

Juvenile Delinquency
Its Prevention
and Control

*Stanton Wheeler and
Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.*

With the assistance of

Anne Romasco

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION, 1966

Juvenile Delinquency
Its Prevention
and Control

Juvenile Delinquency Its Prevention and Control

*Stanton Wheeler and
Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr.*

With the assistance of

Anne Romasco

Prepared at the request of HONORABLE JOHN W.
GARDNER, *Secretary*, United States Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare.

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION
NEW YORK 1966

PUBLICATIONS OF RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

Russell Sage Foundation was established in 1907 by Mrs. Russell Sage for the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States. In carrying out its purpose the Foundation conducts research under the direction of members of the staff or in close collaboration with other institutions, and supports programs designed to develop and demonstrate productive working relations between social scientists and other professional groups. As an integral part of its operations, the Foundation from time to time publishes books or pamphlets resulting from these activities. Publication under the imprint of the Foundation does not necessarily imply agreement by the Foundation, its Trustees, or its staff with the interpretations or conclusions of the authors.

© 1966

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

Printed in the
United States of America

CONNECTICUT PRINTERS, INC.
HARTFORD, CONN.

Designer: Asher Applegate

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
The Problem in Perspective	1
Delinquency Prevention: Analysis of Current Programs	5
Delinquency Prevention: Areas for Further Development	11
The Labeling Process	22
Juvenile Justice: The Police and the Juvenile Court	28
Rehabilitation and Correctional Efforts	37
Research	43
Personnel Training and Development	47
The Organization of Delinquency Prevention and Control	50
Summary	51
Consultants	54

Acknowledgments

THIS REPORT provides a brief overview of major problems, issues, and developments in the field of juvenile delinquency in the United States. It was written at the request of the Honorable John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who asked us to provide a review of the field of delinquency which might be useful to the Department in its planning. The report was prepared in consultation with a variety of specialists in the fields of delinquency and youth crime. Some of these advisers have been actively involved in the practical problems of delinquency adjudication and control; others have approached the problem from a more academic point of view. Some of our contacts were brief telephone conversations, others lengthy interviews, and in some cases we received special written materials. We appreciate their help.

A list of the persons who gave us the benefit of their thoughts and ideas appears at the end of this report. They, of course, cannot be held responsible for the way we have used or reorganized their contributions. The published references that were most helpful in the development of specific sections are cited in the footnotes, but we have not tried to cite in each case the individual sources for much of the interview material. We were particularly fortunate in having access to some of the reports being prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and we wish to thank Dr. Lloyd E. Ohlin for his help in that connection.

The Problem in Perspective

DELINQUENCY is currently regarded as a critical domestic social problem, one that urgently requires immediate social action. Yet any clear understanding of the significance of delinquency in American life and of our general potential for programs of prevention and control requires that the problem first be viewed in its broader outlines.

Delinquency is not a new problem in American society. There has been a heightened public concern about its control in recent years, and perhaps some actual increase in the rate of delinquency.* The particular forms and varieties of delinquency may indeed change with historical circumstances, but there were violent street gangs in our nineteenth-century cities and reports of mounting rates of delinquency at the turn of the twentieth century.

Delinquency is found, in varying degrees of magnitude and quality, in all modern nations and particularly in those that are urban and highly industrialized. Stockholm, London, Tokyo, and Paris have related problems. Indeed, delinquency is not merely an American phenomenon but appears to be an intrinsic part of modern industrial urban life.

The particular form of delinquency in any society is related in fundamental ways to other characteristics of that society. A society that places a high premium on freedom over order, that prizes material success, and that encourages mobility aspirations is not likely to be able to contain all its members within a conventional mold. Delinquency is one way to break that mold. Short of a major change in values, such as a return to a more traditional, pre-industrial way of life, members of our society may have to tolerate a fairly high amount of nonconformity among youth.

* Problems in the use of official delinquency rates require great caution in making claims about changes over time and place. These problems are not reviewed at length in this report, but some of them are dealt with in the section on research. We are indebted to Bernard Cohen of the University of Pennsylvania for a detailed review and critique of delinquency statistics and we have drawn from it at various points throughout the report. We are also indebted to the Children's Bureau and to Richard Perlman for an analysis of the trends and problems in juvenile delinquency statistics at the national level.

These considerations should serve to caution against an assumption that delinquency can be wiped out by one or another crash program, while leaving all else in society unchanged. Its historic roots, its familiar occurrence in urban societies, and its particular relation to the American value system suggest that we are dealing with a chronic problem which is unlikely to yield easily to preventive efforts.

But this is simply a call for realistic planning, and not a fatalistic counsel of despair. Within the limits imposed by these considerations, it is critically important to devote resources of the society to the prevention and control of delinquency.

The most salient facts are that over half of all arrests for burglary and larceny, and almost two-thirds of the arrests for auto theft, are of persons under the age of eighteen. While juveniles predominate in these forms of offense against property, they are also involved to an increasing degree in aggravated assault. Thus any program that will reduce the direct and indirect costs and losses from such offenses will have to be directed toward the young if any substantial effect is to be achieved.

Furthermore, and within the limits imposed by official delinquency statistics, it seems clear that the delinquency problem touches a large segment of the adolescent population. During any given year, approximately two per cent of children ten through eighteen are likely to appear in juvenile court. This is not a large figure, but it gets much larger when we examine the proportion of all persons who reach their eighteenth birthday with at least one appearance in juvenile court on their record. The best estimate for the nation as a whole is about ten per cent, and for boys alone about seventeen per cent. This means that roughly one out of six boys may appear in court at some time during his adolescence. In the "high delinquency rate" areas within our largest cities well over half of all boys appear in court at least once.*

Thus in addition to the direct loss to victims of the offenses, there is the indirect loss to society of careers spent in delinquent and criminal activity that might have been more productively spent in other ways. Delinquency is important precisely because it is a problem of youth. Although most who engage in delinquency do not become adult criminals, many systematic ca-

* Monahan, Thomas P., "On the Incidence of Delinquency," *Social Forces*, vol. 39, October, 1960, pp. 66-72; Savitz, Leonard, "Delinquency and Migration," in Wolfgang, Marvin E., Leonard Savitz and Norman Johnston, editors, *The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency*, John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 199-205; Ball, John C., "Incidence and Estimated Prevalence of Recorded Delinquency in a Metropolitan Area," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 29, February, 1964, pp. 91-93.

reers in crime apparently have their beginnings in the delinquency of adolescence. Even moderately successful efforts to prevent or control delinquency should be of real value to the society.

But do we know enough about delinquency to specify the ways in which even a moderate reduction could be brought about? In terms of verified knowledge, the answer must be an unqualified no. There is, of course, a vast body of literature reporting numerous research findings, and suggesting a variety of plausible theories of delinquency causation and control. But when experiments have been conducted, the results have not been encouraging. Indeed, as of now, there are no demonstrable and proven methods for reducing the incidence of serious delinquent acts through preventive or rehabilitative procedures. Either the descriptive knowledge has not been translated into feasible action programs, or the programs have not been successfully implemented; or if implemented, they have lacked evaluation; or if evaluated, the results have usually been negative; and in the few cases of reported positive results, replications have been lacking.

At the same time, there are systematic and plausible sets of ideas about delinquency that find at least partial support and that may be converted into systematic action strategies. These ideas deserve careful development and refinement, for in the absence of hard evidence they remain our best guide to action, and it sometimes takes years of planning and effort before programs can be successfully launched.

Thus the urgency of the problem suggests the need for action, while the state of our current knowledge and the integral relation of delinquency to American life indicate that progress may come slowly. It is therefore necessary at the outset to begin thinking about delinquency prevention and control in long-range terms, and to plan on an enlarged commitment of time, funds, and other resources if the problem is to be treated seriously. The model is that of the progressive but at times painfully slow development of knowledge, rather than that of quick and easy eradication of the problem.

Three problems need to be kept in mind as we discuss substantive issues in delinquency. These include the vagueness of the concept of delinquency, the different conceptions of it held by various authorities, and the balance between preventive and corrective efforts.

Delinquency is a vague and slippery concept indeed. Acts that may serve to get a juvenile labeled delinquent are enormously varied. Many of our difficulties at all stages of prevention, adjudication, and correction are rooted in the tremendous variety of acts that may at different times and places be defined as delinquent. The following, for example, were all causes for official police contacts with juveniles in a major East Coast city in recent months: selling flowers without a permit, possession of an air rifle, loitering,

neglect of minor children, breaking and entry, assault and battery, and armed robbery. Moreover, activity regarded in one area as "normal" will be regarded as delinquent in another area even in the same jurisdiction. It follows that discussions of delinquency are likely to be plagued by definitional problems.

Second, some authorities limit their usage of the concept of the delinquent to those who have engaged in actual legal infractions. Others conceive of delinquency as synonymous with problem youth. This difference is typically reflected in programs advocated, for some think of delinquency prevention as being directly oriented to the inhibition of specific delinquent acts, whereas others tend to urge action directed toward facilitating healthy personality development and other more general goals. Most action programs can be arranged along a continuum from one of these positions to the other, and, while they are not mutually exclusive, there are obviously very important differences in emphasis between them.

A third problem is posed by the division between programs for the prevention of delinquency and those for the correction and rehabilitation of delinquents. The correctional programs operate only after the fact. On the assumption that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, many workers place a lower value on correctional efforts and favor programs that begin prior to the youth's involvement in delinquency. But correctional programs have the merit of providing a clearly defined population as the target of remedial efforts, whereas prevention programs find it less easy to specify the appropriate target or to maintain a clear focus of effort. It would be fruitless, of course, to try to deal with this problem as a simple dichotomy. Nevertheless, the two orientations and approaches pose significant questions of policy as to the appropriate allocation of resources.

Delinquency Prevention: Analysis of Current Programs

THERE WAS NO major federal effort directed toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency until passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. Many action programs have been supported in local communities, and occasionally there has been sustained support by private philanthropy, but the efforts have been spasmodic. An occasional program has been sustained for some period of time, and a few of these have been evaluated, at least in part. But there have been very few preventive efforts that were based on any systematic theory of delinquency, and very little evaluation of their success or failure.

Most of the programs could be classified very simply into one of two broad categories. On the one hand, there were programs directed toward changing the feelings, attitudes, and eventually the reactions of individual delinquents or pre-delinquents. These programs were based on a theory that emphasized the emotional problems of individual children, allegedly resulting primarily from pathological elements in family relationships. The earliest clinics that directed attention to delinquents derived their theoretical support from individual psychology, and later from psychoanalytic or other psychiatric views. They worked primarily on the pathology of the individual in treating delinquency. The other major category of programs emphasized socio-genic theories of delinquency causation. These theories stress the broader social environment as a source of delinquent behavior and concentrate on the need for changing the nature of that environment in order to control delinquency. The setting for these programs is the streets and neighborhoods of slum communities rather than the confines of medical and psychological clinics. Many of these programs were first developed in Chicago, where they received theoretical support and backing from the social sciences at the University of Chicago.*

* Detailed treatment of the theories of delinquency causation can be found in many standard texts. A good review is found in Martin, John M., and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick,

Although much more could be said about earlier work on theories of delinquency causation and programs of prevention, it seems appropriate to begin our discussion of delinquency prevention by analyzing the programs supported under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and the conceptions on which they were based. That Act established funds for support of planning and demonstration projects in delinquency prevention in a number of our largest urban centers. It also provided funds for training in the skills relevant for preventive and correctional activities.

The basic position taken by the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime was that juvenile delinquency and youth crime are two of many symptoms that emerge from the community's failure to provide the conditions, services, and experiences that enable a person to participate competently in American life. The weight of the findings of systematic research as well as the operating experience of the educational, welfare, political, and economic institutions clearly pointed to the inner areas of the great cities as the settings in which the burden of failure fell most heavily. The impact of this failure was most acutely felt by the young people in these areas.

With this general orientation, it is not surprising that the Committee directed its efforts, on the one hand, toward demonstration programs aimed at increasing the capability of the community and its component institutions to provide the services and conditions needed by its youth if they were to gain the required competence; and, on the other, to aid the people of the demonstration areas in making effective use of the programs undertaken. A significant element in these comprehensive programs was the attempt to involve the people themselves in the process of increasing and improving the capabilities of the community.

Specific programs directed toward delinquents were included in the comprehensive programs but were not a central focus. As a community became more competent to function as such, it was assumed it would cope more effectively with all its problems—including the problem of delinquency.

The situations clearly seemed to require a coordinated, concentrated, and comprehensive approach. Since delinquency was so closely tied to the other social problems that beset the residents of these areas, it could not be

Delinquent Behavior, Random House, New York, 1965. A classic psychogenic treatment is Healy, William, and Augusta F. Bronner, *New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1936. Sociogenic views are reviewed in Short, James F., Jr., "Juvenile Delinquency: The Sociocultural Context," in Hoffman, Lois W., and Martin L. Hoffman, editors, *Review of Child Development Research*, vol. 2, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1966, in press.

conquered without attempts at solving these other problems as well. Any possible solution would require a coordination of social agencies and programs. In many communities, therefore, new agencies were set up to administer funds. Private and public agencies that had competed with one another in the project areas were drawn together.

The specific focus of the programs supported by the President's Committee fell into three chief areas: employment opportunities, educational services, and community organization. There were, first, many programs aimed at integrating the youthful members of these communities into the occupational structure. There were employment plans for school dropouts, special programs for those who needed to learn more basic skills before they could hold a job, the development of special training mechanisms such as programmed learning, group counseling, occasional arrangements with industry to develop new job training programs, special work crews organized at the neighborhood level, and other related employment services. All these recognized the significance of work skills and employment as a basic element in social competence and integration into the community, and they were designed to test the feasibility of upgrading this large, relatively unskilled population to stable employment.

Second, many of the projects were designed to develop new educational services adapted to the special needs of youth in slum areas. These young people were often below average in their educational skills, and the school programs were frequently unsuited to rehabilitating and improving their learning potential. Community resources were developed to stimulate vocational aspirations among the students and to win family support for school programs. Special work-study schedules were developed for potential dropouts, and neighborhood centers offered adult education, tutoring, reading clinics, and counseling. Thus education and employment became important features of the delinquency-prevention effort.

Third, there was a variety of programs that stressed neighborhood and community organization. Underlying these programs was the belief that members of these urban subcommunities were often disinterested in community problems because they had lost confidence in their own ability to deal with them and because they felt powerless in the face of other forces in the community. Such apathy and alienation could well provide a breeding ground for delinquency. It meant that the community had little capacity for collective action in coping with its problems and the way in which they impinged upon youth. Thus programs in neighborhood and community organization were developed as a means of increasing the competence of the community members to deal with their own problems. These programs used local residents as volunteers in service programs, found new places for them

as paid workers, and appointed community members to advisory boards and committees. Some of the activities were organized within neighborhood service centers where low-income residents could learn how to utilize services available to them more effectively. For example, information on legal rights and welfare regulations was made available, and ways to improve poor housing and to fight discrimination were pointed out. An important related service in some of the neighborhoods was the provision of legal counsel to low-income segments of the community who often had not been able to receive adequate legal advice.

A key concept relevant to all three of these programs is the provision of opportunity—opportunity to develop the necessary abilities and skills to participate meaningfully in the society, and thereby to gain a sense of personal dignity and competence.*

The Committee made significant efforts to apply a broad theoretical orientation to the problem of delinquency. The programs were comprehensive in scope and bold in their vision, but the success of the venture remains unknown, in part because many of the plans were too broad to be easily evaluated. Furthermore, the demonstrations had barely got under way before they were virtually inundated by the massive Federal Poverty Program, which so changed the available services and the pressures on the agencies that evaluation programs could not be carried out. Thus, although the Committee developed highly significant ideas for a basic approach to the problem of delinquency, it was largely unable to carry through any tested demonstrations of its conceptions.

Among those who were either directly responsible for these comprehensive programs, or who were close enough to them to be able to provide an informed opinion regarding their adequacy as delinquency preventives, two different views have been expressed. One view is that the ideas underlying the themes of opportunity and community competence are still the most useful and promising orientation toward work on delinquency. Those holding this view feel that delinquency is indeed bound up with a host of related problems, that only a comprehensive and coordinated set of programs can make any real impact, and that unless some other program is shown to be effective as a preventative, we should continue our attempt to test this set of ideas.

* The theoretical base for much of the opportunity theory came from Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin's *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960. The stress on community organization was a long-standing feature of early efforts in Chicago. See Kobrin, Solomon, "The Chicago Area Project—A 25-Year Assessment," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 322, March, 1959, pp. 19–29.

This group agrees that there are severe problems in the implementation of programs, largely because this approach requires a whole series of changed attitudes on the part of established agencies. It is argued that many of those who are in powerful positions within the established organizations do not have the knowledge and manipulative skills to work at the level of community organization necessary to achieve the desired results. The demonstration programs were thrust into competition with entrenched traditional bureaucracies, found in many schools and welfare systems, and the leaders did not command the power and political skills required for the successful launching of these new programs. But those who support these programs feel that the problems they present are only temporary. Once those skills are developed, or new ways are found to make established agencies responsive to the comprehensive programs, the efforts will be successful as delinquency preventatives.

Those holding the other view of the Committee's work feel that the specific target for the program was lost sight of in diffuse activities which were addressed to the general community of underprivileged youths. These persons point out that only some of those reared in even the worst conditions of discrimination and slum life became delinquent. By addressing the total population of youths in such areas, the programs lose focus and increase their costs. Administrators will desire to avoid the delinquency-prone juveniles for fear they will be disruptive elements.

Critics of the comprehensive efforts also feel that the relation between broader community programs and specific acts of auto theft, burglary, and assault is at best indirect and often extremely remote. Problems of successfully implementing long-term programs in the face of high mobility and social change in the inner-city area are very difficult, and the chances great that they will miss the main target population, or if they reach it, that other events will intercede in the lives of those involved to preclude their being greatly affected by the programs. For the small portion that actually complete their experience in a long-term prevention effort, some would succeed without it and others will fail in spite of it, so the long-term payoff may not be great.

From this point of view, the effort to solve the very broad and basic problems of disadvantaged social status, discrimination, poor housing, and inadequate socialization tends to distract attention from the more immediate and specific conditions relating to the commission of particular types of delinquent acts, and from the most obvious target group—those who are already delinquent, but might be prevented from repeating their delinquency.

Both views are relevant to the formulation of new policies concerned with delinquency prevention. A large part of the delinquency problem does in-

deed appear to lie in the structure of the community itself, in the frustrations imposed by the lack of development of appropriate skills in a society that increasingly demands high performance from its members, and in the general problems rooted in discrimination against minority groups. But delinquency is not the only response to these conditions. They appear to play an important part in the genesis of mental illness, of adult crime, of family disintegration, of apathy and alienation, and of other social problems. This is one reason why the broad and general programs developed initially by the President's Committee are now also being supported in part by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by other federal agencies. The rationale and justification for those programs does not depend on their specific value as delinquency-prevention measures; the provision of minimum health and welfare standards and of equal opportunity for advancement are valuable goals in their own right.

In view of the difficulties of implementing large-scale comprehensive programs, and the relatively long causal chain connecting them with delinquency, quick and sizable reductions in delinquency cannot be expected. It is quite possible that whatever impact they have will not be apparent for several years. In any case it will be necessary to engage in a continued evaluation so that whatever effects they have can become known.

Granted that long-range programs should be continued, there is still the question of whether or not there should be other more direct and specific efforts focused on the prevention and control of delinquent behavior. It appears that there should be. The comprehensive efforts by no means exhaust the range of imaginative ideas, and there still appear to be important avenues open for exploration, implementation, and evaluation.

These avenues relate more closely to the delinquent act itself, to its relatively immediate antecedents and surrounding events, and to more effective programs that operate on those who are already defined as delinquent. They emphasize the relation of the potential or actual delinquent to his immediate environment, rather than the relation of deprived youth to long-range opportunities. But these differences are matters of emphasis, and while some of the suggested new programs move in directions left largely unexplored by the President's Committee, others—the connection of delinquency to schools and to employment—derive quite directly from the concerns reflected in the comprehensive efforts.

Delinquency Prevention: Areas for Further Development

WE SUGGEST four areas of concentrated effort toward developing adequate delinquency-prevention programs. These are clarification of the different types of delinquency and the most appropriate prevention techniques for each, use of modern technology to change the immediate environment, improving the school's ability to work with troublesome youths, and further experimentation with youth employment programs. None of these four problem areas is new. Some specialists in delinquency have been concerned with each, and segments of all the problems have received attention from many. Each of the areas offers good theoretical reasons why work on it might be rewarding, but none has received the systematic and sustained effort required to develop and thoroughly test its implications. In some instances the direction of further program efforts is clear, while in others it is only possible to carve out a general problem that appears highly significant, and to suggest that more imagination and constructive effort may yield valuable programs. Finally, some of the areas call primarily for new knowledge, while others more readily suggest immediate action programs. Common to all, however, is the feeling among a significant portion of those familiar with delinquency problems that important progress may be made by their further exploration.

The Varieties and Types of Delinquents

The interest in delinquency as a problem of inner-city areas focused attention on the common problems found in delinquent subcultures and away from the variety of forms and types of delinquency, each of which may call for different prevention or correction strategies. Especially because delinquency is a concept that includes a great variety of behavioral forms, it is important to devote attention to the different patterns of delinquent conduct, to the different conditions that may generate the patterns, and to programs of prevention aimed at the particular problems faced by the delin-

quent in question. Somewhere between the assumption that each juvenile is vastly different from others and the contrary assumption that all juveniles fit a certain pattern, lies an important focus upon specific types of delinquent careers.

Almost all who have worked closely with delinquents have recognized a distinct group of "aggressive" offenders. They are called "Unsocialized Aggressive Delinquents" by Lester Hewitt and Richard Jenkins, "Children Who Hate" by Fritz Redl and David Wineman, and in a study by Albert Bandura and David Walters they are described as cases of "Adolescent Aggression."* Unlike most participants in delinquent subcultures, these children tend to display characteristics associated with psychopathy. They engage in bullying and assaultive conduct, showing little concern for others. They are more egocentric and less peer-oriented than the delinquents dealt with in most studies of delinquency. Although such offenders are less frequent, they are important because they are believed to be unresponsive to usual forms of treatment and they are more likely to continue their patterns of aggression into adulthood. Special rehabilitative efforts are therefore suggested.

Patterns of delinquency in the middle-class areas provide another example of the need to focus on specific types of delinquents.† Although delinquency among suburban and middle-class populations is exploited by the mass media, basic facts regarding its frequency are still lacking. It is clear from a variety of sources that official rates of delinquency in such areas are much lower than they are for the inner-city areas. Although studies of unofficial and unrecorded delinquency do indicate that "hidden delinquency" is a typical middle-class phenomenon, other authorities point out that police and youth workers in middle-class areas are more sensitive to indicators of delinquency and therefore intervene and warn potential delinquents about activities which would not be cause for intervention in the urban slums. A balanced judgment would seem to be that, while there is

* Hewitt, Lester, and Richard Jenkins, *Fundamental Patterns of Maladjustment: The Dynamics of Their Origin*, Illinois State Printer, Springfield, 1947. Redl, Fritz, and David Wineman, *Children Who Hate*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1951. Bandura, Albert, and David Walters, *Adolescent Aggression*, Ronald Press Co., New York, 1959.

† Throughout our discussion of variation in delinquency by social class, we have been aided by discussions with Walter Miller, who provided access to data from his current investigation of delinquency in different types of communities. See also his paper, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," *The Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1958, pp. 5-19.

indeed unreported delinquency and slower resort to official police and court sanctions in middle-class areas than in the central sectors of our cities, there is also an absolute difference in the amount and types of crimes committed in each area. In short, the vast differences represented in official statistics cannot be explained by differential police or court action toward children of varying backgrounds. There are, in fact, real differences leading to more frequent assaults, thefts, and breaking and entering offenses in lower socioeconomic areas of our urban centers.

But middle-class delinquency and the delinquency in middle-class communities are not the same thing. Much of the reported increase in suburban delinquency may be due to the movement of lower-class families out of the urban centers into low-status positions in communities dominated by middle-class membership. Thus the family membership context may be lower class, while the community context is middle class.

Dr. Betty Makkay reports from her experimental delinquency treatment program, operating in an education-conscious and middle-class suburb, that two-thirds of the delinquents in the study are from poor families. Special problems arise for delinquents in such communities. Failure in education, in a community where it is prized, puts special pressure on both parents and children. Furthermore, communities with a heavy emphasis on education for the college-bound population may be lacking in services for poor families despite the high average socioeconomic level. Since current trends are toward the movement out from the inner city, the pattern of lower-class delinquency in middle-class suburbs may be increasingly important. Efforts to distinguish these problems from those associated with the large inner-city areas and to provide the special services they require would seem to be indicated.

When delinquency is committed by middle-class boys, it may well follow a distinctive form involving the automobile, sexual experimentation, and perhaps, the use of alcohol and barbiturates. But the mass media reporting of such activities is often based upon sporadic episodes. These reports may well be unrepresentative of middle-class adolescent life. Indeed, it is interesting that while the press plays upon this theme, there is, of course, a counter theme stressing the extent to which our young people are conforming, serious, and overanxious about college entrance. It seems clear that whatever patterns are represented among middle-class adolescents, they are not primarily the traditional ones associated with delinquency and crime among juveniles. Some of the variation may be due less to social class than to size of community. But, since so little is known about patterns of delinquency in different types and sizes of cities, it is impossible to draw any firm conclusions. There is grave need for more detailed empirical studies designed

to provide specific data on the quantity and quality of delinquency in varying types of communities.

The suburban and middle-class delinquent and the aggressive delinquent are familiar common-sense categories which are simply illustrations of the sorts of problems that require further investigation. In these and other cases we lack knowledge of the extent to which homogeneous patterns exist. For example, is there one dominant pattern which characterizes the female delinquent or is there a variety of different types of delinquent girls? Are there identifiable types of youths with homicidal tendencies? Here we have only the most meager knowledge.

A real advance in our knowledge of patterns of delinquency may be expected only when we become more sophisticated in our efforts to develop classifications and typologies based on personal and social background characteristics, or on modes of personality functioning.* Perhaps the most advanced typology in actual use at this time is that developed by Marguerite Warren and others, based upon an assessment of maturity levels in interpersonal relations.

One consequence of the recent emphasis on the gang and interaction patterns on the street corner has been the withdrawal of attention from family relations and delinquency. Yet most serious students of delinquency recognize the crucial role played by socialization patterns within the family. Since many of the types may yield distinctive patterns in the relationship of the juveniles to parental authority, patterns of parent-youth interaction and programs of family therapy may emerge as relevant. Preventive or rehabilitative services requiring intensive interaction with family members, either individually or in family units, is likely to be prohibitively expensive as a general rehabilitation device, but it may be essential for certain special subtypes of problem youth. A typological approach focuses attention on such issues.

Delinquency and the Immediate Environment

Most delinquency prevention programs are based on the assumption that the cause of the misconduct has deep roots, either in the individual or in the

* Works that are relevant here include: Gibbons, Don C., *Changing the Lawbreaker*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965; also the review in Martin and Fitzpatrick, *op. cit.*, and the work of Marguerite Warren in this area, reviewed in the *6th Annual Report of the Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*, April, 1966 (mimeo.).

structure of the society. Treatment is thought to involve fundamental reorganization of the psyche, the social structure, or the culture.

But if one can commit delinquent acts without having a deep commitment to delinquency and if one can engage in them periodically without making any emotional investment in their expression, perhaps deep underlying forces need not be present for delinquency to occur. One of the major reasons for believing that these forces are not always present is the precipitous decline in delinquency and crime rates as adolescents move into adulthood. Deeply rooted patterns should not be so easily erased.

The concept of the situational delinquent has arisen on the assumption that, for at least a portion of the delinquent population, delinquency is not so deeply rooted as is generally assumed. Rather, delinquency may be, at least in part, an immediate response to an immediate situation. This does not mean that deeper forces are not also at work, but it does suggest that some programs of prevention may be successfully based on concern for the more immediate opportunities for misconduct. To the extent that this reasoning is correct, we may be able to prevent some delinquency, not by acting directly upon the delinquent with casework or other services, but by acting on his social and physical environment. And here it should be possible to make good use of modern technology.

Auto theft would seem to provide a good example, since it is predominantly a teenage crime. It has been suggested that it would not be too difficult to develop an automobile that is reasonably theft proof—one in which, say, any effort to put a key in the ignition or to “hot-wire” it would set off an alarm. If most cars were equipped with such devices, the auto theft rate might decline. Another example is revealed in current efforts to make the setting of false fire alarms less attractive.* Other straightforward attempts to limit the opportunities for delinquency could, no doubt, be found.

The employment of modern technology in crime prevention programs has a common-sense ring. It is likely to be opposed on grounds that the techniques do not really get at the heart of the problem, which is presumed to be the initiation of delinquent attitudes. The budding delinquent, it is feared, will turn to other forms of delinquency if stifled in the chosen one. These are

* These and other ideas for the use of modern technology are contained in a mimeographed report by Albert V. Crewe of Argonne National Laboratory, “Crime as a Scientific Problem” (mimeo.). Other works which contain materials relevant for situationally orientated statements include: Briar, Scott, and Irving Piliavin, “Delinquency, Situational Inducements, and Commitment to Conformity,” *Social Problems*, vol. 13, no. 1, 1965, pp. 35–45; Short, James F., Jr., and Fred L. Strodbeck, *Group Process and Delinquency*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965.

empirical questions in any case, but the possibility of measurable reductions in certain forms of delinquency seems great enough to warrant an expanded effort in this direction. Much of the rest of our lives is governed by a kind of economy of effort, whereby desired activities can become so difficult to complete that the effort is no longer made, and there seems no clear reason that criminal activities should not be governed by analogous principles.

Such measures might be particularly effective if coupled with efforts to make it easier to achieve legitimate access to the desired object. Again the automobile provides a good example. As automobiles are made more difficult to steal, would it not also be possible to make them more readily available in legitimate settings? Training in auto mechanics and driving might be supplemented by designating special settings where used automobiles would be made available for driving.

Programs might also be based on closer examination of the social environment in which delinquency takes place. The apparent effectiveness of detached street workers in reducing the incidence of gang warfare resulted in part from their active efforts in working on the scene with gang leaders when group hostility was at a peak. In a similar fashion police assignments might be systematically based on delinquency rates and other ecological aspects of juvenile crime.

The common element in all these programs is the concern for short-run opportunities and limits, designed to make it easier for adolescents to gain access to valued experiences or objects by legitimate means, while making it harder for them to do so illegally. To the extent that motivations for the activities are relatively superficial and youths are responsive to the situational elements of their environments, such efforts should succeed. Broader aspects of such programs lead into the theory of deterrence—to legislation prohibiting the sale of weapons save under greatly restricted conditions, or the occasional “stop and identify” programs used by the police to check for stolen autos and to deter auto theft. These latter programs open up obvious constitutional issues, and point to the limits of such measures without basic changes in our evaluation of the importance of preventing crime relative to other desired goals.

The intent of this discussion is simply to open up for review the potential value of technological innovation and programs aimed at the immediate environment of delinquency. Such efforts will not begin to resolve the underlying structural supports for delinquent behavior patterns, but they may prevent a certain portion of delinquent acts, thereby saving both the potential victims and the potential wrongdoers. Furthermore, despite relatively high initial investments in technology, such programs might be much less expen-

sive than those directed toward altering the attitudes and values of potential delinquents. Finally, it should be possible to test the effectiveness of such a program fairly easily.

Delinquency and the Schools

School problems, failure in school work, and misbehavior in school are often judged to be a common source of the frustration and alienation which motivate delinquent conduct. The school is frequently the setting within which children and youth first come to think of themselves as consistently inadequate or dumb, and especially, as bad or troublesome. It is also in school that questions arise about the relation between the person's present status and his future career. It is, finally, a sorting station, where some become defined as college material, some as poor but normal students, and others as disturbed ones or troublemakers.*

Even though the behavior problems that appear in school usually reflect inadequacies in family and community background, and therefore may not be in a clear sense created by the school itself, the school may still be the most efficient organization through which to work. Through the school system, it may be possible to bring about changes in the life conditions and opportunities of large numbers of youths more effectively than through the individual families.

There are, of course, dangers attendant on any expansion of school functions. Efforts to use the schools to help prevent or control delinquency must be balanced against the other goals that clearly must guide educational policies. But, since we require school attendance of almost all children until they reach the age of sixteen, it seems important that the school accept responsibilities for those students for whom it is least rewarding, just as it does for those who are most adapted to its disciplines. Furthermore, the school must find some way of dealing with these problems, and much of what is suggested here is a search for more creative ways. Many with whom we talked view the school as an absolutely critical institution in the develop-

* Reiss, Albert J., Jr., *Schools in a Changing Society*, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1965; Woodworth, Donald G., *The Effects of Laws Governing Youth and Employment and School Attendance on Youth Offenses and Delinquency*, Stanford Research Institute, Project 1-5332, Menlo Park, Calif., 1965; Cicourel, Aaron, and John I. Kitsuse, *Educational Decision-Makers*, Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis 1963; and Stinchcombe, Arthur L., *Rebellion in a High School*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1964; Kenneth Polk, who has been working with Walter E. Schafer on school and delinquency problems for the National Crime Commission, provided useful comments for the section.

ment and control of delinquent attitudes and actions. General improvements in teaching, curricula, and special services will naturally benefit those showing learning difficulties, but many of our consultants think there is a need for particular concern about those most likely to be defined as behavior problems.

Some of our consultants feel an urgent need for further development of programs aimed at providing autonomy and responsibility, and thereby a sense of competence in ability to handle life circumstances. Both the home and the school are seen by many near-delinquents as prisons, where dependency rather than opportunity for meaningful experiences is nurtured. Especially for those who are in more vocationally oriented classes, is it possible to find modes of participation that will increase a sense of self-confidence and capacity to control one's own fate?

There is a specific interest in how the school responds to misconduct. How do teachers and guidance counselors put some children into the "problem" category? Is it possible systematically to increase teachers' capacities to deal with these problems? Some authorities report that certain teachers seem to "have a way" with these children, and that for almost all youths who become defined by the system as bad and troublesome, there is at least one teacher who does not hold that definition of the youth in question.

Examination of the process by which suspension and expulsion occurs is particularly important. These decisions are fateful ones, and are usually not lightly made. But some authorities report that delinquent adolescents' sense of injustice and unfairness center much more on how they were handled by the school system than by police or court authorities.

Finally, the whole set of relations that occur between the school, community, police, probation officers, and the delinquent and his family needs further examination. Is it possible to study more closely how these groups combine in their impact on children in trouble, and whether new modes of relations between them might not yield improvements? Of particular concern is the provision of modes of exit from the school system that do not necessarily connote failure, and modes of re-entry that might aid the delinquent in his efforts to become reintegrated into the school system.

Solutions to most of these problems will require more than a simple extension and elaboration of current services, for these questions relate to the organization of the school as a system and not simply to the problems of its individual members. Solutions may require, for example, quite new ways of thinking about the division between college preparatory programs and vocational programs, new mechanisms within the school structure for dealing with behavior problems, and the creation of new kinds of relations with family and community agencies. Attention must be focused, therefore, on

the social organization of the school, and not on a mere increase in services for troublesome pupils.

It is natural that administrators responsible for any given school, or perhaps school system, feel they cannot give these problems prime attention, for in most school systems misconduct and delinquency are problems of only a minority, and primary attention must lie elsewhere. Viewed from the perspective of those responsible for delinquency prevention and control efforts, however, a new significance attaches to these issues, for the vast majority of delinquents have experienced earlier problems in school. This is why it is so important that we find new modes of organization within the school system, designed to make the experience more rewarding for more students.

Employment and Delinquency

Income and employment are so basic to society that one naturally supposes they have strong effects on delinquency. It is, however, not easy to specify the connections in detail, for the relationships may operate through a complicated set of intervening processes.*

Belton Fleisher has recently found evidence that both high income and employment are correlated with low delinquency rates, and that changes in either may change delinquency rates.† In his view the effects are direct, and also operate through other variables, principally family structure. A rise in income is related to lower divorce rates, which, in turn, are related to lower rates of delinquency. Although he concludes that the effect on delinquency of income is greater than that of unemployment, he suggests that unemployment may be the better target for manipulation. The effects are by no means trivial. He estimates that in areas with high tendencies toward crime, a 10 per cent rise in income might produce a 20 per cent drop in delinquency.

In another recent study, Singell found that, among the non-college group of high school graduates in the Detroit area, ability to get a job, the length of time it takes to find it, and the pay are all related to socioeconomic background.**

* Berg, Ivar, "Some Reflection on Juvenile Delinquency and Economic Policy" (undated and unpublished paper).

† Fleisher, Belton, *The Economics of Delinquency*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1966.

** Singell, Larry D., "Some Private and Social Aspects of the Labor Mobility of Young Workers," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, vol. 6, Spring, 1966, p. 26.

The results of both of these studies indicate the need for continued efforts to develop programs of employment for youth. It appears, however, easier to single out employment as a critical target than to work out feasible and successful programs, for it remains unclear what part of the problem lies with the employability of the youths themselves, and what part lies with general economic conditions that affect availability of jobs.

A detailed analysis of youth work programs suggests some of the major obstacles that have been encountered.* It is clear that delinquents or near-delinquents often represent a most difficult group to work with. It was the sixteen and seventeen year olds—often immature, antagonistic, apathetic, and beset by family and other problems—who were most often judged unemployable. The dropout rate during training, often substantial in any event, is even higher for this group. They, more often than other candidates for training, seem to need special attention if they are to accept training and work conditions. New ways must be found to bridge the gap between the relatively middle-class background of many trainers and counselors and the deprived background of the recruits. A special project in learning how to work with such youth may be essential before training them for employment can begin to be successful. It may be necessary, for example, to develop programs which would emphasize teaching the skills necessary for functioning in and mastering an urban environment as a preliminary phase to actual job training.

Employment programs in particular run the risk of raising expectations of the youths who are enrolled to a level which may be difficult to fulfill. The importance of building into the job training programs the mechanisms which will allow for the fulfillment of the objectives of employment subsequent to training cannot be over-emphasized. It is significant that the programs have encountered great difficulties in this respect. Employers, skeptical of those with deprived backgrounds in general, may be even more skeptical of those close to delinquency. Just as the potential employee must learn something about the requirements of stable employment, so must the employer be prepared to handle new problems in working with this segment of the population. Bridging the cultural gap between the two requires effort, and perhaps special effort in orienting the employers, for stable employment to result. Certainly a meshing of general employment needs in the local area with the specific training programs is one of the surest ways to increase success.

* Herman, Melvin, and Stanley Sadofsky, *Youth-Work Programs: Problems of Planning and Operation*, Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University, 1966.

Many new programs are still in an exploratory stage, but despite all the problems some of the projects appear successful. Opportunities Industrialization Center in Philadelphia has apparently effectively placed a large percentage of those it has trained, many of whom were thought of as “hard-core” unemployable youth. A key to their success, apparently, has been the establishment of effective relations with the business community. Employment, then, continues to appear as a meaningful approach to reducing delinquency.

Education and employment are essential for the assumption of stable adult roles. But the employer, like the educator, may be resistant to participation in programs oriented more toward the solution of a social problem than toward his primary concern. Some of the most important developments in the field of delinquency prevention may involve changing the educator and the employer before they can be successful with delinquents. It may also be necessary to provide employers with incentives in the form of public recognition or economic benefits to encourage them to employ these youths. The potentially close relation between school training and employability suggests, furthermore, that any effort to solve one of these problems must be related to the other.

The Labeling Process

DELINQUENCY-PREVENTION activities include all efforts expended before the juvenile's behavior has brought him to the attention of such official agencies as the police and the courts, while adjudicative and correctional activities are those that ensue after the youth's contact with these agencies. Important problems emerge at the meeting of the preventive and adjudicative agencies.

A traditional view of the relationship between delinquents and official agencies is that the latter are primarily passive responders to the active behavior or misbehavior of juveniles. The police exist, among other reasons, to detect delinquency, and the courts to adjudicate the cases of those who are detected. Both are reactions to deviant behavior.

A variety of social science theory and evidence leads to the conclusion that such agencies may play a far more important role than is ordinarily ascribed to them. The evidence suggests that official response to the behavior in question may initiate processes that push the misbehaving juveniles toward further delinquent conduct, and, at least, make it more difficult for them to re-enter the conventional world. This hypothesis is based upon the concept of labeling and a theory of its consequences.*

The assumption is that the public responds to a person informally and in an unorganized way unless that person has been defined as falling into a

* Recent relevant works include: Freidson, Eliot, "Disability as Social Deviance," in Sussman, Marvin B., editor, *Sociology and Rehabilitation*, American Sociological Association and Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, 1965; Becker, Howard S., *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, the Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1963; Lemert, Edwin M., *Social Pathology*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1951; and Kitsuse, John I., "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behavior Problems of Theory and Method," in Becker, Howard S., editor, *The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance*, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1964, pp. 87-102. But the idea is not new in its application to delinquency. Frank Tannenbaum treated it under the concept of "the dramatization of evil" in *Crime and the Community*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1938.

clear category. The official labeling of a misbehaving youth as delinquent has the effect of placing him in such a category. This official stamp may help to organize responses different from those that would have arisen without the official action. The result is that the label has an important effect upon how the individual is regarded by others. If official processing results in an individual's being segregated with others so labeled, an additional push toward deviant behavior may result. Their association with others who are similarly defined may make the category "delinquent" or "criminal" much more salient for them as well as for others' views of them. In other words, the individual begins to think of himself as delinquent, and he organizes his behavior accordingly.

This argument is particularly relevant to the field of delinquency, even though it has been extended to a variety of other forms of deviant behavior. Its special relevance for delinquency is twofold. First, since delinquency is so broadly defined, discretion is necessary in deciding which cases should be officially handled and which dismissed. Most youths may be involved in minor forms of misbehavior during their teens. This means that the official decision to categorize certain youths as delinquent may provide the important cue for public reactions. The second aspect is the nature of the delinquent act itself. There is a very important distinction between engaging in a delinquent *act* and following a delinquent *career* organized around the repetitive commission of such acts. Given the relatively minor, episodic, and perhaps situationally induced character of much delinquency, many who have engaged in minor forms of delinquency once or twice may grow out of this pattern of behavior as they move toward adulthood. For these, the labeling theorists argue, a concerted policy of doing nothing may be more helpful than active intervention, if the long-range goal is to reduce the probability of repetition of the acts. If the labeling hypothesis is correct, official intervention may further define the youth as delinquent in the eyes of neighbors, family members, and peers, thus making it more difficult for him to resume conventional activities.

The counterargument to this view takes two forms. First, if the offender is ignored, he may continue to offend for the same reason he began. The assumption here is that delinquency brings the youth some return and that it will continue to do so unless he is apprehended. It is precisely this argument that provides support for those persons interested in early identification and treatment of problem children.* If we assume that their deviant

* The early identification theme appears most clearly in conjunction with the prediction efforts associated with the work of the Gluecks and the tests carried out by

behavior is not a relatively superficial form of expression of adolescence, but symptomatic of something deep within them, some form of official reaction is essential. It is beneficial for the welfare of the delinquent, as well as for the community, that the deviant behavior be dealt with immediately, before it grows worse.

The second strand of the counterargument is that the process of official police handling in court adjudication may have a deterrent effect on the youths so processed. The youths do not want to be treated like delinquents and hence will refrain from further delinquent acts. This argument justifies intervention on much different grounds from the former one, and entails very different assumptions about the nature of delinquent motivations. Indeed, it is the standard argument for the deterrent impact of punishment. As such, it more often appears in arguments about adult crime and penal sanctions. But, although it is a distinctly secondary theme as applied to delinquency, it is still frequently voiced and forms a part of the public concern for dealing too leniently with delinquents.

These competing rationales for official actions are difficult to test empirically. Indeed, as yet there is very little systematic knowledge regarding reactions of offenders to varying types of sanctions. Conceivably, some delinquents refrain from committing further delinquent acts without official sanctions or labeling processes, while others may refrain only after such inhibition. But what are the conditions under which these various alternatives will occur? No other single question in the field of delinquency prevention and control seems so important and so deserving of careful investigation.

Social policy formation, however, may not be able to wait for the results of such research, and it is necessary to formulate a position on these issues without the carefully gathered and assessed data that would support a more clear-cut choice for one or another alternative. The choice seems clear: in the absence of evidence on the beneficial effects of official contacts, every effort should be made to avoid the use of a formal sanctioning system and particularly the official pronouncement of delinquency. Such a position is justified on grounds of the potentially damaging effects of the labeling proc-

the New York City Youth Board. See Glueck, Eleanor T., "Efforts to Identify Delinquents," *Federal Probation*, vol. 24, June, 1960, pp. 49-56. The identification efforts have been subject to detailed criticisms. See, for example, Kahn, Alfred J., "Public Policy and Delinquency Prediction: The Case of the Premature Claims," *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 11, July, 1965, pp. 217-228; Toby, Jackson, "An Evaluation of Early Identification and Intensive Treatment Programs for Predelinquents," *Social Problems*, vol. 13, no. 2, 1965, pp. 160-175.

ess. The primary reason for use of the official sanctions should be the seriousness of the conduct and its potential damage to the community.

A concomitant effort must be devoted to developing new forms of controlling youthful misbehavior without relying on the traditional agencies that usually process deviants. If the school system, for example, can develop programs for truants and potential dropouts, it might be possible to avoid the potentially negative effects of processing offenders by the police and courts. Further, if cases normally coming before the courts can be handled by police referral to family and neighborhood institutions and child welfare agencies, a similar benefit may result. Currently, about one-fourth of all cases handled by the juvenile courts are youth offenses that have no parallel in adult crime: curfew violation, running away from home, ungovernability, and related types of activity. Many of these activities, and perhaps many of the more minor forms of delinquency, could be handled without official court contact.

The aim in all such cases would be to avoid a possibly premature labeling of a young person as delinquent or deviant, except in cases where the action is so repetitive or so clearly dangerous to the community that really major efforts are required. Adherence to such a policy would considerably reduce the number of cases that now come before the juvenile courts. It would clearly be necessary, for at least many of such cases, to provide supportive services at the family and neighborhood level. The goal of all such services would be to keep the juvenile functioning in the family and community as long as possible without recourse to the official sanctioning systems.*

The same logic should apply at each point in the process of delinquency control. If it is necessary to take official actions, efforts should first be made to leave the offenders in the community. The burden of proof, any time official intervention occurs, must be on the side of those who feel that the intervention is clearly necessary for the safety of the community and the welfare of the juvenile.

This position is fortified by two features of delinquency control as currently practiced. First, it is not at all clear that doing something is better

* A different and in some ways more radical suggestion has been offered in the British White Paper on "The Child, The Family, and the Young Offender," published by Great Britain Home Office, London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965. It recommends that all persons under sixteen years of age be removed from the jurisdiction of the court and placed under local welfare authorities. Family councils, operating on a county level and composed of social workers and others with experience in handling children, would work with parents in devising courses of treatment for the juveniles coming before them.

than doing nothing, or that doing one thing is better than doing another. This is a hard fact that simply must be faced. Indeed, we are finally beginning to understand that any intervention has the possibility of harm as well as help, and it is conceivable that the actions of even the well-meaning helpers do as much harm as good. At least in the absence of strong evidence that they are effective, there is reason to guard against intervening in the life of the child or family. In the past such interventions have often been justified less on grounds of the severity of misconduct of a child than on grounds of the seeming problems and pathologies within his family. While it is important not to underestimate the problems of parental and family pathology, it seems similarly important not to overestimate the power of current therapeutic techniques.

Second, the current trends toward professionalization in the field of delinquency prevention and control services may lead toward a broader category of persons being defined as "in need of service" than in the past. For there is at least a modicum of evidence that the more sophisticated personnel become, the greater is their tendency to see symptoms of problem behavior, and therefore the greater the tendency to engage in some form of intervention. It is the very feeling of confidence in the sophisticated techniques of modern intervention methods that may serve as justification for placing children in special therapeutic settings, in residential treatment centers, and in institutions thought to be beneficial for them. Thus a study of police relations with juveniles suggests that the more professionalized police system formally charges a larger percentage of the juvenile population with delinquency. A study of judges suggests that those with more therapeutically oriented attitudes were somewhat more willing to commit children to institutions, and an authority on youth correctional systems who has surveyed them around the country is left with the strong feeling that it is the states with the most professional services that implicate the largest number of children in the official agencies and institutions.*

In the absence of greater evidence as to their effectiveness, the wisest policy is to refrain from implicating children in the delinquency control apparatus insofar as possible, and to invoke that apparatus only when it is clear that the conduct of the juvenile in question requires it for the protection of the community. There seems to be support for this position from

* Wilson, James Q., "The Police and the Delinquent in Two Cities," in Wheeler, Stanton, editor, *Controlling Delinquents*, to be published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1966; Wheeler, Stanton, "Legal Justice and Mental Health in the Care and Treatment of Deviants," paper presented at meetings of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, San Francisco, April, 1966.

many of those involved in judicial and correctional work. This is not to argue that professionalism is harmful. Rather, it is to argue simply that intervention techniques, if justified on grounds of therapeutic effectiveness, should be demonstrated to be successful before they are widely employed.

Juvenile Justice: The Police and The Juvenile Court

FOR CONVENTIONALLY ORIENTED youths, the most important adults outside their families are likely to be teachers. For juveniles who have become involved in delinquent behavior, however, it is the police and judges who decisively influence their career possibilities.

The Police

The bulk of all juvenile court cases first pass through the hands of the police, and therefore it is police action that determines the kinds and numbers of cases that come to the attention of the courts. The police are also the first point of contact between the juvenile and formal legal authorities. Thus the behavior of the police is a decisive element in the processing of delinquents.*

The police have a greater range of discretionary powers in dealing with juveniles than they do in their relations with adults. The wide variety of juvenile offenses and the fact that almost all youngsters have committed at

* Relevant references include: O'Connor, George W., and Nelson A. Watson, *Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime: The Police Role*, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C., 1964; Myren, Richard A. and Lynn D. Swanson, *Police Work with Children: Perspectives and Principles*, Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau, Pub. No. 399, Washington, 1962; Lohman, Joseph D., James T. Carey, Joel Goldfarb, and Michael J. Rowe, "The Handling of Juveniles from Offense to Disposition," vols. 1-7, University of California, Berkeley, 1965; Piliavin, Irving, and Scott Briar, "Police Encounters with Juveniles," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 60, September, 1964, pp. 206-215; Short and Strodbeck, *op. cit.*; Goldman, Nathan, *The Differential Selection of Juvenile Offenders for Court Appearance*, National Research and Information Center, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, 1963; Wilson, James Q., *op. cit.*

least one of the petty forms of theft and vandalism in the course of their adolescence make the exercise of discretion by the police necessary. They may dismiss the case and return the juvenile to his parents; they may refer the child to appropriate juvenile court authorities; or they may engage in a variety of actions that fall between these two. For example, there may be a wide variety of relationships between the police and voluntary or public social agencies used for the purposes of referral.

The combination of the great variety of delinquent acts, and the wide range of possible official responses, means that police practices may vary tremendously from one jurisdiction to another, and often within the same jurisdiction, depending upon the officer in question. A number of factors influence the police decision to take action or drop charges and affect the seriousness attached to the offense. These decisions are generally based on the nature of the offense, the appraised character of the youth, which, in turn, is based on such facts as his prior police record, age, associations, attitude, family situation, the conduct of his parents, and the attitude of other institutions such as his school. The external community may exert pressures on the police department which may affect the disposition of any given case. Here attitudes of the press and the public, the status of the complainant or victim, the status of the offender, and the conditions which prevail in the available referral agencies (the length of the waiting list, the willingness of social agencies to accept police referrals) are all of consequence. Internal police department pressures such as attitudes of co-workers and supervisors, and the personal experience of the officer may also play an important part in determining the outcome of any officially detected delinquent offense. These factors also indirectly determine the officially recorded police and court delinquency incidence rates.

Indeed, studies of police disposition in different communities clearly show the relevance of factors other than delinquent conduct. In part, this range may be accounted for by differing community standards, but it is also due to differing types of police organization and training. Most workers in the field agree that, given the fateful character of the decision for the juveniles in question, uniform standards for making the decision are essential. Although discretion cannot be eliminated entirely, it may be kept within rational bounds.

The most important of the decisions is the one that sends the youth to court. Yet, at the present, there is often a total lack of contact between the police and the court. In order to bridge the organizational boundary separating the police from the court, special effort is required to establish some degree of interpersonal contact and communication which will allow them to work more effectively together. Establishing such a liaison with the court

may require more personnel than the budget allows. Thus programs designed to increase the effectiveness of communication between the police and the juvenile court might be of great value.

It may be questioned, however, whether either the police or the courts, or both together, are in the best position to set standards for the referral of cases to the court. Legislation defining delinquency is not unlike areas of administrative law where broad legislation requires administrative agencies to develop standards of operation that meet the purposes the legislation is designed to serve. This sort of model might be explored in the case of delinquency and other problems of deviant behavior. Such an administrative agency, which presumably would operate on the local or metropolitan level, could command the expertise necessary for rational standard setting, and could provide for necessary modification and change as new conditions or new knowledge developed. At the same time, the existence of such an agency would make it unnecessary for either the police or judicial officials to take responsibility for this quasi-legislative function.

Police may be able to make use of a variety of community agencies and services as alternatives to referral to the juvenile court. The growth of a variety of types of neighborhood services, for example, may mean that even when the family is found wanting, police have recourse to resources other than the court. There are underway in Detroit, Los Angeles, and elsewhere experimental programs in which arrested youths are referred to youth opportunity or neighborhood centers for help. Further exploration and support of such programs is greatly needed. Among the problems they present is the possible restriction of the liberty of the juvenile in question, if such dispositions are made prior to official court action. While this problem should not be minimized, the trend toward earlier participation of counsel representing the interests of the juvenile may provide a safeguard.

Many good police juvenile units are undoubtedly already utilizing the community resources available to them, and perhaps with very good results. But it is in the area of police relations with juveniles, even more than in the other aspects of delinquency, where systematic programs are most lacking. It is difficult even to describe the range of activities already being undertaken. Again, since contacts with the police are the gateway into the system of delinquent and criminal justice, it seems essential that the disposition practices employed by the police in relation to youthful offenders be studied in detail.

There was a time when many police organizations were assumed to be distrustful of social scientists and others concerned with delinquency, and they, in turn, assumed that police attitudes toward juveniles were harsh

and punitive. The climate of relations is apparently changing in at least some communities. Knowledgeable authorities report that many police organizations are eager to cooperate in efforts to solve the complicated problems of delinquency control. The time seems ripe, therefore, for a renewed examination of the relation between the delinquent, police, and community agencies.

At the same time, hostility toward the police among young people, often organized in the form of racial hostility, has assumed new and dangerous proportions. It is significant that in racial disturbances in ghetto areas, it is often the older adolescents who become most readily involved in violence. One student of police systems has suggested that an immediate task is to examine more carefully the nature and sources of collective disturbances, and to see if ways can be found to increase understanding between police and youth groups.

The Juvenile Court

From its beginning at the turn of the century, the juvenile court has emerged as the principal adjudicative agency for processing youthful offenders.* The impetus for the establishment of the juvenile court was clearly humanitarian. It was designed to reduce the stigma associated with criminal trials, to accent the concept of helping the child rather than punishing him, and to take into account the implications of the belief that the misdeeds of children were the result of failures in the family or were attributable to factors in the larger social environment. The juvenile court was the mechanism established to put this conception into action. By setting up a special tribunal devoted to children, the austerity of the criminal courtroom could be avoided. Judges were encouraged to act on behalf of the child, and to aban-

* Some useful recent analyses of the juvenile court include: Allen, Francis A., *The Borderland of Criminal Justice*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964; Matza, David, *Delinquency and Drift*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1964; Rosenheim, Margaret K., *Justice for the Child*, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1962; Paulsen, Monrad G., "The New York Family Court Act," *Buffalo Law Review*, vol. 12, June, 1963, pp. 420-441; Paulsen, Monrad G., "The Juvenile Court and the Whole of the Law," *Wayne Law Review*, vol. 11, no. 3, 1965, pp. 597-616; Ketcham, Orman W., "Legal Renaissance in the Juvenile Court," *Northwestern University Law Review*, vol. 60, November-December, 1965, pp. 585-597; Ketcham, Orman W., "The Juvenile Court for 1975," *Social Service Review*, September, vol. 40, pp. 283-288.

Abraham S. Goldstein, Monrad G. Paulsen, and Judges Orman W. Ketcham and Florence Kelly also provided useful comments on problems of justice for juveniles.

don their standard roles as arbiters in the conflict between the state and the accused. The legal safeguards provided in adult criminal cases were de-emphasized, for their need was not apparent if the judge was, in fact, representing the juvenile's interests.

Given these underlying assumptions, it is understandable that, as the court evolved, it moved more and more in the direction of a social service agency, with a consequent withdrawal of emphasis upon the judicial character of the court proceedings. The questions and problems that concerned the court were the character of the juvenile in question, his family background, personality problems and the like, while less attention was devoted to establishing the legal facts of the case at hand, and hence the legitimacy of the court's intervention.

Juvenile court operations and procedures have been subject to many criticisms in recent years. Any close look at the facilities and alternative dispositions actually available to the juvenile court makes it clear that the promise of the court has gone largely unfulfilled. In theory, the court could embody its spirit of individualized justice by providing a detailed diagnosis of the problems of the juvenile in question, followed by the development of a treatment plan that would help solve those problems. Available alternatives were assumed to include individual and family casework, probation services, foster home placement, clinical treatment, and treatment within the confines of youth institutions.

But the reality in most jurisdictions is that these facilities are so underdeveloped and understaffed that one cannot speak of them as in any sense the equivalent of parental care and protection. The caseloads of juvenile probation officers are often so high as to make it meaningless to talk in terms of individual counseling or supervision. And although the institutions for young delinquents usually have more treatment facilities and programs than do those for adult offenders, the basic fact of coercive confinement remains, and the actual treatment resources available are often far below any reasonable minimum to qualify as meeting the needs of the juvenile court philosophy. Hence, there is serious question today whether intervention by a juvenile court is of substantial benefit to the future of a juvenile (as contrasted to protecting the public interest). It is not surprising, therefore, to find increasing demands for legal restrictions upon the right of the juvenile court to intervene "in the interests of the child."

If these facilities are lacking at the treatment stage, then the major rationale for the withdrawal of some of the safeguards provided by the criminal court is also lacking. A recent Supreme Court decision puts the matter clearly: "There is evidence, in fact, that there may be grounds for concern that the child receives the worst of both worlds: that he gets neither the pro-

tections accorded to adults nor the solicitous care and regenerative treatment postulated for children.”*

Thus a principal current concern in the juvenile court field has to do with the provision of justice and fairness to the juvenile. There is agreement among most experts in the field that the juvenile court remains an improvement over the standard criminal court proceedings for juveniles, and a concern that these improvements not be lost. But there is a growing recognition that many changes need to be made if the court is to function effectively as a court of law, as well as a resource for responding effectively to juvenile problems. The major needs are for establishing standards for the courts, providing adequate norms for sentencing, and improving the effectiveness of dispositions by expanding the possibilities available to the court.

Even though most of those who appear before the Juvenile Court have committed the alleged offense, it is still necessary to maintain adequate standards of evidence and proof in the determination of fact. In some courts it is still uncommon to find separate hearings on the facts and on the disposition, with the result that information regarding the juvenile's background may be available and used as part of the basis for determination of fact. Although it may be unnecessary and unwise to duplicate all the procedural protections found in courts for adult offenders, reasonable procedural standards must still be maintained. Unless appropriate due process of law is followed, even the juvenile who has violated the law may not feel that he is being fairly treated and may therefore resist the rehabilitative efforts of court personnel.

In the making of the fact determination, there is a growing recognition of both the need and right of the juvenile to legal counsel. Indeed, the right to counsel for juveniles was established in the State of California in 1960, and a system of law guardians was established in New York State in 1961. The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, with support from The Ford Foundation, is currently sponsoring a study of the effects of providing legal counsel for juveniles—effects on the decisions made within the court, and effects on the juveniles themselves, and the juveniles' perception of the processes of justice as manifested by the court.

Once clear determination of fact has been made, the question of the appropriate disposition arises. Here the judge has very wide discretionary powers, justified on grounds that the disposition should serve the interests of the child and should not be governed primarily by such matters as the

* *Morris A. Kent, Jr., Petitioner, v. United States*, No. 104, *Supreme Court Reporter*, West Publishing Co., St. Paul, Minn., vol. 86, April 1, 1966, p. 1054.

seriousness of the act he has committed. Thus it is possible, within juvenile court law, for the judge to commit some minor offenders to institutions and to put more severe cases on probation. The judge in effect acts with no rules or norms to guide his decision. The result is very wide variation in sentencing practices, both within one court jurisdiction and among differing jurisdictions. Many critics of the court claim that disparity in sentencing is one of its basic failures. What this disparity, in fact, means is that the treatment received by an accused youth may depend much more upon his chance assignment to a particular judge than upon the nature of his offense and other relevant factors.

A chief problem is to find a balance between the flexibility in choice of alternatives, and the restraint necessary to assure some relation between the nature of the offense committed and the severity of the sanction imposed. One method for reducing the wide disparity found to exist among jurisdictions would be through the establishment of formal or informal rules that set limits on the discretionary power of the juvenile court judge. Another frequently mentioned method of reducing sentencing disparities is through improved selection and training of juvenile court judges. It seems clear that, to be effective, the juvenile court judge requires not only thorough training in law but also a sound grasp of what is known about human behavior, especially as this knowledge relates to child development and adolescence. In addition, since an effective juvenile court system will provide many alternative dispositions, the judge must be skilled and knowledgeable in the use of these resources.

All of these requirements mean that the juvenile court judge has a more complex job to do than most judges in courts of original jurisdiction. Yet the salaries of juvenile court judges are typically below those of other judges, and their work is often not regarded as important. It is a common feeling among a large number of juvenile court judges that when they begin handling juvenile court cases they are almost totally unprepared for the functions they must perform and the decisions they must make.

Thus there is a strong interest in upgrading the quality of juvenile court judges and in training courses designed to improve their capacity to function effectively. The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, with support from the National Institute of Mental Health, has operated a training program for juvenile court judges. Spokesmen for the Council believe that the form of sensitivity training used in its courses does in fact help the judges to have a new appreciation of their needs, but the courses are still in a very experimental stage. One major difficulty encountered so far is the scarcity of teachers who are competent to provide substantive training in juvenile court law and procedure. Since few law schools have any course covering

these legal and judicial problems, the court staff has no special competence. In only a few large cities have law schools developed any teachers who are both concerned with and knowledgeable in juvenile court matters. It is felt that the law schools have been quite inattentive to the needs of the legal profession and the juvenile court judges in this regard.

Most of those familiar with the problems of juvenile delinquency and the current functions of juvenile courts agree that it is irresponsible to speak of state intervention on behalf of the child when the facilities and resources available to the judge are so meager. Resources for diagnosis of the child's problems have developed fairly readily, but nowhere have they been matched by the facilities for treatment called for by the diagnosis. A large portion of the time of the probation staff attached to a juvenile court, for example, is spent in pre-sentence investigation and in working up the background of the case so that the judge has sufficient information upon which to base his decision. But whether the decision is that the youth in question should be placed on probation, committed to an institution, or provided some special form of treatment, it is unlikely that available facilities will be adequate to the task. Probation staffs are overburdened with paper work and administrative duties, to say nothing of high caseloads. Similarly, institutions for young offenders lack adequate space and equipment and are understaffed. Moreover, the meager staffs at the institutions often lack the training and skills necessary to carry out the treatment called for by the court.

Indeed, questions of the constitutionality of various aspects of the juvenile court are expected to rise with increasing frequency, in part because the available institutions and programs simply do not come close to living up to the underlying philosophy. At least this is the case for a large portion of the juvenile court jurisdictions in the United States. It is possible that the power of the courts may be used to release offenders from institutions in which treatment opportunities are not available, and in this way to compel improvement in treatment facilities and resources. In light of these conditions, many experienced persons feel that too many children are being processed through the juvenile court, and too large a number of those are being sent to youth institutions. These actions are being taken, it is felt, precisely because both the courts and the institutions are thought of as therapeutic settings.

The rhetoric of the juvenile court movement has developed without any necessarily close correspondence to the realities of court and institutional routines. In order to get a clear grasp of the system in operation, it is necessary to sit in on court hearings, to review a typical month in the life of an overworked probation officer, to review the things judges actually consider in making their decisions, to examine in detail the facilities available to

them for diagnosis and treatment, and to look at the daily routines of juvenile offenders in detention centers, or in institutions ostensibly designed for their care and treatment. To do this is to see very clearly the extent to which rhetoric and reality diverge. Unfortunately, the worthy principle that juvenile court hearings should be private has often hampered such observations by those not directly associated with the courts themselves.

These circumstances lead many observers to conclude that the whole concept of the juvenile court and its dispositional alternatives has never been fully implemented. A major suggestion made in this regard is that there should be established in one or more regions in the United States model juvenile court programs with related facilities to demonstrate the possibilities of a fully implemented juvenile court.

The juvenile court and the police are the two most important agencies in the processing of juveniles that are in conflict with the law. They are the agencies that determine whether or not the official stamp of delinquency will be placed on those who come before them, and their actions very largely determine the dispositions that follow upon that stamp. As such, they are both critically important in the administration of juvenile justice. For these reasons there is need for clarification of the aims and objectives of the police and the court in relation to juveniles, for improved coordination of the functions each performs, and especially for a clear rationale that helps to justify use of the court's very great power over the lives of juveniles.

Rehabilitation and Correctional Efforts

AUTHORITIES in correctional services for juveniles agree on two major principles, both of which serve to orient our review of alternatives in the treatment of youths who have been judged delinquent.* The first principle is that traditional forms of incarceration in correctional institutions should be avoided insofar as possible. Such institutions, it is believed, are of dubious value as rehabilitative mechanisms, especially with the inadequate staffing and facilities found in most of them. Extended periods of incarceration in such institutions may prove to be positively damaging to a youth and may reduce the likelihood that he can be rehabilitated. In addition to the stigma attached to assignment to a correctional institution, which may become a serious barrier to the offender's return to a normal social life, there are such added hazards as the loss of contact with conventional society and intensified contact with other offenders. Not only is this form of treatment potentially damaging to the subjects, but the cost of such standard correctional programs is much greater than that associated with most of the alternatives to incarceration. From these considerations, it is clear that this alternative should be used only as a last resort.

The second and related principle is that the alternatives must be broad and diversified enough to encompass the whole range of offenders, both as to type and degree of severity of delinquent conduct. The available alternatives must provide for a wide range of treatment situations and procedures geared to the requirements of different types of delinquents.

Current and Proposed Programs

One form of reaction is to have no formal disposition at all. The court procedures, may be enough to deter the offender from further unlawful ac-

* A major resource for our review of youth corrections is a paper prepared by LaMar T. Empey for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Alternatives to Incarceration: Key Points in the Correctional Process*, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Youth Studies Center (undated).

tivity. He may be less likely to repeat an offense if there is no correctional program put into effect in his behalf. It is precisely this possibility that led the framers of the New York Family Court Act to allow for "no disposition," following the determination of fact. Relatively little use has been made of this alternative so far, but there is a feeling that its use could be systematically increased. Thus one very real and possibly very meaningful alternative is simply to invoke no disposition whatsoever.

Next to the absence of any official reaction, fines and restitution represent the mildest form of correction. These may either be assigned outright, as sanctions for the offense, or as a condition of probation. The potentially therapeutic value of restitution as a sanction has been noted with increasing frequency in many European countries in connection with adult crime. It is difficult to get adequate figures on the use of restitution or compensation to the victim in the case of juvenile offenses in this country, but many judges believe these sanctions to be effective rehabilitative measures by making the offender aware of the harmful consequences his actions have on others.

Probation is the most frequent disposition of cases processed through the juvenile court. The assumption is that the offender can profit from guidance, counseling, and help provided by a person experienced with human problems. Professional training for probation work has typically been social casework, and hence has had as its intellectual foundation some form of psychiatric or psychoanalytic theory. In actual practice, probation methods have varied from those of psychiatric social work to friendly counseling, to a form of supervision very like surveillance.

In most jurisdictions, the probation officer is the chief link between the delinquent and the programs established for him. It is the officer who works with and advises the judge, who is in regular contact with the delinquent, who may know the problems he and his family face, and who may work most directly with him in solving them. Despite all the handicaps of probation officers with heavy caseloads and overwork on pre-sentence investigations, probation remains the central core of any court-established program for delinquents.

If there is a principal need facing probation as a system, it is the need for a greater range of treatment facilities. As such facilities develop, the probation officer will probably be engaged more as a liaison man between the court and other agencies and he will be less responsible for personally inducing change in offenders. This means that professional training for probation workers would have to stress increasingly the utilization of community resources and mechanisms for fitting the delinquent into neighborhood and community programs, and especially the new opportunities now being made available through such projects as the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Standard forms of probation, based upon individually oriented social casework, have been supplemented in recent years by two other forms of treatment, either of which may be employed in an institutional setting or while offenders are free in the community. One set of programs is founded upon what has been called guided group interaction, in which the attitudes and norms maintained by a group of delinquents is the focus of change, rather than the behavior and attitudes of any one of its members. The basis for this approach is the normative support for delinquency that comes from the peer group; hence it is thought that, by working with the values of the peer group as a unit, rather than with the individual, the system can be changed. In such programs the group itself has a stake in the fate of its members for they participate with the staff in solving problems.*

A second and related kind of program is one which uses the delinquent himself as an agent of change or therapy for others. The rationale behind this program is that the youth will learn conventional modes of behavior by being placed in conventional roles, with all the responsibilities such roles entail. In his efforts to help others, it is assumed, he will lose some of his antisocial tendencies and gain direct experience in performing in conventional ways.† These programs are not unlike those of Alcoholics Anonymous and Synanon in their using the deviant himself as an agent of change.

Among the most promising alternatives to full incarceration are various kinds of treatment programs operating in the community, but with the offender spending part of the day in a treatment center. One such program was introduced at the adult level as early as 1913 through the Huber Law in the State of Wisconsin. Current examples are the Provo and Essex Fields experiments designed for about twenty boys at a time, with the subjects living at home while working a full day and then participating in group sessions based upon the model of guided group interaction. The most important feature of these programs is that the youths remain in the community where their problems arose. Whatever efforts at change they make are therefore not restricted by the artificialities of institutional settings. The results from such projects appear promising, although evaluation is not easy and has been plagued by technical difficulties.

* McCorkle, L. W., A. Elias, and F. L. Bixby, *The Highfields Story: A Unique Experiment in the Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency*, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York, 1958.

† The theory has been spelled out in more detail by Donald R. Cressey in "Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association," *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 61, September, 1955, pp. 116-120.

A different type of treatment program has been sponsored by the California Youth Authority. The Community Treatment Project, as it is called, is similar to the Provo and Essex Fields experiments in that it operates within the community and is designed to serve youths who might otherwise be incarcerated. But the assumptions underlying the program and the nature of the program are somewhat different. It begins with a classification of offenders into interpersonal maturity levels.* Each type defines a different problem and requires different treatment. The result is a rich matrix of treatment programs designed for different types of delinquents. The Community Treatment Project is still in the process of evaluation; but it, along with the Provo and Essex Fields experiments, provides a good example of the possibilities of developing forms of treatment short of incarceration which appear to be at least as successful in outcome as more severe methods.

Another way of increasing the range of alternatives available to sentencing authorities and therapeutic agents is the development of different types of institutional settings with great variations in the length of time persons spend in them. It may well be that whatever impact is obtained by staying in an institution is accomplished during the first two weeks or months of that stay and conceivably within the first few days. Extremely short terms, of course, do not allow for intensive treatment over a long period of time in a controlled environment. But the obvious advantages of very short terms would seem to require that the burden of proof should be on those who argue that a long term is really necessary. In a short-term stay, the offender may not lose his standing in his school, nor will he necessarily suffer the presumed stigma of commitment to a traditional penal institution. It seems most reasonable to attempt the development of short-term programs, particularly if educational or vocational programs, which often require several months to complete, can be carried out within the community instead of within an institutional setting.

If all the types of programs discussed above were fully developed and explored—the use of no disposition; of fines and restitution; of simple probation; of probation with related programs of therapy, guidance, educational or employment training, or special programs of attitude or behavior change; of community treatment centers operating outside the confines of typical institutions; and of very short-term stay institutions—there might be a

* The classification system is discussed in our section on types of delinquents, pp. 11–14.

greatly reduced need for the traditional training schools and residential facilities. The principal gain would be a graded and diversified series of programs that would enrich possibilities beyond the stark alternatives of probation or correctional confinement. At the same time, the costs would probably be reduced. It will be essential, of course, to evaluate these choices and to find out what type of offender is most appropriate for which program. Indeed, it might well turn out that institutionalization is more beneficial than community-based programs for some delinquents. But until that is demonstrated, it seems the better part of both wisdom and justice to use institutional confinement only for those who would be dangerous to the community without it.

Corrections and the Community

While we have discussed alternatives to standard correctional facilities, little attention has been devoted to improving existing institutions and programs. This is not because such programs do not need improvement, but because we want to emphasize the tremendous need to develop new kinds of reactions which depend less on traditional practices. This emphasis requires one further kind of program development: the strengthening of relations between the correctional system and the broader community.

It is the community that has a major stake in delinquency prevention. The community is also the arena in which the delinquent must work out normal adaptations to life. Successful programs of rehabilitation and reintegration are always reflected in a successful form of *interaction* between the delinquent and the community, and never solely by the actions of the delinquent alone. Whether he finds employment or not, for example, is partly a function of how hard he looks and how hard the parole and correctional staff work to help him find a job, but it also depends on the willingness of employers to accept delinquents as employees. Industries which refuse to hire persons with arrest records, barriers to entry into military service, and other similar obstacles all restrict the choices available to delinquents and thereby may greatly handicap their rehabilitation. Neighborhoods or communities which only grudgingly accept those who have once made trouble or which strongly resist the presence of half-way homes or other special facilities for delinquents, make the process of rehabilitation and reintegration extremely difficult. Thus the status of the delinquent in the eyes of the community is of great consequence in determining his later fate.

At a minimum the community must be prepared to tolerate the placement of some juvenile offenders in relatively open situations in the com-

munity. Beyond that, employers, school officials, and various other organizational representatives must be prepared to take positive steps to aid in the reintegration of offenders into normal community life. These steps require that correctional officials work closely with community agencies in developing the kinds of programs and resources that can serve to aid the process of reintegration.

Research

IT IS COMMON to hear from social scientists that more research is needed and it is probably not much less common to hear from practitioners that research is usually inconclusive, and that it is more important to get underway with action programs. But whatever its limitations, the long-term development of the field of delinquency control requires the kind of knowledge that can come only from systematic research efforts. Three particular types of research now seem required. National statistical data are necessary for long-term planning and for keeping the public informed. There is a desperate need for a description and evaluation of alternative programs of prevention and control and for techniques which will aid in the development of such programs. Finally, theoretical research is needed to provide a base for the creation of more meaningful and theoretically sound action programs.

The development of sound public policy regarding all aspects of delinquency prevention and control requires adequate information upon which to base decisions. National planning will have to depend on statistical studies of trends in the amount and types of delinquency. There is a need for detailed information on the reasons for referral to juvenile courts, on the length of time spent in detention facilities, on the reasons for the dispositions made by the court, on the personnel who work with juvenile delinquents, and on the character of the training schools and other facilities. All these things call for a collection of local, state, and regional data in a national center which can provide statistical analysis and report the results.

Since 1926 the Children's Bureau has collected a minimal amount of information of this sort, and is, in fact, our principal source of national information on youth crime. Experts in the field agree, however, that while the information produced may be the best possible given the limited resources made available for that purpose, the data are inadequate for the formulation of sound social policy. There are weaknesses in both basic data and statistical treatment.

The information comes on a voluntary basis from juvenile courts throughout the country. The percentage of the child population covered by the reporting courts has risen from approximately 29 per cent in 1952 to

roughly 75 per cent in 1964. This increase in reporting agencies was apparently made possible by a reduction in the amount of information the agencies making the voluntary reports were asked to give, so a minimum of information is now collected. Information is not routinely collected, for example, on the reasons for referral to the courts, on the ages and social backgrounds of the children involved, or on many other highly relevant subjects. This information is critically important, especially for juvenile court decisions which are presumably based on such considerations.

An example of the problems in statistical treatment concerns the baseline for computing the delinquency rate. That baseline is the population of ten- to seventeen-year olds in the country. But since the major delinquency age is approximately fifteen to seventeen, anything that swells that particular age group will give the appearance of a higher rate. What are needed are age-specific rates: the number of fifteen-year-old delinquents in relation to the fifteen-year-old population, and so on.

These are merely examples of areas where vast improvement in the reporting of juvenile delinquency and juvenile court data are needed. Numerous other examples could be enumerated. The essential requirement is for improved quantity and quality of information, improved techniques of analysis, and improved means for dissemination of the resulting information. The technical skills are at hand, but funds are necessary if local jurisdictions are to improve their statistical reporting systems. It would be necessary to provide training and perhaps some personnel to local jurisdictions in order to accomplish this task, but the gain in the quality and utility of the knowledge made available thereby would certainly seem to warrant it.*

No responsible business concern would operate with as little information regarding its success or failure as do nearly all of our delinquency prevention and control programs. It is almost possible to count on one hand the number of true experiments in which alternative techniques are compared; the number of systematic, though nonexperimental, evaluations is not a great deal larger. We spend millions of dollars a year in preventive and corrective efforts, with little other than guesswork to tell us whether we are getting the desired effects.

Two types of program and evaluation research are needed. One is the standard evaluation of impact directed at assessing the effect of the program on delinquency rates, on cost per inmate, on recidivism, or some other rele-

* The most relevant papers here are by Cohen and Perlman, *op. cit.* Also relevant are Sellin, Thorsten, and Marvin E. Wolfgang, *The Measurement of Delinquency*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1964.

vant criterion. The second kind of research calls for examination of the process whereby the effects are achieved, for it is seldom enough to know what the end-results were. Many programs must shift their course in response to changing circumstances, and it is essential to build information that feeds directly into the programs, as well as information pertaining only to the long-term evaluation.

The chief example of a research system designed to produce these research objectives is the Research Division of the California Youth Authority.* The Youth Authority has managed to develop a research orientation, a flow of information required for the evaluation of various program efforts, and apparently a commitment on the part of the State of California to research as an important part of its program. Although less than one per cent of the Youth Authority budget goes for research, the system has produced a series of experiments in the field of youth correction which exceed those produced anywhere else in the country. The actual program results are still modest at best but California is at least learning whether it is getting results and where it is getting them.

A very important feature of the California research program is the long-term commitment to such an enterprise. It is very difficult to build effective research teams without such a commitment. Especially at the prevention stage, where programs operate in the community and often on budgets that may not allow much forward planning, it may be necessary to find new institutional forms such as university-based research institutes that are related directly to service agencies. Experimentation with a variety of plans seems called for. Another problem for evaluation research concerns replication, which is essential to any long-term program development. Here it may be necessary to develop cooperative relations among states, so that programs developed and tested in one locale can be replicated elsewhere.

Research on the process and product of actual delinquency prevention and control programs is essential, but it is not enough. Such programs themselves when rationally designed are based upon theories of delinquency causation and control which have their roots in other studies of behavior. Indeed, many of the most important ideas in the field of delinquency causation and control have come from more theoretical works in social science.

It may take special efforts to make sure the necessary theoretical work is

* See *6th Annual Report of the Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*, Department of Youth Authority, April, 1966 and Griffiths, Keith, "The Role of Research in Corrections," a paper prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

stimulated, and to find promising projects and ideas that deserve further development. Leadership in such efforts must really come at the federal level, perhaps in special grant programs operating through the National Institute of Mental Health, which already has a coordinating mechanism and a review committee for delinquency projects. In any such effort it will be essential to build strong ties to scholars and researchers who may not think of themselves as specialists in delinquency, but whose work when appropriately interpreted has valuable implications for delinquency control programs.

The importance of research designed to fulfill the various purposes described above cannot be overemphasized. When the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime established its grants, there was insistence on adequate research design as a condition for receiving federal funds. But pressure on the agencies to expand before they were prepared for expansion, and to shift directions and goals during the course of the projects, led to the sacrifice of research objectives. The result is that we are still nearly as deep in ignorance regarding the effects of programs and the conditions producing the effects, as we were before the programs were launched. It can only be hoped that a high priority is given to research in future projects, so that we can begin to develop the knowledge base that is essential for the creation of successful programs.

Personnel Training and Development

FAR MORE TRAINING and manpower resources need to be put in this field if the present concerns for delinquency are to be taken seriously. However, it is difficult at this time to specify priorities for training and personnel development as these are decisions which require empirical evidence. We do not have the necessary accumulation of data to know just what is worthwhile in training, since we do not know as yet which types of programs are effective and which are not. Without this information, it is impossible to specify the levels of training needed or the numbers of persons required to staff future programs.*

In the absence of this kind of systematic knowledge, one can turn to the standard-setting agencies. These represent the practitioners who are most familiar with manpower problems. In the field of delinquency control, the two most prominent standard-setting organizations are the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and the Delinquency Division of the Children's Bureau. Both organizations are often commissioned to make studies of the needs for personnel and facilities in various state and local jurisdictions, and each has an experienced staff to diagnose problems and establish requirements. Furthermore, the two agencies cooperate and, broadly speaking, move in the same direction in assaying these needs.

The shortage of skilled manpower is a problem of which both agencies are acutely aware. They have recommended increased professional training,

* Relevant works here include: Prigmore, Charles S., editor, *Manpower and Training for Corrections, Proceedings of an Arden House Conference, June 24-26, 1964*, Council on Social Work Education, New York, 1966; Pearl, Arthur and Frank Reissman, *New Careers for the Poor*, The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1965; Benjamin, Judith G., Marcia K. Freedman, and Edith F. Lynton, *Pros and Cons: New Roles for Nonprofessionals in Corrections*, National Committee on Employment of Youth, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Washington, 1966. Information was also made available to us from a current "Pilot Study of Correctional Training and Manpower," sponsored by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

and additional training programs to upgrade the skills of those already in the field. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency specifically suggests the urgent need for federal support for the following:

Scholarship and stipend programs to help meet manpower needs for the variety of professional and subprofessional tasks.

Grants to help state agencies develop pre- and post-employment training for both state and local correctional agencies.

Grants to help appropriate state agencies assume leadership roles in developing a system for balanced planning and assessment of priority needs between state and local correctional services.

A standard-setting program that would involve selected leaders from national, state, and local correctional programs in the actual promulgation of standards, the attainment of which would be aided by grant and subsidy programs.

Technical consultation services to aid the states in planning and implementing standards toward the end that appropriate state agencies would develop similar standards, grants, subsidies, and technical assistance programs for local services.

There seems no question that some programs of this sort are necessary, if only to provide basic services. Administrators in the field of corrections, as well as the leading consulting agencies, feel the need for much more advanced training. A recent survey of manpower needs showed that most administrators felt that their staffs need more training in social work, psychology, and related disciplines.

These recommendations must serve to represent the accumulated wisdom of practitioners in the field, in the absence of further evidence regarding the effectiveness of programs. But even such estimates are essentially guesses. For example, in the absence of more evidence than is presently available, it is impossible to tell whether probation officers with caseloads of 25 or 30 juveniles actually achieve lower rates of recidivism than those with loads of 75 to 100. Cost-effectiveness studies might show that the state's money for delinquency work is better spent in other ways. Thus a constant process of evaluation of manpower recommendations is essential. Also, the collective wisdom of practitioners may not be fully attentive to new trends and possibilities. A natural tendency is to recommend more and more professional training. But a major new development in other phases of work with problem youth is toward the utilization of nonprofessional personnel. Clearly, what is essential is a careful assessment of the needs and an effort to get particular tasks accomplished with as little training as possible. The feasibility of using so-called indigenous group members, and, in particular, of using delinquents or former delinquents in training programs, needs to be fully explored.

They are a ready source of manpower and, as some rehabilitation theory suggests, such persons may be more effective than trained professionals for certain purposes.*

The essential component of any new planning around personnel training and development is a detailed breakdown of the skills required in rehabilitative efforts, and an analysis of the skill levels necessary to complete them. If trends do, in fact, develop so that there are more community-based programs, and if the emphasis continues to fall on the provision of conventional opportunities relative to the need for deep changes in personality or attitude, then there may be a variety of important tasks which can be accomplished by persons who have not reached high levels of training or education. Such individuals may be able to work in teams that include personnel with more advanced training and who could provide adequate supervision. In the face of personnel shortages and manpower needs, it seems not only desirable but necessary to work toward the development of techniques that can be employed without a great deal of advanced training and education.

One specific problem for training occurs repeatedly and is noted by most personnel in the field of delinquency. This is the problem of establishing adequate communication between those who are responsible for various parts of the total delinquency prevention and control process. Since there is no single jurisdiction or authority which commands control of police, judicial, mental health, welfare and other services, establishing effective liaison among the various components requires special effort. A central component of the total enterprise is a mechanism for communication across disciplinary and occupational boundaries.

A final training requirement concerns the growing need for qualified researchers to help in the development and evaluation of programs. Special programs might be devised to make it easier for college and graduate students to get "on-the-job" research experience. Scholarship programs might also encourage regular program staff to continue their development of skills in research. Finally, many of the more clerical tasks frequently associated with research might provide good avenues for employment and training of relatively unskilled persons.

* Donald R. Cressey has noted these problems in his contribution to the Prigmore volume, *op. cit.* and we are indebted to his discussion.

The Organization of Delinquency Prevention and Control

THE FIELD of delinquency lies at the intersection of a broad variety of disciplines and organizations. It touches problems of youth, urban life, justice, health, education, employment, and welfare. Persons who consider themselves heavily involved in delinquency work may be policemen, psychiatrists, clergymen, or probation officers, to name but a few.

It is therefore natural that work on problems of delinquency knows no unique home or institutional locus. In some states, the more important delinquency services are lodged in a Welfare Department; in others, they are found in a Department of Institutions. In some states, there are special Children and Youth Divisions, while in others, the alignment is closer to adult crime and corrections.

This state of affairs also exists in federal programs in delinquency. Work touching upon delinquency may be found in any number of governmental agencies, though most of them are to be found within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Many of the persons with whom we consulted were worried about the problems of coordination and balance in federal programs for delinquency. Some were fearful lest more bureaucratic struggles be created by new plans, others that the balance between work on prevention and correction would be determined haphazardly. Some wanted a larger role for consideration of justice for juveniles, others a larger role for child welfare.

It seems clear that special efforts must be made to provide coordination of services between all the possible agencies and especially that there be some unit where firm direction and leadership can be lodged. This is necessary if we are to arrive at rational program priorities. Delinquency is too serious a problem to be lodged in a labyrinth of separate bureaucratic settings with little in the name of logic, program, or coordinating mechanism to tie them all together. This does not mean that a new division or department is necessarily essential. It does mean that a mechanism must be found for guiding the development of the field in a responsible and orderly way. Only then can we anticipate that the federal leadership needed in so many areas of concern for delinquency can really emerge.

Summary

THE FIELD of delinquency touches a wide variety of social institutions. Its causes are still incompletely understood. There are diverse ways of proceeding with the most important problems and issues. Indeed, the number of proposed solutions is at least as great as the number of occupations, professions, and organizations that have had a stake in delinquency prevention and control programs.

Views presented in this review undoubtedly do not represent all the diverse perspectives that exist. With this caution, we suggest that some of the major themes discussed in this report are an appropriate basis for further planning and development.

1. Delinquency is an integral feature of American society, and is not likely to be eradicated by crash programs. The first requirement for constructive thinking is to plan for long-term study and knowledge development.
2. An effective balance must be sought between efforts to reduce delinquency by creating broad changes in the structure of community life and programs beamed more specifically at the immediate causes of delinquency. Of the two types, the latter are in greater need of development at this time.
3. Increased efforts need to be made to develop information on the different varieties and types of delinquency with concomitant efforts to develop preventive and corrective programs for the distinctive types.
4. Delinquent behavior is guided only in part by deeply rooted problems of the psyche or the social order. It is also a response to immediate situations and opportunities. Important new prevention programs might be based on greater use of modern technology to make it harder or more costly to commit delinquent acts, while making it easier to gain valued goals by legal means.
5. The school system remains a critical point of reference for the development of delinquent attitudes and behavior. New programs

need to be focused on the process by which youths become defined as troublemakers in the school system and on the boundary relations between the schools, the community, and delinquency-control agencies.

6. Youth employment problems continue to be a most important area for program development.
7. Some of the most fascinating and important problems arise at the point of contact between the juvenile and the official systems of delinquency adjudication and control. The official labeling of juveniles as delinquents may create more delinquency than it solves. The problem requires careful empirical study. Until more is known about it, efforts should be made to refrain from invoking the official processes except where clearly necessary for public safety.
8. The police, as the first point of contact between juveniles and legal authorities, occupy a critically important point in delinquency control. Greater efforts must be made to examine the consequences of different modes of police handling of juveniles and to provide the referral resources in the neighborhood and community that might enable the police to make less frequent use of the court referral.
9. There is a great gap between the rhetoric of juvenile court philosophy and the reality of juvenile court practice. Efforts to close that gap should be accomplished by increasing the resources available to the court and by increasing the legal protections provided the juvenile.
10. The greatest need in juvenile correctional programs is to develop a graded series of alternatives to the traditional dispositions of probation or incarceration in youth institutions. A central part of that process will be to build stronger links between correctional programs and the local community.
11. The only sound basis for program development is knowledge of program effectiveness. The only way to get that knowledge is through systematic research. At the moment, relative to the importance of the problems, we know almost nothing about the effectiveness of potential solutions.
12. Personnel training is an obvious need. Given the shortage of trained professionals, a critical need is to re-evaluate the rehabilitative tasks and to use the least amount of skill required to accomplish each task successfully.

13. The kind of leadership needed at the federal level requires a better integration of the various disparate federal programs than is found at present.

We feel these points cover the significant problems in the field of delinquency, and would be valuable bases for the development of new programs. Most of them are not new, nor are the problems. Even modest success would seem worth the cost and effort.

Consultants

CURTIS C. ALLER
BERTRAM M. BECK
HOWARD S. BECKER
IVAR BERG
VIRGINIA BURNS
AARON CICOUREL
RICHARD A. CLOWARD
BERNARD COHEN
ELI COHEN
HAROLD COHEN
LAMAR T. EMPEY
HOWARD E. FREEMAN
ABRAHAM S. GOLDSTEIN
HERMAN GOLDSTEIN
PHILIP GREEN
KEITH GRIFFITHS
ALEX INKELES
JOHN IRVING
MORRIS JANOWITZ
FLORENCE KELLY
ORMAN W. KETCHAM
MARION LANGER
ELIZABETH S. MAKKAY
HANS W. MATTICK
DAVID MATZA
SHELDON MESSINGER
WALTER B. MILLER
JOHN MOORE

NORVAL MORRIS
RICHARD A. MYREN
LLOYD E. OHLIN
VINCENT O'LEARY
HOWARD OMART
MONRAD G. PAULSEN
ROBERT PEARLMAN
RICHARD PERLMAN
KENNETH POLK
MILTON RECTOR
ALBERT J. REISS, JR.
MARGARET K. ROSENHEIM
BERNARD RUSSELL
JOHN C. SCANLON
CLARENCE C. SCHRAG
CLARENCE SHERWOOD
CHARLES SHIREMAN
JAMES F. SHORT, JR.
JEROME H. SKOLNICK
HERBERT STRINER
JACKSON TOBY
DAVID C. TWAIN
ROBERT WEBER
CARL WERTHMAN
PETER WHITE
MARVIN E. WOLFGANG
RUSSELL WOOD

