particularly in light of other changes in the handling of juveniles.

There was also interest in looking at changes across the two years in the characteristics of the juveniles being sent to these facilities. Regardless of whether changes in volume occurred, the question arises as to whether or not the facilities were faced with different kinds of clients in terms of gender, ethnicity or age, as well as current and prior offenses. Unfortunately, the results of the assessment of changes in the volume of referrals and placements indicated that almost uniformly there were very low levels of referrals and placements in all counties and in both years and, therefore, precluded carrying out this part of the

analysis in any depth. To the extent possible, however, such changes were examined.

Those two investigations are based on information from justice system records and hence represent an analysis of the impact of AB3121 from that perspective. The results, described below, provide a comparison for the second analysis based on surveys of administrators of community facilities.

2.1 Methods

Data on referrals and placements from law enforcement and probation records in five counties were used to assess changes in volume and client type. The data were collected as parts of two evaluation studies of AB3121.¹ The counties to be evaluated were chosen jointly, with one study concentrating on the northern counties and the other concentrating on the southern counties. A number of criteria were considered in selecting the counties to be evaluated--pre-existing trends in the county's handling of juvenile offenders, trends in the county's reaction to AB3121, size of the population of offenders, and the amount of travel time that would be incurred in data collection (Teilmann and Klein, 1980). An effort was made to maximize both the variety of the pre-existing trends and the variety of reactions. Counties in which the population of offenders was too small to yield an adequate sample size were eliminated, as were counties for which the travel time was more than the funding or timetable could bear. Eight counties were selected for evaluation, although only five are considered in this report. Data on referrals and placements were not available in the other three.

¹ The data for the analysis of the two northern counties, Sacramento and Placer, came from an evaluation of AB3121 carried out by the California Youth Authority (1980). Data from Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Ventura counties came from the evaluation of the impact of AB3121 on selected southern counties (Teilmann and Klein, 1980).

Sampling of law enforcement departments and of the juveniles varied between the northern counties and the southern counties and, in the two northern counties, from one to the other. In the three southern counties, Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Ventura, law enforcement departments were selected on the basis of a stratified random sampling procedure (Teilmann and Klein, 1980). Strata were defined by the number of juvenile arrests made by a department. Within the selected law enforcement departments, data were collected on a stratified random sample of juvenile offenders. These strata were defined by the Welfare and Institutions Code categories--601 (status offenders), 602 (delinquent offenders) and 300 (dependency cases).² The sample of youths was divided between two time periods--the second quarter of the year prior to the implementation of AB3121 and the second quarter of the year following its implementation. Data from probation records were collected on only those juveniles in the law enforcement sample who were sent to probation by these police agencies.

In Sacramento County, the law enforcement departments were selected by the Youth Authority research team on the basis of the proportion of total juvenile arrests in the county for which they accounted. Departments accounting for the largest proportions were selected. Within those departments, juveniles were randomly sampled during the same time periods as in the southern counties. Data from probation records were obtained on a random sample of the juveniles in the law enforcement sample.

² Status offenders (601's) refers to those youths arrested for behaviors that are offenses only by virtue of the age of the actor. For instance, only those under 18 years old can be arrested for running away from home. Delinquent offenders (602's) refers to juveniles arrested for acts that are violations of the law, regardless of the age of the actor. Dependency cases (300's) refers to youths brought into the justice system because of neglect or abuse by their parents.

In Placer County, law enforcement departments were also selected by the Youth Authority on the basis of the proportion of total juvenile arrests in the county for which they accounted. In addition, whether or not the necessary information would be available within the department was considered in making the selection. Within the selected departments, all juveniles arrested during the two three-month periods used in the other counties were taken into the sample. Probation data were collected on those juveniles within the law enforcement sample who were sent to probation.

For each juvenile in the law enforcement samples in the five counties, data were gathered on any referrals to community facilities made by law enforcement. For those for whom probation data were gathered, information was collected on any referrals or placements, either as the initial probation action (pre-adjudication) or the final disposition (post-adjudication).

If a referral or placement was made, the name and address of the facility were recorded, when available. Based on this information the facilities were then categorized as public residential, private residential, public non-residential, and private non-residential. These categories formed the basis for the analysis of justice system referrals and placements. The number of juveniles, and their characteristics, referred to facilities in each of those categories were examined.

2.2 Changes in the Volume of Referrals and Placements

The possibility has been suggested that the deinstitutionalization and alternative services provisions of AB3121 might affect the volume of referrals to community facilities. To the extent that fewer juveniles were taken to

probation facilities by law enforcement, fewer are detained by probation and fewer are incarcerated by the court, in compliance with these provisions, community facilities might be relied upon to fill the gap. Another possible reaction to deinstitutionalization is that justice officials will turn to other more traditional means of handling juveniles, such as release or dismissal, or paper (as opposed to physical) referral of the case through the system. In this section an examination will be made of the extent to which law enforcement and probation (at the point of initial action and as a final disposition) made use of the various options for dealing with juvenile offenders and how that changed after the implementation of AB3121.

Table 1 points out quite clearly that in four of the five counties-- Sacramento, Placer, San Bernardino and Ventura--there were no substantial increases in the volume of referrals by law enforcement to any of the categories of community facilities.³ Both prior to and following the implementation of AB3121 there was a very low reliance on community facilities as alternative means of handling arrested juveniles, particularly in Sacramento and Placer counties. Instead, the changes in the processing of juveniles that were apparent involved the standard justice system channels--delivered to probation facilities, counseled-and-released, or retained in the system without detention ("Other").

In Sacramento County the only changes that occurred involved the "Counseled-and-released" and "Other" categories. Despite deinstitutionalization there was

³ In addition to the categories representing the juveniles referred to community facilities, the tables in this section also present numbers and percentages of youths receiving other law enforcement actions. The category "Delivered to Probation Facility" represents those taken by law enforcement to such a facility. It should be pointed out that this does not represent detained juveniles since the decision to detain is made by the probation department. This category instead includes all those youths brought by law enforcement to probation

TABLE 1

Law Enforcement Action in Five Counties in 1976 and 1977
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles		San Bernardino		Ventura		Placer		Sacramento		TOTALS
	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	
Delivered to Probation Facilities	52 12.47	25 7.25	42 26.41	24 17.78	48 23.08	26 15.12	47 27.20	23 12.50	119 19.70	99 19.60	505 17.40
Referred to Public Residential Facilities	1 0.24	45 13.04	0 0.00	1 0.74	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	47 1.62
Referred to Private Residential Facilities	4 0.96	6 1.74	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	10 0.34
Referred to Public Non-Residential Facilities	17 4.08	7 2.03	9 5.66	4 2.96	1 0.48	1 0.58	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	39 1.34
Referred to Private Non-Residential Facilities	12 2.88	11 3.19	0 0.00	0 0.00	7 3.37	5 2.91	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	35 1.21
Referred to Community Facility-Type Unknown	6 1.44	2 0.58	2 1.26	4 2.96	0 0.00	1 0.58	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	15 0.52
Counseled and Released	140 33.57	99 28.70	35 22.01	50 37.04	49 23.56	40 23.26	0 0.00	0 0.00	80 13.20	95 18.80	588 20.26
Other	185 44.36	150 43.48	71 44.65	52 38.52	103 49.52	99 57.56	126 72.80	161 87.50	406 67.10	311 61.60	1664 57.32
TOTALS	417 14.36	345 11.88	159 5.48	135 4.65	208 7.16	172 5.92	173 5.96	184 6.34	605 20.84	505 17.40	2903

no evidence of a decrease in the percentage of youths taken to probation facilities and, concomitantly, no evidence of increased reliance on community facilities.

Figures for Placer, San Bernardino and Ventura counties indicate that decreased percentages of the arrested youths were taken to probation facilities by law enforcement. The apparent decrease in the reliance on probation facilities is not surprising given the deinstitutionalization provision, and in fact it might be somewhat exaggerated in these data. The stratified random sampling procedure employed in San Bernardino and Ventura counties produced equal percentages of status offenders in both the 1976 and 1977 samples. Since following AB3121 this group represented juveniles who could not be securely detained, it is very likely that in these samples there would have been evidence of a decrease in the percentages of youths delivered to probation facilities. That the same trend was apparent in the Placer County data, where the sample represented a total enumeration of the juveniles arrested in the two three-month periods, suggests that this decrease might not have been simply an artifact of the sampling procedure.

These figures also indicate that this decrease was counterbalanced by increased use of other justice system channels and not by increased referrals to community facilities. In Placer and Ventura counties there were increases in

3 (cont'd)

facilities and, therefore, vulnerable to being detained. Also included in the tables are categories representing youths who were referred to a community facility but the type of facility was unknown, and those who were counseled and released. The category "Other" represents a mixture of juveniles who do not fall into the other categories--they were not referred to community facilities, taken to probation facilities, nor counseled and released. They include those referred to probation by petition or citation (these account for the majority of youths in this category), those transferred to other jurisdictions within the justice system, those referred to other government branches (such as the welfare system), and those released for lack of sufficient evidence.

the percentages of juveniles retained in the system without detention; in San Bernardino County increased percentages were counseled and released. There were no changes however in the volume of referrals by law enforcement to community facilities. To the extent that deinstitutionalization occurred in these three counties resources outside of the system were not employed as alternative ways of handling juveniles.

Los Angeles County is the lone exception to this trend. Here also decreased percentages of arrested juveniles were delivered to probation facilities by law enforcement.⁴ In contrast to the other counties, however, there was an accompanying increase in the total percentage of youths referred to community facilities. Although the volume of referrals was not great either prior to or following AB3121 (10% in 1976 and 20% in 1977), the figures clearly demonstrate an increased use of community facilities as an alternative way of handling arrested youth.⁵

Upon closer examination of the figures for Los Angeles County it becomes apparent that this increase is accounted for by referrals to public residential facilities. For the most part these represent referrals to Status Offender Detention Alternative (SODA) homes. This program was implemented in 1977 by the Los Angeles County Probation Department for temporary residential placement of

⁴ Again, as in San Bernardino and Ventura counties, these figures might somewhat exaggerate the actual decline in the use of probation facilities because of the stratified random sampling procedure.

⁵ The analysis of the overall impact of AB3121 from which these data were taken (Teilmann and Klein, 1980) reported that following the implementation of the legislation there was a marked decrease in the arrest of status offenders. Since that type of offender is also most likely to be referred to community facilities, the increase from 10 to 20 percent might represent a more significant increase than is immediately apparent. Because those offenders who are probably most likely to be referred are possibly no longer being arrested, the 20% in 1977 represents law enforcement reaching deeper into the pools of status offenders and delinquent offenders.

status offenders in non-secure surroundings. Funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the program was intended as an aid for Los Angeles County in meeting LEAA's adopted juvenile justice standards on status offender deinstitutionalization. The coincidental timing of the implementation of the SODA home program and the implementation of AB3121 was fortuitous; these homes provided law enforcement and probation with a means for implementing the deinstitutionalization provision of the legislation. The increase in referrals to public residential facilities reflects law enforcement's reliance on SODA homes as an alternative to the secure detention of status offenders. In Los Angeles County, then, deinstitutionalization did result in a greater emphasis on the use of non-standard resources. Specifically, it occurred where preparations had been made already for the development of a program to accommodate the types of changes brought about by the legislation.

Table 1 demonstrates then that the reactions of law enforcement in four of the five selected counties to AB3121 did not involve an increased reliance on community facilities for dealing with arrested juveniles. To the extent that deinstitutionalization occurred, these alternatives were not used to fill the gap. Instead there appeared to have been increased reliance on one or another of the standard justice system channels. Los Angeles County, where preparations were already being made to accommodate deinstitutionalization, was the only place in which there was some indication of a shift toward increased reliance on non-standard facilities. Given these results, the implication is that such facilities were not very much affected by the legislation. Even in Los Angeles County, the impact actually reflected the justice system's effort to conform to existing standards.

Data on the juveniles referred to probation in these five counties indicated a pattern of changes in the handling of arrested youths that was similar to what occurred at the law enforcement level. For both the initial probation action (Table 2) and the final disposition (Table 3) of these cases, there was no evidence of an increased reliance on the use of community facilities. Again, the changes that did occur in the handling of youths involved the standard channels of the justice system. Even in Los Angeles County, which evidenced a decrease in the percentage of juveniles detained at the initial probation action, there were no changes in referrals to community facilities. At both decision-making levels in probation there was continued reliance on the standard justice system channels and no apparent increase in referrals outside of the system.

Based on this analysis of justice system data in five counties it quickly becomes apparent that AB3121 did not bring about an increased reliance on community facilities as a means for dealing with arrested juveniles, with the exception of SODA homes in Los Angeles County. It was suggested earlier that to the extent that deinstitutionalization created a gap in the processing of arrested juveniles, the justice system might shift toward a greater use of resources outside of the system. This was one objective of the alternative services provision of AB3121. Another reaction which it was suggested might have occurred was greater use of other standard justice system procedures. Tables 1 to 3 substantiate that this was in fact what happened with only the exception of the use of SODA homes in Los Angeles County. The implication, then, is that the legislation had minimal impact on these facilities, excluding those developed specifically to fill the void created by deinstitutionalization.

2.3 The Characteristics of the Clients Referred to Community Facilities

Despite the absence of any increase in the justice system's use of community

TABLE 2

Initial Probation Action in Five Counties in 1976 and 1977
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles		San Bernardino		Ventura		Placer		Sacramento		TOTALS
	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	
Detained in Probation Facilities	36 52.70	15 17.40	23 30.30	14 28.00	22 21.40	17 22.70	1 0.70	0 0.00	1 0.50	1 0.50	130 10.92
Referred to Public Residential Facilities	0 0.00	3 3.50	2 2.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	5 0.42
Referred to Private Residential Facilities	0 0.00	1 1.20	1 1.30	0 0.00	2 1.90	0 0.00	1 0.70	0 0.00	1 0.50	2 1.10	8 0.67
Referred to Public Non-Residential Facilities	1 0.90	0 0.00	2 2.60	0 0.00	1 1.00	1 1.30	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.50	6 0.50
Referred to Private Non-Residential Facilities	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 2.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 0.17
Referred to Community Facility - Type Unknown	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.60	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.08
Dismissed	14 12.70	9 10.50	27 35.50	11 22.00	43 41.70	26 34.70	52 35.40	73 42.20	70 37.20	46 25.30	371 31.18
Other	59 53.60	58 67.40	19 25.00	25 50.00	35 34.00	31 41.30	93 63.30	99 57.20	116 61.70	132 72.50	667 56.05
TOTALS	110 9.24	86 7.23	76 6.39	50 4.20	103 8.66	75 6.30	147 12.35	173 14.54	188 15.80	182 15.29	1190

TABLE 3

Final Dispositions in Five Counties in 1976 and 1977
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles		San Bernardino		Ventura		Placer		Sacramento		TOTALS
	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	1976	1977	
Committed to Juvenile Hall	5 4.50	3 3.50	2 2.60	4 8.00	4 3.90	10 13.30	12 8.30	3 1.70	0 0.00	1 0.50	44 3.70
Committed to CYA or County Camp	1 0.90	7 8.10	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.00	1 1.30	0 0.00	2 1.20	8 4.50	7 3.80	27 2.27
Referred to Public Residential Facilities	3 2.70	3 3.50	1 1.30	1 2.00	1 1.00	1 1.30	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 1.10	12 1.01
Referred to Private Residential Facilities	4 3.60	2 2.30	3 3.90	2 4.00	3 2.90	1 1.30	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.50	16 1.34
Referred to Public Non-Residential Facilities	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00
Referred to Private Non-Residential Facilities	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.30	1 2.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 0.17
Referred to Community Facility-Type Unknown	1 0.90	1 1.20	3 3.90	0 0.00	2 1.90	0 0.00	1 0.70	0 0.00	2 1.10	2 1.10	12 1.01
Incarcerated -Type of Facility Unknown	.2 1.80	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.60	3 1.60	6 3.30	12 1.01
Dismissed	35 31.80	24 27.90	40 52.60	20 40.00	57 55.30	34 45.30	64 43.50	92 53.20	82 43.60	61 33.50	509 42.77
Other	59 53.60	46 53.50	26 34.20	22 44.00	35 34.00	28 37.30	70 47.60	75 43.40	93 49.50	102 56.00	556 46.72
TOTALS	110 9.24	86 7.23	76 6.39	50 4.20	103 8.66	75 6.30	147 12.35	173 14.54	188 15.80	182 15.29	1190

facilities, it is possible nonetheless that changes occurred in the characteristics of the clients being referred. Findings from one of the previous analyses of the impact of AB3121 on the justice system indicate that certain classes of offenders were being handled differently following the implementation of the legislation (Teilmann and Klein, 1980). Over and above already existing trends there was a decline in the arrests of status offenders, in referrals of status offenders to probation, and in petitions to court for status offenders. These findings are especially pertinent to this analysis because this type of offender, by virtue of the non-criminal behavior involved, probably has a greater likelihood of being referred outside of the system. Changes in how certain categories of juveniles are handled has implications for the characteristics of those potentially eligible for referral at each subsequent step in the justice system process.

Two considerations made such an analysis difficult. First, the low volume of referrals to community facilities made analysis and interpretation of changes quite difficult. Examination of percentage changes can be very misleading when the frequencies are low because large percentage differences may reflect absolute differences of just one or a few cases. The generalizability of the results must also be questioned when the numbers are this small.

Second, even if changes in characteristics did occur, the overall low volume of referrals suggests that they could not have been of substantial size or significance. Whatever changes might have occurred could have involved only a very limited number of clients.

For these reasons an analysis of the characteristics of clients simply was not feasible for any of the categories of facilities except one--law enforcement referrals to public residential facilities in Los Angeles County. As with other categories and other counties it made little sense to examine changes in client characteristics within this category because of the small number of referrals prior

to AB3121. In looking at only those juveniles referred in 1977 it was found, not surprisingly, that they had been brought into the system on status offenses or dependency charges. Slightly more than half were female and the average age was between fourteen and fifteen. The majority had no prior offenses and of those with records of previous offenses, more than half had either committed status offenses only or had dependency charges only. The type of juvenile offender being referred to these facilities appeared to be quite consistent with the intended purpose of SODA homes. They served as an alternative to detention for less serious offenders who were not deeply involved in law-violating behavior, but for whom law enforcement desired some kind of placement, possibly because of age and gender. This is not so much a discovery as a validation.

2.4 Summary of Justice System Referrals and Placements

Based on data on juveniles sampled from the justice system in five counties, it would appear that AB3121 had little impact on the extent to which juveniles were alternatively handled outside of the system. Despite provisions deinstitutionalizing status offenders and encouraging the use of alternative services, there were generally no changes in the volume of referrals to community facilities at any point in the justice system following the implementation of AB3121. The changes that did occur involved standard justice system procedures --detention, referral to probation or other branches of the system without detention, and release. The one exception which we have discussed was the category of public residential facilities in Los Angeles County. No examination was made of changes in the characteristics of the clients who were referred to community facilities since the low volume of referrals made it infeasible to do so. In sum, the impact of the legislation on community facilities appears to have been minimal.

Given this, it would be expected that the facilities, for the most part, would also report minimal impact from AB3121. On the other hand, the small changes that we have hesitated to interpret as affecting the facilities might have been perceived as substantial from their point of view. Additionally, other changes might have occurred that are not apparent in an analysis of official patterns or referrals. The purpose of the survey of facilities was to determine the extent to which agency officials perceived an impact from AB3121. This will be addressed next.

3. Survey of Community Facilities

The second analysis undertaken as part of this research consisted of a survey of the facilities to whom law enforcement and probation referred juveniles taken into custody.

This part was designed (a) to assess the changes experienced by those facilities as a result of AB3121, (b) to attempt to bring to the forefront those processes by which the mandates of the legislation had an impact on the facilities, and (c) to assess this impact in terms of adaptations made by the facilities. While doing this the results of the previous analysis should be kept in mind, but it should be recognized also that the perception of impact on the part of the facilities is a separate and important factor in determining their responses to the legislation. That perception can have significant implications for the clients of those facilities.

3.1 Methods

3.1.1 Sampling. The law enforcement and probation data from the five selected counties were used again to draw the group of facilities to be surveyed. As described in the previous section, data were collected in each of these counties on whether or not a juvenile was referred to or placed in a facility at any of three points in the justice system process--arrest, initial probation action, or final disposition. For those juveniles referred or placed, the name and address of the facility, if available, were recorded. These lists served as the initial pool of 132 organizations from which the final group of fifty facilities was drawn. There were three criteria by which the selection took place. The first was imposed by the limitations of the data, the second was the attrition rate over time, and the third was imposed by our definition of the boundaries of the Facilities Component--which ones should and which ones should not be included in the analysis.

There were problems with the data collected on facilities that made it impossible to use the entire original list of organizations to which juveniles had been referred. In some instances the information was incomplete. The records, for example, might show that a youth was referred to a "home for unwed mothers" or to "alcohol counseling," but with no additional information enabling us to locate the particular place to which the juvenile was sent. Thus, the type of services that the referring agency intended the youth to receive was known but not the actual facility to which he was sent. Eight percent of the original list of referrals was lost because of incomplete information.

Another problem involved the time lag between the time the information was recorded and the time at which attempts were made to locate the facilities. There is as much as a three year span between the data collected for the year prior to the implementation of AB3121 and the collection of data for this report. In the meantime, changes occurred that made it difficult to track down facilities. They closed down; they changed their names; they changed addresses. All of these problems were encountered. Some of the facilities were eventually found but not others. Thus, although the information collected from the records might have appeared to be complete, it was necessary to drop some facilities due to the inability to locate them two to three years after the actual referral. Every effort was made to locate both the ones for which complete information was lacking and those for which the information appeared incorrect.⁶ In the end, however, an additional nine percent of the original pool of facilities could not be located.

⁶ In an attempt to locate as many of the facilities as possible, we turned to a number of sources. We checked with persons at the departments where the data were collected to see if they could provide additional or more current information. Again, we were faced with the time lag since often the people dealing with that type of information now had not been there two or three years earlier when the data had been recorded. We tried various other sources - telephone books, the telephone company's directory assistance, the county directory of social service agencies, and other similar facilities - but often to no avail.

In addition, some facilities were judged to be inappropriate for the original conception of this analysis. The intention was to assess the impact of AB3121 on the development and use of alternatives to the juvenile justice system. The focus was on community facilities, whether public or private, that are not part of that system but exist outside of it as substitutes. The legislation put emphasis on these facilities by prohibiting the secure detention of status offenders (thereby outlawing the use of Juvenile Hall) and by encouraging the use of alternatives to the justice system for all offenders. Consequently, all detention facilities-- Juvenile Hall, probation camps, and those run by welfare officials--were excluded from this analysis. In Los Angeles County this included SODA homes. Although these are private homes and are employed as alternatives to secure detention, they were nonetheless established by the probation department. In order for law enforcement personnel to place a juvenile in one of these homes, a petition must be filed with probation requesting that the youth be detained. They are, indeed, an alternative to detention in Juvenile Hall and for that reason were of some interest and were included in the previous assessment of changes in referrals. However, because they are detention facilities under the jurisdiction of the probation department, they cannot, for our purposes, be considered as alternatives to justice system processing outside of that system.

We also dropped some facilities that at first glance appeared to meet our criterion that they be community organizations providing alternative placements to the juvenile justice system. Hospitals, particularly psychiatric units, and schools are examples. It was found on investigation, especially in the case of hospitals, that the youths referred to these places would probably not have been handled by the juvenile justice system anyway.⁷ Therefore, these referrals did not represent

⁷ For example, the referral of a juvenile to a hospital for a gunshot would hardly constitute the use of alternative resources. Referrals to psychiatric units are not so clearly defined. While psychiatric treatment may represent an alternative to justice system processing (See Guttridge and Warren, 1980), most of the cases encountered involved behavior that was unlikely to have been handled by the justice system at any time (e.g., suicide threats). Again, rather than representing the development of alternative resources, these referrals represent the most appropriate channel for handling the problem.

an attempt to develop alternative resources but were more likely to be the most appropriate way of handling the youth's immediate problem. Schools (or school districts) were included in the sample only if there was established a specific program for working with juvenile offenders. Most of the referrals to schools were actually truants being returned there by the police and not referrals for treatment. Again, the emphasis on alternative resources dictated that unless the schools could be regarded as alternative sources of treatment for the youth's problem they be excluded. For the same reason, law enforcement operated diversion programs were also excluded; their purpose is to refer juveniles on to facilities that have programs designed to deal with their problems and not to provide treatment themselves. An additional forty-five percent of the initial pool had to be excluded because they did not operate as genuine alternatives.

Difficulty in locating some facilities plus decisions about the particular types of facilities to be included finally reduced the group to fifty organizations in the five counties. This is less than forty percent of the original list of organizations collected from law enforcement and probation records, yet it seems to be a rather "pure" list of genuine community alternatives. It remains open to question how well these fifty facilities represent the total population of community organizations that provide services to juvenile offenders. It is apparent that law enforcement and probation agencies did not at that time make a great deal of use of these types of alternative referrals. The fact that so many "referrals" had to be trimmed from the original list because they did not represent movement away from the system is testimony to this. Due to the sparing use made of community facilities, it is quite possible that this group does not represent the bulk of such organizations. What it does represent, however, is that group of alternative service providers upon which the juvenile justice system chooses to rely. In an assessment of AB3121 this may be the most appropriate group to examine. Because the provisions of the bill involved changes within the system, much of the impact, although not all, on those

community facilities will occur as a result of their connections with the various parts of that system. Those facilities upon which law enforcement, probation and the court rely may be, therefore, most vulnerable to whatever impact AB3121 had on the juvenile justice system. The fifty organizations in the group, then, are the ones very likely to feel the effects of the bill.

3.1.2 Questionnaire Design. The data concerning the impact of AB3121 on community facilities were collected by means of a questionnaire mailed to the group of fifty facilities described above (see Appendix A). The final version of the questionnaire consisted of three sections covering 1) organizational characteristics of the facilities (including size and professional level of staff, services, referral sources, and frequency and quality of contact with other actors in the juvenile justice process), 2) sources and amounts of funding, and 3) perceived changes in the types of clients being referred and their problems. These areas were all thought to be potentially vulnerable to changes as a result of AB3121.

As an initial step in the construction of the questionnaire, pilot interviews were conducted with administrators from four facilities that represented a range of the types of agencies that deal with juveniles. As such they provided information about the variety of ways in which AB3121 might have had impact. These pilot interviews made it possible to design a questionnaire that focused on the issues in which we were interested and that was, at the same time, relevant to the facilities.

The questionnaires were mailed to the administrators or directors of the facilities in the final pool who were asked to complete the first section themselves. It was felt that items such as staffing, services, referral sources and relationships with other actors in the juvenile justice system could best be addressed by the administrators. On the other hand, data about funding and clients might be more applicable to other staff members with easy access to budget records or more direct involvement with clients. For this reason, it was suggested that these sections be

filled out by the person best able to answer those specific questions. The questions tap the respondent's perception of changes occurring, so dividing the instrument among different staff members means that, for each facility, as many as three different people's perceptions of the effects of AB3121 are being measured. On the other hand, having only the administrator (or any one individual) complete the questionnaire, would have run the risk of having that person provide information with which he is not familiar. The decision was made to get the most accurate reflection of the changes occurring at the facility despite the fact that it might represent three different views of the present situation of the facility.

The final instrument, then, was a closed-ended mailed questionnaire focusing on the staff's perceptions of changes in the structure, funding and clients of the facility. Approximately three weeks after the original questionnaire and cover letter were mailed out to the sample, a follow-up letter was sent to the entire sample in an attempt to increase the number of responses. A third letter and another questionnaire were mailed out two weeks later and a fourth letter, with questionnaire, was sent two weeks following that. At the same time that the fourth letter was mailed, telephone calls were made to the administrators of the facilities in the sample, encouraging them to respond if they had not already done so.⁸ After ten weeks the response rate was seventy percent, representing thirty-five respondents out of the original group of fifty facilities.

3.2 The Respondents

The facilities included in the group of respondents were mainly private, non-profit organizations; seventy-one percent (twenty-five of the thirty-five facilities) fell into this category. An additional six percent (two facilities) were private,

⁸ We did not know which facilities had already responded and which had not because anonymity was promised as part of the request for data.

profit-making facilities. The seven public facilities accounted for twenty percent of the group, and there was also a doctor in private practice. Over half of the facilities had been operating only since 1971. Fifty-seven percent were facilities that dealt only with juveniles. The remainder had populations in which the percentage of juveniles ranged from five to eighty-five. Forty-three percent of the sample was residential facilities. On some characteristics, then, there was quite a bit of variation. On others, particularly legal status, it was not as great, but this may in part be due to the boundaries defined for this research.

3.3 Analysis

In attempting to assess the extent and the nature of the impact of AB3121 on community facilities, three issues were envisioned that needed to be addressed. First, what were the effects of that legislation from the point of view of the facilities? In particular, what changes did they experience as a result of AB3121? The analysis presented in the first half of this report suggests that there was very little impact on these facilities. Second, if changes did occur, how were they related to the legislation? What were the processes by which the legislative change brought change to the facilities? It has been suggested that, because the thrust of AB3121 was directed at the juvenile justice system and not at community facilities, the impact felt at the facility level would be indirect. The effects experienced by these organizations most likely would be by-products of other processes generated by the legislation. Third, how did the facilities respond to the changes engendered by the legislation? Were additional changes made in order to accommodate the impact or was accommodation not necessary?

3.3.1 Changes Perceived by the Facilities

3.3.1.1 Volume of Clients Served. Although very little evidence was found

in the first analysis that the numbers of juveniles being referred to community facilities had changed, close to half of the surveyed facilities (forty-six percent or sixteen facilities) reported changes in the numbers of clients served. Thirty-seven percent (thirteen facilities) indicated increases in numbers, nine percent (three facilities) decreases. Although this appears discrepant with the results of the previous analysis, only referrals from the juvenile justice system were examined at that point. It is possible that the changes indicated by the facilities in the questionnaires reflect shifts in the volume of referrals from other sources.

3.3.1.2 Referral Sources. When we examine changes in the volume of referrals from each of the various sources, however, this does not appear to have been the case. The majority of the facilities reported that there was no change in the volume of referrals from sources outside of the justice system--welfare or social service agencies, schools, private community agencies, parents or the juveniles themselves. On the other hand, forty percent (fourteen facilities) reported changes in referrals from law enforcement and fifty-four percent reported changes in referrals from court and probation. With regard to both of these latter sources, the majority of those experiencing changes had increases in the numbers of referrals. Seventy-one percent of those reporting changes in referrals from law enforcement (ten facilities) reported increases; fifty-eight percent of those reporting changes in referrals from court and probation (eleven facilities) reported increases. That the most substantial changes were increased referrals from the justice system is very much at odds with what was found in examining data on actual justice system referrals. This difference could represent a process of informal referral, possibly resulting from law enforcement's unwillingness to arrest offenders with whom they

feel they can do very little. Rather than arresting them and then referring them elsewhere, one reaction on the part of law enforcement might have been to suggest other resources available in the community, in the hope that the juvenile would receive some kind of service. Since youths arriving at facilities in this way were "referred" by the justice system, they might be so defined by the facilities. At any rate, the facilities perceived a greater impact in terms of referrals than was indicated by the first analysis.

3.3.1.3 Client Characteristics. As has been noted previously, one study of impact of AB3121 found a decrease in the arrests of status offenders following AB3121 (Teilmann and Klein, 1980) and it was suggested that this would result in changes in the characteristics of the juveniles eligible for referral by law enforcement and, subsequently, probation. Since nearly one-third of the facilities indicated increases in referrals from law enforcement and court and probation, it seems not unlikely that they would have perceived changes in the characteristics of their referrals. In general, there was evidence that a substantial proportion of the facilities did perceive differences; however, there was not overwhelming agreement over the extent and nature of those differences, nor over the consequences of changes.

Juveniles arrested for status offenses tend more often to be female than male and they tend to be relatively young in comparison with the delinquent offenders. These then are two characteristics of the referrals to community facilities that might be expected to have changed. According to the responses of most of the facilities, they did not. Only three facilities reported that the ratio of males to females among their clients changed. Twenty-three of the thirty-five facilities (sixty-six percent) indicated that the average age of clients did not change. Among

those that did report changes (twelve facilities), the majority (seven of the twelve) indicated that the average age had decreased. This runs counter to what might have been anticipated, but involves only a minority (twenty percent) of all respondents.

The increased referrals from the justice system might be expected to affect more directly the type of offender being referred to community facilities and, consequently, the types of problems with which the facilities must deal. Information was not requested from the facilities on the proportions of their clients falling into the different categories of offense types.⁹ Instead, perceptions of changes in the types of problems the clients had and in the seriousness of those problems, as well as the direction of those changes were solicited. Their perceptions concerning changes in their ability to treat the referred juveniles were also requested.

A substantial proportion of the facilities (77% or twenty-seven facilities) indicated that the clients being referred after AB3121 had at least some differences from those previously referred. Forty percent (fourteen facilities) responded that they were somewhat or very different and thirty-seven percent (thirteen facilities) that they were as much different as similar. The remaining twenty-three percent (eight facilities) indicated that the two cohorts of referrals were very or somewhat similar to one another.

Among those that perceived at least some kind of difference, there was a nearly equal division between those facilities that perceived a greater likelihood of certain types of problems among post-AB3121 clients and those that perceived no change in the likelihood problems. We asked whether clients referred after the

⁹ By this we refer to the WIC categories of 601, 602 and 300. This information was not requested because we did not feel that it was data which would be readily available at the facilities, and we felt that, in fact, it might not be at all relevant to them.

implementation of the legislation were more or less likely than previous clients to 1) be in trouble with the law, 2) have trouble getting along with their families, and 3) have problems of psychological adjustment. For all three issues, slightly less than half of those reporting any overall change in clients perceived a greater likelihood for the 1977 clients than for the 1976 clients; at the same time, close to half perceived no change in the likelihood of any of these problems. Thus, among the seventy-seven percent indicating some overall changes in the clients there was no consistency as to whether this change also constituted a change in the types of problems.

Also within that seventy-seven percent, however, two-thirds reported that post-AB3121 clients were more difficult to treat. On the other hand, nearly two-thirds of the total number of facilities, twenty-three of the thirty-five (regardless of whether they perceived overall changes in the clients) noted no change in the seriousness of the clients' problems.

The responses to the survey indicate, then, that from the point of view of a sizeable number of the facilities a different type of client was being referred. This much appears consistent with changes in law enforcement behavior reported in another study and changes in the volume of referrals from the justice system reported in this survey. It is also evident, however, that among those reporting change there were varying perceptions about the magnitude and the nature of the changes. Additionally, changes that might have been anticipated in the gender, age and seriousness of the problems of the referrals were not evident. These findings give some but not consistent support to the idea that there was a change in the type of juvenile being referred to community facilities. Nevertheless, even this discordant support is contrary to what was suggested was the likelihood

of changes in the characteristics of clients based on the first analysis in this report. Again, the perception of change on the part of the facilities was greater than was apparent from the examination of justice system data.

3.3.1.4 Control Over Clients. The evidence so far has suggested that according to the perceptions of the facilities, a different type of offender, one more difficult to treat, was being referred to community facilities. This could have resulted from changes in the arrest patterns of law enforcement and subsequent changes in the volume of law enforcement referrals to the facilities. On the other hand this perception might be more a reflection of changing conditions for dealing with juvenile offenders than a reflection of an actual change in the nature of clients. This seems particularly possible given the small amount of change already noted in the specific problems of the referrals and in the seriousness of those problems. One early criticism of AB3121 expressed by those involved in the treatment of juvenile offenders was that, by prohibiting secure detention, it took away most of a facility's ability to control its clients, either with physical barriers or with the threat of secure detention, and, as a result, treatment would be seriously impeded. Thus, it was expected that independent of changes in the characteristics of the referrals, facilities would feel less able to deal effectively with them. In order to assess the extent to which the facilities felt such a loss, an analysis was made of their perceptions of changes in the degree of control, their perceptions of the effect of those changes on treatment, changes in the number of clients not completing the programs to which they were referred, and changes in the number of runaways from residential facilities.

Thirty-seven percent of the facilities (thirteen facilities) reported that clients referred after AB3121 were more difficult to control than previous referrals. Only one facility indicated that control was less difficult. Fifty-four percent

(nineteen facilities) indicated there was no change in the difficulty or ease with which clients could be controlled. For a number of the facilities control was obviously an issue, but it was not as widespread a concern as might have been anticipated. However, for most of those facilities that did perceive a change in control, it was an important change; eight out of fourteen indicated that the changes in control had made providing treatment more difficult.

Despite the fact that a number of the facilities found control and treatment to be more difficult, the majority experienced either no change or a decrease in the number of clients not completing the facility's program. Twenty-nine percent (ten facilities) indicated that there had been an increase in numbers and they were also more likely to have indicated that the clients were more difficult to control than that there was no change or that clients were less difficult to control. They were also more likely to have reported the post-AB3121 clients to be different from previous clients.

Loss of control was seen as a particularly crucial issue for residential facilities, since the non-secure detention of status offenders increases the likelihood of runaways. Forty percent (six facilities) experienced an increase in the number juveniles running away. This can not be attributed simply to the change from of secure to non-secure, since none of the facilities in the sample made that change.¹⁰

¹⁰ Because of the deinstitutionalization provision of AB3121, it was anticipated that facilities might be forced to make physical changes in order to be classified as non-secure. Such changes might also have been necessary to accommodate whatever increase occurred in referrals as a result of this provision and the alternative resources provision. Possible changes might range from the removal of locks to increased bed-space. Since these types of changes applied mainly to residential facilities, we looked only at those in the sample to determine the extent and kinds of structural renovations made. Only two facilities indicated that any changes had been made and in neither case did they seem to result from the AB3121 provisions. One facility cited structural work done for maintenance, upkeep and improved appearance. The other expanded office and counseling space. Although the latter might have resulted from an increased demand on the facility's services; those changes alone do not suggest that AB3121 made structural renovations necessary. There appears to have been no movement on the part of the facilities to make physical changes in order to accommodate the legislative provisions. In fact, the two facilities which were secure in 1976 remained so in 1977.

As with the facilities that had increased numbers of clients not completing their program, those with an increase in runaways were more likely to have indicated that post-AB3121 clients were different from pre-AB3121 clients, and to have indicated greater difficulty in controlling clients after AB3121. Two-thirds of the facilities that perceived their clients to be more difficult to control also experienced an increase in the number of runaways. In **contrast**, two-thirds of those that perceived no change in control also experienced no change in the number of runaways and the remaining one-third had decreases. Again, although the majority of residential facilities did not experience an increase in runaways, those that did were also most likely to have been referred clients in 1977 that they perceived as being more difficult to control.

Evidently there was a sense among some of the facilities that they were less able to control clients following AB3121. This appeared to be related also to increased difficulty in treatment, increases in the number of clients not completing the facility's program and, for residential facilities, increases in the number of runaways. There was also some suggestion that these changes occurred in facilities that also perceived a change in the type of juvenile being referred. This might indicate that changes in control stemmed more from the characteristics of the referrals than from changing conditions for handling them. As with other changes that have been noted, although a number of facilities reported changes in control, they did not constitute a majority, nor was there consensus as to the nature or consequences of those changes.¹¹ Still, some effect was apparent and

¹¹ Although slightly more than half of the respondents indicated that they experienced no change in the ability to control clients, this was evidently still a very salient issue in the larger community of agencies and individuals, including legislators, concerned with the problem of juvenile delinquency. More than a year after the enactment AB3121, an amendment bill, AB958, was implemented. This legislation allowed for the secure detention of status offenders, under specified conditions and for limited periods of time. The new conditions under which 601's

it was generally in line with other changes reported, in these data and elsewhere, in law enforcement behavior, sources of referrals and other characteristics of clients. Again, the suggestion of change in the facilities' abilities to control clients is contrary to the effect that was anticipated based on the analysis of justice system data.

3.3.1.5 Contact with other Organizations. Because AB3121 had the potential to affect the volume and type of juveniles being referred, it was thought that it might also have an effect on the frequency and quality of contact between community facilities and other organizations that are also involved with those juveniles. Given the increase in referrals from law enforcement and court and probation reported by some of the facilities, it might also be expected that more frequent contact was consequently necessary. How that would affect the quality of contact is open to investigation.

Not surprisingly, some facilities reported increased contact with the justice system--twenty-six percent (nine facilities) with law enforcement and twenty-three percent (eight facilities) with court and probation. These figures are similar to,

11 (Cont'd)

could be detained allow authorities sufficient time to locate the juvenile's parents or guardians and allow them time to pick up the youth. Nonetheless, it was thought that even such limited conditions might reinstate some of the control over status offenders felt to be lost under AB3121.

Among the facilities surveyed, however, AB958 had very little impact. Eighty percent, twenty-eight of the thirty-five facilities, indicated that it had made no difference in the ability to control clients. Of those that noted a difference in control, more found that it was more difficult after AB958 than before. Ninety-one percent, thirty-two facilities, responded that it had made no change in the amount of time that clients spent in the programs. AB958, it appears, was not used as a means for holding on to clients in order to gain back some of the control lost under AB3121.

although not quite as substantial as, the percentages reporting increases in referrals from these organizations. Forty-five percent of the facilities (sixteen facilities) reported changes in the frequency of contact with welfare and social service agencies; thirty-four percent (twelve facilities) experienced increases and eleven percent (four facilities) decreases. The majority of facilities reported no change in the frequency of contact with private community agencies or schools.

Apparently then there was some impact on the contacts among organizations dealing with juvenile offenders, although none of it overwhelming. In the case of increased contact with the justice system, this might be related to the perception of increased referrals from those agencies. The reported increase in the frequency of contact with welfare and social service agencies is somewhat more surprising.

There was very little change reported in the quality of the contacts with the other organizations. Better than half of the facilities indicated that no change had occurred, with regard to any and all of these agencies. Fifty-seven percent (twenty facilities) reported no change in the quality of contact with law enforcement, while seventy-one percent (twenty-five facilities) reported no change with regard to welfare and social service agencies. The remainder fell in between. Although the frequency of contact changed the most with regard to the welfare and social service agencies, this did not affect the quality of those contacts. In general, then, AB3121 did not have an impact on the quality of contacts within the juvenile delinquency arena.

3.3.1.6 Funding Sources and Amounts. AB3121 did not deal specifically with funding for facilities, either to provide money to pay for their services or to reimburse them for accommodations, physical or organizational, made necessary by the constraints imposed by the legislation. Nonetheless, to the extent that

referral sources did change or the facilities made changes to adapt to AB3121, this might have affected their financial situations.

Thirty-seven percent of the facilities (thirteen facilities) indicated that some kind of change in their funding, either sources or amounts, had occurred. Forty-six percent (sixteen facilities) responded that there had been shifts in the amounts of their funding; twenty percent (seven facilities) experienced decreases and twenty-six percent (nine facilities) increases. As with changes in other aspects of the facilities, it is apparent that some facilities felt an impact, but it was neither widespread nor consistent in its direction.

Funding from the public sector was noted by the largest percentage of facilities as the source of changes. Thirty-one percent of those with changes (four of thirteen facilities) noted an increase in such funding and another four facilities noted a decrease. This is more than indicated changes, increases or decreases, from either the private sector or clients' fees. While this accounts for a large share (slightly more than sixty percent) of the reported changes, it does little to explicate funding fluctuations because of the inconsistency in the direction of changes.

Although AB3121 itself did not actually affect many of the facilities financially, it prompted another piece of legislation which was intended as a remedy for the potential impact on the funding situations of community facilities. AB90, implemented on July 1, 1978, provided state funding to counties that was to be used to develop new crime and delinquency prevention programs and to bolster existing programs, both public and private. It was thought that this might compensate for funding losses brought about by AB3121 or for expenses incurred in making accommodations (although, according to the responses from the questionnaire, little compensation was necessary).

Thirty-four percent of the facilities applied for AB90 funding; this represents twelve of our respondents. Eight of those facilities were ones that had indicated funding changes. Still, better than one-third of the facilities that reported funding changes did not apply for AB90 funds. Of those facilities that applied, six received funding in 1978 and ten in 1979. The amount of AB90 funding received by facilities varied considerably, ranging from five percent of the facility's budget to fifty percent. The most often cited use for AB90 funds was the addition of staff members. Cited almost as frequently were "other" uses: development of programs designed to deal with delinquent offenders or with juveniles with prior arrest records; replacement of funding lost due to Proposition 13 (to be discussed below) or non-continued grants; staff training programs; increased payment to shelter care families; payment for staff and vehicles formerly paid for with other funds.

While it appears that AB3121 might have had an impact on the financial situations of some of these facilities, it is unclear just how that impact was related to the mandates of the legislation because of the inconsistencies in the direction of the impact. Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that the link between the response to AB90 and AB3121-induced funding changes was not as strong as might be expected based on the intended purpose of AB90. The majority of the facilities that applied for and received AB90 funding were those whose financial situations had undergone change, but there were both facilities with funding changes that did not apply and facilities without funding changes that did. For these reasons and others it seemed quite possible that factors outside the realm of juvenile justice legislation might have influenced the financial situations of the facilities or, at least, respondents' perceptions of the extent of changes.

In particular, the chronology of AB3121 and AB90, as well as comments from the respondents, suggested that the effects of another political event in California might have been coincidental with the effects of these pieces of legislation. In June of 1978, eighteen months after the implementation of AB3121 and approximately one month before the implementation of AB90, California voters passed a referendum, known as Proposition 13, that put a low ceiling on personal property taxes. One direct outcome of Proposition 13 was a decrease in the state's revenue and, therefore, decreased financial support to local governments. The victims of these cuts were expected to be social services financed by city and county budgets. A great deal of publicity and controversy preceded the passage of the referendum, particularly with regard to the effect it would actually have on government budgets. Because Proposition 13 took effect between the implementation of AB3121 and the collection of data for this research (and, in fact, was chronologically closer to data collection), it is quite conceivable that its influence would pervade the perceptions of those facility administrators completing the questionnaire and, hence, would influence their responses. Similarly, since it also occurred between the implementation of AB3121 and the implementation of AB90 (and, again, was chronologically closer to the latter), its effect or anticipated effect might have been an additional factor in determining response to AB90. There is evidence to suggest that to an extent both of these possibilities were realized. Many comments appeared on the questionnaires concerning the impact of Proposition 13 on funding, some even making the point that its effect was much greater than that of AB3121. One facility explicitly named Proposition 13 as the reason for decreased funding from the public sector. The loose association that existed between reported changes in funding and applications for AB90 funds has already been noted. The

order of events suggests that these funds might have been directed toward making up for Proposition 13 losses. In fact, one facility administrator with whom we conducted a pilot interview pointed out that, in one of the counties included in this analysis, the bulk of AB90 funding was distributed to public agencies as a way of recouping those losses.¹²

We have to conclude from the evidence we have that there was a very good possibility that at least one factor other than AB3121 influenced the responses to the questionnaire regarding the financial situations of these facilities. Although it appeared that changes occurred in the sources and amounts of funding of some of the facilities and that this might have encouraged responses to AB90, we cannot be at all certain that these results are attributable to AB3121.

3.3.1.7 Summary. It seems quite apparent that from the point of view of the community facilities that responded to the survey, AB3121 had several effects. There were increases in the volume of referrals from law enforcement and probation. Clients referred after the implementation of the legislation were perceived by some agencies as being different from previous referrals--they were more difficult to treat and to control. More clients failed to complete the programs at the facilities and more ran away from residential settings. Facilities experienced an increase in the frequency of contact with the justice system and

¹² This suggestion was not borne out by the data since in that particular county private facilities were more likely than public ones to apply for AB90 funding and to receive it. However, the criteria according to which facilities were selected to be surveyed eliminated many public agencies from consideration. Private facilities far outnumbered public ones among the respondents and, therefore, the results might be more an artifact of the selection criteria than a true reflection of how the funding was distributed.

welfare and social service agencies. While it was apparent that all of these effects were felt, in no case were they perceived by a majority of the facilities. Most of these changes were reported by only thirty to forty percent of the group of respondents. This represents only about ten to fifteen facilities, obviously not enough from which to draw strong conclusions. Yet in each instance there was a group of facilities that reported change of some kind following AB3121. While we certainly must conclude that the impact of the legislation on community facilities was not overwhelming or widespread, we must also conclude that for at least some facilities there were effects.

The nature, the direction and the extent of these effects were neither clear nor consistent. On the one hand the changes that were reported in the characteristics of clients were what might have been expected in light of changes in law enforcement behavior that were reported elsewhere and in light of changes in the volume of referrals from law enforcement reported in the survey. At the same time, changes that might have been expected in other client characteristics were not apparent. Also, while a sizeable number of facilities perceived the type of client referred to have changed, there was little agreement over the nature of the change. The effects that were felt, then, were not always consistent with one another, nor was it clear how they related to each other or to AB3121.

Despite the lack of overwhelming consensus or consistency, the impact that was perceived by a number of the facilities was discrepant with the extent of impact suggested by the analysis of justice system data. It will be remembered that in this analysis little change was apparent at the facility level. There was no increase in the extent to which community facilities were used and the overall low volume of referrals suggested that no substantial changes would have occurred in the types of clients with which the facilities deal. These two analyses, then,

provide quite discrepant conclusions about the effects of AB3121. Perceived changes, regardless of whether or not they agree with the records, are important in determining subsequent action and as such are a necessary part of an assessment of the impact of the legislation. This discrepancy between the perceptions of change and the evidence provided by official records invites speculation as to how those perceptions were developed. What were the processes, apparently not picked up by official records, through which AB3121 brought about changes at the facilities? We analyzed the responses to our survey from a number of different angles in an attempt to understand the discrepancy between the two analyses and the processes by which the mandates of the legislation brought about changes, or the perception of changes, at the facilities.

3.3.2 The Context of AB3121. One obvious and quite simple reason for the discrepancy between these two analyses is the difference between the two sets of data. The first analysis relied upon law enforcement and probation records of referrals and placements; the second relied upon individuals' perceptions. Many other factors, beyond the actual events, will influence how an individual sees and interprets, and therefore reports, what happened. These outside influences are absent from the factual reports of the events, i.e., justice system records (although these are, of course, subject to their own set of influences). Therefore, because perceptions are filtered through and interpreted in light of factors other than the actual events, they will reflect a different picture of the situation than will "facts and figures."

In particular, one factor affecting the perceptions of the impact of AB3121 was probably the environment within which it was implemented. The bill was a mixture of provisions reflecting different points of view with regard to juvenile

delinquency. Its implementation, especially the provision deinstitutionalizing juveniles arrested for status offenses, was met with much controversy and debate. Many individuals in the field of providing services to juveniles were critical because they feared a loss of control over offenders and, with that, a loss of effectiveness in delivering services. Given this climate at the outset, it is not unlikely that facilities would be sensitive to changes that might effect their ability to control clients or to provide treatment. This environment might easily have heightened their sensitivity to change, as well as influenced their interpretations of changes.

Information drawn from justice system records, while not free of outside influences, is susceptible to a different set of factors. It would, therefore, probably not reflect the same sensitivity to changes that individual perceptions would.

Therefore, the context within which AB3121 was implemented probably did much to produce a discrepancy between the two analyses. This is not to suggest that one or the other is more accurate or more "true." Each reflects a different perspective with regard to the impact of the legislation and each is equally important for obtaining a thorough understanding of the ramifications of this legislation. In fact, it will be suggested later that the differences between the two analyses, rather than presenting an issue which needs to be resolved, actually provide additional insight into the effects of the legislation. The environment, then, can be seen as one channel through which AB3121 affected the facilities and one that shapes the perception of those effects. There are other processes that may have carried the impact of the legislation to the facilities and that might also shed light on the discrepancy between the two analyses. We will focus on one specific category of such processes, those concerned with interorganizational matters.

3.3.3 Interorganizational Processes. In order to bring to light those processes by which the changes mandated by AB3121 had an effect on community facilities, the responses to the survey were examined to find patterns of change. We began by determining whether particular types of facilities were more or less likely to have been affected and to try to explain how the effects might flow through various features of the facilities. These attempts to uncover patterns or trends in the reported changes brought to light some interesting relationships. These relationships, in combination with the findings of the Teilmann and Klein assessment of the broader impact of AB3121, suggested possible interorganizational processes through which the effects of AB3121 were felt. They also provided some insight into the discrepancy between the results of the analysis of justice system data and the responses to the questionnaire, suggesting that the two sets of findings are not as much contrary to one another as they are opposite sides of the same coin.

It has been pointed out in the context of outlining the effects of AB3121 that the response of the justice system appears to have involved a significant shift in the system's willingness to handle status offenders. One assessment of the broad impact of the legislation found that both on a statewide level and within selected southern counties (Los Angeles, San Bernardino and Ventura) there was a marked decrease in the arrests of status offenders following the implementation of AB3121 (Teilmann and Klein, 1980). This same study also found evidence that suggested that the welfare system might have been used as one alternative route for dealing with status offenders. Evidently, some juveniles who formerly would have been handled by the justice system were no longer being picked up by that system. Others were picked up, but because of the constraints of AB3121, the problems of these juveniles were redefined so as to be more appropriate to the welfare system.

The net result was that there was a major change in the referral of status offenders.

This has at least two consequences for the process by which juveniles are referred to community facilities. The first concerns those status offenders who did get arrested. If arrests of status offenders decreased, then presumably those still being arrested were the ones whom law enforcement considered to be the most difficult. This was probably even more true of those youths whose cases continued all the way through the system to the point of referral by probation or court. Community facilities to whom law enforcement and probation and court referred such juveniles, then, might have experienced a change in the seriousness of offenders coming from those agencies. From the analysis of the responses of facilities, it is known that they did in fact perceive a change in the type of client being referred. Further examination of those data suggests that the change might have been the product of this shift in the handling of status offenders.

The second consequence has to do with those juveniles who do not get arrested because of the justice system's inability or perceived inability to do anything with them. To the extent that the justice system could not or would not deal with status offenders, other agencies or individuals would have had to take on the role of making referrals, if these youths were to receive any services. Presumably, these would have been the less serious offenders among those who were at risk of being arrested. Because of the constraints imposed by AB3121, law enforcement chose not to handle them in any way. It became possible, then, (and maybe necessary) for other agencies or individuals to pick up the slack, in order to insure services for these youths. There were, in addition, those juveniles whom the justice system considered too troublesome to leave alone but about whom the system itself could do little. By redefining the problems of this group of offenders

to be more appropriate to the welfare system, and then rerouting them in that direction, the justice system was able to take some action in these cases. These offenders were presumably somewhat more serious than those who would have been left alone completely. In both instances, however, a major change occurred in the process by which juveniles were referred to community facilities. Instead of coming directly from law enforcement or probation and court, they would come instead from welfare or social service agencies or from other agencies and individuals concerned with delinquency.

Patterns of changes among the responses to the questionnaire suggest that both of these consequences occurred. There was evidence of changes in referral sources and corresponding changes in clients, and further evidence of changes in the characteristics of clients referred by the justice system.

Tables 4 to 7 provide some support for the possible changes suggested above. Before discussing them, however, a cautionary note is necessary concerning the strength of the evidence presented in the tables. Comparisons among categories of facilities and proposals about the meaning of those comparisons are made on the basis of the percentage differences among the categories. Such an analysis can be quite seductive and ultimately misleading unless careful attention is paid also to the number of cases represented in the tables. When the total number of cases is small, substantial and seemingly significant percentage differences can be generated by small absolute differences. With only thirty-five facilities responding to the survey (and missing information often reducing the number even more), the tables presented below are plagued by this problem. Although the percentage differences among categories might be large enough to spark interest, they are derived in almost all instances from such small absolute differences that in themselves they are poor evidence for our arguments. Recognizing these limitations in

the date, the tables are not intended to provide independent support for particular points in the analysis; no one table is offered as clear evidence of change. Instead the focus is on the consistency with which, as a group, they are suggestive of a fit between the responses to the survey and the processes proposed in the discussion above. Individually they give sparse support to the possible changes that have been outlined. Taken together, however, the consistency with which the data tend to agree with what has been suggested lends some credence to the processual changes that have been proposed. It should be remembered throughout the analysis that the small number of cases demands caution in interpreting these tables as evidence and that, therefore, they should be regarded as merely suggestive.

According to the changes reported by the pool of facility respondents, the most frequent change in the volume of referrals to facilities involved referrals from court and probation. This would not seem to suggest that any gap occurred in the referral process that might have been filled by agencies or individuals other than the justice system. However, there were indications that the changes that occurred in referrals varied according to certain characteristics of the facilities.

Tables 4 to 7 demonstrate that by distinguishing among the facilities according to county, legal status, and the availability of residential services, different patterns emerge among the reported changes in referrals. A larger percentage of Los Angeles County facilities, than those elsewhere, indicated increased referrals from schools (Table 4), while a larger percentage of those from the other counties

Amount Of Change In the Volume Of Referrals
From Schools Reported By
Facilities In Los Angeles County and By All Other Counties
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles County	All Other Counties	Totals
Fewer Referrals From Schools After AB3121	1 7.1 %	1 7.7 %	2 7.4 %
No Change In Referrals From Schools After AB3121	6 42.9 %	9 69.2 %	15 55.6 %
More Referrals From Schools After AB3121	7 50.0 %	3 23.1 %	10 37.0 %
Totals	14 51.9 %	13 48.1 %	27

TABLE 5

Amount Of Change In the Volume Of Referrals
From Probation and Court Reported By
Facilities In Los Angeles County and By All Other Counties
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles County	All Other Counties	Totals
Fewer Referrals From Probation and Court After AB3121	3 21.4%	5 29.4%	8 25.8%
No Change In Referrals From Probation and Court After AB3121	7 50.0%	5 29.4%	12 38.7%
More Referrals From Probation and Court After AB3121	4 28.6%	7 41.2%	11 35.5%
Totals	14 45.2%	17 54.8%	31

Table 6

Amount Of Change In the Volume Of Referrals From Parents
Reported By Private and Public Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Private	Public	Other	Totals
Fewer Referrals From Parents After AB3121	1 5.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 3.8%
No Change In Referrals From Parents After AB3121	10 52.6%	5 83.3%	1 100.0%	16 61.5%
More Referrals From Parents After AB3121	8 42.1%	1 16.7%	0 0.0%	9 34.6%
Totals	19 73.1%	6 23.1%	1 3.8%	26

Table 7

Amount Of Change In the Volume Of Referrals
From Welfare and Social Service Agencies
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Fewer Referrals From Welfare and Social Service Agencies After AB3121	2 10.5%	2 15.4%	4 12.5%
No Change In Referrals From Welfare and Social Service Agencies After AB3121	13 68.4%	4 30.8%	17 53.1%
More Referrals From Welfare and Social Service Agencies After AB3121	4 21.1%	7 53.8%	11 34.4%
Totals	19 59.4%	13 40.6%	32

experienced increased referrals from probation and court (Table 5).¹³ Private facilities were more likely than public ones to have reported increased referrals from parents (Table 6) and a larger percentage of residential ones, than non-residential, responded that referrals from welfare and public social service agencies had increased (Table 7).¹⁴ Of course, as has been noted, these percentage differences represent small absolute differences.

There are many possible explanations for why one type of facility experienced increases while the others did not. As Table 8 demonstrates, facilities in Los Angeles County were much more likely to be non-residential, and, therefore, probably more suitable for the type of referrals that schools would be making. Private facilities, experiencing an increase in referrals from parents, might make more of an effort than public ones to seek out families in need of help since they are more dependent upon client fees for their continued existence. Finally, the increase in welfare referrals to residential facilities might reflect the nature of the problems with which those agencies deal. Since they often deal with family

¹³ With the exception of Los Angeles County, the number of facilities surveyed in a single county, was very small. Seventeen facilities were surveyed in Los Angeles County, but only six in San Bernardino County, five in Ventura County, three in Sacramento County and one in Placer County. (The remaining three respondents, from the total of thirty-five, were missing the information which allowed us to identify the counties from which they had been sampled.) These numbers are too small to allow comparisons among the separate counties. Therefore, it was only possible to compare the facilities in Los Angeles County with those in the other four counties combined.

¹⁴ Because only seven of the thirty-five facilities included in the analysis (20%) were public organizations, it is somewhat difficult to make comparisons with the private ones. All discussion of the differences between public and private facilities needs to be assessed with this limitation in mind.

Table 8

Residential and Non-residential Facilities By County
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles County	All Other Counties	Totals
Non-residential	13 76.5%	7 38.9%	20 57.1%
Residential	4 23.5%	11 61.1%	15 42.9%
Totals	17 48.6%	18 51.4%	35

problems in which the well-being of the youth might be at stake, residential facilities would provide a means for removing the juvenile from that situation.

Whatever the reasons, however, these tables indicate that facilities did experience increases in referrals from outside the justice system, despite what appeared to be the relative lack of changes when we looked at the answers from the total pool of respondents. This, then gives some support, albeit weak, to the suggestion that while law enforcement decreased arrests of status offenders, some were either rerouted into the welfare system, or other agencies and individuals took on the task of referring those juveniles to community facilities.

It was also suggested that this change in the referral process would produce changes in the type of offender being referred to the facilities. If, in fact, schools, parents, and welfare and social service agencies were filling the gap in the referral process, then it would be expected that there would also have been variation in the extent to which the different types of facilities reported changes in the characteristics of the clients being referred. Tables 9 to 17 indicate that there were, indeed, variations when facilities were categorized according to county and the availability of residential services. However, the caution concerning the strength of the data is applicable for these tables too.

Facilities in counties other than Los Angeles, which were more likely to have experienced increased referrals from court and probation, were also more likely to report that their post-AB3121 clients had a greater likelihood of being in trouble with the law (Table 9), as well as a greater likelihood of having trouble getting along with their families (Table 10), whereas Los Angeles County facilities were more likely to respond that there was no change in the likelihood of trouble with the law or family problems. These county differences in perceptions of changes in client characteristics seem consistent with the shifts we have suggested might have occurred in the referral process. The increase in referrals to

Table 9

Amount Of Change In the Likelihood Of
Clients Having Been In Trouble With the Law
Reported By Facilities In Los Angeles County and All Other Counties
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles County	All Other Counties	Totals
Less Likely After AB3121	1 9.1%	1 9.1%	2 9.1%
No Change In Likelihood After AB3121	6 54.5%	3 27.3%	9 40.9%
More Likely After AB3121	4 36.4%	7 63.6%	11 50.0%
Total	11 50.0%	11 50.0%	22

Table 10

Amount Of Change In the Likelihood Of Clients Having Family Problems
Reported By Facilities In Los Angeles County and All Other Counties
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Los Angeles County	All Other Counties	Totals
Less Likely After AB3121	0 0.0%	1 10.0%	1 4.5%
No Change In Likelihood After AB3121	8 66.7%	3 30.0%	11 50.0%
More Likely After AB3121	4 33.3%	6 60.0%	10 45.5%
Totals	12 54.5%	10 45.5%	22

Los Angeles County facilities came from schools, and it has been suggested that they would be handling those status offenders whom law enforcement no longer considered enough of a problem to arrest. Elsewhere, the increase in referrals came from probation and court, and the suggestion was that these juveniles were likely to be more troublesome than was previously the case, given law enforcement's response to AB3121. Thus, it is quite consistent that a larger percentage of the facilities from outside of Los Angeles County would have reported an increase in the likelihood of problems, although it should be noted again that these differences are based on small absolute differences.

Residential facilities, which were more likely than non-residential ones to have reported increased referrals from the welfare and social service agencies, were also more likely to indicate a greater likelihood of problems with clients. Tables 11 to 17 demonstrate that a larger percentage of residential facilities perceived post-AB3121 clients to have had a greater likelihood of legal, familial, and psychological problems. These facilities were also more likely to perceive the problems of those clients as being more serious, to perceive the clients as more difficult to treat and to control, and report an increase in the number of clients not completing the program. All these differences between residential and non-residential facilities are small but consistent and, therefore, lend some support to the suggestion that the welfare system was used as an alternative route for handling juvenile offenders. The suggestion has been made that these were youths considered too troublesome to leave alone, but for whom the justice system could do very little. By redefining their problems, it was possible to handle them through welfare and social service agencies. Yet, to the extent that they were offenders that formerly would have been handled by the justice system, they were likely to be more troublesome and difficult than the traditional welfare cases.

Amount Of Change In the Likelihood of
Clients Having Been In Trouble With the Law
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Less Likely After AB3121	1 9.1%	1 9.1%	2 9.1%
No Change In Likelihood After AB3121	6 54.5%	3 27.3%	9 40.9%
More Likely After AB3121	4 36.4%	7 63.6%	11 50.0%
Totals	11 50.0%	11 50.0%	22

Table 12

Amount Of Change In the Likelihood Of Clients Having Family Problems
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Less Likely After AB3121	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	1 4.5%
No Change In Likelihood After AB3121	8 66.7%	3 30.0%	11 50.0%
More Likely After AB3121	3 25.0%	7 70.0%	10 45.5%
Totals	12 54.5%	10 45.5%	22

Table 13

Amount Of Change In the Likelihood Of
Clients Having Problems Of Psychological Adjustment
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Less Likely After AB3121	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	2 9.1%
No Change In Likelihood After AB3121	7 58.3%	3 30.0%	10 45.5%
More Likely After AB3121	3 25.0%	7 70.0%	10 45.5%
Totals	12 54.5%	10 45.5%	22

Table 14

Amount Of Change In the Seriousness Of Clients' Problems
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Less Serious After AB3121	1 5.0%	1 6.7%	2 5.7%
No Change In Seriousness After AB3121	16 80.0%	7 46.7%	23 65.7%
More Serious After AB3121	3 15.0%	7 46.7%	10 28.6%
Totals	20 57.1%	15 42.9%	35

Table 15

Amount Of Change In the Difficulty Of Treating Clients
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Treatment Less Difficult After AB3121	1 8.3%	0 0.0%	1 4.5%
No Change In Difficulty Of Treatment After AB3121	5 41.7%	1 10.0%	6 27.3%
Treatment More Difficult After AB3121	6 50.0%	9 90.0%	15 68.2%
Totals	12 54.5%	10 45.5%	22

Table 16

Amount Of Change In Facility's Ability To Control Clients
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Control Less Difficult After AB3121	1 5.6%	0 0.0%	1 3.0%
No Change In Difficulty Of Control After AB3121	14 77.8%	5 33.3%	19 57.6%
Control More Difficult After AB3121	3 16.7%	10 66.7%	13 39.4%
Totals	18 54.5%	15 45.5%	33

Table 17

Amount Of Change In the Number Of Clients
Not Completing the Program Of Services
 Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
 (Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Decrease In Number Of Clients Not Completing Program After AB3121 .	3 16.7%	3 21.4%	6 18.8%
No Change In Number Of Clients Not Completing Program After AB3121	11 61.1%	5 35.7%	16 50.0%
Increase In Number Of Clients Not Completing Program After AB3121	4 22.2%	6 42.9%	10 31.3%
Totals	18 56.3%	14 43.8%	32

Thus, the consistency with which the data in these tables fit these proposed changes, lends some support to the suggestions about changes in the referral process.

So far, then, by distinguishing among facilities according to certain characteristics evidence has been found to suggest that change did, in fact, occur in the referral process. Responses to the questionnaire give some indication that facilities experienced increased referrals from sources outside of the justice system, as well as congruent changes in the characteristics of clients. This was suggested as one consequence of the change in referral process that resulted from the justice system's reported response to AB3121, and it supports the suggestion that that change in the referral process involved the rerouting of offenders. A second consequence of the change in the referral process concerns those juveniles who were handled by the justice system. Presumably they would have been more troublesome and difficult than previously. Again, reports of changes in referral sources and in characteristics of clients suggest that this consequence, too, was apparent. Again, however, it is not the strength of the individual tables but the consistency among them that provides some evidence that shifts occurred in the referral of juveniles to facilities.

Residential facilities were more likely than non-residential ones to have experienced increases in referrals from law enforcement and from probation and court (Tables 18 and 19). The majority of the non-residential facilities reported no change in the volume of referrals from these sources, or any others for that matter. Given what has been suggested about the characteristics of the juveniles who were handled by the justice system following AB3121, this increase in referrals to residential facilities is not surprising. Because AB3121 prohibited the secure detention of status offenders, law enforcement and probation were forced to turn

Table 18

Amount of change In the Volume Of Referrals From Law Enforcement
Reported By Residential and Non-residential Facilities
(Frequencies and Column Percentages)

	Non-residential	Residential	Totals
Fewer Referrals From Law Enforcement After AB3121	4 20.0%	0 0.0%	4 14.3%
No Change In Referrals From Law Enforcement After AB3121	10 50.0%	4 50.0%	14 50.0%
More Referrals From Law Enforcement After AB3121	6 30.0%	4 50.0%	10 35.7%
Totals	20 71.4%	8 28.6%	28

to alternative types of placements for those whom they considered to be serious offenders--too serious to leave alone or to reroute through the welfare system--but whom they could not securely detain. Residential facilities, with near-constant supervision, come closest to providing the control that formerly was possible with the use of secure detention. In certain respects, residential facilities are the next best thing to juvenile hall. Thus, the increased use of those facilities suggests that law enforcement and probation saw those juveniles who made it into the system as more serious and more in need of the control provided by a residential setting. It has been pointed out already (Tables 11 to 17) that from the point of view of these facilities the referrals showed a greater likelihood of legal, familial and psychological problems, had more serious problems, were more difficult to treat and to control, and were less likely to complete the program of services set out for them.

These findings imply, within the constraints imposed by the small number of cases, that the juveniles who were processed by the justice system were, indeed, more serious offenders than previously was the case. This then, further supports the suggestions about the change in the referral process. Some of the less serious offenders whom the system would no longer handle were handled instead by other agencies and individuals filling that gap. Some offenders, serious enough that the justice system did not want to let them go entirely, were evidently rerouted to community facilities through the welfare system. The ones picked up by and processed by the justice system were, apparently from the points of view of both the justice system and the community facilities to which they were referred, more serious and difficult offenders.

This interorganizational process, the referral of juveniles to community facilities, was apparently one means by which AB3121 affected the facilities in

the pool of respondents. It seems possible that through this process the justice system's reported unwillingness to handle status offenders resulted in noticeable but not extremely substantial impacts on the facilities. The effect of AB3121 was, as we suggested it might have been, indirect but appeared to have involved agencies outside of the justice system in addition to law enforcement and probation.

In addition to suggesting a means by which that effect came to be felt by the facilities, this change in the referral process also sheds light on the discrepancy between the results of the two analyses comprising this research component. That gap can be viewed, in fact, as providing additional support for the suggested change. By using information from law enforcement and probation records in the first analysis, the assessment was confined to only those juveniles who were arrested following AB3121. Those status offenders not arrested but referred to community facilities by other sources would not have been included in that analysis. The survey analysis has suggested that the very fact that those juveniles were not arrested and were referred by other sources is the key change instigated by AB3121. Thus, by virtue of the nature of the change, the methods used in the first analysis were inappropriate for assessing this impact of the legislation. Because the effect involved decreased participation by the justice system this change in the process by which juveniles were referred would not have been apparent in an analysis that concentrated on those cases in which law enforcement chose to become involved. This change, suggested to be a major impact of AB3121, could only have been apparent in the second of the analyses which assessed changes from the point of view of the facilities. The discrepancy that existed between the two sets of results itself suggests that the effect on community facilities occurred through channels other than the justice system, thereby lending support to the changed referral process that has been proposed.

However, not all the discrepancies noted between the two sets of results are explainable in terms of this change in the referral process. Close to one-third of the respondents reported increased referrals from law enforcement and court and probation when, according to the records of those agencies, such increases were not apparent. The change that has been suggested offers no rationale for why the facilities would have perceived such an increase and, in fact, one possible implication of this shift in referrals is quite the opposite of what has been observed. If, as suggested, the juveniles who were arrested following AB3121 were the more serious offenders among those at risk, then they probably also were offenders over whom the justice system would have wanted to maintain control. It was suggested that these were the juveniles whose problems law enforcement deemed to be serious enough to warrant arrest. Additionally, having made that decision, the justice system probably would be less inclined to refer the juveniles to facilities outside of the system. Thus, instead of an increase in referrals from law enforcement and court and probation, the suggested change in the process of referral implies that the facilities would have experienced decreases in referrals from these sources. At least some of the facilities clearly did not perceive the situation this way.

One reason for this discrepancy might be the difference between the two sets of data, perceptions versus records, that has been discussed previously. Given the atmosphere surrounding the implementation of AB3121, these facilities might have anticipated and, therefore, perceived the impact to have been greater than it was according to the official records. The respondents were a subgroup of a pool of facilities that was drawn from justice system records. Since they are facilities upon which the system relies, they might have been that much more sensitive to changes in referrals from that particular source. Hence, in this instance the differences between perceptions and records might have been heightened.

It is also possible that the perceived increase in justice system referrals represents the informal referrals as was mentioned previously. The difference between the facilities' perceptions and the information in the official records might not be due completely to two different versions of the same events but might be partially explained by a definitional problem. Depending upon how the facilities chose to define justice system referrals, juveniles who arrived there at the suggestion or recommendation of law enforcement without having been arrested or officially referred might have been included in this category. Thus, the facility might report them as such while law enforcement would have no record of the referral.

Whatever the basis for this difference between justice system data and the perceptions of the facilities, its existence serves as an important reminder. The process which we have suggested as the catalyst for the impact of AB3121 on community facilities is just that--suggested. There is evidence in the responses to the survey that such a process occurred, but there are also findings which do not fall into line, e.g., the reported increases in referrals from law enforcement and court and probation. There is no direct evidence to show that, in fact, status offenders who prior to AB3121 probably would have been arrested were not likely to be arrested following it and instead would have been handled by other sources. To the extent that this process did occur, by its very nature it made the analysis of justice system data inadequate for assessing its impact. The fact that that analysis indicated little change, in contradiction to the results of the survey, lent some indirect support to the suggestion of such a process. Still, it can only be regarded as a suggestion. Additionally, the responses from the questionnaire that appear to indicate that this was how the facilities perceived the impact must be viewed with caution. As we have discussed, we had only a small number of respondents (thirty-five) upon which to base our conclusions. As a result, the percentage

differences upon which the analysis and interpretation focused represented small absolute differences. Hence, the conclusions must be regarded as tentative and merely suggestive of the process we have proposed. Within the limits of these restrictions, however, the analyses seem to indicate that AB3121 had some impact on community facilities by way of the reaction of the justice system and the processes that that reaction subsequently put into motion.

3.3.4 Reactions to AB3121. In light of the changes reported by a number of the respondents and the process that might have been responsible for them, it seems apparent that at least some of the facilities were faced with an altered situation in terms of referral sources, the volume and characteristics of clients and contacts with other agencies. As part of the survey information was solicited about other changes that might have been made by the facilities in response to these. The areas in which it was thought that adaptations might have been necessary, particularly given the changes in clients, were staff and services. The size of the staff was indeed one aspect that underwent change, but virtually no shifts occurred in either the type or the frequency of the services offered.

A majority of the facilities experienced changes in the size of their total staff or in the number of staff members in the various professional categories. forty-six percent of the sample (sixteen facilities) had increases in their total staff, seventeen percent (six facilities) had decreases. Fifty-seven percent (twenty facilities) experienced changes in the size of their professional staff, the majority of which were increases; forty-six percent (sixteen facilities) had changes in their pre-professional level staff and, again, the majority of those were increases. Paraprofessional and volunteer level staff, in most facilities, either did not change or the information was missing (which most likely indicates that there were no staff members at that professional level).

Expansion of the services offered to clients and change in the facility's funding situation were the two reasons cited most frequently as reasons for staff changes. This was true of changes in the size of the overall staff as well as changes in the number of staff in any of the professional categories. With only one exception, fifty percent or more of the facilities reporting change, indicated these two reasons.

On the one hand, the fact that facilities made staff changes as a result of having changed services suggests that they might have been reacting to different problems presented by their clients and, consequently, different needs. On the other hand, however, funding changes were also cited by a number of facilities as a reason for staffing changes. It was pointed out in the discussion of the financial situations of the facilities that there were reasons to be cautious in attributing funding changes to processes generated by AB3121. Thus, to the extent that these contributed to additions or cutbacks in staff, it implies that such changes were not entirely accommodations to effects generated by the legislation. To some degree, they simply might have been reactions to a period of budget tightening or budget expansion.

By way of contrast to the foregoing, very little change appeared to have been made in the services offered to clients following AB3121. The majority of facilities, sixty-nine percent (or twenty-four facilities) did not change the services they offered, nor did they change the relative frequency with which those services were offered. This was true despite all the other impacts reported by the facilities and despite the fact that changes in services were frequently cited as a reason for staffing changes. In fact, slightly more than half of those that gave that reason then reported that no changes occurred in their services. Evidently the changes reported in the types of clients being referred and in the ability of facilities to control and treat them generally were not met with changes in the

facilities' techniques for dealing with clients' problems. However, among those facilities that made changes in their services, expansion and changes in clients were the most frequently cited reasons. Slightly more than half of the facilities indicated each of these two reasons. Although few changes were made, it is possible that these represented adaptations to the effects produced by AB3121.

Keeping in mind that the majority of the facilities did not change the types of services that they offered, most of the changes that did occur were with regard to the relative emphasis placed on those services that were available. For the most part, the changes meant that one type of service was offered less in 1977 than in 1976 while another was offered more. Only four facilities either dropped a particular type of service or added a new one.

Overall, there was very little adaptation to the impacts of AB3121 in terms of what the facilities offered as ways of dealing with clients' problems. This is particularly intriguing given the fact that, again and again, a number of the facilities, although not a majority, reported changes that could have had implications for the needs of the clients and, hence, the services offered. Nonetheless, those changes did not appear to have instigated accommodations in the handling of clients.

In making a closer examination of the relationship between these reactions (or lack thereof) and the other effects of AB3121, the relationships that were found were neither strong nor consistent. For the most part there did not appear to be any substantial links relating changes in referral sources, clients, contacts, or funding to changes in staffing and services. There was no consistency in the direction of relationships that might have been suggestive of the processes by which the effects of AB3121 caused reactions on the part of the facilities.

There was some indication of a weak association between changes in the characteristics of clients and changes in the size of staff; facilities that perceived a greater likelihood of familial and psychological problems among clients following AB3121 were more likely to have increased the size of their staffs than were other facilities. However, the trend was not strong and was based on such a small number of facilities that it must be regarded as tentative. In general, the associations that appeared were weak and did not suggest any patterns of change.

Still, it is interesting to note that over the range of possible relationships examined, there was some consistency within facilities as to whether or not change occurred. That is, there was some tendency for those facilities that reported change in one area to have also reported change in other areas. As mentioned above, the associations were weak and based on small numbers, yet a rather superficial pattern did appear to exist. Change was associated with further change. Because of the lack of a substantial and consistent relationship among these changes, it seems unlikely that they represent any broad impact of AB3121. Instead, this consistency suggests that the facilities simply were behaving as organizations. To the extent that an organization represents a system of interrelated characteristics, then by its nature, as one aspect changes it will have ramifications for other related aspects. This tendency for one change to be associated with another probably reflects the organizational nature of the facilities and is probably independent of the influence of AB3121.

4. Summary

We stated at the outset that the aim of this research component was to assess the impact of AB3121 on the functioning of community facilities. To accomplish this aim, two analyses were carried out, each approaching the issue from a different side. The first examined the law enforcement and probation records for samples of arrested juveniles in five counties and checked the extent to which the justice system's use of those facilities (and of other options also) changed following the legislation. With that analysis as a reference point, the second involved a survey of the facilities used by the justice system aimed at determining the extent of the impact from their point of view.

These two analyses provided different pictures of the effect of AB3121. The justice system data indicated that relatively little use was made of community facilities and that, with one outstanding exception, there was no increase in the volume of juveniles referred to them following the legislation. The exception was the use of Status Offender Detention Alternative (SODA) homes in Los Angeles County which handled a much larger percentage of arrested juveniles in 1977 than did any other type of community facility in that county or in any of the other four counties. The SODA home program, however, was developed independently of AB3121 to accommodate the types of changes that were subsequently brought about that legislation and was officially an arm of the probation department. Thus, the only apparent change occurred where preparations had already been made to accommodate deinstitutionalization, and even this did not completely remove juveniles from the grasp of the justice system. Because of the low volume of referrals to community facilities, it was not feasible to attempt to examine the extent to which there might have been changes in the types of clients being referred. Given that, in addition to the absence of any change in the volume of referrals, the suggestion was made that it was unlikely that there would have been significant differences in the characteristics of referred juveniles. The outcome of this analysis then was

that it did not appear as though community facilities had been affected in any substantial or significant way.

The responses of those facilities to the survey indicated something quite different. The impact of the legislation was clearly felt in a number of different areas by some of the facilities, although not by a majority of them. Change was reported, by thirty to forty percent of the facilities, in the volume of clients being served, the volume of referrals from various sources, the types of clients being referred, and the frequency of contact with other agencies. Additionally, further examination of the reported changes suggested that the effects felt by the facilities stemmed in part from reported changes in law enforcement's handling of status offenders. The seeming unwillingness of police to arrest those juveniles appeared to have made it necessary for other agencies and actors involved with youth to take on the task of making referrals for services and this appeared to influence the characteristics of the juveniles being referred. The individual relationships were not strong, largely as a result of the small number of facilities, but the consistency among the reported changes and the patterns of association that were evident lent support to our interpretation of the process we suggested was responsible for the effects felt by the facilities. This process also helped to account for the discrepancy between what the justice system data suggested was the lack of impact and what the responses to the survey suggested. The nature of that process was such that it made an analysis of arrested juveniles inappropriate for assessing the changes that have been suggested as stemming from it.

Finally, there appeared to have been only minimal reaction on the part of the facilities. They reported increases in staff size following AB3121, but virtually no changes were made in the type or relative frequency of the services offered.

This latter finding seemed particularly intriguing in light of the reported changes in the clients referred after AB3121, especially an increase in the difficulty of treating them. What reactions there were appeared to have been only loosely associated with the other reported changes. The only pattern that became evident was that those facilities experiencing change in one area also tended to experience it in other areas, but even this tendency was not consistent.

In short, our research indicated that community facilities were affected by the implementation of AB3121. That effect was not marked and it did not involve all the responding facilities. Some patterns of change were evident, suggesting possible processes through which impact was felt by the facilities, but there were almost always contradictions and inconsistencies.

5. Discussion

Apart from our general conclusion concerning the impact of AB3121, several points of interest have arisen from this research that are worthy of discussion. These can be considered both as cautions against reading too much into the data and as prescriptions for future research.

The first point concerns the suggestion that a change occurred in the process through which juveniles were referred to community facilities. To the extent that this represents what actually happened as a result of AB3121, it is a crucial and unanticipated effect and it has important implications for the facilities and their clients. The possibility that schools, parents and others involved with juveniles are not able to rely on the justice system as a resource for dealing with offenders introduces new problems and uncertainties into the service delivery process. The burden of making referrals appeared to have been shifted to these other agencies and actors. The question then arises concerning whether or not they were ready for such a role or even able to take it on. If these other agencies and actors do not have the resources to assume this task, it becomes quite possible that some of these juveniles will not be referred to facilities for services at all. Whether or not this is detrimental to the youths is another question. What this points out is the possibility that a significant but unanticipated change might have occurred in the referral process and that, to the extent that it was unanticipated, an adequate response might not have been possible. There are consequences for the facilities that deal with juveniles, as we have seen, and, perhaps more importantly, for the juveniles and their needs.

This brings us to our second point, the methodology for assessing impact. In some respects this is the most important point to come out of this research. The methodology employed in this study has been both a hindrance and a help. It has been noted previously that if the change described above reflected what actually

happened, an analysis of arrested juveniles would be inadequate to assess its impact. By virtue of nature of that change, i.e., the shift in emphasis from the justice system to other agencies and actors, the very processes that are most crucial and, as mentioned above, most in need of scrutiny, are neglected by the use of justice system data. At the same time, however, because that analysis did not pick up the possibility of that change and was, therefore, discrepant with the results of the survey, there was an implication of some process occurring outside of the justice system that affected the facilities. In this regard, the inadequacy of that analysis lent support to the suggestion of a change in the referral process. Because it fails to be sensitive to that change, however, we can do no more than suggest what might be occurring. The focus on arrested juveniles prevents us from being able to validate what appears to be an effect of the legislation. Thus, the methodology is inadequate to take a closer look at the extent of change in the referral process generated by AB3121 or at the potential consequences. In order to do so it would be necessary to be able to track those juveniles who were at risk of being arrested but were not. Ironically, the need for this analysis became apparent only because the inadequacies of the present methodology led to the speculation of such a change.

The change in the referral process that has been suggested also has implications for the method of selecting the facilities to be surveyed. We relied upon justice system data, again, to obtain the pool of facilities to which questionnaires were sent. The speculation was that since the most direct effect of AB3121 would be on the justice system, then these facilities, because of their link to that system, would be most likely to feel the impact of the legislation. However, we have suggested that the referral process changed and that, in effect, that system never became involved with many of the juveniles. In light of this,

the facilities that were surveyed might have been the least likely to experience changes in their referral sources. Although relied upon by the justice system, they might not be the ones to which schools, parents, other facilities or the welfare system turn to find services for juveniles. On the other hand, in terms of reflecting changes in the characteristics of the juveniles actually arrested, these probably represent the most adequate group. Once again, by its nature, the suggested change in turn suggests that this pool of facilities might actually be the least likely to be affected by some of its consequences, although most likely to be affected by other. This implies the need to broaden the range of facilities being examined.

While the above discussion certainly points out some of the weaknesses of the methodology, it is not intended to discount the analyses entirely. In fact, it is only in light of what we were able to suggest, based on the present methods, that they begin to appear inadequate. The points brought out are issues that could only have come to our attention after having carried out the analysis as we did. In this respect then, they represent not faults but findings that should be taken into consideration in any similar analysis. The findings of this research and the problems with the methods that they subsequently pointed out are issues that need to be dealt with in succeeding attempts to determine the impact of legislation on the delivery of services to juveniles.

Finally, our conclusion was that AB3121 had a definite although not overwhelming impact on the facilities. It was apparent that an effect was there as, in one area after another, facilities reported change, yet hardly ever was change reported by a majority of the respondents. Given the potential for impact in a number of areas, that was noted at the outset, this low level of effect was somewhat unexpected. However, before discounting the effects that were found as trivial,

two other issues should be considered. First, there actually might have been a greater level of impact than was evident in these analyses; second, we might have been anticipating a greater and more consistent effect than was warranted.

Because of the size of the group of respondents, it was difficult to draw conclusions about the extent of change. Looking at differences in either frequencies or percentages can be very misleading when the numbers are small. Quite large percentage differences can be generated by small absolute differences that are themselves of questionable significance. The problem is exacerbated by trying to control for characteristics of the facilities. The already small group is simply being divided into smaller categories that are that much more difficult to analyze. Additionally, the possibility that the respondents might be the ones least likely to experience the effects of the legislation has already been noted. Thus, the seemingly low intensity of impact might be due to the fact that this simply was not a large enough group of respondents to bring out the effects and that they were also not the facilities subject to a strong impact. Given a larger pool of facilities the results might have been more definitive and clear-cut.

We have been implying throughout this research that we anticipated a stronger impact on the facilities than was apparent. At the outset the potential effects of both the deinstitutionalization and alternative services provisions were outlined. In addition to describing what changes were and were not reported by the facilities, we attempted to ascertain the processes that linked AB3121 to those changes and that linked the changes to one another. Implicit in this was the expectation that the changes mandated by the legislation would generate other changes that would eventually filter down to the facilities, producing a new situation for them and necessitating response on their part. All of this assumes a somewhat tightly knit

process of impact and reaction. In fact, a more realistic view of this process might be one in which the connections are more loose and less definite. While organizations are certainly influenced by their environments (e.g., legislative changes) and while they may attempt to maintain an internal balance by meeting change with counterbalancing change, the assumption that effects and reactions form a clearly defined process that then explains the resulting changes is probably too narrow a conceptualization of organizational change. In reality the link between the impact of the environment and the reaction of the facility is probably much weaker and much more contingent than has been assumed in this analysis. This suggests the notion of what has been referred to as a "loosely coupled system" (Weick, 1976).

Rather than making the assumption that linkages among aspects of an organization's functioning are tightly knit, the intention of the loose coupling approach is to "convey the image that coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness" (Weick, 1976:3). In accepting loose coupling as a feature of organizations one "lowers the probability that the organization will have to - or be able to - respond to each little change in the environment that occurs" (Weick, 1976:6). By taking this approach to the research presented in this report, the low level of impact found becomes less of an anomaly. To the extent that the facility is loosely coupled with its environment, the influence of the latter is not a necessary or sufficient cause of reaction. Likewise, to the extent that the internal mechanisms of the facilities (i.e., staff and services) are loosely coupled with the inputs from the environment (i.e., clients), changes in the latter will not necessarily generate a change in the former. Given the relative permanence of many of these facilities in the face of an unstable and uncertain environment (in particular, with regard to their ability to maintain a flow of

resources such as funding and clients), the loose coupling approach presents a realistic conceptualization of organizational flexibility. It allows us to view these facilities as somewhat self-contained and not entirely dependent upon or vulnerable to the current tide in juvenile justice. Taking this approach implies that we should not necessarily expect substantial effects from or reactions to AB3121. Like many other fluctuations in the environment it has an impact on the facilities, but because of the nature of the relationship between the organization and its environment--loosely coupled--the impact was less than definitive.

This research has indicated that indeed the implementation of AB3121 had consequences for community facilities and we have tried to suggest the areas of impact and the processes through which impact occurred. In addition, and perhaps more importantly, this research has also highlighted important issues which need to be taken into consideration in attempting to assess the effects of legislative change. Care needs to be taken in designing the research methods to allow, as much as possible, for unanticipated effects, but we have suggested also that the underlying assumptions about the nature of organizations might be an additional influence in this type of analysis.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I: Structure

This section contains questions regarding various aspects of the structure of your facility. Where possible please provide information from your facility's records. If this is not possible, please give us your best estimate of the information.

1. In what year was this facility founded? _____

2. What was the legal status of this facility in 1976?

_____ Private, non-profit organization

_____ Private, profit-making organization

_____ Public facility (this means that the facility or the agency of which it is a part appears as a line item on a federal, state or local government budget)

_____ Other (specify) _____

What was its legal status in 1977?

_____ Private, non-profit organization

_____ Private, profit-making organization

_____ Public facility

_____ Other (specify) _____

3. What was the approximate gender composition of the juvenile clientele in 1976? (Juveniles are youths under 18 years of age.) What was it in 1977?

	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Estimated number of males	_____	_____
Estimated number of females	_____	_____

4. What was the approximate average age of the juvenile clients in 1976? _____

What was the approximate average age of the juvenile clients in 1977? _____

5. If this facility serves other age groups in addition to juveniles, estimate the proportion of the total clientele in 1976 who were juveniles. _____

Estimate the proportion in 1977. _____

6. Since the implementation of AB3121 (January 1, 1977) has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the size of the staff or the professional level of the staff of your facility? For the total staff and each category of professional training, please indicate whether there has been an increase, decrease or no change in the number of staff members by putting a check in the appropriate column.

	<u>No Change</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Decrease</u>
Total Staff	_____	_____	_____
Professionally Trained*	_____	_____	_____
Pre-Professional**	_____	_____	_____
Paraprofessional***	_____	_____	_____
Volunteer****	_____	_____	_____

*Professional level staff includes those with training in social work, psychology, or similar clinical disciplines possessing (a) a degree from an accredited graduate school; or (b) a baccalaureate degree from an approved social work or other related program.

**Pre-Professional level staff includes those with training in social work possessing an associate of arts degree conferred by a two-year educational program, and those with a baccalaureate degree in a field other than social work, psychology or similar behavioral discipline.

***Paraprofessional level staff are those selected on the basis of an assessment of the individual's life experiences, motivation and skills required by the specific task or function.

****Volunteer staff are those who, regardless of level of skill and training, contribute unpaid time usefully in performing program functions.

7. If there were changes in the size or professional level of the staff, what were the major reasons for those changes? Check as many reasons as apply.

_____ Changes were necessitated by changes in the types of clients being served by the facility

_____ Part of an effort to expand the scope of the services offered by the facility

_____ Changes in funding (sources or amounts)

_____ Other (specify) _____

8. Which three services in the following list were most frequently offered to juvenile clients prior to the implementation of AB3121? Which three were most frequently offered after the implementation of AB3121? For each time period, place a 1 in the blank next to the service most frequently offered, a 2 next to the second most frequently offered service, and a 3 next to the third most frequently offered service.

	<u>Prior to AB3121</u>	<u>After AB3121</u>
Counseling (Individual, family or group)	_____	_____
Drug Abuse Program	_____	_____
Educational Program	_____	_____
Recreational Program	_____	_____
Vocational Program (Counseling, training or placement)	_____	_____
Legal Services	_____	_____
Emergency Shelter Care	_____	_____
Long-term Residential Care	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____

9. If your facility made changes in the services offered, what were the major reasons for those changes? Check as many reasons as apply.

- _____ Changes were necessitated by changes in the types of clients being served by the facility
- _____ Part of an effort to expand the scope of the services offered by the facility
- _____ Additional services were requested by clients
- _____ Services were not applicable to clients being served
- _____ Expertise, training or skills of the staff changed
- _____ Funding changes
- _____ Other (specify) _____
- _____

10. Did the number of clients being referred by each of the following sources change as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number from the following scale for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of the change for each source.

Many More Referrals After AB3121	Somewhat More Referrals After AB3121	No Change After AB3121	Somewhat Fewer Referrals After AB3121	Many Fewer Referrals After AB3121
--	--	---------------------------	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

- _____ Law Enforcement
- _____ Probation or Court
- _____ Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies
- _____ Schools
- _____ Private Community Agencies
- _____ Parents
- _____ Self
- _____ Other (specify) _____

11. Has there been a change in the average amount of contact between the staff of your facility and members of the following organizations as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of change in the frequency of contact with each of these organizations.

Contact Much More Frequent After AB3121	Contact Somewhat More Frequent After AB3121	No Change In Contact. After AB3121	Contact Somewhat Less Frequent After AB3121	Contact Much Less Frequent After AB3121
---	---	--	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

- _____ Law Enforcement
- _____ Probation or Court
- _____ Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies
- _____ Schools
- _____ Private Community Agencies

12. Has there been a change in the quality of those contacts since the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of change in the quality of contacts with each of these organizations. (If your facility has no contact with any one of these organizations please leave that line blank.)

Contact Is Much Less Likely to Produce Positive Results	Contact Is Somewhat Less Likely To Produce Positive Results	No Change In Quality	Contact Is Somewhat More Likely To Produce Positive Results	Contact Is Much More Likely to Produce Positive Results
5	4	3	2	1
<input type="checkbox"/>				
Law Enforcement				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
Probation or Court				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
Schools				
<input type="checkbox"/>				
Private Community Agencies				

If your facility provides residential care, please answer questions 14-16.
If not, please skip to Section II.

13. Is this a secure facility? _____
Was it secure in 1976? _____

14. Have any physical changes been made at this facility since the implementation of AB3121 to comply with the provisions of that legislation? If so, what were they?

15. Has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the number of runaways from your facility since the implementation of AB3121?

Increase	No Change	Decrease
3	2	1

This section contains questions regarding the effect of the implementation of AB3121 (January 1, 1977) on the sources of funding for your facility and the amount of funding provided by those sources. Please note that in these questions we are referring to calendar, not fiscal, years.

1. Have there been changes in the funding sources of your facility or in the amount of funding provided by any of those sources, as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Circle the number for the phrase that best describes the amount of change for your facility.

Funding Sources Or Amounts Changed Greatly	Funding Sources Or Amounts Changed Somewhat	Funding Sources Or Amounts Did not Change
3	2	1

2. If there were changes in your funding sources, what was the nature of those changes? Check as many as apply.

- Increased funding from agencies in the private sector
- Decreased funding from agencies in the private sector
- Increased funding from agencies in the public sector
- Decreased funding from agencies in the public sector
- Increased charges to clients
- Decreased charges to clients

3. Overall, has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the total amount of funding received by your facility since the implementation of AB3121?

Increase	No Change	Decrease
3	2	1

AB90, enacted in 1978, provided funding to community agencies in order to accommodate changes in the handling of status offenders as specified by AB3121, in particular, the provision that status offenders no longer be detained in secure facilities.

4. Did your facility apply for funding provided by AB90? _____
5. Did your facility receive AB90 funding during calendar year 1978? _____

6. Did your facility receive AB90 funding or is it under consideration for such funding during calendar year 1979? _____

7. For each calendar year in which your facility has received AB90 funding, what proportion of your total budget did it account for?

1978 _____

1979 _____

8. If your facility has received AB90 funding, how was this funding used to accommodate changes brought about by the implementation of AB3121? Check all those below that apply.

_____ Creation of new programs or services

_____ Addition of more staff members

_____ Change in the professional level of the staff

_____ Increased residential capacity

_____ Other physical changes to the facility

_____ Acquisition of the resources (services, treatment, equipment, etc.) necessary to carry out the functions of the facility

_____ Other (specify) _____

This section contains questions regarding your perception of changes since the implementation of AB3121 (January 1, 1977) in the types of clients being referred to your facility.

1. Do you feel that the clients referred to your facility after the implementation of AB3121 are different from or the same as the clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?

Clients After AB3121 Are Very Different	Clients After AB3121 Are Somewhat Different	As Much Different As Similar	Clients After AB3121 Are Somewhat Similar	Clients After AB3121 Are Very Similar
5	4	3	2	1

- a. If you feel they are different, would you say that clients referred after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less likely to be in trouble with the law than clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?

Much More Likely After AB3121	Somewhat More Likely After AB3121	About the Same	Somewhat Less Likely After AB3121	Much Less Likely After AB3121
5	4	3	2	1

- b. If you feel they are different, would you say that clients referred after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less likely to have trouble getting along with their parents or families than clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?

Much More Likely After AB3121	Somewhat More Likely After AB3121	About the Same	Somewhat Less Likely After AB3121	Much Less Likely After AB3121
5	4	3	2	1

- c. If you feel they are different, would you say that clients referred after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less likely to have problems of psychological adjustment than clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?

Much More Likely After AB3121	Somewhat More Likely After AB3121	About the Same	Somewhat Less Likely After AB3121	Much Less Likely After AB3121
5	4	3	2	1

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
6	DRUGPR*	Drug Abuse Program offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
7	DRUGAF*	Drug Abuse Program offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
8	EDUCPR*	Educational Program offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
9	EDUCAF*	Educational Program offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
10	RECP R*	Recreational Program offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
11	RECAF*	Recreational Program offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
12	VOCPR*	Vocational Program offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
13	VOCAF*	Vocational Program offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
14	LGLSERPR*	Legal Services offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No

* These variables indicate whether or not the service was offered by the facility regardless of the frequency relative to other services with which they were offered. These are coded based on information from Question 8. If services are not rank ordered but some indication is made of which services were offered, code variables N1PRIOR through N3AFTER as missing (-9). Code variables COUNSPR through OTHERAF according to whether or not each service was indicated as having been offered.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
15	LGLSERAF*	Legal Services offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
16	SHELTPR*	Emergency Shelter Care offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
17	SHELTAF*	Emergency Shelter Care offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
18	RESIDPR*	Long-term Residential Care offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
19	RESIDAF*	Long-term Residential Care offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
20	OTHSERPR*	Other services offered prior to AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No
21	OTHSERAF*	Other services offered after AB3121 1 = Yes 0 = No

* These variables indicate whether or not the service was offered by the facility regardless of the frequency relative to other services with which they were offered. These are coded based on information from Question 8. If services are not rank ordered but some indication is made of which services were offered, code variables N1PRIOR through N3AFTER as missing (-9). Code variables COUNSPR through OTHERAF according to whether or not each service was indicated as having been offered.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
		9. If your facility made changes in the services offered what were the major reasons for those changes? Check as many reasons as apply.
22 - 23	CLICHNG2*	Changes were necessitated by changes in the types of clients being served by the facility 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
24 - 25	EXPAND2*	Part of an effort to expand the scope of the services offered by the facility. .1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
26 - 27	ADDSERV*	Additional services were requested by clients. 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
28 - 29	SERVNA*	Services were not applicable to clients being served. 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
30 - 31	STAFCHNG*	Expertise, training or skills of the staff changed 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
32 - 33	FUNDCHN2*	Funding changes 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable

* Question 9 should only be answered if Question 8 indicated there were changes in the services offered. If there were no changes indicated but Question 9 was answered, code 1 (Reason checked) for those reasons that were checked and -8 (Not Applicable) for those that were not.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
34 - 35	OTHER2*	Other 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable
		10. Did the number of clients being referred by each of the following sources change as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number from the following scale for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of the change for each source.
36 - 37	LEREF	Law Enforcement 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source
38 - 39	CTREF	Probation or Court 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source

* Question 9 should only be answered if Question 8 indicated there were changes in the services offered. If there were no changes indicated but Question 9 was answered, code 1 (Reason checked) for those reasons that were checked and -8 (Not Applicable) for those that were not.

If "Other" is checked and "No changes" (or something similar) is written in, code as -8 (Not Applicable), not 1 (Reason checked).

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
40 - 41	WEIREF	Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source
42 - 43	SCHREF	Schools 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source
44 - 45	PRIVREF	Private Community Agencies 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source
46 - 47	PARREF	Parents 5 = Many more referrals after AB3121 4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121 3 = No change after AB3121 2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121 1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/not a referral source

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
48 - 49	SELFREF	<p>Self</p> <p>5 = Many more referrals after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121</p> <p>3 = No change after AB3121</p> <p>2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer/not a referral source</p>
50 - 51	OTHREF	<p>Other</p> <p>5 = Many more referrals after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more referrals after AB3121</p> <p>3 = No change after AB3121</p> <p>2 = Somewhat fewer referrals after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Many fewer referrals after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer/not a referral source</p> <p>11. Has there been a change in the average amount of contact between the staff of your facility and members of the following organizations as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of change in the <u>frequency of contact</u> with each of these organizations.</p>
52 - 53	LECON	<p>Law Enforcement</p> <p>5 = Contact much more frequent after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Contact somewhat more frequent after AB3121</p> <p>3 = No change in contact after AB3121</p> <p>2 = Contact somewhat less frequent after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Contact much less frequent after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer/no contact</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
54 - 55	CTCON	Probation or Court 5 = Contact much more frequent after AB3121 4 = Contact somewhat more frequent after AB3121 3 = No change in contact after AB3121 2 = Contact somewhat less frequent after AB3121 1 = Contact much less frequent after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/no contact
56 - 57	WELCON	Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies 5 = Contact much more frequent after AB3121 4 = Contact somewhat more frequent after AB3121 3 = No change in contact after AB3121 2 = Contact somewhat less frequent after AB3121 1 = Contact much less frequent after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/no contact
58 - 59	SCHCON	Schools 5 = Contact much more frequent after AB3121 4 = Contact somewhat more frequent after AB3121 3 = No change in contact after AB3121 2 = Contact somewhat less frequent after AB3121 1 = Contact much less frequent after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/no contact

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
60 - 61	PRIVCON	Private Community Agencies 5 = Contact much more frequent after AB3121 4 = Contact somewhat more frequent after AB3121 3 = No change in contact after AB3121 2 = Contact somewhat less frequent after AB3121 1 = Contact much less frequent after AB3121 -9 = No Answer/no contact 12. Has there been a change in the quality of those contacts since the implementation of AB3121? Choose the number for the phrase that best describes the amount and direction of change in the <u>quality of contacts</u> with each of these organizations. (If your facility has no contact with any one of these organizations, please leave that line blank.)
62 - 63	LEQUAL	Law Enforcement 5 = Contact is much less likely to produce positive results 4 = Contact is somewhat less likely to produce positive results 3 = No change in quality 2 = Contact is somewhat more likely to produce positive results 1 = Contact is much more likely to produce positive results -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (No contact)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
64 - 65	CTQUAL	Probation or Court 5 = Contact is much less likely to produce positive results 4 = Contact is somewhat less likely to produce positive results 3 = No change in quality 2 = Contact is somewhat more likely to produce positive results 1 = Contact is much more likely to produce positive results -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (No contact)
66 - 67	WELQUAL	Welfare Department or other Public Social Service Agencies 5 = Contact is much less likely to produce positive results 4 = Contact is somewhat less likely to produce positive results 3 = No change in quality 2 = Contact is somewhat more likely to produce positive results 1 = Contact is much more likely to produce positive results -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (No contact)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
68 - 69	SCHQUAL	Schools 5 = Contact is much less likely to produce positive results 4 = Contact is somewhat less likely to produce positive results 3 = No change in quality 2 = Contact is somewhat more likely to produce positive results 1 = Contact is much more likely to produce positive results -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (No contact)
70 - 71	PRIVQUAL	Private Community Agencies 5 = Contact is much less likely to produce positive results 4 = Contact is somewhat less likely to produce positive results 3 = No change in quality 2 = Contact is somewhat more likely to produce positive results 1 = Contact is much more likely to produce positive results -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (No contact)

(Deck 3)

1-3	ID	Identification Number
4	RESIDENT*	Facility provides residential care 1 = Yes 0 = No

* Resident coded 1 if any of questions 13, 14 or 15 are completed. If there is difficulty determining whether or not a facility is residential, refer back to Question 8, Section I. If Question 8 is in conflict with the information in Questions 13, 14, and 15, Section I, go with what is in Questions 13-15.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
5 - 6	SECURE	13. Is this a secure facility? 1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (RESIDENT coded 0)
7 - 8	SECURE6	Was it secure in 1976? 1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (RESIDENT coded 0)
9 - 10	PHYSCHNG	14. Have any physical changes been made at this facility since the implementation of AB3121 to comply with the provisions of that legislation? If so, what were they? 1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (RESIDENT coded 0)
11 - 12	RUNS	15. Has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the number of runaways from your facility since the implementation of AB3121? 1 = Decrease 2 = No Change 3 = Increase -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (RESIDENT coded 0)
<u>SECTION II</u>		
13 - 14	CHNGFUND	1. Have there been changes in the funding sources of your facility or in the amount of funding provided by any of those sources, as a result of the implementation of AB3121? Circle the number for the phrase that best describes the amount of change for your facility. 1 = Funding sources or amounts did not change 2 = Funding sources or amounts changed somewhat 3 = Funding sources or amounts changed greatly -9 = No Answer

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
		2. If there were changes in your funding sources, what was the nature of these changes? Check as many as apply.
15 - 16	INCPRIV*	Increased funding from agencies in the private sector 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)
17 - 18	DECPRIV*	Decreased funding from agencies in the private sector 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)
19 - 20	INCPUB*	Increased funding from agencies in the public sector 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)
21 - 22	DECPUB*	Decreased funding from agencies in public sector 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)
23 - 24	INCCLI*	Increased charges to clients 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)
25 - 26	DECCLI*	Decreased charges to clients 1 = Reason checked 0 = Reason not checked -8 = Not Applicable (CHNGFUND coded 1)

* Question 2 should only be answered if Question 1 indicated that there were changes in the sources or amounts of funding. If there were no changes but Question 2 was answered code 1 (Reason checked) for those reasons that were checked and -8 (Not Applicable) for those that were not.

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
27 - 28	TOTCHNG	<p>3. Overall, has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the total amount of funding received by your facility since the implementation of AB3121?</p> <p>1 = Decrease 2 = No Change 3 = Increase -9 = No Answer</p>
29 - 30	APPLY90	<p>4. Did your facility apply for funding provided by AB90?</p> <p>1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer</p>
31 - 32	REC908	<p>5. Did your facility receive AB90 funding during <u>calendar</u> year 1978?</p> <p>1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)</p>
33 - 34	REC909	<p>6. Did your facility receive AB90 funding or is it under consideration for such funding during <u>calendar</u> year 1979?</p> <p>1 = Yes 0 = No -9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)</p> <p>7. For each calendar year in which your facility has received AB90 funding, what proportion of your total budget did it account for?</p>
35 - 37	PROP78	<p>Code the proportion for 1978</p> <p>-9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0 or REC908 coded 0)</p>
38 - 40	PROP79	<p>Code the proportion for 1979</p> <p>-9 = No Answer -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0 or REC909 coded 0)</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
		8. If your facility has received AB90 funding, how was this funding used to accommodate changes brought about by the implementation of AB3121? Check all those below that apply.
41 - 42	NEWPGMS	Creation of new programs or services 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 code 0)
43 - 44	ADDSTAFF	Addition of more staff members 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)
45 - 46	CHNGPROF	Change in the professional level of the staff 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)
47 - 48	INCRSID	Increased residential capacity 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)
49 - 50	CHNGPHYS	Other physical changes to the facility 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)
51 - 52	RESOURCE	Acquisition of the resources (services, treatment, equipment, etc.) necessary to carry out the functions of the facility. 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)
53 - 54	OTHCHNG	Other 1 = Checked 0 = Not checked -8 = Not Applicable (APPLY90 coded 0)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
		<u>Section III</u>
55 - 56	CLISAME	<p>1. Do you feel that the clients referred to your facility <u>after the implementation</u> of AB3121 are different from or are the same as the clients referred <u>prior to the implementation</u> of AB3121?</p> <p>5 = Clients after AB3121 are very different</p> <p>4 = Clients after AB3121 are somewhat different</p> <p>3 = As much different as similar</p> <p>2 = Clients after AB3121 are somewhat similar</p> <p>1 = Clients after AB3121 are very similar</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p>
57 - 58	LAWTRBL	<p>a. <u>If you feel they are different</u>, would you say that clients referred <u>after the implementation</u> of AB3121 are more or less likely to have trouble with the law than clients referred <u>prior to AB3121</u>?</p> <p>5 = much more likely after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more likely after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat less likely after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much less likely after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (CLISAME coded 3, 2 or 1 and LAWTRBL not answered; if CLISAME is coded 3,2 or 1 and LAWTRBL is answered, code that answer)</p>

Column	Variable Name	Question and Codes
59 - 60	FAMILY	<p>b. <u>If you feel they are different, would you say that clients referred after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less likely to have trouble getting along with their parents or families than clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?</u></p> <p>5 = Much more likely after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more likely after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat less likely after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much less likely after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (CLISAME coded 3, 2 or 1 and FAMILY not answered; if CLISAME is coded 3,2 or 1 and FAMILY is answered, code that answer)</p>
61 - 62	PSYCHADJ	<p>c. <u>If you feel they are different, would you say that clients referred after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less likely to have problems of psychological adjustment than clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?</u></p> <p>5 = Much more likely after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more likely after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat less likely after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much less likely after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (CLISAME coded 3, 2 or 1 and PSYCHADJ is not answered; if CLISAME is coded 3, 2 or 1 and PSYCHADJ is answered, code that answer).</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
63 - 64	TREATDIF	<p>d. <u>If you feel they are different, would you say that the changes in the types of clients being referred to your facility have made treatment more or less difficult?</u></p> <p>5 = Treatment much more difficult</p> <p>4 = Treatment somewhat more difficult</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Treatment somewhat less difficult</p> <p>1 = Treatment much less difficult</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (CLISAME coded 3, 2 or 1 and TREATDIF not answered; if CLISAME is coded 3,2 or 1 and TREATDIF is answered, code that answer)</p>
65 - 66	SERIOUS	<p>2. Do you feel that the problems of clients referred <u>after</u> the implementation of AB3121 are more or less <u>serious</u> than the problems of clients referred prior to the implementation of AB3121?</p> <p>5 = Much more serious after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more serious after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat less serious after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much less serious after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
67 - 68	CONTROL	<p>3. Do you feel that clients referred to your facility after the implementation of AB3121 are more or less difficult to control than clients referred <u>prior</u> to the implementation of AB3121?</p> <p>5 = Much more difficult to control after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat more difficult to control after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat less difficult to control after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much less difficult to control after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p>
69 - 70	CONTREAT	<p>a. <u>If you feel there are differences in control, to what extent would you say that they have affected your ability to provide treatment for clients?</u></p> <p>5 = Treatment much more difficult after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Treatment somewhat more difficult after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Treatment somewhat less difficult after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Treatment much less difficult after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (CONTROL coded 3 and CONTREAT not answered; if CONTROL is coded 3 and CONTREAT is answered, code that answer).</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
71 - 72	TIME	<p>4. Would you say that clients referred <u>after</u> the implementation of AB3121 remain in your program for a longer or shorter length of time, on the average, than clients referred <u>prior</u> to the implementation of AB3121</p> <p>5 = Much longer length of time after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Somewhat longer time after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Somewhat shorter time after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Much shorter length of time after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p>
(Deck 4)		
1 - 3	ID	Identification Number
4 - 5	TIMTREAT	<p>a. <u>If you feel there has been a change in the length of time clients spend in the program, to what extent would you say that it has affected your ability to provide treatment for clients?</u></p> <p>5 = Treatment much more difficult after AB3121</p> <p>4 = Treatment somewhat more difficult after AB3121</p> <p>3 = About the same</p> <p>2 = Treatment somewhat less difficult after AB3121</p> <p>1 = Treatment much less difficult after AB3121</p> <p>-9 = No Answer</p> <p>-8 = Not Applicable (TIME coded 3 and TIMTREAT not answered; if TIME is coded 3 and TIMTREAT is answered, code that answer)</p>

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Name</u>	<u>Question and Codes</u>
6 - 7	COMPLETE	<p>5. Since the implementation of AB3121, has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the number of clients not completing the program of service outlined for them at your facility?</p> <p>3 = Increase 2 = No change 1 = Decrease -9 = No Answer</p>
8 - 9	CONT958	<p>6. Has AB958 made it more or less difficult to control the clients referred to your facility?</p> <p>5 = Clients much more difficult to control now 4 = Clients somewhat more difficult to control now 3 = About the same 2 = Clients somewhat less difficult to control now 1 = Clients much less difficult to control now -9 = No Answer</p>
10 - 11	TIME958	<p>7. Since the implementation of AB958, has there been an increase, decrease or no change in the length of time clients spend in the program?</p> <p>3 = Increase 2 = No change 1 = Decrease -9 = No Answer</p>