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Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

“Schools may prevent delinquency if they successfully socialize people to fit into the society, yet the schools cause delinquency in those who reject that socialization” (Liazos 1978:368).

Youth delinquency has been and continues to be an immense concern to our society. Concern over the broad issues relating to delinquency have been manifested in legal decisions and public policy about how to best manage the burdens that juvenile delinquency has placed on the shoulders of society. Such decisions and policies have resulted in various creative programs by many of society’s institutions. Of these institutions, juvenile probation departments are often the first and primary point of contact for many juvenile delinquents.

The history of “what to do” with juvenile delinquents is long and convoluted. Prior to the Progressive Era our nation dealt with juvenile delinquents in very much the same manner as adult offenders; minors who committed crimes were tried in adult court and incarcerated with adult offenders. Progressive Era thinkers recognized the social cost of having our nation’s youth housed with adult offenders, as well as the perpetuate reality of juvenile delinquents learning worse criminal behavior from adult offenders. By the end of the 1800’s juvenile courts and reformatory houses were springing up around the nation with the goal to rehabilitate opposed to incarcerate juvenile delinquents. In 1974 the Juvenile Justice and Prevention Act (JJCPA) was passed, which subsequently allowed for the creation of numerous national, state and
local, institutes, offices and programs, all having access to federal funding for increased research into juvenile prevention and intervention. The program evaluated here is evidence of JJCPA at work.

The arrays of programs within educational institutions are also of particular importance to this study. Schools have been met with a certain amount of apprehension by the media and policy makers alike, due to their location as a place for the perpetuation of juvenile delinquency, as well as their role in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Specifically, in an era where peer pressure is synonymous with socialization, schools are being criticized for their inability to properly socialize youth. Although schools have long been implicated by criminological perspectives as being centers for the causation of delinquency, schools also have great potential for delinquency intervention by providing regular access to at-risk youth during key developmental years (Gottfredson as quoted by Sherman et al. 2002:56).

This study will evaluate a unique Juvenile Justice Intervention Program (JJIP) instituted throughout a northern California County, which targets high-risk first-time offenders in an effort to decrease recidivism for a range of offenses. This program is unique in that it was developed using a multi-agency approach, which depends on multiple school, non-profit, criminal justice and community programs to work collaboratively in order to decrease a number of aspects of juvenile delinquency. Specifically, the rates of probation violation, arrests, and incarcerations, along with drug and alcohol use, will be examined before and after program participation to assess
whether or not providing increased services to juvenile delinquents reduces recidivism in these categories.

Public perception of the causes and concerns of juvenile delinquency in the United States is broad in scope. Cause for concern is justified by the increase in juvenile crime rates worldwide over the last half of the Twentieth Century. Therefore, the desire for rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents is a primary goal of juvenile justice. The effort to curtail the increase in criminogenic behavior has caused many local and national efforts to blossom, spanning community involvement to school involvement, as well as increased law enforcement (Heilbrun et. al. 2005:4). For the purposes of this study, juvenile justice and high school based programs implemented by the United States Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention (OJJDP) will be examined in further detail below.

Rehabilitation has taken form through numerous different juvenile delinquency intervention and prevention programs both at the national and community level. Research shows school-based intervention and prevention programs to be an exceptional example of delinquency-based programs, in that they involve both criminal justice and school participation. JJIP is a bit of a hybrid of Juvenile Justice and School based programs. Therefore, the effectiveness of juvenile justice and school based programs will be the focus of examination for this study. Research in this area has demonstrated that programs which span prevention of crime, substance abuse, truancy, dropout, and other conduct problems can work, but evaluations of specific program
models show great variability in their effectiveness (Gottfredson as cited by Sherman et al. 2002:56).

Many of these programs have been evaluated, however a number of these evaluations often come from a standpoint of ‘how they are effective’ opposed to ‘if they are effective. Furthermore, although many different sectors of communities get involved in delinquency intervention, few programs create coalitions between various community agencies with the understanding that working together across disciplines can be more effective than working alone. And finally, as for the programs that have been widely studied, many of them have proven to be ineffective, and the focus of rehabilitation to be poorly implemented (Gottfredson and Gottfredson 2002; Durlack 1997; Powell and Hawkins 1996; Gottfredson, Wilson and Najaka 2002).

Strengthening such programs could substantially reduce future criminality.

The JJIP is unique in that it fundamentally involves commitment and cooperation by law enforcement, school officials, and community resources. An in-depth analysis of this program will provide a necessary understanding of how joint efforts between numerous organizations can benefit and/or burden each other in reaching their independent goals. Additionally, it is necessary to take a close look at the actual outcomes of a juvenile intervention program to see whether or not it is truly effective in meeting its program goals; too often success is measured by perceived accomplishment and not based on empirical research. Statistically analyzing the
differences between minors who have and have not participated in this program will provide an accurate representation of program effectiveness.

The *JJIP* was implemented in year 2000 throughout a northern California county. The experiment and comparison groups are composed of first time offenders who are on probation. Crimes committed by minors stem mainly from anger problems, mental health issues, and/or drug and alcohol use; subsequently, intervention programs available to the experimental group target these behaviors. Minors are randomly placed into the treatment group or comparison group. The treatment group receives access to a myriad of services stressing frequent multi-agency contacts, increased school contacts, and night and weekend probation contacts. Additionally, probation case loads for the treatment group are twenty minors, which allow for more face-to-face contact and increased interpersonal relationships between probation officer and minor. The comparison group, on the other hand, receive only probation services, with probation officers handling case loads up to eighty minors. Each agency involved in the *JJIP* has its own objectives of success, however they work together to help provide achievement in all areas. This is accomplished by creating a *case plan*, which requires the minor and parent(s) to meet collectively with all parties involved with the minor, including school, mental health, and probation personnel. Together, all parties refer the minor to counseling, anger management, drug and alcohol, and recreational programs as deemed appropriate. Goal oriented contracts are then drawn up, which include incentives and sanctions for program participation.
To determine the JJIP’s ultimate effectiveness, this research will look at how successful it is at reducing recidivism in areas of theft, vandalism, battery, and drug and alcohol offenses. This will be determined by taking previously compiled data on all the minors in the program having access to wraparound\(^1\) services, and comparing them to a reference group of minors who did not participate in the program, receiving only juvenile probation monitoring.

Although there have been many implementations of juvenile delinquency intervention programs, there are very few demonstrably effective and empirically valid examples of such programs (Gottfredson 1981). The reason for this has overwhelmingly been attributed not to a lack of potentially effective ideas, but rather to issues with implementation itself (Gottfredson 1986). Evaluations of intervention programs are thus necessary to describe the effects of success or failure of such programs. Therefore, this study asks the question, is the JJIP effective at reducing the above mentioned aspects of delinquency; and, how does the implementation of this program inform program effectiveness. In addition, the program will be analyzed through the lenses of social control theory, and social learning theory, to determine which theory is best suited to explain any measure of success. By answering these questions we can discover how to best allocate our time, energy, and funds toward realistic and effective juvenile delinquency intervention programs.

---

\(^1\) Family preservation services, geared to meet the total needs of the family through the use of community resources, concrete services, and counseling. [www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/crisis/crisisl.cfm](http://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/crisis/crisisl.cfm)
Chapter 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Any review of juvenile delinquency deserves consideration of the social factors involved in creating juvenile delinquents. Researchers have identified a core set of delinquency initiators, including family, peer-related, and school related factors. Drug and alcohol abuse is also a highly salient factor in determining future delinquency; in one research study, over fifty percent of incarcerated youth reported having used drugs and/or alcohol at the time of committing the offense for which they were incarcerated (Bilchik 1999). These social factors are often either learned or encouraged by delinquent youths’ family and/or peers. Some prominent factors associated with delinquency initiation within the family are child abuse or neglect, hostility, low parental involvement, family conflict, parental criminality, aggression within the family, parent-child separation, and emotional deprivation (Heilbrun et al. 2005; Hawkins et al. 2000; Loeber et al. 1998).

Peer influences are an equally important factor in predicting involvement in juvenile delinquency, with one study finding anti-social peers to be the strongest predictor for criminal offending for youth ages 12 to 14 (Lipsey and Derzon 1998). Another area for the development of potential delinquency is found in the school. School related factors are complex to understand because problems youth experience in school are often directly related to emotional and/or social issues which originate elsewhere, such as the home or peer groups. However, several risk factors do stand out as being highly correlated with involvement in delinquency; low academic achievement and
performance, frequent absences, multiple school transitions, and delinquent peers (Hawkins et al. 2000).

Below I will discuss two prominent theoretical explanations for the above mentioned causes of delinquency. Theories in juvenile delinquency often considered include social control theories and learning theories. Following, an overview of school initiated juvenile delinquency programs will be evaluated. The focus of program evaluations will be to consider their potential effectiveness based on the theoretical assumptions of social learning theory and control theory.

Control Theories

Control theorists don’t question why people commit crime; rather their focus is why people don’t commit crime. This stems from an understanding that humans, like all animals, seek gratification; thus, people are assumed to be predisposed to law breaking as a means to attaining gratification. Therefore, the key factor in delinquency causation can be seen as the presence or absence of control. Sources of control are both external and internal. External sources are generally rooted in relationships with others; such as parents, teachers, and law-enforcement; alternately, internal sources are exercised through aspects of self-control and moral obligations (Agnew and Cullen, 2002). As a result, social control theories focus on strategies which attempt to control behavior. The intended result is thus conformity to the rules and regulations of society. Control does not exist in a vacuum however. Consequently, control theory asserts that the more committed juveniles are to appropriate relationships and conventional
activities, the less likely juveniles will be drawn towards delinquency (Agnew and Cullen, 2002). Following will be an in depth discussion of two prominent varieties of control theory. These include Walter Reckless’s \textit{containment theory} and Travis Hirschi’s \textit{social bond theory}.

In the 1960’s Walter Reckless proposed \textit{containment theory}, which states that a series of inner and outer containment mechanisms, also thought of as ‘pushes’ and ‘pulls’ toward crime and deviancy, are important to understand why people do or do not commit crime. Outer containment is seen as the social controls, such as “institutional reinforcement of … norms, goals, and expectations … [and] effective supervision and discipline” (Agnew and Cullen 2003:228). Conversely, inner containment is internal to the individual; such as possessing conventional beliefs, having self-control, a good self-concept, feelings of responsibility, being goal oriented, having a strong conscience, and so on (Agnew and Cullen 2003).

Outer containment plays a significant role in delinquency reduction in organized communities. However, of the two types, inner containment is thought to be the most influential in accounting for conformity to societal norms, especially in disorganized societies where forms of outer containment are weak due to an abundance of pushes and pulls towards delinquency (Reckless 1961 as discussed in Agnew and Cullen 2003). Beyond explaining delinquency, this theory also helps shed light on causes of conformity. Because inner containment is so important, intervention programs that focus on building positive inner containment mechanisms at an early age can prevent
young children from developing into juvenile delinquents. However, when considering juvenile offenders, it is important to realize that the majority have already demonstrated low levels of inner containment. Therefore, containment theory would assume that high levels of outer containment are necessary to enforce social control on these minors.

This understanding grants optimism towards programs such as the one under study, in that having an omnipresent figure of authority making daily contacts with these minors, along with their being involved in highly structured and monitored case-plans, these minors should theoretically be less likely to engage in delinquent behavior.

Travis Hirschi proposed social bond theory to explain how the control that society exerts over individuals explains peoples involvement, or lack thereof, in crime; it assumes that “delinquent acts result when an individual’s bond to society is broken” (Hirschi 1969:16). Therefore, social bonds that promote proper socialization and conformity can be seen as mechanisms which reduce crime and deviance. Hirschi points out four primary social bonds that restrain deviance: The first bond, attachment, refers to the attachment to parents, school and peers as important in developing conforming behavior; the second bond is that of commitment, and refers to the amount of time and energy a person invests in a certain reputation, and is primarily fear driven. When considering deviant behavior, one must also consider the consequences as well, “commitment assumes that … the interests of most persons would be endangered if they were to engage in criminal acts” (Agnew and Cullen 2003:234); Involvement, the third attachment, states that the more involved in conventional activities one is, the less likely
there will be time to be involved in crime; Lastly there is the attachment to belief, or the conformity one has for a common value system in society. Having belief in societies value system produces conforming behavior. However, if that belief is weakened by association with delinquent peers, one is more likely to engage in criminal behavior (Hirschi 1969; Agnew and Cullen 2003).

This theory, in its most basic interpretation, sees delinquency and social bonds as ‘inversely related’; furthermore, social control is what should theoretically restrain juveniles from engaging in delinquency through strengthening the four bonds listed above. However, since the juvenile delinquents have already demonstrated a rejection for social norms, the bonds of social control will have to outweigh negative social bonds. Therefore, intervention programs should create an atmosphere that increases strong and rewarding relationships to law-enforcement, teachers, and auxiliary support; enhances commitment thru the use of negative consequences for misbehaving; provides additional avenues for involvement in productive conventional activities beyond the classroom; and increases belief in the values held by society.

In sum, control theories see the key factor in crime causation, and thus juvenile delinquency, as the presence or absence of control. Control takes the form of social institutions and social relationships, as well as internal self control. Furthermore, the degree of control is understood to vary in relation to social location and socioeconomic status.
Learning Theories

Differential association theory was introduced in 1939 by Edwin Sutherland as a means of gaining a micro-level understanding of juvenile delinquency. Sutherland’s specific aim for this theory was to “extract common elements and organize the heretofore diverse set of facts that criminological research had generated into the single theoretical abstraction of “differential association” (Laub and Sampson 1991:1418). In its most basic interpretation, this theory looks at crime as a social process, and further asserts that through interaction with others, “we learn techniques of committing crime and “definitions” (motives, drives, rationalizations, attitudes) favorable and unfavorable toward violation of the law” (Sutherland as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:125).

Interaction with primary groups, such as family and peers, are seen as most influential in the propensity for a minor to engage in criminal behavior. However, secondary groups, such as reference groups, schools, authority figures, mass media, and the community in general also influence delinquent behavior.

Differential association further asserts that a juvenile’s self-image is continuously reconstructed during interaction with the above mentioned individuals and/or groups, and in the event that an excess of “definitions favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law” occur, juveniles will be more likely to engage in criminal behavior (Sutherland and Cresse 1974:75). Following is the process for engagement in criminal behavior: 1) Criminal behavior is learned; 2) Criminal behavior is learned through interaction with others; 3) Learning of
criminal behavior takes place within ‘intimate’ groups; 4) Learning of criminal behavior include techniques, “direction of motives, drives, rationalizations and attitudes”; 5) The direction of motives and attitudes is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable; 6) An excess of definitions favorable to violation of the law creates a person to engage in delinquency; and 7) Associations with criminal behavior and anti-criminal behavior “vary in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity” (Sutherland and Cressey 1972:123-133). Therefore, individuals who are exposed to “definitions favorable to law violation early in life … on a relatively frequent basis … over a long period of time … and from sources they like or respect” are at an increase risk for engaging in crime (Agnew and Cullen 2003:125).

Numerous studies have proved this theory to accurately portray juvenile delinquency, especially in regards to the effect of peer groups on offending. A longitudinal study using data from the National Youth Survey looked at how delinquent friends influenced the behaviors and attitudes on general, group, and solo offending. Findings supported the hypothesis that “interaction with deviant peers results in cognitive changes that make offending more attractive” for all three categories (Hochstetler et al. 2002:559). Therefore, differential association theory is supported insofar as “a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violations of law” (Sutherland and Cressey 1960 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:123).
Although Sutherland’s theory was a major contribution to the study of criminology, it has received good deal of criticism, especially in regards to its narrowness in scope. Differential association theory intended to identify a model for the field of criminology around what is considered to be “abstract generalizations” (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990; Laub and Sampson 1991). By focusing on such generalizations, this theory devalued aspects such as the early onset of offending, decline in offending with age, and the role of the individual in relation to crime causation (Laub and Sampson 1991; Hochstetler et al. 2002). However, high-risk youth generally follow the process outlined above, with an excess of definitions favorable to law violation. Furthermore, interaction with minors who all have similar delinquency backgrounds provides a breeding ground for negative differential association to occur.

Gresham Sykes and David Matza furthered differential association theory with the intent to more fully describe an area of previous criticism; that the concept of ‘definitions’ was not precisely defined (Akers 1996:229). This lack of the “specific content” of the “motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes favorable to violation of the law” drove their research in the *Techniques of Neutralization*. Whereas differential association theory sees juvenile delinquency as based on “values and norms of a deviant sub-culture” independent of the individual, Sykes and Matza consider the balance between such sub-cultures and individual attitudes. This consideration is based on the understanding that many juvenile delinquents experience guilt in relation to committing acts of crime; often admire and respect law abiding persons; distinguish between who
can and cannot be victimized; and do not consider themselves “totally immune from the demands for conformity made by the dominate social order” (Sykes and Matza 1957 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:135-137).

The techniques of neutralization are the methods that juveniles use to justify their delinquency, and are summarized as follows:

- **The Denial of Responsibility**, “In so far as the delinquent can define himself as lacking responsibility for his deviant actions, the disapproval of self or others is sharply reduced in effectiveness as a restraining influence”.

- **The Denial of Injury**, delinquents make the distinction between “acts that are wrong in themselves and acts that are illegal but not immoral … the delinquent frequently, and in a hazy fashion, feels that his behavior does not really cause any great harm, despite the fact that it runs counter to law”.

- **The Denial of Victim**, “Even if the delinquent accepts the responsibility for his deviant actions and is willing to admit that his deviant actions involve an injury or hurt, the moral indignation may be neutralized by an instance that the injury is not wrong in light of the circumstances”.

- **The Condemnation of the Condemners**, “The delinquent shifts the focus of attention from his own deviant acts to the motives and behaviors of those who disapprove of his violations. His condemners … are hypocrites, deviants in disguise”.
• *The Appeal to Higher Loyalties*, “deviation from certain norms may occur not because the norms are rejected but because other norms, held to be more pressing or involving a higher loyalty, are accorded precedence” (1957:138-141).

This theory is an important contribution for understanding why some minors exposed to crime choose to engage in crime, whereas other minors choose not to. Furthermore, techniques of neutralization have shown to be instrumental in reducing the effectiveness of social controls that aid in delinquent behavior (Sykes and Matza 1953:141). However, several challenges to this theory have arisen; specifically, attempts to empirically verify assumptions made by neutralization theory have been found to be methodologically flawed and inconclusive (Agnew 1994). Therefore, without understanding why some juveniles get involved in delinquency where others do not, this theory may be too vague to be of practical use. Nonetheless, it is an important theory to consider in the context of intervention programs, as it does seem to leave more room for personal intervention to occur. Therefore, techniques that increase respect for the law and conformity to society, such as is found in the program under study, have a greater chance of deterring future delinquency.

In 1966 Ronald Akers and Robert Burgess sought to further extend and build on the popular learning theories in criminology. They did so by integrating aspects of Sutherland’s *differential association* theory and Matza and Sykes *techniques of neutralization* theory, among others. The end result, *differential reinforcement* theory,
sought to further explain how individuals learn definitions that are either favorable or unfavorable to engaging in crime and deviance through association with others (Burgess and Akers 1966; Akers 1985). In addition, differential reinforcement theory takes into consideration non-social aspects, such as the effect of drugs and alcohol, on reinforcing criminal behavior (Akers 1985 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:145).

Akers went on to advance differential reinforcement theory, now termed social learning theory, to show that juveniles are first introduced to criminal behavior by means of differential association; then through differential reinforcement they learn “the anticipated or actual rewards and punishments that follow or are consequences of behavior” (Akers 1985 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:145). This learning process follows three steps: “First, individuals learn beliefs that define crime as desirable or justified in certain situations … Second, individuals engage in crime because they are differentially reinforced for criminal behavior … [and] Third, individuals engage in crime because they imitate the criminal behavior of others” (Akers 1985, 1998, 2000 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:126). Furthermore, whereas differential association theory sees social situations as the primary force for engaging in deviance, social learning theory also takes into consideration non-social aspects, such as the effect that drugs and alcohol have on reinforcing criminal behavior (Akers 1985 as discussed in Agnew and Cullen 2003:145). In sum, the level of positive reinforcement for crimes that produce a gain, be it positive attention from peers or accumulation of material goods, will determine whether the behavior is continued.
Social learning theory does a good job at explaining the decision making process involved in developing motives, attitudes and techniques necessary to commit a crime. Furthermore, this theory has been proven to be successful at explaining certain types of delinquency. In one study the deviant behavior of teenagers, seen through tobacco, drug, and alcohol use, was tested using social learning theory; findings supported this theory in accounting for 50-60% of differences found between users and non-users (Akers et al. 1979).

Social learning theory can be applied to the understanding of many types of criminals and deviants. Yet its best application has been found in dealing with the behavior of groups that supply reinforcement, such as peer groups and social groups (Akers 1973). Furthermore, this theory has been shown to support punishment through institutional means, such as using probation and incarceration as a means of negatively reinforcing criminal behavior (Livingston 1996). Therefore, when applied to juvenile intervention programs, this theory should help to prevent future criminal behavior. By having daily contact with a probation officer, there is an omnipresent reminder of the consequences for delinquency. Furthermore, the behavior of the probation officer, school personnel, and other positive role-models involved in such a program model and positively reinforce good behavior for juveniles. However, the ‘appeal to higher loyalties’, such as deviant peers, is stronger in cases where juveniles have already decided to engage in delinquency, such as is the case for the program under study. Therefore, it is necessary to see if social learning theory, especially in regards to its use
of scare tactics such as the threat of legal punishment for non-conformity, will outweigh the positive reinforcement that appealing to higher loyalties brings.

**Summary**

Both control theory and social learning theory have made substantive contributions to understanding the causes and correction of juvenile delinquency. Based on the review of literature below however, it appears that each of these theories has strengths and weaknesses in accounting for certain types of delinquency. Furthermore, different institutions appear to have more success explaining delinquency intervention by use of one theoretical explanation over another. For instance, intervention programs that group at-risk youth together are at risk for creating an atmosphere where differential association may occur, and where delinquent youth can learn and imitate new ways of being deviant. Conversely, intervention programs that place a great amount of emphasis on implementing social controls, which aid in the production of increased sense of moral obligation to conform to societal norms, can decrease delinquency.

There is a considerable amount of overlap with these theories, in that they both help to explain causes and correlates of juvenile delinquency. Both theories also point to the importance of strong and supportive social relationships in deterring delinquent behavior. Learning theories view deviant behavior as learned through interaction with others. Furthermore, motives, drives, rationalization, and attitudes are formed through such interaction. Conversely, social control theory asserts that individuals have the freedom to choose whether or not to engage in delinquent behavior, but that this choice
arises when the individual’s ties to mainstream society have been broken (Hirschi 2002). Therefore, delinquency occurs when group norms have been broken and/or violated (control theory); and, in this context, an area for learning new norms arises (social learning theory). Consequently, a consideration for how both of these theories interact on explaining the success or failure of the program under study must be allowed. This will be attempted by creating theoretical links between control theories framework for the development of choice, and learning theories development for how such choices are made.

The JJIP combines aspects related to both theories. All students in the reference group are infrequently monitored by probation; therefore, when viewed through the lens of social learning theory, this setting is ideal for association with deviant subcultures who reinforce definitions favorable toward delinquency, and therefore lessen any positive gain probation could provide. On the other hand, as viewed through the lens of control theory, the myriad of services offered to the experimental group should allow for a more intense immersion of positive role models on these students. Everyday these students encounter their probation officer, opposed to once every few weeks. This should allow for a closer relationship between the probation officer and juvenile, and thus create a positive view toward law enforcement. At the very least it should decrease violation of probation, and rates of arrest and incarceration. Additionally, students in the experimental group engage in rehabilitative case plans tailored to their specific needs: Theoretically, the more involved and committed students become to their case
plan, the more their attachment to the rules of society increase, decreasing the likelihood they will violate those rules in the future.

For all these reasons, the success or failure of the JJIP will be evaluated through the lens of both control theory and social learning theory. To determine which theory best describes the outcomes of the JJIP, control theory will be attributed to positive correlations of program effectiveness for all variables, and social learning theory will be attributed to negative correlations of program ineffectiveness for all variables.
Chapter 3

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

All of the theories mentioned above suggest the role of juvenile justice programs and school programs as important for considering the causes of delinquency, and further recognize these roles to be complex one at best. Schools in particular can be seen as a locus for delinquency causation as well as delinquency prevention and intervention. For instance, one school might decrease delinquency by providing sources of social control and reinforcing appropriate behavior, whereas another school might increase delinquency by grouping motivated delinquents together without the proper social control to reprimand inappropriate behavior. In short, “schools have the potential to minimize opportunities for delinquent behavior … [but] schools also have the potential to influence delinquency” (Gottfredson 2001:3).

When considering the school as a delinquency-producing institution, a few areas of interest emerge as a place where prevention and intervention programs, if instituted, could help improve the general climate of the school and behavior of its students. Additionally, community and probation based programs have the capability to enhance the overall success of juvenile delinquents, and therefore directly affect the success or failure of school-based delinquency intervention programs.

Following I will cover four areas of delinquency intervention programs. The first are School Environment programs, which aim to alter the school and/or classroom environment with the goal of controlling delinquent behavior through a system of
providing rewards for rule compliance and assigning punishments for rule infraction.

The second are *Behavior Modification* programs, which seek to control individual delinquency producing aspects by teaching emotional, behavioral and cognitive skills that increase self-regulation and self-esteem. Third, programs which combine elements of *School Environment* and *Behavior Modification* programs will be considered. And lastly, *Juvenile Probation* and *Juvenile Justice* programs are considered as a method for dealing with and attempting to correct juvenile delinquency issues.

Because there are a vast number of programs aimed at delinquency intervention, I have chosen to look at programs which have been funded by the U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Reasoning for this stems from their being an insufficient number of intervention programs aimed at this age group and funded by California’s Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), such as the *JJIP*. However, many JJCPA programs receive funding from OJJDP block grants issued to the state of California, and both agencies have similar goals and criteria for funding eligibility. JJCPA objectives include prevention of juvenile delinquency and reduction in juvenile crime and recidivism; OJJDP objectives are to prevent, treat, and control juvenile violence and delinquency. In addition, this study will examine intervention programs which implemented OJJDP sponsored programs that focus on improving one or more aspects that the *JJIP* addresses. These include objectives that aim to reduce truancy, substance abuse, violence, theft, and probation violation.
School Environment Programs

Many factors go into what makes a school successful or not at controlling delinquency; however some factors stand out as more influential than others. The actual school, including equipment, area structures, and quality of instruction, are directly influenced by the wealth, or lack thereof, of the community in which the school is located. Whereas some schools have state of the art equipment, pools, science labs, extracurricular clubs and activities, other schools resemble more a prison, with mandatory metal detectors, security officers, and drug sniffing dogs. Intervention studies which aspire to change the school climate generally employ techniques that aim to build overall school ability; set expectations for behavior which enforce school rules and regulations; increase management of classes to improve education; and group students to achieve appropriate smaller learning climates (Gottfredson 1998).

The majority of intervention studies concerned with changing school climate test for a causal association between these factors and delinquency. However, as with programs aimed at altering school environment, the bulk of these studies have been implemented at elementary schools, middle schools, and junior highs (see: Greenwood et al. 1993; Moskowitz et al. 1983; Hawkins et al. 1991, 1992, 1988, 1998; Cook et al. 1998; Gottfredson 1986, 1987, 1990). Nevertheless, there are a number of programs that were applied to high schools, and a few more specifically designed for high schools. Programs which focus on grouping students have been evaluated at the high school level, and are predominantly geared toward high-risk youth. The School Transitional
Environment Project, or STEP, was designed to help ease the transition from junior high to high school. This program is a year in duration, and consists of 65 to 100 freshmen students who are broken into smaller sub-groups, or “schools within a school”, which remain together through their academic day.

The primary goals of STEP are to increase student accountability and enhance socialization in regards to school rules and regulations; in addition, homeroom teachers provide the added functions of administrators and guidance counselors, providing academic and personal counseling. Assessments were taken at mid-year and end-of-year intervals, and measured students’ self-concepts, attendance and academic achievement. Results indicated that students enrolled in STEP had increased attendance, persistence, and achievement in relation to the comparison group, along with a reduction in delinquency and drug use (Felner et al. 1982). Yearly follow-up studies indicated progress remained stable for program students compared to the control group (Felner and Adan 1988). However, a replication of a similar but slightly different program was undertaken by Rayes and Jason and found that the program effectiveness was for the most part a failure (1991). In addition, significant issues with validity of the original data are present due to a lack of pretest measures (DuBois et al. 1993).

Another student grouping program, called Dropout Prevention Program, was implemented in a high school with the intention to reduce disruption in mainstream classrooms and increase involvement in classroom socialization for at-risk youth. This program grouped students in a similar fashion to the previous study, as well as offered
after school paid vocational training. The study compared the outcomes of three cohorts of ‘disruptive’ students; cohorts consisted of a ‘self-contained’ group who spent their academic day contained in one classroom, with the same teacher and students; a ‘mainstream’ group of disruptive students who received no special services; and a group who were ‘mainstream’ but also received services via a resource program available to them, where they received tutoring and counseling as well as the opportunity to engage in after school vocational training. Comparisons between groups were made for three consecutive years in areas of attendance, GPA, suspension rates, academic persistence and achievement scores. In all areas, the mainstream/resource program group outshone the self-contained and mainstream groups (Trice et al. 1982 as discussed in Gottfredson 2001).

Programs that focus on grouping students have thus been found to be varied in effectiveness. STEP was initially found to be moderately effective in reducing truancy and dropouts in the Felner studies, but those findings were not replicated in the Reyes and Jayson study. Additionally, it is interesting to note that grouping students in the Dropout Prevention Program did not compare in effectiveness to mainstream students who had the benefit of additional resource services. Therefore, it appears that although grouping students into smaller units can be beneficial in reducing aspects of delinquency, these programs need to be implemented with caution, and incorporate other strategies for delinquency reduction. The extreme case of grouping students who share disruptive and/or delinquent characteristics is found in alternative schools; and
although there is not much research that looks at the effect of the composition of these schools, what is known is that the effects are generally neutral or negative (Sherman et al. 1997; Gottfredson 2001).

**Behavior Modification Programs**

Schools provide a location for socialization away from the family and community. However, somewhere in the process of socialization, school influence is superseded by outside deviant promoting influences. In this light, schools have been criticized for failing to properly socialize youth. In disadvantaged communities this problem is exacerbated by the view that the school should assume responsibility for many types of training that parents are unable to give their children due to inabilitys ranging from low parental involvement, family conflict, parental criminality, aggression within the family, parent-child separation, and emotional deprivation (Heilbrun et al. 2005; Hawkins et al. 2000; Loeber et al. 1998).

There have been a myriad of programs aimed towards elementary schools, middle schools and junior highs, which seek to help proper socialization begin at an early age (see: Tremblay et al. 1991, 1994; Grossman et al. 1997; Weissberg et al. 1981; Greenberg et al. 1995, 1996). However, programs intended to better properly socialize high school students are rather rare in nature. Evaluated programs that have been applied to high schools focus on fostering behavior modification through instructing, counseling and mentoring students. The *Moral Reasoning Development Program* is one
such intervention program, which has the goal of increasing moral reasoning
development in teenage students.

This program consists of small discussion groups which met weekly for sixteen
to twenty weeks, and is composed of students targeted as behaviorally disordered.
Discussion topics included problem solving skills, listening and communication skills,
and social competency skills; moral reasoning and perspective taking were the primary
goal to increase students “generation of alternatives, consideration of consequences,
choice, and action” (Gottfredson 2001:202). During intervention, the treatment groups’
moral reasoning’ improved significantly compared to the control group (measures of
increase are not specified). In addition, misconduct and delinquency, measured by
office referrals and police contacts, improved; however, teacher evaluations of student
behavior was unaffected by treatment. In addition, academic achievement in some areas
and tardiness (but not absenteeism) improved. One year later positive effects still
existed in all areas, but validity of these data were severely weakened due to participant
attrition, group convergence in some areas (specifically police contacts) as well as
missing data (Arbuthnot and Gordon 1986; Arbuthnot 1992; both as discussed in
Gottfredson 2001).

Peer group counseling programs have also gained popularity as intervention
programs for at-risk youth specifically, and are considered one of the most widely used
for all age groups (Gottfredson 1987, 2001; Lipsey & Wilson 1998; Brannon et al.
1989). Generally, these programs consist of an adult counseling facilitator and a group
of youth, who recognize and empathize with the problems relating to attitude, values, and behavior misconduct. The Peer Culture Development program is one such program which was implemented at all school levels. Intervention approaches include alteration of distorted self-images, and acceptance of responsibility. Results of every instituted program, at every level of school found these programs “lend no support to any claim of benefit of treatment, with the possible exception … for elementary school students”, and furthermore, “For the high school students, the effects appear predominantly harmful” (Gottfredson 1987b:708). In addition, most studies evaluated have been found to be methodologically flawed (Gottfredson 1997). Therefore, it appears that peer group counseling for at-risk youth actually appears to be more harmful than helpful, and can exacerbate delinquency issues through modeling and reinforcement of negative behaviors (Dishion et al. 1999).

These studies show that program content and design are of the utmost importance for programs intended to modify behavior. The measurable success achieved in the moral reasoning program can be attributed to an increased “rational component” to conformity (Hirschi 1969 as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:231). Furthermore, as control theory asserts, an increase in moral reasoning may allow for an amplified awareness and acceptance for conventional standards, and has the potential to increase youth’s bond to society (Hirschi 1969 as discussed in Agnew and Cullen 2003:232). However, as observed in peer counseling programs, grouping juvenile delinquents together can have adverse effects. Social learning theory explains how
delinquency may be learned through interaction with deviant sub-groups. In a setting where association with deviants outweigh association with conforming youth, motivation for being involved in delinquency increases (Akers as discussed in Agnew and Cullen 2003:142).

**Comprehensive Programs**

Programs which combine elements of behavior modification with altering school environments are designed to enhance both youth experiences and attitudes about engaging in delinquent activities. Major goals of these type of programs include involving staff, students and community participation in programming planning and implementation; creating school environments aimed at increasing academic performance and enhancing school climate; career oriented programs for students; and services designed specifically for high-risk youth (Catalano et al. 1999). Such programs are applauded for their simultaneous focus on improving school environment coupled with individual treatment.

The Positive Action through Holistic Education (PATHE) program is a comprehensive program that aimed to promote a sense of belonging to school through a combination of environmental and individual factor interventions, which in turn would decrease truancy, increase academic achievement, and decrease delinquency. This program was implemented at all levels of school and followed over the course of three years. However, due to attrition issues, findings for the high school level are based only on a one year follow up. Measures of delinquency and school conduct were obtained by
comparing reports of school punishments, suspensions, and drug involvement between control and comparison groups. Findings reported significant improvements in favor of the comparison group for school punishment and suspension, and moderate improvements for self-reported drug use. In addition, school attendance was significantly improved for the comparison group; however there was no significant difference for improvement of grades. Although there is a measurable reduction in delinquent behavior for the general student population, a target group of at-risk students showed no reductions in delinquent behavior and even showed increases in self-reported drug use over control students (Gottfredson 1986).

Student Training through Urban Strategies (STATUS) employed a “school within a school” initiative, which incorporated the use of grouping students, innovative teaching methods, classroom management techniques, and specialized curriculum including teaching a law-related program of study to students with the intent of reducing delinquency and drug use. The specialized curriculum included the coverage five functions of different institutions in society designed to properly socialize students; the school, the family, interpersonal relations, social contracts, and the criminal justice system. In addition, students in STATUS were grouped for only a part of the day, spending the rest of the day in mainstream classes. Two schools participated in STATUS, and due to self-referrals and school scheduling difficulties non-equivalent groups resulted. However, significant differences were reported for the comparison groups over the control groups. Findings reported delinquency, including drug use and
contact with law-enforcement were significantly reduced. Furthermore, several
delinquency promoting factors had changed in a positive direction, including academic
achievement and negative peer influence (Gottfredson 1990).

PATHE and STATUS both appear to have been successful in a number of
aspects, however, due to the multiplicity of tactics employed in these programs it is
impossible to separate what components were responsible for the positive outcomes;
likely it was the combination of tactics used which are responsible. Both of these
programs rational closely resemble social control theory, in that through increasing
awareness to institutional goals and involving youth in conventional activities which
promote conformity, youth are less likely to engage in delinquency and/or associate with
delinquent peers (Hirschi 1969; Agnew and Cullen 2003). However, that these
programs do include, at least to some extent, the tactic of grouping students, there is risk
for increased delinquency. This can be understood by looking towards social learning
theory, which views interaction with primary groups as most influential for engagement
in delinquency. Additionally, juveniles in small groups made up primarily of delinquent
peers may shy away from institutional goals because the delinquent peer group holds a
higher loyalty (Agnew and Cullen 2003).

**Juvenile Probation and Juvenile Justice Initiatives**

Juvenile Justice Initiatives have taken numerous forms, all with differing
opinions of the effectiveness of such initiatives. The goals of the office of Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention are best summarized by their mission statement:
The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and victimization. OJJDP supports states and communities in their efforts to develop and implement effective and coordinated prevention and intervention programs and to improve the juvenile justice system so that it protects public safety, holds offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services tailored to the needs of juveniles and their families.

Many ambitious programs have been instituted with these goals in mind, however end results often do not mirror initial program ideals; and when they do the results often are not accepted by society as a whole. This discrepancy is seen when considering how policy makers and the public view punishment of juvenile delinquency. When viewed from the perspective of a rehabilitative approach, punishment is not effective for juvenile offenders. In a study evaluating OJJDP’s national restitution program and involving 876 convicted juvenile delinquents, it was found that juveniles actually committed more crimes when they believed they were more likely to be caught (Schneider, 1990:109). It is important to recognize the differences between punishment and rehabilitation; in this same study, Schneider found victim restitution lowered recidivism, while probation did not. However, this study also found that incarceration also lowered recidivism when compared to probation alone. Therefore, this study provides support for proponents of the rehabilitation approach, as well as proponents for the punitive approach.

Advocates for the punitive approach believe if America ‘gets tough on crime’, the nation will in turn see a reduction in crime rates. There is plenty of evidence to support this statement, and numerous initiatives and programs have been born out of this
ideology. Below I will highlight some of the more popular initiatives and programs seen throughout juvenile courts and enforced by juvenile probation.

Scared Straight programs were invented in the 1970’s by a group of inmates at Rahway State Prison in New Jersey as a means of deterring youth from a life of crime by subjecting them to a type of shock therapy. The program brings students into the prison and imposes numerous forms of bullying, threats, and intimidation tactics to literally ‘scare’ them away from a life of crime. There have been numerous evaluations of Scared Straight programs, and although results are mixed, they generally yield negative results. For instance, in a meta-analysis of several Scared Straight programs, Lipsey found that youth who already had contact with law enforcement and were exposed to this program had an average increase in recidivism of about 12% (Lipsey 1992).

In 2001 the OJJDP published a bulletin on Juvenile Drug Courts, stating “the rigorous monitoring … treatment and rehabilitation requirements of juvenile drug court programs promote a greater likelihood of success in reducing drug and delinquent activity … (p.13).” However, this same bulletin also recognized that juvenile drug courts, being relatively new in practice, have yielded “no significant long-term results (p.13).” A central tenant of juvenile drug courts focuses on the idea that drug use will decrease if drug testing is increased. However, evidence from a study monitoring juvenile delinquents with different frequencies of drug testing found no reduction in arrests or improvement in overall success for groups testing more frequently.
Coincidentally, the groups with more frequent drug testing were found to do worse than their counterparts in terms of adherence to probation rules and regulations (Haapanen & Britton 2002).

Another initiative sanctioned by juvenile courts and monitored by juvenile probation is electric monitoring (EM). EM is designed primarily as a means of monitoring a juvenile’s adherence to curfew laws and other juvenile court and/or probation requirements; at its extreme it can be used as a form of house arrest. EM has grown in popularity within the law enforcement community over the last decade; however very little empirical research has been conducted to measure the effectiveness of EM on reducing recidivism. Additionally, research that has been conducted looks primarily at adult offenders, and yields unsupportive results, with the general consensus to be summarized as follows; “After more than 15 years of experience with electronic monitoring programs, their effectiveness as a true alternative to incarceration and reducing recidivism has yet to be demonstrated” (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta and Rooney, 2000:71).

However, the Juvenile Electric Monitoring project in New York does provide positive support for EM. In their study of EM with adjudicated youth, 58% of the youth successfully completed the terms of their program, with an average time spent of three to four months in the EM program. Evidence from this research also suggests that effectiveness of the actual electronic device should be considered when looking at overall efficacy of youth choosing to remain in the program; this is evidenced by their
finding that “64% of program failures chose to cut off their ankle bracelet, generally thought by program staff to be due to coping difficulties … this occurred on average after approximately two months in the EM program” (Harig 2002). Likewise, a study of an EM program in Lake County, Indiana, involving lower-risk status offenders found participants in the EM program had a higher program completion rate (90% vs. 26%) and a lower recidivism rate (17% vs. 26%) compared to the group not monitored electronically (Roy & Brown 1995).

More extreme attempts at correcting juvenile delinquency are executed by means of juvenile confinement, such as placing minors in juvenile detention or correction centers, boot camps, or other custodial facilities. Juvenile detention centers, or “juvenile halls,” are a primary form of short-term incarceration facilities and are not supposed to be a form of punishment, but rather a secure holding facility for juveniles awaiting court and/or other placement. Most of the residents found in these types of facilities are being held for status offenses and violations of probation; some however have committed serious and/or violent offenses. The Advisory Commission on Accreditation for Corrections has stated that placement of youth in juvenile detention facilities should not exceed 30 days; however, often time these facilities become a holding tank for adjudicated youth who for whatever reasons were unsuccessful at remaining in other holding facilities (Kratkoski & Kratcoski 2004:364). For instance, the OJJDP Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement found in 1997 that 28% of juveniles awaiting adjudication were detained for at least 30 days, 14% remained after 60 days, and 10%
were still detained after 90 days. Likewise, 48% of adjudicated youth awaiting placement elsewhere were detained for at least 30 days, 25% for 60 days, and 15% for 90 plus days (referenced in Kratcoski & Kratcoski 2004:364).

Boot camps are a good example of a long-term incarceration facility. Boot camps were designed to imitate the physically and emotionally challenging ‘armed service’ boot camps, and are generally reserved for older adolescents convicted of nonviolent crimes. Despite the popularity of these “tough love” programs, boot camps have been found to be ineffective in terms of reducing subsequent recidivism, and have high tendencies to impart psychological, emotional, and physical abuse to youth who tackle them (Wilson et al. 2005; Mackenzie et al. 2001).

In 1991 the OJJDP conducted a longitudinal study examining three newly constructed boot camps, all of which ran a military like program encompassing rehabilitative components such as counseling, academic instruction, and drug and alcohol treatment. The program was three months in duration with a 6 to 9 month aftercare component for all three boot camps, and held mostly nonviolent, nonhabitual offenders. The initial evaluation found the following: “What appeared to be a promising prognosis at the conclusion of the boot camp disintegrated during aftercare. All three programs were plagued by high attrition rates for noncompliance, absenteeism, and new arrests during the aftercare period. No other indicators of progress were observed during this phase that would help pinpoint where the problems lay (Bourque et al. 1996: 111).” A follow-up evaluation at the same three boot camps 2 ½ years later found that
none of them had appeared to reduce recidivism; one camp actually reported higher recidivism rates than those found in traditional correctional facilities (Bourque et al. 1996).

In general, numerous studies have found incarceration to not be effective at reducing recidivism, and in many instances can result in adverse effects; for instance, in 1992 Lipsey found punishment based programs resulted in up to a 25% increase in recidivism (Lipsey 1992; Lipsey & Cullen 2007). Furthermore, some research has found incarceration in juvenile correction facilities to be as harmful as adult facilities; in 1999 Gottfredson found youth incarcerated in juvenile facilities had a re-arrested rate of 93%, compared to 81% for adults sent to jail, and 81% for adults sent to prison (Gottfredson 1999). Furthermore, it is widely understood that incarceration imparts an array of negative emotional and psychological effects onto youth, and can subject them to various forms of physical and sexual aggression and assault as well. A focus on punishment or control opposed to rehabilitation is often the most important consideration when in determining the ineffectiveness of these facilities; a more appropriate solution would be to reserve incarceration for the most threatening perpetrators and spend more time, effort and capital on developing programs which focus on rehabilitation for the majority of juvenile delinquents.

In 2001 it was estimated that over one hundred thousand juveniles were incarcerated in the United States (Austin et al. 2001). It is with this understanding in mind that I have decided to evaluate the JJIP. The basic theoretical premise for this
program lays in the assertion that intensive supervision, structure, and support will provide the scaffolding necessary for at-risk and/or delinquent youth to realize their maximum potential and shy away from deviance. Evaluating this program through the lenses of control theory and social learning theory will allow for a determination of what social pull is greater for the juvenile delinquent; the push to conform to rules and regulations or the pull to conform to peers.

Furthermore, previously evaluated programs have been riddled with methodological problems, and overwhelmingly found to be poorly implemented, leaving very few studies available to consider as empirically sound and valid. Thus, there stands a need for programs of this nature to be evaluated with a rigorous method to determine whether such programs are effective due to program structure or implementation, or if program success or failure is a methodological fluke. Only then can state and national agencies know how to best allocate limited funds to intervention programs that will be most beneficial at reducing delinquency and promoting successful futures.
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METHODOLOGY AND DEMOGRAPHICS

Methods

The following chapter provides an in-depth overview of the methodology used throughout the research project. Initially there is a discussion of the Juvenile Justice Intervention Program. Then, techniques employed for gathering data are discussed; followed by a detailed discussion of the variables being analyzed. Finally, the statistical analysis method employed is rationalized, along with an explanation of operational definitions.

The purpose of this study is to determine to what degree the JJIP is serving high-risk first time offenders, and whether or not these services are reducing recidivism of future crimes and drug and alcohol abuse. Variables used to measure delinquent behavior will be arrest resulting in referral to probation, most serious probation violation and/or arrest, type of probation violation and/or arrest, suspension or expulsion from school, and drug and alcohol use. Using a quasi-experimental design, a pre-test/post-test will be employed to compare the treatment group of students against the comparison group of students, all of whom met the criteria for being included in this program prior to program implementation (criteria for inclusion are discussed in detail below).

The JJIP is funded by the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA), a state-wide program which supports community-based intervention efforts which have proven effective in reducing crime and delinquency among at-risk youth and young
offenders. A pre-requisite for any agency requesting funding from JJCPA is a description of programs goals, youth who will be served, services they will receive, and a description of the basis upon which the program will demonstrate to reduce juvenile crime and/or delinquency. The JJIP’s original application for funding gave an explanation for these pre-requisites; a summary follows.

The general focus of the JJIP was to provide intensive supervision and case management services to at-risk high school minors, using a multi-agency, multi-program approach, in an effort to reduce arrest rate, referral to probation, probation violation, and drug and alcohol use. This was expected to be accomplished by subjecting minors to frequent school and multi-agency contacts, engaging minors in various community programs, and having probation officers contact minors via phone and/or in person on nights and weekends. Additionally, the caseload per probation officer was limited to an average of 20 minors opposed to the standard average of 60 to 80 minors. Every minor in the program had an individual ‘case plan’, which was developed by major parties involved in the minors program, including the minor, parents, probation, school personnel, and a mental health professional. The case plan is designed in such a way as to target the individual needs of the minor and parents, and often include referrals to drug and alcohol programs, anger management programs, counseling, and recreational programs (see appendix A for full list of program referrals). Occasionally parents were required to participate in various programs as well, such as drug and alcohol programs, parenting classes, and job training programs.
After case plans were constructed, contracts including personal goals were drawn up to ensure compliance by both the minor and parent(s). Minors received certificates of completion, which could be turned in for rewards upon completing their goals. Likewise, failure to complete goals often lead to revision of the case plan and/or sanctions, such as having to do community service or participate in a weekend work program. The goal of these interventions is that recidivism would be reduced. Thus, the main hypothesis for this study is that students placed in the treatment group, and therefore received intensive supervision and wrap-around services, will have lower recidivism rates than students placed in the comparison group.

The basis upon which the original program was to demonstrate a reduction in juvenile crime and/or delinquency was multi-faceted, and encompasses numerous assessments. In order to determine current level of risk and need for service prior to acceptance, minors were assessed using the Juvenile Risk and Juvenile Needs Assessment tool. This assessment filters out minors whose assessment scores indicate a likelihood that increased supervision and wrap-around services would provide no meaningful benefit to the minor. After acceptance into the study, all minors were further assessed using the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment (CAFAS), the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), and the Youth Self Report (YSR). The CAFAS measures the level of impairment and functional status relating to emotional, behavioral, and/or substance abuse symptoms, and is completed by a Mental Health worker. The CBCL is completed by either the minor’s parent or guardian, and is designed to report
the minor’s problems as perceived by the parent or guardian. Lastly, the YSR is a self-assessment completed by the minor, and is designed to obtain a report of the minor’s self-perceived problems. After completion of all the above assessments, minors were randomly placed in either the treatment or comparison group; all minors in both groups were then re-assessed using these same assessments every six months until their successfully completed or unsuccessful termination from the study. After each re-assessment, the control group outcomes for the variables listed above were compared to the reference group outcomes using SPSS to find the statistical difference between the two groups. I used only the variables from the original study that directly pertain to this study (see variables below).

For the purposes of this study, in order to determine whether or not the JJIP made significant differences in the reduction of recidivism in the measures listed below, a pre-test/post-test comparing the treatment group to the control group will be employed. The total sample size includes 314 students; of this, 153 students were in the treatment group and 161 students were in the comparison group. Both groups were comparable in age, gender, ethnicity, and probation status. Recidivism measures for both groups will be compared using standard t-tests, and will compare the following variables at three follow up intervals:

- Drug problem

Note: the variables being assessed in this study are just a few of many used in the original study. See appendix B for a complete list of variables.
• Alcohol problem
• Expulsions/ suspensions during program
• Number of arrests resulting in referral to probation
• Most serious arrest resulting in referral to probation
  o felony, misdemeanor, violation of probation, incorrigibility/truancy
• Type of arrest resulting in referral to probation
  o Violent offense, property offense, drug offense, other misdemeanor offenses, other felony offenses, violation of probation offense.

As discussed in the previous section, this program is being look at through the lenses of social learning theory and control theory to determine if peer-pressure to conform to deviant norms outweighs forces of social control to conform to societal norms, or if these competing forces cancel both theories out. To determine which theory best describes the outcomes of the JJIP, control theory will be attributed to positive correlations of program effectiveness for all variables, and social learning theory will be attributed to negative correlations of program ineffectiveness for all variables.

As found in the previous section, few juvenile delinquency intervention programs have been found to be empirically valid due to reasons ranging from participant attrition to changing techniques for gathering and presenting data. It is with this understanding that the methodology for this study arouse. By re-structuring the data provided to account for and correct methodological errors, an in-depth analysis that
provides valid statistical analysis of this program is possible. Then we can see whether or not delinquency intervention programs using techniques employed by the JJIP really does work.

**Demographics**

The analyses in this study are based on three waves of data compiled by a northern California County, and statistics are derived from pre and post program responses. There were a total of 314 students participating in the original study, and of whom data were collected from. Of this, 153 students were in the treatment group and 161 students were in the comparison group. Student demographics consisted of the following: 235 participants from both groups were male; 68% of males were in the treatment group and 81% of males were in the comparison group. Likewise, 79 participants from both groups were female; 32% of females were in the treatment group and 19% of females were in the comparison group. Ages ranged from 16 to 18 years old. Participant ethnicities consist of 76.6% White, 18.4% Hispanic, 2.3% American Indian, 1.3% Black, .6% Asian, .3% Filipino, .3% Pacific Islander, and 1.6% ‘other’
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STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Following are the statistical analysis of the aforementioned variables of interest to this study. Independent sample t-tests are employed to assess whether or not there are statistically significant differences between the treatment and comparison group in areas of drug and alcohol use, truancy issues, and arrest data.

Table #1: Alcohol Problem Prior to Program Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of self-reportedly having a drinking problem prior to program participation.

Table #2: Alcohol Problem at End of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>$P &gt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison group in terms of self-reportedly having a drinking problem at the end of the
program follow up. However, it does appear as though the treatment group did have a slight decrease in self-reportedly having an alcohol problem at the end of the program.

Table #3: Drug Problem Prior to Program Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of self-reportedly having a drug problem prior to program participation.

Table #4: Drug Problem at End of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison group in terms of self-reportedly having a drug problem at the end of the program follow up. However, it does appear as though the treatment group did have a slight decrease in self-reportedly having a drug problem at the end of the program.
There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of having been suspended and/or expelled from high school during the year precipitating program participation.

Table #6: School Suspensions &/or Expulsions During Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>P &gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #7: Number of Arrests During First Stage of Program Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of the number of arrests occurring during the first stage of program participation: the treatment group had fewer arrests than the comparison group did.

Table #8: Number of Arrests at End of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>P&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>P&gt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison group in terms of the number of arrests occurring at the end of program participation. However, it does appear as though both groups had significant decreases in arrests.
Table #9: Most Serious Arrest during First Stage of Program Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of most serious arrest occurring during the first stage of program participation. While the treatment group participants were more likely to be arrested for reasons of “incorrigibility”, otherwise known as status offenses, such as disobeying curfew laws, truancy, and possession of alcohol or tobacco, the comparison group participants were more likely to be arrested for “violation of probation.”

Table #10: Most Serious Arrest at End of Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>P&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a statistically significant difference between the treatment and comparison groups in terms of most serious arrest occurring during the first stage of program participation. The treatment group participants were more likely to be arrested for reasons of “incorrigibility”, but are significantly closer to the category of “does not apply”, meaning respondents were not arrested during this period. The comparison group
was also more likely to be arrested for reason of “incorrigibility”; however this group is not significantly closer to the category of “does not apply”, meaning these arrests were less likely to result in charges being filed against the perpetrator.
Chapter 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

As previously stated, control theory doesn’t ask why people do commit crimes, they ask why people don’t commit crimes, and they look to the absence or presence of control to answer this question. Learning theory on the other hand looks at crime as a social process, and further asserts that through interaction with others “we learn techniques of committing crime and definitions favorable and unfavorable toward violation of the law” (Sutherland as quoted in Agnew and Cullen 2003:125). A goal of this thesis is to identify which theory best explains the success or failure of the Juvenile Justice Intervention Program. However, the data above does not support this program as being effective for most variables considered, in that the treatment and comparison group outcomes were not statistically significant. Therefore, I will look at the outcomes for each variable through both theoretical lenses in order to explore the causes for such close findings.

The differences between self reported problems with drug and/or alcohol use were not significant between the treatment and comparison group, nor were the differences very significant within groups from pre to post program. Control theory postulates that theoretically there should be a reduction in drug and alcohol use, as the minors in both groups were being supervised by probation at the very least. Furthermore, the treatment group had access to drug and alcohol counseling and treatment in some cases. So why
then were the differences between the two groups not all that significant? As Travis Hisrchi postulated, deviant acts occur because people’s social bond to societal norms have been broken, i.e. their attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief in the status quo are fractured. This understanding helps to see why study participants may view drug and alcohol use as ‘not such a big deal.’ But the fact that the treatment group was surrounded with seemingly positive role models reinforcing appropriate societal norms and values, and these youth still had no significant change in attitude towards drug and/or alcohol use, means something else is likely responsible.

Social learning theory can also help to explain why neither the treatment nor comparison group had significant differences in perceptions about drug and/or alcohol use. One option is to look at the youths primary groups; who are these kids hanging out with? Who has the greatest influence on what attitudes and behaviors these kids adopt? If they have friends who continue to use drugs and/or alcohol, then these friends also act as models to study participants, reinforcing using drug and/or alcohol as something acceptable and not ‘problematic.’ The process of differential association creates a pattern for youths to act according too, and this process vacillates between definitions favorable and unfavorable toward the law, depending on what social forces are exacting more influence. The fact that the treatment group had a minimal yet slight increase in awareness of the problematic effects drugs and/or alcohol play in their lives could be attributed to the various social forces involved in their case plans. However, if these particular kids have friends and family supporting a more deviant lifestyle, probation
alone and/or probation along with a myriad of additional services may not be able to counter the effects from these primary groups.

Suspensions and/or expulsions from school dropped significantly for both the treatment and comparison group. This is an area where control theory does a good example of how beneficial any amount of increased supervision and accountability can be. Interestingly enough however, it doesn’t appear that the additional amount of supervision granted to the treatment group was any more effective at reducing suspensions and expulsions than was traditional probation supervision. This could possibly be due to the fact that once on probation, a status offense can equate to spending some time locked up in juvenile hall, whether in the treatment or control group. This fact alone could be the reason both group’s scores dropped so significantly. This is also a good area to look at when developing policy for juvenile delinquency intervention and prevention programs. Knowing there is not a big difference between intensive and moderate supervision from probation could allow more funding to stream toward other agencies involved in these youth’s treatment plans and allow probation departments to be more effective in monitoring other populations.

During the first phase of the program the treatment group had a lower incident of arrest than did the comparison group. Control theorists could explain this as being due to the fact that the treatment group was provided with wrap-around services from various social agents, all with the aim of promoting conformity to the rules of society in one way or another. The comparison group, on the other hand, were being supervised by
probation only, and supervision was much less efficacious than the comparison group in that the case load for this group ranged from 60 to 80 youth versus 20 youth for officers supervising the comparison group. Social learning theory might postulate that youth in the treatment group, being flash flooded with new role models all modeling appropriate social norms, might initially respond positively to something different and socially acceptable, something they have not experienced from their standard role models, such as their family and friends. On the other hand, the comparison group was not subjected to other types of social conditioning, and was therefore left to continue learning primarily from the same social agents that conditioned them to be deviant in the first place.

The number of arrests for the two groups at the programs end dropped significantly, and most likely for similar reasons as did the number of suspensions and/or expulsions. Once on probation, the chances of going to juvenile hall for any offense is much more likely than if you’re not on probation, and the period of incarceration is often much longer. Prior to being placed on probation a youth is likely to spent a few days in juvenile hall before going before a judge and likely being released. However, if you violate probation you are likely to spend a standard 30 days incarcerated. Additionally, a result of spending more time incarcerated if arrested on a violation of probation (VOP) reduces the opportunity to be arrested again, as you cannot get arrested if you are already incarcerated. Therefore, in the assumption that probation is monitoring delinquent behavior in an effort to control delinquent behavior, it appears that control theory does a
good job at explaining why the two groups have much lower occurrences of arrests, but not significant differences from each other.

The outcomes were significantly different between the treatment and comparison group for the variable looking at most serious offense during arrest; however it is hard to compare these differences. Unfortunately this has to do with study design, in that the categories of “incorrigibility” and “violation of probation” are overlapping, and this study did not have access to differentiate exactly what arrests were placed into which categories. However, traditionally incorrigibility offenses include status offenses that are not considered illegal for adults, such as truancy, running away, drinking alcohol and smoking cigarettes. Depending on the terms of probation, any of these offenses could be considered a VOP. Nonetheless, there is one specific difference between these categories in that certain offenses, such as being under the influence of illegal substances, are only considered a VOP. Additionally, there are many VOP’s that are also considered misdemeanors or felonies, and neither group had scores closest two either of these categories. Therefore, if we assume the primary difference is whether or not minors were arrested for status offenses or for being under the influence of illegal substances, then we can say the comparison group was slightly more likely to be arrested for being under the influence of illegal substances. This is just an assumption; the follow up period shows a more clear comparison between the two groups.

At the program’s end, participants in the treatment and comparison group were all more likely to be arrested for incorrigibility than any worse offense; however more
treatment group participants had a mean score closer to “does not apply” than incorrigibility, meaning more treatment group participants were either not arrested, or arrested for charges that were not serious enough to result in additional legal action. When looking at this finding through the lens of control theory we could conclude that closer supervision truncated the likelihood of engaging in delinquent acts. Additionally, these youth had the benefit of continuing to learn appropriate and socially acceptable models for engaging in society from numerous other social agents. However, this finding could also be explained from a social learning theory perspective, in that the youth in the comparison group, not having the distraction of agents modeling social restraint, continued to view the delinquent lifestyle as an acceptable one, but also learned how to fly under the radar as to avoid additional sanctions.

Through the process of looking at all variables through both social control and social learning theory, I feel it is hard to attribute either theory to any measure of success in its entirety. The fact is both theories can to an extent provide explanation for the outcomes. What I find more interesting to consider at this point is why the two groups were so close in their outcomes, with many variables not even statistically significant. Furthermore, how can these findings inform how policy makers and local officials plan and implement juvenile delinquency intervention and prevention programs in the future.

On the one hand, it seems that having smaller probation case loads and closer and more intense supervision may not have the added benefit of reducing drug and/or alcohol problems for the treatment group. If this is the case, then perhaps youth being charged
with these types of charges should be placed on informal traditional probation and offered drug and alcohol treatment and/or counseling. On the other hand, it is possible that the additional services offered to the treatment group along with the closer probation supervision did influence this group to abstain from engaging in delinquent activity during the final follow up. So what theory best supports this finding? Above I considered control theory as being responsible; however, if these youth are exposed to a surplus of definitions unfavorable toward violation of the law, opposed to definitions favorable toward law violation, then learning theory can also explain why treatment group participants were less likely to be arrested for charges that would result in further legal action, or even arrested at all.

**Conclusion**

In closing, through the use of sound methodology we find that with few exceptions, there are not significant differences between the treatment and comparison group for the reduction of ‘self-reported problems with drug and/or alcohol use’; there were not significant differences between the two groups for ‘suspension or expulsion’, but both groups had significant reductions in these areas; there were not significant differences between the two groups for ‘arrests’, but both groups did have significant reductions in arrests; and there were not significant differences between the two groups for ‘type of arrests’, with the exception that the treatment group were less likely to have arrests result in charges being filed against them. What this study does not show
however, is whether or not the myriad of services afforded to the treatment group had latent effects that may have helped to curtail future criminality in the treatment group.

This thesis began with the quote, “Schools may prevent delinquency if they successfully socialize people to fit into the society, yet the schools cause delinquency in those who reject that socialization” (Liazos 1978:368). I would conceive at this point and time that society may prevent delinquency if they successfully socialize people to fit into society, yet society will cause delinquency if it continues to diminish services responsible for such socialization.

Legal decisions and national policies implemented since the Progressive Era were intended to reduce juvenile delinquency, and in many aspects the collective result of these initiatives did just that. During the nineties, the economy underwent significant economic growth; inflation rates were low as were unemployment rates. These factors certainly provided a cushion for all levels of government and the non-profit sector to allocate resources toward the creation of intervention and prevention programs and policies. Subsequently, in 2002 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention released a statement that crime rates had fallen across most of the key categories listed over the last 10 years. This is undoubtedly due to the myriad of intervention and prevention programs and efforts reviewed in this study and elsewhere. However, in an era where school budgets are being slashed, teachers, mental health workers, and probation officers laid off, and various other important programs loosing funding, how can we expect this trend to continue?
I fear in light of our current fiscal crisis, which is crippling the societal structures in charge of properly socializing America’s youth, the aforementioned trend will start to reverse. Signs of such a reversal are already beginning to show; currently the White House Budget is proposing $50 million in cuts to Juvenile Justice Programs across the nation. What’s worse, if Republican proposals are passed, America is looking at a cut in all funding to numerous juvenile intervention and prevention programs, as well as other numerous programs designed for the betterment of our youth, including grants for incarcerated youth, teen pregnancy prevention, AmeriCorps, and many others (Lewis 2011). To the extent that the program under study or any other collaborative program produces positive effects in the reduction of juvenile crime and delinquency, they will surely be lost if we continue allowing policies to dictate the future of juvenile justice, of which the success or failure have been empirically found to be most effective when exercised in a collaborative fashion, incorporating all structures appointed with the role of properly socializing America’s youth.
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