

212433

Self Reported Outcomes in a Randomized Trial of a Community-Based Multi-Agency Intensive Supervision Juvenile Probation Program

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Karen Hennigan, Ph.D.
*Social Science Research Institute
University of Southern California, Los Angeles*

Cheryl L. Maxson, Ph.D.
*Department of Criminology, Law and Society
School of Social Ecology
University of California, Irvine*

Sheldon Zhang, Ph.D.
*Department of Sociology
San Diego State University, San Diego*

March 2005 (revised May 2005)

Final report submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, Grant 2000-JR-VX-0001. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
Executive Summary	v
Acknowledgements	xi
List of Tables	xii
STUDY BACKGROUND	1
Progress in Community-Based Probation Programs	1
Evolution of a New Supervision Approach	2
Description of the YFAM Program and Program Enrollment	3
Findings of the State-Funded Evaluation Based on Official Records	4
Rationale for Augmenting Official Data with Self-Reported Measures	5
Study Hypotheses	6
METHODS	6
Design	6
Procedures	6
Comparability of the achieved sample	7
Measures	7
Demographics and risk measured at intake	8
Self-reported delinquency measures	8
Time in controlled settings.	9
Confirmation of services received.	9
Strength of program implementation.	10
Reaction to their probation program.	10
Variables that mediate delinquency.	10
Data Analyses	12
RESULTS	13
Confirmation of Services Received	13
Self-Reported Delinquency Measures	13
Overall.	14
Within subgroups	14
Breakdown by types of offending	15
By strength of program implementation.	15
Days in Controlled Settings	16
Variables that Mediate Delinquency	16
Reactions to the Probation Program	18
DISCUSSION	18
Summary of Findings	18

Higher risk offenders.	18
Lower risk offenders.	19
Limitations	20
Implications for Practice and Research	20

TABLES

Table 1	23
Table 2	24
Table 3	25
Table 4	26
Table 5	27
Table 6	28
Table 7	29
Table 8	30
Table 9	31
Table 10	32
Table 11	33
Table 12	34
Table 13	35
Table 14	36
Table 15	37
Table 16	38
Table 17	39
Table 18	40

REFERENCES

41

ABSTRACT

A critical issue facing corrections officials is how to respond to young offenders in ways that will minimize their future involvement in crime. This study evaluates the outcomes of an experimental trial of a community-based intensive supervision probation program in Los Angeles County called the Youth and Family Accountability Model (YFAM). The new program promotes a partnership between probation officers and community-based service organizations. Probation services are integrated within a structured after-school program operating at community reporting centers.

Evaluation of the YFAM program using self-reported outcomes was undertaken to confirm and expand the findings from official records. Records revealed that the new program significantly reduced recidivism among high risk male and female participants relative to randomly equivalent controls assigned to supervision as usual over the program year and the subsequent year.

Preservation of random equivalence of the comparison groups established at intake was a critical element of the research design. A subset of the youth that had been randomly assigned to the YFAM or control condition was randomly selected for an interview. A total of 745 youth (71%) were successfully interviewed approximately 22 months after intake. There were no indications that the random equivalence of the interviewed groups was diminished.

Mid and high risk YFAM participants reported less offending than controls. Specifically, high risk female and high school-aged mid and high risk male YFAM participants reported less offending over all, less violent offending and to a lesser extent less property offending. Low risk program males, especially younger males and those at the weaker programs reported *more* overall delinquent activity and more property, drug sale and status offending than their controls.

Within high risk, ameliorative program effects on the YFAM youth were linked to associating with less criminally active friends and for the females also linked with more positive family relations. Within low risk, negative program effects on the YFAM participants were associated with more criminogenic perceptions and beliefs about the likelihood of punishment for offending and the morality and normality of delinquent behaviors.

The YFAM partnership between probation and community-based agencies sets up a potentially powerful dynamic and that incorporates a rehabilitative as well as an enforcement focus that has an ameliorative impact on mid and high risk high school age females and males. However, the program had a criminogenic impact on lower risk and younger youth. Low risk and younger should not be assigned to this kind of intensive supervision model.

Self-Reported Outcomes in a Randomized Trial of a Community-Based
Multi-Agency Intensive Supervision Juvenile Probation Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A critical issue facing corrections officials is how to respond to young offenders in ways that will minimize their involvement in the criminal justice system into adulthood. Several large meta-analytic reviews examining the effectiveness of treatment strategies for young offenders have isolated some characteristics of successful programs (Andrews et al. 1990; Lipsey 1992; Lipsey 1995; Lipsey and Wilson, 1998; Lipsey 1999).

This report presents findings from an experimental trial of a community-based probation program in Los Angeles County, called the Youth and Family Accountability Model (YFAM). The YFAM program incorporated several of the program characteristics that Howell and Lipsey (2004) have associated with positive program impacts including: community-based intensive supervision with a focus on academic skills, a mandate to attend the program from juvenile court with some services administered by probation officers, continuous service for more than eighteen weeks with more than five hours of contact week, and some of the target participants (but not all) were more serious offenders (beyond just status offending and beyond just property offending).

The program, funded as part of the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program under the authority of the California Board of Corrections, aimed to: (1) hold offenders accountable for their actions through graduate sanctions and restitution; (2) protect the community by reducing recidivism among program participants; and (3) build offenders' competence and thereby reduce placement out of the community. The program targeted offenders who had at least two arrests or one felony arrest, were placed home on probation, and had not previously been placed out of the home.

Data from official records, gathered as part of a state-funded evaluation of the program, revealed that the YFAM program significantly reduced recidivism among high risk male and female participants relative to randomly equivalent young offenders assigned to supervision-as-usual, but did not result in less placement out of the home over the program year or the subsequent year. One possible reason for the discrepancy between recidivism and placement was that more technical probation violations were filed against mid and high risk YFAM participants than the controls during the program year. Overall there were no indications in the official records that this intensive supervision program was helpful for mid or low risk participants, but in areas where the program implementation was weak, recidivism among the low risk YFAM participants was higher than their controls.

Rationale for the Self Reported Outcomes Study

In a parallel effort, funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) enabled the research team to collect self-report data from a sample of the YFAM program and control program participants. Evaluation using self-reported outcomes was undertaken to confirm and expand the findings from official records. Only a small portion

of delinquent or criminal behavior comes to the attention of authorities, so official records are likely to underestimate true levels of offending. Self-reported outcomes are based directly on the youth's behavior rather than on the actions of police or probation officers. Personal interviews with youth also make it possible to include measures that can illuminate how motivations related to offending that may or may not have been influenced by the program. This is critically important for our knowledge of the effectiveness of interventions that can influence change in the behavior of young offenders and that may lead to different long-term outcomes for the individuals involved, their families and their communities. The findings from the self-report evaluation are the subject of this report.

Components of the Youth and Family Accountability Model Program

The YFAM program promoted a partnership between probation officers and the program staff of community-based organizations. Intensive supervision probation services were integrated within a structured after-school program operating out of a total of 12 centers throughout the county. The centers provided tutoring or homework help, mentoring opportunities, drug education, recreation opportunities and services as needed for each young offender based on a risk and needs assessment administered at intake. Participants randomly assigned to the intensive supervision treatment group were required to report to the center each day after school for three hours, while the control subjects were assigned to supervision-as-usual. Probation officers located at the YFAM centers carried caseloads of 45 or less at their center, while officers handling regular supervision were responsible for caseloads that varied between 75-150.

Each of the centers was staffed with at least one probation officer, a project monitor who served as the center manager, and other program staff employed to work with the young offenders. These centers varied in the ways that the probation officer and project staff integrated their activities, provided various aspects of the structured program, enforced attendance and used case management to provide as needed services.

Enrollment in the YFAM centers was random. All eligible youth in the chosen catchment areas receiving a new home on probation order between February 2000 and December 2001 were randomly assigned to the new YFAM program or to supervision-as-usual. Random assignments were blocked by area (12 areas) by gender and by an initial rough calculation of risk (early initiation or not) to preserve the opportunity to partition the sample later by area, gender, and risk. Ultimately, study participants were categorized into three levels of risk at intake, assessed on a 14-factor risk assessment scale.

Research Design and Methods

Preservation of the random equivalence of the program comparison groups established at intake was critical to the research design of the self-report study. A subset of the youth originally assigned to program conditions was randomly selected within eleven of the twelve catchment areas excluding the first three months of intake. The original sample, the sampling frame for the self-report study, and the achieved interview sample were all statistically equivalent on a wide array of demographic and risk variables. Further, there were no indications that random equivalence of the program groups interviewed was compromised in other ways.

The percent of nonresponse, the location of the interviews, and the timing of the interviews did not differ. The interview staff was blind to the earlier program assignment and to the study hypotheses.

A total of 745 young offenders, 71% of those randomly selected, were successfully located, consented, and interviewed between 18 and 26 months after intake. Self-reported involvement in delinquent activities over the six months prior to the interview was assessed using prevalence questions (i.e., “Have you ever <done this offense>?”) and incidence questions (i.e., “How many times did you do it in the last six months?”). To control for the extreme outliers created by a few very active respondents as well as the skew created by large numbers of inactive or slightly active respondents, the frequencies above zero were coded into the top third, middle third, or bottom third of the distribution. An overall index of the relative frequency of delinquency and five indices of specific types of offending were calculated by summing these scores across and within offense categories including violent offenses, property offenses, status offenses, public disorder, and drug sales. Log transformation was used to adjust for skew. A second general delinquency index was based on versatility in offending. This measure counted the number of different types of delinquent behaviors reported in the last six months.

The interview protocol also included measures of services received, time in controlled settings, and variables that mediate delinquent behavior that were derived from general theories of delinquency. The latter measures were organized into several domains including self regard, family, school, peers, perceptions of offending, perceived risk of punishment, and reactions of significant adults and friends to offending.

Study Findings

Confirmation of services received. YFAM youth reported receiving more of the services required by the program, including tutoring, mentoring, drug education and recreation, than the controls. YFAM youth received these services at a center in their community that they initially attended daily for three hours after school. Over the course of the program year, the attendance requirement was gradually cut back for most youth. While the self-reports confirmed successful implementation of the basic YFAM program, they did not confirm that significantly more *as-needed* services were delivered in YFAM as intended. In both program groups counseling and other as needed services were delivered at approximately the same rates, with more services delivered to the higher risk youth.

Self-reported delinquency measures. Self-reported outcomes confirmed but also expanded the findings from official records. Higher risk female and older (high school-aged) mid and high risk male YFAM participants reported less offending than their controls on two commonly used self-report general delinquency measures, versatility in offending and the overall frequency of offending. Follow up tests found that this ameliorative program effect was primarily evident for violent offenses, with a weaker but similar pattern for property offenses. In contrast, self reported outcomes revealed the opposite program impact for low risk males, especially the younger males. Within low risk, YFAM males reported more delinquency in general and more property, drug sale and status offending in particular than the low risk controls.

This criminogenic impact was strongest at YFAM centers where the program implementation was weak – less structured and of lower quality.

Days in controlled settings. The opportunity to engage in delinquent behavior is limited during the time a youth is confined in a controlled setting. If the youth in the program groups being compared differed on time in controlled settings, comparisons of delinquent activity could be biased. In the interview sample, a greater percentage of the high risk control males spent time in a controlled setting than their YFAM counterparts. The same pattern was evident among the higher risk females but was not statistically significant. This suggests that the magnitude of the positive program effect for high risk YFAM youth is modest. The positive program effect might have been underestimated due to less street time for high risk control youth during the self-report period.

Variables that mediate delinquency. Information on possible mediating factors from five conceptual domains including self regard, family relations, school relations, peer relations, and attitudes and beliefs about offending was gathered from each young offender during the interview. Within low risk, all of the differences found between the YFAM youth and the control youth on mediating variables were in the criminogenic direction. The low risk younger males, who showed the strongest and most consistent criminogenic program outcomes on their self-reported offending, also report strong, consistent criminogenic differences on mediating factors in every category compared to their counterparts in the control group. These young males agreed more strongly that they were the “kind of person who gets in trouble,” were more defiant of parental authority and more involved with street gangs. They had less belief in deterrence-related perceptions of the likely consequences of offending and had less moral scruples about offending. They stated that they were more often tempted to offend and were more likely to offend in the future compared to their low risk young male counterparts in the control condition.

At mid risk, most of the differences found between the younger and older YFAM males and their controls were promising. The older mid risk males who reported less delinquency were less sure that they would “do OK” in the long run, but were more convinced that their friends would lose respect for them if they offended and would personally feel more remorse for offending than their control counterparts. Surprisingly, the younger mid risk males showed protective differences in three domains including less involvement with gangs relative to their controls, but did not report significantly less offending. In short, the mid risk younger YFAM participants did not offend less but were less involved with street gangs and other delinquent friends and had more positive relations with their families.

Comparisons of the mediating factors within high risk, were primarily within the domain of peer relations. High risk females and older males who reported positive program outcomes -- less violent offending and less offending in general, also reported less having friends who were less involved in serious offending and offending in general. In addition, the high risk program females reported more favorable relations with their families than their controls. The high risk younger males did not show favorable outcomes on offending, rather nonsignificant trends toward greater offending were evident in the offense tables. The only mediator that varies in this

subgroup suggests a protective influence. The younger males in the YFAM group were more likely to believe that friends would lose respect for them if they offend.

Implications for Practice and Research

The findings of this study could have far reaching implications for the practice of juvenile supervision in California and elsewhere. Interventions work best when they are matched with the needs of the youth involved, but in practice it has sometimes been difficult to clearly identify which models of probation services are well-suited for the higher risk offenders, and work for females as well as for males. Here there is strong evidence for the success of the YFAM program for females and older higher risk males and females. The outcomes are striking in light of the mixed findings on program implementation. Over months of regular attendance at the center, the YFAM program positively influenced higher risk youth through community-based intensive supervision in a structured program that provided discipline, prosocial models and help with school. It would seem that the impact of this partnership between probation and community-based organizations has the potential for even greater positive impact than found here if the case management component of the model were fully developed. Future trials of the YFAM model involving high school-aged mid and high risk youth are needed to test the impact of the fully developed YFAM conceptual model.

The YFAM partnership between probation and community-based agencies sets up a potentially powerful dynamic and that incorporates a rehabilitative as well as an enforcement focus. Engaging the probation officer in a partnership with community-based social service providers and locating the officer in the community center with the youth, broadens the supervision experience. Community-based agencies can improve their service provision through strong case management. With the practical knowledge developed from the centers set up for this trial, stronger and more detailed support for the implementation of YFAM centers is possible.

While the results of this experimental trial confirm that the YFAM program is a good match for the high school-aged higher risk males and females, it is decidedly *not* a good match for the lower risk and younger youth. For them, the program had little impact or worse, it was counterproductive in centers where the program was poorly implemented. Young and low risk youth should not be assigned to this kind of intensive supervision model. This study powerfully conveys the concept that these youth will be better served in less intensive supervision arrangements.

Finally, it is important to note that there are no absolute definitions of low, mid and high risk. Here these levels were defined in a relative sense for the population of youth who received home on probation orders for the first time in areas of the county with high levels of juvenile crime. Fourteen dimensions of risk were examined at intake and youth that were in the upper quartile on only one dimension or less were labeled low risk. Yet these youth might be considered mid risk relative to a community sample of youth where those with no arrests could be considered low risk. Youth that scored in the upper quartile on five or more risk factors were labeled high risk for this study. At the same time, other youth with the same level of risk factors that were already more heavily involved in the juvenile justice system (e.g., found unfit or

previously sent to camp or juvenile hall) were not eligible for the YFAM program, so most of the high risk youth in the program were coming to the attention of the court for the first time. While the results varied by the relative levels of risk assigned at intake in this study, translating the levels as labeled here to other places and situations should be approached cautiously.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this report were assisted by a large number of individuals who contributed to this evaluation study of the Youth Family Accountability Model. The tenacity, attention to detail, and social administrative skills of graduate research assistants Wendy DeBour, Sarah Cusworth Walker, and Katharine Sisa and Project Assistants Sandra Medearis, Giao Luong, Maria Rivera and Kathryn Elayda contributed significantly to the quality of the interviews and the high response rate. These assistants at various times helped recruit, train and supervise interviewers, supervise the coding and entry of data on a daily basis, and conducted interviews and coding as needed. We also appreciate the work of graduate research assistants Qi Qin and Steven Wilson who assisted in the development of program strength variables. The study benefited greatly from the able guidance of study consultant Malcolm Klein at critical stages of the project.

A large number of interviewers and trackers, mostly students, were recruited and trained over the many months of interviewing for this project. We are grateful to Adrienne Bankert, Desiree Barnett, Leslie Barranon, Josephina Barroso, Ricardo Berisso, Kendall Burks, Jessica Caceres, Joshua Charney, Yeva Chilingaryan, Carlos Cordoba, Shannon Edwards, Desiree Elekwa, Eduardo Escobedo, Mayra Fernandez, Austin Flack, Saunte Nicole Furnace, Alin Gharapetian, Graig Gilkeson, Laurel Golden, Sara Gunther, Jenae Heitkamp, Maricela Hernandez, Christian Iniguez, Annie Ledoux, Po Chun Lee, Patricia Literte, Celina Lozano, Zare Manoukian, Therese Mansour, Javier Markowicz, Alex Marquez, Michelle Mondia, Myka Miller, Socorro Munoz, Donald Nadalin, Juliane Ngan, Fernanda Nobrega-Zill, Nancy Rodriguez, Jarrod Scuglik, and Victoria Young, all of whom interviewed youth or worked to locate youth for this project. In addition we greatly appreciate the efforts of other assistants including Jennifer Pacheco, Kristine So, Clara Hyun, Kathryn Elayda, Jenna Bennett, Luis Campa, Kristina Ferris, Marybel Gonzales, Krystal Parra who helped administer the project and carefully code and verify the data.

We would like to express special appreciation to all of the youth who participated in this study and all of the community-based program staff who worked closely with the youth over a three-year period. In addition, our thanks go to the deputy probation officers who embraced this program and worked with the YFAM youth in the twelve area centers including Anthony Allan, Lesley Bourne, Nancy Camarena, Makisha Diggins, Peter Garnica, Arturo Guerra, Priscilla Hands, Robert Henderson, Michelle Kennedy, Hans Liang, Nathaniel Lumpkin, Maria McDowell, Kelly Patey, Carlos Rowe, Gabriella Sanchez, Everett Scott, Byron Smith, Dawn Smith, Dexter Stinson, Edward Sykes, and Phillipa Tucker.

Finally, special recognition is warranted for the high level of support and cooperation from the Probation Department's administrative staff including the YFAM Director, John Poplawski, the Juvenile Field Services Bureau Chief Virginia Snapps, the two Supervising Deputy Probation Officers LaTonya Lindsey and Paul Vinez, the Department Ombudsman Joe Estrada, Program Analyst Hania Cardenas, DPO-Program Monitor Jennifer Salveson, and Senior Assistant Monica Gastelum. The cordial and mutually supportive researcher-practitioner partnership that developed among our staff and these directors and officers significantly improved the quality of this study.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics in the full study sample, sampling frame for the self-report study and the achieved self-report sample

Table 2. The percent of youth in the YFAM and control group that were assigned risk points within each sample.

Table 3. The percent of YFAM and control youth categorized as relatively low, mid, or high risk for future offending in each sample.

Table 4. Percent of YFAM and control youth who have a new arrest during the program year.

Table 5. Percent of YFAM and control youth who have a new arrest during the follow-up year.

Table 6. General delinquency measured as the versatility of self reported offending by program condition and level of risk.

Table 7. General delinquency measured as the logged relative frequency of all self reported offenses by program condition and level of risk.

Table 8. Logged frequency of self reported violent offenses by program condition and risk level.

Table 9. Logged frequency of self reported property offenses by program condition and risk level.

Table 10. Logged frequency of self reported drug sale offenses by program condition and risk level.

Table 11. Logged frequency of self reported status offenses by program condition and risk level.

Table 12. Logged frequency of self reported public disorder offenses by program condition and risk level.

Table 13. Logged frequency of self reported substance use by program condition and risk level.

Table 14. Versatility of offending and logged relative frequency of offending program condition and implementation level within low risk males.

Table 15. Percent of youth living in a controlled setting over the last six months by program condition and risk level.

Table 16. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p \leq .10$) between low risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

Table 17. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p \leq .10$) between mid risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

Table 18. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p \leq .10$) between high risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

SELF-REPORTED OUTCOMES IN A RANDOMIZED TRIAL OF A COMMUNITY-BASED MULTI-AGENCY INTENSIVE SUPERVISION JUVENILE PROBATION PROGRAM

STUDY BACKGROUND

Progress in Community-Based Probation Programs

More than a half million juveniles are under community supervision as a result of their violent or delinquent behavior. A critical issue facing corrections officials is how to respond to young offenders in ways that will minimize their involvement in the criminal justice system into adulthood. Longitudinal studies have found that early onset and repeated involvement in the juvenile justice system predispose a small number of offenders to long-term criminal careers (Moffitt 1993; Laub & Sampson 2003). Researchers and practitioners have searched for effective ways to intervene early and curtail involvement. Although debate on what intervention strategies are most effective continues, researchers and policy makers in general agree that early identification and intervention with high risk young offenders is a key to reducing criminal behavior in adulthood (Greenwood 1995).

One of the intervention strategies that justice policy makers and agency practitioners have devised is intensive probation supervision. First, the idea of using intensive supervision with adults as an intermediate sanction positioned between regular probation and commitment to controlled settings became very popular shortly after Georgia's Department of Corrections published an evaluation in 1986 that seemed to show that participants had dramatically lowered recidivism rates (Erwin 1986). Over the next decade the concept spread rapidly through many states with wide variation in the ways programs were conceptualized and implemented. Petersilia and Turner (1993) conducted an influential national multi-site evaluation of several randomized trials of intensive supervision for adult offenders. From these experiments it became clear that intensive supervision frequently had a negative impact on participants rather than the desired positive impacts, in part because it led to the discovery of technical violations and further involvement in the justice system, even in the absence of new arrests for criminal behavior. Effective intermediate sanctions programs have had the following features in common: they were intensive and behavioral; were aimed at absorbing offenders' daily schedule and providing positive reinforcement for pro-social behavior; were targeted at high risk offenders; matched treatment modalities and services with identified needs; and provided pro-social contexts that advocated bridging offenders with law-abiding lifestyles (Gendreau et al. 1996, Petersilia 1998).

The development of intensive supervision probation programs for juveniles evolved more slowly, perhaps because the adult programs embraced a punitive orientation that seemed at odds with a more rehabilitative orientation that was prevalent in the juvenile system at the time. As pressures on the juvenile system grew due to increasing numbers of serious and violent juvenile offenders, interest in juvenile intensive supervision approaches grew as well (Goodstein & Sontheimer 1997; Grisso & Schwartz 2000). The juvenile intensive supervision programs frequently sought to combine increased monitoring and accountability with rehabilitative goals (Clear 1991).

Intensive supervision programs for juveniles is one of many types of programs included in meta-analytic reviews of over 400 studies of the effects of a wide range of different types of intervention programs on juvenile delinquency (Andrews et al. 1990; Lipsey 1992; Lipsey 1995; Lipsey and Wilson, 1998; Lipsey 1999). These reviews found that the overall average effect of evaluated interventions for serious juvenile offenders on recidivism has been positive but modest in magnitude. Howell and Lipsey (2004) further summarized the meta-analytical findings by highlighting program characteristics associated with positive program impacts. The juvenile intensive supervision program evaluated here includes many of the highlighted program characteristics including: community-based intensive supervision with a focus on academic skills, mandate to attend the program by juvenile court with some services administered by probation officers, continuous service for more than eighteen weeks with more than five hours of contact week, and some (but not all) were more serious offenders (beyond just status offending and beyond just property offending).

The field of evaluations in community corrections has been plagued by less than rigorous methods (Sherman 2000; Sherman et al. 1997; Weisburd 2000; Palmer & Petrosino 2003). Much of our current correctional policy is not based on evidence gathered through the use of rigorous methods such as true experimental trials. Calls to move toward the ideal of evaluating public policy using true experimental designs have been persistent (Riecken & Boruch 1974; Sechrest et al. 1979; Farrington et al. 1986). However, true experimental designs remain the exception rather than the norm in criminal justice research today (Weisburd 2003; Shepherd 2003).

In 1999 Los Angeles County developed and implemented a new juvenile intensive supervision program and the state funded an experimental evaluation design.¹ Young offenders were randomly assigned to the new program or to supervision-as-usual. A state-funded program evaluation was based on outcomes coded from official records (i.e., new arrests, technical probation violations, and placements in controlled settings). The results of this evaluation are summarized below. The focus of this report is on the findings from a parallel evaluation funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Programs (OJJDP), based on self-reported outcomes including general delinquency, substance use, and several social and personal variables thought to mediate offending. The intensive supervision model evaluated by these studies is described next.

Evolution of a New Supervision Approach

Under the auspices of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, a Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council developed a local action plan that provided the blueprint for a new probation program. The Council sought to develop a model that would be empirically grounded and based on exemplary principles distributed by the Justice Department (Wilson & Howell 1993; Howell 1995). These principles called for immediate responses to offending when it

¹ In 1998 the California Legislature initiated a second round of funding under the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program called the Challenge Grant II program. The California Board of Corrections (BOC) administered the Challenge Grant program with participating counties and supported an experimental evaluation of the programs' effectiveness.

occurs through the use of graduated sanctions in community supervision combined with case management to create a continuum of community-based care to meet the varied needs of each offender. The group envisioned a supervision model that would strengthen an offender's bonds with pro-social family members, teachers, other significant adults and peers who have clear positive standards of behavior (Hawkins et al. 1992; Werner & Smith 1982) and facilitate access to opportunities in the community that could help the young offenders achieve personal fulfillment and social participation (Krisberg et al. 1993).

This new probation program, named the Youth Family Accountability Model (YFAM), was funded as part of the Juvenile Crime Enforcement and Accountability Challenge Grant Program under the authority of the California Board of Corrections. Through community-based supervision and services, the program aimed to: hold offenders accountable for their actions (i.e., impose appropriate sanctions and require offenders to make restitution to victims); protect the community by reducing recidivism among program participants; and build offenders' competence and thereby reduce placement out of the community. The program was developed as an intervention targeting young offenders who had had at least two arrests or one felony arrest, were placed home on probation (HOP), and had not previously been placed out of the home.

Description of the YFAM Program and Program Enrollment.

The YFAM program promoted a partnership between probation officers and the program staff of specific community-based organizations. Probation services were integrated within a structured after-school program operating out of a community reporting center. Young offenders were assigned to the center to fulfill a year-long home-on-probation order from the juvenile court and were initially required to report to the center each day after school for three hours. Over the course of the program year, the attendance requirement was gradually cut back for most youth. While attending their community center, YFAM participants received tutoring or homework help, mentoring, drug education, recreation opportunities and social services as needed for each young offender based on a risk and needs assessment administered at intake. One or more probation officers had an office at the center and the opportunity to interact with the young offenders frequently. The officers assigned to YFAM carried only the young offenders assigned to the program at their center on their caseload. Over the course of the evaluation described below, the YFAM program caseloads averaged no higher than 45, whereas officers handling regular supervision were responsible for caseloads that reached as high as 150 when the program evaluation began, and dropped gradually over the course of the evaluation to average between 75 and 100. Knowing that with intensive supervision, officers would become aware of a broader range of probationers' behavior than with regular supervision, a system of graduated sanctions was available to provide options to deal with behavioral indiscretions that did not require the judge's attention.

The twelve centers established early in 2000 were each staffed with at least one probation officer, a project monitor who served as the center manager, and other program staff employed to work with the young offenders. In many cases, service providers traveled to or were located at the site to provide counseling or classes for the young offenders. Case plans were developed for each young offender that focused primarily on the completion of the conditions of probation set out by the court, but also on the provision of other services needed by the young offender. These

centers varied in the ways that the probation officer and project staff integrated their activities, provided various aspects of the structured program, enforced attendance, and used case management to provide as needed services (Hennigan et al. 2003; Hennigan & Maxson 2004).

In accordance with the experimental evaluation design, 1815 young offenders in twelve different catchment areas were randomly assigned to the new YFAM program or to supervision-as-usual between February 2000 and December 2001. Court records and the automated data systems records used by the Probation Department were examined for the young offenders enrolled in the study and outcomes were coded for the program year (0 to 12 months post enrollment) and for the subsequent or follow-up year (13 to 24 months post enrollment). The coders were blind to the study hypotheses. The state-funded evaluation was completed in September of 2003 (see Hennigan et al. 2003).

The assignment process was successful in creating two randomly equivalent groups, one that received supervision-as-usual and the other participated in the YFAM program at a community reporting center in their neighborhood. The random assignment process was protected and carefully documented by the researchers. There were very few exceptions to the process.² The first column in Table 1 shows the demographics of the young offenders randomly assigned to YFAM or control “supervision as usual” in the experiment.

Just prior to random assignment, each eligible young offender and a parent or guardian were separately interviewed as part of a structured risk and needs assessment developed for the program. These assessments were then faxed to a university research office where eligibility was checked and the random assignment made within twenty-four hours to the YFAM program or to supervision-as-usual. Random assignments were blocked by area (12 areas) by gender and by an initial rough calculation of risk (early initiation or not) to preserve the opportunity to partition the sample later by area, gender, and risk.

Ultimately, risk of future offending at intake was assessed using the breadth of information collected from multiple sources --the young offender, the guardian, and the probation officer. Fourteen risk factors were examined. Young offenders received a risk point each time they were in the top 25% of the distribution on a risk factor (or as near as the distribution would allow) received a risk point. Young offenders with 0 or 1 risk point were categorized as low risk, more than 1 and less than 5 were labeled mid risk, and 5 or more risk points were considered high risk. The distribution of young offenders across risk categories was approximately 25%, 50%, 25% for low, mid and high risk respectively. The distribution of risk factor points and risk level categories for the fully YFAM sample is shown in the first column in Tables 2 and 3.

² As a matter of program policy, when two siblings become eligible for the YFAM study, they were randomly assigned as a pair. This happened 20 times, 12 pairs fell into treatment and 8 into the control condition. In one area, a judge intervened and changed the assignment of the youth in two cases. Finally, there were 16 youth who were randomly assigned to YFAM but were never enrolled in a YFAM program. An intent-to-treat approach was taken to resolve these discrepancies. All youth were categorized by the condition randomly assigned, except for two cases that were excluded because after being assigned early in the study they later received a new court order and were randomly assigned a second time.

Findings of the State-Funded Evaluation Based on Official Records

The state-funded evaluation showed that the new program had a beneficial impact on the young offenders who were assessed at high risk for future offending at intake. Fewer of the high risk YFAM offenders were rearrested during the program year than their randomly equivalent counterparts who received supervision-as-usual (48% vs. 59% respectively) as shown in Table 4. Over the 12 months following the program year (13 to 24 months after intake), fewer high risk YFAM participants were rearrested (35% vs. 52%) as shown in Table 5. The analyses confirmed that the effect of the program varied across risk levels and follow-up analyses confirmed fewer new arrests among the high risk YFAM young offenders, both males and females. In the follow-up year the apparent program effects had grown larger and were supported by significant main effects for the program. However, this positive program outcome was again confirmed only within the high risk group for males and for females.

Despite these differences in recidivism, there were no differences in the percentage of program or control young offenders placed in a correctional facility during the program year or the follow-up year according to court records. A key reason for finding no differences in incarceration may be the increased number of technical probation violations that were filed against the intensively supervised YFAM participants relative to the supervision-as-usual controls. Technical violations were more likely to be filed against mid and high risk YFAM participants than their randomly equivalent controls during the program year (53% vs. 43%) but not thereafter.

Since implementation varied across the twelve centers, follow-up analyses re-examined the program year outcomes in catchment areas where the relative strength of program implementation was strong or weak. Only one deviation from the results summarized above was evident. In four catchment areas where program implementation was relatively weak, low risk YFAM young offenders had significantly *more* new arrests during the program year than their randomly equivalent controls (32% vs. 15%). Overall, there were no indications in the official records that the intensive supervision program was helpful for mid or low risk participants, and there was an indication that the program was unfavorable for the low risk participants in the areas where implementation was weak.

Rationale for Augmenting Official Data with Self-Reported Measures

The self-reported outcomes evaluation was undertaken to confirm and expand the findings above. There are advantages and disadvantages to outcomes based on official records. Official outcomes are important because they indicate the level of offenders' continued involvement of the justice system. This is critically important for our knowledge of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of our criminal justice institutions. On the other hand, these outcomes are not sensitive to the wide range of behaviors in which these offenders may be involved. Only a small portion of delinquent or criminal behavior comes to the attention of authorities. Official records underestimate the true level of offending by the YFAM and control youth. Self-reported outcomes are based directly on the youth's behavior rather than on the actions of police or probation officers. Self-reported delinquent activities should confirm the

findings above based on official records, but should also be more sensitive to program effects and may reveal more about the impact of the program on the young offenders' behaviors. The wider range of behavior sampled by self-report allows a richer view of the variety of behaviors undertaken. Interviews also make it possible to include measures that can illuminate how motivations related to offending may or may not have been influenced by the program. Personal and social variables relating to family, school, community, and the probation experience were included. This is critically important for our knowledge of the effectiveness of interventions that can influence change in the behavior of young offenders and that may lead to different long-term outcomes for the individuals involved, their families and their communities.

Studies have found self-report measures of delinquency to have remarkable criterion and predictive validity (Paschall et al. 2001), as well as over time reliability (McMurrin et al. 1990; Zhang et al. 2000). Frequently studies have used self-report measures to gauge the level of delinquency involvement or risk-taking behaviors (Aklina et al. 2005). Many of these studies employed a combination of official as well as self-reports to compliment or check against one another in measuring delinquency behaviors (Huizinga & Elliott 1986; Farrington et al. 1997).

Study Hypotheses

Past empirical studies suggest that the intensive supervision program will be most effective for high risk youth, and may be hampered by an increase in technical violations filed against the intensive supervision program participants relative to the controls in supervision-as usual. The findings based on official records support these expectations. It is predicted that the self-report outcomes will confirm and extend these findings and provide insight into the personal and social processes than may be mediating these outcomes.

METHODS

Design

The objective of the OJJDP-funded evaluation was to expand the outcomes to include self-reported delinquency, substance use and other personal and social factors that mediate offending while preserving the random equivalence between program groups. The sampling frame for the interview study included all youth randomly assigned to YFAM or supervision as usual with two exceptions. First, one catchment area that was located in the farthest corner of the county was excluded for logistical reasons. Second, enrollment at the YFAM centers began slowly and unevenly during the time that the centers were working to hire staff and set up their programs. Sampling for the self-report study excluded the first three months of intake. All youth randomly assigned in the eleven catchment areas during the fourth through the twenty-second month of intake were included in the sampling frame for the interview study. The sampling frame was not statistically different from the original study sample in terms of demographics or risk factors at intake or the risk categories created (comparing columns one and two in Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Procedures

Interviews were targeted beginning about 18 months after program intake. Each month a random subset of the study cases that became eligible for an interview was selected for the interview project. At intake, guardians of each young offender had given consent to be contacted later about a follow-up study conducted by the university. They gave current addresses and phone numbers of guardians and a friend or relative. All of this information was used in multiple attempts to locate the young offender beginning 16 months after intake, starting with calls to all phone numbers, letters to all addresses, internet searches, a request for the most recent address known for the young offender in the probation department automated system, and the multiple visits to each address. When the interviewers were told that the young offender was in a controlled setting, the probation department assisted in determining where the young offender was currently placed.

The average age of the young offenders who were interviewed was 15.6 years old at intake and 17.4 years old at the time of the interview. Interviews took place from 18 to 25 months after intake or 6 to 13 months after the end of their initial year long probation program. Sixty-five percent of the interviews were conducted from 8 to 10 months after the end of the program year.

The staff of the interview study was blind to the program assignment and to the study hypotheses. Interviewers received six hours of training in interview techniques that included gaining the trust of the respondent and clearly conveying the confidentiality protections. Another priority was being sure the interview was private and could not be overheard by others. The latter was particularly important for interviews in controlled settings. These interviews took place in the yard outside of the building or in an office provided for private interviews.

Comparability of the Achieved Sample

Seventy-one percent (n=745) of the young offenders selected for an interview were located, consented, and interviewed. Consent was not obtained from either the young offender or from the guardian in only 7% of the control cases and 5% of the YFAM cases. The main reason for not completing an interview was failure to locate the young offender. By all indications the random equivalence between the YFAM and comparison program groups was maintained in the achieved self-report study sample. There were no indications that random equivalence of the program groups was compromised by differences on demographics (see Table 1) or on the proportion of YFAM to control cases selected (43.6% vs. 41.5%), or the percent of interviews completed once selected (72.8% vs. 70.1%), or the location of the interviews (82.1% vs. 79.2% at home; 13.9% vs. 15.9% in controlled settings). The interviews took place between 18 and 26 months after intake. The timing of the interviews did not vary by for the YFAM and control youth (19.8% vs. 19.4% at 18-19 months after intake; 66.3% vs. 64.2% at 20 to 22 months after; and 13.9% vs. 16.4% at 23 to 25 months after). Tables 2 and 3 show that the percentage of young offenders by program group within the original study sample, the sampling frame for the interview project and the achieved interview sample who were assigned risk points and categorized as low, mid or high risk did not vary. The program by risk groups were equivalent in every way tested.

Measures

Demographics and risk measured at intake. Days before young offenders were assigned to the YFAM program or to the supervision-as-usual control, demographic, contact information and risk factor information was collected by a probation officer in an interview with the youth and a parent or guardian. This information was used in the current study to examine the program effects across three risk levels (low, mid or high) and across gender and age groups.

Three subgroups were formed, older males, younger males, and females. The males were divided into those who were younger than the median age (Mn =14.8 years old at intake and 16.6 years old at the time of the interview) and those above the median age (Mn = 16.6 years old at intake and 18.4 years old at the time of the interview). The sample of males was large enough to support this median split on age for analyses within three risk levels. Low risk was defined as zero or one risk point. Mid risk had more than one and less than 5 risk points and high risk had five or more risk points. The sample of females was too small to divide by age or support analyses with three levels of risk without encountering several cells with less than 20 individuals. For this reason, analyses involving females only used a median split on the risk point scale, creating two rather than three risk levels. High risk females had three or more risk factor points, and lower risk had two or fewer.

Self-reported delinquency measures. Over the years researchers have undertaken to create summary indexes of self-reported criminal behavior in various ways. Early researchers were concerned with creating an index weighted by culturally defined or normative views of the seriousness of offenses (Sellin & Wolfgang 1964; Rossi et al. 1974; Rossi & Henry 1980; Sankey & Huon 1999). However, indices weighted by seriousness are not advocated for the evaluation of criminal justice programs because “Ranking crimes by seriousness does not line them up on a continuum with respect to either causation or increasing involvement in criminal activities” (Rossi and Henry, 1980). For example, research on violent offenders has shown that these individuals commit more nonviolent offenses than nonviolent-only offenders. The inference is that the more serious offenders are also the more *frequent* offenders (Piquero 2000). Frequency of offending is predictive of violent crime because those who offend more are more likely to have become involved in violent crime. Further, Piquero’s research suggests that the most frequent offenders are likely to be committing the least common crimes. For this reason, the *variety* of offenses a person commits or *versatility* in offending is a useful index of the level of their criminal involvement. It is common in current research to use measures based on variety (i.e., the number of different offenses) to represent the extent of current criminal behavior (Piquero et al. 1999). Variety scales may be the best operational measure of general delinquency and criminal offending (Hirschi & Gottfredson 1995: p. 134).

Two measures of general delinquency were created from the youth’s self-reported involvement in delinquent activities over the six months prior to the interview using an instrument adapted from Elliott & Huizinga (1989). For each offense or delinquent behavior, the respondent was asked, “Have you ever <done this offense>?” A relative frequency index was calculated based on the responses to the follow-up question, “How many times did you do it in the last six months?” The modal frequency of responses varies widely between offenses like vandalism or skipping school and arson or forgery for example. For more common offenses some respondents may estimate they have done it 100 times, whereas for the less common offenses the highest estimate may be three times. In an effort to control for the extreme outliers created by a few very active respondents, the frequencies above zero for each offense were coded

in the top third, middle third, or bottom third of the distribution. For each offense, then, the frequency codes varied from zero to three. An index of the relative frequency of delinquency was calculated by summing these scores across all of the listed behaviors in five categories including violent offenses (throwing dangerous objects at people, involved in a gang fight, assault, assault with weapon, robbery); property offenses (vandalism, arson, burglary, various kinds of theft, fencing stolen goods, auto theft, forgery, credit card fraud, other fraud); status offenses (runaway, skip school, lie about age to get in or make a purchase, hitchhike with a stranger, avoid paying for things, joy riding); public disorder (trouble for being loud and rowdy in public, drunk in public place, made obscene phone calls, paid for sex, begged money from strangers); and drug sales (sold marijuana, crack or cocaine, other drugs such as heroin, LSD, acid). An index of the relative frequency of substance use was tallied separately including use of widely available substances (alcohol, marijuana, inhalants); and use of other substances (psychedelics, cocaine or coke, heroin, tranquilizers, barbiturates, amphetamines). In addition, a relative frequency score for each category of offending and substance use was created by summing the scores within each category separately. The overall frequency index and the indices within each category were logged to adjust for extreme skew.

A second general delinquency index was based on versatility in offending. This measure was based on a count of the number of different delinquent behaviors reported in the last six months. Similar behaviors (i.e., various kinds of theft and various kinds of drug sales) were counted only once and substance use was excluded from the count. The prevalence of each category of offending was also calculated by counting the percent of youth who reported engaging in any offense within each categories above. The self-reported delinquency and substance abuse outcomes, then, include: the logged relative frequency of delinquency, versatility of offending, and the logged relative frequency within each offending category including violent offenses, property offenses, drug sales, status offenses, public disorder, and substance use. The prevalence of offending within each category is used to describe the magnitude of program differences found.

Time in controlled settings. The interviewer asked each respondent to list all the places he or she had lived (defined as stayed over night) over the previous six months, including any controlled settings. The interviewer assisted the youth in walking back through time to remember places he or she had lived. From this information, the number of days in a controlled setting and the number of youth that spent any time in a controlled setting were calculated. The log of the total number of days and percent of youth spending any time in a controlled setting were analyzed.

Confirmation of services received. Respondents were also asked a series of questions about services they may or may not have received over the 18 to 20 months prior to the interview. The purpose of these questions was to confirm that YFAM participants actually received different services than the youth on regular supervision. Six questions referred to services that were part of the basic YFAM program. These included a substance abuse prevention program (split into two questions about receiving this in a community program or receiving this at school or church), mentoring, peer tutoring or homework help, adult tutoring or homework help, and organized recreational games. The goal was to see if the YFAM

participants had more of these experiences than youth on regular supervision as expected. The reported experiences were summed to produce a score from 0 to 6.

Seven questions referred to services offered by the YFAM program on an as-needed basis through case management. Three asked about classes in anger management, problem-solving or life skills, and job skills. Three asked about individual, group or family counseling for substance abuse, family problems or personal problems. The number of service types reported within each of these areas were summed, resulting in a score from 0 to 3 for skill classes, and a score from 0 to 3 for counseling. A final question in this section asked if the youth had participated in a pregnancy or sexually transmitted diseases prevention program. Youth on regular supervision might also be referred to these services.

Two questions referred to probation requirements that were assigned at the judges' discretion for both YFAM and control youth including community service and paying restitution. No difference in participation in these conditions of probation was expected.

Strength of program implementation. Program records and summaries of site visit interviews provided the basis for describing the strength (quantity and quality) of the implementation of the YFAM program at each of the centers. It was apparent that the provision of as-needed services, average hours of and days of attendance, and the consistency and quality of the required services delivered (tutoring, mentoring, drug education, recreation) varied across the programs from well-functioning structured programs to those struggling to maintain staff and fulfill the basic requirements. The centers were rated and divided into two categories representing the stronger and weaker programs.

Reaction to their probation program. At the end of the interview, the interviewer asked the youth to recall what probation or probation-sponsored program they had participated in eighteen to twenty months ago. The interviewer read the possibilities including: regular probation, the YFAM program, or <the names of each center>. "*Thinking about that experience*" each youth answered a series of questions. Four questions on the perceived helpfulness of the program were averaged to form a helpfulness score (alpha = .73, an example item is the "*probation program I participated in made me get into more trouble*" – reverse coded). Four questions on the perceived fairness of the program were averaged to form a fairness score (alpha=.70, an example item is the "*probation program I participated in was a worse consequence than I deserved*").

Variables that mediate delinquency. Potential mediating factors were derived from general theories of delinquency (c.f., Paternoster & Iovanni 1989; Hawkins et al. 1992; Catalano & Hawkins 1996; Akers 1985, 1996; Elliott & Menard, 1996; Paternoster et al. 1983; Grasmick & Bursik 1990). Here the variables were organized into several domains including self regard, family, school, peers, perceptions about offending including the perceived risks of punishment and the reactions of significant adults and friends to offending.

1. Self regard variables. Self regard was measured by the respondent's agreement or disagreement on a 6 point scale with the statements: *I'm the kind of person who gets in trouble;*

I'm the kind of person who will do OK in things like school, jobs, having a family, etc.; and I'm the kind of person who will need help for personal problems.

2. Family variables. Measures of family relationships using a 6 point response scale were taken from previous studies (see Maxson et al. 2000; Maxson & Whitlock 2004) and were formed into scales representing: close family ties (4 items, $\alpha = .79$, an example item is *I am happy when I am with my family*); parents ask youth to take responsibility for work around the home (2 items; $r = .38$, an example item is *I have chores at home that I am supposed to do every day or almost every day*); level of parental supervision (6 items, $\alpha = .65$; an example item is *How often do your parents or guardians ask you to tell them where you are going and who you will be with when you are away from home?*); defiance of parental authority (4 items; $\alpha = .77$, an example item is *How often do you do things or go places that your parent tells you not to?*).

Selected items from the Hare Self Esteem Scale (reproduced in Corcoran & Fischer 2000) in the area of home (4 items, $\alpha = .72$, sample item is *My parents are proud of the type of person I am*) were included.

3. School variables. Selected items from the Hare Self Esteem Scale in the area of school were included (5 items, $\alpha = .67$, sample item is *I often feel worthless in school*) were included. Respondents who had attended school in the last six months were asked how much he or she values school (see Maxson et al. 2000; Maxson & Whitlock 2004) using a 4 point response scale (7 items; $\alpha = .74$, an example item is *How often do you care what teachers think about you?*). Respondents who had attended school in the last 6 months were asked how they were doing in school: doing well, getting mostly getting As and Bs; just passing, getting about a C average; or not passing, getting mostly Ds and Fs.

Nine school and community activities were listed. Each respondent indicated which ones they had been involved in over the last 6 months. A count of the number of activities was calculated and scored 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or more. An example activity question is, *"In the last six months did you participate in religious services or youth group or choir associated with religious services?"*

4. Peer associations. After their own self-reported delinquency, respondents were asked several questions about their close friends activities using a 6 point response scale anchored from "none of them" to "all of them". One score combined the prosocial items (5 items, $\alpha = .73$, an example item is *During the last six months how many of your close friends have gone to a school dance or sports event?*) and another score combined the antisocial items (13 items, $\alpha = .92$, an example item is *During the last six months how many of your close friends have purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them?*). A score was created for a subset of status offenses including skipped school, runaway from home, used marijuana, and disobeyed parents ($\alpha = .77$). A subset of the most serious items included burglary, assault and assault with a weapon ($\alpha = .85$) was also scored.

A set of items asked the respondents about the nature of their closest group of friends. They were asked to indicate if the friends they spent the most time with were called a club, band,

crew, taggers, posse, bikers, skaters, club members, gang or something else. Respondents were also asked to indicate if this group of friends was involved in defending its territory or getting into fights with other groups and whether the group has a name. One hundred twenty-one (121) respondents indicated that their group was a gang. Two independent coders rated 39 other ambiguous cases. With 85% agreement, 7 additional cases were deemed gang members.

5. Perceptions of offending. The final sets of mediating variables were measured in the context of three scenarios where respondents were asked to imagine that they had just stolen a wallet or purse; sold marijuana to a stranger on the street; or stolen a car.

In the context of each incident, using 6 point response scales, respondents indicated if they would feel remorse for what they had done (9 items, $\alpha = .86$, an example item is *How sorry or glad would you feel if you <did each offense in the scenario>?*); if they thought their actions were wrong or immoral (6 items, $\alpha = .86$, an example item is *How right or wrong do you think <doing each offense> would be?*); and whether this action was the kind of thing that was typical or normal for other persons their age who live around them (6 items, $\alpha = .80$, an example item is *For kids my age who live around here, <each offense> is no big deal*).

6. Perceived risk of punishment. Risk of punishment was measured in context of these scenarios as well. Three items measured sureness of getting caught ($\alpha = .67$, an example item is *What would happen if you <did each offense; How likely or unlikely is it that you would be arrested and have to go to court for doing this?*) and 6 items measured severity of punishment ($\alpha = .67$, and example item is *How severe or light do you think the judge's order or punishment would be for doing this?*).

7. Expected reactions from others. The expected reactions from the adults that you care about ($\alpha = .76$, *Imagine that all of the adults you care about found out that you <did each offense>; How likely or unlikely is it that they would lose some respect for you?*) and the expected reactions from your friends ($\alpha = .86$, *How likely or unlikely is that your friends would lose some respect for you if you did this?*) were measured with three items each.

8. Temptation and future intentions. End scenario ended by asking the respondent “*In the last year, how often have you been tempted to <do the offense>*” and “*If I <have the opportunity to do the offense>, I have a strong urge to do it.*” A measure of temptation was created from six items, two for each scenario with an alpha of .81. Similarly, respondents were asked, “How likely or unlikely is it that during the next year you will <do each offense>?” and how much do you agree with the statement: “*In the future, it is very likely that I will <do each offense>*.” A measure of future intentions was created from the mean of these six items with an alpha of .75.

Data Analyses

The self-reported outcome variables and mediating variables were first entered in 2 x 3 ANOVA using program group and risk level as factors. Two advantages of this analysis are that it allows one to easily examine program condition interactions across risk and that it uses the entire sample. If the program benefits higher risk youth the most as predicted, significant risk by program group interactions should be found. For the delinquency and mediating variable

analyses, this more powerful omnibus analysis was followed by targeted t tests or χ^2 analyses within risk levels to more specifically describe the nature of significant interactions or main effects. However, the power to detect significant effects is weaker in these follow-up tests due to smaller sample sizes. This is especially a problem within high risk where the sample size is reduced and at the same time the variances are heightened by more severe positive skews due to greater delinquent activity in general and more extreme levels of activity by some. In response to power concerns, the alpha level for reported effects is set at .10 with an understanding that the risk of Type I errors is heightened as a result.

These analysis steps were repeated within three subgroups, females, older males and younger males. The entire sample and the male subgroups were further divided by three levels of risk in some analyses. However, in analyses involving females only, a median split on risk creating two rather than three levels of risk was used. In follow-up analyses where the variances between the programs groups were not homogeneous, t tests using pooled variances were conducted and are reported in the results.

RESULTS

Confirmation of Services Received

Youth were asked to describe the services they had received while participating in their probation program approximately twenty months prior to the interview. As intended, YFAM youth reported receiving more of the services required by the program than the controls ($F = 30.49$; $df=1,739$; $p=.000$) overall and this was true for each service (more drug education, mentoring, tutoring, and organized recreation). There were no differences in the receipt of these services by risk or by gender. While the self-reports confirmed successful implementation of the basic YFAM program, they did not confirm that more as-needed services were delivered in YFAM as intended. Counseling did increase from low to high risk as expected ($F = 18.43$; $df = 2,737$; $p = .000$), but it did not vary between the program groups (YFAM vs. control) or by gender. The receipt of skills classes (e.g., anger management, life skills) also did not vary by program or risk or gender. The only non-required service that was reported more frequently among YFAM youth was prevention education for HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases. YFAM youth at every risk level were more likely to report receiving this ($F = 10.27$; $df=1,739$; $p=.000$) and higher risk youth across both programs were more likely to report receiving this as well ($F = 3.22$; $df=2,737$; $p = .041$).

There was no overall difference in the prevalence of community service work or participation in restitution between the YFAM and control youth. Since these were included as conditions of probation at the judges' discretion, the prevalence of orders for these should be randomly equivalent between program groups. The equivalence reflected in the youth's self reports may suggest that compliance with these orders was not substantially different overall.

Self-Reported Delinquency Measures

Overall. Program-related differences on the level of offending reported by the youth interviewed approximately 10 months after the end of their probation program year were examined and tested for statistical significance. Program differences by risk level on self-reported general delinquency operationalized in terms of versatility and in terms of frequency were tested in 2 x 3 ANOVA. As predicted, the analyses also showed significant program by risk interactions for both the versatility and frequency of offending ($F = 3.32$; $df=2,737$ for versatility; $p = .037$ and $F = 3.77$; $df=2,737$; $p = .023$ for frequency), suggesting that the program effects varied across risk levels. The patterns of means for versatility in the first column of Table 6 and for frequency in the first column of Table 7 suggest that general delinquency 10 months after the end of the program was lower among the mid and high risk YFAM participants as intended, but *higher* among the low risk YFAM participants than among their randomly equivalent controls.

Follow-up tests within risk level confirmed positive program effects within mid risk on both general delinquency measures ($t = 3.52$; $df=399$; $p=.061$ and $t = 3.90$; $df=399$; $p=.049$ respectively), but failed to confirm statistical significance for the apparent program differences within high risk. Follow up tests within low risk confirmed significant negative program effects within low risk on both the versatility ($t = -4.50$; $df=170$; $p=.035$) and frequency ($t = -4.80$; $df=170$; $p=.030$) of offending. In other words, the program had a criminogenic rather than an ameliorative impact on the low risk participants. Significant program effects that are the reverse of the intended effects are indicated by an R in the tables.

Within subgroups. The analyses above clearly indicated that the program affected lower risk and higher risk youth quite differently. The program may have also affected younger and older, male and female participants in different ways. To check this, three subgroups were formed to compare the results for older males, younger males and the females.³ In each subgroup, ANOVA was conducted using program and risk level as factors with follow-up t tests and the results are indicated in Table 6 for versatility and Table 7 for frequency of offending.

Strong evidence for the positive program impacts was found for the older males and females. Mid and high risk older male YFAM participants reported less versatility in offending ($t = 2.07$; $df=132$; $p = .041$ and $t = 2.00$; $df=59$; $p=.050$ respectively) and less frequency of offending ($t = 2.28$; $df=150$; $p = .024$ and $t = 1.68$; $df=59$; $p=.098$ respectively) than the mid and high risk controls. Similarly, the higher risk female YFAM participants reported less versatile and less frequent offending than the female control youth ($t = 2.56$; $df=51$; $p = .014$ and $t = 2.15$; $df=69$; $p=.035$ respectively). These results provide solid evidence for the intended ameliorative effects of the program on higher risk older male and female participants.

The young males subgroup, however, did not show any significant positive program effects at any risk level, and showed statistically significant reversals in low risk. The low risk young male YFAM participants reported more versatile and more frequent offending than their controls ($t = -2.47$; $df=32$; $p = .019$ and $t = -1.85$; $df=55$; $p = .070$ respectively). In addition, on one of the general delinquency measures, low risk older males also reported more frequent criminal activity relative to their controls ($t = -1.82$; $df=79$; $p = .072$). These results indicate that

³ Given the limited sample size for the females, only two levels of risk were used in analyses within this subgroup (defined as higher or lower than the median number of risk points).

the program had unintended negative impacts on lower risk males, and no positive impact on younger males in general.

Breakdown by types of offending. Program effects on the relative frequency of offending in six categories including violent offending, property offending, drug sales, status offending, public disorder and on the relative frequency substance use were tested. The analyses reported above on the two indicators of general delinquency were repeated for each type of offending reported.

The results for violent offending given in Table 8 are strong and consistent with the pattern found for general delinquency. In the entire sample, significant positive program effects are found for high and mid risk YFAM participants. The ANOVA showed a strong risk by program interaction ($F = 4.519$; $df=1,737$; $p = .011$) caused by ameliorative program effects in mid and high risk and criminogenic effects in low risk, all confirmed with follow-up tests run within high ($t = 2.20$; $df=163$; $p=.029$) mid ($t = 2.25$; $df=378$; $p = .025$) and low risk ($t = -2.20$; $df=164$; $p = .029$). The beneficial program effects on violent offending were evident for mid and high risk older males and the females, but not for the younger males. Nonsignificant trends toward reversals were apparent for low risk older and younger males.

Table 9 shows the results for property offending. The pattern of program effects mirrors the results found from violent offending, except among high risk older males. Ameliorative program effects were found for mid risk older males ($t = 2.20$; $df = 164$; $p = .029$) and higher risk females ($t = 2.60$; $df=55$; $p = .012$). Criminogenic program effects were found for low risk younger males ($t = -2.20$; $df=36$; $p = .033$).

Drug sales in Table 10, status offending in Table 11, and public disorder in Table 12 showed no overall program effects on YFAM participants. Within the subgroups, no ameliorative program effects were found for any of these offenses for the males. A beneficial program effect for females on status offenses was found ($t = 1.73$; $df = 69$; $p = .088$). Criminogenic impacts on the low risk younger males was evident for drug sales ($t = -2.68$; $df = 24$; $p = .013$) and for status offending ($t = -2.21$; $df = 55$; $p = .032$) but not for public disorder.

Substance use, in Table 13, was not strongly effected by the YFAM program overall. However, advantages were found for the older mid and high risk males ($t = 2.16$; $df=149$; $p = .033$ and $t = 1.68$; $df=59$; $p = .098$ respectively) and negative effects were found for younger low risk ($t = -2.04$; $df=43$; $p = .048$) and younger high risk males ($t = -2.36$; $df=72$; $p = .021$). No program effects for the females on substance use were detected.

By strength of program implementation. YFAM centers were rated as relatively strong or weak on the implementation of the after-school program delivered by the community agency. For the males, ANOVA run within risk levels tested whether the program effects varied by program implementation. Within high and mid risk, the interactions were not significant but the positive program effects on general delinquency were stronger where implementation was stronger. Within low risk, the program by implementation interaction was statistically significant for one measure of general delinquency ($F = 4.00$; $df=1,134$; $p = .048$ for general frequency) but not for the other ($F = 2.53$; $df=1,134$; $p = .114$ for versatility of offending)

Follow-up *t* tests run on the means within implementation levels in Table 14, confirmed statistically significant negative program effects on recidivism where implementation was weak ($t = 2.93$; $df=69$; $p = .005$ on versatility in offending and $t = 3.42$; $df=69$; $p = .001$ on general frequency) and not where implementation was strong.

Days in controlled settings

In evaluating the differences in self reported delinquency found above, it is important to take into account any differences in the time spent in controlled settings. Time in controlled settings limits a person's opportunity to engage in delinquent activity. The percent of youth living in a controlled setting during the six-month self-report period by program condition and risk level are given for older and younger males and females in Table 15. Within high risk, fewer YFAM participants spent time in controlled settings than the high risk control participants ($\chi^2 = 6.15$; $df=1$, $n = 170$, $p = .013$). Among high risk males, a greater percentage of the control males spent any time in a controlled setting, 64% vs. 42% for older high risk males ($\chi^2 = 2.90$; $df = 1$, $n = 61$, $p = .087$) and 73% vs. 54% for younger high risk males ($\chi^2 = 2.86$; $df = 1$, $n = 74$, $p = .090$). The same pattern was evident among the higher risk females but was not statistically significant (38% control vs. 29% YFAM). This suggests that the magnitude of the positive program effect in high risk may have been underestimated because, as a group, the high risk control offenders had less street time.

No statistically significant differences were found among the mid or low risk males or the lower risk females on controlled settings. However there were nonsignificant trends toward more low risk YFAM boys lower risk YFAM females in controlled settings.

Variables that Mediate Delinquent Behavior

Official records showed that high risk male and female participants in YFAM had fewer new arrests over the 12 months immediately following the program year than their randomly equivalent controls who had supervision as usual. The self reported outcomes confirmed these positive program effects and revealed a broader and more nuanced view of the impact of the YFAM program. During private interviews approximately ten months after the program year, reports of delinquency activity overall and reports of violent offending in particular were significantly lower for higher risk female, older mid risk male and older high risk male participants in YFAM relative to their controls. At the same time, low risk male, especially the younger low risk male participants reported more delinquency including violent, property, drug sale and status offenses. In this section we turn to the question of what may have mediated these varying program effects. How did the YFAM program effect older and younger, high and low risk youth differently?

Information on possible mediating factors from five conceptual domains including self regard, family relations, school relations, peer relations, and attitudes and beliefs about offending was gathered from each young offender during the interview. Tests confirmed that the randomly equivalent program groups did not differ at intake on a wide variety of demographics and risk factors predictive of future offending (see Tables 1, 2 and 3). Differences found later, at the time of their interview approximately ten months after the program or 22 months after intake,

plausibly can be attributed to experiences linked to the random assignment to different program conditions, YFAM or supervision-as-usual. This includes program experiences as implemented and much beyond the YFAM and supervision-as-usual programs themselves including all manner of experiences in the community and in commitments or placements that resulted from or were linked in some way to the program assignment. Differences on the mediating variables found at the time of the interviews between the YFAM and control youth serve as clues to the processes by which the program year may have differentially influenced the behavior of young offenders.

Program differences on the mediating variables were tested within risk level for three subgroups, females, older males, and younger males. As in the analyses above, the males were divided into three levels of risk while the smaller sample of females was divided into only two levels of risk. Tables 16, 17 and 18 list the specific mediating variables tested for the low, mid and high risk study participants respectively. For each mediating variable a “C” indicates a significant or marginally significant difference ($p \leq .10$) between the YFAM and control youth in the criminogenic direction – consistent with an increase in offending in among YFAM participants. A “P” indicates a difference in the ameliorative or protective direction – consistent with a decrease in offending among YFAM participants.

In Table 16, all of the differences found between the YFAM youth and the control youth were in the criminogenic direction. The low risk younger males, who showed the strongest and most consistent criminogenic program outcomes on their self-reported offending, also report strong, consistent criminogenic differences on mediating factors in every category compared to the low risk younger males in the control condition. These young males agreed more strongly that they were the “kind of person who gets in trouble,” were more defiant of parental authority and more involved with street gangs. They had less belief in deterrence-related perceptions of the likely consequences of offending and had less moral scruples about offending. They stated that they were more often tempted to offend and were more likely to offend in the future compared to their low risk young male counterparts in the control condition.

Table 16 shows that all three of the low risk subgroups held more criminogenic attitudes and beliefs about offending than their controls. This includes the older low risk YFAM males who reported higher levels of offending and also the low risk YFAM females who did not report more offending. However, these females appear to have had more involvement with controlled settings (20% YFAM vs. 12% control) during the self-report period. . The females report more involvement with delinquent friends than their controls, an ominous finding if these differences persist.

At mid risk, Table 17 shows that most of the differences found between the younger and older YFAM males and their controls were promising. The older mid risk males who reported less general delinquency and less violent, property, and public disorder offenses were less sure that they would “do OK” in the long run, but were more convinced that their friends would lose respect for them if they offended and would personally feel more remorse for offending than their control counterparts. Surprisingly, the younger mid risk males showed protective differences in three domains including less involvement with gangs relative to their controls, but did not report significantly less offending. In short, the mid risk younger YFAM participants did

not offend less but were less involved with street gangs and other delinquent friends and had more positive relations with their families.

Comparisons of the mediating factors for the high risk program and control youth are shown in Table 18. Older males and females who participated in YFAM reported positive program outcomes -- less violent offending and less offending in general. Consistent with these outcome findings, the high risk females and older males report having friends who are less involved in serious offending and offending in general. The high risk females also report more favorable relations with their families. The high risk younger males did not show favorable outcomes on offending, rather nonsignificant trends toward greater offending were evident in the offense tables. The only mediator that varies in this subgroup suggests a protective influence. The younger males in the YFAM group were more likely to believe that friends would lose respect for them if they offend.

Reactions to the Probation Program

Both the male and female low risk YFAM participants perceived that that YFAM program itself was a sanction that was too severe and an unfair consequence for their transgression. The reactions of low risk YFAM participants to their program were compared to the reactions the low risk control participants had for their program of supervision-as-usual. Analyses run within gender and risk confirmed that both the low risk females ($t=2.75$; $df=32$; $p=.010$) and the low risk males believed ($t=2.00$; $df=136$; $p=.047$) believed that their probation program was more unfair as sanction given what they had done than the controls believed. The low risk males also rated their probation program as less helpful ($t=2.35$; $df=104$; $p=.026$) to them than the low risk control males rated their supervision-as-usual program. There were no significant differences on reactions to their probation experience within the mid and high risk groups for either gender.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

Self-reported outcomes strengthen and expand the previous findings on the impact of the YFAM program based on official records. The new findings give more detail on the promising positive impact of YFAM on the high risk females and the older mid and high risk males. At the same time the new findings reveal negative impacts among low risk males, especially younger low risk males that should be avoided in the future. Mediating variables suggest some of the processes by which the program may have influenced these youth in positive and negative ways and suggests ways of enhancing the over all effectiveness of the program.

Higher risk offenders. Official records showed positive program impacts on higher risk males and females. These program participants had fewer new arrests during the program year and during the follow-up year (12 to 24 months after intake) than the randomly equivalent high risk males and females that received supervision-as-usual. When a random subset of these youth were interviewed approximately 22 months after intake, positive program impacts were again found among high risk females but only for the subgroup of older males with an average age of

16.6 years old at intake (high school-aged males). The mid and high risk older males showed a 35% lower index and the females a 50% lower index of general offending versatility relative to their controls. Violent offending was the type of offending most reduced by the program. Property crime was reduced to lesser extent. These results are compelling given that a higher percentage of high risk *control* youth spent some time in controlled settings (64%) than high risk YFAM youth (45%). The positive program differences may have been underestimated due to fewer opportunities for high risk control youth to engage in delinquent behavior.

Additional information provided clues as to the processes by which the YFAM program successfully influenced some participants. To begin with, the interviewed youth confirmed that those in the YFAM program clearly received more of the required program services while attending the community reporting centers in the afternoons after school, but the case management part of the program model was not fully implemented. Overall, the YFAM participants received more help with school work, group mentoring, drug education, HIV education and organized recreation, but did not receive more counseling, anger management, life skills classes, or other as needed services than youth on supervision as usual. The YFAM program as implemented provided community-based intensive supervision in a daily structured program that provided discipline, prosocial models and help with school.

As a result, the higher risk females who participated in the program as it was implemented reported better family relations (closer ties, less defiance of parental authority, less parental tolerance for offending, and more parental supervision) and reported having close friends with less involvement in delinquency at the time of their interview than the higher risk control females. The high and mid risk older males who participated in the program reported also having friends who were less involved in delinquency or were less accepting of offending. Given that these program groups were randomly equivalent to their control groups at program intake, we can infer that the differences observed approximately 22 months later were due to improvements in the program group and/or declines in the control group over that period of time. The YFAM partnership created between probation and community-based organizations was effective for higher risk and older males. The YFAM program was a good match for higher risk females and the older mid and high risk males in this random trial. The potential for greater or broader positive impact of the program with a strong the case management component was not tested here.

Lower risk offenders. Past literature suggests that community-based intensive supervision combined with treatment will be most effective for higher risk youth than for lower risk offenders. This evaluation detected a *negative* impact of the YFAM program among low risk males, especially the younger males. Low risk YFAM males self-reported more delinquency in general, more property, drug sale and status offenses than low risk control males. The negative impact was most evident in catchment areas where the program side of the YFAM partnership was underdeveloped. In these areas, the youth reported to the centers as required by the judge and probation officers, but the program provided there lacked structure and quality. In these settings, the low risk youth found themselves spending time in unstructured interactions with other offenders, many of whom were at higher risk than they were at program intake. It may not be surprising to find that the low risk YFAM youth in these centers came to believe that their risk of being caught and severely punished for offending was lower, that the immorality of

offending was lower, and the normative nature of offending was higher than the low risk control youth. Clearly the YFAM program is *not* a good match for low risk youth, especially younger low risk males.

Limitations

The findings to date consistently show remarkable decreases in offending among higher risk and older youth over the year following their probation experience, but we don't yet know to what extent this impact persists and whether fewer of these YFAM participants end up becoming involved in the adult justice system. It is clear that the program holds great potential for reducing recidivism among females and mid and high risk males and equally clear that low risk males, especially younger males should not be involved in the program. Future trials of the YFAM model involving mid and high risk males and females are needed. The conceptual program model was not fully developed at all the sites in this trial. Future trials should provide the training resources needed to support strong case management for counseling and other as needed services. Implementation should be actively monitored to insure that the full program model is well-implemented.

A second limitation is the generalizability of the risk level labels as defined here. There are no absolute definitions of low, mid and high risk. Here these levels were defined in a relative sense. Fourteen dimensions of risk were examined at intake and youth that were in the upper quartile on only one dimension or less were labeled low risk. Yet these youth might be considered mid risk relative to a community sample of youth where those with no arrests could be considered low risk. Youth that scored in the upper quartile on five or more risk factors were labeled high risk for this study. At the same time, other youth with the same level of risk factors that were already more heavily involved in the juvenile justice system (e.g., found unfit or previously sent to camp or juvenile hall) were not eligible for the YFAM program. While the results varied by the relative levels of risk assigned at intake in this study, translating the levels as labeled here to other places and situations should be approached cautiously.

Finally, as with most research on criminal behavior, statistical power is an issue because of strongly skewed variables. Self-reported delinquency measures have more volume and variance, but still 25 to 30% of the youth report no activity and the top five percent or so report extremely high activity. The need to look at program differences within risk, within gender, and within implementation rapidly diluted the power to detect significant differences even with the large overall sample. For this reason the results of statistical tests with a p value between .05 and .10 were reported and cautiously interpreted. Hopefully this approach avoids missing "real" differences that were only marginally significant, but at the same time, it increases the risk of false positives. Confidence is increased in the self-report findings that overlap with the records-based findings.

Implications for Practice and Research

The findings of this study could have far reaching implications for the practice of juvenile supervision in California and elsewhere. Interventions work best when they respond to specific needs (Dowden & Andrews 1999; Lipsey & Wilson 1998). It is known that matching higher risk

offenders with more intensive supervisions with services increases the chances of reducing recidivism (Thanner & Taxman 2001; Andrews & Bonta 1996), but in practice it has been difficult to clearly identify which models of probation services are well-suited for the higher risk offenders, and work for females as well as for males. The findings here suggest that the YFAM model may provide a good alternative for the supervision of high school aged-mid to high risk youth in the community. As the governor and agencies in the state of California are working to reform aspects of the juvenile criminal justice system and the California Youth Authority to enhance the rehabilitative elements in its treatment of high risk offenders (Warren 2005a, 2005b), this kind of community-based supervision holds great promise for early rehabilitative treatment for higher risk youth.

However, it is important to be cognizant that the effectiveness of this program for high risk youth is in some ways contrary to past findings that question the effectiveness of group or aggregate intervention as opposed to individual interventions (see Borum, 2003). It is important to note that the YFAM program was built around structured group experiences with a probation officer on site. It is this model of group intervention that was found to be productive for higher risk youth but not for lower risk youth. Similar to past findings (Dishion, Capaldi, Spracklen & Li 1995; Dishion, Eddy, Haas, Li & Spracklen 1997; Dishion, McCord & Poulin 1999; Elliott & Menard 1996; Poulin, Dishion & Burraston 2001), for some participants, in this case the lower risk and younger boys, this well-intentioned program was counterproductive. This underscores the importance of strong adherence to the implementation of structured and engaging programs, purposeful avoidance of situations where “deviance training” can take place when youth are grouped together, and matching the intervention with the needs of youth. Lower risk youth should not be assigned to this kind of intensive supervision program.

The YFAM partnership between probation and community-based agencies sets up a potentially powerful dynamic and that incorporates a rehabilitative as well as an enforcement focus. On the probation side, the purpose of supervision has drifted more toward the role of “enforcer” and away from the role of “social worker” over the last decade, especially in large urban areas where a growing percent of serious crime is committed by juveniles (Taxman 2002). Engaging the probation officer in a partnership with community-based social service providers and locating the officer in the community center with the youth broadens the supervision experience. Such contact between officers and offenders might expand the enforcer orientation to include motivator, and might incorporate aspects of the positive influence of prosocial peers, community role models, and parents. A community-based program affords the opportunity to coordinate with local informal social control mechanisms that are believed to be more powerful than formal social control mechanisms in the lives of young offenders (Sampson & Laub 1993; Warr 1998).

In the community-based agency domain, the effectiveness of the YFAM approach can very likely be enhanced with the implementation of a strong case management component that focuses intervention on the individual, family and other criminogenic factors (Borum 2003; Dowden & Andrews 1999; Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). With the practical knowledge developed from the centers set up for this trial, stronger and more detailed support for the implementation of YFAM centers is possible. For example, achieving the potential of a partnership between probation officers trained primarily in the role of enforcer and program staff trained in service

delivery is not easy or automatic and can fail to gel, as may have happened at some of the YFAM sites. The findings of this study will be critical in clearly defining *what has to happen* to make the program work, and in guiding training and oversight.

Finally, the negative experiences of the young and low risk offenders in this study powerfully conveys the concept that matching offenders' risk of future offending with an appropriate level of intensity in their supervision and treatment. They underscore the importance of matching the treatment with the needs of the offenders. Clearly, young and low risk youth will be better served in less intensively supervised settings with less exposure to criminogenic attitudes.

Table 1. Demographics in the Full Study Sample, Sampling Frame for the Self-Report Study and the Achieved Self-Report Sample

	Full Study Sample at Intake		Sampling Frame for Self-Report Study at Intake ¹		Achieved Self-Report Sample at Intake	
	n=1815		n=1533		n=745	
	YFAM %	Control %	YFAM %	Control %	YFAM %	Control %
Gender²						
Male	83%	83%	83%	83%	81%	81%
Female	17%	17%	17%	17%	20%	19%
Age						
12 or younger	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%
13	8%	7%	9%	7%	7%	6%
14	16%	17%	17%	17%	17%	17%
15	26%	29%	25%	28%	28%	29%
16	32%	30%	32%	30%	32%	33%
17	15%	14%	15%	14%	14%	13%
Race/Ethnicity						
Black	23%	22%	23%	22%	20%	19%
Hispanic	61%	59%	66%	63%	67%	64%
Non Hispanic White	10%	11%	6%	7%	7%	7%
Asian & Pacific Inlander	3%	4%	3%	5%	2%	4%
Other	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	6%
Arrests at Intake						
1			40%	41%	40%	42%
2			34%	35%	35%	32%
3 or more			26%	25%	24%	27%
Risks factor points at intake						
Any mental health risk						
Any risk in family domain						
Any risk in school domain						
Any gang association						
Risk from prior delinquency						

¹ Area 1 and the first three months of intake were not included in the Self-Reported Study Sampling Frame.

Table 2. The percent of youth in the YFAM and Control group that were assigned risk points within each sample.

	Full Study Sample		Sampling Frame for Self-Report Study ¹		Achieved Self-Report Sample	
	YFAM	Control	YFAM	Control ²	YFAM	Control ²
	n=913	n=902	n=763	n=770	n=374	n=371
poor school performance	35%	35%	35%	34%	36%	33%
early onset of delinquent behavior	32%	31%	31%	29%	32%	30%
school disciplinary action	25%	24%	24%	23%	25%	25%
conduct disorder	24%	26%	25%	25%	25%	25%
referred for emotional / behavioral problems	27%	25%	24%	22%	25%	23%
variety of past delinquent behaviors	23%	21%	22%	19%	24%	22%
defiance of parents	24%	23%	24%	21%	24%	19%
parent criminal history	22%	22%	20%	20%	21%	17%
skip school	19%	20%	19%	19%	21%	22%
recent substance use	22%	23%	21%	23%	20%	25%
runaway from home	16%	15%	16%	13%	17%	14%
possible gang association	18%	20%	18%	20%	15%	18%
numerous significant life changes	17%	17%	16%	16%	15%	13%
negative attitude toward authority	9%	8%	7%	6%	8%	5%

¹ One of the twelve catchment areas and the first three months of intake were not included in the Self-Reported Study Sampling Frame.

² The program groups do not vary in risk level categories in any sample. X^2 tests, ns

Table 3. The percent of YFAM and Control youth categorized as relatively low, mid, or high risk for future offending in each sample.

Distribution across Risk Categories (based on intake characteristics)	Full Study Sample				Sampling Frame for Self-Report Study 1				Achieved Self-Report Sample			
	YFAM		Control		YFAM		Control		YFAM		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Low Risk (0 or 1 risk point)	197	22%	212	24%	164	22%	196	25%	79	21%	93	25%
Mid Risk (more than 1 less than 5 risk pts)	483	53%	463	51%	426	56%	399	52%	209	56%	194	52%
High Risk (5 or more risk points)	233	25%	227	25%	173	23%	175	23%	86	23%	84	23%
Total	913	100%	902	100%	763	100%	770	100%	374	100%	371	100%

¹ The program groups do not vary across risk level categories in any sample.

Table 4. Percent of YFAM and Control youth who have a NEW ARREST during the INTERVENTION YEAR.

	ALL PARTICIPANTS				BOYS				GIRLS			
	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ¹	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ¹	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ¹
ENTIRE PROGRAM	1817	37%	38%		1505	41%	41%		312	16%	22%	*
LOW RISK ONLY	409	22%	23%		342	23%	24%		--	--	--	
MID RISK ONLY	947	38%	35%		798	42%	37%		216	18%	20%	
HIGH RISK ONLY	461	48%	59%	**	365	57%	68%	*	96	11%	29%	*

¹ For Entire Program, the significance of a main effect for program in a 2 x 3 ANOVA is reported. Within each Risk Level, the results of follow up Chi Square tests are reported. Details are recorded below.

[†] p<.10 * p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.00

3X2 ANOVA Results	me Prog	ns	me Prog	ns	me Prog	F(1,308)= 3.96, p<.05
	me Risk	F(2,1811)=47.84, p<.00	me Risk	F(2,1499)=60.04, p<.00	me Risk	ns
	R x P int	F(2,1811)= 3.93, p<.02	R x P int	F(2,1499)= 3.15, p<.04	R x P int	F(1,308)= 2.98, p<.08
Follow up X ² analyses testing program within risk						
within low risk		ns		ns		--
within mid risk		ns		ns		ns
within high risk		X ² (1)= 6.20, p<.01		X ² (1)= 4.37, p<.04		X ² (1)= 4.86, p<.03

taken from Hennigan, Maxson, Zhang, Poplawski, et. al. 2003.

Table 5. Percent of YFAM and Control youth who have a NEW ARREST during the FOLLOW-UP YEAR.

	ALL PARTICIPANTS ¹				BOYS				GIRLS			
	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ²	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ²	N	YFAM	CONTROL	SIG ²
ENTIRE PROGRAM	1318	32%	40%	***	1105	35%	44%	***	213	16%	18%	
LOW RISK ONLY	298	26%	30%		253	26%	32%		--	--	--	
MID RISK ONLY	637	33%	38%		550	36%	43%		132	16%	9%	
HIGH RISK ONLY	383	35%	52%	***	302	40%	57%	***	81	17%	33%	^t

¹ Records were coded for 73% of the study sample because the remaining youth had not yet completed the follow-up year by the end of the study.

² For Entire Program, the significance of a main effect for program in a 2 x 3 ANOVA is reported. Within each Risk Level, the results of follow up Chi Square tests are reported. Details are recorded below.

^t p<.10 * p<.05, ** p<.01, ***p<.00

3X2 ANOVA Results	me Prog	F(1,1312)=9.84, p<.00	me Prog	F(1,1099)=10.12, p<.00	me Prog	ns
	me Risk	F(2,1312)=9.47, p<.00	me Risk	F(2,1099)=11.28, p<.00	me Risk	F(1,209)= 5.37, p<.02
	R x P int	ns	R x P int	ns	R x P int	F(1,209)= 4.95, p<.03
Follow up X ² analyses testing program within risk						
within low risk		ns		ns		--
within mid risk		ns		ns		ns
within high risk		X ² (1)= 10.65, p<.00		X ² (1)= 8.19, p<.00		X ² (1)= 3.02, p<.08

taken from Hennigan, Maxson, Zhang, Poplawski, et. al. 2003.

Table 6. General delinquency measured as the versatility of self reported offending by program condition and level of risk.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	1.978	0.268	R *	46	2.348	0.446		32	1.563	0.373	R *	33	2.182	0.503	
YFAM	79	2.937	0.375		35	2.914	0.479		25	3.920	0.877		39	1.949	0.419	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	3.630	0.294	t	70	4.129	0.524	*	86	3.384	0.409					
YFAM	209	2.928	0.235		82	2.780	0.390		89	3.225	0.379					
High Risk																
Control	84	5.369	0.589		28	6.857	1.011	*	37	4.216	0.848		37	4.703	0.853	*
YFAM	86	4.360	0.526		33	4.394	0.741		37	5.541	0.946		34	2.294	0.397	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program				*			*		*
ME for Risk	**			**			**		*
P x R Interaction	*			t			t		t

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 7. General delinquency measured as the logged relative frequency of all self reported offenses by program condition and level of risk.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.438	0.043	R *	46	0.468	0.064	R ^t	32	0.409	0.071	R ^t	33	0.447	0.071	
YFAM	79	0.576	0.046		35	0.636	0.063		25	0.626	0.098		39	0.419	0.067	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	0.637	0.035	*	70	0.698	0.060	*	86	0.616	0.053					
YFAM	209	0.542	0.033		82	0.518	0.052		89	0.571	0.052					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.784	0.059		28	0.982	0.076	^t	37	0.637	0.097		37	0.721	0.086	*
YFAM	86	0.707	0.055		33	0.794	0.080		37	0.800	0.088		34	0.481	0.069	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program										t						t
ME for Risk			**				**			t						*
P x R Interaction			*				*									

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 8. Logged frequency of self reported violent offenses by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.137	0.026	R [†]	46	0.179	0.041		32	0.107	0.042		33	0.096	0.041	
YFAM	79	0.209	0.033		35	0.279	0.051		25	0.217	0.061		39	0.112	0.041	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	0.245	0.025	*	70	0.272	0.043	*	86	0.235	0.037					
YFAM	209	0.174	0.02		82	0.141	0.029		89	0.211	0.035					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.410	0.044	*	28	0.522	0.075	†	37	0.390	0.068		37	0.303	0.058	*
YFAM	86	0.282	0.038		33	0.331	0.065		37	0.326	0.060		34	0.126	0.036	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program		†				†										†
ME for Risk		**				**			**							*
P x R Interaction		**				*										*

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 9. Logged frequency of self reported property offenses by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.101	0.024	R *	46	0.120	0.038		32	0.086	0.035	R *	33	0.091	0.037	
YFAM	79	0.181	0.033		35	0.190	0.051		25	0.259	0.069		39	0.074	0.027	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	0.236	0.024	t	70	0.278	0.043	*	86	0.229	0.037					
YFAM	209	0.177	0.020		82	0.163	0.035		89	0.210	0.033					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.335	0.045		28	0.383	0.077		37	0.273	0.067		37	0.314	0.065	*
YFAM	86	0.295	0.042		33	0.325	0.064		37	0.372	0.074		34	0.122	0.035	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program										t						*
ME for Risk			**				**			*						*
P x R Interaction			t													*

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 10. Logged frequency of self reported drug sale offenses by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.034	0.013	R ^t	46	0.043	0.022		32	0.000	0.000	R ^{**}	33	0.069	0.027	
YFAM	78	0.079	0.020		34	0.081	0.032		25	0.100	0.037		39	0.035	0.021	
Mid Risk																
Control	191	0.089	0.014		69	0.112	0.026		86	0.092	0.021					
YFAM	209	0.071	0.012		82	0.078	0.019		89	0.084	0.019					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.148	0.025		28	0.202	0.045		37	0.117	0.037		37	0.075	0.029	
YFAM	86	0.146	0.025		33	0.125	0.038		37	0.204	0.043		34	0.041	0.024	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program											*
ME for Risk			**			**					**
P x R Int											t

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 11. Logged frequency of self reported status offenses by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.237	0.031	R ^t	46	0.239	0.046		32	0.224	0.053	R *	33	0.290	0.054	
YFAM	79	0.313	0.032		35	0.279	0.045		25	0.409	0.066		39	0.250	0.047	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	0.357	0.025		70	0.359	0.041		86	0.360	0.038					
YFAM	209	0.329	0.024		82	0.328	0.039		89	0.334	0.035					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.396	0.041		28	0.475	0.066		37	0.301	0.061	R ^t	37	0.424	0.062	t
YFAM	86	0.353	0.038		33	0.342	0.063		37	0.449	0.060		34	0.281	0.053	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program										*						t
ME for Risk				*			*									
P x R Interaction											t					

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 12. Logged frequency of self reported public disorder offenses by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.153	0.025		46	0.170	0.037		32	0.157	0.047		33	0.134	0.041	
YFAM	79	0.163	0.028		35	0.180	0.041		25	0.192	0.053		39	0.136	0.046	
Mid Risk																
Control	192	0.231	0.021		70	0.311	0.037	**	86	0.177	0.028					
YFAM	209	0.182	0.018		82	0.173	0.029		89	0.189	0.027					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.310	0.037		28	0.455	0.061		37	0.194	0.050		37	0.281	0.058	
YFAM	86	0.295	0.035		33	0.356	0.060		37	0.297	0.054		34	0.176	0.044	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program

*

ME for Risk

**

**

t

P x R Int

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² † p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 13. Logged frequency of self reported substance use by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)			
	n	Mn	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk
Low Risk																
Control	93	0.251	0.029		46	0.322	0.042		32	0.135	0.038	R *	33	0.270	0.052	
YFAM	79	0.273	0.032		35	0.344	0.047		25	0.276	0.057		39	0.195	0.042	
Mid Risk																
Control	191	0.315	0.021		69	0.418	0.033	*	86	0.248	0.030					
YFAM	209	0.305	0.019		82	0.320	0.031		89	0.294	0.028					
High Risk																
Control	84	0.357	0.035		28	0.498	0.052	^t	37	0.260	0.051	R *	37	0.316	0.050	
YFAM	86	0.362	0.031		33	0.380	0.047		37	0.426	0.048		34	0.273	0.046	

Significant effects² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors

ME Program							^t									**
ME for Risk				**			^t									*
P x R Interaction																

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 14. Versatility of offending and logged relative frequency of offending program condition and implementation level within low risk males.

		General Delinquency Measures						
		Versatility in Offending Measure			Log Relative Frequency Index			
		n	Mn	SE	test within risk ¹	Mn	SE	test within risk ¹
Strong Implementation								
	Control	39	2.359	0.468		0.503	0.071	
	YFAM	28	2.786	0.655		0.542	0.079	.
Weak Implementation								
	Control	39	1.692	0.392	**	0.385	0.062	***
	YFAM	32	3.813	0.642		0.711	0.073	
Significant effects ¹ in ANOVA								
	ME Program				*			*
	ME for Implementation							
	P x I Interaction							*

¹ ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01

Table 15. Percent of youth living in a controlled setting over the last six months by program condition and risk level.

	ENTIRE SAMPLE				OLDER MALES				YOUNGER MALES				FEMALES ONLY ¹ (two levels of risk)							
	n	%	SE	test within risk ²	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk	n	Mn	SE	test within risk				
Low Risk																				
Control	93	12.9%	0.035		46	15.2%	0.054		32	9.4%	0.052		33	12.1%	0.058					
YFAM	79	19.0%	0.044		35	22.9%	0.072		25	12.0%	0.066		39	20.2%	0.065					
Mid Risk																				
Control	194	31.4%	0.033		70	30.0%	0.055		88	37.5%	0.052									
YFAM	209	29.7%	0.032		82	25.6%	0.048		89	36.0%	0.051									
High Risk																				
Control	84	64.3%	0.053	*	28	64.3%	0.092	^t	37	73.0%	0.074	^t	37	37.8%	0.081					
YFAM	86	45.3%	0.054		33	42.4%	0.087		37	54.1%	0.083		34	29.4%	0.079					
Significant effects ² in ANOVA with program and risk level as factors																				
ME Program																				
ME for Risk				**					**					**				*		
P x R Int				*																

¹ Females were divided into two levels of risk (median split) to avoid cell sizes below 30.

² ^t p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; R indicates effect is the reverse of the intended direction.

Table 16. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p < .10$) between low risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

LOW RISK	Older males (n=81) program effect ²	Younger males (n=57) program effect	Females ¹ (n=72) program effect
Self			
I'm the kind of person who gets in trouble		C	
I'm the kind of person who will do OK			
I'm the kind of person who will need help			
Family			
Hare self esteem family subscale			
Chores or other family responsibilities required			
Parents or guardians monitor behavior			
Close family ties			
If I offend, I'd lose respect from adults I care about			
Defiant of parental authority		C	
School			
Positive orientation toward school		C	
Subjective school performance			
Positive self esteem (Hare school subscale)		C	
Involvement in school and community activities			
Peers			
If I offend, I'd lose some respect from friends			C
Close friends involved in delinquent activities			
Close friends involved in serious offending			C
Close friends involved in status offending			
Close friends involved in gangs		C	
Attitudes and beliefs about offending			
If I offend, I am likely to get caught		C	
If I offend, I am likely to get a severe punishment	C		
If I offend, I would feel remorse		C	
Offending is wrong	C	C	C
Offending is normative ("no big deal")	C		C
I am often tempted to offend	C	C	
In the future I am likely to offend		C	

¹ Due to the small sample of females, they were split at the median into low and high risk only.

² C indicates criminogenic differences and P indicates protective differences for the YFAM program.

Table 17. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p \leq .10$) between mid risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

MID RISK	Older males (n=152) program effect ²	Younger males (n=175) program effect
Self		
I'm the kind of person who gets in trouble		
I'm the kind of person who will do OK	C	P
I'm the kind of person who will need help		
Family		
Hare self esteem family subscale		
Chores or other family responsibilities required		P
Parents or guardians monitor behavior		P
Close family ties		P
If I offend, I'd lose respect from adults I care about		
Defiant of parental authority		P
School		
Positive orientation toward school		
Subjective school performance		
Positive self esteem (Hare school subscale)		P
Involvement in school and community activities		
Peers		
If I offend, I'd lose some respect from friends	P	P
Close friends involved in delinquent activities		P
Close friends involved in serious offending		P
Close friends involved in status offending		P
Close friends involved in gangs		P
Attitudes and beliefs about offending		
If I offend, I am likely to get caught		
If I offend, I am likely to get a severe punishment		
If I offend, I would feel remorse	P	P
Offending is wrong		
Offending is normative ("no big deal")		
I am often tempted to offend		
In the future I am likely to offend		

¹ Due to the small sample of females, they were split at the median into low and high risk only.

² C indicates criminogenic differences and P indicates protective differences for the YFAM program.

Table 18. Risk factors, attitudes and beliefs that show significant program effects ($p \leq .10$) between high risk YFAM and control youth approximately 10 months after the program year.

HIGH RISK	Older males (n=61) program effect ²	Younger males (n=74) program effect	Females ¹ (n=71) program effect
Self			
I'm the kind of person who gets in trouble			
I'm the kind of person who will do OK (reversed)			
I'm the kind of person who will need help			
Family			
Hare self esteem family subscale			
Chores or other family responsibilities required			
Parents or guardians monitor behavior			P
Close family ties			P
If I offend, I'd lose respect from adults I care about			P
Defiant of parental authority			P
School			
Positive orientation toward school			
Subjective school performance			
Positive self esteem (Hare school subscale)			
Involvement in school and community activities			
Peers			
If I offend, I'd lose some respect from friends		P	
Close friends involved in delinquent activities	P		P
Close friends involved in serious offending	P		P
Close friends involved in status offending			
Close friends involved in gangs			P
Attitudes and beliefs about offending			
If I offend, I am likely to get caught			
If I offend, I am likely to get a severe punishment			
If I offend, I would feel remorse			
Offending is wrong			
Offending is normative ("no big deal")			
I am often tempted to offend			
In the future I am likely to offend			

¹ Due to the small sample of females, they were split at the median into low and high risk only.

² C indicates criminogenic differences and P indicates protective differences for the YFAM program.

References

- Akers, R. L. *Deviant behavior: A social learning approach* (1985) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Akers, R. L. (1996) Is differential association/social learning cultural deviance theory? *Criminology*, 34(2), 229-247.
- Aklina, W. M., Lejuez, C. W., Zvolensky, M. J., Kahler, C. W. & Gwadz, M. (2005). Evaluation of behavioral measures of risk taking propensity with inner city adolescents, *Behavior Research & Therapy* 43(2): 215-228.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P. & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, (3): 369-404.
- Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (1996). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Banks, S., McHugo, G. J., Williams, V., Drake, R. E., & Shinn, M. (2002). A prospective meta-analytic approach in a multisite study of homelessness prevention. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 94, 45-59.
- Borum, R. (2003) Managing at-risk juvenile offenders in the community: Putting evidence-based principles into practice. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19 (1) 114-137.
- Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Thornton, A., Freedman, D., Amell, J. W., Harrington, H., Smeijers, J., & Silva, P. A (1996). The life history calendar: A research and clinical assessment for collecting retrospective event-history data. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research* 6:101-114.
- Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (1996) The social development model: A theory of antisocial behavior, in J. D. Hawkins (Ed) *Delinquency and crime: current theories*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 149-197.
- Corcoran, K. & Fischer, J. (2000). Measures for clinical practice: A sourcebook. 3rd Ed. (2 vols.) New York: Free Press. 1,550-552.
- Dishion, T. J., Capaldi, D. M., Spracklen, K. M., & Li, F. (1995). Peer ecology of male adolescent drug use. *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 803-824.
- Dishion, T. J., Eddy, J. M., Haas, E., Li, F., & Spracklen, K. (1997). Friendships and violent behavior during adolescence. *Social Development*, 6, 207-223.
- Dishion, T. J., McCord, J., & Poulin, F. (1999). When interventions harm: Peer groups and problem behavior. *American Psychologist*, 54, 755-764.

- Elliott, D.S., & Huizinga, D. (1989) Improving self-report measures of delinquency.” *Cross-national research in self-reported crime and delinquency*, Malcolm Klein (Ed.) Dordrecht: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 155-186.
- Elliott, D.S., & Menard, S. (1996) Delinquent friends and delinquent behavior: Temporal and developmental patterns. In J.D. Hawkins (Ed) *Delinquency and crime: Current theories*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 28-67.
- Empey, L. T. & Stafford, M. C. (1991) *American Delinquency--Its Meaning and Construction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, p 101
- Erwin, Billie S. (1986). Turning up the heat on probationers in Georgia. *Federal Probation*, 50(2):17-24.
- Farrington, D. P., Ohlin, L. E., and Wilson, J. Q. (1986). *Understanding and controlling crime: Toward a new research strategy*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Farrington, D.P., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Van Kammen, W.B. & Schmidt, L. (1997). Self-reported delinquency and a combined delinquency seriousness scale based on boys, mothers, and teachers: Concurrent and predictive validity for African-Americans and Caucasians. *Criminology* 34:493-517.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). “A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: what works?” *Criminology* 34: 575-607.
- Grasmick, H. R. & Bursik, R.J. (1990) Conscience, significant others, and rational choice: extending the deterrence model, *Law and Society Review*, 24(3), 837-861.
- Greenwood, Peter W. (1995) Juvenile crime and juvenile justice. In (James Q. Wilson and Joan Petersilia, eds.) *Crime*, Pp. 91-117. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies (ICS).
- Grisso, T. & Schwartz, R. (2000) (Eds.) *Youth in trial; A developmental perspective on juvenile justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawkins, J., Catalano, R., & Miller, J. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105
- Hennigan, K., Maxson, C., Zhang, S., Poplawski, J., Lindsey, L., and Cardenas, H. (2003) An implementation and outcome evaluation of the Youth/Family Accountability Model. Report to the California Board of Corrections. Sacramento, Ca.
- Hennigan, K., & Maxson, C. (2004) Promising findings from an experimental evaluation of community based-after school programs. *Societies of criminology first key issues conference: What works in reducing crime*. Paris, France.

- Hirschi, T. and Gottfredson, M.R. (1995) Control theory and the life-course perspective. *Studies on crime and crime-prevention*. 4, 131-142.
- Howell, J.C. (1995) *Guide for implementing the comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Huizinga, David & Elliot, D.S. (1986). Reassessing the reliability and validity of self-report delinquency measures. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 2:293-327.
- Krisberg, B., Onek, D., Jones, M. and Schwartz, I. (1993). *Juveniles in state custody: prospects for community based care of troubled adolescents*. San Francisco: National Council of Crime and Delinquency.
- Laub, J.H. & Sampson, R.J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Lipsey, Mark W. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects. In Thomas D. Cook, Harris Cooper, David S. Cordray, Heidi Hartman, Larry V. Hedges, Richard J. Light, Thomas A. Louis, and Fredrick Mosteller, (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for explanation* (pp. 83-127). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lipsey, Mark W. (1995). What do we learn from 400 research studies on the effectiveness of treatment with juvenile delinquents? In James McGuire (Ed.). *What works? Reducing reoffending: Guidelines from research and practice* (pp. 63-78). Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lipsey, M.W. (1999) Can intervention rehabilitate serious delinquents? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 564, 142-166.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1998). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders: A synthesis of research. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious & violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: US Sage.
- Lipsey, M.W., & Wilson, D.B. (2001). *Practical meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxson, C. & Whitlock, M. School-based protection of youth at-risk for joining gangs. Report to U.S. Department of Education: Institute of Education Sciences, February, 2004.
- Maxson, C., Lomonaco, C. & Klein, M. Social processes in adolescent violence. Report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, September, 2000.
- McMurrin, M., Hollin, C.R. & Bowen, A. (1990). Consistency of alcohol self-report measures in a male young offender population. *British Journal of Addiction* 85(2): 205-208.

- Moffitt, Terrie E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent anti-social behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* 100: 674-701.
- Palmer, T. & Petrosino, A. (2003). The experimenting agency: The California Youth Authority Research Division. *Evaluation Review* 2003 27: 228-266
- Paschall, M.J., Ornstein, M.L. & Flewelling, R.L.. (2001). African American male adolescents' involvement in the criminal justice system: The criterion validity of *self-report measures* in a prospective study, *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 38(2): 174-187.
- Paternoster, R., Saltzman, L., Waldo, G., & Chiricos, T. (1983) Perceived risk and social control: Do sanctions really deter? *Law and Society Review*, 17.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. In Tonry (Ed.) *Crime and justice: a review of research* (Vol. 17, pp.281-336) Chicago.: University of Chicago Press.
- Petersilia, J. (1998). A decade of experimenting with intermediate sanctions: What have we learned? *Federal Probation*, 62(2): 3-7.
- Piquero, A.R., Paternoster, R., Mazerolle, P., Brame, R. & Dean, C. W. (1999) Onset age and offense specialization, *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 36:275-99.
- Piquero, A. R. (2000) Frequency, specialization, and violence in offending careers. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 37:392-418.
- Poulin, F., Dishion, T., & Burraston, B. (2001). 3-year iatrogenic effects associated with aggregating high-risk adolescents in cognitive-behavioral preventive interventions. *Applied Developmental Science*, 5, 214-224.
- Riecken, H.W., & Boruch, R. F. (1974). *Social experimentation: A method for planning and evaluating social intervention*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sampson, R.J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sechrest, L., White, S.O., & Brown, E. B. (Eds.). (1979). *The Rehabilitation of criminal offenders: Problems and prospects*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences.
- Shepherd, J. P. (2003). Explaining feast or famine in randomized field trials. *Evaluation Review* 27 (3): 290-315.
- Sherman, Lawrence. (2000). Reducing incarceration rates: The promise of experimental criminology. *Crime and Delinquency*, 46 (3): 299-314.

- Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., & B. (1997). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. A report to the United States Congress prepared for the National Institute of Justice. College Park, Maryland: Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland.
- Taxman, F.S. (2002) Supervision – Exploring the dimensions of effectiveness. *Federal Probation*, 66(2), 14-27.
- Thanner, M.H. & Taxman, F.S. (2001). Presponsivity: the value of providing intensive services to high-risk offenders. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 24, 137-147.
- Tonry, M. (1998) Intermediate sanctions. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The Handbook of Crime And Punishment*, pp. 683-711. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, C.F., Ku, L., Rogers, S.M., Lindberg, L.D., Pleck, J.H. & Sonenstein, F.L. (1998) Adolescent sexual behavior, drug use, and violence: Increased reporting with computer survey technology. *Science* 280:867-73.
- Warr, M. (1998). Life course transitions and desistance from crime. *Criminology*, 36: 183-218.
- Warren, Jenifer. (2005a) "Shift in housing urged for CYA". *Los Angeles Times*, March 18, pg. B.3.
- Warren, Jenifer. (2005b) For young offenders, a softer approach. *Los Angeles Times*, Feb. 1, pg. A.1.
- Weisburd, David. (2000). Randomized experiments in criminal justice policy: Prospects and problems. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(2): 181-193.
- Weisburd, David. (2003). Ethical practice and evaluation of interventions in crime and justice: The moral imperative for randomized trials. *Evaluation Review*, 27(3): 336-354.
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wilson, J.J., & Howell, J.C. (1993). *Comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Zhang, S., Benson, T. & Deng, X. (2000). A test and re-test of the International Self-Report Delinquency Instrument. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28: 283-295.

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Baltimore, MD 20849-6000