COMMUNITY CHANGE, SOCIAL CONTROL, AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Alden D. Miller

Lloyd E. Ohlin

Julie A. Taylor

Center for Criminal Justice

Harvard Law School

December 1982

Prepared under a grant from the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U. S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions herein are not necessarily those of the funding agency.

Mr. Miller is at the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Maryland (College Park). Mr. Ohlin and Ms. Taylor are at the Center for Criminal Justice, Harvard Law School.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile justice policy is in a state of confusion and uncertainty about the strategies to be pursued in achieving the objectives of delinquency prevention and control. For two decades the Federal government has actively supported states and local communities in the search for effective policies and programs. The current disillusionment and retreat to traditional measures of punishment and repression represent an overreaction to the difficulty of achieving major organizational and community change to implement new juvenile justice policies. We expected too much, too quickly from demonstration projects hastily evaluated by crude measures of outcome. Our sense of drift and loss of direction arises in part from a failure to assess more carefully these lessons of the past. What were the underlying policy and theoretical assumptions, change strategies, and implementation problems? What worked, what did not and why? More careful attention to such issues is essential to regain a constructive sense of direction, continuity and growth between past, present and future policies. Though this report is not the appropriate place for such a detailed appraisal, it would place our research findings and recommendations in clearer perspective to review several major streams of development in theory, policy formulation, and programmatic demonstrations which show evidence of converging and defining fresh targets of action.

In the following sections of this introductory note to our research report we would like to direct attention to three impor-

tant avenues of research, experimentation and theoretical development. The first traces briefly the long history of institutional treatment of adjudicated delinquents and major alternatives to such dispositions. The second focuses on the mobilization of communities to institute prevention and control programs for troubled youth. The third reviews progress in understanding and developing strategies of organizational and community change to implement new policy initiatives. In the final section we will locate our studies of youth correctional reform in relation to these three areas of research to prepare the way for a more detailed account of our theoretical and empirical research findings.

Institutional Treatment of Delinquents

The institutional treatment of delinquents has a long history in the United States. In recent years historians have provided us with excellent studies of the origin and development of these institutions or training schools, as they came to be called, in the 19th Century.[1] From the establishment of the first municipal institution, the New York House of Refuge in 1825, the building of institutions expanded quickly to Boston and Philadelphia within three years and subsequently to other major cities. The first state supported institutions were set up in Massachusetts at the Lyman School for Boys in Westborough in 1847 and the School for Girls in Lancaster in 1854. Though the initial intention in establishing these school drew in part on the emerging models of public schools and Sunday schools for academic and moral instruction, they also drew upon

the emerging models of adult prison work and discipline being established in New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts.

The development of these training schools reflects a chaotic and constantly troubled and sobering history. The benign intentions of the founders invariably succumbed to the increasing regimentation of treatment, harsh disciplinary measure, and the stress of managing quickly overcrowded facilities. For the keepers the extant models of adult prison treatment and discipline promised more expedient forms of control and administration. Throughout the 19th Century the picture is one of repeated scandals, of mistreatment of youth and new reform efforts followed by renewed regimentation and prisonization of the training schools.[2] For example the early congregate forms of organization of the training schools quickly reflected the familiar pattern of overcrowding, increasing regimentation and abusive discipline. New models of organization emerged in the 1850's and 60's with the introduction of family style cottages in a rural campus-like institutional setting. To remove the pressures of overcrowding and increasing regimentation the older adolescents were separated out and sent to newly established nautical training schools for a time in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania in the 1870's and subsequently in these and many other states to reformatories for older boys that stressed vocational training.[3]

To a large extent this model of a training school built on the cottage system with centralized academic or vocational educa-

tion facilities has endured to the present time. Despite the subsequent addition of casework, individual and group counseling and therapy, the basic model has been of a custodial character with a central concern for the maintenance of order and discipline as a precondition for treatment. Overcrowding, excessive regimentation and overly harsh disciplinary measures are constantly recurring problems. The juvenile court movement initiated at the turn of the century helped enormously in relieving overcrowding by creating an alternative control option with the rapid growth of supervised probation in the community.[4] Probation offered a more benign, individualized form of treatment and control. It spread a wider net for the management of youthful deviance, but did not fully solve the problem of institutional overcrowding. Frequent failures in coordination of institutional and juvenile court policies produced periodic overcrowding with its attendant custodial ills.

Following World War II a residential alternative for some part of the training school population appeared in the form of intensive treatment in a small group home housing from twelve to twenty youth. The development of such homes were stimulated by the work of August Aichorn in Europe. His influential book published in 1939 described his experience in treating a small group of boys based on psychoanalytic theories of deviance.[5] Experiments using a similar approach were conducted in the United States by Fritz Redl.[6] But the most influential model was called "guided-group interaction" developed by Lloyd McCorkle in a small group home in Highfield, New Jersey.[7]

This search for alternatives to the training school was stimulated in a significant way by the research of Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck.[8] Their influential follow-up studies of reformatory graduates and juvenile court cases in Massachusetts found recidivism rates up to 80 percent. Training school proponents were shocked by this unanticipated evidence of failure and the path was opened to explore other forms of treatment. Along with small group homes the decade of the 1950's witnessed the establishment of many small forestry camps for youth patterned after those established by the California Youth Authority.[9]

Research in the late 1950's by Cloward and Ohlin and Polsky in New York State's public and private training schools and studies by Vinter and his associates in the mid-West documented the existence of strong inmate subcultures in these schools which served to insulate the youth and frustrate staff efforts at treatment.[10] These results challenged the effectiveness of individual case work as the primary intervention approach in congregate residential institutions, and underscored the importance of using group therapies in smaller more manageable units. The theoretical assumptions underlying such policy recommendations pointed to the possibility of controlling the oppositional stance of inmate subcultures by making the criteria of decisions affecting individuals or the group both more visible and more accessible to influence through use of the group in reaching decisions related to assignments, home visits, discipline and release. Our subsequent studies in the 1970's of small group process before and after the closing

of the large training schools by the Department of Youth Services (DYS) in Massachusetts provided more solid evidence of the validity of these assumptions. The context and oppositional character of the inmate subculture proved responsive and controllable to a considerable degree by organizational changes that fostered reliance on small group processes of communication and decision-making in residential facilities.

In its 1967 report the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice took account of these early studies to recommend a shift in policy away from large institutions to small group homes providing intensive treatment in community based facilities.[11] The Commission staff and consultants were fully aware of the research findings on the ineffectiveness of rehabilitation programs in large institutions, the types of studies subsequently collected and reviewed by Martinson and his associates.[12] The Commission recommendations, therefore, were in direct line of continuity with the emerging professional concensus in favor of small units. The Commission was also responsive to labeling theories and sought to reduce the negative effects of confinement in large institutions by encouraging diversion of juvenile status offenders and less serious delinquents to alternative dispositions.[13] This was consistent with other recommendations calling for decriminalization of victimless crimes, decentralization and diversification of treatment alternatives, greater due process protection, and less reliance generally on large facilities through a process of deinstitutionalization.[14]

Our Massachusetts studies show that when Jerome Miller was appointed Commissioner of DYS in 1969 he came with the intention of creating self-contained cottage units in the training schools which would utilize small group process and diversify treatment possibilities. He drew programmatic suggestions from the milieu therapy approach of the psychiatrist Maxwell Jones in England.[15] This policy and the subsequent closing of the institutions in favor of a diversified network of small group homes and other treatment alternatives in seven regions of the State were consistent with the general thrust of the National Crime Commission recommendations. The measures taken were radical in terms of their scope and speed of execution. The deinstitutionalization process was applied to all the major training schools of the Department and was virtually completed before the alternative program were fully established. Miller's reforms went deeper but also were consistent with the subsequent largely successful efforts of the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to deinstitutionalize the treatment of status offenders in the late seventies.

This brief review of institutions for delinquents has traced the development in theory, research and policy of a long term trend away from large public or private training schools especially since World War II. Except in Massachusetts the trend has often been incremental in systems still dominated primarily by reliance on traditional training schools. In fact, most recently, the prevailing law and order mood of the country has led to greater use

of confinement in training schools, despite the weight of evidence against such a policy.[16] It remains to be seen how long this countervailing trend to deinstitutionalization can be sustained in the face of this evidence and predominant professional opinion.

Community Delinquency Prevention Programs

A convenient anchoring point in the 20th century for the development of community programs designed to prevent delinquency may be located in the settlement house movement, which originated at the turn of the century and flowered in the first three decades. Designed to facilitate the assimilation of successive waves of immigrants largely from European countries, they took on a wide variety of community challenges. They established education and language classes for adults and children, fought for better housing, sanitation and poor relief programs, promoted vocational skill training, employment and recreational opportunities and established a variety of self-help programs. Delinquency prevention efforts were rooted therefore in these broader programs designed to foster the assimilation of the immigrant families and the socialization of the children.[17]

For a time in Chicago there existed a close working relationship between the social reformers in the settlement house movement and the sociologists at the University of Chicago under the leadership of Robert Park who looked on the city as an urban laboratory where the impersonal impact of ecological processes ordered the

distribution of people, activities, and facilities.[18] Though this coalition dissolved in the 1920's, the sociologists maintained close contact with the Chicago Area Project which was specifically designed to promote delinquency prevention programs in Chicago's high crime rate neighborhoods. The project ran anti-delinquency programs with a strong recreational emphasis and carried on research studies on the distribution of delinquent conduct, the development of delinquent careers, and the effect of social disorganization on the formation of delinquent subcultures and the learning of delinquent activities, beliefs and norms. The directors of the research program, Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay, were convinced that the roots of delinquent conduct were to be found in the differential impact of the processes of social disorganization on residents of areas which were undergoing rapid change. Neighborhoods in a process of transition, as former residents were displaced by newcomers, were perceived as experiencing disorganization of the major institutions of neighborhood stability, socialization and control. The area projects tried to encourage the rebuilding of those institutional supports related to prevention and control of delinquency. The projects sought to mobilize community initiatives to take responsibility and action to deal with youthful deviance. Though it proved diffficult to develop data to evaluate the impact of these programs, a great deal was learned about both the difficulties and the possibilities of taking the local community as the arena and target of prevention and reintegration activities.[19]

The Back-of-the Yards community action project in Chicago was undertaken by Saul Alinsky as a modification of the Area Projects approach.[20] With the support of the Catholic Church he sought to build the power of local community organizations in the stockyard area. He felt that delinquency prevention depended on the ability of local residents to exercise control or significant influence over the organization and operation of local institutions. This was to be achieved through organized confrontations between the local residents and the powers that controlled these institutions. Thus Alinsky's action programs were directed largely to broad community organization and empowerment efforts. It was expected that community residents would only be effective in preventing delinquency if they successfully acquired a sense of responsibility, confidence and competence to control the operation of local institutions and their impact on families and youth. As with the Area Projects the funds and technical capabilities for rigorous impact evaluation were too limited to measure the results effectively. Again, however, many practical lessons were learned about the problems of this type of community organization work.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's the Mobilization for Youth project on the Lower East Side of Manhatten in New York City drew inspiration and guidance form these earlier community oriented projects.[21] The initial impetus was somewhat different. A local coalition of settlement houses and social service agencies decided that their delinquency prevention programs could achieve signifi-

cant reductions in delinquency rates if funding of these programs collectively could reach a threshold of effective saturation and coverage of the community. The initial appeal for government funds failed for lack of an adequately developed theoretical justification and a research evaluation plan. The agency coalition appealed for assistance to professors Cloward and Ohlin at the Columbia University School of Social Work. Cloward and Ohlin had been working for two years on a comparative assessment of inmate subcultures at a public and a private training school in New York State. The differential opportunity theory developed in that context was used to provide a theoretical focus for the organization, programs and research approach of Mobilization for Youth. An expanded theoretical statement was then published in Delinquency and Opportunity in 1960.[22] This statement draw on Durkheim and Merton's theories of anomie and Tarde and Sutherland's theories of learning and differential association. It held that the organization of a neighborhood created both legitimate and illegitimate structures of opportunity to which youth in the area were differentially exposed. The pattern of delinquent subculture that emerged in the area responded to this differential opportunity structure. Thus to maximize the impact of delinquency prevention measures over the long run, it would be necesssary to alter these opportunity structures and in turn the delinquent subcultures they fostered. Communities had to assume responsibility for changing these structures if they wished to prevent and control delinquency. The historical linkage of this approach to the Chicago Area Projects and Alinsky's

community organization efforts was clear and direct though cast in a more fully elaborated and somewhat different theoretical scheme.

In 1961 this approach was adopted as the central strategy of the new federal delinquency program initiated by the Kennedy administration under the aegis of the newly created President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.[23] The committee joined three federal departments in a collaborative effort, consisting of Attorney General Robert Kennedy as chairman and HEW Secretary Abraham Ribcioff and Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg as members. The work of the Committee was directed by a special assistant to each of the Committee members and led to sixteen urban planning grants and five major projects following the general model developed by Mobilization for Youth. Though an evaluation design and research team was required of each project, the difficulties of evaluation and effective collaboration of the action and research components failed to produce definitive results. All too quickly these fledgling enterprises became absorbed in the War on Poverty programs and other more ambitious efforts at community development, such as the Model Cities program. Though these early delinquency programs of the President's Committee were generously funded by the federal government, private foundations and the project cities, it proved difficult to differentiate the impact of the project programs from the larger social development programs that followed or the effect of the rapidly developing civil rights movement. Indigenous leadership resources were limited at the outset, the tech-

nical capacity to orchestrate such large scale community change programs were lacking, and the delinquency programs were lost in the general reaction against these types of social engineering efforts after the urban riots of the middle sixties and the escalating cost and dissension over the Vietnam war.

However, the basic premise of these community based delinquency prevention programs continues to be a central concern. To be successful delinquency prevention must be based on programs rooted in local neighborhoods with organization of indigenous groups which accept responsibility for the task, even though provision of new opportunity structures may also require related resources and programs organized by city, state and federal agencies. In its 1967 report on juvenile delinquency the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice clearly underscored the importance of such community responsibility for delinquency prevention and also, as noted above, for community based treatment and supervision programs for adjudicated delinquents.[24] At present we are also seeing renewed appeals to adopt a community approach not only as part of the politics of "new federalism", but as justified by theories defining the local neighborhood as the key focus of action.

Processes of Institutional and Community Change

It is clear from the foregoing review of institutional and community approaches to delinquency that a major stumbling block

in reforms has been deficiencies of both knowledge and skill in instituting new policies effectively. In the past the failure to expend sufficient effort on both process and impact evaluation has left us uncertain of what measures were actually carried out and to what effect. Accordingly, the data for developing better understanding of the processes of both institutional and community change has been lacking. We have not built systematically on the lessons of the past because we have not known for sure what really happened. Study of the processes of institutional and community change is still in its infancy though now it is coming to be recognized as essential to more orderly growth. Our theories about such changes are also limited and inadequately tested. This condition must be rectified if our understanding of the sources of delinquent conduct and its prevention and control is to yield new and more effective strategies capable of being implemented successfully in different jurisdictions.

Changing institutions and communities to deal with youth problems involves political action since power relationships are inevitably involved. In the past professional social service workers have been reluctant to make the study of political processes or intervention in such processes an essential part of professional training or research focus. Yet to undertake major social reforms requires such understanding

As the brief review of institutional and community strategies to control or prevent delinquency amply illustrates, many attempts at major reform have been made. Only recently, however, in crim-

inology have we become more acutely conscious of the need to develop better theories, analyses and factual descriptions of the processes of social and organizational change. In the field of criminal justice, for example, the phenomenon of prison riots and nonviolent disturbances has evoked theoretical and research interest from a change perspective.[25] Historical accounts of the development of adult and juvenile penal systems have placed the evolution of these systems in the framework of larger social, economic and ideological trends in the larger society.[26]

Especially since World War II conceptualization of the processes of social and organizational change has proceeded more rapidly among social scientists. Political scientists have concentrated more attention on the distribution and struggles for power among interest groups in case studies of institutional and agency change.[27] Sociologists have devoted more attention to the role of social movements in social change as part of the study of collective behavior.[28] As noted above Alinsky was especially concerned with power relationships as they effect community change. In the following sections we will describe more fully the central focus on the processes of change which has guided the development of our studies to date of the Massachusetts reforms in youth corrections.

Youth Correctional Reform in Massachusetts

The three developing streams of theory, research and policy relating to institutional and community programs and to social and

organizational change have converged as organizing perspectives for our studies of youth correctional reform. These studies began with the appointment of Jerome Miller as Commissioner of the Department of Youth Services in the fall of 1969. At the outset it appeared that his appointment would provide an unusual opportunity to undertake a prospective study of reforms in youth corrections. Though no one anticipated at that stage the move to close the training schools two and half years later, it was clear that many significant changes in policy and program were imminent. The pending reforms, therefore, promised an unusual opportunity to study the impact of new programs compared to former ones and especially to trace the process by which such changes were instituted and the difficulties encountered in bringing them about. The appendix contains a listing of the many reports, published and unpublished papers and books which the research project has generated to date.

The research project's studies have focused on five major issue areas dealing with institutional and community correctional responses to delinquency. The first such area explored the impact of traditional training school regimens on youth subcultures and responsiveness of youths to treatment as contrasted with the impact of group therapy or guided-group-interaction forms of treatment.[29] The early attempts by Commissioner Miller to institute milieu therapy in some of the cottages at the three largest training schools provided an opportunity to assess the impact of this approach compared to cottages of boys and girls organized in the traditional fashion. The results showed a high degree of consistency in these comparisons. The youth subcultures in the therapy

cottages reflected group values, norms and role expectaions which were much more supportive of staff efforts to engage youth in solving personal and group problems. Acts of violence between youth or youth and staff were markedly reduced and perceptions of helpfulness with problems, as contrasted with preoccupation with control, much more pervasive. It now seems abundantly clear that the content of inmate subcultures is influenced considerably by the official definition and organization of staff and youth roles and expectations. The oppositional character of subcultures in traditional training schools and the violence often associated with it can be neutralized and made more supportive of treatment objectives by utilizing various forms of group process in decision-making and resolving problems.

The second issue area extended this exploration to group residential and nonresidential programs in the community.[30] If group therapy programs could create greater willingness and accessibility of youth to treatment in large training school environments by creating self-contained cottage programs, would this also hold true in similar community based programs? This extension of subcultural studies to community settings produced interesting insights and differences. Some of the residential small group programs operated in relative isolation from the surrounding community. They were more like the milieu therapy cottages in the training school. Significant shifts in youth values and perceptions of self and others were achieved and the staff-youth relationship were perceived generally as helpful. The lack of follow-up services

on release from these programs made the gains achieved less durable than they might have been. They contrasted significantly in this respect with residential and non-residential group programs more open to community interactions. These programs permitted more contact with friends immersed in youth subcultures in the community. Problems arising from these contacts with street-corner groups could be addressed in program discussions and decisions. Though value and attitude changes were less pronounced than in the closed programs they appeared to be more enduring. In both of these studies of client and staff subcultures in different settings there is direct continuity with other studies cited above of inmate subcultures and their relationship to the pattern of official organization. In our research the comparative study of subculture formation in different residential and non-residential settings through extensive direct observation and staff and youth interviews permitted the isolation of critical organizational differences such as the degree of staff youth equality, the extent of community contact, the amount of inmate participation in programs and decision-making, and the level of supervision of interactions in the program.

The third major issue involved an assessment of the comparative effect of institutional versus community based programs on subsequent contacts of youth with juvenile or adult criminal justice agencies.[31] It proved possible to arrange programs on a continuum from closed institutional programs to more normalized settings in the community. The recidivism results proved somewhat inconclusive

since overall the training school graduates showed slightly lower rates of rearrest or reconviction. However, the community based alternatives were absent or poorly developed in some regions of the state. Where they were firmly in place the results favored the community programs. Perhaps the most important finding of this study, however, pertained to the short-term impact of most forms of treatment. Though the results documented positive changes in youth especially in many of the group process programs, these changes correlated less highly with recidivism than the experiences of youth before adjudication and after release from the programs to unsupervised living in the community. It thus appears that youth correctional programs will have limited short term effects unless they engage the relationships and problems a youth must deal with when free of correctional supervision. In short, community- based programs must be more fully integrated into the everyday life of the community and should allow for greater continuity between the more intensive and isolated group therapy programs and those which deal with problems arising in programs with more extensive contacts and relationships of youth in the community.

The fourth issue area concerned the conceptualization and analysis of social and organizational change in the reform process.[32] In this area the project has broken new ground in developing a theoretical scheme that permits identification and tracking of the interest group relationships that shape the reform process. Interview instruments were developed directly reflecting the various components of the theoretical analysis. By administering these interviews in successive time periods, the distribution of

power, responsibility and reward within and among the competing interest groups and coalitions can be tracked to permit simulations of these interactions into the future to predict the course of reform and counter-reform processes. Simulations of this process by six month intervals from 1976 to 1984 continue to be on target. They suggest that this complex process can in fact be reasonably represented by a small number of variables responding to logical and empirical principles of relationship. Furthermore, the conceptual scheme can be applied to map the processes of change in a variety of social service contexts from the level of service delivery to clients in the community to the struggles for control of this service system among competing coalitions of interest groups. The theoretical system is rooted in a broad range of social science theories of individual and group behavior. What is of special value here is its usefulness in understanding and anticipating the path of organizational change. This scheme has not only been applied prospectively to the Massachusetts youth correctional reforms, but also retrospectively to an extensive study of correctional reform over a fifty year period in Wisconsin by Ohlin and associates in 1953 to 1956.[33]

The final issue area relates to the integration of youth correctional services with the differential opportunity structure for youth in two communities in the Boston area. This forms the subject matter of this report. It brings together the study of youth correctional programs and programs of youth socialization and delinquency prevention in the community. To study the interface between such programs and the differential opportunities available to youth, the theoretical conceptualization has been

refined and the interview instruments redesigned as described in the next section of this report. Our studies of youth correctional reform in the state Department of Youth Services has led us back to the community context in which the resolution of youth problems must finally take place. We see here therefore the convergence of interests in the treatment of delinquents, community programs for delinquency prevention, and the implementation of organizational and community reform. Our studies of the local communities have covered only a short time period of one year in which changes could occur. They represent, therefore, a first attempt to examine more closely the relationship of youth correctional programs and the differential opportunity structures for youth in the same community. If we wish to develop better delinquency prevention and control policies and programs for youth in the future, it will be necessary to understand more fully how they can be organized and integrated in communities prepared to accept responsibility for a major part of the problem and its solution.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

In this section of our report on youth in the community we will present the conceptualization we have developed to guide our data collection and analysis. We will begin with the youth's experiences and work from there through the controls and programs that shape these experiences and finally to the policies and politics affecting the community service system.

The Behavior Generating System

The Behavior Generating system is the social system within which youthful behavior is immediately determined. It is a relationship between the youth and all other people who relate directly to the youth and whose actions affect the youth's behavior. We can measure this relationship by answering four questions. (We will frequently refer to these questions in subsequent sections by the underlined labels.)

1. Actual Behavior. What have the youth been doing?
2. Anticipated Behavior. What do the youth think they are likely to do in the near future?
3. Available Behavior. What do the youth think it would be possible for them to do in the near future?
4. Aspired Behavior. What do the youth want to do?

The answers to these four questions provide an indication, or reflection, of a whole world of social structure and process. What the youth have been doing is perhaps the obvious central point, since it is, for example, what makes the headlines when people in the community become concerned about youth on their own in the com-

munity. We read about gang fighting, or dropping rocks from bridges on passing cars, and so on. When we read these things we want to know whether this behavior is a pattern, whether there is a continuing force or power behind it. So we ask, "Will it keep happening in the near future?" Since the behavior derives its significance to us from a social context, we are asking whether people in the social context who somehow promote the behavior are more powerful than others who in one way or another discourage it.

We also want to know why. Perhaps what was done was the only thing that the youth had a really clear opportunity to do. Or perhaps it was simply that they wanted to do it. When we ask whether youth could do various things in the near future if they wanted, and whether they in fact want to do those things, the answers reflect, again because of the social context of behavior, the actions of people who in one way or another have made some things more possible than others, and some things more desirable to the youth than others.

Part of the social system reflected in the Behavior Generating System is institutionalized, in the sense that it consists of regular, well known and normative patterns routinized in organizations. We can talk of the institutions of family and neighborhood, education, work, recreation, religion, social work, mental health, prevention, police, courts, and corrections. These institutionalized patterns taken together we will call Institutionalized Social Control by Adults. For exerting day to day social

control these institutions have two basic strategies, which they can use singly or together. The first is to act to affect directly the real world of the youth's relationship to the larger community. The second is to create a model world within the institution, and act to affect that, with the hope that the model world will affect the youth's relationship to the larger community by example.

In the first strategy a family might try to help its children negotiate their way, perhaps by helping them find jobs, or intervening for them at school, or helping them get access to recreation facilities, etc. Much of this kind of action amounts to negotiation with other day to day social control institutions. In the second strategy the family might try to teach the children respect for authority, or independence and self reliance, or social skills within the family itself. Thus the child learns to respect his or her parents, or to make decisions without relying on the parents, or to negotiate with siblings on a choice of group activity. In the first strategy the actions are directed outward from the family. In the second they are contained within the family. Most day to day social control institutions employ both strategies to some extent, but most <u>emphasize</u> one or the other, since maximal development of either tends to conflict with the other. Total control within the institution depends on isolation from outside interference. Affecting the environment depends on being open to some give and take with it.

To study these institutional components of the Behavior Generating System we ask three questions.

1. Action Affecting Youth-Community. What do the adults do to affect the relationship of the youth to the community?

2. Staff-Youth Power. What is the distribution of responsibility, power, and reward among youth and adults within the "model world?"

3. Action Affecting Staff-Youth. What do the adults do to affect the distribution?

The first question assesses the first strategy--affecting directly the relationship of the youth to the larger community, while the second and third assess the second strategy, relying on the "model world" within the institution. It is worth noting that sometimes the model world of questions two and three becomes a dominating goal in its own right, and may even displace concern about the larger community entirely.

How does Institutionalized Social Control by Adults relate to the larger Behavior Generating System, of which it is part? The answer to each of our questions under Institutionalized Social Control by Adults is part of what is reflected by one of the questions under the Behavior Generating System. Action Affecting Youth-Community is a part of what is involved in Available Behavior, Staff-Youth Power is part of what is involved in Anticipated Behavior, and Action Affecting Staff-Youth is part of what is involved in Aspired Behavior. Thus, since Aspired and Available Behavior are the key pressure point for change in the Behavior Generating System, Action Affecting Youth-Community and Action Affecting Staff-Youth are the parts of those pressure points under institutionalized control by adults.

What else is involved in the Behavior Generating System besides Institutionalized Social Control by Adults? The rest is the larger

relationship of the youth to the community as a whole that the many social control systems for youth treat as an environment out into which the youth will move on their own, beyond the boundaries of the social control institutions themselves. It is the world school children go home to at night and graduate into, that correctional youth are released to, that people at work spend their leisure time in, that youth in a recreational program play in without supervision when not at the recreational program, and so on. Even when we add up all the sectors, or institutions of social control, there is still a large residual zone of life space that is not institutionally organized, but which is negotiated element by element between the child and the environment. This zone of life space, larger for some youth than for others, is the rest of the Behavior System. We can study it by participant observation. We can also study it by looking for variation in measures of the total Behavior Generating System that is not accounted for by variation in our measures of Institutionalized Social Control by Adults.

For policy purposes, we are especially interested in Institutionalized Social Control by Adults, and the political process that shapes it. We turn now to the Control Generating System.

Control Generating System

In the Control Generating System we describe the structure and process of political influences that control how Institutionalized Social Control by Adults works. We study it by examining

the behavior and perceptions of some key actors--not the key movers, but the key people that have to be moved. The key movers, in addition to legal advocates, may be administrators, court people, legislators, people in special interest groups, representatives of programs, the media, anyone who has an interest in an issue and acts on that interest. The key people who have to be moved are more simply identified. They are the adults who exercise the day to day social contol--parents, employers, teachers, all the people who run programs. Since these people are moved by influencing their perceptions of possibilities and desirabilities, our task is to measure changes in these perceptions. So to measure change in the Control Generating System we ask the following four questions about the adults who exercise Institutionalized Social Control over youth.

1. Institutionalized Social Control by Adults. What controls have the adults been using recently on the youth?

2. Anticipated Controls. What controls do the adults think they are likely to use in the near future?

3. Available Controls. What controls do the adults think they could use in the near future if they wanted?

4. Aspired Controls. What controls do the adults want to use?

What is happening in Institutionalized Social Control by Adults is of course the actual, current behavior of these key people who must be moved. What they think they are likely to do in the near future tells us about the potential of various behaviors, their staying power and strength, and of course that refelects the power

of the key movers who advocate particular controls. We can identify forces for change in the changes we observe at the two key pressure points for change, perceptions of possibility and desirability.

Policy Generating System

We can assess change and the forces for it and even build predictive mathematical models of change over periods of time at least as long as a decade and a half using just the Behavior Generating Systm (including Institutionalized Day to Day Social Control by Adults) and the Control Generating System. However curiosity may drive us further, and practical concern may also. It would be nice to know, for example, more about how the Control Generating System itself is controlled--that is, exactly what are the actions (we will call them policies) of the key movers that are reflected in the feelings of the adults involved in Institutionalized Social Control about available and aspired controls? Who are the key movers who employ those policies? We might even like to know how they feel about what they are doing. We could apply to these key movers the same sorts of questions we applied to the key people who must be moved, the people who do day to day social control. Again, we might have four questions.

1. Actual Policies. What have the movers been doing recently that might have affected available and aspired control?

2. Anticipated Policies. What are the key movers likely to do in the near future that might affect available and aspired controls?

3. Available Policies. What could the key movers do in the near future if they wanted that might affect available and aspired controls?

4. Aspired Policies. What do the key movers want to do that might affect available and aspired control?

Anticipated policies measures the longer term trends in policy and reflects the power of people who try to get the key movers to move in a particular direction. There is obviously possible an infinite regression here in the analysis of people who move the people who move people, and so forth. Available and aspired policies are the pressure points whereby the movers are themselves moved.

We do not have to follow the infinite regression infinitely seeking closure in our analysis. If we stop with the Behavior Generating System and the Control Generating System, we will already have a kind of closure because the explanations of changes in the aspired and available controls lie in the other variables of those two systems. Our questions about policies and any we might add on in a further regression, are really just another way of looking at the same processes. The influences that we chart in the policy questions as affecting the key movers were set in motion in the first place by characteristics of the Behavior and Control Generating Systems.

In our study we are interested in the policy questions because they are a way of studying these influences that for our purposes offers an important complement to the analysis of the Behavior and Control Generating System. These questions are what enable us to tease apart the overall process represented by those two systems so as to see what role different interest groups have in its operation. Essentially it fills out the flesh of certain

muscles on a moving skeleton. With the two systems we plot the movements of the skeleton. With the questions about policies we study those special muscles we are concerned to know more about. The muscles in question are the key movers.

TYPES OF BEHAVIORS, CONTROLS AND POLICIES

Types of Behaviors

Behaviors can be considered basically law abiding or illegal. Within each of these two types we can think of behaviors that involve status, skill, and resources, and those that do not. Law abiding behaviors such as going to college or college prep or getting a white collar job involve more than getting an unskilled job or going to parties. Illegal behaviors such as con games or armed robbery take more skill and resources than shoplifting.

Types of Control

We think of social control as being pursued by internal strategies focused on the "model world" we spoke of earlier and by external strategies focused on the real world of the Youth Opportunity System. We will describe three types of internal strategy--attempts to control aspired behavior, and three types of external strategy--attempts to control available behavior. An observed social control system can usually be seen to employ a combination of types of strategy. We suspect that certain types of external strategy tend to be associated with certain types of internal strategy.

The three types of internal strategy, operating on the "model world" within the social control institution, are custodial, open, and therapeutic.

Custody is recognizable by its reliance on punishment and by the fact that the principal responsibility of the youth is for obedience and respect for authority. There is frequently a strong emphasis by the staff on conventional academic or vocational education. There tends to be found among the youth an oppositional subculture, where the youth tend to split into cliques separate from the staff, with their own rules, and where some of the youth control the others through the use of physical sanctions. In sum:

1. Communication is severely restricted
2. Staff do the decision making
3. Control is by punishment and illicit reward
4. Fairness requires all to be treated alike in the continuing conflict between inmates and staff.

In open programs, in contrast, the staff has moved to share some decision making power with the youth, relies more on rewards than on punishment, and the youth subculture tends to reflect that of the larger surrounding community, rather than being shaped so strongly by the program itself. Unlike the custodial program, the open program is compatible with a lot of contact between the youth and the community, although such contact does not always occur. In sum:

1. Communication is free but not insisted upon
2. Decision making is shared, but youth do not decide about each other
3. Control is largely by reward
4. Fairness is more flexible and individualistic than in the custodial pattern.

Therapeutic programs, the third type, are even more isolated from the surrounding community than are the custodial ones because they build within themselves a complete community that is quite different from the surrounding community, and the program seeks to avoid contamination. In therapeutic programs the "model world" inside the program is all-important. There is reliance mostly on rewards, sharing of decision making power, and sharing of the power to reward and punish each other. Youth become responsible for each other as well as for themselves, and are much involved in getting each other to confront their personal problems. In sum:

1. Communication is intense and insisted upon
2. Youth are encouraged to share in decision making and help make decision about each other
3. Control relies more on reward than on punishment
4. Fairness is judged differently by youth who have accepted the therapeutic subculture with its particularistic emphasis, as compared with newcomers who still equate universalism with fairness.

The three types of external strategy are supervision, coaching and advocacy. Supervision is an obedience and punishment dominated mode of keeping watch over youth in the community. It is likely to be associated with a custodial internal strategy. Coaching is an external strategy that is oriented toward helping the youth cope with the larger community, but consists of actions taken from the sidelines--such things as rewarding or punishing the youth depending on how he does in the community, or even arranging for him to get into school or to have a job. Advocacy, by contrast, consists of

actions in which the adults go into the larger community with the youth and fight the battle with him. The hallmark of such a strategy is the effort to get people in the community to participate in structuring consequences for the youth, so that not all the reward for doing well or the punishment for doing wrong comes from the program staff on the sidelines. Coaching is fairly commonly associated with the therapeutic internal strategies, while advocacy is associated with open strategies. It should be born in mind, however, that it is possible for internal and external strategies to vary independently within broad limits. Thus it is quite possible to find open internal strategies associated with supervision as an external strategy, for example.

Types of Policies

Policies can be designed to affect aspired controls or to affect available controls. If they are to affect aspired controls they will be actions that increase or decrease the stakes, or vested interests, that the staff of programs have in the use of various controls. If the policies are to affect available controls, they will be actions that increase or decrease the resources program staff have for using various controls. To change the controls used by a program, policies will be selected that lower both stakes and resources relating to the old controls, and increase both stakes and resources relating to the new controls.

Summary: Behaviors, Controls, and Policies

Thus we are dealing with policies which affect controls which affect behaviors, as in the following table:

Behaviors:	1) Law abiding	2) Illegal
Controls:	1) To affect aspired behavior a) therapy b) custody c) support	2) To affect available behavior a) coaching b) advocacy c) supervision
Policies:	1) To affect aspired controls a) increase stakes b) decrease stakes	2) To affect available controls a) increase resources b) decrease resources

The Policy Generation System describes the process whereby the policies are shaped. The Control Generating System describes the process whereby the policies lead to the controls. And the Behavior Generating System describes the process whereby the controls lead to the behaviors.

THE COMMUNITY

It is important to place our discussion of our survey of youth services and opportunities in its community context. Within any community system there are both supportive and restrictive forces at play, facilitating or restricting an indivual's use of resources. The community in which our research was carried out is a section of the central city in an eastern metropolis; we'll call this section "Center" and the larger city "Metropolis".

Center is a community undergoing significant changes. It has been steadily losing population over the last twenty years and has decreased in its proportion of Metropolis's population--it now contains only 5% of the city's citizens. Yet it is a diverse, lively, and evolving community. Borders with other areas of the city have always been fuzzy and are still so today; Center is not a cohesive community with a strong identity, though sections of it are. While it is a neighborhood of Metropolis, Center is itself divided up into neighborhoods; in fact, many residents identify themselves not as being from Center, but from Town Square or North Street, and people who live in one neighborhood may not travel much beyond their little enclave--services, stores, and schools may be available to them in other areas of Center or Metropolis, but remain unknown or unused.

Center is mostly residential, but has significant areas of industrial and commercial zones. It is geographically large and spread out, and the community looks very different from different vantage points. A visitor can stand in the dim dirty shadow of an elevated subway line, surrounded by litter and the noise and smell from trains, buses, trucks, cars, and blaring radios. Ten minutes later, that same visitor can walk around a beautiful pond, hear nothing but the crunch of leaves underfoot, and gaze at large stately homes with well-tended yards. One can shop in stores catering to Cubans, Puerto Ricans and Costa Ricans, and then have a beer in an Irish pub. There are vegetarian restaurants, ma-and-pa luncheonettes, herbal tea shops in alternative bookstores, neighborhood corner markets, ice cream parlors, and discount chain stores; the commercial areas are full of small independent businesses. Center has a good public transportation system that is used by all classes and all ages. Two rapid transit lines and several buses run the length of the community; getting across the community is more difficult.

The population is unusually varied in its composition and continues to change. The average age is dropping--30% of the population is aged 20 or younger and 12% is between the ages of 11 and 20. This decrease is partly due to the community becoming increasingly Hispanic and, to a lesser extent, black; over half the total Metropolitan

Hispanic population is under 18. In 1970, Hispanics formed only 6% of Center's population, but by 1980 they accounted for 25%. It has become the most heavily Hispanic of the city's 18 neighborhoods and is home to 25% of the city's Hispanic population.

Center is racially unusually mixed: it is 53% white (with large Irish and Greek communities), 25% Hispanic, 17% black, and 5% other races. Even the Hispanic community has socioeconomic and nationality distinctions among Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Central Americans. Metropolis as a whole is 69% white, only 6% Hispanic, 20% black and 5% other races.

Yet in contrast to much of Metropolis, where racial tensions are visible and, some say, increasing, the atmosphere in Center is one of tolerance rather than divisive strife. To many residents, the racial, ethnic, and economic diversity and tolerance are characteristics they enjoy and are proud of. It has attracted new groups such as students and politically progressive people looking for a relatively safe, integrated, and diverse community. The presence of these new groups has been reflected in the election results from Center the last few years.

Center is noted for its concerned citizens of all kinds and of all political persuasions: a black tenants

group that has achieve widespread recognition for its effective resident-run management of a housing project and for its programs that have fostered a sense of pride and community and minimized crime and abandonment in the project; neighborhood block watches in Irish working-class homes; a socialist community-organizing group that prints its own newspaper; young gay groups; the conservative Irish columnist of the weekly community paper; and several elderly organizations and activists. One Catholic church located in a changing Hispanic area had two youth groups--one Hispanic and one "American". Language was not so much of a barrier as was the cultural hostility, but the church is now merging the groups, hoping to foster interaction and understanding. Another church organized a mixed youth group of blacks, whites, Hispanics, and Cambodians into a team that supervised youth activities at a community playground.

But the changes have also yielded problems for Center. The already tight housing market was further tightened by the clearing and destruction of a major corridor that was to be used for a super highway extension; that work was halted when the project was cancelled, partly due to community opposition. For many years the corridor was a barren scar physically dividing the community. Now construction has begun anew, relocating the subway system, which will remove the old,

ugly elevated section. But the destruction from this corridor, along with fears of racial change, led in the late 1970's to falling property values, diminished private and public investment in Center, and abandonment and deterioration of the housing stock. Three of the major industries in the community left, the business district suffered from lack of investment, and unemployment soared.

Center and an adjacent neighborhood have the highest jobless rates in Metropolis. Minority unemployment is higher, as is youth unemployment; more than 40% of the minority youth, so numerous in Center, are unemployed. The educational level of black and Hispanic adults in Center is low--two-thirds have not finished high school. The two public high schools serving the community have the second and third highest drop-out rates in Metropolis. For example, of the 500 students who entered the ninth grade in Center High School in 1976, only 153 graduated in 1981. Some of this is accounted for by students transferring to other schools and by those who may take an extra year to graduate, but the very low graduation rate remains. Over half of Center High's drop-outs are black and more than 25% are Hispanic. Estimates of Hispanic school-age children not attending school range upwards from 40%.

Center has its poor, as well. In 1970, 16% of the population in Center was living below the poverty line; in one neighborhood, 23% were classified as living in

poverty. The supply and expense of housing have been issues of concern to many of Center's residents, who have been facing perhaps the major urban housing problem of the 1980's: gentrification--the displacement of low and moderate income households by more affluent people, often single professionals or childless couples. The inner cities have again become desireable places to live: Center's reputation as a community of rich variety and its large housing stock made it popular. Young professionals have been renting and buying Center houses; while some have contributed to groups working on social, economic, and educational issues in the community, the net effect has been to increase rents and condomominium conversions thereby decreasing the amount of rental housing, and pushing out poor, working class, and elderly residents.

Housing prices have climbed 120% in the last two years. Three deckers and old Victorian mansions from the days when Center developed as a "streetcar suburb", that used to house six families, are being bought and rehabbed into three-family or single family dwellings, with housing prices and rentals rising to levels beyond the reach of many residents. Condominium conversions--some costing $100,000 and more--further promote the trend toward higher prices and more exclusive neighborhoods.

Another factor that drew people to Center was the fact that it used to be though of as one of the safe areas of Metropolis. To many it still seems safe; people of all ages are visible on the streets almost all the time. But a height-

ened fear of crime now affects many residents. Several neighborhoods have started forming neighborhood watches and meeting with police to voice their concerns and demands for protection. Two recent events have exacerbated residents' fears. First, the Metropolitan police force was cut due to budget decreases, the result of a taxpayer referendum. Second, the local police station, located in the downtown commercial area and physically in the middle of Center, was closed by Metropolis; the new area police station serving several communities is located 20 minutes from the old station in an adjacent community. There have been efforts by the citizens to have the old station re-opened or a sub-station opened, but these have not met yet with any success. Also, in the last two years, there have been many incidents of arson of occupied and unoccupied buildings. One community agency has made progress in its attempts to get funds and political support to rehabilitate old buildings before they get torched, so that the poor can have better housing: it has begun to achieve some of these goals.

Characteristics of Youth and Youth Serving Agencies

Turning now more directly to the programs and youth studied, we interviewed a sample of 104 youth who had the following characteristics:

Race	White	56%
	Black	36%
	Hispanic	7%
	other	1%
Sex	Male	58%
	Female	42%
Age	13-15	29%
	16	27%
	17	25%
	18-19	12%
	20-21	5%

It should be noted that some of the youth we interviewed did not come from Center, but were participating in programs we studied. Programs included ones that were either in Center and serviced Center youth or in Metopolis, used by some Center youth and available to Center youth. In addition, we looked at some secure correctional programs located half-way across the state, which were used for youth from Metropolis.

We interviewed these youth and a slightly larger number of staff in a wide variety of programs and institutions. Center, in combination with Metropolis, has a large network of public

and private agencies for youth. It should be kept in mind, however, that many youth do not participate in any programs. Little outreach work is done and what there was has been cut back or eliminated in many areas due to financial constraints. Center High School, for example, had a bilingual outreach worker who worked with youth who had dropped out or were on the verge of dropping out; his position was eliminated this past school year.

We interviewed people in seven schools and five educational programs not associated with formal schools. Included were public high schools and middle schools, public high schools available only to those who passed rigorous entrance examination, vocational schools, and parochial schools; special education classes were included. The schools varied a great deal in their physical condition, administration, counseling and special education services, and student body composition. For example, one public high school was run by a principal who was visibly involved with and supported by both students and teachers. Morale was high and it had many good programs for a variety of different types of youth. Another school had numerous operational problems and breakdowns in its facility, vandalism and violence were considered serious problems by staff and by students, and morale was low.

The education programs we visited that were not associated with formal schools ranged from after-school tutoring for average youth who had minor academic problems to complete supplementary education programs with counseling services for youth out of school and in trouble with the law.

In the correctional area, we visited eighteen different programs that ranged from casework services for youths at home to vocational training to residential placement for counseling and education to locked secure treatment units; detention programs were included.

In the other sectors, we talked with eight families, one family planning and counseling agency, people from four job programs and from four job sites, seven recreation programs, four churches, twelve social work agencies (residential and non-residential), six mental health agencies (residential and non-residential), two police departments, and eight court programs in two different courts that included diversion programs for first offenders and intensive supervision for multiple and/or serious offenders.

We talked to kids in a multi-racial boy scout troop, a pregnant black teenager under court probation in a residential counseling program, Irish youth in a Catholic high school, repeat offenders arrested for armed robbery, and students at Metropolis's most elite high school. Staff interviewed ranged from young caseworkers to seasoned youth advocates to commissioners of state agencies. Center is considered to have some typical difficulties with its youthful population, but is not perceived to have a severe problem. Only 200 youth were arrested by the Center police last year, and not all of these were Center youth; this is a low rate compared to that of Metropolis. The most frequent charges for these arrests were receiving stolen property, disorderly conduct, breaking and entering, and consumption of alcohol.

Center is fortunate to have a community based, non-profit social agency that provides services to youth and their families, as well as to elderly and Hispanic residents. It also offers fiscal management and administrative support to local organizations. Formed seventeen years ago by seven local churches to develop programs that would "stabilize and renew the community", it has tried and succeeded in having active resident particpation in its agency and in the community at large. Staff members and volunteers have initiated needs assessments, conferences, joint programs, home repair services, job training, and many other needed services. It continues to be a major agency for planning and coordinating social services in the Center community.

THE PROGRAM SURVEYS: 1981 and 1982

Introduction

The program survey in this study is a large scale exploratory analysis. To make the most use of it we need to see clearly what has been done, what has not been done, and what can be done in the future.

1. Done. We have essentially accomplished two things. First we have produced in two successive years snapshots of behavior and control within the sectors of family, education, work, recreation, religion, social work, mental health, prevention, police, courts, and corrections. Taken together this amounts to two successive snapshots of institutionalized social control by adults over youth in community.

The second accomplishment is implied in the first. We have proven that it is feasible to assess a community over time in terms of its patterns of adult social control over youth using survey methods supported by a small staff and a modest budget. Nearly universal patterns of response to our research proposal indicated that feasibility was not obvious before we did the project. People thought the work was important but likely to be extraordinarily difficult.

2. Not Done. We have not in the present survey obtained in either year representative samples of families. In fact we have interviewed only a few families, although we have established that we can interview families and obtain the required data.

We have not obtained representative samples of all youth in school, although we have collected representative data from identifiable programs within schools.

We do not have representative samples of all work places that employ youth, although we have data from what are probably examples of the major types.

In mental health and in the justice system except for corrections we have obtained data mainly from staff. In the social work area youth are somewhat underrepresented in the data compared to staff. These problems in access had to do with confidentiality, fear on the part of the staff that the interviewing might be upsetting to the youth, and difficulty in obtaining parental consent where that was required. These problems are obviously capable of solution in some circumstances, and we hope that they can be routinely solved in the context of community-wide surveys such as this one in the future.

Finally, we have not made each program's representation in the sample closely proportional to the size of the program, although we have tried in a rough way to include more cases from larger programs than from smaller ones.

These limitations must qualify characterizations of the whole community's patterns of institutionalized social control over youth. They also complicate our comparisons over time. The solution to that problem, of course, is to test observed change patterns within carefully defined strata, where the stratifying variables are types of programs.

3. Could Be Done in the Future. It would clearly be possible to do what we have listed as done plus what we have listed as not done if we were to perhaps double our staff or subcontract some of the sample survey work, such as the families, to a survey firm with an established sampling frame.

Such an expansion of effort would make possible the complete characterization of community systems of social control over youth. Over time comparisons would be easier, since stratification would not be needed to correct for nonrepresentativeness. The overtime comparisons which we have begun in this report, make it possible to study change patterns both in the whole community and in individual components, such as the education or corrections sectors. With longer time series that the one-year period we have had, we could investigate such questions as, do changes occur in the mental health system before the corresponding changes occur in the correctional system? Or do all sectors change more or less together? Or is it a random matter which sectors begin to change first? Are tactical considerations for change or for resistance to change different in the different sectors? These questions stem naturally from our previous work. In the 1960's and 70's the Massachusetts mental health system began to deinstitutionalize before the youth correctional system did. Reformers seeking to establish group homes for retarded people worked with a slightly different perspective than did some of those trying to establish group homes for delinquent youth. Those working in the retardation area were less concerned about obtaining the neighborhood's cooperation than were some of the early reformers in youth corrections.

4. Practical Use of What Has Been Done. Obviously what has been done can provide strong hints of what would be found with a more complete study. Equally obviously, it provides examples of how a common methodology can be used to assess what is happening in and with respect to a wide variety of institutions of social control.

What has been done is particularly relevant to a current focus in our research, namely specific, identifiable programs that would be especially important to know about when putting problem youth from a correctional system back into the community. To pursue such a focus we want to know where some of the needed supports can be found already or are in the process of developing, and what others need to be added, either specifically for correctional youth or for all youth. Our sampling in the present survey, where it has departed from the optimal representative sampling, has focused on specific, identifiable programs that an advocate for difficult youth might seek out. As we shall see below, many of them do not deal much with difficult youth, and many do not provide the intensive support an advocate might seek for troubled youth. Thus both access problems and the question of what additional services are required beyond what the community normally provides to ordinary youth emerge as serious concerns for the advocate.

In interpreting the data to follow, it should be remembered that the youth in a program survey are not all youth in a community, but rather youth in programs. Thus if we find a strikingly low crime rate, for example, that does not necessarily mean that youth

in the community are nondelinquent--it just means that youth in programs are. It may also mean that programs exclude youth with serious problems. We found a year ago when we analyzed a small amount of data from a survey of street groups that youth in programs were distinctly different from youth on the streets and not in programs, in that the street youth were more likely to actually want to be involved in delinquent acts.

We will divide our presentation of data from the Program Survey into a section on the total Behavior Generating System and a section on Institutionalized Social Control by Adults, and the Control Generating System. The latter section will be subdivided into three parts: Action Affecting Staff-Youth, Staff-Youth Power, and Action Affecting Youth-Community. Institutionalized social control and policy making will be dealt with in the same tables. All tables will show for two successive years the community as a whole (eleven sectors taken together) followed by the educational and correctional sectors taken separately. These two sectors were chosen for display over all of the others because they represent two ends of a continuum. Education is probably the most main-stream of all community-organized activities for youth. Corrections is probably the most extremely stigmatizing. Thus we use education as an example of what the community does with youth in the ordinary course of things, and corrections as an example of what the community does when there is "big trouble."

For 1981, we have 178 staff interviews (including 43 in education and 31 in corrections) and 89 youth interviews (including 23 in education and 25 in corrections).

For 1982, we have 140 staff interviews (including 36 in education and 36 in corrections) and 104 youth interviews (including 30 in education and 30 in corrections).

The Behavior Generating System

The data for the Behavior Generating System is arranged in four tables displaying illegitimate activities (crimes against persons, crimes against property, crimes of vice, and crimes of misbehavior) and four tables displaying legitimate activities (career activities, special skill activities, sports, and social activities). In each table there are listed several activities in the rows, and four response dimensions across the top. The response dimensions are "recently," "choice," "want," and "likely." These refer to whether the youthful respondent has been doing an activity recently, a measure of actual behavior; whether he thinks his friends believe he could do the activity if he wanted, a measure of available behavior; whether he wants to do the activity in the near future, a measure of aspired behavior; and whether he thinks he is likely to do the activity in the near future, a measure of anticipated behavior. As we explained earlier, "likely" is a measure of power, in that if a behavior is likely then the constituency for that behavior is more powerful than the constituency against it. "Choice" and "want" are the key pressure points for promoting or hindering change.

We will analyze each table by first comparing the rows in the first two columns which show the percent of youth engaging in each behavior recently, for 1981 and 1982. We will be interested

in comparing the rows to see which behaviors predominate, and in comparing the two columns to see change from 1981 to 1982. To facilitate the comparison of the two years, we have placed plus and minus signs in front of the 1982 entries that show changes of ten percent or more. The signs do not mean that the percentages are positive or negative, only that there has been a change up or down. The signs are flags, rather than true signs.

We will then examine the remaining pairs of columns, for choice, want, and likely, for signs of impending change in the behavior--that is for signs that the 1983 behaviors will be different from the 1982 behaviors. These indications of change will be registered in changes between 1981 and 1982 in the choice and want columns, sometimes reinforced by changes in the likely columns. We have flagged changes of ten percent or more with plus and minus signs to make the scanning process easier and quicker.

One reservation we must consider in the interpretation of the data is that a year may be too long an interval, and it may be that in cases where there has been a change in behavior (in the recently columns) and changes in the choice, want, and likely columns also, the changes in the choice, want, and likely columns may have already had their effect on the recently column, and not presage further change in that column.

In Table 1 it is clear that among the crimes against persons listed, fighting is the most common, followed by unarmed robbery and then by stick up. There is little change between 1981 and 1982. It is also clear that crimes against persons are reported principally

Table 1: PERCENT INDICATING CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Stickup	10	15	19	25	0	5	1	3
Arson	3	4	18	17	1	1	0	1
Unarmed Robbery	16	17	28	34	1	1	1	1
Roll drunks for small change	4	4	17	15	0	1	4	1
Fighting	-	44	-	74	-	12	-	39
Education								
Stickup	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0
Arson	0	0	9	13	0	3	0	0
Unarmed Robbery	0	0	22	-3	0	0	0	0
Roll drunks for small change	4	0	22	-7	0	3	4	3
Fighting	-	32	-	61	-	7	-	36
Corrections								
Stickup	36	43	52	53	0	+13	4	7
Arson	4	13	40	-23	0	0	0	3
Unarmed Robbery	52	47	60	67	4	3	0	3
Roll drunks for small change	8	10	16	23	0	0	8	0
Fighting	-	69	-	83	-	7	-	55

by the correctional youth, and not by youth in the schools, except for fighting, which is not as clearly delinquent as the others, and which takes the least criminal skill and know-how. We shall discover as we move through the tables that correctional youth and school youth are largely separate populations, doing different things, and with different opportunities. Few school youth do things that would get them into trouble and most correctional youth skip school.

Turning to the last three columns, we see a characteristic pattern. For illegitimate behaviors we generally find that more youth report that they have a choice of engaging in the behavior than report having engaged in it, but fewer youth report wanting the behavior or considering it likely than report having engaged in it. Correctional youth do these activities more and see more possibilities. Correctional youth and school youth are virtually the same, however, in their consensus that they do not want these activities or think them likely. We noted that earlier analysis of youth not in programs indicated that those youth did want to engage in delinquent acts.

Examining change in the choice, want, and likely columns in Table 1 we see little to talk about. There are two decreases of ten percent or more in the education data, in the choice column for unarmed robbery and for rolling drunks for small change, and two changes in the correctional data, where there is less opportunity for arson and more interest in stickup. As these appear to be isolated fluctuations it is hard to make much of them individually. As we examine successive tables, however, we will

see that most of the increases for possibility and interest in illegitimate activity occur in the correctional population and most of the decrease occurs in the school population. This pattern will hold in spite of budget crunches in the schools that seem to have led to a slackening of institutionalized social control by adults in the schools. It may be helpful to recall Delbert Elliott's finding that staying in school increases delinquency and dropping out lessens it,[34] and David Greenberg's argument that school is degrading and a strong provacation for delinquency.[35] If these arguments are correct, then recent budget crunches might take some of the teeth out of that degradation, lessening delinquency among school youth, while at the same time lessening the opportunities of bonding correctional youth to straight society, and therefore increasing their delinquency.

With Table 2, concerning property crimes, we move to an area of illegitimate activity which is more common among youth, and our patterns begin to show more strongly. We look at con games to make money, shakedown or extortion, auto stripping, burglary, shoplifting, receiving stolen goods, and vandalism. Receiving stolen goods is particularly common, even showing up in the schools. The possibilities of burglary, receiving stolen goods, shoplifting, and vandalism are generally greater than the possibilities for con games, shakedown, and auto stripping, which might be thought of as a little more difficult activities, requiring more skill and resources. Receiving stolen goods has declined among school youth, and increased among correctional youth. Con games have decreased among correctional youth.

Table 2: PERCENT INDICATING CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Con games to make money	15	10	31	28	7	7	7	8
Shakedown	1	4	9	17	0	2	0	3
Auto stripping	9	9	27	33	3	1	7	2
Burglary	17	18	35	39	1	0	3	4
Shoplifting	-	22	-	41	-	2	-	6
Receiving Stolen goods	19	+31	46	50	11	11	13	15
Vandalism	16	18	40	48	1	2	7	6
Education								
Con games to make money	4	0	22	-10	4	7	4	7
Shakedown	0	0	13	- 0	0	3	0	0
Auto stripping	4	0	17	- 7	0	0	4	3
Burglary	0	0	30	- 4	0	0	0	0
Shoplifting	-	7	-	27	-	3	-	3
Receiving Stolen goods	13	- 3	39	-27	17	-3	9	7
Vandalism	4	3	39	30	4	3	4	3
Corrections								
Con games to make money	36	- 20	52	50	8	10	12	13
Shakedown	4	10	16	+ 37	0	0	0	7
Auto stripping	28	27	44	+ 60	12	3	16	- 3
Burglary	56	53	68	77	0	0	12	10
Shoplifting	-	48	-	59	-	3	-	17
Receiving Stolen goods	52	+ 70	76	70	8	+ 20	24	+ 53
Vandalism	40	37	60	63	0	0	12	10

In the choice columns, we discover that the opportunities for everything but shoplifting and vandalism have decreased for school youth, while among correctional youth none of these crimes has decreased in opportunity, and two, shakedown and auto stripping, offer greater opportunity. Desire to commit crimes has increased for receiving stolen goods among correctional youth, and decreased among school youth. Correctional youth consider themselves more likely to receive stolen goods, and less likely to do auto stripping.

Turning to Table 3, we look at crimes of vice. Clearly there are substantial amounts of drug and alcohol use everywhere, but much more in the corrections population. The prostitution and pimping and selling of drugs are confined to the corrections population. Of the three activities, prostitution and pimping, drug selling, and drug and alcohol use, prostitution and pimping is least frequent, least possible, least desirable, and least likely. The possibilities of prostitution and pimping and using drugs and alcohol have declined in the schools, while the possibility of selling drugs and the desirability of using drugs and alcohol have increased in the correctional population, although selling drugs did decrease in the correctional population between 1981 and 1982.

In Table 4 we consider crimes of misbehavior. In the school population joy riding is the most common behavior in both 1981 and 1982. Truancy has increased and public misbehavior has decreased. The decrease in public misbehavior fits our patterns of decreased crime among school youth. The increase in truancy is a reflection of the lessening of adult control in the schools, which we suggested

Table 3: PERCENT INDICATING CRIMES OF VICE

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Prostitution or Pimping	6	2	17	16	2	3	3	2
Selling Drugs	17	13	43	52	7	8	9	9
Drug or Alcohol Use	52	52	71	69	34	40	44	47
Education								
Prostitution or Pimping	0	0	22	-10	4	2	4	1
Selling Drugs	0	0	35	37	4	3	4	2
Drug or Alcohol Use	35	-3	61	-17	35	27	35	4
Corrections								
Prostitution or Pimping	12	3	32	27	0	0	4	3
Selling Drugs	48	-33	68	+80	12	20	20	27
Drug or Alcohol Use	80	80	84	93	40	+57	72	63

Table 4: PERCENT INDICATING CRIMES OF MISBEHAVIOR

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Joyriding	28	33	54	54	22	23	26	20
Running away	24	21	39	38	7	6	11	4
Truancy	36	+ 50	47	+ 74	10	+ 20	11	+ 26
Public Misbehavior	15	18	36	38	1	8	12	10
Education								
Joyriding	22	20	61	53	26	20	17	11
Running away	9	3	26	20	9	3	4	0
Truancy	17	+ 33	43	+ 63	4	10	9	13
Public Misbehavior	17	- 7	35	30	0	3	13	-
Corrections								
Joyriding	44	+ 63	68	73	24	30	24	27
Running away	68	- 43	72	- 50	8	3	20	- 7
Truancy	84	- 70	76	83	16	+ 30	32	+ 37
Public Misbehavior	24	33	48	50	0	7	24	- 13

might be responsible for the decrease in other crimes. Among school youth the opportunity for truancy has increased as well.

Among correctional youth our pattern is a little mixed. Joy riding is up, and running away and truancy are down, although the interest in and likelihood of truancy are up. But the decreased running away is reinforced by decreases in opportunity and likelihood of running away. Perhaps there are fewer places to run away to.

For illegitimate activities, opportunities were greater than actual behavior, while wants and likelihoods were less, suggesting that Institutionalized Social Control by Adults focuses on wants, and not on possibilities. The failure to focus also on possibilities might well be a crucial weakness in our society's crime control efforts. The pattern is different for legitimate behaviors. There "want" and "likely" are strong responses.

In Table 5 we begin to look at legitimate behavior, starting with career activities. We begin with college track education. Everywhere, even in corrections, substantial proportions of youth have participated in college-track education and more think they could and want to than actually have. Between 1981 and 1982, however, there have been decreases in the number doing this in corrections, decreases in the desirability of doing this in corrections. Aspirations and expectations are falling.

Turning to jobs, we see that the actual experience in both school and corrections is mostly with unskilled jobs. The choice columns tell us that unskilled jobs are the most available, also, although white collar jobs make a very close second in the school population. In 1981 the professional job was in both places the

Table 5: PERCENT INDICATING CAREER ACTIVITIES

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
College or College Prep	51	45	76	-63	78	-66	64	60
Professional Job	3	4	35	-23	65	-52	32	24
White Collar Job	11	7	34	32	53	48	28	25
Skilled Blue Collar Job	11	16	42	-32	55	49	34	38
Unskilled Job	61	53	72	67	37	40	55	53
Education								
College or College Prep	52	60	91	-77	83	77	74	77
Professional Job	0	7	52	-40	78	73	39	37
White Collar Job	13	17	48	+60	61	-50	35	33
Skilled Blue Collar Job	9	17	52	53	57	-47	33	30
Unskilled Job	48	43	65	63	30	23	51	43
Corrections								
College or College Prep	40	-30	64	-50	72	-57	44	47
Professional Job	0	0	20	17	60	-43	28	20
White Collar Job	8	3	20	23	50	-37	28	+23
Skilled Blue Collar Job	12	13	32	27	52	53	32	+50
Unskilled Job	64	57	76	-63	36	-23	60	-40

most desired, but in 1982 it has given way to a greater preference for skilled blue collar jobs among correctional youth.

Focusing on changes in choice, want, and likely for the entire Table 5, we see four minus signs and one plus sign in education, and seven minus signs and two plus signs in corrections. Things are looking bleak.

It is worth pointing out that the pattern of the unskilled job not being wanted as much as it occurs and is possible suggests that efforts to ease the strain of unemployment on society by creating unskilled jobs will not be an adequate solution. The unskilled job, with its low desirability is much like crime, which also has a low desirability. It would not seem like a particularly attractive alternative to crime, therefore, and this impression is borne out by the observations of people who work with youth. Make work jobs and "meaningless" work simply do not "count" as the "honest toil" that is so romanticized in our heritage. Even in our old rural countryside, there was a distinction between the farmer and the unskilled laborer, and in our war-time industries, Rosie the Riveter was skilled.

In Table 6 we turn to special skills: performing music, fixing up cars, crafts, and hobbies. Crafts are skills like leatherworking or woodworking or sewing, while hobbies are things like games, cards, reading, and so on.

Performing music is an activity that requires a certain amount of leisure time yet is likely to involve strong bonds with other people. Music is increasing and becoming more desirable among school youth, while it is decreasing and becoming less possible

Table 6: PERCENT INDICATING SPECIAL SKILL ACTIVITIES

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Music (performing)	43	40	63	- 52	62	63	48	42
Fixing up Cars	31	27	49	47	51	46	44	35
Crafts	51	59	64	70	62	70	54	60
Indoor Hobbies	70	75	83	75	74	74	67	76
Education								
Music (performing)	35	+ 47	61	60	61	+ 77	48	53
Fixing up Cars	35	- 13	52	- 37	43	37	45	- 23
Crafts	61	53	70	77	65	+ 77	65	70
Indoor Hobbies	78	+ 90	91	90	83	83	78	87
Corrections								
Music (performing)	44	- 33	72	- 50	56	50	44	- 33
Fixing up Cars	36	- 47	52	73	52	60	40	+ 53
Crafts	52	60	68	67	64	63	49	53
Indoor Hobbies	72	- 60	80	- 63	68	67	60	+ 70

and less likely among correctional youth. Fixing up cars tends to be a solitary, sometimes even rebellious activity, and is decreasing and becoming less possible or likely among school youth, while at the same time increasing and becoming more possible and likely among correctional youth. Indoor hobbies and crafts are more neutral, and require less skill and resources. They are more common in both school and correctional populations than the other activities, and change patterns are mixed. Among school youth, crafts are becoming more attractive and hobbies more frequent, while among correctional youth there is no change in crafts, and hobbies are less frequent and possible, but more likely in 1982 than in 1981.

Turning to Table 7 we look at sports. In 1981 neighborhood sports, requiring less skill and resources, were more frequent than competitive league sports, for both school and corrections youth. Camping was, and still is, more frequent for correctional youth than for school youth. The competitive sports, neighborhood sports, certainly, and, perhaps for most youth, camping and hiking also, require linkage into, or bonding with large legitimate networks. School youth are increasing in the frequency and possibility of competitive sports, and in the frequency, possibility, desirability and likelihood of camping and hiking. Correctional youth, on the other hand, are looking at competitive sports as less desirable and likely; are doing neighborhood sports less often and considering them less possible, desirable, and likely; and are doing less hiking and camping, which they consider less possible though more likely in 1982 than in 1981. The pattern in

Table 7: PERCENT INDICATING SPORTS ACTIVITIES

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Competitive Leagues for Sports	4[illegible]	+52	72	66	66	61	56	54
Neighborhood Sports	63	58	84	-74	78	70	72	-59
Hiking or Camping	56	-46	65	59	67	72	48	56
Education								
Competitive Leagues for Sports	43	+67	70	+80	65	73	7[illegible]	67
Neighborhood Sports	65	63	83	90	78	87	74	7[illegible]
Hiking or Camping	30	+43	43	+67	48	+[illegible]	[illegible]	+[illegible]
Corrections								
Competitive Leagues for Sports	48	43	76	67	72	-59	64	-47
Neighborhood Sports	76	-57	92	-[illegible]	[illegible]	-57	[illegible]	-[illegible]
Hiking or Camping	68	-47	68	-57	56	63	[illegible]	+[illegible]

this table and also in Table 6 would seem to be the other side of the pattern we looked at in the crime tables, where school youth were lessening their involvement in crime, while corrections youth were increasing theirs. Perhaps a lessening of school resources lessens the degradation and alienation of the school experience and allows stronger bonds to develop, supporting less crime and more legitimate activity among school youth, while at the same time depriving correctional youth of their last links into straight society, and so decreasing their legitimate activity and increasing their crime.

Such an interpretation might be supported somewhat with our last table about legitimate activities, Table 8, which concerns social activities. The big activities are school activities, dances, and parties. Parties are essentially the same in 1981 and 1982 for both school and correctional youth. Gangs, on the other hand, are less possible for school youth, and more possible for correctional youth. School activities are less possible for everyone, but especially for correctional youth, whose frequency of school activities has already dropped, and who also consider them now less desirable and less likely. Religious youth groups have grown for school youth and seem more possible, desirable, and likely, while for correctional youth they have decreased, and seem less possible, desirable, and likely. Dances have increased for school youth and seem more likely, while for correctional youth they have decreased, and seem less possible, desirable, and likely. Hanging on the corner shows signs of decreasing for both school and correctional youth, decreasing in possibility and

Table 8: PERCENT INDICATING SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Item	% Youth							
	Recently		Choice		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total								
Be a member of a Gang	10	13	32	+44	8	9	8	9
School Activities	66	-55	80	-63	75	-57	71	-59
Religious Youth Groups	37	-24	60	-50	40	35	42	-29
Dances	62	65	87	79	73	70	76	71
Parties	79	86	85	93	84	84	82	88
Hanging on the Corner	48	50	62	71	35	35	37	45
Education								
Be a member of a Gang	4	3	35	-23	4	2	4	2
School Activities	78	80	87	-77	83	83	78	77
Religious Youth Groups	26	+43	48	+67	26	+57	35	+47
Dances	61	+73	93	90	74	89	65	+88
Parties	74	83	91	90	87	80	78	87
Hanging on the Corner	26	23	65	-43	30	-10	30	31
Corrections								
Be a member of a Gang	24	23	48	+67	8	13	16	20
School Activities	52	-37	80	-47	56	-27	51	-33
Religious Youth Groups	36	-10	76	-37	36	-20	36	-33
Dances	64	-53	92	-63	76	-50	68	-53
Parties	92	87	94	93	84	77	88	87
Hanging on the Corner	68	-73	84	87	48	53	68	-57

attractiveness for school youth, and decreasing in frequency and likelihood for correctional youth.

In looking back over the eight tables, two patterns loom large. Considering the data for each year separately, we find that opportunities for illegitimate activities are quite extensive, while desire to commit illegal acts is not. For legitimate activites, both the opportunity and the interest tend to be high. There is thus a basic and fundamental difference in the way youth describe legitimate and illegitimate activities that suggests a lot for policy. We are being told "loud and clear" that we have done little to cut down on opportunities for youth crime, and that our concerns about more strenuously "converting" youth to want legitimate rather than illegitimate activities are probably misplaced, since the youth appear to conform on that point already. Even if what the youth tell us they <u>do not want</u> is not accepted at face value, what they tell us is <u>possible</u> is enough on which to base a revolution in social control strategy. All our earlier work with change strategies for correctional systems and for individuals in corrections points to the need for an effective change strategy to change both what people can and can not do, and what they want and want not to do. Our data clearly indicate that we have not been reducing sufficiently the possibilities of delinquent behavior. There is fairly consistently a possibility for more delinquency than actually occurs. Many will say that to do anything about that would be to change society, and we can not do that. But we have been changing our society since we started it; there is no reason to stop now.

The other pattern concerns the changes from 1981 to 1982. School youth are getting together more in straight activities and are less associated with illegal activities, while correctional youth are getting together with other youth in legal activities less and are more associated with illegal activities. This is in a time when schools are feeling severe budget crunches, and corrections are doing relatively well in maintaining their budgets. We will see as we examine the data on Institutionalized Social Control by Adults and the data on the Control Generating System that the budget crunch has indeed lessened the degree to which the schools pay attention to their youth, while corrections has maintained its programs and even increased its efforts in some ways.

It appears that our society is becoming more correctionally oriented and less school oriented, meaning that it puts more emphasis on corrections than on prevention, with the curious effect that we lessen the bad effects of bad prevention, but also lessen the reintegrative possibilities of our correctional youth. We may be, as a consequence, about to move large numbers of youth from school to corrections.

Let us turn to the data on Institutionalized Social Control by Adults and the Control Generating System to see what is actually happening to institutionalized social control.

Institutionalized Social Control By Adults And The Control Generating System

Our data will show a mixed pattern of social control, with some elements of custody, therapy, and open programs that could

be associated with advocacy, although we will not find very much advocacy. We will see signs of improvement in group process in corrections, with some suggestion of limited but increased interest in the community's role in reintegration of correctional clients. In the schools we will see a general lessening of control activities of all sorts, probably reflecting the budget crunches and the shift of emphasis form education to corrections, more than any shift of emphasis from one pattern of social control to another within the schools. In general staff perceptions have changed less than those of youth in both school and corrections.

1. Action Affecting Staff-Youth Power and Related Control Generating System Data. Our tables for this section have five double columns, the first two being youth and staff estimates of what type of social control is actually happening, and the remaining three being staff estimates of what is realistic, wanted, and likely for the near future. The two columns with each "double column" are for 1981 and 1982. Again, the plus and minus signs in the 1982 columns represent changes of ten percent or more from 1981. In analyzing the tables we will look first at the first two double columns to see which controls have occurred most frequently and what changes have taken place. This will be our analysis of action affecting staff-youth within Institutionalized Social Control by Adults. Then we will look at the remaining double columns, guided by the plus and minus signs. That will constitute our analysis of the Control Generating System. When we find signs of the same direction in both the realistic and want columns we will interpret that as pressure for change. We will not find that often.

As with the Behavior Generating System data we are looking at the percent of respondents giving high ratings on each dimension. Since we are combining staff and youth data for comparison, it is important to know that youth gave us ratings on a three point scale, with the highest category being a clear positive answer that the behavior occurred often. Staff gave us ratings on a six point scale, with the top two ratings being clear positive answers that the behaviors occurred frequently, or were realistic, wanted, or likely. Our percentages represent the youth giving the highest response of the youth three-point scale and the staff giving the two highest responses of the staff six-point scale. In setting these cut points, care was taken to see that agreement was maximized between youth and staff for the data as a whole, and comfort was taken from the fact that the cut points do in fact reflect the same meaning on their faces -- i.e., unqualified positive responses.

In Table 9 we see that there is considerable agreement between youth and staff about whether the staff tell youth personally when they do well or do wrong. On the whole, there seems to be more emphasis on telling the youth when they do wrong, a custodial characteristic of social control, but perhaps it is more realistic to simply say that staff and youth agree that there is a great deal of communication about both positive and negative behaviors.

There is less punishment and reward, defined as actually making life less pleasant when the youth does wrong, or more pleasant when the youth does well, than there is communication. In the schools there is more reward than punishment, except for a very slight

Table 9: PERCENT INDICATING REWARD AND PUNISHMENT

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Total										
Tell when do well	78	72	87	88	94	91	94	91	91	87
Tell when do wrong	87	81	85	90	94	92	89	89	86	89
Reward	44	43	53	52	56	55	63	72	52	55
Punish	33	30	26	35	45	51	18	+35	27	+38
Education										
Tell when do well	77	-50	79	+89	86	92	93	94	91	89
Tell when do wrong	87	-75	86	92	88	92	79	+97	84	86
Reward	39	-28	55	47	52	53	60	61	49	+56
Punish	41	-10	23	17	37	42	21	25	33	35
Corrections										
Tell when do well	80	-70	77	+89	100	97	84	86	97	86
Tell when do wrong	84	90	90	97	100	100	84	+94	100	97
Reward	36	+57	61	56	71	-58	71	+89	68	62
Punish	56	+67	58	64	71	72	39	+61	53	57

deviation in youth reports in 1981, while in corrections there is more punishment than reward, except for a slight deviation in staff reports in 1981. The youth in the schools indicate there is less communication and less reward and punishment in 1982--that is, less of everything. Staff think there is more telling about doing well, and little change otherwise, although there are staff indications of declines less than ten percent in the reward and punishment. There are not clear signs of impending change in the last three double columns. In corrections, on the other hand, there is a more mixed picture. Youth think that there have been clear increases in reward and punishment, and a decrease in telling them when they do well, while staff think there has been an increase in telling them when they do well and not much change otherwise. There is more staff interest in 1982 in telling when do wrong, rewarding, and punishing, but this interest does not coincide with increases in possibility.

Thus the schools are more therapeutic or open and corrections is more custodial. Change between 1981 and 1982 is lessening the intensity of the school experience and increasing that of the correctional experience.

Table 10 presents data on the use of group process in social control. Such practices are very important in what we are calling the therapeutic type of social control. They pervaded our culture in the sixties and early seventies. We had open classrooms in schools, with a lot of small group process. We got much of our psychotherapy in groups. We raised our consciousness in groups. We made many political decisions in small groups by consensus

Table 10: PERCENT INDICATING ENCOURAGEMENT OF GROUP PROCESS

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Total										
Pay Attention to D ads	59	57	54	61	57	63	72	70	55	59
Protect if Cooperate	46	48	36	41	39	40	52	51	37	38
Encourage to confrontation	24	29	38	39	43	39	47	41	41	36
Encourage to tell if do well	34	-19	25	28	34	39	45	45	30	34
Encourage to tell if do wrong	16	10	16	14	28	25	22	18	18	10
Encourage reward	33	35	34	-24	34	25	46	37	34	25
Encourage Punishment	5	2	4	2	12	10	8	7	5	4
Education										
Pay Attention to D ads	64	-32	40	39	37	+47	65	56	35	42
Protect if Cooperate	52	-38	40	43	45	-31	57	49	38	34
Encourage to confrontation	18	24	40	36	42	44	53	-36	40	33
Encourage to tell if do well	39	-21	21	18	36	-26	45	-26	29	-18
Encourage to tell if do wrong	22	-7	17	11	26	-14	26	-14	14	6
Encourage reward	55	-41	34	28	32	31	46	39	37	-25
Encourage Punishment	9	0	5	0	12	3	15	-3	5	3
Corrections										
Pay Attention to Dyads	52	+73	71	+81	77	83	81	86	77	72
Protect if Cooperate	52	+72	52	+66	58	+71	68	77	61	69
Encourage to confrontation	20	+30	39	44	48	39	26	+53	39	42
Encourage to tell if do well	16	13	19	+36	45	50	42	50	29	+42
Encourage to tell if do wrong	20	20	13	+25	55	-39	19	28	19	25
Encourage reward	20	+30	16	19	26	23	29	+40	16	17
Encourage Punishment	8	7	3	8	16	17	3	+17	3	9

rather than by majority vote. And we found that we could mobilize small groups in youth corrections so as to engender a positive subculture among the youth, rather than the traditionally feared oppositional prison subculture. We will see that such use of group process is less than pervasive now.

In Table 10 we look at a range of controls that relate to this group process. First, there is paying attention to dyads, defined as paying attention to each youth's relationship with each other youth. This practice is essential for management of group process and the control of violence within the group. It makes possible the second practice, protecting a youth who cooperates with the program from other youth who are not cooperating. This practice is essential or it will be practically impossible for the first youth to begin cooperating. The rest of the items describe the therapeutic group practice itself: encouraging youth to make each other confront personal problems, encouraging youth to tell each other personally when they do well, or when they do wrong, and encouraging the youth to reward and punish each other. All of these practices are shunned in the custodial type of social control, and not much pursued in open programs, but are important in the therapeutic approach.

We see that in general there is more laying of groundwork for group process than there is actual pursuit of group process. That is there is more emphasis on paying attention to dyads and protecting cooperators than there is on the other practices.

As we move into the actual practices of promoting group process, our precentages go down. Around a fourth of the youth think that

staff encourage youth to push each other to confront personal problems, although around forty percent of the staff think they do this. In education, there is agreement that what little encouragement there is of youth to tell each other when they do well or do wrong is slanted toward more encouragement to tell each other when they do well. But in corrections, the youth perceive more encouragement to tell each other when they do wrong. The correctional staff disagree with the youth on this. There is, however, agreement generally that, while there is not much encouragement of the youth to reward each other, there is much less encouragement of the youth to punish each other.

In terms of change from 1981 to 1982, we see decreases in everything according to the youth in education while staff perceive less change. In corrections we see the youth perceiving increases in paying attention to dyads, protection if they cooperate, encouragement of confrontation, and encouragement of rewards, while staff see increases in attention to dyads, protection if they cooperate, encouragement to tell if they do well, and encouragement to tell if they do wrong. This sharp contrast between schools and corrections in terms of changes between 1981 and 1982 is reinforced by the fact that there are clear indications of pressure in the schools for less encouragement to tell if they do well and encouragement to tell if they do wrong--there are minus signs for both of these in both the realistic and want columns. There is no such clear indication of impending further change on the corrections side, but there are more plus signs than minus signs in the last three double columns of the corrections table.

The balance of reward and punishment and communication favoring reward and positive communication in the schools, combined with the low and decreasing level of group process in the schools, suggests the open, as opposed to therapeutic or custodial, styles of social control. The possible predominance of telling them when they do wrong in corrections is less encouraging, but, on the other hand, the increase in group process is very encouraging, and suggests some of the compromises characteristic of custodial consolidation prior to a new wave of therapeutic reform.

In Table 11 we look at a set of items grouped together to tell us whether the youth are figuratively moved around unceremoniously like apples in an applesauce factory or whether they are treated delicately and carefully, like the apple one used to bring to one's teacher. Do they get bruised by the routine treatment or are they taken care of as individuals? We find some disagreement about this between youth and staff.

Staff do keep youth fairly well informed about what is going on, but the youth think that between 1981 and 1982 that pattern has lessened. Staff in the schools think it has remained about the same, while staff in corrections think it has strengthened.

In the schools relatively few youth or staff feel that the staff make changes without consulting them and fewer staff in 1982 and in 1981 feel that it is possible or desirable to make changes without consulting the youth. Correctional youth are more likely to say that staff do make changes without consulting them, and while the staff do not see as much of this as the youth, more staff in 1982 than in 1981 want to make changes without consulting.

Table 11: PERCENT INDICATING INDIVIDUAL AND CATEGORY APPROACHES

Item	% Youth Often		% Staff Often		Realistic		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total										
Kee_ informed	85	-75	73	+85	85	86	88	86	80	82
Make Change without consulting	32	24	22	25	45	47	17	22	22	27
Deal Fairly with All	81	72	81	87	82	87	90	90	83	85
Counseling	47	43	67	63	72	66	76	85	72	66
Work with Individual	45	39	72	71	74	74	84	88	71	75
Get involved in personal roblems	33	41	58	59	65	63	66	63	61	60
Concern about Control	57	61	61	61	68	68	68	70	61	61
Regimentation	21	21	13	12	22	22	14	15	13	14
ducation										
Keep informed	87	-66	72	78	81	86	81	78	77	78
Make Change without consulting	27	28	26	19	51	-36	28	-17	37	-19
Deal Fairly with All	78	69	72	81	74	83	81	83	70	75
ounseling	52	-38	56	58	67	64	72	81	63	61
Work with Individual	57	-41	58	+72	63	67	72	+86	58	+75
Get involved in personal problems	29	24	23	31	35	+49	40	43	26	34
Concern about Control	57	+69	74	69	79	-69	79	75	67	69
Regimentation	30	-17	19	11	33	-20	23	17	21	14
Corrections										
Keep informed	80	-67	70	+94	97	92	93	92	80	+92
Make Change without consulting	46	40	26	33	61	61	13	+31	26	33
Deal Fairly with All	68	70	76	+89	90	92	97	92	97	89
Counseling	56	50	77	-61	81	-61	74	+86	84	-69
Work with Individual	36	33	74	67	77	75	84	86	74	72
Get involved in personal problems	52	53	71	67	81	-67	74	72	71	67
Concern about Control	46	+67	74	72	90	-75	74	83	81	-61
Regimentation	20	27	23	22	48	44	16	+31	19	28

Estimates of fairness are high in both school and corrections, with staff in corrections registering a slight increase in fairness.

In 1981 about half of the youth and staff in education thought there was counseling. In 1982 fewer youth think so, although staff have not changed their estimates. In corrections the staff see a decline in counseling, while the youth who saw less counseling than the staff in 1981 have not changed their opinion in 1982.

In 1981 a little over half of youth and staff in education felt that staff worked with individual youth. In 1982 fewer youth think so and more staff think so. In corrections about a third of the youth and over two thirds of the staff think the staff work with individual youth, and these figures have not changed much over the year. There is thus in 1982 substantial disagreement between youth and staff in both schools and corrections on this point.

Noticeably fewer youth and staff in schools than in corrections feel that staff get involved in the youth's personal problems, and this has not changed much from 1981 to 1982. Interestingly, however, more staff in 1982 than in 1981 think this would be possible in the schools, while fewer staff in 1982 than in 1981 think this involvement will be possible in the near future in corrections. Perhaps we will see a convergence.

Youth in both schools and corrections were less likely than staff to see the staff as concerned about control. In both places the youth have become more likely to see the staff as expressing this concern. In 1981 the youth in school rated the staff's interest in control higher than interest in the youth's personal problems, while in corrections youth rated interest in personal problems

higher. The changes have meant that in 1982 youth in both places are more likely to see the staff as interested in control than as interested in the youth's personal problems. The staff saw it that way all along, but more so in the schools.

There is consensus in both schools and corrections in 1982 that there is little regimentation. This represents a decline in youth perceptions of regimentation in the schools.

The only place in this table where we find the plus and minus signs lined up in the realistic and want columns is for making changes without consulting the youth in the schools, where the indication is for less making of change without consultation in the future.

The picture is mixed, but the preponderance of control interests over interests in personal problems together with the disagreements between staff and youth about the staff concern for youth problems, working with individual youth, and counseling all suggest some tendency in the direction of custodial patterns, accompanied by some bruising.

In Table 12 we consider what is taught to youth. The emphasis in both school and corrections is on academic education and on obedience and respect for authority, as opposed to vocational skills. In the schools the youth register declines in academic education and an emphasis on obedience and authority, while the staff of the schools do not see such declines. Fewer staff in 1982 than in 1981 see training in obedience and respect for authority as realistic for the near future. In corrections there is more direct disagreement between youth and staff. Youth see declines in academic and voca-

Table 12: PERCENT INDICATING TEACHING

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Total										
Academic Education	62	59	57	51	57	53	64	63	57	50
Vocational Education	30	+40	34	32	38	35	52	57	38	35
Obedience and Respect for Authority	65	-53	56	+67	64	63	64	69	[illegible]	[illegible]
Education										
Academic Education	91	-79	86	86	86	86	91	86	86	86
Vocational Education	43	45	48	49	50	57	64	57	[illegible]	[illegible]
Obedience and Respect for Authority	70	-52	62	63	76	-51	74	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Corrections										
Academic Education	64	-53	58	67	65	64	71	+81	[illegible]	[illegible]
Vocational Education	36	-23	32	39	42	39	65	+83	[illegible]	[illegible]
Obedience and Respect for Authority	64	57	65	+83	74	78	77	86	--	[illegible]

tional training, while staff do not see such decreases but see increases in training for obedience and respect for authority. More staff in 1982 than in 1981 want to train youth in academics and vocational skills. Since much of the academic and vocational training in a community based system occurs in the community, perhaps correctional staff are simply not as aware as the youth of declines in the effectiveness of community academic and vocational programs during the budget crunches of this period.

The relationship of these variables to our types of social control is slightly complicated. Of course the emphasis on obedience and respect for authority is characteristic of the custodial approach. The other two, academic and vocational, however, are a little bit like wild cards. They may or may not be present in therapy, and it is not unusual to find a concentration on either one to the exclusion of the other in open programs associated with advocacy. Perhaps the important point is that without at least some of both there are going to be youth with little stake in legitimate activity. In looking at the Behavior Generating System we saw that unskilled work did not look as though it would lure delinquents away from delinquency. Declines in academic and vocational education are therefore ominous developments.

In Table 13 we consider whether programs avoid working with the youth who need help the most. Such avoidance is characteristic of a custodial system, where problem youth are simply bumped into successively more secure and repressive settings until they cease to be problems. The data shows that everywhere, according to both staff and youth, there is little effort to avoid or eject difficult

Table 13: PERCENT INDICATING EXCLUSION OR INCLUSION OF DIFFICULT YOUTH

Item	% Youth Often		% Staff Often		Realistic		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total										
Avoid Admitting	15	13	11	11	22	21	26	29	12	11
Exclude After Failure	3	7	13	10	31	25	12	17	13	11
Work with All	74	70	93	93	86	86	88	86	87	89
Include even After Fail	83	-71	86	83	82	81	82	87	84	83
Education										
Avoid Admitting	27	-11	9	6	14	9	43	35	9	6
Exclude After Failure	0	+14	19	-6	23	17	21	20	19	-6
Work with All	74	-52	93	91	84	86	86	86	84	89
Include even After Fail	91	-72	84	-66	84	-74	74	74	79	71
Corrections										
Avoid Admitting	4	12	9	+19	10	+25	29	+47	11	17
Exclude After Failure	0	0	3	11	19	22	6	+19	3	11
Work with All	80	-67	94	97	90	89	94	86	91	89
Include even After Fail	80	-60	84	92	84	92	81	+92	87	92

youth and there is effort to continue working with difficult youth. But there are signs of change. Fewer youth in 1982 than in 1981 say the schools avoid admitting difficult youth, but more say they exclude youth after failure, although the staff disagree. Fewer youth in 1982 than in 1981 say the schools work with all youth, and fewer staff and youth say that the schools will include a youth even after he or she fails. In corrections the staff are more likely in 1982 than in 1981 to say that they avoid admitting difficult youth, and also more likely to say that it is realistic and desirable to avoid such admissions. Fewer youth in 1982 than in 1981 say that the corrections programs work with all youth or include youth even after they fail. These patterns are important because one of the ways in which a program can be turned in the direction of custody is by making it a program only for the "good" youth, and turning away all the "difficult" ones, who soon become the bulk of the system, located in holding programs that were earlier programs of last resort.

2. Staff-Youth Power. We have found in actions afffecting staff-youth that there is a divergence between education and corrections in that there is increasing attention to group process in corrections and not in the schools. We shall see some of the fruit of that development in this section.

We should begin by pointing out that the old debate about whether oppositional prison subcultures are imported or produced within prisons is not very much to the point here. In the Center's earlier work, reported by Feld and McEwen,[36] it has become clear that correctional programs can choose between accepting what comes in with the kids and fostering their own, positive, subculture.

Custodial programs choose to accept what comes in and then make it even more oppositional. Therapy programs foster a positive subculture. Open programs are in between, largely accepting what comes in, but with sufficient intervention to limit violence.

In the tables that follow we consider only youth responses about what is actually happening. Staff were not asked these questions. We do not examine staff opinions about what is realistic, desirable, or likely because we are not talking about staff actions.

In Table 14 we see that for schools there is more communication among the youth than actual rewarding and punishing, and that the balance of the communication is slightly negative, but that the balance of reward and punishment favors reward. We also see, however, that rewarding has gone down between 1981 and 1982, and that punishment has declined slightly also. In corrections there is also more communication than actual reward and punishing among the youth, but the balance of positive and negative is quite different. In both communication and in actual providing of consequences the youth tend to concentrate on negative communication and on punishing each other, not on positive communication or on rewarding each other. Telling each other when they do wrong has increased, as has reward, while punishment has declined, so that in 1982 reward virtually equals punishment. Thus we see that the increased emphasis on group process in corrections and the general slackening of attention to youth in the schools has had corresponding effects on youth subculture in both places.

In Table 15 we address the degree to which there is conflict between youth and staff. A program being split into two groups,

Table 14: PERCENT INDICATING YOUTH THEMSELVES REWARD AND PUNISH

Item	% Youth Often 1981	1982
Total		
Youth tell if do well	34	25
Youth tell if do wrong	48	53
Youth reward	24	16
Youth Punish	18	9
Education		
Youth tell if do well	43	43
Youth tell if do wrong	52	54
Youth reward	35	-14
Youth Punish	14	7
Corrections		
Youth tell if do well	16	13
Youth tell if do wrong	60	+77
Youth reward	8	+23
Youth Punish	36	-24

Table 15: PERCENT INDICATING STAFF-YOUTH CONFLICT OR COOPERATION

Item	% Youth Often 1981	1982
Total		
Split in Two Groups	11	15
Youth have own Rules	8	9
Share Decisions	53	- 42
Rules Fair	66	66
Education		
Split in Two Groups	4	+ 29
Youth have own Rules	14	11
Share Decisions	65	- 46
Rules Fair	70	- 57
Corrections		
Split in Two Groups	28	21
Youth have own Rules	12	17
Share Decisions	28	33
Rules Fair	48	47

with youth in one and staff in the other, is characteristic of custodial programs. In custodial programs the youth have their own rules that are different, frequently in opposition to those promoted by the staff. Sharing of decisions between staff and youth is characteristic of therapy and open programs. The youth may consider the rules fair in custodial programs because of their consistency, and may consider them unfair, because of their personalized application, in therapy. (Of course custody programs do not have to be consistent, and therefore fair.)

In the schools we see sharp increases in the tendency for staff and youth to be split into two groups, and decreases in sharing of decisions and the fairness of rules. In corrections the splitting and the separate rule systems remain at low levels, sharing of decision making still stays fairly low, and the fairness of rules remains about the same with about half of the youth thinking the rules are fair. Although more youth in schools still think decisions are shared and rules are fair than is true in corrections, the trends are definitely bad in the schools and at least neutral in corrections.

In Table 16 we look at the extent to which youth in programs are controlled by bullies among the youth. We ask whether kids try to take advantage of each other, whether a few kids run the place, whether kids get on each others' backs for no reason, and whether they beat each other up. It should be pointed out that a few kids running the show is not by itself evidence of bullying, but would become important in combination with other practices.

The picture is more encouraging here. While in the schools there are increases in youth taking advantage of each other, there

Table 16: PERCENT INDICATING CONTROL BY BULLIES

Item	% Youth Often 1981	1982
Total		
Take Advantage	29	28
Few Kids Run Place	19	10
On Backs for Nothing	27	20
Beat Up	13	6
Education		
Take Advantage	22	+3c
Few Kids Run Place	17	14
On Backs for Nothing	26	-14
Beat Up	26	-11
Corrections		
Take Advantage	52	43
Few Kids Run Place	20	-7
On Backs for Nothing	36	41
Beat Up	8	7

are decreases in getting on each others' backs for nothing, and in beating up. In corrections there is a decrease in having a few youth run things.

The improvement in corrections may reflect the increase in attention to dyadic relations among youth, which is crucial to the control of violence. The increase in taking advantage and the decreases in violence in the schools may both reflect the slackening of social control providing more opportunity for students to exploit each other, but also lessening the frustrations of dealing with adult social control in the schools.

3. Action Affecting Youth-Community. So far we have a mixture of types of social control with distinct developments of custody as well as traces of therapy. Much of what we have seen would be consistent with a classification of the school and correctional programs as open, a type of social control that could be coupled with advocacy or with supervision or coaching. We will discover here that there is not advocacy, and that the findings, in the correctional system at least, are consistent with what we would expect in the later stages of the conservative cycle, where there is consolidation and compromise, prior to the beginnings of a new wave of liberal reform.

We begin in Table 17 with some basic measures of how much contact a youth has with the larger community and how much contact staff staff members have with the larger community while working to support the youth's efforts in the larger community.

There is a big contrast between schools and corrections. School youth spend more time in the community than do correctional youth, but both school youth and correctional youth are more likely

Table 17: PERCENT INDICATING COMMUNITY CONTACT

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Total										
Time Outside	60	+71	75	82	80	80	80	85	76	83
Staff talk Outside	34	31	57	50	66	-54	72	77	63	55
Leave Family Alone	41	48	27	31	39	38	25	26	25	31
Arrange Participat-tion Outside	39	43	50	49	52	53	65	71	51	52
Help get jobs, school, programs,etc.	56	51	61	56	59	59	80	81	69	57
Education										
Time Outside	61	+93	81	+97	86	+97	88	97	81	+97
Staff talk Outside	35	29	51	-37	56	51	65	69	47	41
Leave Family Alone	57	50	41	43	54	-43	37	40	37	43
Arrange Participat-tion Outside	48	43	38	43	45	51	67	66	49	43
Help get jobs, school, programs,etc.	83	-61	69	-57	64	69	90	83	62	61
Corrections										
Time Outside	16	+31	29	+42	42	36	58	61	35	44
Staff talk Outside	36	28	61	-47	77	-50	81	86	74	-53
Leave Family Alone	20	+41	19	28	42	44	13	14	16	+28
Arrange Participat-tion Outside	24	21	48	50	42	47	68	+78	42	50
Help get jobs, school, programs,etc.	40	31	39	39	35	42	74	69	45	39

to spend time out in the community in 1982 than in 1981, according to both staff and youth. School staff are more likely in 1982 than in 1981 to think youth spending time in the larger community is realistic and likely for the future, although neither school nor correctional staff are any more likely to want this in 1982 than they were in 1981.

Youth in both school and corrections are less likely than staff to think that staff talk with people in the community about a youth, but in both school and corrections staff are less likely in 1982 than in 1981 to say that they do this.

Youth are more likely than staff in both school and corrections to think that the staff leaves their families alone, and in corrections, where the youth are less likely than school youth to think this, the proportion has increased sharply between 1981 and 1982.

Around half or a little less of the staff in both school and corrections feel that they arrange for the participation of the youth in community programs, but in corrections youth are strikingly less likely to think this.

There is consensus between staff and youth that there is more help in the schools for getting jobs, getting into school programs, and so forth, but there is also a consensus between staff and youth in the schools that practice is declining in the schools.

Thus the youth have more contact with the community in 1982, but not because of an effort to strengthen supports for youth in the community. It is probably simply because of the budget crunch. Corrections is losing its edge in work with families and talking to people outside the program, and the schools are declining in what

they did more of, helping the youth get jobs and into other school programs.

The fact that the youth in corrections have less contact with the community and get less help finding jobs and new school programs and less help getting into community programs in general is not a trivial thing flowing as a matter of course from the different purposes of school and corrections. During the height of the Massachusetts youth correctional reforms youth did have contact with the larger community. A visit to some of the most dramatically successful detention centers during the height of the reform would allow the visitor to meet only a small number of the programs' youth--the majority might be out on trips to a nearby university, or camping with members of a local civic group. The isolation of correctional youth that we see in the present data is an important indicator of what is special about the present time.

The correctional youth are more in need of help than the school youth. They get more of some services and less of others. They get more family intervention and less help getting jobs and into school programs. Corrections staff will intervene in family and, according to staff, but not according to the youth, talk with other people in the community, but will not do so much to help the youth back into school and jobs. The pattern is that the staff will deal with the youth himself and his family, i.e., the people on the program's doorstep, and may talk the problems over with others, but will not do as much as ordinary schools will do to help deal with the problem of connecting the youth back into the educational and working institutions of the society.

The starkness of this pattern is increased by our including detention as well as placement youth in corrections. However that is only because the state has stopped providing services in detention, in spite of the fact that many youth stay long periods in detention even if they have already been through court. These patterns are not trivial; they represent choices to abandon youth once they get in trouble, depriving them of services that would be routine in regular schools, and for which they have a more than usual need.

The pattern of pluses and minuses in the last three double columns suggests no reason to expect major change in the immediate future.

In Table 18 we can look systematically at the issue of supervision, coaching, and advocacy. The table contains a series of items beginning with staff communication to youth about whether they do well or wrong in the larger community, moving then to items about whether staff reward or punish youth for what they do in the community, and then to items which show whether staff get people in the community to take over the function of communicating to the youth about their behavior and rewarding or punishing them for it. These last items are the crux of advocacy--getting the community to take over in a permanent way what a program can do only temporarily to support the youth's progress in a straight life style. We find that as we move along this progression from staff communicating with youth to staff getting the community to reward and punish the youth, our percentages drop off radically. There seems to be very little activity along the lines of getting the community involved in providing consequences for youthful acts.

Table 18: PERCENT INDICATING REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IN COMMUNITY

Item	% Youth Often		% Staff Often		% Staff Realistic		% Staff Want		% Staff Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total										
Tell if do well outside	55	52	72	67	72	68	86	84	74	63
Tell if do wrong outside	36	45	60	58	63	60	62	58	58	58
Reward if do well outside	34	25	32	36	36	38	49	55	35	37
Punish if do wrong outside	22	21	14	+32	25	+36	15	+33	14	+31
Community tell if do well	20	17	23	20	27	18	53	-43	23	17
Community tell if do wrong	9	9	8	12	12	18	20	22	9	12
Community reward	9	16	20	19	18	16	49	50	21	17
Community Punish	1	5	1	4	2	6	4	7	2	4
Education										
Tell if do well outside	45	43	57	51	57	-46	76	77	64	-46
Tell if do wrong outside	13	+25	49	-26	51	-26	51	-26	46	-26
Reward if do well outside	35	-11	33	-14	35	-14	45	-34	35	-17
Punish if do wrong outside	9	0	0	3	10	6	5	3	0	3
Community tell if do well	27	-14	28	-11	33	-14	50	-23	28	-11
Community tell if do wrong	23	-11	3	11	8	14	28	20	5	14
Community reward	10	11	20	17	23	14	50	-34	28	-14
Community Punish	0	+14	0	0	0	6	5	6	0	3
Corrections										
Tell if do well outside	72	-52	74	69	74	75	90	89	71	64
Tell if do wrong outside	80	-66	81	86	81	86	84	89	77	86
Reward if do well outside	52	-34	39	+53	45	53	65	72	39	+53
Punish if do wrong outside	64	-52	48	+66	58	63	48	+71	48	+60
Community tell if do well	16	17	13	+26	19	17	58	57	13	17
Community tell if do wrong	8	7	6	+20	13	+23	13	+29	3	+14
Community reward	8	10	16	14	3	9	45	+57	6	9
Community Punish	0	0	0	+11	0	9	3	+14	0	6

We are looking at percentage differences here of up to seventy-two points. It is clear that we are not looking at social control by advocacy. It has to be either coaching or supervision.

The difference between coaching and supervision, in our use of these terms, turns on positive communication and reward versus negative communication and punishment. In this we find a difference between the school and corrections. The pattern is simple. In the schools the staff emphasize positive feedback and reward regarding a youth's activities in the community, while in corrections the staff emphasize negative feedback and punishment. There is consensus between staff and youth on this point. In both school and corrections what little response is encouraged from the community emphasizes positive communication and reward.

Thus the schools coach and corrections supervises. The expected response to supervision is alienation and crime. Supervised children have little stake in cooperating with adults; we are the enemy.

What about patterns of change from 1981 to 1982? School youth think that staff have become more likely to tell them if they do wrong outside, less likely to reward them for doing well outside, less likely to get the community to tell them if they do well or do wrong, and more likely to get the community to punish them if they do wrong. Staff disagree about the communication and say they are telling the youth less often when they do wrong in the community, and see little difference in their efforts to get the community to tell the youth when they do wrong or to punish the youth when they do wrong. The staff are less likely in 1982 than they were in 1981 to think it both realistic and desirable to tell the youth when they do wrong outside, reward the youth for doing well outside, or to

get the community to tell the youth when they do well outside. The school is backing out of having anything to do with what the youth do in the community.

In corrections the picture is different. Youth see declines in the staff's communicating with them about how well they are doing outside and punishing or rewarding them for how well they do outside. Staff see increases in reward and punishment and in all of the variables describing community involvement except for the community rewarding the youth. More staff in 1982 than in 1981 think it both possible and desirable to get the community involved in telling the youth when they do wrong. Thus in corrections there is a trend toward greater interest in getting the community involved in supporting the youth. The support that is being thought about does stress the negative somewhat more than the positive.

It should be kept in mind that even with these traces of change in the wind the absolute numbers are for the most part quite small. Still, over half of the correctional staff want positve involvement of the community in rewarding the youth.

Finally, Table 19 adds two qualitative notes to this picture. Substantial numbers of youth in both school and corrections believe that they can help plan their own future. Correctional youth see a decline in this however from 1981 to 1982, and school staff are less likely in 1982 than in 1981 to consider this realistic and desirable for the near future.

Second, in both school and corrections there is more concern about control over youth in the community than there is staff involvement in the personal problems of youth while they are in the community. Staff in schools think that involvement in the

Table 19: PERCENT INDICATING INDIVIDUAL AND CATEGORY APPROACHES IN COMMUNITY

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Total										
Can Plan Future	70	61	78	78	75	71	87	83	76	73
Involved in Personal Problems	30	34	55	- 39	54	- 41	64	58	53	- 41
Concern about Control	62	61	84	91	77	78	92	91	79	82
Education										
Can Plan Future	74	71	76	68	76	- 62	90	- 71	73	- 62
Involved in Personal Problems	22	26	34	- 20	39	- 23	51	- 32	39	- 26
Concern about Control	61	57	76	77	76	- 66	93	- 80	76	- 66
Corrections										
Can Plan Future	60	- 48	77	78	74	72	90	86	81	75
Involved in Personal Problems	44	- 31	55	- 42	55	47	65	72	52	- 42
Concern about Control	64	59	87	+100	90	86	90	97	81	83

youth's personal problems has decreased from 1981 to 1982, and are less likely in 1982 than in 1981 to think that either involvement in personal problems or concerns about control are realistic or desirable. Correctional youth and staff agree that staff involvement in personal problems has decreased, and staff register an increase in concern about control.

4. Summary of Institutionalized Social Control by Adults and the Control Generating System. Table 20 assembles from earlier tables all the items dealing with positive and negative communication and reward and punishment, progressing from communication within the program, at the top of the table, down through encouragement of group process, the results of group process, and staff interventions regarding youth activity in the community and finally staff encouragement of community members to intervene as well.

We have already discussed each of these items individually and in groups. What is striking when looking at them assembled together is the larger patterns of change. In the education table we find thirty-four minus signs and five plus signs, indicating that social control in general is declining, as we suggested earlier. In the corrections table we find eight minus signs and twenty-seven plus signs, indicating that social control is increasing. We suggested earlier that society was moving its emphasis from education to corrections. It is clear from our data that it is in the community that we studied.

Table 20: PERCENT INDICATING REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IN EACH PART OF THE SYSTEM

Item	% Youth Often		% Staff Often		Realistic		Want		Likely	
	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982
Total										
Tell when do well	78	72	87	88	94	91	94	91	91	87
Tell when do wrong	87	81	85	90	94	92	80	89	86	89
Reward	44	43	53	52	56	55	63	72	52	55
Punish	33	30	26	35	45	51	18	+35	27	+38
Encourage to tell if do well	34	-19	25	28	34	39	45	45	30	34
Encourage to tell if do wrong	16	10	16	14	28	25	22	18	18	20
Encourage reward	33	35	34	-24	34	25	46	37	3-	25
Encourage punishment	5	2	4	2	12	10	8	7	5	4
Youth tell if do well	34	35								
Youth tell if do wrong	48	53								
Youth reward	24	16								
Youth Punish	18	9								
Tell if do well outside	55	52	72	67	72	68	86	84	74	-63
Tell if do wrong outside	36	45	60	58	63	60	62	58	58	58
Reward if do well outside	34	25	32	36	36	38	49	55	35	37
Punish if do wrong outside	22	21	14	+32	25	+36	15	+33	14	+31
Community tell if do well	20	17	23	20	27	18	53	-43	23	17
Community tell if do wrong	9	9	8	12	12	18	20	22	9	12
Community reward	9	16	20	19	18	16	49	50	21	17
Community Punish	1	5	1	4	2	6	4	7	2	4

Table 20: PERCENT INDICATING REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IN EACH PART OF THE SYSTEM

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Education										
Tell when do well	77	-50	79	+89	86	92	93	94	91	89
Tell when do wrong	87	-75	86	92	88	92	79	+97	84	86
Reward	39	-28	55	47	52	53	60	61	43	+56
Punish	41	-10	23	17	37	42	21	25	23	25
Encourage to tell if do well	39	-21	21	18	36	-26	45	-26	29	-18
Encourage to tell if do wrong	22	- 7	17	11	26	-14	26	-14	14	6
Encourage reward	55	-41	34	28	32	31	46	29	27	-25
Encourage punishment	9	0	5	0	12	3	15	- 3	5	3
Youth tell if do well	43	43								
Youth tell if do wrong	52	54								
Youth reward	35	-14								
Youth Punish	14	7								
Tell if do well outside	45	43	57	51	57	-46	76	77	64	-46
Tell if do wrong outside	13	+25	49	-26	51	-26	51	-26	-6	-26
Reward if do well outside	35	-11	33	-14	35	-14	45	-34	35	-17
Punish if do wrong outside	9	0	0	3	10	6	5	3	3	3
Community tell if do well	27	-14	28	-11	33	-14	50	-23	28	-11
Community tell if do wrong	23	-11	3	11	8	14	28	20	5	14
Community reward	10	11	20	17	23	14	50	-34	28	-14
Community Punish	0	+14	0	0	0	6	5	6	0	-

Table 20: PERCENT INDICATING REWARD AND PUNISHMENT IN EACH PART OF THE SYSTEM

Item	% Youth Often 1981	% Youth Often 1982	% Staff Often 1981	% Staff Often 1982	% Staff Realistic 1981	% Staff Realistic 1982	% Staff Want 1981	% Staff Want 1982	% Staff Likely 1981	% Staff Likely 1982
Corrections										
Tell when do well	80	-70	77	+89	100	97	84	86	87	86
Tell when do wrong	84	90	90	97	100	100	84	+94	100	97
Reward	36	+57	61	56	71	-58	71	+89	68	61
Punish	56	+67	58	64	71	72	39	+61	58	67
Encourage to tell if do well	16	13	19	+36	45	50	42	50	29	+42
Encourage to tell if do wrong	20	20	13	+25	55	-39	19	28	19	25
Encourage reward	20	+30	16	19	26	23	29	+40	16	17
Encourage punishment	8	7	3	8	16	17	3	+17	3	9
Youth tell if do well	16	13								
Youth tell if do wrong	60	+77								
Youth reward	8	+23								
Youth Punish	36	-24								
Tell if do well outside	72	-52	74	69	74	75	90	89	71	64
Tell if do wrong outside	80	-66	81	86	81	86	84	89	77	86
Reward if do well outside	52	-34	39	+53	45	53	65	72	39	+53
Punish if do wrong outside	64	-52	48	+66	58	63	48	+71	48	+60
Community tell if do well	16	17	13	+26	19	17	58	57	13	17
Community tell if do wrong	8	7	6	+20	13	+23	13	+29	3	+14
Community reward	8	10	16	14	3	9	45	+57	6	9
Community Punish	0	0	0	+11	0	9	3	+14	0	6

KEY PARTICIPANT AND INSTITUTE NETWORK SURVEYS

Another way to gain an understanding of the trends in programs and policies is to solicit the opinions of the key participants. We turn now to the Key Participant and Institute Network Interviews.[37] We will present our conclusions formed from reviewing the Key Participant Interviews and Institute Network Interviews, as well as newspaper articles, research publications, and other sources of information about policies.

In contrast to the close-ended program surveys, which focus on the Behavior Generating System and the Control Generating System, the Key Participant Interview is open-ended and addresses the actors and actions in the Policy Generating System. We asked respondents to identify the key individuals and groups who affect policy and programs in different sectors such as education or corrections. Then we asked what actions these key movers have taken recently to affect the Control Generating and Behavior Generating Systems; these questions assess actual policies. Next we questioned respondents about what the key people want to do in the near future, what they realistically can do, and what they are likely to do.

The Institute Network Interview parallels the Key Participant Interview in format, but differs in its focus. It examines the actors and actions in a network of services broader than youth services; our focus and definitions were provided by a neighborhood legal services program located in Center. This legal clinic offers services to poor residents and provides training and internships for law students interested in civil poverty law. It handles cases in the family area such as divorce and child custody, housing

cases such as evictions, immigration problems, employment cases, and difficulties with Social Security.

We wanted to look at how an agency might alter the opportunities and resources of a family, for example, by preventing that family's eviction, or change the social climate of a housing development by concentrating its representation in housing cases in that project, in effect helping the tenants to organize themselves. By doing these things, the agency can help families free up resources of time, attention, money and emotional energy for dealing with problems related more directly to their children. Such actions might prevent a child from being removed to foster care from the "unstable household".

The legal clinic has ties to local organizations, especially in housing and tenants rights, and makes referrals to area agencies. It worked with one neighborhood health center in a housing project, teaching the staff about medical and employment services and benefits, so that staff might use this information to improve their resources and those of their clients. The staff of the legal clinic, composed of lawyers, paralegals, law students, and administrative staff, try to translate the concept of "empowerment" into action by teaching people to represent themselves --"pro se"-- in legal cases and administrative hearings.

Findings

In general, we found that liberals and those promoting advocacy were more optimistic than last year; they could be characterized as being in a period of regeneration after a fight for survival. Many groups

became invigorated after their organization survived the severe budget and funding problems of the last two years. Most youth groups in Center and Metropolis had to cope with major losses of financial support from city, state, and federal coffers. Those that survived strengthened their internal resources and refocused their attention on programmatic and policy concerns.

Achievements were particularly notable in the areas of corrections, social services, and welfare rights. Losses in funding and morale were greatest in education. Several "victories" for social services in the courts and in the state legislature buoyed hopes for building alliances that could sway the key movers. The gubernatorial election was particularly heartening for liberals and advocates of community services. The incumbent, who held very conservative positions on criminal justice, welfare, and education issues, was defeated. In legislative activity, Center suffered from the somewhat adversarial stance some state legislators took towards Metropolis, its mayor, and its financial difficulties; this conflict resulted in delays of funding which hampered educational and police functions.

But one legislator filed a bill that would help those who want to provide services in the community; his bill would provide additional state aid for localities that had community care facilities for populations in juvenile and adult corrections, foster care, mental retardation programs, and mental health services. For every person served in a facility within its boundaries the locality would receive an additional $1,500.

In spite of these positive signs, the serious cutbacks in governmental support had a deep impact on youth in Center. For

example, federal summer job funds for Metropolis dropped from 8 million dollars in 1979 to 2.3 million in 1982. Some educational services were eliminated, classes grew larger, and many teachers were laid off. There were serious delays in the processing of special education requests. The city's public housing waiting list, which had more than 6,000 applicants on it , was closed to further applicants. Many small social services programs disappeared overnight. The corrections budget, however, was doing relatively well compared to the other sectors, especially education.

In social services, a significant battle was being fought in the courts. It concerned community based care and the preservation of families through provision of services to a family instead of the removal of its child to foster care. A legal services office brought a class action suit on behalf of all children in the care of state protective services. Its goal was to ensure that neglect and abuse cases were evaluated and covered by the state social service agency and that children were kept in their natural homes when provision of support services by the state would make that possible. The court has been finding for the children and is forcing the state to comply. Though the children's advocates and interest groups involved in this case have been fighting for more resources for the state agency so that it <u>can</u> provide services, the agency has provided little in the way of collaboration or cooperation. In fact, the commissioner was cited for contempt of court for forcing the resignation of a worker who had provided testimony critical of the agency.

The importance and role of the courts has been even greater in the area of education. A federal judge has been supervising

the Metropolis public schools for several years, and is currently working with the city, general parents groups, a group of parents of black students, and the independent administrative policy committee that oversees the school system, on how the court should remove itself to let other organizations run the schools. One parents advisory council achieved a breakthrough by being able, through court order, to participate in negotiations between the policy committee and the teachers union. This has expanded people's ideas about what actions they might realistically take to influence educational policies and practices.

The Metropolitan public schools have so many problems--money, administration, morale, truancy, physical maintenance--that many parents who can afford to send their children to private schools. But some of those who remain suffer. Students who experience problems are often referred to special education classes; in fact, Metropolis has a higher percentage of students in special education programs than other major cities-- 21% versus 8%. But many of these youth, rather than being helped by special attention, are instead shunted off for most of the day and rarely returned to the regular educational mainstream. Several people complained that too many youth were inappropriately placed in special education, that it had in effect become a holding tank for disruptive youth. In general, people felt that the possibilities for working with youth in schools had greatly declined; many expressed the dismal opinion that the schools could do little more than babysit those students who did attend and do nothing for those who didn't.

People concerned about youth in trouble with the law had not had their expectations so decimated as those in education. People have not give up the goal of rehabilitation in the least restrictive community setting. Though some new secure detention and treatment facilities have opened, they are small; there is no indication that the state will return to using the large training schools. The trend toward locking up all offenders that has occurred in the adult criminal justice system does not seem to have taken hold of the state's juvenile justice system, though there are problems of increased demand for secure detention placements.

The major threat to the continued operation of the juvenile correctional system seems to be a legislative initiative that would shift the power for making sentencing decisions from the juvenile correctional agency to individual judges, some of whom are clamoring for the discretionary ability to lock kids up. Many other judges, however, do not want to transfer this decision to judges, and most observers agree that the bill does not have the support it needs to pass. This divergence in judicial opinion is reflected in the operation of the two courts that handle youth from Center. One court has many special, privately funded programs for youth and commits very few to the state's juvenile corrections. The other provides essentially no services to youth and commits a high proportion of those who appear before the judge.

The motivations of those who led the fight to cut taxes and governmental budgets seem to have been concerned with lessening the financial demands on taxpayers, not with providing fewer services and supports to youth in the community and its schools; unfortunately, the latter has been the result. Meanwhile, the corrections agency continues to receive support.

CONCLUSION

Our data are exploratory. They reveal patterns that suggest an urgent need for a larger scale study using the same approach. The exploratory findings show that, in the community we studied, youth in school are committing less crime in 1982 than in 1981, and are more involved in legitimate activities, especially ones done in groups. At the same time correctional youth are involved in more crime in 1982 than in 1981, and in fewer legitimate activities. We found that adult social control in the schools is declining while adult social control in the correctional system is increasing. We found little sign of advocacy anywhere, but found coaching in the schools, and supervision in corrections. The coaching in the schools seemed to be fading, like all other social control, while in corrections there were some faint signs of developments toward advocacy.

We speculated that the declining social control in the schools might be coupled with the decreasing crime and increasing legitimate activities among school youth because the decline in adult social control in the schools might also be a decline in the degradation that Greenberg has argued is characteristic of our schools.[38] We suggested that the increase in crime among correctional youth might also be related to the decline in adult social control in the schools, because along with the decrease in degradation there is clearly a decrease in the special supports that are important for reintegrating delinquent youth.

The increased emphasis on corrections and the decreased emphasis on the schools was further confirmed in the analysis

of political forces. The schools have been subject to draconian cutbacks in a time when corrections has continued to develop.

We are changing our society. We are retreating from working with youth in the school, and working more with them in corrections. If we do not change that pattern of shifting emphasis we will also no doubt shift the youth to where the emphasis is, and find ourselves working proportionately with more and more youth in corrections and fewer and fewer youth in the schools. We will turn our society into a treacherous divider of youth, relaxing both the degradation and the support provided by schooling, rewarding those who succeed in this new freedom, banishing to a correctional archipelago those who fail. The value of improvement in corrections will be lost without corresponding maintenance and improvement of the schools and the rest of the free community. It is the community that produces, or does not produce, delinquency.

FOOTNOTES

1. Robert Pickett, House of Refuge (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969); Anthony Platt, The Child Savers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969); Robert Bremner et. al., eds., Children and Youth in America, 3 volumes (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970-74); Joseph Hawes, Children in Urban Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971); Jack Holl, Juvenile Reform in the Progressive Era (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1971); Robert Mennel, Thorns and Thistles (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1973); Steven Schlossman, Love and the American Delinquent (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1977);

2. Schlossman, ibid.

3. Mennel, op. cit.

4. Platt, op. cit.

5. August Aichorn, Wayward Youth, (New York, The Viking Press, 1939).

6. Fritz Redl and David Winemen, Children Who Hate (Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1951).

7. Lloyd W. McCorkle, "Group Therapy in the Treatment of Offenders," 16 Federal Probation (1952), 28-32. See also H. Ashley Weeks, Youthful Offenders at Highfields (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1958).

8. Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, 500 Criminal Careers (New York, Alfred Knopf, 1930); One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents (Boston, Harvard University Press, 1934); Five Hundred Delinquent Women (New York, Alfred Knopf, 1934); Later Criminal Careers (New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1937); Criminal Careers in Retrospect (New York, The Commonwealth Fund, 1943); After-Conduct of Discharge Offenders (New York, MacMillen Co., 1945).

9. Allen F. Breed, "California Youth Authority Forestry Camp Program," 17 Federal Probation (1953) 37-43.

10. Lloyd E. Ohlin and William Lawrence, "Social Interaction Among Clients As a Treatment Problem" Social Work April 1959. Howard W. Polsky, Cottage Six-The Social System of Delinquent Boys in Treatment (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962); David Street, Robert D. Vinter and Charles Perrow, Organization for Treatment (New York; Free Press, 1966). For more recent statement see Clemens Bartollas, Stuart J. Miller and Simon Dinitz, Juvenile Victimization: The Institutional Paradox (New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1976).

11. Presidents's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 171.

12. Douglas Lipton, Robert Martinson, and Judith Wilks, The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment: A Survey of Treatment Evaluation Studies (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1975).

13. President's Commission, op. cit, see recommendations and dicussion in the chapter on juvenile delinquency, pp. 55-89.

14. President's Commission, op. cit., see table of recommendations pp. 293-301.

15. Maxwell Jones, Social Psychiatry: A Study of Therapeutic Communities (London, Tavistock, 1952); Social Psychiatry in Practice: The Idea of the Therapeutic Community (Baltimore, Penquin Books, 1968); Beyond the Therapeutic Community: Social Learning and Social Psychiatry (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1968).

16. Barry Krisberg, Paul Litsky, and Ira Schwartz, "Youth in Confinement: Justice by Geography", Unpublished paper by the Rethinking Juvenile Justice Project of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs and the School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, (September, 1982).

17. S.P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbort, The Delinquent Child and the Home (New York, 1912).

18. Robert E. Park, Human Communities: The City and Human Ecology. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952).

19. Solomon Kobrin, "The Chicago Area Project: A Twenty-Five Year Assessment," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Volume 322, (March 1959).

20. Saul D. Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (New York: Vintage Books, 1969). See also S.D. Alinsky, "Community Analysis and Organization" American Journal of Sociology (May, 1941).

21. Mobilization for Youth, Inc. A Proposal for the Prevention and Control of Delinquency by Expanding Opportunites. (New York: Mobilization for Youth, Inc., 1961).

22. Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1960).

23. Peter Marris and Martin Rein, Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States (New York: Atherton Press, 1967); John Knapp, Scouting the War on Poverty: Social Reform Politics in the Kennedy Administration (Lexingtion, Ma: Lexington Books, 1971); Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible

Misunderstanding: Community Action in the War on Poverty (New York: Free Press, 1970); Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., A Thousand Days (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967).

24. President's Commission, op. cit.

25. Albert K. Cohen, George Cole, and Robert Bailey, eds. Prison Violence. (Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books 1976.)

26. Robert Mennel, in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, eds. Crime and Justice Annual Review Vol. 4 1983, forthcoming.

27. Valdimer O. Key, Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups (New York: Knopf, 1964)

28. Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963); Ralph H. Turner and Lewis M. Killian, Collective Behavior (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972).

29. Barry C. Feld, Neutralizing Inmate Violence: Juvenile Offenders in Institutions, (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977); "Legislative Policies Toward the Serious Juvenile Offender: On the Virtues of Automatic Adulthood" Crime and Delinquency, October 1981.

30. Craig A. McEwen, Designing Correctional Organizations for Youths: Dilemmas of Subcultural Development, (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977).

31. Robert B. Coates, Alden D. Miller, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Diversity in a Youth Correctional System: Handling Delinquents in Massachusetts (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977).

32. Alden D. Miller, Lloyd E. Ohlin, Robert B. Coates, A Theory of Social Reform: Correctional Change Processes in Two States, (Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1977).

33. Ibid, pp. xvii

34. Delbert S. Elliott, "Delinquency and School Drop-out" in Leonard D. Savitz and Norman Johnston, Contemporary Criminology. (New York: John Wiley, 1982)

35. David F. Greenberg, "Delinquency and Age Structure of Society," Contemporary Crises April 1977, pp. 189-223.

36. Barry C. Feld, Neutralizing Inmate Violence, and Craig A. McEwen, Designing Correctional Organizations for Youths.

37. For a detailed description of the methodology and instruments used in this research, see Alden D. Miller, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and Julie A. Taylor, A Method of Studying Change in Delinquency and Community (Center for Criminal Justice, Harvard Law School, June 1982: mimeo)

38. Greenberg, op. cit.

APPENDIX

Department of Youth Services

Listed below are reports and publications from the cohort analysis and the larger project from the beginning of the larger project in 1970 through August of 1982.

Reports

1970

Reform of Correctional Services for Youth (Ohlin).

1971

Annual Report, December 31.

1972

Youth Reactions to Massachusetts Department of Youth Services Institutions, 1970-1972 (Coates, Miller).

The University of Massachusetts Conference: An Experiment in Youth Corrections.

Neutralization of Community Resistance to Group Homes (Coates, Miller).

Evaluating Large Scale Social Service Systems in Changing Environments (Coates, Miller).

Subcultures of Selected Cottages in Massachusetts Department of Youth Services Institutions in 1971 (Feld).

Quarterly Reports.

1973

Annual Report, January 15.

The Cohort Questionnaire, January 15.

Quarterly Report, April 15.

Quarterly Report, July 15.

Presentation to Massachusetts Sociological Association, "Deinstitutionalization of Programs for Youthful Offenders," (Ohlin, Miller, Coates) May 5.

Presentation at Society for the Study of Social Problems Annual Meeting in New York City, August 25, "Strategies for Radical Correctional Reform: A Case Study of the Massachusetts Youth Correctional System" (Ohlin, Miller, Coates, Feld).

Annual Report, October 15.

Presentence on Community Resistance to Group Homes at the 20th Annual Conference of the American Association on Mental Deficiency (Coates, Miller), October 9.

General Description of Research Design of the Project.

Preliminary Analysis of Initial Data in a Longitudinal Study of Youth in the Community Based System of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (Immediate Effects of Being Processed through the DYS System - Analysis of first three interviews of cohort on partial sample) December.

1974

A Theoretical Synthesis for Promoting Change in Social Service Systems (Miller, Ohlin, Coates) January.

Quarterly Report, January 15, Preliminary Report on Subculture Study of Summer of 1973.

Quarterly Report, April 15, Preliminary Report on Special Study of Roles of Courts and DYS (Results and implications of observation and interviewing in courts during Summer of 1973).

Quarterly Report, July 15, Preliminary Report on Recidivism.

Annual Report, October 15, including Final Report on special study of Roles of Courts and DYS.

The Mythic Mysteriousness of Radical Change by Crisis Tactics: A Logical Analysis (Miller, Ohlin, Coates) November.

Presentation at the Academy for Contemporary Problems Columbus, Ohio, on the Politics and Organization of Correctional Reform (Ohlin, Miller, Coates, Stolz) March.

Presentation at Conference on Mental Retardation at Niles, Michigan (Ohlin) April.

Presentation at the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency, Boston, Massachusetts, June, "A System Model Approach to Evaluation in Juvenile Corrections." (Coates).

Presentation at the American Correctional Association 104th Congress, Houston, Texas. "Evaluation of Corrections Effectiveness: A Study of the Massachusetts Experience" (Ohlin, Miller, Coates) August.

Paper presented at the National Conference on Catholic Charities, October, "Juvenile Justice: A Need for Community Reconciliation" (Coates).

Paper presented at the Massachusetts Standards and Goals Conference, November, "A Working Paper on Community-Based Corrections: Concept, Historical Development, Impact, and Potential Dangers" (Coates).

1975

Report on Analysis of Detention Data from Cohort (first two interviews for entire cohort sample) January.

Report on the Subculture Study of Summer of 1973, (McEwen).

"A Brief Look at Some Strains and Developments in Community-Based Corrections in the United States, 1970-1975," for the U.S. Delegation to the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, January (Coates).

Presentation at Council on State Governments, March, Boston, Massachusetts. "Impact and Implications of Deinstitutionalization: The Massachusetts Experience," March (Coates).

Quarterly Report, April 15, A Note on Roslindale Detention and Secure Care, and A Note on the Progress of the Research Project.

"Systematically Charting the Process of Reform in Massachusetts Youth Services," (Miller, Ohlin, Coates. May.

Presentation to the National Institute on Crime and Delinquence, (Coates) June.

"Logical Analysis of the Process of Change in Human Services: A Simulation of Youth Correctional Reform in Massachusetts," (Miller, Ohlin, Coates) June (a revision of "Mythical Mystericusness").

Quarterly Report, July 15, Exploratory Analysis of Recidivism and Cohort Data on the Massachusetts Youth Correctional System (Coates, Miller, Ohlin).

Presentation to the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco (Ohlin, Miller, Coates) August.

Presentation to Conference of Pennsylvania Juvenile Agencies on Deinstitutionalization in Massachusetts (Ohlin, Coates) August.

Presentation to National Conference on Alternatives to Incarceration, Boston, (Ohlin, Coates, Miller) September.

Annual Report, October 15, Preliminary Analysis Relating to the Generalizability of the Massachusetts Experience in Juvenile Corrections Reform.

Presentation to the American Society of Criminology, Toronto, (Coates) November.

Presentation to Directors of Criminal Justice Centers, Davis, California, (Miller) Fall.

Presentation to a Massachusetts Conference on Youth Services sponsored by Shaw Foundation, Sturbridge, Massachusetts, (Miller) Fall.

"Some Observations on the Conceptualization and Replicability of the Massachusetts Youth Correctional Reforms" (Miller, Ohlin, Coates).

1976

Presentation to a regional conference on Youth Service Bureaus, Seattle, (Miller) Winter.

Presentation to National Conference of State Planning Agency Evaluators, Denver (Coates, Miller) Winter.

Presentation to New England Coordinating Council Program organized by Massachusetts Half-Way Houses, (Miller) Spring.

Social Climate, Extent of Community Linkages, and Quality of Community Linkages: The Institutionalization-Normalization Continuum (Coates, Miller, Ohlin) July.

Presentation to Faculty of Law, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, (Coates) August.

Presentation to Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and other LEAA staff, (Ohlin, Miller, Sumner.

Presentation to National Advisory Committee of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Ohlin, Miller) New Hampshire, Fall.

1977

Presentation to LEAA Evaluation Conference, Washington, D.C., (Miller) Winter.

Presentation to the Association of Criminal Justice Researchers, (Miller) Spring.

Presentation to the Rehabilitation Panel of the National Academy of Sciences, (Miller) Summer.

Department of Youth Services (continued)

Presentation at the Closing the Juvenile Prisons...The Massachusetts Experience, conference sponsored by the Northeastern Family Institute (Coates) June.

Presentation at Vermont Summer Institute, University of Vermont School of Education (Coates) July.

Ph.D. Dissertations

Subculture I (Feld) April 1973, Sociology Department, Harvard University.

Subculture II (McEwen) April 1975, Sociology Department, Harvard University.

Politics of DYS Reform (Stolz) March 1975, Political Science Department, Brandeis University.

Administrative Analysis of DYS Reform (Klein) currently in write-up stage, Political Science Department, Bryn Mawr University.

Publications

1. "Organizational Reform in Correctional Agencies," by Lloyd E. Ohlin, in Daniel Glaser (ed.), Handbook of Criminology, Rand McNally, Inc., 1974. Discussion of organizational reform in correctional agencies. Identifies sources of resistance to change. Specifies the importance of considering the dynamics of reform particularly in terms of vested interest groups and crisis resolution. This article provided the orientation for formulating the original objectives of the research project.

2. "Evaluating Large Scale Social Service Systems in Changing Environments: The Case of Correctional Agencies," by Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller, in the July 1975 issue of the Journal on Research in Crime and Delinquency. Identifies problems confronting research on changing systems and specifies strategies for looking at systems undergoing change. Stresses the importance of looking at entire systems rather than focusing on specific programs. Represents the Project's early effort at coping with the everchanging DYS system and coordinating the Project's organizational and evaluation interests.

3. "Strategic Innovation in the Process of Deinstitutionalization: The University of Massachusetts Con-

ference," by Robert B. Coates, Alden D. Miller, and Lloyd E. Ohlin, in Yitzhak Bakal, The Closing Down of Institutions, D.C. Heath, 1973. Description of an advocacy program at the University of Massachusetts used to enable rapid closing of training schools in January 1972. Provides fairly extensive case study description of the advocacy/placement process, the roles of various actors, and an assessment of the process.

4. "Neutralization of Community Resistance to Group Homes," by Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller, in Yitzhak Bakal, The Closing Down of Institutions, D.C. Heath, 1973. Analysis of the process of setting up a group home. Three successful and three unsuccessful attempts were studied. Results underscore the importance of knowing the community and developing appropriate strategies for the type of community. Experience shows that an informed group using appropriate strategies can establish a program in a relatively short time period. Includes recommendations about dealing with conflict.

5. "Institutions for Predelinquent or Delinquent Children," (Ohlin) in Donnel M. Pappenfort, Dee Morgan Kilpatrick, and Robert W. Roberts, Child Caring, Social Policy and the Institution, Chicago, Aldine, 1973.

6. "Radical Correctional Reform: A Case Study of the Massachusetts Youth Correctional System," by Lloyd E. Ohlin, Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller, Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 44, February, 1974. Represents the Center's first effort at describing, in some detail, the reform process from the middle sixties through 1973. Includes fragmentary comparisons of youth responses concerning the new system with institutional baseline data. While problems are identified, data tend to support the direction of the reform effort.

7. "The Labeling Perspective and Innovation in Juvenile Correctional Systems," by Robert B. Coates, Alden D. Miller and Lloyd E. Ohlin, in Nicholas Hobbs (ed.) Issues in the Classification of Children: A Sourcebook on Categories, Labels, and Their Consequences, Josey Bass, 197-. The underpinning ideas of the DYS reform effort rests, in part, on the labeling perspective. This article looks at the labeling perspective as it relates to reform in juvenile corrections around the country but most specifically in Massachusetts. It identifies key decision points in the correctional process and describes efforts which attempt to reduce the negative consequences of labeling at those points.

8. "Evaluating the Reform of Youth Corrections in Massachusetts," by Lloyd E. Ohlin, Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 12, January 1975. Provides a description of the Project's research design and how the Project is organized to look at the reform process and its impact. Contains a brief overview of the reform effort and some impact data.

9. "Reforming Programs for Youth in Trouble," (Ohlin) in Begab and Richardson, The Mentally Retarded and Society: A Social Science Perspective, University Park Press, 1975.

10. "Knocking Heads and Solutions to Functional Problems: Components of Change," (Miller) in Sociological Practice, Vol. 1, #1, 1976. This paper adapts material from other reports to address a different audience, applied sociologists, concerning strategies of change and the conceptualization of change.

11. "Criminal Justice Sets, Strategies, and Component Programs: Evaluating Change in the Criminal Justice System," by Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller in Criminal Justice Research, Emilio Viano, (ed.) D.C. Heath, 1975.

12. Juvenile Correctional Reform in Massachusetts. (Ohlin, Miller, Coates) A collection of articles from the project published by LEAA, 1977.

13. The Aftermath of Extreme Tactics in Juvenile Justice Reform: A Crisis Four Years Later (Miller, Ohlin, Coates), Fall of 1977 in - "Corrections and Punishment: Structure, Function, and Process," Vol. VIII, Sage Criminal Justice System Annuals.

14. Reforming Juvenile Corrections: The Massachusetts Experience, by Lloyd E. Ohlin, Robert B. Coates and Alden D. Miller, Cambridge, Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978 (not available).

15. A Theory of Social Reform: Correctional Change Processes in Two States, by Alden D. Miller, Lloyd E. Ohlin and Robert B. Coates, Cambridge, Ballinger Publishing Co., 1977.

16. Diversity in a Youth Correctional System: Handling Delinquents in Massachusetts, by Robert B. Coates, Alden D. Miller and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Cambridge, Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

17. Designing Correctional Organizations for Youths: Dilemmas of Subcultural Development, by Craig A. McEwen, Cambridge, Ballinger Publishing Co., 1978.

18. Neutralizing Inmate Violence: Juvenile Offenders in Institutions, by Barry C. Feld, Cambridge, Ballinger Publishing Co., 1977.

The Problem of Secure Care in a Community Based Correctional System: Interagency Conflict in Dispositions of Youth Offenders.

"The Politics of Correctional Reform: An Analytical Approach to the Natural History of Social Change," Miller, Ohlin, and Coates. Presented at the 1979 meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, in Boston, used in two training conferences, and printed in the Pennsylvania Association on Probation, Parole, and Correction, The Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 3, Autumn 1979.

"Evaluation of Correctional Systems Under Conditions of Normal Operation and Major Change." Miller, Coates, and Ohlin, in Klein and Teilmann, Handbook of Criminal Justice Evaluation, 1980.

Preliminary Feedback from the Harvard Study of Secure Care Decision Making, 1980.

"Conceptualization and Measurement for Study of Change in Youth Opportunity Systems and Youth Correctional Systems." Miller and Ohlin, 1980.

"The Politics of Secure Care in Youth Correctional Reform," Miller and Ohlin, forthcoming in Crime and Delinquency.

"Decision Making About Security for Juveniles: Report of the First Two Years of the Secure Care Project," Miller and Ohlin, 1980.

"The Politics of Control and Opportunity: A Background Paper on the Youth Opportunity System, the Day to Day Social Control System, and the Policy Making System," Miller and Ohlin, 1981.

"Mobilization of Policy for Day to Day Social Control Affecting Youth Opportunities," Miller and Ohlin, 1981.

"Baseline Data on Mobilization for Day to Day Social Control Affecting Youth Opportunities in Two Communities," Miller and Ohlin, January 1982.

"A Method of Studying Change in Delinquency and Community," Alden D. Miller, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and Julie A. Taylor, June 1982.

"RESPONDING TO DELINQUENCY: The Importance of the Community," Alden D. Miller, Julie A. Taylor, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and Robert B. Coates, August 1982.