THE EFFECTS AND OUTCOME OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION UPON JUVENILES

A Follow-Up Evaluation of the Iowa State Training Schools

September, 1975

FINAL

GRID APP... [illegible]
ORIGINAL ... [illegible]

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION	SECRETARY'S COPY PROGRESS REPORT		
GRANTEE Iowa Crime Commission	LEAA GRANT NO. 73-ED-07-0008	DATE OF REPORT 10-23-75	REPORT NO. 9
IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE Iowa Department of Social Services	TYPE OF REPORT ☐ REGULAR QUARTERLY ☐ SPECIAL REQUEST ☒ FINAL REPORT		
SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT Evaluation of Iowa State Training Schools	GRANT AMOUNT $78,220.00		
REPORT IS FOR STATED REPORTING PERIOD 7-1-75 THROUGH 9-30-75			
SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	TYPED NAME & TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR Howard E. Tinker, Chief Psychologist Iowa Training School for Boys		

(ATTACH REPORT HERE (Use continuation pages as required)

Final copies of the project to be/are submitted under separate cover. It is entitled "The Effects and Outcome of Institutionalization upon Juveniles: An Evaluation of the Iowa State Training Schools" (by Jeanne Hunt and Dennis Hoffman).

RECEIVED BY CHAIRTEE STATE PLANNING AGENCY (OPTIONAL) DATE 12/15/75

THE EFFECTS AND OUTCOME OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION UPON JUVENILES

A Follow-Up Evaluation of the Iowa State Training Schools

by

Jeanne Hunt
Research Specialist

Dennis Hoffman
Research Specialist

September, 1975

Supported by a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
(Project No. 73-ED-07-0008)

Project Staff

Howard E. Tupker	Project Director
Paul S. Stageberg	Assistant Director
Kenneth Walcutt	Research Associate
Jeanne Hunt	Research Specialist
Dennis E. Hoffman	Research Specialist
Marcia Boal Cohan	Research Specialist
Carol Deal	Secretary
Terri Smith	Secretary
Deborah Loehr	Secretary
Carla Jacobson	Secretary

Research Advisory Committee

Dr. Carol Barker
Dr. Martin G. Miller
Dr. Vincent J. Webb

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A study such as this could never have been completed without the cooperation of individuals too numerous to name. The 101 individuals who consented to be interviewed have made a considerable contribution to the betterment of the juvenile justice system in Iowa. We appreciate their willingness to reopen a perhaps painful chapter in their lives in the interest of helping those young people to follow.

To Marcia Boal Cohan goes special thanks for her contribution in the first five months of the project. We hope her interests and concerns are reflected in this final report.

Without the expert assistance of the staff at the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory, this report would probably still be in the preparatory stages. The personnel at both Eldora and Mitchellville as well as at the adult correctional facilities helped make our job somewhat easier. Many State agencies cooperated by checking their files for the names of individuals, and to them we express our appreciation.

To the staff at the Des Moines/Polk County Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center go our thanks for the luxurious office space and for Friday afternoons. Carol, Terri, and Debby saved us many times with their secretarial skills.

PROJECT DIRECTOR'S FOREWORD

This project, termed the Follow-up Study of State Training Schools, involved an attempt to obtain directly from some former residents of Iowa's two training schools some feedback of information based on their perceptions and self-reports, i.e., through structured personal interviews. It involved the selection of a sample of 200 former residents (selected from the first-admissions of the years 1965, 1968, and 1971), an attempt to locate each one, and the eventual completion of personal interviews with 101 of these individuals. While other previous attempts had been made to study former residents and groups of residents,[1] it was thought that an approach involving personal interviews with a random sample of such individuals might be especially worthwhile in learning about their post-release experience.

The present project involved the development and analysis of a rather massive amount of data. Information covering the period prior to, during, and following institutionalization was sought from those interviewed, in addition to all that developed from other sources, e.g., casefiles. The Research Specialists are to be commended for coping with this voluminous amount of data and reducing it down to somewhat smaller proportions.

---

[1] George Rivers and Sherman Phipps, "A Descriptive Study of Three Hundred Forty-nine Boys Who Experienced Their First Release from the Iowa Training School for Boys" (unpublished Master's project, University of Iowa, 1968); Glenn R. Waughman, "A Comparison on Selected Characteristics of Recidivists and Non-recidivists: Iowa Training School for Girls (unpublished Master's project, University of Iowa, 1967); and Paul J. Carroll and William E. Kersting, "A Description of Former Iowa Training School Boys Currently Incarcerated at the Iowa Men's Reformatory by Comparison with Two Other Inmate Groups" (unpublished Master's project, University of Iowa, 1971).

Points of view, assumptions, opinions, conclusions, and recommendations in this report are, of course, the authors' own and, thus, do not necessarily reflect the position or viewpoint of the Project Director or of others affiliated with the project. In fact, as one who has been concerned with, and involved in, research, and thus places a high value on objectivity, and as one who is at least somewhat familiar with the operation of the juvenile justice system and one of the training schools in Iowa, it, perhaps, should be made clear at the outset that I am not in agreement with a number of the statements, opinions, and recommendations which the writers made. However, it is recognized that it usually is an author's prerogative to include at least some opinion statements in his report; and, of course, it is also recognized that, given identical findings, different writers probably would formulate different opinions and recommendations, depending on their underlying theoretical beliefs and system of values. A point-by-point critique of the report will not be attempted here; however, it is felt that a few comments might be helpful in developing a better understanding of the study.

First of all, as one reads the report, it is important to keep in mind the proper perspective with respect to time. The report, as would be the case in any follow-up study, really deals with history. It should be noted that many changes have occurred since most of those interviewed were in residence at the institutions. Over the past few years, numerous changes have occurred insofar as administrative personnel, policies governing the institutions, and programs are concerned--a fact which, it has been observed, is not given a great deal of emphasis in the report. The authors do not present information about the average length of time the study group has been out of the institutions, but it is obvious that

some could have been out as many as about nine years prior to the time they were interviewed. The respondents' perceptions concerning their experience at the training schools would, thus, necessarily be based on policies, programs, and situations that may have undergone some rather extensive changes. One such change which immediately comes to mind, for example, concerns policy dealing with mandatory attendance at religious services at the Eldora institution, which the authors mention. Although not pointed out, such attendance is not required anymore. Detention is another area where programs and policies, at least at the Eldora institution, have also changed greatly.

Recidivism data are generally regarded as of key importance in most correctional outcome studies, so findings dealing with this factor in the current study probably will be similarly regarded. In this study, a dichotomous measure was used. Former residents were classified as either a "success" or a "failure", and a review of results concerning degree of success or failure was not presented. It probably should also be mentioned that "failures" were very broadly defined in this study. Even those who may have had only a single return to a training school or those who may have had as little as one day in jail since their release from a training school were counted as "failures." In other words, it appears that the "failure" group identified in the study was made up of those who had experienced some further involvement with the law since their first release from a training school. The "failure" rate, thus calculated, is high, but it should be noted that it appears to be comparable to that which has been reported in other studies of rather similar populations over a post-release

period that probably is quite similar to that of those studies.[2] (As was mentioned earlier, statistics on the length of the post-release period are not presented for this study group by the authors, and, therefore, it is roughly estimated that the average amount of time elapsed since first release from a training school would likely be about five years.)

In order to gain a clearer understanding of the make-up and nature of the "failure" group, a very brief "post-study" review of that group was made. This cursory analysis revealed that, among the 72 counted as "failures", there were eleven individuals who had been so labeled because they had simply experienced one or more returns to a training school (seven with a single return, three with two returns, and one with three returns); there were eight more who had been so classified because they had spent two days or less in jail; and there were three additional ones who met both of these criteria (i.e., training school return and two days or less in jail subsequent to their first training school release). It might be argued that the post-release experience of these 22 former residents represents a rather minimal amount of failure. If this group were to be deleted from the "failure" group, the resulting "failure" rate would be only about 50%. If, on the other hand, one were to classify former residents as recidivists only if (1) they had indicated being in an adult correctional facility

---

[2] Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate All Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs, The Report of the Interdepartmental Council to Coordinate All Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs, FY 1972. First annual report, Juvenile Delinquency Council's Publication Series, 1973 (Washington, D. C.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service.); and Henry D. McKay, "Report on the Criminal Careers of Male Delinquents in Chicago." In Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 107-113.

(including a county jail), (2) they had indicated being placed on adult probation, and/or (3) they had reported having spent 30 days or more in a jail (thus, in effect, taking into account only adult level recidivism of a more serious nature), then the number of recidivists in the study group of 101 individuals interviewed is 43 (43%). I think the important points to be recognized here are that (1) the recidivism rate is still uncomfortably high, even with a narrower definition, and (2) the recidivism rates do vary greatly depending on how one chooses to define the so-called "failure" group.

One area with which the study dealt had to do with employment and its relationship to prior vocational training at one of the training schools. One of the findings revealed a more negative outcome for those males who had vocational training than for those who had none. Since it is not known that the two groups being compared were equal on relevant variables at the outset, and thus comparable, it would appear that care should be exercised in drawing inferences about program effectiveness. The differences on the outcome criterion may have been due, in part or in whole, to some unaccounted for variable(s) other than the training program. Also, with respect to employment and vocational training, an attempt was made to use former residents' perceptions of the vocational programs' applicability to their present occupation as an indicator of vocational program effectiveness. This would seem to be an extremely stringent test for evaluating the effectiveness of a vocational training program, especially when one considers the age level of those participating in it in this case, for it appears to me that jobs obtained early in one's life would be quite likely to be temporary ones of short duration. Logically, vocational exploration rather than stability would seem to characterize this stage of one's vocational development. This reasoning would lead one to expect very few of these individuals to

respond in a manner that would show the training programs' applicability to their present occupation. Furthermore, such an approach overlooks any therapeutic value the programs may have had. Another criterion which might have been used for evaluating the success of the vocational training programs was the direct rating of them by those who had participated in them (which, in this study, revealed that they were liked by 78% of the respondents and disliked by 12%, males and females combined).

I would also like to direct a few comments to the topic of research design. As the authors have noted (p.59), the study design may be described as a "one-shot case study." This type of design, as Campbell and Stanley have noted, has certain inherent weaknesses.[3] This is due, largely, to the lack of an appropriate comparison group. Needed, ideally, is a control group made up of adjudicated delinquents who ordinarily would have been committed to the training schools but who, instead, were not committed to them, with the selection of who would, or would not, be committed based solely on a random procedure. These two groups, theoretically at least, would differ only on the matter of commitment (or non-commitment) to a training school. In the world of reality, though, this ideal situation probably would be unachievable. It certainly would be unless planned in advance, and, in the case of a follow-up study, this would mean years in advance. McKay has also discussed other limitations of follow-up studies.[4] It should be emphasized, though, that this is not a criticism of the present study. Such a comparison group simply was not available. Neither does it

---

[3]Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963), p. 6.

[4]McKay, loc. cit.

mean that the study does not have value. It does seem to me to indicate, though, that a certain amount of care is needed in drawing inferences and conclusions from the data (in this case, concerning the effectiveness of the training schools).

The above comments appear to have focused to a large extent on limitations. These comments do not cover every point, nor was the purpose to present a complete critique of the report. Caution and awareness of major limitations, in my opinion, though, are essential in reading and interpreting any research findings. As was mentioned above, such limitation certainly should not be looked upon as reflecting on the basic value of the study and its results. These data have a great deal of value. A vast amount of information is now available on former residents that was not available previously. Former residents' perceptions of the institutions and the various programs within them, for example, should be of great interest. Finding out about what really happens to former residents after they leave the institution and how successfully they reintegrate themselves into their communities are other examples of extremely interesting and worthwhile information. It is felt that much additional research could yet be done with these data, and perhaps much of the real value of it is here. It provides a solid basis, for example, for initiating further research into questions of why some former residents succeed while others do not. To say that the results of this study suggest that there is a great need for further research that focuses on treatment and rehabilitation programs for those designated delinquent (both residential training school programs and community-based programs) seems to be an understatement. In fact, a continuous, ongoing evaluative effort of this sort is believed to be needed.

As Project Director, I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for providing financial support for the project and to the Des Moines/Polk County Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center for their support and cooperation. I also want to thank each of the members of the Research Advisory Committee for their valuable role in it.

Howard E. Tupker
Project Director
September 22, 1975

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Juvenile Justice System in Iowa

Within the State of Iowa, the juvenile justice system tends to be somewhat fragmented. When a juvenile comes under the purview of a juvenile court, he/she may receive supervision from an employee of that court, a probation officer. Once a judge determines that the needs of an individual can no longer be met by the services of the court, and warrant the youth's removal from the home community to the secure environment of a training school, that court surrenders jurisdiction of the child to the State Department of Social Services. The Department, in turn, is charged with the responsibility of determining the proper treatment facility for each child committed to its care. The facilities at its disposal include the Iowa Annie Wittenmeyer Home at Davenport (now closed) and the State Juvenile Home at Toledo, as well as the two training schools. Davenport and Toldeo have been utilized most frequently for dependent/neglected children, providing a somewhat more open setting than the tightly structured training schools. All four have, however, been used somewhat interchangeably. It appears from an examination of the records that the Department tends to follow the recommendation for placement that is made at the dispositional hearing even though by law the Department alone can make that decision.

When the State Department of Social Services accepts custody of a child, he/she is confronted with a new set of treatment personnel both at the institution and in the aftercare services component. The probation staff which conceivably has worked with a child for a substantial amount of time no longer has any voice in what happens to the child even though he/she will most likely return to the home community. While still in the institu-

tion, the child is assigned to an area social worker who performs the role of the traditional parole officer. With the help of institutional staff--and taking into account the wishes of the child--the ASW begins to plan for the child's release. It then becomes the primary responsibility of the ASW to aid the child in making a successful re-entry into his/her community. This involvement ends, however, when the child reaches the age of majority, if circumstances have not warranted an earlier release from Department control. Once discharge papers are issued, no further effort is made to follow through on the services received by the child to determine whether the training schools or the continuum of services have been of benefit. The only post-treatment source of information may come from adult institutions when a former training school inmate is received by one of those facilities. Without this kind of knowledge, one begins to question the continued use of an unproven treatment modality.

Project Background

The lack of information on the effectiveness of the Training Schools is clear when one considers that since their funding in 1868, the Iowa State Training Schools have operated without benefit of an on-going evaluative effort. Few if any attempts have been made to assess the validity of the programs or their effectiveness in aiding young people to lead productive adult lives without further involvement in the criminal justice system. In spite of this, Juvenile Court judges and the State Department of Social Services have continued to send children to the State Training Schools without any factual knowledge that such an experience has been either beneficial or detrimental to these youths. This study is an attempt to close the gap between fact and supposition.

The goals of the Follow-up Study as enunciated in the grant application were originally four:

1. To provide the State Training Schools with an assessment of their effectiveness;
2. To more accurately assess the types of youths committed to the State Training Schools;
3. To evaluate the mobility of releases from the Training Schools; and
4. To attempt to determine the feasibility of using multiple criteria for determining success or failure following release from juvenile institutions.

After careful consideration, the decision was made to concentrate on only three goals. Due to the time-limited (12 months) nature of the study, it became necessary to try to focus in on those elements of the study that would potentially have the most long-lasting and far-reaching impact on the juvenile justice system of the State of Iowa. The need for input within that system is so great that it was agreed goals one, two and four, reflecting the areas most directly affecting children, would be the primary focus of the study.

When the grant application was being prepared, it was believed a 12-month project period would be sufficient with two full-time staff persons assuming primary responsibility for project activity. It became apparent all too soon, however, that at a minimum 18 months to two years could easily be consumed before all the research was completed. Application was then made to LEAA to expand project time to March, 1975. While the application was eventually approved, no additional funds were forthcoming, which necessitated a close-down date of October 1, 1974.

Project activity was to begin with a review of the literature to determine the existence of similar studies and the methodological approaches utilized. The research specialists then visited each training school talk-

ing with key personnel, reviewing individual programs, and examining records before beginning the collection of data. Following this, development of instruments was completed for gathering information from the files at the training schools and for conducting the interviews of the 200 subjects. The effort to track down the potential interviewees was an on-going one, with actual interviewing beginning in late January of 1974.

Operational Problems

From the outset of project activity, unexpected problems were encountered both with the project design and with the original time-table.

The review of literature state, which was scheduled to take the first two weeks of project time, was interrupted when it was discovered that some of the state funds being used to match the federal share were indeed partially federal money, thereby prohibiting their use. The research specialists therefore diverted their attention to the effort to correct this defect in the budget.

When development of the interview form began, ideas were considered covering the broadest range possible. The interests on the part of the researchers and others involved dictated gathering as much data as possible while the opportunity existed. It soon became evident that however enlightening this approach would be, it would also prove an exhausting labor both for interviewer and interviewee. Once the ideas were compiled and categorized according to pre-training school, training school and post training school items, the researchers' task was to narrow concentration to those data that would be most likely to accomplish the goals of the study. This resulted in the reduction of a four-hour interview to one that consumed one and one-half hours. Following a pretest with several residents at the training schools, on January 24 the final interview form was ready to be

printed, with the first interview scheduled for January 30. Since neither researcher had had considerable experience in the development of interview schedules, the services of the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory were utilized to ensure the use of proper language in the most appropriate format. Emphasis was on making the form as easy to use as possible as well as to develop questions yielding easily categorized answers, thereby simplifying analysis of data. After talking with people who had conducted interviews, it began to appear, as early as November, that the interviewing process would be more time consuming than originally planned. Discussions were started at that time with the Statistics Lab and Sociology Department at ISU and the School of Social Work at the University of Iowa to explore the feasibility of employing an additional three to four persons as interviewers. With a total sample of 200 subjects whose last known residences covered the length and breadth of the State of Iowa, it appeared less than ideal for two persons to undertake this task. After a delay of six months, it was finally decided to use the Statistics Lab, which regularly employs interviewers for a variety of projects. Following a training session, the four interviewers began their work May 1, with approximately 70 interviews completed by June 15. The research specialists covered the Polk County area and the adult correctional facilities, for a final 101 interviews. Other persons in the sample were located, but, for a variety of reasons, chose to not participate. Through such agencies as the Bureau of Adult Corrections, additional information was available on persons no longer living in Iowa. A number of other individuals were reported to be deceased.

Once the interviews were completed and data collected from the training schools, research specialists began coding and preparing data for computer analysis. This took about a month, then the computers took over. By

the second week of September, data analysis was completed, and the preparation of this report began in earnest. Unfortunately, operating funds were almost exhausted thereby necessitating the formal termination of the project while actual work to finalize the report was continuing. Although this termination was unfortunate in that it may have delayed final presentation of results (due to inconvenience and the researchers' assumption of other responsibilities), it has probably not had a significant negative impact on the study.

YOUTHS STUDIED

Before attempting to define the programs at the training schools or to evaluate the relative success or failure of the students, and thereby the schools themselves, it is necessary to have a general picture of the types of adolescents who enter these institutions. These children--and it is important to remember that they are children--have been singled out by courts and by adult society as exhibiting behaviors and engaging in activities so as to be in need of the most extreme sanction society can currently place upon them as juveniles: adjudication as "delinquent" and subsequent removal from their families and communities. This chapter will examine briefly certain factors that may have had an influence upon their actions, bringing them into the juvenile justice system.

Demographic Aspects

The sample consisted of 198 young men and women, 133 former students at the Boys' Training School in Eldora, and 65 former residents of the Girls' Training School in Mitchellville. Each person was committed for the first time in the year shown. By year of commitment, the breakdown is thus:

Table I

Year of Commitment by Sex

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	54	40.6	45	33.8	34	25.6	133	67.2
Female	23	35.4	23	35.4	19	29.2	65	32.8
Total	77	38.9	68	34.3	53	26.8	198	100.0

As can be seen from this table, the total number selected decreased from 1965 to 1971. This was done to reflect the percentage decrease in total enrollment that has been evident in recent years. The small ratio of females to males is in fact an overrepresentation of the former. If a true ratio had been selected, the number of females would have been too small for valid research. (The 1965 female sample was 25; however, in the course of data collection it was discovered that two of the individuals had been originally committed to GTS prior to that time.)

The children committed to the training schools in these three years represented 55 of Iowa's 99 counties. As might be expected, the most populous counties contributed the highest number, with Polk (population 286,101)[1] leading with 44 or 22.2% of the total commitments. The other counties in the top five are:

County	Population	Number	Percent
Woodbury	103,052	18	9.1
Blackhawk	132,916	13	6.6
Scott	142,687	11	5.6
Linn	163,213	9	4.5

These five counties contain almost 30% of all of Iowa's residents, but together they account for 48% of the total commitments to the training schools of the sample population. Because of the location of the training schools, the treatment that is available must be largely self-contained and provided through the funds allocated by the State Legislature for the maintenance of large institutional staff and facilities.

Upon first commitment to the training schools, the 198 young people came from all types of community settings found in the State of Iowa.

[1] U.S. Bureau of Census, 1970.

Approximately 80.3% came primarily from the population centers of Iowa, with 19.7% coming from the rural segments (farms and communities of less than 2500) of the State. It is difficult to ascertain if rural youngsters just naturally engage in less behavior defined as delinquent than do their urban peers, if their behavior is less often discovered, or if the types of delinquent behavior are viewed as less severe by small town law enforcement personnel. Children living in a rural environment may also be aided by the possibility that they or their parents may know the local law enforcement officials personally, thereby having an intermediary on their behalf that may be lacking in the urban areas.

Commitments from suburban areas also appear very low, particularly in relation to commitments from towns of 2500 (30.8%) and central cities. If one maintains that crime is an "urban" phenomenon, suburbs should have delinquency rates corresponding to those of adjacent central cities. Training School commitment rates, however, do not bear this out.

Racially, the sample breaks down as follows:

Table II

Race and Sex of Sample

	White		Black		Amer. Ind.		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	116	87.2	12	9.0	3	2.3	2	1.6	133	67.2
Female	59	90.8	5	7.7	1	1.5	0	0.0	65	32.8
Total	175	77.4	17	8.6	4	2.0	2	1.0	198	100.0

The reader should note that the percentage of blacks being sent to the training schools has more than doubled since 1965, from 6.5% to 13.2%. The total number found in the sample is not large enough, however, to be said to represent a trend.

In 1970, the State's population consisted of 98.5% white residents, 1.2% black, and 0.3% others,[2] indicating that blacks and other racial minorities tend to be over-represented at the training schools. Are members of the non-white races committing more than their "fair share" of delinquent offenses, or are they more highly visible to the typically white police forces? One can speculate that the racial minorities would tend to come from the metropolitan centers of Iowa and within them from the "inner city" areas, areas that are generally reported to have a high crime rate. How much concentration of police surveillance on these areas may affect a youth's chances of apprehension for acts that might go undetected in other parts of the city is unknown.

When they first entered the training schools, 184 of the 198 subjects were in school. Table III shows their educational attainment. In 1965, the modal grade attainment (the largest number of youths in any one category) was 8th grade, with 30.6% completing 8th grade. In 1968, a similar result is found, with modal grade attainment again being 8th grade. In 1971, however, educational attainment had jumped back to grade 7, with a total of 29.4% ready to begin 8th grade. Since only three years were sampled, it is hard to see or predict trends, but since the law has been changed granting adult rights to 18-year-olds, it would appear likely that the training schools will continue to receive more and more younger offenders than was true in 1965. The table may indicate, however, that this shift had begun as early as 1971 in that there was an over-representation of youths having completed 7th grade or less in that year (31.4% vs. 19.6% and 22.2% in 1968 and 1965, respectively).

[2] Ibid.

Table III

Grade Completed Prior to Institutionalization by Year of Commitment

	4-6		7		8		9		10		11-12		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	6	8.3	10	13.9	22	30.6	19	26.4	11	15.3	4	5.6	72	39.1
1968	2	3.3	10	16.4	22	36.1	8	13.1	14	23.0	5	8.2	61	33.2
1971	1	2.0	15	29.4	12	23.5	12	23.5	7	13.7	4	7.8	51	27.7
Total	9	4.9	35	19.0	56	30.4	39	21.2	32	17.4	13	7.1	184	100.0*

*Unknown: 14.

If one compares Table IV with Table XIII (Age and Sex at First Commitment), it becomes apparent that the typical child entering a training school is on a lower educational level than could be expected according to his/her age. It is unfortunate that these youngsters who appear to be in need of a good educational program must enter a system that may not allow them to progress at the same rate as their peers "on the outs" who are offered a much broader range of subjects (see Chapter on the courses available at the training schools). Information on those who returned to school after their release is available only on the 101 who were interviewed and will be discussed below. It is glaringly apparent that Training School commitments have had educational difficulties prior to admission to the Training Schools.

In intelligence, training school students probably closely resemble an average school population. Their IQ's range from 65 to 132, with an average of 98.7. This information was gathered from training school records, since upon admittance, most youngsters are administered a battery of tests, possibly including one of the more popular intelligence scales. Thus, it is likely that the educational difficulties experienced by training schools commitments are more due to behavioral problems than lack of basic intelligence.

The data collected in this study seem to verify many of the assumptions researchers have made over the years concerning the "sameness" of adjudicated delinquents and their supposedly non-delinquent peers. The data fail, however, to reveal anything about those who do not receive the maximum sanctions of the system, even though they may have violated some of its precepts at one time or another. It is possible that the similarities of these youth speak more to the workings of the entire judicial process than to the relative severity of their offenses or their "differentness" from non-adjudicated peers. A great deal of discretion is used throughout the juvenile justice

system in disposing of individual cases, accounting in large degree for the relatively small number of youths who do eventually find themselves in training schools. This discretion may be the decisive variable in making those youngsters in a training school setting a relatively homogeneous group, with homogeneity based on race, socioeconomic level, degree of family disintegration, etc.

Family Situation of Sample

In searching the records, it was found that the 198 youths were raised primarily by the following parental figures:

Table IV

Rearing Situation by Sex

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Both natural parents	81	60.9	30	46.2	111	56.1
Father/stepmother	2	1.5	4	6.2	6	3.0
Mother/stepfather	9	6.8	9	13.8	18	9.1
Father only	2	1.5	3	4.6	5	2.5
Mother only	25	18.8	14	21.5	39	19.7
Adoptive parents	6	4.5	2	3.1	8	4.0
Other	8	6.0	3	4.6	11	5.6
Total	133	67.2	65	32.8	198	100.0

At the time of commitment, the family situation cited above had changed somewhat, indicating that some major family upheavals may have taken place. We can only speculate that these changes may have contributed to the behaviors the child was exhibiting which led to removal from the home.

Table V

Living Arrangement at Commitment by Sex

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Both natural parents	53	39.8	14	21.5	67	33.8
Father/stepmother	2	1.5	6	9.2	8	4.0
Mother/stepfather	15	11.3	7	10.8	22	11.1
Father only	4	3.0	3	4.6	7	3.5
Mother only	29	21.8	16	24.6	45	22.7
Adoptive parents	5	3.8	1	1.5	6	3.0
Foster parents	5	3.8	3	4.6	8	4.0
Independent	3	2.3	1	1.5	4	2.0
State Juvenile Home and Annie Wittenmeyer Home	6	4.6	6	9.2	12	6.0
Other relative	4	3.0	2	3.1	6	3.0
Juvenile detention facility	3	2.3	3	4.6	6	3.0
Group home	2	1.5	2	3.1	4	2.0
Other	2	1.5	1	1.5	3	1.5
Total	133	67.2	65	32.8	198	100.0

As can be seen from a comparison of the above tables, the living arrangements for a substantial number of youths had changed from the one in which they could be said to have received the major portion of their rearing to the one in which they found themselves at the time they entered the training schools. Eleven (or 5.5%) were raised outside a parental home while 43 (or 21.7%) were living in a non-family setting when they were institutionalized.

Along this same line, 116 (or 58.6%) of the 198 were found to have lived outside of their parental home at some time prior to institutionalization. These living arrangements may have been for relatively short periods of time or for an extended length, and they range from group homes and foster homes to mental health or juvenile institutions to detention facilities. These 116 youths compiled a total of 221 times out of the home for an average of 19 times per person. The most frequently used living arrangement was the juvenile detention facility, which accounted for 23.1% of the out-of-home placements. Group homes were used in 19.5% of the cases, State Mental Health Institutions in 14.0% and foster homes in 13.1%. Independent living arrangements were utilized only 1.8% of the time.

Table VI

Non-Family Living Arrangements Prior to Institutionalization

	N	%
Group home	43	19.5
Foster home	29	13.1
Mental health center	7	3.2
State juvenile home	10	4.5
Annie Wittenmeyer Home	13	5.9
Independent	4	1.8
Jail	9	4.1
Juvenile detention	51	23.1
Other relative	12	5.4
Job Corps	5	2.3
State Mental Health	31	14.0
Other	7	3.2
Total	221	100.1

Available records were very poor in indicating the amount of time spent in these various arrangements, so no estimate can be made, nor is there any way of knowing how living outside of the parental home may have affected the child's development. It appears from these data, however, that alternative living arrangements are being pursued prior to committing a child to a training school, a practice that seems to imply the child's family situation is a major factor in his/her delinquent behavior. As far as use of other alternative treatment techniques is concerned, the data are inconclusive. Concerning family size, the youngsters in the sample come from families with from zero to 16 siblings, including full, half, and step brothers and sisters. The average number of siblings is 4.6. This finding also seems fairly consistent with other research.

Researchers tend to associate a child's delinquency with the relative success or failure of his/her parents and with the stability or instability of the family unit. If it is true that delinquents tend to come from families that are somewhat unstable, this factor may reflect the discretionary powers of those enforcing the Juvenile Code as well as the types of families who seek help from juvenile courts. The following parental characteristics will be cited as an attempt to describe the "typical" parent of delinquent children and to discover the degree of homogeneity, if any, that may be found in these families.

Marital status of the natural or adoptive parents is depicted in the table below:

Table VII

Marital Status of Parents

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Married	71	53.8	21	32.8	92	46.9
Divorced	38	28.8	30	46.9	68	34.7
Separated	5	3.8	5	7.8	10	5.1
One deceased	13	9.8	7	10.9	20	10.2
Common law	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	0.5
Unmarried	5	3.8	0	0.0	5	2.6
Unknown					2	
Total					198	100.0

As is evident from these figures, more than half of those sampled had experienced a major family upheaval, resulting in the loss of one parent. Obviously these figures say nothing about the relative stability of those marriages that remained intact. Reports in Training School files, however, frequently cited as a problem the passivity and isolation from the family of the male parent as well as an overly protective and inadequate female parent.

The information on the educational attainment of the parents tends to support the supposition that the parents of delinquents are poorly educated, although the median may not be as low as may have been anticipated. No information could be found on 42 (or 21.2%) of the men and 29 (14.6%) of the women. The following table indicates the highest grade completed by the remainder.

Table VIII

Parents' Highest Level of Education

Grade level	Father N	Father %	Mother N	Mother %	Total N	Total %
4 or less	4	2.6	2	1.2	6	1.8
5-7	15	9.6	5	3.0	20	6.2
8	52	33.3	38	22.5	90	27.7
9-11	38	24.4	60	35.5	98	30.2
12	32	20.5	54	32.0	86	26.5
13-15	6	3.8	8	4.7	14	4.3
16-18	9	5.8	2	1.2	11	3.4
Total	156	100.0	169	100.1	325	100.1

For the father, the median is 9.4, while for the mother, it is 10.3.

Socio-Economic Level of Parents

The occupations of parents were classified according to the categories established by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Since occupations as recorded in the training school records did not always fall easily into these categories, arbitrary decisions sometimes had to be made. It is believed, however, that the classifications are representative of the occupational levels which denote to some degree the socio-economic status of the families.

As may have been predicted, the occupations tend to fall toward the middle or lower end of the scale, with the vast majority of the parents being engaged in some form of blue collar work. Unfortunately, information on the incomes of the parents was quite sparse so it would be futile to try to draw any conclusions from the existing data.

Table IX

Occupation of Parents by Sex

		Father Male N	Father Male %	Father Female N	Father Female %	Mother Male N	Mother Male %	Mother Female N	Mother Female %	Total N	Total %
White Collar	Professional, tech; and kindred	5	4.3	2	3.9	4	3.2	1	1.9	12	3.5
	Managers, admin; ex. farm.	5	4.3	0		0		0		5	1.5
	Sales workers	3	2.6	1	2.0	3	2.4	1	1.9	8	2.3
	Clerical, kindred	2	1.7	3	5.9	11	8.8	7	13.5	23	6.7
		15	13.0	6	11.8	18	14.4	9	17.3	48	14.0
Blue Collar	Craftsmen, kindred	32	27.8	15	29.4	3	2.4	2	3.8	52	15.2
	Operatives, exc. transport.	10	8.7	9	17.6	5	4.0	1	1.9	25	7.3
	Transport equipment operatives	10	8.7	3	5.9	0		0		13	3.8
	Laborers, exc. farm	25	21.7	9	17.6	2	1.6	0		36	10.5
Farm and Service	Farmers, farm managers	5	4.3	1	2.0	0		0		6	1.7
	Farm laborers, foremen	5	4.3	1	2.0	0		0		6	1.7
	Service workers, exc. private household	7	6.1	3	5.9	30	24.0	8	15.4	48	14.0
	In prison	0		2	3.9	0		0		2	0.6
	Self employed	1	0.9	0		0		0		1	0.3
	Unemployed	9	7.8	2	3.9	5	4.0	2	3.8	18	5.2
	Housewives	0		0		62	49.6	30	57.7	92	26.2
	Total	115	33.5	51	14.9	125	36.4	52	15.2	343	100.0

Drug Abuse, Physical Abuse and Criminal Records of Parents

An attempt was made to gather information on the use of drugs by the parents as a possible means of assessing the type of family experiences on the lives of these adolescents. Again, it was unfortunate that this information for the most part was inadequate. Of the 65 fathers on whom some data were in the records, however, 63 (31.8% of the total sample) were said to have a problem with alcohol. Of the 20 mothers who reportedly had a drug problem, 18 (9.1% of 198) of them abused alcohol to some extent.

Records were found to indicate that 44 (22.2% of 198) of the youngsters in the sample had experienced some form of physical abuse or were aware of excessive physical measures being taken against another member of the family. It is hard to ascertain how much covering up may be taking place when the parents are asked to report on such activities or even if such reports are normally made. It should be noted also that there were reports of incestuous relations in a few of the families, mostly involving fathers and daughters, but in at least one instance siblings were involved. Another boy's delinquent problems seemed to have developed after he discovered his father's incestuous relationship with his sister.

Again the data were very sparse concerning any criminal records the parents may have had. However, 33 fathers and 5 mothers could definitely be identified as having been in trouble with the law at some time, and having served time in jails and prisons.

Delinquent Behavior of Sample

In collecting data from the files at the training schools, some difficulty was encountered in sorting out the actual offense with which the child was charged and subsequently committed to the training school. Information on the offenses, therefore, includes the array of acts which precipitated

institutionalization. These acts may span a number of years, starting with the youth's first contact with the juvenile justice system or they may represent a very limited time period. In other words, in some cases a child may be committed the first time he/she is referred to court, or probation may be granted for an indefinite period of time. There is no uniform practice to determine this, as a variety of factors are taken into consideration. This information was for the most part unavailable. Unfortunately, these missing data may seriously bias the results as reflected in the seriousness of the delinquent behavior exhibited by the sample population. One can only conjecture that the more serious offenses were those that finally led the Court to order commitment to the training school and that the less seriously delinquent behaviors were a prelude to the later ones. As a general rule, Court action removing a child to an institution is the last (and most severe) alternative to be utilized. In the case of status offenses, severity is a difficult thing to judge. The deciding factor may be the unwillingness or inability of parents to cope with the problems presented by their children.

In reviewing the data, it was found that a majority of both boys and girls participated in a large number of status offenses, albeit the greatest number of offenses for boys involves both status and index offenses.

For first commitment to the training school, the offense categories break down thus: according to whether the offenses were solely status in nature, a combination of status and criminal or index, or only index.

In the sample, a total of 56 males (42.1%) and 15 females (23.1%) had been returned to the training school a second time. (Many persons in the 1971 sample were still minors at the time of this study so were still susceptible to a return to an institution.) For males, 16 or 28.6% were

recommitted for status offenses, 15 or 26.8% for both status and index, and 25 or 44.6% for index only. Female returnees fall most heavily into the status offense category, with 13 or 86.7%. The other two categories have one (6.7%) each. It seems apparent, therefore, that reason for commitment is directly related to sex.

Table X

Committing Offense Category for First Commitment by Sex and Year

Type	Year	Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Total N	Total %
Status only	1965	12	22.2	19	82.6	31	40.3
	1968	4	8.9	15	65.2	19	27.9
	1971	0	0.0	12	63.2	12	22.6
Status/ index	1965	17	31.5	3	13.0	20	26.0
	1968	23	51.1	5	21.7	28	41.2
	1971	30	88.2	6	31.6	36	67.9
Index only	1965	25	46.3	1	4.3	26	33.8
	1968	18	40.0	3	13.0	21	30.9
	1971	4	11.8	1	5.3	5	9.4

Forty-two point one percent of the male sample returned to the training school at least once, while 23.1% of the females returned. Of the males, 14.3% returned to the training school for a third stay, while only 9.2% of the girls were returned. Obviously, males do commit offenses that are viewed by the legal system as being of more potential harm to the community than do the females. It might be said of females that society is protecting them from themselves, since status offenses contain more potential personal harm than danger to the community. It also would appear to be more difficult to prove within the judicial setting that a person is "habitually disobedient and/or beyond the control of his/her parents." Were status offenses to be eliminated from the Juvenile Code, it appears that the need for Mitchellville would dwindle.

Table XI

Total Number of Offenses by Crime Category at First Commitment

	Murder N	Murder %	Crimes against persons N	Crimes against persons %	Crimes against property N	Crimes against property %	Crimes w/ potential harm N	Crimes w/ potential harm %	Victimless crimes N	Victimless crimes %	Status offenses N	Status offenses %	Transfer in N	Transfer in %	Total N	Total %
Male	2	0.4	21	4.7	209	46.8	17	3.8	44	9.8	151	33.8	3	6.7	447	76.3
Female	0	0.0	2	1.4	13	9.4	6	4.3	7	5.0	109	78.4	2	1.4	139	23.7
Total	2	0.3	23	3.9	222	37.9	23	3.9	51	8.7	260	44.4	5	0.9	586	100.0

Crimes against persons: assault and battery, robbery, rape.
Crimes against property: breaking and entering, burglary, larceny of motor vehicle.
Crimes with potential harm: delivery of a controlled substance, intoxication.
Victimless crimes: possession of a controlled substance, parental control.
Status offenses: run away, waywardness, beyond parental control.
Transfer-in: administrative transfer from another juvenile institution.

Broken down according to degree of severity, the less serious offenses appear to be in preponderance. Again, because of the method of data collection, this could be misleading. The total number of offenses which led to the first commitment to the training schools are shown in Table XI.

The questions that were not answered by the data include most information that could have been used to more accurately assess the seriousness of the offenses. For instance, little or no information was available to differentiate between joy-riding and larceny of a motor vehicle or to indicate whether weapons were carried or whether there was any harm inflicted on victims.

It is somewhat astounding, nevertheless, to note the amount of delinquent behavior that does indeed fall into the "victimless" sphere. Is this an indication of the degree of tumult children experience in their homes as they are beginning the physical process of becoming adults? Or do the data merely show that children who may be classified as delinquent exhibit the full range of delinquent behavior rather than "specializing" in the most lucrative form? The fact remains, however, that for females those offenses for which they are deemed in need of treatment are those which, for males, are at most seen as contributing factors to a more "hard-core" or "sophisticated" form of delinquency. It is apparent from these data that society is continuing to discriminate against females within the judicial setting.

This is not to suggest, however, that adolescent males are not suffering at the hands of the judicial process. In terms of the long-term consequences, it is conceivable that boys may have a more difficult time erasing the stigma that may attach from being adjudicated delinquent, since they are still expected to be the mainstay in the future labor market and the breadwinners for their families. Even though a relatively small number of youths

are committed to training schools, it is imperative that those who are be given every chance at alternative forms of treatment. The common law establishment of separate treatment for juveniles (based upon lack of responsibility), upon which our juvenile justice system is founded, rests upon the notion that people should not be made to suffer from acts of adolescence throughout their adult lives. As a record of institutionalization can (and does) follow an individual into adult life, it should thus be incumbent upon the State either to ensure that the stigma associated with institutionalization is minimal, or seek alternatives to institutionalization to the maximum degree, or both.

A question that needs an extensive amount of research is the age at which a youngster first has serious contact with the juvenile justice system and whether he/she is more likely to become locked into the system if this contact comes at an early stage of development. According to Ashley Weeks, "It is generally accepted by most students in the field that the earlier a boy is delinquent the more likely he is to persist in his delinquency and to be involved in further difficulty with the law."[3]

Table XII gives the age at which the sample population first appeared before a court. As may be expected, the 14- to 16-year-olds are the most frequently represented group in the sample. For those under the age of 13, a substantial number may have been originally adjudicated dependent/neglected. The information in the files tended to indicate that this is not an unusual lead-in to formal adjudication as a delinquent.

A comparison between Table XII and Table XIII will show that the majority of the children who ultimately are committed to training school tend to

---

[3] H. Ashley Weeks, Youthful Offenders at Highfields, The University of Michigan Press, 1958, p. 39.

Table XII

Age at First Court Appearance by Sex

	5-11		12		13		14		15		16		17		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	9	6.9	8	6.2	14	10.8	29	22.3	30	23.1	29	22.3	11	8.5	130	70.7
Female	2	3.7	4	7.4	5	9.3	14	25.9	14	25.9	12	22.2	3	5.6	54	29.3
Total	11	6.0	12	6.5	19	10.3	43	23.4	44	23.9	41	22.3	14	7.6	184	100.0

Unknown: 14.

be about one year older than when they first appeared before the court. Unfortunately, the files do not indicate the treatment that may have been prescribed by the courts for these children. The age of youths committed tended to remain somewhat stable for the three-year period. However, it is anticipated that this pattern will begin to change with an increasingly large number of younger children entering the institutions. This may be one of the less beneficial effects of the recent law reducing the age of majority to 18. More and more youths heretofore treated within the juvenile justice system may find their cases being transferred to criminal court.

One can speculate on the basis of this table that due to the large number of 17 year olds being committed to the training schools, the "recidivism" rate to the juvenile institutions may be somewhat low. Rather than return a boy or girl to training school who is fast approaching age 18, the State may choose instead to discharge this individual on the basis of having received "maximum benefits" from the supervisory program. If the kind of delinquent behavior this person had been displaying were more typically of the "status" nature, it would stand to reason that he/she would not come into contact with the criminal justice system in the future. Also, if one subscribes to the idea that "...delinquent behavior is a function of role inadequacy--of adolescents' finding themselves unable to live up to expectations in school, at home, and among their friends,"[4] then once one is removed from those situations that foster the feelings of inadequacy, one no longer would need to prove oneself through delinquent activities. Perhaps if such institutions as training schools are to continue to function, they

---

[4]Martin Gold, Delinquent Behavior in an American City, (Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., Belmont, California, 1970) p. 130.

Table XIII

Age and Sex at First Commitment

Age	1965 Male N	1965 Male %	1965 Female N	1965 Female %	1968 Male N	1968 Male %	1968 Female N	1968 Female %	1971 Male N	1971 Male %	1971 Female N	1971 Female %	Total N	Total %
13	1	1.9	1	4.3	3	6.7	1	4.3	1	2.9	0	0	7	3.5
14	6	11.1	3	13.0	2	4.4	3	13.0	3	8.8	7	36.8	24	12.1
15	15	27.8	6	26.1	8	17.8	7	30.4	4	11.8	4	21.1	44	22.2
16	12	22.2	7	30.4	11	24.4	7	30.4	7	20.6	5	26.3	49	24.7
17	17	31.5	5	21.7	15	33.3	5	21.7	15	44.1	2	10.5	59	29.8
18	3	5.6	1	4.3	6	13.3	0	0.0	4	11.8	1	5.3	15	7.6
Total	54	100.0	23	100.0	45	100.0	23	100.0	34	100.0	19	100.0	198	100.0

should focus on raising the self-esteem and feelings of worthiness among the individuals whose lives they touch, rather than teaching mechanical skills which cannot be proven to have a long-term effect.

The following table lists the total number of court appearances (hearings before a judge) each individual had, including the one committing him/her to the control of the State Department of Social Services.

Table XIV

Total Number of Court Appearances by Sex

	0 N	0 %	1 N	1 %	2 N	2 %	3 N	3 %	4 N	4 %	5 N	5 %	6 N	6 %	Total N	Total %
Male	1	0.8	39	29.5	51	38.6	24	18.2	12	9.1	3	2.3	2	1.5	132	78.1
Female	1	2.7	12	32.4	17	45.9	4	10.8	2	5.4	1	2.7	0	0.0	37	21.9
Total	2	1.2	51	30.2	68	40.2	28	16.6	14	8.3	5	2.4	2	1.2	169	100.0

Unknown: 29

The fact that females are over-represented among those committed to the training schools after zero, one, or two court appearances (81.0% of girls and 68.9% of boys) may suggest one of two possibilities: first, it may be that judges are more willing to commit a female to the training schools, not offering her as many "chances" as a male; second, it may be that judges make a greater effort to avoid a court hearing for females when they become involved in proscribed behavior. Thus, when the girls continue delinquent behavior, the only alternative remaining may involve a formal court hearing, with subsequent commitment to Mitchellville.

The number of youths offered the services of the probation officers of Juvenile Court may be seen below:

Table XV

Number of Youths on Probation by Sex

	No		Yes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	31	23.8	99	76.2	130	68.4
Female	15	25.0	45	75.0	60	31.6
Total	46	24.2	144	75.8	190	100.0

Unknown: 8.

The amount of time a child spent on probation ranged from 1 to 54 months. Eleven youths (5.6%) spent only one month on probation, 12 (6.1%) spent six months, 14 (7.1%) spent 12 months, and 9 (4.5%) were on probation for 24 months. The average amount of time was 11.3 months. It is difficult to assess the benefit or lack thereof that may derive from the services a child receives from the probation office staff. Suffice it to say, however, that it is possible better, more intensive services could be provided those children who may be termed seriously delinquent if those who have violated no laws (status offenders) were to go elsewhere for the help they may need. This would help to reduce the case loads of probation officers as well as to divert children from the juvenile justice system into the less stigmatizing social services system.

It is unfortunate that this study did not call for a control group of non-delinquent juveniles since that reduces the possibility for comparing the ways in which the populations may differ and the attributes they may have in common. If the study Martin Gold conducted in Flint, Michigan, were

to hold true for youths in general, then those children who find themselves caught up in the juvenile justice system would differ only slightly, if at all, from non-adjudicated individuals. The contention is that beliefs held concerning the racial characteristics, socio-economic level, marital history of parents, etc., are in actuality indications of the manner in which the law enforcement personnel, intake officers at the probation offices, and juvenile court judges use the wide discretionary powers that are given them by the Juvenile Code.[5] It would appear inevitable that these persons would be viewing the judicial process through the eyes of a white, middle-class male since this is the group that overwhelmingly dominates the criminal justice system. This does not preclude their ability to dispense justice fairly to all individuals, it simply gives this frame of reference the greatest degree of visibility and may tend to make the disposition of justice appear less judicious than it may in fact be.

It is extremely difficult to draw any conclusions from the statistics in this chapter concerning delinquents. As stated earlier, without a comparable sample of adolescents who have never been in trouble, nothing can be said about delinquent behavior beyond the fact that this is the way 198 young people look who went through all levels of the juvenile justice system. Another chapter will look more closely at the 101 individuals who were interviewed, and an effort will be made to quantify them according to degree of success or failure.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 3.

DESCRIPTION OF YOUTHS' TRAINING SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

Like other Training Schools in the United States, the Iowa State Training Schools adhere to the "treatment model" in philosophy and program. In brief, this Training School treatment orientation consists of two basic components:

1) Segregation of young offenders from the community, and
2) Provision of institutional treatment programs which attempt to rehabilitate inmates.

The institutional treatment provided at the Training School is aimed toward compensating for residents' background deficiencies and satisfaction of their basic social, psychological and personal needs. The ultimate goal of these treatment policies is the residents' successful reintegration into the community.

As discussed in Chapter I, the treatment program at the Training Schools is multifaceted and comprehensive. In this chapter, we shall describe the kinds of treatment received by our sample and some experience aspects of the sample.

Cottage Program

Both training schools utilize the cottage plan, with each cottage having its own treatment program which is geared to meet the needs of the residents. While each cottage program to some extent follows the guidelines set down by the professional staff, the cottage directors and cottage parents have considerable influence on the content of the program in the individual living unit.

An important part of all of the cottage programs is the cottage meeting. Cottage meetings tend to vary, but in general involve some type of

group counseling by the cottage staff, e.g., positive reinforcement of appropriate behavior, negative action toward inappropriate behavior, and opportunity for resident participation. In accordance with the treatment philosophy, the meetings provide an open forum for discussion of their complaints about Training School policy and staff. The staff, in turn, has the opportunity to learn about the youths' various problems and utilize appropriate treatment strategies.

Table XVI shows the participation of the 101 youths who were interviewed.[6]

Table XVI

Proportion of Youths Participating in Cottage Meetings by Sex and Year

	1965 Yes		1968 Yes		1971 Yes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	21	84.0	27	100.0	16	94.1	64	87.7
Female	2	28.6	4	36.4	3	37.5	9	12.3
Total	23	16.8	31	22.6	19	13.9	73	100.0

A glance at Table XVI makes it obvious that for each sample year a higher proportion of males than females participated in cottage meetings. Female participation, however, increased slightly through the period under study and has increased significantly since 1971, according to the current Superintendent at Mitchellville.

[6]The reader should keep in mind that most of the tables in this chapter are based on information gained through interviews. The N in these tables may vary since the asking of many questions was conditional upon a positive response to a previous answer.

Academic Education Program

An important component of the Training School treatment program is the academic education program. The objective of this program is to prepare residents for re-entry into the public school system.[7] The schools at the institutions are presently geared to providing the youths with academic training which is relevant to their needs and to the realities of life on the outside.[8]

In general, the Girls' Training School has tended to stress academic education more than the Boys' Training School. As Table XVII shows, in 1965 and 1968, a larger proportion of females than males participated in the academic education program. Even in 1971, when the proportion of males was higher, there was less than a 1.0% difference in proportional participation. This apparent emphasis on education may, however, have more to do with a lack of other alternatives. During the years under investigation, girls went to school half the day and worked her "detail" the remainder. In recent months, the academic program at GTS has been expanded to include several off-grounds alternatives.

The participation of males in the academic education program does appear to be increasing. Male participation has increased from 73.1 in 1965 to 77.8% in 1968 and finally to 88.2 in 1971. This increase may be attributed in part to the termination of some vocational offerings, such as barbering.

[7]"Discussion of Programs," Iowa Training School for Boys, February, 1973.

[8]"Aims," Iowa Training School for Boys.

Table XVII

Proportion of Youths Participating in Academic Education Program by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	19	73.1	21	77.8	15	88.2	55	66.3
Female	8	88.9	13	92.9	7	87.5	28	33.7
Total	27		34		22		83	100.0

Vocational Program and Work Details

In comparison to most public schools, the Boys' Training School has characteristically placed a greater emphasis on vocational training.[9] During the time period of 1965-1973, the vocational department at BTS has normally consisted of 12 to 13 vocational areas. The Girls' Training School, on the other hand, has placed little importance on vocational programs. Only three areas of vocational training, cosmetology, laundry, and sewing, have ever been offered at the GTS.[10] In as much as the cosmetology and laundry programs have been discontinued and the sewing program is taught as a class project and recognized as a part of the academic department, there is presently no formal vocational program at Mitchellville.

Table XVIII provides some indication of the traditionally greater emphasis on vocational programs at Eldora. In each of the sample years, male participation was considerably higher than female participation.

As in the academic education program, female participation in the vocational program appears to have increased from 1968 to 1971. Caution should

[9]This emphasis was most pronounced prior to 1968.

[10]The cosmetology program discontinued in December, 1968; laundry program was discontinued in October, 1972.

be used, however, because of the ambiguity which accompanies the youths' perceptions of the "vocational programs."[11] It is likely that many of the females were thinking of "work details" and "academic education courses" when they responded that they had participated.

Table XVIII

Proportion of Youths Participating in Vocational Program by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	17	65.4	14	51.9	14	82.4	45	90.0
Female	1	11.1	1	7.7	3	37.5	5	10.0
Total	18	36.0	15	30.0	17	34.0	50	100.0

As was pointed out earlier, the Boys' Training School offered between 12 and 13 vocational areas for the time period under consideration. During the year 1965, the vocational department consisted of 13 departments: vocational agriculture, auto body, auto mechanics, baking, barbering, cooking and cafeteria, horticulture, journalism, machine shop, meat cutting, painting and decorating, and welding. The following departments have been added since 1965: auto service in 1966, building trades in 1969, home ground improvements in 1973, and home maintenance repair. Areas which have been eliminated since 1965 are as follows: barbering in 1972, journalism in 1972[12], meat cutting in 1973, and grounds improvement in 1973.[13] These pro-

[11]An elaboration of this ambiguity follows in a later section.

[12]The journalism department was incorporated into the academic English department.

[13]Personal correspondence with Vernon Van Sickle, Vocational Principal, Boys' Training School, April 22, 1974.

grams were phased out because of lack of interest from the boys or lack of funds to continually upgrade the equipment.

The Girls' Training School, as stated above, has offered cosmetology, laundry and sewing.[14] However, these programs have been terminated and a formally organized vocational program is non-existent at the time of this writing.

The issue of Training School vocational programs becomes somewhat muddled when such activities as work details and on-the-job training are grouped with other vocational areas. At the Girls' Training School, the following activities have been available at different time periods since 1965: art, cleaning, errand girl, food preparation (baking, cooking, etc.), gardening, housework, low-level office work, sewing, and shop.[15] Details offered the boys have included cottage work, errand duties, hospital aid, canteen work, gym duties, and other activities sometimes labeled as vocational programs by the boys. Both training schools claim that these types of activities supplement their vocational programs.

Upon closer examination of these activities, it appears that some of them may be more functional for balancing the Training School budget than for teaching a marketable trade or an industrious work attitude. Indeed, it is difficult to understand how work details at Mitchellville--such as "cleaning" and "gardening"--and "on-the-job training activities" at Eldora--

---

[14]Beulah Findley, Secretary to the Superintendent, Girls' Training School, April 22, 1974.

[15]The washing and ironing details (also known as the laundry vocational program) were discontinued in the latter part of 1972 due to criticism from some members of legislative committees and administrative policy change. It seems incongruous that this committee or other groups of legislators have not attempted to curtail similar details at the Boys' Training School.

such as low-level food service and bakery work and mowing lawns--can be categorized as vocational training. In these instances, it seems that some of the vocational activities may be contributing more toward meeting the needs of institutional maintenance than to the more inmate-oriented objectives which are proclaimed by the vocational department.

When these activities are classified as vocational training, it follows that their performance by residents would not be subject to pay. The authors question the justness of this policy. It would seem reasonable to presume that when such labor is forced and unrewarded, there is little incentive for diligence and development of even low-level skills. In fairness to the youths, it would seem sensible to offer monetary compensation for all labor which cannot be strictly categorized as vocational training.[16] In situation where inmates perform work which is necessary to the maintenance of the Training Schools, institution of the federal minimum wage may be a reasonable course of action.

Off-Grounds Employment

The only part of the vocational program which allows residents to earn wages is the off-grounds employment area. Boys involved in off-grounds employment typically find work in the Eldora vicinity in farming, mechanics, and welding, and nursery work in Ames. The areas of employment in which girls participate are baby-sitting and restaurant work.

Table XIX shows that male participation in off-grounds employment has steadily increased since 1965, whereas female participation has been minimal. This lack of female participation can possibly be attributed to the

---

[16]Even some prisons seem to be more progressive than the Iowa Training Schools on the matter of compensation for work. Leavenworth Penitentiary has rewarded prisoner workers with a paid vacation after 2 years of good conduct.[12] ([12]Johnson, Crime, Correction and Society).

lack of adequate employment opportunities within the community of Mitchellville, or a lack of cultivation of whatever might be available. Our presumption, however, is that employment opportunities simply had not been developed during the study period. Since 1971, it is reported that off-grounds employment has substantially increased at the Girls' Training School, which supports this belief.

Table XIX

Proportion of Youths Participating in Off-Grounds Exployment Program

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	7	26.9	12	44.4	13	76.5	32	97.0
Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	3.0
Total	7	21.2	12	36.4	14	42.4	33	100.0

Health Center Program

The Health Center at the Boys' Training School provides residential treatment for those inmates who cannot adequately function in the other treatment programs with the other residents. In addition, the facility provides medical services and a secure unit which is used when severe disciplinary action seems called for. While Mitchellville has a hospital unit which is also the site of the detention rooms, it does not, for the most part, provide the separate treatment programs found at Eldora.

The Eldora program provides a highly structured and controlled environment for intensive individual and group counseling.[17] A limited amount of academic education and recreation is also included. Program supervision is

[17] "Discussion of Programs," op. cit.

exercised by a full-time director. Psychiatrists are available on a part-time consulting basis for the total Training School program.

Table XX

Youths Participating in Health Center Treatment Program by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	7	26.9	12	46.2	4	23.5	23	100.0
Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	7	30.4	12	52.2	4	17.4	23	100.0

Table XX shows the proportion of those interviewed who participated in the Health Center treatment programs. Five females reported that they did indeed participate in such a program, but it is uncertain whether they were referring to the detention or hospital program instead of a treatment-centered format. While the question was designed to elicit responses concerning the treatment unit within the Health Center complex only, it is likely that the 33.3% male participation includes inmate utilization of Stewart Hall, a recent addition to the Training School which serves older boys needing a separate facility; the West Wing, located in the original portion of the building and serving a distinct population; and the East Wing, used exclusively for disciplinary purposes.

The following table shows the number of days spent in detention by boys. These data were collected from the case files, which accounts for the paucity of information on the female population. In interpreting this data, it must be remembered that the time period may range from a few months to two to three years as well as covering several commitments.

Table XXI

Number of Days in Detention[18]

Days	1965 N	1965 %	1968 N	1968 %	1971 N	1971 %	Total N	Total %
1	1	10.0	2	25.0	1	7.1	4	12.5
3-9	1	10.0	2	25.0	3	21.4	6	18.8
10-24	3	30.0	0	0.0	4	28.6	7	21.9
25-49	2	20.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	3	9.4
50-99	3	30.0	1	12.5	3	21.4	7	21.9
100-199	0	0.0	1	12.5	2	14.8	3	9.4
200+	0	0.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	2	6.3
Total	10	100.0	8	100.0	14	99.9	32	100.2

In reading through the case files, the authors discovered two boys who apparently spent 248 and 445 days, respectively, in the detention unit. It is difficult, however, to verify this information since the records are hard to read with little distinction between the various living units at the Health Center.

The Training School position on the usage of detention is that the units are used to house those youths with serious problems for short periods of time.[19] Table XXII gives views of some of the inmates on why they were placed in detention.

[18] Information not available for females.

[19] However, from interviews with inmates the researchers learned that the staffs' conception of "serious" tends at times to be broad and inclusive. For instance, testimony was given by inmates that they were put in detention for not using washrags in the showers, refusing to attend church, and refusing to do strenuous physical activity because of an asthmatic condition.

Table XXII

Reasons for Detention As Perceived by Respondents by Sex and Year[20]

	1965 Male N	1965 Male %	1965 Female N	1965 Female %	1968 Male N	1968 Male %	1968 Female N	1968 Female %	1971 Male N	1971 Male %	1971 Female N	1971 Female %	Total N	Total %
Attempted runaway	6	40.0	0	0.0	4	50.0	2	33.3	5	38.5	2	33.3	19	36.5
Fighting	3	20.0	1	25.0	1	12.5	0	0.0	6	46.2	0	0.0	11	21.2
Disobeying orders and rules	2	13.3	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	2	33.3	8	15.4
Insolence to staff	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	15.7	4	7.7
Use or suspected use of drugs	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.8
Other	3	20.3	0	0.0	1	12.5	2	33.3	1	7.7	1	16.7	8	15.4
Total	15	28.8	4	7.7	8	15.4	4	11.5	13	25.0	6	11.5	52	

[20] It should be noted that some tables in this section on detention differ in the total N. These differences are due to inconsistent record keeping at the Training Schools.

How serious is running away? From Table XXV, it appears that training school personnel have assessed it as being very serious, with absconding being the most frequent reason for detention among our sample population, particularly among boys. Regardless of the legitimacy of the Training Schools' reaction to absconding, running away is not an infrequent occurrence. Although none of the 1965 females reported absconding, more than 20% of the 1965 males and both males and females in 1968 admitted absconding.

Table XXIII

Youths Absconding from Training Schools by Sex and Year

	1965				1968				1971			
	No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	20	76.9	6	23.1	20	74.1	7	25.9	8	47.1	9	52.9
Female	9	100.0	0	0.0	11	78.6	3	21.4	5	62.5	3	37.5
Total	29	87.9	6	17.1	31	75.6	10	24.4	13	52.0	12	48.0

The proportion of youths' absconding in 1971 was even higher. Over one-half of the males interviewed (52.9%) and more than one-third of the females (37.5%) stated they had run away from the institution.

Looking at the rate of absconding over time, it is clear that from 1965 to 1971 there was a marked increase in youths running away from the training schools. This increase may correspond to a "loosening up" of the schools, with less concentration on security and more on programming. Additionally--and this is our impression after interviewing--it may also correspond to a change in the types of youths committed to the schools, with the most recent commitments being more intelligent, more rebellious, and more willing to act out their rebellion by running away (be it from home or from an institution).

Although in some circles this increase would be viewed with alarm and apprehension--perhaps accompanied by cries to "clamp down"--we don't necessarily view it that way. Certainly the schools must make some effort to avoid absconding, if only to provide structure. However, this effort must be balanced with other needs (and goals) of the institutions. For example, it isn't especially difficult to completely eliminate absconding in an institutional setting; locking up all inmates or maintaining complete supervision at all times can accomplish this without great effort. In doing this, however, all other institutional goals are sacrificed. Inmates have all decisions made for them, rather than making any themselves. Thus the goal of assisting residents to make responsible decisions cannot be attained (i.e., one doesn't learn to make responsible decisions when one never makes any decisions).

Institutions today frequently attempt in some form to provide opportunities for residents to make their own decisions--in a sense, giving them the "freedom to fail." Some of this freedom, of course, manifests itself in inappropriate activities, which may include running away, acting out, or assaultive behavior. Without condoning such behavior, we must say that it is not very realistic to institutionalize a group for making inappropriate decisions (and violating the law in the process) and expect them to suddenly start making responsible decisions 100% of the time.

Thus we would caution against an alarmist reaction to the increase in absconding at the training schools. Our impressions, after spending considerable time at the schools, are that security, if anything, continues to be over-emphasized. Absent a hue and cry from communities, resulting from victimization because of escapes, we would urge further reduction of security-consciousness at the training schools.

Table XXIV shows the typical training school reaction to absconding: detention. In the three years studied, only 3 (11.5%) sampled youths who absconded were not placed in detention.

Table XXIV

Absconders Placed in Detention by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	5	83.3	5	71.4	7	100.0	17	73.9
Female			3	100.0	3	100.0	6	26.1
Total	5	83.3	8	80.0	10	100.0	23	100.0

The next seemingly logical question is, "how long do the youths stay in detention for absconding?" In Table XXV, this question is answered. Of the males placed in detention for absconding, 80% or more in the three sample years were subjected to 8 or more days in detention. For females, the period spent in detention for absconding was similar. These data make it clear that a significant proportion of males and females in this study spent more than a "short" period of time in detention.

In light of the apparently extensive and sometimes arbitrary use of detention, some aspects of the Training Schools' treatment philosophy seem to resemble punishment more than "treatment." This approach is not consistent with the "modernistic" philosophy proclaimed by training school advocates.

Table XXVI contains the inmates' views on the purpose of detention.

Even though it dropped over the period studied, punishment was, in fact, most frequently perceived by males as the purpose of detention. While half of the 1968 females also viewed punishment as the purpose of detention,

Table XXV

Number of Days in Detention for Absconding Reported by Respondents by Sex and Year

	1965				1968				1971			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 8	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	2	66.7
8-15	2	40.0	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3
16-21	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	5	71.4	0	0.0
More than 22	2	40.0	0	0.0	3	60.0	2	66.7	1	14.3	0	0.0
Total	5	100.0	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	38.5	7	70.0	3	30.0

Table XXVI

Youths' Perceptions of Institutional Purpose of Detention by Sex and Year*

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Punishment	5	33.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	3	50.0	3	23.1	1	16.7	10	28.6	4	25.0
Control method for staff	1	6.7	1	25.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	3	23.1	1	16.7	6	17.1	2	12.5
Rehabilitative method for instilling discipline	3	20.0	2	50.0	1	14.3	2	33.3	2	15.4	2	33.3	6	17.1	6	37.5
No purpose	2	13.3	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	23.1	1	16.7	5	14.3	3	18.8
Isolation to protect other youths	1	6.7	0	0.0	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.6	0	0.0
Other	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	15.4	1	16.7	5	14.3	1	6.3
Total	15	100.0	4	100.0	7	100.1	6	100.0	13	100.1	6	100.0	35	100.0	16	100.1

*Responses were given only by those who had been in detention.

some type of rehabilitative method was most frequently cited by 1965 and 1971 females. In general, those perceiving a rehabilitative purpose felt that detention instilled discipline and provided a chance for youths to cognitively work out problems.

Family Therapy Program

In 1971, the Boys' Training School initiated a family therapy program. Counseling and other family-related services are provided by family therapists located in Eldora, Des Moines, and Sioux City. The Eldora team is available for males only and the Des Moines and Sioux City teams work with males and females whose families reside in Polk or Woodbury Counties.

The program is aimed at alleviating family-related problems which serve as barriers to the youths' reintegration into the community. Training School personnel involved in the family therapy program and the family therapists work both with the youths and their families. Of the 1971 sample, 42.9% reported participation in the family therapy program.

There is some doubt, however, that this figure actually indicates a proportionate participation of the youths in family therapy. The authors suspect that participation may be overrepresented due to a lack of clarity as to the meaning of family therapy. Since youths at both training schools sometimes receive counseling on family-related problems other than family therapy, it seems possible that some respondents may have been thinking in terms of this other counseling. Accordingly, they would have reported participation, while, in fact, there was none.

Religious Program

Until the recent administrative changes at the Girls' Training School, both schools had a policy of mandatory attendance at religious services. New administrators at the GTS dropped this requirement in 1972. Males, how-

ever, were still required to attend religious services at the time of this writing.

Mandatory attendance at the Boys' Training School has been officially defended on the basis of Iowa Law.[21] According to staff, the students at the institutions must be encouraged in "religious habits." Yet, closer inspection of the situation seems to indicate that other factors may influence the policy. The authors suspect that one factor in particular--Training School organizational needs--has an effect.

As in other correctional institutions, purported needs of the inmates sometimes arise from the very real management problems in staffing a facility 7 days a week. At the Training Schools, this problem is especially apparent on weekends when the ratio of staff to inmates is lower than on weekdays. Until very recently, staff could work as many hours as necessary and receive compensatory time off at some future date. Under new guidelines, however, such an accumulation of time is not allowed. This will most likely add to the problem of providing sufficient staff round-the-clock. The majority of treatment personnel are on duty from Monday through Friday. On weekends, some inmates receive Trial Home Visits, thus decreasing the population to some extent.

The requirement of church attendance appears to be a coping mechanism for this situation. By having all of the inmates in the same place at the same time, the Training School minimizes the necessary number of supervisory personnel and thus eases a managerial problem.

The question of whether or not mandatory attendance is necessary to fulfill the inmates' treatment needs will be discussed in a later section.

---

[21]Discussion of Program, February, 1973.

Nearly all of those interviewed did state they participated in the religious program, although there were a small number of exceptions to this rule. It is interesting to point out that one of the males who did not participate reported that he refused to attend every week. For lack of either a more appropriate alternative or sufficient staff, the boy was placed in detention while the other boys attended church.

Recreation Program

Both Training Schools have recreational programs, which include physical activity for academic credit as well as intra-cottage sports. The involvement of those interviewed in these programs is, with few exceptions, almost universal.

The programs are being upgraded and expanded constantly. In an institutional setting, organized sports are a valuable component of the treatment program.

Associational Effects of Institutionalization

Critics of correctional institutions often make the point that training schools can serve as schools for crime. The underlying assumption here is that all human behavior (including criminal behavior), is learned through social interaction. If one accepts this assumption, it does seem possible that training schools' inmates may learn more about criminal behavior through association with other delinquents. Proponents of the concept of differential association "would take the process one step further and offer the equation that a training school inmate becomes more criminalized at training school because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law."[22]

---

[22]Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Principles of Criminology, 8th ed. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1973), pp. 75-77.

The authors attempted to gain information on the first part of the differential association thesis. Table XXVII includes this information on deviant behavior learned about at the training schools by those interviewed.

A part of the questionnaire used in this study was devised to explore the applicability of differential association theory to the training school situation. While the authors acknowledge that their procedure for examining the appropriateness of the theory was rather simplistic compared to the 20 or more refined methods used by Short to study the same question,[23] it does seem that the procedure employed provides at least a rough estimate of the suitability of elements of the theory.

In administering this part of the questionnaire, the authors were primarily interested in the youths' perceptions. Whether or not the respondent felt that he/she had learned more about delinquent conduct at the training school was the important variable. The data regarding this question are displayed in Tables XXVII-XXX.

As was expected, the highest proportion of males and females occurred in the 1971 population. This finding no doubt reflects the increased usage of drugs among young people which has occurred in society. Without a control group outside the training school (which would ideally vary delinquent associations in intensity, duration, frequency, and priority), it is not possible to know if the training school youths would have learned as much (or more) outside of that setting. In any case, the proportions of 1971 males (70.6%) and 1971 females (50.0%) are sizable and may indicate a good deal of learning about drugs from peers.

---

[23] James F. Short, Jr, "Differential Association and Delinquency," Social Problems, Volume 4, No. 3, January, 1957, pp. 233-239.

Table XXVII

Youths Who Reported Learning More about Drugs at Training School by Sex and Year

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	6	23.1	20	76.9	10	37.0	17	63.0	12	70.6	5	29.4	28	40.0	42	60.0
Female	0	0.0	9	100.0	1	7.1	13	92.9	4	50.0	4	50.0	5	16.1	26	83.9
Total	6	17.1	29	87.9	11	26.8	30	73.2	16	64.0	9	36.0	33	32.7	68	67.3

It might be supposed that homosexual tendencies would be a part of juvenile correctional institutions as they are in adult correctional institutions. The segregated organization of juvenile institutions prevents normal social interaction with members of the opposite sex and, of course, heterosexual relationships. Thus, it is possible that the one-sex nature of the training schools could perpetuate some excessive discussion of sex, and even homosexual practices.

In this respect, then, there is a chance that some youths will learn more about homosexuality through association. Data on learning about homosexuality in the training school are given below.

Table XXVIII suggests that some learning about homosexual behavior took place for the sample years. Although the proportions are relatively low, it is possible that some respondents may have felt inhibited because of the nature of the question.

Fighting and stealing are two other kinds of criminal behavior which a youth could possibly learn more about through associations at training school. The proportions of males and females who felt that they did learn more about these kinds of behavior are shown in Table XXIX and Table XXX.

The data in Tables XXIX and XXX indicate that significant proportions of males from each sample year felt that their stay at training school increased their knowledge of fighting and stealing. While the number responding "yes" to the question is significant, it should be noted that more than 50% reported no such learning taking place. Smaller proportions of females in the 1968 population also reported learning more about fighting and stealing.

It is interesting to find that the percent who learned more about fighting and stealing follows a general downward trend with less learning

Table XXVIII

Youths Learning More about Homosexuality at Training School by Sex and Year

	1965 Yes N	1965 Yes %	1965 No N	1965 No %	1968 Yes N	1968 Yes %	1968 No N	1968 No %	Total Yes N	Total Yes %	Total No N	Total No %
Male	4	15.4	22	84.6	5	18.5	22	81.5	11	15.7	59	84.3
Female	1	11.1	8	88.9	3	21.4	11	78.6	5	16.1	26	83.9
Total	5	14.3	30	85.7	8	19.5	33	80.5	16	15.8	85	84.2

	1971 Yes N	1971 Yes %	1971 No N	1971 No %	Total Yes N	Total Yes %	Total No N	Total No %
Male	2	11.8	15	88.2	11	15.7	59	84.3
Female	1	12.5	7	87.5	5	16.1	26	83.9
Total	3	12.0	22	88.0	16	15.8	85	84.2

Table XXIX

Youths Learning More about Fighting at Training School by Sex and Year

	1965 Yes N	1965 Yes %	1965 No N	1965 No %	1968 Yes N	1968 Yes %	1968 No N	1968 No %	Total Yes N	Total Yes %	Total No N	Total No %
Male	14	53.8	12	46.2	13	48.1	14	51.9	27	51.0	26	49.0
Female	2	22.2	7	77.8	4	28.6	10	71.4	6	35.3	11	64.7
Total	16	45.7	19	54.3	17	41.5	24	58.5	33	47.1	37	52.9

	1971 Yes N	1971 Yes %	1971 No N	1971 No %	Total Yes N	Total Yes %	Total No N	Total No %
Male	6	35.3	11	64.7	33	47.1	37	52.9
Female	0	0.0	8	100.0	6	19.4	25	80.6
Total	6	24.0	19	76.0	39	38.6	62	61.4

reported by the 1968 and 1971 populations. This trend may support the notion that the more recent training school populations are more sophisticated (with less to learn).

Table XXX

Youths Learning More about Stealing at Training School by Sex and Year

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	16	61.5	10	38.5	12	44.4	15	55.6	8	47.1	9	52.9	36	51.4	34	48.6
Female	2	22.2	7	77.8	2	14.3	12	85.7	0	0.0	8	100.0	4	12.9	27	87.1
Total	18	51.4	17	48.6	14	34.1	27	65.9	8	32.0	17	68.0	40	39.6	61	60.4

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Research Design

The plan of study undertaken can probably be described as a "one-shot case study." Although attempts were made to learn as much as possible about the youths' situation prior to training school and during training school, a primary component of the design involved the measurement of the youths after exposure to institutional programs. No matched groups or control groups were used.

The evaluation of the training schools' effectiveness was based on conventional measures of recidivism and by testimony of former training school inmates. Using these sources of evidence, the researchers attempted to assess the impact of the training school programs and developed recommendations for the Iowa State Department of Social Services.

Sampling Procedure

Sampling methods were utilized to ensure that the data were reliable and generalizable to the populations of both training schools. Cases were selected from the registers of admission at each institution, which contain the names of all boys and girls who have been committed to the Iowa Training Schools. Names are not arranged in any type of order other than chronological. Youths are simply listed and given a number as they are admitted to the training schools. Thus, the registers provided a complete, unbiased sampling frame.

Within the one-year period allowed for this research, it was decided that 200 cases could be thoroughly studied. It was also decided that a systematic sample be utilized because of the relatively short duration of the project. The sampling procedure used in this study involved selecting every

seventh case from the registers of admissions. Inasmuch as the first case was not selected randomly, and most of the cases had a zero probability of being included in the sample, the procedure used was not, in a strict sense, probability sampling. However, there do not seem to be any particular reasons to think that the sampling procedure gave deceptive or biased results.

The sample was drawn from three different populations, selected from all cases first admitted within the period of January 1 to December 31 in the years 1971, 1968, and 1965. In selecting these years, the researchers attempted to use time periods which were recent enough to make the research relevant but distant enough to allow some assessment of the training schools' effects.

The three samples ranged in size from 79 to 53, giving the project an original sample size of 200 cases.

Table XXXI

Original Sample Distribution by Sex and Year

	1965	1968	1971	Total
Male	54	45	34	133
Female	25	23	19	67
Total	79	68	53	200

As Table XXXI shows, the ratio of male youths to female youths in the original sample was approximately 2:1. While the actual ratio of male youths to female youths in the State Training Schools' populations approached 5:1, this ratio was rejected for the purposes of this research because a very large sample would have been necessary to obtain a statistically adequate number of female youths. In order to maintain a sample representative of the population at both schools, however, more boys than girls

were included. Therefore, 133 male youths were included, along with 67 female youths.

After the sampling was completed, 2 cases were rejected when it was found that first admittance did not occur in the prescribed years. The sample, of course, was further decreased in the process of locating and interviewing youths in order to discern their perceptions of the training schools' effectiveness. Of the original sample of 200 youths, the researchers were able to interview 101 individuals. As Table XXXII indicates, the ratio of males to females in the final sample resembles the 2:1 ratio of the original sample.

Table XXXII

Interview Sample Distribution by Sex and Year

	1965	1968	1971	Total
Male	26	27	19	72
Female	9	14	6	29
Total	35	41	25	101

Considering the follow-up nature of the study, the 50% return seems to be an adequate proportion of the original sample upon which to base the evaluation. Although we cannot assume that the persons located and interviewed were similar in all respects to those persons who were inaccessible, we have been unsuccessful in finding any obvious differences between the original sample and the final sample. Therefore, the researchers proceeded to treat and study the 101 cases as though they were basically representative of the original sample.

In terms of organization, part of this report includes a descriptive analysis of the youths' situation prior to training school and during train-

ing school based on 198 youths of the original sample and other parts deal with the 101 youths who were interviewed. The evaluation sections of the report, to reiterate, were based solely on the 101 youths. The reason for limiting the evaluation to the 101 youths was because several variables which were important components of the recidivism criterion were obtained only in the interview schedules.

Institutional Records

Most of the youths committed to the Iowa Training Schools have had a considerable amount of contact with social, psychological, and legal organizations prior to their commitment to training school. Much of the information collected by these organizations is summarized in the files of the schools, which was the primary source for evidence of the youths' pre-commitment activities. Most of the data in the files was included by training school personnel to provide information pertinent to the schools' treatment goals and to keep reports on the youths' participation in institutional programs.

Since we expected that the casefiles at the two training schools would provide the most complete information, data were extracted mainly from files at Mitchellville and Eldora. Some information was also collected from the central files maintained by the State (better known as "the Archives") in Des Moines. From these duplicate files, some information missing at the institutions was available.

The information relevant to the study was extracted from the files by the authors of the study. The items to be sought in the files were listed on a single instrument, a "Central File Information Sheet" (see Appendix A).

The Central File Information Sheet contained items relating to the youths' life prior to commitment, e.g., committing offenses, last grade of

academic school completed prior to commitment, prior non-family living arrangements, and family occupational and educational levels, items on the youths' activities during the period of training school commitment, e.g., academic, vocational, and work programs, treatment units, placement sites, and subsequent readmissions to training school, and a few items on the youths' present status.

Certain information on the youths' status after release, especially requests from other penal institutions for copies of reports in training school files, aided the researchers in tracing potential interviewees. Other information on their after-treatment situation provided clues as to the youths' present location. This information was also recorded on the Central File Information Sheets and later used mainly in locating youths for follow-up interviews.

To complete the Central File Information Sheet, we found it necessary to search through the files for each item and record the pertinent information on the sheet, carefully checking one another's work for errors. Approximately one and one-half hours were required to complete each form.

Another instrument used in the research was a "Record of Institutionalization" (see Appendix B). This form contained information on all institutional commitments within Iowa and the length of these commitments prior to and following training school residence. This information was also important to objectively classify a youth as a "success" or "failure."

Fortunately, the files at the Department of Social Services were accessible enough so the researchers could obtain this information. However, it was not possible within the time allotted for this study to collect and utilize similar information from other states.

Problems with the Records

A major problem encountered in the course of this study was the completeness of training school records. A fairly large amount of data which the researchers had originally deemed to have potential value was not available in sufficient proportions to be included in the study, while other items were available in such a small proportion of the cases that they could not be used. Some of these items were as follows:

1. drug usage by parents;
2. subsequent number of marriages by parents;
3. amount of individual and group counseling received by inmates;
4. staff predictions on likelihood of parole success; and,
5. criminal record of other family members.

With regard to the factor of academic performance, the researchers were not able to use the "hardest" measure, that is, actual school transcripts. (It was learned later that these records were in fact available at Eldora; the researchers had been misinformed.) The files in neither of the two training schools contained sufficient information on the youths' academic records prior to commitment or during residence for an assessment to be made. Therefore, this information could not be used in the research.

The problem of completeness of records was found to be most extensive at the Girls' Training School. Information on the female youths' life before training school was consistently unavailable in the files. One form which specifically pertains to the youths' pre-committement activities, the probation officers' social history investigation reports, did not turn up regularly in the files. The lack of these reports and other pre-commitment information on the female youths places definite limitations on the adequacy of our overall pre-commitment data.

Information covering the period of time the female youths were at Mitchellville was also rather thinly distributed throughout the files. Most

of the reports and records which pertain to the youths' treatment programs, e.g., vocational program, academic program, counseling, were found to lack the thoroughness and detail required for an in-depth evaluative analysis. Additional information on the treatment programs, however, was gathered in the form of interviews with former inmates, literature from the training schools, correspondence with the training school superintendents, and personal observations. Information on other parts of the female youths' training school experience, e.g., time in detention, was usually not available at all. This type of information was also gained from other sources to the extent possible.

Another time period which was not adequately covered in the training school records was the post-release period. Information was often found to be lacking on important items such as placement sites, reasons for readmittance, and contacts with the Department of Social Services' field offices.

The authors were, of course, disappointed with the lack of information available at the Girls' Training School. The absence of this information not only limits the depth of our research investigation, but it also serves the function of abdicating the Training School's accountability for the treatment and care of the youths. Indeed, this situation does not appear to be conducive to effective administration of the programs at GTS.

While the records at the Girls' Training School placed more restrictions on our analysis than the records at the Boys' Training School, the objectivity of records at both schools also limited the amount of information amenable to analysis. Throughout the data collection and data analysis phases of our research, we strove to rely mainly upon objective facts rather than subjective information. Some situations, however, necessitated use of subjective information.

Unfortunately, we found that the usage of these data necessitated a compromise with regards to the comparability of the data. From our readings of the files, it appears that no youth, upon reaching the training school, is ever given an evaluation without the evaluator first reading previous reports on the youth. The consequences of this practice were obvious. Evaluators of a particular case tended to use the same descriptive items (and at times identical sentences!) used by other evaluators who had previously assessed that case. Thus, it seems that the content of the evaluation reports are too often influenced by circularity and prejudgment in diagnosis to contain even a modicum of objectivity.

Overall, the record-keeping problems encountered by the authors tended to be of a type capable of alleviation. In spite of a stated objective of the schools "to maintain adequate record systems whereby data may be gathered for use in evaluative processes,"[24] it seems that part of the incompleteness and subjectivity of the records is due to concentration on administrative rather than research purposes.

There is no defensible reason why information cannot be simultaneously collected for administrative and research purposes. This task would involve more thoroughness, specificity, and consistency. Whenever possible, all information relevant to a case should be included in the records; however, it should be presented in a uniform and consistent manner. In situations where a decision is made to delete certain pieces of information, the reasons for the decision should be set forth in the record.[25]

---

[24] Criminal Justice System in Polk County, p. 41.

[25] Hermann Mannheim and Leslie T. Wilkins, Prediction Methods in Relation to Borstal Training, (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1955), p. 242.

Special care should also be taken with regard to the methods of reporting this information. While the subjective assessments of staff and others are a necessary and valuable part of a case file, these judgmental data, as well as the rest of the case file information, should state the specific facts which led to conclusions and judgments. This procedure would enable researchers to make more adequate estimations of the associations between specific facts. Administrators would also have more standardized information upon which they could base their various decisions.

Standardized Interviews

A large share of the information pertaining to the youths' activities since training school was obtained from personal interviews. In addition to providing further information on the youths' recidivism, the interviews provided other data on factors such as occupational status and income level which were also used as criteria of success or failure.

The interview form was originally constructed with a two-fold purpose: to obtain objective indicators of the youths' current status and to gain the youth's own subjective assessments of the training schools. In the process of delimiting the scope of the study to a manageable size and writing the final report, the authors decided to give more emphasis to objective facts rather than subjective perceptions and feelings.

The information collected with the interview form itself was quite extensive (see Appendix C). The form contained separate sections on delinquent activities before and after training school, training school activities, parole and placement situations, institutional commitments after release from training school, school experiences before, during, and after training school, employment experiences before, during, and after training school, and current home life situations.

The interview form was comprised of a total of 77 questions, many of which contained conditional parts. The time needed to conduct each interview was approximately 1½ hours. Interviews took place in state prisons, county jails, mental health facilities, private homes, and a number of other miscellaneous places.

As found in most follow-up studies, one of the major problems encountered in this study was the difficulty of locating persons for interviews and gaining permission to interview them. The authors of this study went to fairly extensive lengths to locate and interview all persons in the original sample of 198 cases. The following sources of information were utilized in the attempts to locate persons:

Iowa State Volunteer Services Bureau;
United States Postal Services;
Iowa State Bureau of Adult Corrections;
Iowa State Mental Health Bureau;
Iowa State Department of Social Services;
Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.;
Iowa State Marriage License Bureau;
Records and Statistics Office of the Iowa State Health Department;
Area Field Offices for Iowa State Department of Social Services;
Driver's License Files, Department of Public Safety;
Iowa State Employment Security Commission; and,
Iowa State Selective Service Office.

Other sources included newspapers, letters to possible residences of interviewees, and telephone calls. Two potential sources which did not cooperate were the Social Security Administration and the Income Maintainance Division of the Iowa State Department of Social Services.

One of the techniques used to ensure interviews with as many persons as possible included remuneration to respondents for their cooperation. Upon completion of an interview or receipt of a mailed interview form, each respondent received $10.00.

In the course of locating and interviewing the former training school inmates, the authors were concerned with maintaining the youths' right to

confidentiality. When questioning persons other than members of the youths' immediate family about the youths' whereabouts, the researchers were careful not to disclose either the nature of the study or their reasons for seeking the youths.

Another precaution taken to safeguard the identity of the respondents was that persons were never contacted at their place of business. The authors felt that attempts to contact respondents on the job could result in employer suspicion and possible dissatisfaction.

Once contact was made or a residence was at least partially determined, professional interviewers set out to thoroughly search for each person and then conduct an interview.

Locating and interviewing respondents did not come easily. Initially, the research design called for the two authors to locate and interview all persons in the sample. Therefore, the design was altered in several ways. Most importantly, as mentioned earlier, the Iowa State Statistical Laboratory completed the locating and interviewing stage.

Data Management and Computer Analysis

Information from each of the instruments, the Central File Information Sheet, the Interview Form, and the Record of Institutionalization, was coded. Coding was performed by two groups. Trained coders from Iowa State Statistical Laboratory coded the Central File Information Sheet and the Record of Institutionalization. However, because of the large number of open-ended questions on the interview forms, the authors coded these. The open-ended questions, of course, required a great deal of interpretation by the coders and thus it seemed appropriate that those most familiar with the form do the coding.

Upon completion of coding, the data sheets were transposed to punched cards and basic descriptive statistical analyses were carried out by computer.

Potential Biases in the Research

Perhaps the greatest source of potential bias in this research was the problem of the representativeness of the persons interviewed. Even though we were able to interview 101 respondents, there is no basis for assuming that those persons not interviewed were essentially similar to those interviewed.

It is very possible that those persons not interviewed may either have the most to hide or may be the most highly involved in criminal activity. Other research in the area of juvenile delinquency tends to support this possibility. Hirschi and Selvin, in their benchmark analysis of methods used in delinquency research, state that "the least accessible persons tend to be delinquents."[26] In a study of the training schools in England, Mannheim and Wilkins reached similar conclusions, finding that the availability of information was correlated with success.[27] That is, the more successful the case, the more available the information, and conversely, the worse the case, the more difficult it was to obtain information.

Some of this bias may have been eliminated in our study. An attempt was made to interview all of the persons in our sample who were in any institution in Iowa (penal, mental health, etc.) during the time of the

[26]Travis Hirschi and Hannan Selvin, Delinquency Research, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 58.

[27]Mannheim and Wilkins, op. cit.

interviewing phase of the project. Interviewers were able to interview a total of 18 persons in institutions.[28]

Eleven of the eighteen persons were interviewed in Iowa's three adult correctional institutions and one person was interviewed in a correctional half-way house. Another person was found to have been recommitted to training school, and she was interviewed at the Girls' Training School.

Because of the inclusion of these "captive" individuals, especially those in adult or juvenile correctional facilities who are known to be "failures," it seems possible that the effects of bias were somewhat reduced. However, it may be we only got to the "failures" in criminal activity.

While the authors believed that bias was somewhat reduced, by no means did we ignore the possibility of bias. The lack of information on past training school institutionalization in other states could be still another source of bias. It is possible that some of those whom we were not able to locate have been institutionalized in other states.

Another point of possible bias should also be made clear. In interpreting the results of the study, and particularly in the section describing the sample, the reader must remember that the sample was selected from the population of first admissions to the training schools during each particular year. Consideration of second and subsequent commitments to the training schools during those years was omitted. (Since the sample youths were followed through their total training school experience, however, second and subsequent commitments are in fact accounted for within this group.) The cases studied were, indeed, first commitments and therefore it may not be

[28]Of this total, 3 persons were interviewed in out-of-state prisons.

100% legitimate to generalize to the whole training school population. In fact, the whole training school population may, as a whole, be worse off than the sample group.

A final potential source of bias which researchers attempted to cope with was one which occurs too frequently in public service research. This bias occurs when evaluative research is undertaken and directed by personnel of the program being evaluated. The two researchers who actually conducted the research and dominated the project's decision-making processes attempted to be as sensitive as possible to this bias. While the researchers themselves were employed on a contract basis to conduct this project only, the project director was an employee of the Department of Social Services at the Boys' Training School and due to his position may have possessed a "stake" in the outcome of the research. Despite this situation, we have made a concerted effort to make the final report objective and independent of Department influence.

EVALUATION RESULTS:

ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTIVENESS OF RECIDIVISM CRITERIA

Probably the most dismal fact pertaining to evaluations of juvenile correctional institutions is the finding of a preponderance of institutional failure. As Paul Lerman has pointed out, residential institutions for delinquents tend to be characterized by high rates of failure.[29]

To a large extent, these findings of failure have been based upon recidivism as the single criterion of institutional success or failure. As a general rule, these recidivism rates relate to the offender's frequency of return to crime after release from the institution.[30]

While the necessity for using criteria besides recidivism is acknowledged, the recidivism rate remains the most important single criterion of a correctional institution's success or failure. Leslie Wilkins, an expert in the area of correctional evaluation, forcefully puts the matter thus:

> No matter what else is done in institutions and no matter how successfully one may run a prison in other ways, if inmates after discharge are found guilty of further offenses and return to custody, then we must regard either the offenders, or their treatment, or both, as failures.[31]

Indeed, if one is setting about to do an honest and objective evaluation, it does seem inappropriate to deny the centrality of recidivism. In this section, the major goal of the Iowa State Training Schools--to rehabilitate delinquent youths--will be examined. To assess the degree of achieve-

---

[29] Paul Lerman, Delinquency and Social Policy, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 317.

[30] Leslie T. Wilkins, Evaluation of Penal Measures, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 12.

[31] Ibid.

ment related to this goal, a criterion of training school program outcomes was developed. Following similar research studies, a dichotomous criterion of recidivism was used. In other words, an operational definition of recidivism was devised and then applied to each case. In the end, each case was classified as a success or failure with regard to the goal of reducing recidivism.

The following recidivism criteria were used to determine the success or failure since first release from the training schools of the 101 persons interviewed:

1. subsequent admissions or recommitments to the training school for a new offense;
2. commitment of an offense resulting in a jail sentence as an adult;
3. commitment of an offense resulting in placement on probation as an adult; and/or
4. commitment to an adult correctional facility.

An application of these recidivism criteria to the 101 individuals interviewed is shown below.

Table XXXIII

Success/Failure of Interviewees by Sex

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Success	9	12.9	20	64.5	29	28.7
Failure	61	87.1	11	35.5	72	71.3
Total	70	69.3	31	30.7	101	100.0

As can be seen from this table, 71.3% of those interviewed can be said to be failures, based entirely on the recidivism rate, be it training school, jail, or prison. These data do not attempt to deal with the degree of delinquent or criminal activity that may have resulted in further institutionalization as can be seen in the use of jail sentences. Eight individuals were termed failures solely on the basis of jail sentences resulting in incarceration for a period of two days or less. Another 11 had only returned to training school. (Obviously data collection covered only a specified period of time so an on-going process might in fact reveal further criminal involvement.) Tables XXXIV through XLIII will clarify the data in Table XXXIII.

Just as it is difficult to rate the seriousness of offenses for which juveniles are sent to training schools, so is it difficult to make such a differentiation here. Return to training school may range from a relatively minor violation of parole conditions--for which no court hearing is held--to the commission of new offenses. Suffice it to say that the goal of the training schools to rehabilitate those youths committed to their care to the point where they may pursue a life-style free of involvement in the criminal justice system, both juvenile and adult, seems to be woefully unattained.

One can, of course, surmise that an equal number of youths would have had the same failure rate regardless of the actions taken by the courts to secure for them "treatment" for their delinquent behavior, based on the supposition that commitment to a juvenile institution is the "last resort" to be used after all other efforts have failed. Whether this is true or not cannot be proven; however, it can be shown that institutionalization--at least in this study--has apparently failed to make a positive impact on a significantly large proportion of adolescents treated within a secure facility. The question that one must continue to ask is the degree to which the experience of institutional life, with its overriding emphasis on conformity, security, jail-like detention facilities, and isolation, may be a contributing factor in the hardening of delinquent patterns.

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

Referring again to Table XXXIII, one can see the large proportion of females falling into the success category, which superficially might suggest that it is Mitchellville rather than Eldora that is to be praised for the rehabilitative work it is doing. This, however, would be a somewhat simplistic view. As noted earlier, the offenses for which girls are incarcerated are overwhelmingly those categorized as status offenses: running away from home, being beyond the control of their parents, and engaging in sexual activity. These acts are proscribed by law only for those individuals under the age of 18; therefore, once minors become adults they may legally continue to conduct themselves in the same manner without court intervention. If a boy continues to steal cars, however, he will continue to experience difficulties with the law.

It is still distressing to note the relatively small percentage of individuals who have managed, both over the long- and short-term, to avoid further involvement with the juvenile or adult criminal justice systems. As many researchers currently believe, it is entirely conceivable that adolescents ". . . become progressively deviant <u>after</u> they have been exposed to court and training school."[32]

Again, one might argue that it is not surprising that the success rate is so low since the training schools are theoretically viewed as the last resort for the treatment and confinement of juvenile delinquents. The claim by juvenile court workers is made that a juvenile will not be incarcerated until all other viable alternatives have been explored. These alternatives may include both informal and formal probation, removal from the home to foster homes and groups homes, etc. It is extremely difficult, however, for

---

[32]Paul Tappan, "The Nature of Juvenile Delinquency" in Juvenile Delinquency: a Book of Readings, Rose Giallomsardo, ed: p. 19.

the layperson to get a grasp on the actual "treatment" program that is set up by the Courts to rehabilitate the youngster, beyond reporting to a probation officer periodically, having certain restrictions placed on his/her activities (such as a curfew, an admonition to avoid certain associates, etc.), and parental reports on their child's behavior.

If one subscribes to the theory that delinquent behavior may be an indication of a child's search for the self-esteem that may not be forthcoming from either parents, teachers, or "non-delinquent" peers,[33] it is difficult to understand how the sanctions of the juvenile court processes, that tend to single a child out as being deviant and delinquent from an age group that as a whole tends to engage in such behaviors,[34] can be said to enhance this feeling of worthiness. The child who receives such attention from authorities may in fact gain stature in the eyes of those associates who view delinquent behavior as a legitimate means of gaining the recognition and attention not available from other sources, thereby fostering such behavior.

One can only speculate that non-intervention and non-recognition of such behavior by adults may work toward the reduction of that behavior by the refusal to give to it any degree of status. A number of surveys, by Gold and Porterfield,[35] including individuals who committed infractions of the law comparable to those of adjudicated delinquents, indicate that such activities do in fact cease without the intervention of rehabilitative efforts.

---

[33]Martin Gold, <u>Delinquent Behavior in an American City</u>.

[34]<u>Ibid</u>.

[35]<u>Op. Cit</u>.

Another disturbing aspect of these success/failure data is the large percentage of young men who have gone through the treatment program at the Boys' Training School who continue to experience difficulties with the criminal justice system. It has been popular recently to malign the Girls' Training School for a variety of reasons, including possible discriminatory application of the law and a lack of adequate educational and vocational programs.

These claims appear to be indisputable and do indeed support the need for change in the way society and its institutions view the female role. What is most alarming, however, is the apparent lack of such dissatisfaction with the programs at Eldora, which is often held up as an example of the way in which a juvenile institution should operate.[36] Perhaps it is time for those who claim to be concerned about discrimination on the basis of sex to examine the atmosphere in which some 200 boys each year spend several months of their lives, a time during which they may become irretrievably caught up in the criminal justice system.

Regarding the issue of degree of success or failure, it was discovered through the use of a self-report checklist that 12 or 11.9% of those persons interviewed had continued to engage in some form of delinquent or criminal activity, with these activities ranging from status offenses to assault and robbery. These 12 people were never apprehended by the authorities, yet on the basis of the criteria of subsequent involvement with the criminal justice system, they remain classified as successful. If they were added to the list of failures, the total would be 84 (83.2%) out of the 101 interviewed.

---

[36] Carle F. O'Neil in foreward to booklet describing the programs and philosophy of Eldora.

Table XXXIV illustrates the total number of times the 198 youths in the sample were committed and readmitted to training schools:

Table XXXIV

Total Commitments to Training School of Total Sample by Sex

	One		Two		Three		Four		Five		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	76	57.1	39	29.3	14	10.5	2	1.5	2	1.5	133	67.5
Female	48	75.0	8	12.5	5	7.8	3	4.7	0	0.0	64	32.5
Total	124	62.9	47	23.9	19	9.6	5	2.5	2	1.0	197	100.0

Unknown: 1.

As can be seen, 62.9% were in the training schools only once. While this figure might be ostensibly optimistic, it must be remembered that approximately 62.1% of those entering the training schools did so at the age of 16 or older which means they are effectively removed from the juvenile justice system within a year or two following their release. 37.1% experienced two or more admissions.

The following information will delve beyond the environs of the training schools into the adult criminal careers, if any, of those individuals interviewed. Since the approximate age range of those interviewed is 15 to 26, the figures on adult criminal behavior are certainly inconclusive unless one wants to assume that by age 26 one will have developed a pattern of behavior that would at least predict criminal involvement.

Table XXXV gives the breakdown by year and sex of those who have served some time in jail or in a juvenile detention center since being in the training schools. These data are based only on the self-reporting of the interview.

Table XXXV

Commitment of Interviewees to Jail or Detention Since Training School Release by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	22	84.6	25	92.6	10	58.8	57	81.4
Female	1	11.1	2	14.3	0	0.0	3	10.0
Total	23	65.7	27	65.9	10	41.7	60	60.0

Unknown: 1

Both 1965 and 1968 show slightly more than 65% of the respondents admitting to having spent time in jail or in a juvenile detention center. The figures for 1971 may again reflect the relatively short amount of time since the training school experience. On the basis of the previous two years, one might expect the 1971 training school graduates to duplicate the higher figure. As might be expected, the females appear to stay out of jail more than their male counterparts, yet another figure that may reflect the types of offenses for which girls are adjudicated delinquent.

Another measurement of the ability of the interviewees to stay out of the criminal justice system is reflected in the number of contacts they have with the police. Tables XXXVI and XXXVII compare the number of police contacts both before and after residence at the training school, again as reported by interviewees. Only 4% reported no police contacts prior to training school, while 20.2% said they had none afterwards. While this is one of the more encouraging figures, it is interesting that all of the 1968 respondents claimed police contacts while about 34% from both 1965 and 1971 said they had experienced none. In the categories showing six or more police contacts, the 1968 figures indicate an extremely high percentage,

with the 1965 and 1971 figures trailing substantially. If these were the 1965 trends, it would appear logical, but being the middle year leaves little logical explanation.

Table XXXVI

Number of Police Contacts Reported by Interviewees before Training School by Sex and Year

		0		1-5		6-10		11-15		15+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	Male	1	3.8	18	69.2	3	11.5	2	7.7	2	7.7	26	74.3
	Female	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	25.7
	Sub-Total	2	5.7	25	71.4	4	11.4	2	5.7	2	5.7	35	100.0
1968	Male	0	0.0	11	40.7	6	22.2	1	14.8	0	22.2	27	65.9
	Female	2	14.3	11	78.6	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	14	34.1
	Sub-Total	2	4.9	22	53.7	6	14.6	5	12.2	6	14.6	41	100.0
1971	Male	0	0.0	8	47.1	3	17.6	1	5.9	5	29.4	17	68.0
	Female	0	0.0	5	62.5	3	37.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	32.0
	Sub-Total	0	0.0	13	52.0	6	24.0	1	4.0	5	20.0	25	100.0
Total	Male	1	1.4	37	52.9	12	17.1	7	10.0	13	18.6	70	69.3
	Female	3	9.7	23	74.2	4	12.9	1	3.2	0	0.0	31	30.7
	Total	4	4.0	60	59.4	16	15.8	8	7.9	13	12.9	101	100.0

Table XXXVII

Number of Police Contacts Reported by Interviewees after Training School Release by Sex and Year

		0		1-5		6-10		11-15		15+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	Male	5	19.2	12	46.2	4	15.4	2	7.7	3	11.5	26	74.3
	Female	7	77.8	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	25.7
	Sub-Total	12	34.3	14	40.0	4	11.4	2	5.7	3	8.6	35	100.0
1968	Male	0	0.0	1	3.7	19	70.4	4	14.8	3	11.1	27	65.9
	Female	0	0.0	9	64.3	4	28.6	0	0.0	1	7.1	14	34.1
	Sub-Total	0	0.0	10	24.4	23	56.1	4	9.8	4	9.8	41	100.0
1971	Male	5	31.3	10	62.5	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	69.6
	Female	3	42.9	4	57.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	30.4
	Sub-Total	8	34.8	14	60.9	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	100.0
Total	Male	10	14.5	23	33.3	24	34.8	6	8.7	6	8.7	69	69.7
	Female	10	33.3	15	50.0	4	13.3	0	0.0	1	3.3	30	30.3
	Total	20	20.2	38	38.4	28	28.3	6	6.0	7	7.1	99	100.0

Unknown: 2.

When one compares the success/failure rate with the type of offenses[37] for which the individuals were incarcerated, the results are not surprising. On the table below, the figures indicate that persons who commit crimes against property are more likely to continue getting into trouble than those committing crimes against persons, except in the case of murder. This is not an unexpected finding, since criminologists generally believe that

[37]See Table XIV for definition of crime categories.

Table XXXVIII

Success/Failure of Interviewees by Reason for Commitment to Training School by Crime Category

	Murder		Crimes vs persons		Crimes vs property		Potential harm		Victimless		Status		No offense		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Success	0	0.0	4	36.4	17	13.4	1	11.1	5	18.5	43	30.9	0	0.0	70	22.2
Failure	1	100.0	7	63.6	110	86.6	8	88.9	22	81.5	96	69.1	2	100.0	246	77.8
Total	1	0.3	11	3.5	127	40.2	9	2.8	27	8.5	139	44.0	2	0.6	316*	100.0

*Total offenses of 101 interviewees.

crimes against persons are committed in the heat of anger. Crimes against property, on the other hand, more frequently involve some degree of planning and the desire for monetary gain. Surprisingly, those who primarily commit status offenses have a high rate of failure with a rate of 69.1%. Since it appears that status offenders suffer at the hands of the juvenile justice system by perpetuating their involvement within it, perhaps it is time for that system to re-examine its treatment methods and juvenile laws.

These figures can be compared with those of Table XL which shows the types of crimes committed for which individuals were placed on probation as adults. The following table reflects the number of interviewees who have been on adult probation at some time since their tenure at the training schools. These figures, as most others in this chapter, are based entirely on self-reports, so the possibility of "covering-up" exists.

Table XXXIX

Adult Probation Served by Interviewees by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	4	15.4	6	22.2	5	29.4	15	21.4
Female	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.4
Total	4	11.4	7	17.1	5	21.7	16	16.2

Unknown: 2.

A relatively small number has been placed on probation, however, with each year that number has increased. This may be an additional indication of increased sophistication of training school commitments.

Table XL indicates that the incidence of property crimes continues to be significant but has been surpassed by crimes that may have only a potential harm (such as possession of drugs). The more serious property crimes probably result in incarceration.

Table XL

Reason for Probation of Interviewees by Sex and Year

		Crimes vs property		Potential harm		Victim-less		No crime *		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	Male	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
	Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Sub-Total	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
1968	Male	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	0	0.0	6	85.7
	Female	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3
	Sub-Total	1	14.3	5	71.4	1	14.3	0	0.0	7	100.0
1971	Male	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
	Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Sub-Total	3	60.0	1	20.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	5	100.0
	Total	6	37.5	7	43.8	2	12.5	1	6.3	16	100.0

*Drug, alcohol, etc. treatment.

Those persons interviewed were also asked about any institutions they may have been committed to, post-training school. These institutions include adult correctional facilities, other juvenile institutions or detention facilities, and mental health institutions. Over 30% have experienced another institutional living arrangement since the training schools. As in the previous tables, only one female indicated she had had other institutional experiences.

Table XLI

Other Institutional Experiences of Interviewees Since Training School Release by Sex and Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	15	57.7	11	40.7	5	29.4	31	44.3
Female	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	3.4
Total	15	44.1	12	29.3	5	20.8	32	32.3

Unknown: 2.

These institutional experiences were a result of the reasons shown on Table XLII. It will be noted that a large percentage of those receiving institutional care did so for problems with alcohol or drugs. In this instance, the 1971 population overtakes that of 1968 percentage-wise. This may indicate a failure on the part of the training schools to provide adequate treatment and/or education in these areas just as it may be indicative of the use of drugs at the institutions, both by prescription and by stealth. It must be remembered that the use of drugs has increased greatly among the general population in the last few years.

Again, it looks as though the institutional experiences increase the longer the young men are out of the training school. Since a slightly higher number of 1968 releasees were interviewed, the figures may be somewhat over-representative. It is interesting to note, nevertheless, that overall the 1968 sample looks less successful than those of either of the other years. Table XLIII emphasizes this fact.

Table XLII

Reasons for Institutionalizations of Interviewees by Year

		Murder, man-slaughter		Crimes vs persons		Crimes vs property		Potential harm		Victim-less		Status		No crime *		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965	Male	0	0.0	7	19.4	10	27.8	2	5.6	3	8.3	0	0.0	14	38.9	36	100.0
	Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Sub-Total	0	0.0	7	19.4	10	27.8	2	5.6	3	8.3	0	0.0	14	38.9	36	100.0
1968	Male	3	8.1	4	10.8	6	16.2	8	21.6	6	16.2	1	2.7	9	24.3	37	90.2
	Female	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	9.8
	Sub-Total	3	7.3	6	14.6	6	14.6	8	19.5	6	14.6	2	4.9	10	24.4	41	100.0
1971	Male	0	0.0	1	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	5	33.3	15	100.0
	Female	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Sub-Total	0	0.0	1	6.7	5	33.3	3	20.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	5	33.3	15	100.0
Total	Male	3	3.4	12	13.6	21	23.9	13	14.8	10	11.4	1	1.1	28	31.8	88	95.7
	Female	0	0.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	1	25.0	4	4.3
	Total	3	3.3	14	15.2	21	22.8	13	14.1	10	10.9	2	2.2	29	31.5	92	100.0

*Drug, alcohol, etc. treatment.

Table XLIII

Success/Failure of Interviewees by Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Success	9	25.7	9	22.0	11	44.0	29	28.7
Failure	26	74.3	32	78.0	14	56.0	72	71.3
Total	35	34.7	41	40.6	25	24.8	101	100.0

One can anticipate that in a few years the three samples will be practically identical. While it appears that young men and women tend to get into less trouble immediately following their release from training school, this salutary effect apparently does not last. (Since there was no control group, it is impossible to know if they "get into less trouble" than non-institutionalized adolescents or that they are merely at this point getting into less trouble than the slightly older sample of releasees.)

As stated earlier, it is impossible to say that a stay at the training schools has a direct causal relationship with further criminal or delinquent behavior. Correspondingly, one cannot credit the institutions with succeeding with those youngsters who become lost in the generally lawabiding populace. It can only be hoped that the institutional experience has a more positive than negative influence in the long-run.

The following table shows that the statistical relationship between the success/failure variable and those of race, year of commitment, and subsequent commitments to the training schools is statistically insignificant.

It would appear that, while still not significant, the more commitments one has to a training school, the more likely one is to fail. Racially, non-whites have a greater tenden to fail, and by year, the 1965 population is more failure-prone.

Table XLIV

Correlation of Success/Failure to Race, Year, Subsequent Commitment to Training School

	Success/ failure	Race	Year	Subsequent commitment
Success/failure	1.000	0.1646	-0.1395	0.4578
Race		1.000	-0.1206	0.3336
Year			1.000	-0.1353
Subsequent commitment				1.000

Tests were run to determine the correlation, if any, between such factors as the total amount of time spent under the supervision of the State Department of Social Services, age at first commitment to the training school, and the total amount of time in residence at the training schools and success/failure. Once again, the results show no high degree of association.

Table XLV

Correlation of Success/Failure to Time under DSS Supervision, Age at First Commitment, Total Time at TS

	Success/ failure	Total DSS	Age	Total TS
Success/failure	1.000	0.2383	-0.0287	0.3506
Total DDS		1.000	-0.4670	0.3379
Age			1.000	-0.4326
Total TS				1.000

This table shows that the longer a child is under the supervision of the State Department of Social Services, the more likely he/she is to fail, and that the younger a child is when first entering the institution, he/she

has a greater chance for accumulating a longer record of institutionalization than an older child.

The lack of statistical significance indicated by these figures is not surprising. There are simply too many intervening variables in the lives of these children for cause and effect relationships to be drawn.

CRITERIA OTHER THAN RECIDIVISM FOR ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TRAINING SCHOOLS

One of the primary goals of this study was to determine the appropriateness of using criteria other than reconviction to evaluate the training schools' success and failure. It is generally felt by correctional officials that reconviction by itself is too narrow a criterion of effectiveness. These officials claim that treatment programs, in addition to decreasing recidivism, enhance the post-release vocational, educational, and financial chances of program recipients.

Thus far, little empirical research has been directed toward this question of "other criteria." Typically, researchers have conducted follow-up studies which emphasize the criterion of recidivism to the point of excluding other post-release information. In this evaluation, the authors have attempted to provide a more comprehensive picture of the youths' post-release situation. The first section of this chapter is devoted to the direct analysis of a number of non-criminal factors which, in part, serve as a description of "what has happened to the youths since training school." (As in the previous chapter, these data were developed on the 101 interviewees on the basis of their self-reports.) In the latter section of the chapter, an effort was made to ascertain the association between some of these "other criteria" and our criterion of recidivism. In addition, intercorrelations among these other criteria were computed.

Even though the amount of research on this matter is hardly negligible, practitioners and researchers alike seem to accept the existence of a high correlation between other criteria of a correctional program's success or

failure and reconviction. The scant bit of correctional research which has been addressed to similar problems of correlation and intercorrelation has tended to show that factors other than criminality are, indeed, highly intercorrelated with each other and highly correlated with reconviction (recidivism).[38] The authors of this study anticipated similar findings.

Employment

Traditionally, the Boys' State Training School has emphasized the importance of vocational training. This emphasis has been in line with the mainstream of correctional reform philosophy in the U.S. As early as the mid-19th Century, for example, John Augustus and other correctional reformers theorized that employment directly relates to the rehabilitation of criminals.[39] More recently, research in the area has stressed that a job is crucial to successful rehabilitation and that unemployment may be a primary factor in recidivism of adults.[40]

Consistent with this view, the Boys' Training School has developed a vocational program which aims to enhance the youths' job motivations, job skills, and overall employability. Put another way, an objective of the vocational program is to provide the boys with habits of industry and marketable job skills.[41]

---

[38] J. Rumney and J. P. Murphy (1952), Probation and Social Adjustment; R. G. Hood, The Borstal System cited in 2, 171.

[39] President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report: Corrections (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 2-4.

[40] Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1964), p. 329. Also Goerge Pownall, Employment Problems of Released Prisoners, Report to Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 1969).

[41] Elmer H. Johnson, Crime Correction, and Society, revised edition (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1966), pp. 558-566.

To determine the effect of the vocational program on the youths' employment experiences, Table XLVI was constructed presenting present or most recent occupation for those residents who did or did not participate in vocational training at the Training Schools. The table is based upon the Occupational Classifications System of the 1973 Census Bureau. The major categories of this system which are ordered according to a general socio-economic index are as follows:

White Collar	(Professional, Technical, and Kindred Workers. (Managers and Administrators, Except Farm (Sales Workers (Clerical and Kindred Workers
Blue Collar	(Craftsmen and Kindred Workers (Operatives, Except Transport (Transport Equipment Operatives (Laborers, Except Farm
Farm and Service	(Farmers and Farm Managers (Farm Laborers and Farm Foremen (Service Workers, Except Private Household (Private Household Workers
Unemployed	(Unemployed

As can be seen in Table XLVI, all of the occupational categories were not found among the sample. Specifically, none of the inmates' occupations could be classified into either of the two highest ranked occupational categories.

Because of the size of the sample of occupations, with just a few occupations in each cell, it is useful to collapse and combine some of the occupational categories. In this study, the authors chose to divide the occupations into four broad classes: white collar, blue collar, farm and service, and unemployed. Table XLVI displays the breaking points for these classes.

Table XLVI

Present or Most Recent Occupation of Interviewees by Sex by Vocational Program

	Males				Females				Total			
	Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White Collar												
Sales workers	1	2.2	2	8.0			3	12.5	2	4.0	5	10.2
Clerical & kindred	1	2.2	2	8.0			3	12.5	2	4.0	5	10.2
Sub-Total	2	4.4	4	16.0			6	25.0	4	8.0	10	20.4
Blue Collar												
Craftsmen & kindred	3	6.7	6	24.0			2	8.3	3	6.0	8	16.3
Operatives, except trans.	6	13.3	3	12.0	1	20.0			7	14.0	3	6.1
Transport equip. oper.	2	4.4							2	4.0		
Laborers, except farm	8	17.8	4	16.0					8	16.0	4	8.2
Sub-Total	19	42.2	13	52.0	1	20.0	2	8.3	20	40.0	15	30.6
Farm & Service												
Farm	1	2.2							1	2.0		
Service					2	40.0	2	8.3	2	4.0	2	4.1
Sub-Total	1	2.2			2	40.0	2	8.3	3	6.0	2	4.1
Unemp.	10	22.2	2	8.0	2	40.0	16	66.7	12	24.0	18	36.7
Other												
Occupation unknown	3	6.1	3	12.0					3	6.1	3	6.1
Prison	13	28.9	5	20.0			1	4.2	13	26.0	6	12.2
Sub-Total	13	28.9	8	32.0			1	4.2	13	26.0	9	18.4
Total	45	100.0	25	100.0	5	100.0	24	100.0	50	100.0	49	100.0
Grand total	70		29				29.3%		99		100.0%	
	70.7%											

An examination of the proportions of persons in the white collar occupations does not seem to show an appreciable effect of participation in vocational programs on the procurement of higher status occupations. Whereas 10.2% of those not participating in vocational programs could be classed into white collar occupations, only 4.0% of those participating could be similarly classed. With blue collar jobs, on the other hand, youths receiving vocational training are more numerous than those without training. Combining blue and white collar occupations (not done in the table), these differences disappear (44.0% of those receiving vocational training vs. 40.8% of those without training).

There appears to be no impact from vocational training upon youths in farm or service jobs, with few youths either with or without such training occupying this type of position.

It is within the "unemployed" and "other" categories that the greatest differences appear. Among males, unemployment or prison is considerably more abundant for those having received vocational training: 23 (51.1%) of the trained group, versus seven (28.0%) of those not receiving training. Among females, the opposite is true, with two (40%) of those receiving training falling into those categories, vs. 17 (70.9%) of the untrained group. Caution must be exercised when drawing conclusions regarding the female group, however, because of the small number who received vocational training (N=5).

Regarding the high unemployment of females in the sample, it should be pointed out that the figures 40.0% and 66.7% do not truly represent the proportions of women unemployed. Included in these figures are women who are employed as housewives. Despite the negligence of the creators of the Census Bureau classification scheme in omitting an occupational classification

for housewife, washing dishes, washing and ironing clothes, vacuuming floors, preparing meals, etc. is difficult labor and is most definitely employment.

Even though the exact number of housewives in the sample is not known, it can be assuredly stated that there was a sufficient number of them to significantly lower the 36.7% figure. Taking this into account, the total proportion of unemployed among those not receiving vocational training would also be lower and, thus, the difference between the total proportions unemployed who did and did not participate in vocational training would be reduced. Therefore, when one considers the distorting impact of classifying housewives as unemployed, it seems that participation in vocational programs had little effect on the chances to avoid unemployment. Among males, placement in vocational training programs may possibly be deleterious by perpetuating the tracking system youngsters experience in public schools.

If the same information is broken down by the sample years, it is possible to gain at least a rough notion of the differential effectiveness of the vocational programs by year.

Table XLVII seems to show that the 1965 sample was the most successful in terms of obtaining higher status occupations, with the 1968 sample most successful in terms of not being unemployed or in prison (42.5% unemployed or in prison, compared to 52.9% in 1965, and 68.0% in 1971). Other trends identified in Table XLVII hold true for each sample year: those with no vocational training more frequently held white collar positions (1965 and 1968), hold fewer blue-collar positions (1965, 1968, and 1971), are more frequently unemployed (1965 and 1971), but are not as frequently incarcerated (1965, 1968, and 1971).

Table XLVII

Present or Most Recent Occupation of Interviewees by Vocational Program by Year

		1965				1968				1971				Total			
		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White Collar	Sales							2	8.0					1	2.0		
	Clerical	1	5.6	3	18.8					1	2.0	5	10.2				
	Sub-Total	1	5.6	3	18.8	1	6.7	2	8.0	2	4.0	5	10.2				
Blue Collar	Craftsmen	2	11.1	1	6.3			7	28.0	1	5.9			3	6.0	8	16.3
	Operatives	2	11.1	1	6.3	4	26.7	1	4.0	1	5.9	1	12.5	7	14.0	3	6.1
	Transport	1	5.6			1	6.7							2	4.0		
	Laborers	3	16.7	1	6.3	3	20.0	3	12.0	2	11.8			8	16.0	4	8.2
	Sub-Total	8	44.5	3	18.9	8	53.4	11	44.0	4	23.6	1	12.5	20	40.0	15	30.6
Farm & Service	Farm									1	5.9			1	2.0		
	Service			1	6.3			1	4.0	2	11.8			2	4.0	2	4.1
	Sub-Total			1	6.3			1	4.0	3	17.7			3	6.0	2	4.1
Unemp.	Unemployed	3	16.7	6	37.5	4	26.7	6	24.0	5	29.4	6	75.0	12	24.0	18	36.7
Other	Unknown							2	8.0			1	12.5			3	6.1
	Prison	6	33.3	3	18.8	2	13.3	3	12.0	5	29.4			13	26.0	6	12.2
	Sub-Total	6	33.3	3	18.8	2	13.3	5	18.0	5	29.4	1	12.5	13	26.0	9	18.2
	Total	18	100.0	16	100.0	15	100.0	25	100.0	17	100.0	8	100.0	50	100.0	49	100.0
	Grand total	34		34.3		40		40.4		25		25.3		99		100.0	

Regarding the 1965 and 1968 samples holding white-collar jobs more frequently than the 1971 sample, this finding tends to concur with most research on occupational mobility. It was expected that the 1971 population would have few higher status occupations merely because they had less time to advance in various occupational career sequences.

The problem noted above regarding the classification of housewives as unemployed remains visible in Table XLVIII. If the 13 women who did not receive vocational training who were engaged as housewives were included among the ranks of the employed, a significant reduction would occur in the over-all percentage of non-vocationally-trained unemployed. Classifying these women as employed would erase the differences in unemployment between vocationally-trained and non-vocationally-trained samples. Table XLVIII presents these adjusted figures and shows youths not having received vocational training as having less than half the unemployment rate of those with training.

Another good indicator of the effectiveness of the vocational program would seem to be the youths' perceptions of the programs' applicability to their present occupation. A major objective of the "vocational department philosophy" is to train the youths in a trade to be self-supporting.[42] According to administrators of the vocational program at BTS, every effort is made to insure that the vocational courses are applicable to the manpower demands of society and are meaningful to the needs of the youths.[43]

---

[42] Vocational Programming at Iowa Training School for Boys, p. 111.

[43] Personal Correspondence, Vernon Van Sickle, Iowa Training School for Boys, April 22, 1974.

Table XLVIII

Adjusted Unemployment Figures by Year

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.		Voc.		No voc.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Raw unemployment figures	3	16.7	6	37.5	4	26.7	6	24.0	5	29.4	6	75.0	12	24.0	18	36.7
Known housewives			4	25.0			5	20.0			4	50.0			13	26.5
Adjusted unemployment figures	3	16.7	2	12.5	4	26.7	1	4.0	5	29.4	2	25.0	12	24.0	5	10.2
N		18		16		15		25		17		8		50		49

In this study, the authors were able to look at whether or not outcomes of the program met the standards set by administrators. Table XLIX shows the youths own perceptions as to the usefulness of the program in their present occupation. Only those claiming to have received vocational training responded.

Table XLIX

Interviewees Enrolled in Vocational Program Perceiving Vocational Training As Useful in Present Occupation by Sex

	No		Yes		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	20	87.0	3	13.0	23	92.0
Female	2	100.0	0	0.0	2	8.0
Total	22	88.0	3	12.0	25	100.0

Although this question was not applicable to 51 of the respondents for reasons of unemployment, prison, etc., this data in Table XLIX still seem to be adequate. The table shows that the youths did not feel that their vocational experience at training school was applicable to their present occupation. Whether it was useful in prior occupations is not shown in this table. As shown in the table, 87.0% of the males and 100.0% of the females reported that the vocational program was not useful.

If we consider the same information by the sample years, we might expect to find that vocational training was more useful to the 1971 sample than to the other two samples. It would seem that the 1971 sample, in general, being at an earlier stage in their occupational careers and also being more recently released from TS, should be more apt to use the low level, basic work skills which are learned at TS. Table L was constructed to examine this possibility.

Table L

Interviewees Enrolled in Vocational Program Perceiving Vocational Training As Useful in Present Occupation by Year

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	8	88.9	8	88.9	7	100.0	23	92.0
Yes	1	11.1	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	8.0
Total	9	36.0	9	36.0	7	28.0	25	100.0

As shown in the above table, the usefulness of vocational training did differ as we expected. However, there were too few youths who used the training to provide any analysis of much value.

Education

As Daniel Glaser, a leading authority in the field of corrections, rightly has pointed out, "nobody known conclusively and precisely the effectiveness of correctional education."[44] Glaser's statement is probably even more true for training school education than for adult correctional education. The authors know of no studies either within the State or outside of it which have specifically dealt with the question of training school education. In this section, we attempted to gain a perspective on the effectiveness of the Iowa Training Schools' academic education program. Emphasis was given to the goals and purposes of the program and the congruence between these goals and outcomes (the achievement or non-achievement of goals).

Educational activities at Iowa's Training Schools are, of course, designed for rehabilitation or treatment purposes. The academic programs' "major objective is to prepare students academically, socially, and emotion-

[44] Daniel Glaser, "The Effectiveness of Correctional Education," American Journal of Correction, 28,2 (March-April, 1966): 4-9.

ally for re-entry into the public school system."[45] Admittedly, re-entry is a formidable challenge in itself. Teachers at the Training Schools are faced with a number of disadvantageous conditions. The students themselves are generally alienated from academic school because of negative school experiences outside the TS. In addition, the students "average two years academic retardation and many have severe reading disabilities."[46]

In spite of these conditions, our data appear to indicate that the academic education was fairly successful in achieving its primary goal of re-entry into the public school system.

From our survey of the youths, we have constructed Table LI which shows an apparent association between participation in the academic education program and re-entry into school.

Table LI

Interviewees Returning to School after Release from Training School by Vocational Program by Sex

	Males				Females			
	Ed. prog.		No ed.		Ed. prog.		No ed.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Returned	45	81.8	6	40.0	27	96.4	1	33.3
Not returned	10	18.2	9	60.0	1	3.6	2	66.7
Total	55	100.0	15	100.0	28	100.0	3	100.0

It will be seen that for both sexes there was a significant difference between the re-entry rates of those who participated and those that did not. The difference was great for both sexes, with approximately 60% more females

[45] "Discussion of Program," February, 1973, p. 2.

[46] Ibid.

and 40% more males returning to school if they were involved in the academic education program.

Table LII provides the same information by year.

These tables make it appear that the training schools were least successful with the 1971 sample in the accomplishment of re-entry. Twenty-seven and three-tenths percent of the youths in the 1971 sample did not return to school, while only 11.8% of the 1968 sample and 3.8% of the 1965 sample failed to return. Despite the sizeable percentage of youths who did not return, it should be stated that the overall return rate seems to be fairly consistent with the program's goal of re-entry into school.

Although the schools seem to have achieved their major aim, at least in the samples studied, it would seem that the educational program is charged with a more important and difficult goal. The program should be directed at the specific objectives of preparing the youths with sufficient resources to compete equally for a reasonable share in American abundance. In terms of education, this, of course, entails providing the intellectual skills and courses necessary for a college education, an achievement orientation toward education, and various other resources.

While these goals are admittedly relatively high compared to the educational programs' present standards, totally successful treatment of the youths can be achieved only through the use of standards that are far in advance of those presently established.

Census data have repeatedly demonstrated the fact that economic success, i.e., income and occupational success, is generally contingent upon educational success. In spite of the vocational, paraprofessional, and other alternative forms of education, a college education is still the key

Table LII

Interviewees Returning to School by Educational Program by Year

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Ed. prog.		No ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.		Ed.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Returned	26	96.3	2	25.0	30	88.2	3	42.9	16	72.7	2	66.7	72	86.7	7	38.9
Not returned	1	3.7	6	75.0	4	11.8	4	57.1	6	27.3	1	33.3	11	13.3	11	61.1
Total	27	100.0	8	100.0	34	100.0	7	100.0	22	100.0	3	100.0	83	100.0	18	100.0

to success.[47] And, of course, it does not require a Harvard PhD. in Sociology to realize the crucial importance of educational achievement for institutionalized youths who typically come from lower-class families. The social origins of these youths hamper their educational mobility from the start.

Unfortunately, there were no matched comparison groups of non-delinquent youths available. However, educational achievement of our sample was compared to the educational achievement of a census sample of all persons 25 years and above. Tables LIII and LIV display the educational achievement. It should be made clear that our 1968 and 1971 samples tend to be younger than 25 and thus the educational achievement of these samples is likely to increase. However, a rough idea of our total sample's educational achievement can be attained since most of the youths have had sufficient time to graduate from high school. It should also be pointed out that the four youths categorized in Table LIII as having completed one to two years of college are the only persons in our sample currently enrolled in college.

Table LIII

Educational Achievement of Interviewees by Educational Program by Sex

	Males				Females				Total			
	Ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
8 grades	1	2.2	1	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	2.8	1	9.9
1-3 years h. s.	27	60.0	5	55.5	14	51.8	1	50.0	41	56.9	6	54.5
G.E.D.	2	4.4	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.8	2	18.2

(table continued on next page)

[47] Charles H. Anderson demonstrates this fact in his discussion of U.S. Bureau of Census data. See Charles H. Anderson, Toward a New Sociology, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1971, pp. 142-146.

Table LIII (Continued)

	Males				Females				Total			
	Ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.		Ed.		No ed.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High school grad.	13	28.9	1	11.1	10	37.0	1	50.0	23	31.9	2	18.2
1-2 years college	2	4.4	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	4	5.6	0	0.0
Total	45	99.9	9	99.9	27	99.9	2	100.0	72	100.0	11[48]	99.8

Table LIV

Educational Achievement for Persons 25 Years Old and Above in the United States[49]

	Less than 8 grades %	8 grades %	1 to 3 years high school %	High school grad. %	1 to 3 years college %	4 years college or more %	Total %
Total	16	14	17	32	10	11	100

The above tables appear to show that the percentage of youths participating in the education program who graduate from high school (31.9%) is nearly the same as the national norm. Training school youths are actually significantly under-represented among those having completed eight or fewer grades.

An obvious difference between the training school youths who participated in the educational program and the national sample comes in the categories of 1 to 3 years of college and 4 years of college or more. For training school youths with an involvement in the education program, only 5.6% have completed even 1 to 2 years of college and none have received education beyond this level. In the Census Bureau sample, 10.0% completed 1 to 3 years of college and 11.0% finished four or more years of college.[50]

[48]There are 18 missing observations in Table LIII.

[49]Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

A comprehensive explanation of the disparity in the categories of college education would seem to require a discussion of the influence of a person's class and the inheritance of privilege in the United States. Such a macro-analysis is not the purpose of this study. Rather, our focus in on mutable factors and situations which are readily subject to change by the State Department of Social Services.

Another factor which delimits the effectiveness of the educational program is the shuttling of youths from one program to the next and from training school to placement and vice versa. Although we were not able to empirically verify this suspicion, the entrance and departure of the youths into the educational program and other programs at irregular intervals throughout the year obviously detracts from the program's coherence and impact. This deficiency seemed to be more pronounced at the Boys' Training School.

Other factors which it is hypothesized by the authors might have a negative impact on the educational program were as follows:

(1) Salaries of the faculty compared to salaries of the faculties in public schools;
(2) Amount of money spent on school supplies and curriculum per year, per student;
(3) Amount of money spent for upgrading present facilities per year; and,
(4) Inadequate library facilities - number of books and periodicals in training school libraries compared to public school libraries.

[50]As stated earlier, the 4 youths who have completed 1 to 2 years of college are still attending college. It is, of course, possible that they may eventually graduate. Graduation would merely shift the 5.6% to the next category where 11.0% have completed 4 or more years of college. Thus, the chances of significant inflow of Training School youths into the 4 or more years category appear slim. Inflow from lower levels to either of the college categories also appears doubtful as only 2 other youths were attending school at the time of the interview. These youths were enrolled in the tenth grade.

Despite the fact that this information was specifically requested from Training School officials, it was not provided.

The lack of college education among training school youths can probably be partially attributed to a melange of micro-factors. One deficiency of the education program at the Boys' Training School is an inadequate core of college preparatory courses. For example, two areas of study which seem to be crucial for college-bound students are foreign language and science. The Boys' Training School provides no foreign language courses and there are no science laboratory facilities.

Educational opportunities for college preparation do seem to have improved at the Girls' Training School with the Simpson Bridge Project allowing girls to attend Simpson College or Indianola High School. While several youths at the Boys' Training School have attended classes at the University of Northern Iowa, no programs such as that at Simpson College are available to the boys.

A final factor which seems to have an enormous effect on "who goes to college" or even "who graduates from high school" is the "tracking system" which has been established mainly at the Boys' Training School. When a youth initially enters training school, his case is received by a Programming Committee which decides, taking in consideration the youth's preference, whether he is placed on the "academic" track or the "vocational" track.[51] This Committee's judgment of the youth's academic potential is generally narrowly defined in terms of standardized and structured intelli-

[51]The criteria used by this Committee has varied over the years. For example, a few years ago decisions were based solely on a person's age. If a youth was under 16, he was put on the academic track simply because this was the law. Persons over 16 were generally shunted into the vocational track - again, we are referring to the Boys' Training School.

gence and achievement tests, along with past school records.[52] These tests, in addition to the Social History Report, which has been previously discussed, are used to place the youth in "appropriate" learning situations.

Through this process, the youths are channeled away from college. If the Committee decides that a youth has "academic potential," he is placed in a classroom with other youths similarly categorized. As shown earlier, persons in this track have a decent chance to graduate from high school. On the other hand, if the Committee decides that a youth is "not academically inclined," he is taught different materials, spends more time in vocational classes, and he eventually absorbs the idea that he is not capable of academic achievement and that he should pass up high school or college. These youths on the "vocational track" are naturally taught by teachers who "know" the youths are not "academically inclined" and not expected to achieve in academic settings.[53]

Training school officials maintain that those selected into the two areas may not be equal when they enter the institutions. Those going into the vocational "track" are typically those displaying less apptitude, less motivation, learning disabilities, etc. In other words, these are the youngsters who have failed in an academic setting on the outside, so they cannot be expected to handle academics at the training schools. The authors believe, on the other hand, that training schools are in a position to turn

[52]A good deal of sociological and psychological literature has been devoted to demonstrating how such tests discriminate against lower status youths and also undermeasure important personal attributes such as spontaneity and creativity.

[53]The matter of teachers' low expectations of working class and minority children has received much attention. For example, see Robert Rosenthal and Lenore F. Jacobson, Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968) pp. 61-97.

this pattern around, rather than perpetuate it. If a youth was evaluated without reference to prior performance, it might be found that an individual possessed more potential than records show. The tracking system would appear to have yet another ill effect on a youth's self-esteem, namely that of labeling the vocational trainee as the worst of the training school population and then placing all those so labeled together during the day.

Many training school personnel would possibly argue that not going to college is a personal decision for the youths. This sort of argument typically assumes that working class youth (training school youth) are simply inclined to favor mechanical-vocational type jobs. The argument further states that these youth are not capable, in a social-psychological sense, to forego the immediate gratification of earning money for the later payoff of higher education. It should not be surprising if this type of philosophy is pervasive among training school personnel. After all, the Code of Iowa seems to specifically subscribe to the idea that working class youth (training school youth) should be socialized and prepared to accept lower level jobs. As can be seen below, no mention is even made of academic education:

> The state director shall cause the boys and girls in said schools to be instructed...in such branches of useful knowledge as are adapted to their age and capacity...in some regular course of labor, either mechanical, agricultural, or manufactural as is best suited to their age, strength, disposition, capacity, reformation, and well being.[54]

The authors' view is somewhat different. It seems to us that the youths' needs would be better met if they had an equal chance to study engineering or business at the college level. By "programming" the youths into the "vocational track," as the Code suggests, a college education is a rare outcome.

[54] Code of Iowa, Vol. I., Chapter 242.4, 1973, pp. 1060-1061.

It is important that our main point be understood. That is, we do not take the position that everyone should complete high school or go to college. But, as the economy presently stands, everyone who desires a decent job must complete high school, and increasingly attend college.[55] Therefore, all barriers at the training schools to educational mobility should be eliminated. In part, this would entail abandonment of the "tracking philosophy" and the notion that training school youths are "culturally impoverished" and thus incapable of fairly high level accomplishment.

Income

In all except 22 cases, we were able to gain information on the youths' yearly income. We show these data in Table LV, which also contains income data for the entire United States, displayed only for purposes of rough comparison. Due to the over-representation of female unemployment, our discussion of income will focus on males.

Table LV

Income Classes for Training School Sample by Sex

	Under 3,000		3,000 to 4,999		5,000 to 6,999		7,000 to 8,999		9,000 to 11,999		12,000+		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	12	23.5	8	15.6	11	21.6	8	15.6	11	21.6	1	2.1	51	100.0
Female	21	75.0	2	7.1	4	14.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	28	100.0
Total	33	41.8	10	12.7	15	19.0	8	10.1	11	13.9	2	2.5	79	100.0
Total U.S.	11%		12%		16%		25%				24%		88%	

[55] Anderson, op. cit, p. 149.

A comparison of the Training School samples and the national population is interesting in that the proportion of persons whose income is below the so-called "poverty level" of $3,000 is so widely separated with 23.5% for the males in our sample and 11% in the national sample. It also appears that the training school males might have a significantly lower proportion in the upper economic brackets. We must, however, be cautious about either of these generalizations because the national sample was older and thus more likely to have decent income levels. The national sample also includes all socio-economic classes, while the training school sample was comprised mainly of youths from working class families. Also, as can be seen in the two tables, we utilized different income groupings for several income classes. Our main purpose in presenting these income data is merely to provide a descriptive picture of the youths' post-training school income.

Correlations between Other Criteria and Recidivism Criterion

In this section, an attempt was made to ascertain correlations between the criteria of income education, and occupation and reconviction. In all correlations, we have used the Pearson Product Moment Correlation because the income, education, and occupation factors were continuous variables and also because in many cases the expected number per cell was less than 5.[56]

The reader should be cautioned that the correlations in this section do not tell us anything about causality, i.e., which variable influences which. Therefore, as R. G. Hood, a prominent criminologist, has noted, "a high correlation between other criteria of success and avoidance of reconviction

[56]Other procedures, such as X2 tests, are not valid tests when the cell numbers are so low.

should not be taken as proof of a causal relationship."[57] Instead, the correlational method has been used to look at possible relationships between variables. In particular, the relationships between other criteria of success/failure and the criterion of recidivism are reported.

Exact comparison of the following correlations with correlations found in previous works was not possible. As mentioned at the first part of this chapter, others before us have found certain other criteria, i.e., lack of adjustment and deterioration,[58] work habits, residential stability, leisure pursuits, and response to supervision,[59] good industrial adjustment, fulfillment of economic responsibilities and good family relationships[60] to be associated with recidivism.

In view of other criminological research on the relationship of recidivism to the offender's experiences in the community, the associations or lack of associations found in this study may seem a bit surprising.

As shown in Table LVI, the amount of association between our success/failure (recidivism) variable and the school and income variables was so low as to lack significance. The negative correlation of -.0915 between recidivism and occupation is even further from the high positive correlation which was expected.

[57]R. G. Hood, The Borstal System, (London: Her Majesty's Stationary, 1964), p. 171.

[58]J. Rumney and J. P. Murphy, Probation and Social Adjustment, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

[59]R. G. Hood, op. cit.

[60]Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Delinquent Women (200-241) and Five Hundred Criminal Careers, 217-223.

Table LVI

Correlation Matrix of Other Criteria and Recidivism Criteria

	Success/ Fail	Education	Occupation	Income
Success/Failure (recidivism)	1.0000	.1361	-.0915	.2632
Education (highest completed grade)		1.0000	.1538	.0252
Occupation (present occupation)			1.0000	.7834
Income (yearly income, present occupation)				1.0000

Several explanations of these unanticipated findings seem plausible. First, it is possible that our definition of failure on the basis of recidivism was so broad as to include some persons who may not have truly been failures. A dichotomous criterion of success/failure based solely on one or more convictions, such as ours, tells us nothing about the type of offense, or the circumstances under which the offense was committed.[61] Under our definition of recidivism, for example, a person committed for aggravated assault who returns to school and obtains a high status occupation with a decent wage, but subsequently commits one petty larceny within three years after release, may be classified as a failure. In this case, it may be called a success that the person refrained from the violence evidence in his/her committing offense and also was successful in other experiences in the community.

[61] R. G. Hood, op. cit., p. 70.

Considering the experience of the Gluecks in an analyses of offenders' post-prison experiences,[62] it seems reasonable to assume that a modification of our definition of recidivism could result in higher correlations of income, education, and occupation with recidivism. In the Gluecks' study of 500 male criminals, 41.9% of those who were industrially successful showed some degree of recidivism. Using a more rigid definition of recidivism, only 2.4% of the industrial successes turned out to be total failures, and 75.0% of the industrial failures turned out to be total failures.[63]

Another explanation is that the distorted representation of female unemployment no doubt had a depressing effect on correlations involving income or occupation. The high number of females classified as unemployed probably inflated the income category of "less than $3,000" and the occupation category of "unemployed."

The high degrees of association which we had anticipated between education and income and education and occupation also were not found, with the exception of the high correlation (.7834) between occupation and income. Again the high number of females categorized as unemployed probably affected these correlations.

Table LVII, for males only,[64] was constructed in order to eliminate the biasing effects of the so-called unemployed females.

[62] Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Criminal Careers, pp. 217-223.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Due to the extremely small numbers in some cells of the variables for females, it was not deemed worthwhile to include a table for them.

Table LVII

Correlation Matrix of Other Criteria and Recidivism for Males

	Success/ Fail	Education	Occupation	Income
Success/Failure	1.0000	.1465	.1359	.0512
Education		1.0000	.1493	.0848
Occupation			1.0000	.7202
Income				1.0000

Somewhat to our surprise, the exclusion of females did not result in a finding of high correlations between education, occupation, and income and recidivism. The only significant change was the strong relationship found between education and income.

YOUTHS' EVALUATIONS OF TRAINING SCHOOL PROGRAM

One of the assessment techniques utilized in this study was to administer interviews with youths who had been committed to the two Iowa State Training Schools. As indicated earlier, the interviews were designed to elicit the youths' opinions and perceptions about the schools. The purpose of this technique was to find clues about the strengths and weaknesses of the institutions' treatment programs.

General Assessment

The concept of diversion in juvenile justice seems to be gaining credibility among both practitioners and academicians. An integral part of the diversion school of thought is the view that contacts with the juvenile justice system produce more harm than benefit for many youths.[65] In the area of juvenile corrections, the "diversion" concept has been translated into endeavors to reduce the number of youths sent through the juvenile justice machinery.

Thus far most of the testimony on the values and limitations of diversion policies has been presented by professionals, e.g., probation officers, correctional administrators and staff, criminologists, etc. In this study, the researchers sought a different perspective: the opinions of the youths themselves.

Table LVIII presents data on the opinions of the 101 interviewees as to the relative effectiveness of training school, community programs, and other

---

[65] Edwin Lemert, Instead of Court, (New York: National Mental Health Institute, 1973), p. 8.

Table LVIII

Interviewees' Opinions of Most Effective Correctional Alternative

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Training school	8	30.8	5	55.6	9	34.6	10	71.4	6	35.3	3	37.5	23	33.3	18	58.1
Community	11	42.3	2	22.2	8	30.8	2	14.3	8	47.1	2	25.0	27	39.1	6	19.4
Neither	7	26.9	2	22.2	9	34.6	2	14.3	3	17.6	3	37.5	19	27.5	7	22.6
Total	26	100.0	9	100.0	26	100.0	14	100.0	17	100.0	8	100.0	69	99.9	31	100.1

possibilities. (The N's in these tables may vary according to the number for whom the question was appropriate.)

Of our male sample, approximately 30% in each sample year felt that the Boys' Training School was the most effective alternative. Females in the sample years were even more supportive of the Mitchellville program.

For those youths who felt that a stay at training school would be most effective, reasons for such preference varied. These youths said that the Training School allowed them to get away from pressures at home, gave them time to work out personal and family problems, afforded them the opportunity for counseling, and kept them out of the community at a time when they were likely to commit more delinquent activities.

The one-third of the youths who desired to be left in the community offered an assortment of reasons for their opinion. Some of the reasons specified by the youths are summarized in this way:

1. The problems were due to emotional or maturational reasons and were not serious enough to require training school;

2. Treatment programs of any kind are not helpful. People can only help themselves;

3. The Training School situation is different from the situation in communities. A youth can only learn to adjust to the community in the community; and,

4. The Training School has harmful effects such as providing the potential for learning additional criminal behavior and a stigma which delimits social and employment opportunities.

Youths who stated that neither training school nor being left in the community would have been effective also listed a variety of preferences. Some of the more frequently cited choices were as follows: foster home placements, group home placements out of home community, out-of-state placements, moves to different cities, group home placements in home community, and counseling for youths.

Viewing these data from a somewhat different perspective, Table LVIII appears to show that sizable proportions of males and females in each sample year felt that the Training School was less effective than being left in the community or other alternatives. For example, of the 1971 sample, 64.7% of the males and 62.5% of the females preferred either being left in the community or other alternatives. A qualifier is needed, however, since earlier samples of girls seemed to prefer institutionalization.

Ratings of Individual Treatment Programs

Each element of the Training Schools' overall treatment program is presumed to contribute to the youths' rehabilitation and to the youths' ability to adjust to institutional and outside societal communities. Whereas the rigorous controls required to assess the effects of these elements on outcomes were not built into the study design, no attempt was made to determine their effects. Instead, the researchers sought information on the various treatment programs which was more general and reformist in nature. To achieve this aim, youths were asked to give a simple rating to each element of the treatment program and to explain their ratings.

In general, the youths' ratings of the academic education program could be classified as being fairly favorable. The highest proportions of males and females indicating dislike for the program were found in the 1971 sample, in which 33.3% of the males and 28.6% of the females reported a negative evaluation (Table LIX).

Those who disliked school at the Training School complained that the overall education was of a low quality and the curriculum was too narrow, plus a general dislike for schools of any kind, and other school-related matters. Youths who indicated a liking for the school program cited high

Table LIX

Interviewees' Ratings of Academic School Program

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	11	57.9	7	87.5	12	57.1	12	85.7	9	60.0	3	42.9	32	58.2	22	75.9
Indifferent	2	10.5	1	12.5	4	19.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	2	28.6	7	12.7	3	10.3
Dislike	6	31.6	0	0.0	5	23.8	2	14.3	5	33.3	2	28.6	16	29.1	4	13.8
Total	19	100.0	8	100.0	21	99.9	14	100.0	15	100.0	7	100.1	55	100.0	29	100.0

quality teachers, the individualized approach used, and other qualities of the training school academic program.

The youths' ratings of the vocational program were even more favorable than their ratings of the school program. In Table LX, it may be observed that considerable proportions of the males interviewed in all three years looked favorably on the vocational program. Positive evaluations were highest in the 1971 male population, where 92.9% expressed approval. Due to the lack of vocational programs at the Girls' Training School and resulting low participation, the small number of females responding to this question prevented generalization.

One of the more frequently mentioned reasons for favoring the vocational program was that it served as preparation for employment outside of the institution. As has already been shown, this opinion is in contradiction with other information on the youths' post-release employment.

In Table LXI, the youths' ratings of the cottage meetings are given.

Of those participating in cottage meetings, significant proportions indicated dissatisfaction, although the greatest single response was favorable. For example, 37.0% of the 1968 males and 56.3% of the 1971 males reported dislike for the program. A sizable proportion of the number of females included in Table LXI also stated a dislike for the meetings.

The main reasons given for disapproval of the meetings was that the meetings too often resembled a "cut-down" session. According to the respondents, some inmates and staff sometimes used the meetings for the purpose of enbarrassing, harassing, and chastizing particular inmates. Many of the sizable proportion disliking the meetings felt so strongly as to recommend that the meetings be eliminated. Positive assessments of the meetings typically centered around the opinions that the meetings helped the youths to

Table LX

Interviewees' Ratings of Vocational Programs

	1965				1968				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	13	76.5	1	100.0	9	64.3	1	100.0	35	77.8	4	80.0
Indifferent	2	11.8	0	0.0	2	14.3	0	0.0	4	8.9	1	20.0
Dislike	2	11.8	0	0.0	3	21.4	0	0.0	6	13.3	0	0.0
Total	17	100.1	1	100.0	14	100.0	1	100.0	45	100.0	5	100.0

Table LXI

Interviewees' Ratings of Cottage Meetings

	1965				1968				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	9	45.0	0	0.0	14	51.9	2	50.0	28	44.4	3	33.3
Indifferent	9	45.0	0	0.0	3	11.1	0	0.0	14	22.2	0	0.0
Dislike	2	10.0	2	100.0	10	37.0	2	50.0	21	33.3	6	66.7
Total	20	100.0	2	100.0	27	100.0	4	100.0	63	99.9	9	100.0

learn about themselves and others by talking about their problems and that the meetings provided a chance for the youths to communicate their feelings to the staff.

The ratings of the Health Center treatment program can be seen in Table LXII. Substantial proportions of the males from all three years indicated disapproval of the program. Analysis of the large proportion of males providing a negative evaluation should probably be curtailed, as it seems likely that respondents based their answers only on the detention portion of the program.

Table LXII

Male Interviewees' Ratings of Health Center Treatment Program

	1965		1968		1971		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	3	42.9	1	8.3	0	0.0	4	17.4
Indifferent	1	14.3	3	25.0	0	0.0	4	17.4
Dislike	3	42.9	8	66.7	4	100.0	15	65.2
Total	7	100.1	12	100.0	4	100.0	23	100.0

In addition to the ratings, the youths were asked to explain their ratings. Poor treatment and too much confinement were frequently cited. Few of those who indicated dislike of the program for reasons of poor or improper treatment offered a definition of "good" or "bad" treatment. While no precise definitions were obtained, many of the youths' answers seemed to reflect disdain for the humaneness of the treatment. One of the boys made this pointed observation: "We were treated too much like animals. I felt I needed to be punished, but not that way."

Table LXIII

Interviewees' Ratings of Off-Grounds Employment

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	8	100.0	0	0.0	10	83.3	0	0.0	10	76.9	1	100.0	28	84.8	1	100.0
Indifferent	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	0	0.0	1	3.0	0	0.0
Dislike	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	4	12.1	0	0.0
Total	8	100.0	0	0.0	12	100.0	0	0.0	13	100.0	1	100.0	33	99.9	1	100.0

As stated earlier, off-grounds employment is a part of the vocational program. The ratings of youths who worked in off-grounds employment are shown in Table LXIII.

In Table LXIII, it may be seen that over three-fourths of the males in 1965, 1968, and 1971 liked off-grounds employment. The only female who participated also gave a positive evaluation.

The most frequently cited reasons for favoring the program were that it provided opportunities to be outdoors, to be away from the Training School, and to earn some money. The main objections to off-grounds employment were that the pay was insufficient and the type of work offered was not interesting.

As pointed out earlier, the family therapy program began in 1971. Therefore, only the 1971 population had a chance to participate in it. The participants' ratings are given in Table LXIV, which indicates that over 42.9% of the males and 100.0% of the females disliked the program. Some of those who favored the program reported that it helped the entire family and afforded the youths a chance to be with their families.

Table LXIV

1971 Interviewees' Ratings of Family Therapy

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	3	42.9	0	0.0	3	33.3
Indifferent	1	14.3	0	0.0	1	11.1
Dislike	3	42.9	2	100.0	5	55.6
Total	7	100.1	2	100.0	9	100.0

Despite the fairly positive assessment of some youths, 42.9% of males who participated gave a negative rating. The main reason for disliking the program was that it did not alleviate or change the youths' family situation.

Table LXV shows the youths' ratings of the recreation programs.

Referring to Table LXV, it appears that the males gave the program a more favorable rating than the females. Ratings were lowest for both sexes in 1971, with two-thirds of the females (66.7%) and one-half of the males (50.0%) voicing dislike for the program.

Three of the most frequently cited reasons given by those respondents favoring the program were as follows:

(1) The program was well planned;

(2) It offered an alternative to sitting in the cottage; and

(3) The program was liked by some due to their general interest in all kinds of sports and recreation.

Youths who disliked the program gave several reasons. Two of these were that they did not like sports in general and that they were made to do things they did not like.[66]

The next table (Table LXVI) shows the youths' ratings of the church program.

Significant proportions of the males (28.0%, 1965; 38.5%, 1968; and 33.3%, 1971) and a small proportion of the females (14.3%, 1968 and 1971) indicated dislike for the church program. Many who disliked the program

[66]Other than the recreation program, the conspicuous absence of outdoor activities for youths at both Training Schools and the tremendous amount of emphasis on keeping the boys (and girls) indoors implied, at least to the authors, a heavy stress on security. Informal interviews with members of the professional staff at the Ft. Madison Penitentiary corroberated this view. According to several of the staff (who claimed to be familiar with the Training School operations), the Training Schools place an inordinate amount of stress on security.

Table LXV

Interviewees' Ratings of Recreation Programs

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	16	66.7	2	28.6	16	64.0	7	50.0	7	43.8	1	16.7	39	60.0	10	37.0
Indifferent	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	12.0	2	14.3	1	6.3	1	16.7	4	6.2	3	11.1
Dislike	8	33.3	5	71.4	6	24.0	5	35.7	8	50.0	4	66.7	22	33.8	14	51.9
Total	24	100.0	7	100.0	25	100.0	14	100.0	16	100.1	6	100.1	65	100.0	27	100.0

Table LXVI

Interviewees' Ratings of Church Program

	1965				1968				1971				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Like	12	48.0	6	66.7	7	26.9	9	64.3	9	60.0	5	71.4	28	42.4	20	66.7
Indifferent	6	24.0	3	33.3	9	34.6	3	21.4	1	6.7	1	14.3	16	24.2	7	23.3
Dislike	7	28.0	0	0.0	10	38.5	2	14.3	5	33.3	1	14.3	22	33.3	3	10.0
Total	25	100.0	9	100.0	26	100.0	14	100.0	15	100.0	7	100.0	66	99.9	30	100.0

reported that they did not appreciate being "forced" to attend church services.

Of those who liked the program, most stated that they liked church in general and that church gave them a chance to get out of the cottage.

Inmates Recommendations for Program Change

In addition to collecting data on inmate ratings of the treatment program and reasons for these ratings, the researchers attempted to gather more tangible data which can easily be utilized by administrators. These data were gathered with an emphasis on decisions rather than finding out ultimate causes.[67] Thus, the researchers strove to provide the administrators with data with which to permit more informed decision-making.

In this section, a particular decision problem, "what changes (from the viewpoint of the consumer) are needed in the treatment program?" is examined.

The various training school programs and the proportions of those desiring change in these programs are shown in Table LXVII. From the considerable proportions of youths favoring change in each program, it may be concluded that there is a great deal of sentiment for change in training school treatment programs. The following specific changes were suggested by the former residents:

Academic Program:

1. The program needs to be upgraded so it is more comparable to public school.
2. A larger variety and number of courses are needed.
3. Better teachers are needed.

---

[67] A. Wald, "Statistical Decision Function," (1950, London, Chapman and Hall).

Table LXVII

Proportion of Interviewees Favoring Changes in Training School Programs

	1965				1968				1971			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Academic	8 40.0	12 60.0	5 55.6	4 44.4	8 34.8	15 65.2	6 42.9	7 50.0	7 43.8	7 43.8	4 57.1	3 42.9
Vocational	7 35.0	13 65.0	3 60.0	2 40.0	8 38.1	13 61.9	4 50.0	4 50.0	5 31.3	11 68.8	3 50.0	3 50.0
Cottage	13 50.0	13 50.0	5 83.3	1 16.7	17 65.4	9 34.6	8 61.5	5 38.5	14 82.4	3 17.6	4 57.1	3 42.9
Health Center Treatment	9 52.9	8 47.1			14 77.8	4 22.2			7 70.0	3 30.0	1 100.0	0 0.0
Family Therapy									4 36.4	7 63.6	1 33.3	2 66.7
Recreation	10 38.5	16 61.5	7 77.8	2 22.2	13 48.1	14 51.9	11 78.6	3 21.4	8 50.0	8 50.0	4 57.1	3 42.9
Church	11 42.3	15 57.7	3 37.5	5 62.5	16 59.3	11 40.7	5 35.7	9 64.3	10 62.5	6 37.5	1 14.3	6 85.7
Off-Grounds Employment	10 62.5	6 37.5	3 75.0	1 25.0	12 63.2	7 36.8	7 77.8	2 22.2	7 46.7	8 53.3	2 40.0	3 60.0

4. Courses need to be more relevant to students' needs relating to school readmittance or college.

Vocational Program:

1. More vocational areas are needed, especially at the Girls' Training School.

2. The vocational program should be made available to everyone.

3. Areas of vocational training should be more applicable to the job market in society.

Cottage Program:

1. Instead of the present arrangement with all of the boys sleeping in the same room, the inmates interviewed recommended separate rooms for more privacy.

2. Less time confined to the cottage is advised by the inmates.

3. The inmates indicated the need for more free time.

4. There should be fewer persons living in each cottage. The cottages are usually too crowded.

5. Cottage staff who genuinely care about the youths and understand their problems are needed.

6. Efforts should be made to increase communication between the youths and the cottage staff.

7. Cottage meetings should be fundamentally changed or eliminated.

8. Newspapers and other sources of news should be more accessible to students in cottages.

Health Center Treatment Program:

1. Less confinement and more freedom are desired by the former training school inmates.

2. Look into the health care practices, especially the dental care at the Boys' Training School.

3. Detention should not be used for runaways.

4. The amount of time in detention should be decreased drastically or detention should be eliminated.

5. Unnecessary use of drugs for control purposes should be investigated.

Off-Grounds Employment:

1. More of the inmates should have the opportunity to participate in the programs. The program should not be restricted to the use of a few.

2. The training school should have more employment opportunities in the communities.

3. If communities of Eldora and Mitchellville can't provide adequate employment opportunities, facilities similar to Ft. Des Moines should be developed for juveniles.[68]

Family Therapy:

1. The program should be enlarged to provide services to more youths and families.

2. Parents should be induced to play a more active role in the program.

Recreation:

1. Inmates should not be forced to participate in recreation programs.

2. The recreation facilities should be accessible to the inmates for longer periods of time.

3. A larger proportion of the inmates' daily activities should be recreation-related.

4. More and better recreation activities are needed, including off-grounds programs to add variety.

5. The training schools should have their own athletic teams which compete with teams from other public schools.

Church:

1. The requirement of mandatory church attendance should be dropped at the Boys' Training School.

2. Inmates should be given a broader choice of religious services at both training schools.

Besides the above recommendations to reform the present treatment program, inmates had additional requests for changes. Three of the most cited

[68]Reference is to the Fort Des Moines Residential Treatment Program in Des Moines which diverts male offenders from adult correctional institutions.

recommendations were for an independent living skills program, a driver's education program, and more counseling (small groups and individual).

Youth Participation in Treatment Program Operation

The notion that inmates should have a voice in determining their own rehabilitation or treatment program is an integral component of the humanistic philosophy of corrections. Arguments for implementation of this notion have stated that inmate participation promotes the institutional goals of reduction of criminal behavior and management of inmates.

In addition to these arguments, it would seem that inmate participation may have other positive effects. Again, from the standpoint of prison management, it appears plausible that inmate participation in decisions regarding their own treatment would serve to increase inmate satisfaction and morale. Support for this assertion can be found in the area of business management which uses similar psychological principles. Another justification for inmate participation is that it would enable the inmates to assume some responsibility for their own behavior. In a situation where inmates were involved in the program operation, inmates would be responsible for making their own decisions and not allowing the staff to make decisions for them. Thus would inmate participation play a role in the socialization of inmates for reentry into the community.

Unfortunately, there is little empirical research in juvenile corrections which either seeks to ascertain the existence of inmate participation or assess its effects. Efforts were made in this study to determine the extent to which inmates at the training schools participate in treatment program decision-making.

From the data presented in Table LXVIII, the amount of inmate participation can be observed. As it shows, youths play a minimal part in the

Table LXVIII

Proportion of Interviewees Participating in Treatment Program Decision-Making

	1965				1968				1971			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %	N %
Academic	12 63.2	7 36.8	5 62.5	3 37.5	15 71.4	6 28.6	3 21.4	11 78.6	11 73.3	4 26.7	2 28.6	5 71.2
Vocational	15 88.2	2 11.8	1 100.0	0 0.0	12 85.7	2 14.3	0 0.0	1 100.0	13 92.9	1 7.1	3 75.0	1 25.0
Cottage Meetings	6 31.6	12 63.2	1 33.3	2 66.7	9 33.3	18 66.7	0 0.0	4 100.0	6 40.0	9 60.0	1 25.0	3 75.0
Health Center Treatment	2 40.0	3 60.0			6 50.0	6 50.0			0 0.0	4 100.0	0 0.0	1 100.0
Off-Grounds Employment	7 87.5	1 12.5			11 91.7	1 8.3			11 84.6	2 15.4	1 50.0	1 50.0
Family Therapy									4 57.1	3 42.9	1 33.3	2 66.7
Recreation	23 95.8	1 4.2	3 42.9	4 57.1	20 80.0	5 20.0	6 42.9	8 57.1	11 68.8	5 31.3	3 42.9	4 57.1
Church	7 28.0	18 72.0	2 22.2	7 77.8	5 19.2	21 80.8	2 14.3	12 85.7	2 13.3	13 86.7	3 42.9	4 57.1

decisions regarding some programs. Youth participation seems to be lowest in these programs: the church program, cottage meetings, and the Health Center treatment program. It should be noted that each of these programs received considerable criticism above.

Further it may be seen in Table LXVIII that the greatest amount of male participation occurred in the vocational program and the off-grounds employment program. Over 80% of the male youths who participated in these programs reported that they were involved in the decision to participate. It would not be safe, however, to conclude that youth participation was the greatest in these programs. The figures in Table LXVIII pertain only to those participating in the programs. It is likely that some of those not participating in a program were not involved in the decision to exclude them from that particular program.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE AT THE IOWA STATE TRAINING SCHOOLS

It should be emphasized at this point that the researchers fully endorse the recommendations of the former training school residents as presented in the preceding chapter. When one reflects upon the negative findings of the study, it is difficult to reach any conclusion except that there is a need for institutional change. And from our own view as "informed observers" who were deeply involved in analyzing the Training School situation, the type of change should be fundamental and immediate.

The recommended changes in the previous section are obviously reformist in nature. That is, they imply that the basic structure and treatment process of the Training Schools remain intact. The recommendations suggest, however, that significant internal changes are required.

That these changes should be sweeping seems only too clear upon examination of the data herein presented. A primary dictum of evaluation research is, "if a program is unsuccessful, it is either because the program failed to operationalize a particular theory or because the theory itself was deficient."[69] The solution to the first problem is to improve and upgrade the program processes which preclude realization of the ultimate objectives. In the case of the Training Schools, this could mean making vocational training relevant to the job market in society. Translated into the administrator's vocabulary, this comes out as more money, improved resource allocation, upgrading of personnel, etc.

---

[69]Edward Suchman, Evaluative Research.

The solution to the second type of failure relates to the various theoretical problems in a treatment-oriented notion of corrections. While it is quite likely that these theoretical deficiencies may be at the roots of the training schools' failure, ours is an empirical research venture and not a theoretical excursion.

Unfortunately, the remedy to the first problem--the problem of implementation--is not so simple in practice. Administrators do not control infinite resources which are marked for upgrading training schools. Variables, such as budgetary constraints, make it necessary for administrators to think in cost/benefit terms as a format for decision making.

Some key cost/benefit questions which administrators face in the case of the Training Schools are: "How do the Training Schools measure up when the Training School goals are assessed in terms of monetary and resource input?" "Are there alternative policies, e.g., community-based programs, which could be run more effectively and economically?" Perhaps these queries can be summarized in the question, "Are the Training Schools really worth it?"

Even though the purpose of this study was not policy analysis, we have formulated six basic recommendations. These recommendations are provided with an appreciation of the difficulty involved in comparing, predicting, and assessing different programs for juvenile offenders. Three points undergird the recommendations:

(1) The Training Schools have failed to sufficiently realize their goals and objectives;

(2) An abundance of resources will be required to operationalize the melange of much needed changes;

(3) Other policies and preferred choices appear more appropriate than training schools when costs and benefits are balanced.[70]

At this time, it should be clear that our recommendations are partially based upon qualitative rather than quantitative factors (as the study). This is not to say that the conclusions rest solely on the authority or the opinions of the researchers. Instead, the recommendations rest on a comprehensive analytical and in-depth analysis of the situation of the Iowa State Training Schools. A good piece of policy research which quantified and compared the costs and deficits of various programs would, of course, provide a "harder" base for the decision-oriented recommendations which follow.

Nevertheless, the results of this study should be considered as carefully as the results of a more rigorous analysis. Most importantly, information on how former Training School inmates are faring is finally available in this report. And, after all, this is a very legitimate type of information upon which to evaluate the effectiveness of the Training School program.

The authors urge administrators to utilize this information in the best interest of justice for juveniles in Iowa.

Rather than merely turning this information to the administrators of the Training Schools and waiting for the facts to speak for themselves, then, the authors prefer to make substantive recommendations for institutional change.

---

[70] Comparative research on the effectiveness of training schools and prisons versus community-based correctional alternatives is in an early stage. Thus far, the scant findings do seem to indicate the superiority of community-based choices, especially when the factors of recidivism, monetary cost, and type of offender are examined. Robert Martinson, among others, has written extensively in this area.

We believe the data in this report show a definite negative effect on those young people committed to an institution for those behaviors defined as status offenses. Therefore, the authors recommend that the Juvenile Code of Iowa, Chapter 232.2 13c & d, should be revised extensively to eliminate the sections that place children who commit no public offenses under the judicial system. These children deserve the right to treatment under the social services system, a system that does not place a stigma on them.

Children and their families deserve the right to non-interference by the courts and the social services system. However, children must be guaranteed certain rights that their parents cannot withhold from them. For this reason, and because in cases of court litigation the interest of the child and parent may be divergent, a child must be assured of the right to representation by an attorney regardless of the wishes of his/her parents.

Chapter 232.28, defining the right to counsel should be clarified. The "child, parents, guardian, and/or custodian shall have the right to legal counsel." In reading the court orders committing children to the custody of the State Director of the Division of Child and Family Services of the Department of Social Services, it appeared that parents were given the authority to waive legal counsel for the child. This would seem inconsistent with the protection of the rights of children, especially in the instance of status offenses when the complainant may in fact be the parents.

Chapter 232.1 of the Code says that:

> . . . each child coming within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court shall receive, preferably in his home, the care, guidance, and control that will conduce to his welfare and the best interests of the state, and that when he is removed from the control of his parents, the court shall secure for him care as nearly as possible equivalent to that which he should have seen given.

We feel that emphasis should be placed on maintaining a child in his/her home with removal to an institution taking place only when it can be proven that the child is a danger to him/herself and the community. An institutional setting can in no way approximate the home environment. An alternative to removal from the home (which is the place to which the majority of the children return following institutionalization anyway) is the establishment of more community-based programs and an effort to support the family rather than to break it up. Again, the data in this study, showing a high rate of recidivism, would indicate that neither the child's nor the State's best interests are being served by institutionalization.

Chapter 242.14 goes on to state that "the state director may transfer to the schools minor wards of the state from any institution under his charge . . ." This section gives to the director of the State Department of Social Services exclusive authority to transfer a child from another juvenile institution to a training school without specifying that the child shall have been adjudicated delinquent by a court. Since the emphasis on security at the schools differ, as does the clientele served, transfers should not be allowed without granting the child full legal rights.

Based on the recidivism rate and the apparent ineffectiveness of institutional programs, the authors recommend the closing of the Training School for Girls at Mitchellville and the Training School for Boys at Eldora. We further recommend that the small minority of youths who can be identified as seriously delinquent, both boys and girls, should be housed at Mitchellville which provides a somewhat more humane-appearing atmosphere than the facility at Eldora. It has the added advantage of being within a short distance of the major metropolitan center of Iowa where a vast array of community ser-

vices not available in the rural area surrounding Eldora could be utilized for the care and treatment of these individuals.

The overwhelming number of girls who enter this facility have never been convicted of a public offense. Instead they are committed under the vaguest of legal jargon:

> Chapter 232.2.13 defines a "delinquent child" as one:
>
> c. Who is uncontrolled by his parents, guardian, or legal custodian by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient.
>
> d. Who habitually deports himself in a manner that is injurious to himself or others.

It is almost impossible to understand exactly what modes of behavior fall under these subsections that most frequently affect the lives of teen-age girls. If the law were to be applied equitably, then virtually every adolescent at one time or another could be subject to punishment under these subsections of the Code. Since these subsections tend to strike most heavily against females, the use of these rationale for institutionalizing them is a blatant display of the double standard still in existence in this state.

For the types of behavior, such as sexual acting out, disobediance to parents, and running away, that are more generally enforced against females, treatment within the community would not only be more feasible but would also provide help to the family unit as a whole rather than an isolated individual. Community treatment rests upon the assumption, of course, that there is something wrong with these girls and that they are in need of some special kinds of treatment unwarranted by the majority of adolescent girls and boys. The wording of the Code ("uncontrolled by his parents") points to the parents as having problems in maintaining control or discipline so a logical extension would seem to be increased services to the family, thereby helping the parents to do a more adequate job of parenting.

The rationale for recommending the closure of the Eldora institution is based on the following:

1) at least 81% of those males interviewed proved to some degree to be failures;

2) the majority of those youths institutionalized present very little danger to the community, as evidenced by the relatively small number of violent crimes perpetrated by them;

3) when faced with institutional life, a youth is in danger of becoming institutionalized (or unable to function effectively without the external controls forced upon him) or of reacting to confinement by attempting to escape. It is at this point that his treatment may begin to focus upon the ways in which he presents a threat to the internal functionings of the institution rather than upon the problems he may have in adjusting to society;

4) in the study conducted by Martin Gold in Flint, Michigan, it was found that the majority of adolescents in that city had at one time or another been guilty of some form of delinquent behavior. If one assumes the results of this study would be duplicated in most locales, then the process of institutionalizing a small minority of children ceases to make a great deal of sense in light of the amount of delinquent behavior that goes undetected and therefore unpunished. No study has yet proved conclusively that getting caught has any deterrent value. In fact, Gold maintains that "Getting caught by the police had no deterrent effect on youngsters. On the contrary, youngsters who were caught went on to commit more offenses than youngsters who were not caught, no matter what the police did."[71] Also, based on the high degree of failure, it would appear that the process of institutionalization may have more negative than positive long-term effects.

5) the process of being labeled a delinquent may in the long run have a more detrimental effect on boys than on girls. Because of the types of offenses boys tend to commit, it is easier for them to become identified as a part of the "criminal" element even though they may be exhibiting fairly normal adolescent behavior. One must decide whether a boy could be helped more through the use of community resources that would not attach a stigma or through his removal from his home to an institution that isolates him from his family and his peers, deprives him of all forms of privacy, forces him into association with others who have similarly been declared delinquent and subjects him to constant scrutiny from staff.

---

[71] Martin Gold, Delinquent Behavior in an American City, (California: Brooks/Cole, 1970), p. 106.

6) the atmosphere at the Training School can in no way be said to approximate normal human living conditions. Both boys and girls are segregated from members of the opposite sex as well as from a peer group that would hopefully contain a cross section of behavioral norms. The physical setting is constraining and inhibits individuality. The use of the detention unit or threat of its use gives staff an easy out in dealing with behavior problems while the conditions of this unit are degrading to an individual. Obviously, the presence of such a facility does little if anything to deter the kinds of behaviors or actions that are the reason for its existence, since boys are repeatedly placed there.

And finally, the State Department of Social Services in conjunction with local communities should begin immediately to develop a plan for community-based correctional programs for juveniles. The policy of removing a child from his/her home and community for treatment places the total blame on that child without trying to change the environment that may have fostered the acting out behavior. To remove the child for a period of months only to send that child back into an unchanged environment to face the same problems does not make sense. We feel the total environment needs treatment, and this can best be accomplished through the coordinated efforts of the available community resources. Thus far, the local communities have failed in their efforts to "rehabilitate" almost 300 youngsters each year. These failures may be due to understaffed and overworked probation office staffs at the juvenile court level; however, we feel the policy of placing a child on probation needs examination to determine the effectiveness of this traditional method of treatment. Generally the child is given rules to follow such as a curfew, non-association with members of his/her peer group, and adherence to parental controls while reporting periodically to a probation officer. If a team approach were utilized, involving the active participation of the child with teachers, probation officers, social workers, and parents, the rate of success might increase. We feel the probation system should work to increase a child's self-esteem rather than pointing an accusatory finger.

To reiterate our position, we do not believe the present system works and that the time for major change is now.

APPENDIX A:

CENTRAL FILE INFORMATION SHEET

CENTRAL FILE INFORMATION SHEET

1. Case number: __ __ __ __ __ __
2. Date of birth: __ __-__ __-__ __
3. Race: __
4. Sex: __
5. Date of admission: __ __-__ __-__ __
6. County of commitment: __ __
7. Address: _____
8. Committing judge: _____
9. Legal counsel at hearing: no yes
10. Committing offense: _____
11. Age at first court appearance: _____
12. Total number of court appearances: __ __
13. Placed on probation: no yes

    Total number of months on probation: __ __
14. Subsequent number of commitments to Training School: __ __

In	Out	Reason for readmission:
__ __-__ __-__ __	__/__ __-__ __-__ __	_____
__ __-__ __-__ __	__/__ __-__ __-__ __	_____
__ __-__ __-__ __	__/__ __-__ __-__ __	_____
__ __-__ __-__ __	__/__ __-__ __-__ __	_____
__ __-__ __-__ __	__/__ __-__ __-__ __	_____

15. Last grade completed prior to commitment: __ __

    School attended: _____

    Location: _____
16. Medication used prior to commitment: no yes unknown

    Type: _____

    Reason for use: _____
17. Medication used during commitment: no yes unknown

    Type: _____

    Reason for use: _____
18. Medication continued after release: no yes unknown
19. Attempted suicide: no yes unknown

    Method used: _____

    Date: __ __-__ __-__ __ unknown
20. Currently living: no yes

    Date of death: __ __-__ __-__ __ unknown

    Cause of death: _____ unknown
21. Living arrangement at time of commitment:

    both natural parents father/stepmother mother/stepmother father only

    mother only foster parents adoptive parents independent

    other: _____
22. Raised by: _____
23. Prior non-family living arrangements: no yes unknown

    group home foster home other institution independent

    other: _____

    dates: __ __-__ __-__ __/__ __-__ __-__ __;__ __-__ __-__ __/__ __-__ __-__ __

    addresses: _____

    _____

    reasons: _____

PARENTS:

24. Date of birth:

father: __ __-__ __-__ __ mother: __ __-__ __-__ __

step-father: __ __-__ __-__ __ stepmother: __ __-__ __-__ __

25. Education:

father: __ __ unknown mother: __ __ unknown

stepfather: __ __ unknown stepmother: __ __ unknown

26. Occupation:

father:_____ mother:_____

stepfather:_____ stepmother:_____

27. Marital status of natural or adoptive parents:

married divorced separated one deceased common law unmarried

unknown other:_____

28. Number of previous marriages:

father: __ __ how terminated: _____

mother: __ __ how terminated: _____

29. Number of subsequent marriages:

father: __ __ mother: __ __

30. Approximate family income: unknown

less than $1000 $1000 to 2999 $3000 to 4999 $5000 to 6999

$7000 to 8999 $9000 to 11999 $12000 to 24999 $25000 or more

31. Income from other sources: no yes unknown

ADC disability veterans pension social security alimony

child support other: _____

32. Drug usage:

father: no yes unknown _____

stepfather: no yes unknown _____

mother: no yes unknown _____

stepmother: no yes unknown _____

33. History of physical abuse: no yes unknown

SIBLINGS:

34. Sex Age Sex Age Sex Age

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

35. Criminal record:
relation: Juvenile/adult: institutionalized: where:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

36. Mental health record:
relation: juvenile/adult: institutionalized: where:

_____

_____

_____

_____

TRAINING SCHOOL INFORMATION:

37. A.P.A. diagnostic classification: _____ unknown

38. IQ: __ __ __ test: _____ date: __ __ __

39. Program:
academic/vocational: dates: title: hours:

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

_____ __ __ __/__ __ __ _____

40. Vocational certificate: no yes unknown vocational on-the-job

41. Number of discipline reports: __ __

Reason: _____

42. Number of runaway attempts: __ __

43. Total number of times in detention: __ __

total amount of time in detention: __ __ days

44. Treatment unit: cottage Cooper West Wing Stewart Hall

dates in each:	unit:
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____

45. Involvement in off-grounds activities: no yes unknown

46. Number of trial home visits: __ __ unknown

47. Number of special leaves: __ __ unknown

48. Number of visits by parents: __ __ unknown

49. Number of hours in group counseling: __ __ unknown

50. Number of hours in individual counseling: __ __ unknown

51. Date of discharge: __ __ __ __ __ __ still active

52. Type of discharge: _____

53. Placement:

dates:	location:
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____
__ __ __ __ __ __/__ __ __ __ __ __	_____

54. Current status:

discharged on placement return for PV return for new offense

return for re-placement court conviction as adult

commitment to other juvenile facility: _____

other: _____

55. Staff estimate for success:

excellent good fair poor unknown

title of person making evaluation: _____

Other comments:

APPENDIX B:

RECORD OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Record of Institutionalization

ID_____

Social Services #_____

Training School #_____

Social Security #_____

Date of Birth _____

Institution	From	To

Address at commitment _____

_____

Address at release _____

_____

APPENDIX C:

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Id. No. _____

State Department
of
Social Services

A Study of Iowa Training Schools

Name _____ Interviewer _____

Home address _____ Date _____

_____ Location of Interview _____

Telephone No. _____ Starting time _____

Hello. I am _____ (name) from the Social Services Department of the State of Iowa. Our Department is conducting a study of 200 boys and girls who have been in a training school in Iowa at some time since 1965. We would like to talk with you about your experience in connection with the training school. We hope to get some recommendations from this study that will help the Department develop the best possible programs for helping others who will get in trouble in the future.

Your name was drawn at random, and anything you tell me will be held in strictest confidence. We are in no way connected with the police or the courts. Neither the information from this study about your personal life nor the fact that you have been in training school will be revealed to your family, friends, or employers. Only the Department of Social Services will have access to information gained by this study. We would very much appreciate your helping us out on this project.

SECTION I. Delinquent Activities

We are interested in learning if there is any pattern that young people seem to follow once they begin to get into trouble and if there might have been someone or something that could have helped them. We would like to talk with you a bit about your life leading up to your commitment to the Training School.

1. Could we start by asking you, for what reasons do you feel you got into trouble?

_____

_____

_____

2. (a). Were the police involved in your first commitment to the Training School? How do you feel about the way the police handled your case?

(b). Was a lawyer involved in your first commitment to the Training School? How do you feel about the way the lawyer handled your case?

(c). Was a judge involved in your first commitment to the Training School? How do you feel about the way the judge handled your case?

	no	yes	how?
Police			
Lawyer			
Judge			

3. Have you ever been in jail or a juvenile detention facility since leaving the Training School the last time?

____ no

____ yes → (a). How many times? _____

(b). How much time altogether have you spent in:

jail _____days

juvenile detention _____days

4. (a). Who in your family would you say was most responsible for disciplining you?

_____

(b). What kind of discipline was most often used?

_____

(c). Do you feel this was the right kind of discipline for you?

____ no ⟶ What kind do you think would have worked for you?

____ yes _____

5. (a). How did you get along with your parents? _____

_____

(b). How did you get along with your brothers and sisters? _____

_____

(c). For what reasons do you feel this way? _____

_____

6. (a). In general were there other people with you when you got into the trouble that led to your commitment to the Training School?

____ no ⟶ Skip to Q. 7

____ yes ⟶ About how many? _____

(b). Do you feel you would have done this if you had been alone?

____ no

____ unsure

____ yes

7. (a). Who do you think could have helped you stay out of trouble?

_____

(b). Who would you turn to for help now if you were in trouble?

_____

8. (a). How many contacts did you have with the police...

	0	1-5	6-10	11-15	15+
before you went to the Training School?					
after your final release from the TS?					

(b). Would you describe most of your contacts with the police as . . .

___ hassling

___ questioning about crimes

___ arrests

___ search of house and/or person

___ informal checking on activities

___ other Specify: _____

9. Before you were sent to the Training School, were you ever placed on probation by the Juvenile Court?

___ no

___ yes ⟶ (a). How many times were you on probation? _____

(b). What was the total amount of time you were on probation?

_____ months

10. (a). Where did you live from age 10 until your commitment to the Training School? (INT: Begin recording with age 10)

(b). How long did you live there?

(c). With whom did you live? (INT: Show R living arrangement card)

(a) City	(b) Time	(c) Whom

11. (INT: Give R list of activities)

(a). On this list that I'm giving you, please check those activities in which you were involved before you entered the Training School.

(b). For each item you have checked, please indicate those for which you were brought to the attention of the authorities.

(c). In the last column, please check those activities in which you have been involved since your release from the Training School.

11. Activity	(a). 0	(a). 1-5	(a). 5+	(b). authorities	(c). 0	(c). 1-5	(c). 5+
armed robbery							
assault							
breaking & entering							
auto theft							
petty theft							
larceny over $20							
carrying/possession of weapons							
sex offenses (rape, promiscuity, etc.)							
drugs (not alcohol)							
trespassing							
property destruction							
running away							
truancy							
violation of curfew							
being ungovernable							
possession of liquor							
drinking offenses							
driving offenses							
forgery or writing bad checks							
other							

12. Do you think someone involved in the following juvenile crimes should be sent to the Training School?

	no	unsure	yes
running away			
truancy			
violation of curfew			
being ungovernable			
possession of or drinking liquor			
sexual acting out			
other			

13. Did you or your family ever go to any agencies (such as welfare, a mental health center, etc.) for help before you entered the Training School?

___ no

___ yes→(a). For what reasons did you go to these agencies?

_____

_____

SECTION II. Training School

We have been talking about the period before you entered Training School. Now we would like to ask about the time you spent there.

14. Indicate on the following scale whether you strongly disagree, disagree, are undecided, agree, or strongly agree to the following 3 statements.

	SD	D	U	A	SA
(a) The time I put in at TS was helpful because I was helped in solving some of my problems.					
(b) The time I put in at TS was a kind of punishment.					
(c) The time I put in at TS was wasted time in my life.					

15. Were you ever in detention at the TS?

___ no→Skip to Q. 17

___ yes→For what reasons? _____

_____

_____

16. (a) In your opinion, what is the purpose of detention? _____

_____

(b) In your case, was this accomplished?

___ no

___ undecided

___ yes

(c) What, if any changes, do you think should be made in the detention unit?

___ none

_____

_____

17. While in the TS, did you ever try to run?

___ no

___ yes ⟶ (a) How long had you been at the TS before attempting to run? _____

(b) How many times did you run away? _____

(c) Why did you run away? _____

_____

(d) Did you break any laws while on the run?

___ no

___ yes Could you explain? _____

_____

(e) If you returned, were you:

___ placed in detention? For how long? _____(days)

___ denied visits by family

___ denied THV's?

___ other (specify): _____

_____

18. While you were in the TS . . .

(a) Did you participate in . . .

(b) Did you help decide your participation in . . .

(c) Would you say you liked, disliked or were indifferent to. . .

(d) What are your reasons for giving these ratings to . . .

(INT: read (a) - (d) for each program listed)

Programs	(a)		(b)		(c)			(d)
	no	yes	no	yes	like	ind	dis	reasons
a school program								
vocational classes (job training)								
cottage meetings								
the health center treatment program (males only)								
off-grounds employment								
family therapy (males only)								
recreation								
Church								

19. Do you think changes should be made in . . .

	No	Yes	What changes?
(a) the school program			
(b) the vocational program			
(c) the cottage program			
(d) the health center treatment program (male only)			
(e) off-grounds employment			
(f) family therapy(males only)			
(g) recreation			
(h) church			

20. What other programs should have been available? _____

_____

21. Did you make any friends while at the TS?

___ no

___ yes → (a) (Do)(Did) you continue to see any of these friends?

___ no

___ yes

(b) (Do)(Did) you feel these friends:

___ helped you stay out of trouble?

___ influenced you to get into trouble?

___ had no affect on you?

22. How would you describe the way you got along with other (boys) (girls) at the TS when you were there?

___ poor

___ fair

___ good

23. Did you know anyone who was already there when you first entered the TS?

___ no

___ yes → How many people? _____

24. Looking back, what did you like most about the TS? _____

_____

25. What did you like least about the TS? _____

_____

For what reasons? _____

_____

26. (a). How did you get along with the _____ at the TS?
(INT: ask this question for each of the titles listed on the chart below. Ask vocational instructors and family therapists of males only)

(b). Who on the staff helped you the least?

(c). Who on the staff helped you the most?

(a) Staff	(b) poor	fair	good	(c) least	most
cottage directors					
cottage parents					
teachers					
cottage counselors					
voc. instructors					
psychologists					
family therapists					
chaplain					
psychiatrist					
superintendent					
others					

27. Which of the following did you learn more about while at TS?

___ drugs

___ homosexuality

___ fighting

___ stealing

___ others (specify): _____

_____

28. Which do you think would have been more effective in helping you stay out of trouble?

___ a stay at the Training School

___ being left in your community

___ neither (specify): _____

_____

Why do you feel this way? _____

_____

29. After you left the TS, did you find that _____ became easier, more difficult, or made no difference? (INT: read (a) - (d) for R)

	easier	more difficult	no difference	NA
(a) making friends				
(b) getting a job				
(c) returning to school				
(d) staying out of trouble				

30. (a) What were your main personal problems before you went to the TS?
(INT: Give R a few seconds to respond before reading foils)

(1) ___ losing temper
(2) ___ being tempted to steal
(3) ___ getting talked into doing things
(4) ___ getting into arguments or fights easily
(5) ___ getting mixed up in thinking
(6) ___ not getting along with people Specify: _____

_____

_____

(7) ___ other (specify): _____

_____

(8) ___ none

(b) Have any of these been a problem since you left the TS?

(1) ___ no → Skip to (d)

(2) ___ yes

(c) Which problems are these? (INT: Record answer by number)_____

_____

_____

(d) Thinking of the problems that did change, to what extent was the TS helpful in solving (this) these problem(s)?

(1) ___ none
(2) ___ little
(3) ___ some
(4) ___ great deal

(e) Thinking of the problems that did change, to what extent was the TS harmful in solving these problems?

(1) ___ none
(2) ___ little
(3) ___ some
(4) ___ great deal

31. (a) Did you like living in a cottage?

___ no

___ yes

(b) What did you like most about it? _____

_____

(c) What did you dislike most about it? _____

_____

32. Did you have enough privacy at the TS?

___ no

___ yes

33. Do you feel the cottage staff talked with you enough so you knew:

(a) when you were getting out? ___ no ___ yes

(b) how staff felt about you? ___ no ___ yes

(c) what the rules were? ___ no ___ yes

(d) what you needed to do to get out? ___ no ___ yes

34. What were some of the major things you needed to do before you could get out?

_____

_____

_____

35. (a) Did you have any free time at the TS?

___ no

___ yes → How did you spend it? _____

_____

(b) Were there ever periods of time when you had nothing to do?

___ no

___ yes

(c) What activities would you like to see made available at the TS? _____

_____

_____

36. In your opinion, what was the purpose of the TS? _____

_____

_____

37. Do you feel what you did at the TS helped you get along better when you went home?

___ no

___ yes → In what ways? _____

___ unsure _____

SECTION III. Parole

Often, when a person leaves an institution, he/she is placed on parole. We would like to find out something about the experience people have while on parole, with their parole officers, etc.

38. Were you placed on juvenile parole when you left the Training School?

___no→If no, skip to Q. 43

___yes

39. Are you still on juvenile parole?

___no

___yes

40. How often did you talk with your juvenile parole officer the first time you were on parole?

___less than once a month (specify) _____

___once a month

___2-3 times a month

___more than 3 times a month (specify) _____

41. (a) Did your juvenile parole officer try to help you in doing any of the following things?

	No	Yes
1. getting a job		
2. getting into school		
3. with problems at home		
4. with the police		
5. with personal problems		
6. other		

(b) Which of these things was he successful in trying to help you with? (INT: List answers in terms of numbers. If "none" is answer write "none").

_____

42. (a) How many juvenile parole officers did you have? _____

(b) Would you say you benefited from having more than one juvenile parole officer?

___no

___made no difference

___yes

SECTION IV. Placement

When a person is released on parole, he/she is placed in some type of living arrangement, i.e., the home of his/her mother and father, the home of step-parents, the home of foster parents, a group home, etc. In this part of the interview, we would like to ask you about your placement(s).

43. (a) Where did you live after each release from the Training School?

(b) Did you help make this decision?

(c) What kind of living arrangement was this? (INT: Show R living arrangement card.)

(d) Did the people you lived with or you yourself receive any kind of help before you came or while you were there? (Suggestions for INT: vocational rehabilitation, family therapy, welfare, counseling, homemaker services, employment, etc.)

(a)	(b)		(c)	(d)		
location	no	yes	living arrangement	no	yes	DK

SECTION V. Institutional Commitments Since TS

In this section, we would like to talk about any institutions you might have been in since leaving the TS the first time. This might include institutions for such things as mental health, drug treatment, adult corrections, etc.

44. (a) Were you ever placed on probation as an adult?

___no ⟶ Skip to Q. 45

___yes ⟶ What had you done? _____

(b) Are you still on probation?

___no

___yes

45. Since leaving the TS the first time, have you been in any other institutions, including previous commitments to _____
(name of present institution, not TS)

___no ⟶ Skip to Section VI

___yes

46. Are you presently on parole from an adult corrections institution?

___no

___yes

47. (INT: In chronological order from the time R was released from TS, list in Col. (a) each admittance to an institution to which R has been committed; then complete Cols. (b) thru (h) for each entry.)

(a) Please tell me the names of the institutions you were in.

(b) How long (is)(was) your sentence? (Applies only to adult corrections)

(c) How long were you there?

(d) For what reason(s) were you there?

(INT: (e) and (f) for correctional institutions only)

(e) Do you think anything could have been done to keep you from getting into trouble? If yes, what?

(f) Were you still on juvenile parole when you got into trouble?

(g) Where did you live when you left?

(h) With whom did you live then? (INT: Hand R living arrangement card)

(a) Name of institution	(b) Sentence	(c) from	(c) to	(c) total	(d) reason	(e) no	(e) DK	(e) yes	(e) what	(f) no	(f) yes	(g) where	(h) whom

SECTION VI. School

In this part we will talk about your schooling, including before and after your stay at the Training School.

48. Were you enrolled in school when you were sent to the Training School the first time?

___no→(a) When were you last enrolled in school? _____ Year

(b) Why did you leave school?_____

___yes→(c)—What grade were you in? _____

49. Did you return to school at any time <u>after leaving the Training School?</u>

___no→Skip to Question 51

___yes→What grade did you enroll in? _____

50. Are you presently enrolled in school (of any kind?)

___no→(a) How old were you when you last attended? _____

(b) What grade did you last attend? _____

(c) Why are you no longer in school? _____

___yes→(d) What is the name of the school? _____

(e) What grade are you in ? _____

(course, field, area you in)? _____

51. Ask each question for before Training School, and after Training School. (INT: If R answered "no" to Questions 49 or 50 , ask only questions pertaining to "before Training School". Then, skip to Question 56.)

(a) Did you have problems with your teachers?

(b) Did you have problems with your principal? (any administrator)

(c) Did you have problems with other students?

(d) Were you ever truant from school?
If yes, about how many times per week were you truant?

(e) Were you ever suspended or expelled from school?

(f) Would you rate your school work as below average, average, or above average?

(g) What kinds of successes did you have in school?

(h) What extra-curricular activities were you in?

(i) Did you feel you disliked, were indifferent to, or liked school at _____?
(INT: mention name of school last attended)

	(a) Teachers		(b) Admin.		(c) Students		(d) Truant		(e) Suspend		(f) Schoolwork			(g) Successes	(h) Extra-curricular activities	(i) School		
	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	below	average	above			dis	ind	like
Before TS																		
After TS																		

52. Did the Training School play any part in (this)(these) changes?

___no

___yes →In what ways?_____

_____

_____

53. (a) (Do)(Did) none, some, or most of your fellow students know you were in the Training School?

___none→ Skip to Question 54

___some

___most

(b) Did this make any difference in the way you got along with them?

___no

___yes→(c) In what ways?_____

_____

54. (Do)(Did) none, some, or most of your teachers know you were in the Training School?

___none→Skip to Question 55

___some

___most

(b) Did this make any difference in the way you got along with them?

___no

___yes→(c) In what ways?_____

_____

55. (Did)(Do) you ever receive any counseling from any of the following persons since your last release from the Training School?

(a) ___school psychologists

___school social workers

___guidance counselors

___others (specify)_____

(b) How much did this counseling help you?

___none

___very little

___some

___a great deal

56. Did (Does) your family encourage, discourage (or neither) you to complete school?

___encourage

___discourage

___neither

___other (specify) _____

57. How (did) most of your friends feel about school?

___like

___indifferent

___dislike

58. Do you plan to continue your schooling or return to school?

___no

___yes⟶(a) In what area?_____

___DK

SECTION VII - Employment

This section deals with your full-time employment, if any, since leaving the Training School. When talking about full-time employment, we mean a job which requires working 30 or more hours per week. We would like to know about the success you have had in finding employment, about any problems you may have run into, and how you feel about it in general. (INT: fill in chart beginning with present job or last previous job and list in chronological order.)

59. (a) Are you employed on a full-time basis at the present time?

___ no ⟶ Have you ever had a full-time job?

___ no ⟶ (Skip to Q. 63)

___ yes ⟶ (complete (b) through (n))

___ yes ⟶ complete (b) through (h)

(b) Where are (were) you employed? (Employer and city)

(c) What is (was) your occupation?

(d) How long have (did) you had (have) this job?

(e) In this job, do (did) you use the training you received at the TS, if any?

(f) Rate your satisfaction with your present job.
(INT: ask R if he/she liked, disliked, indifferent)

(g) What was your yearly income?

(h) What was your reason for leaving this job?

	(b) Where employed? (include city)	(c) Kind of work (occupation)	(d) Dates from to	(e) Training yes no	(f) Job. Sat. Dis Ind Like	(g) Earnings	(h) Reason for Termination
Present job							
Previous job							

60. Why did you take your present or more recent job? (More than one may be listed) (INT: Do not read foils)

___ for what it pays

___ only job available at the time

___ have long wanted to get into this type of work

___ fits the type of training received at Training School

___ fits tested aptitudes and/or interests

___ stated interest only

___ vocational counseling indicated it would be appropriate

___ had inside pull

___ it was a good opportunity

___ someone made me take job (specify): _____

_____

___ other (specify): _____

_____

___ don't know

61. (INT: If not presently working, skip to Q. 62)
Do you regard your present job as permanent -- one you plan to stay in for quite awhile?

___ no

___ yes

62. (a) Do (Did) none, some, or most of your fellow workers know you were in the Training School? (present or last job)

___ none

___ some / ___ most → (b) Has this made any difference in your working relationships?

___ no

___ yes

(c) How? _____

_____

_____

63. Are you currently looking for a job?

188

___ no (if not employed, ask why?) _____

___ yes→(a) How long have you been looking? _____

(b) What kind of job do you want? _____

(c) How do (would) you go about getting a job?

___ Voc. Rehab.

___ Iowa State Employment Service

___ private employment service

___ someone from Training School

___ friends

___ family

___ parole officer

___ newspaper ads

___ applying different places

___ hearing about them from someone else

___ other (specify) _____

_____

64. Have you ever had any job counseling?

___ no→(go to Q. 65)

___ yes

(b) When? _____

(c) From whom? _____

(d) Was it helpful?

___ no

___ yes→In what ways? _____

_____

65. What problems have you had in getting a job? (Do not read)

189

___none

___color

___sex

___not enough training (vocational)

___not enough education

___age

___record at Training School(s)

___record at other penal institutions

___mental health record

___military record

___other (specify): _____

66. Have you received any additional job training since leaving the Training School?

___no

___yes→Where did you get it? What kind of training was it?

___military _____

___area college _____

___technical high school _____

___on-the-job training _____

___public or private training program _____

___another institution _____

___other (specify) _____ _____

_____

67. Do you feel an employer should be told by a prospective employee that he/she had been in the Training School?

___no

___yes

Why or why not? _____ _____

68. What are your career goals? _____

_____

69. What will you have to do in order to _____
(INT: Repeat answer to #68)

_____

SECTION VIII. Current Home Life

Now we would like you to think about your home life as it is today.

70. What is your marital status, are you

___single → skip to Q 71

___married

___separated

___divorced

___widowed

___other specify: _____

(a). (Is) (Was) this your first marriage?

___no

___yes

(b). If not, how many times have you been married? _____

71. Do you have any children?

___no → skip to Q 72

___yes

(a). What are the ages of your children? _____

(b). Are they living in your home?

___no → Where are they living? _____

___yes

(INT: If R is presently in an institution, skip to Q 74)

72. Who lives in your home now besides you?

Col. (a) INT: For each person currently living with R, list the relation of the person to R. If the person is not related to R, give a brief explanation.

(b) Is _____ working at the present time?
(INT: if response is no, do not ask (c) or (d))

(c) What is his/her occupation?

(d) What income group is he/she in?
(INT: Show R income category card)

(a) Relation to R	(b) no	yes	(c) Occupation	(d) Income

73. Indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, are undecided, agree, or strongly agree to the following statements:

	SD	D	U	SA	A
(a). My home is a good place for a child to grow up.					
(b). My family and I share common interests in such things a hobbies and sports.					
(c). My family and I spend a lot of time doing things together.					
(d). I am satisfied and fairly happy with my present family situation.					

74. (a). Where have you lived since receiving your discharge?

(b). How long did you live there?

(c). What were your living arrangements?
(INT: Show R living arrangement card)

(a) City	(b) Time	(c) Living

75. How do you spend your free time? _____

_____

76. Do you have any friends who have gotten into trouble recently?

___no

___yes

77. Did you or your family ever go to any agencies for help after you left the Training School? (social welfare, mental health centers, etc.)

___no

___yes

(a). For what reasons did you/did you not go? _____

_____

_____

SECTION XIII. Closing

That completes my questions. Could you tell me how you felt about answering these questions? (Do not read)

____ good ____ scared

____ okay ____ uncomfortable

____ nervous ____ unsure

____ other _____

Do you feel that the answers you have given us could help make (some) changes at the Training School?

____ no

____yes

Why _____

_____

Is there anything you'd like to ask me about these questions or about this study?

____ no

____ yes What? _____

_____

We want to thank you for your cooperation in this project. I am sure it will be of help.

196 Respondent's name _____

Id. No. _____

SECTION XIV. Interviewer's Impressions

1. Did the interviewee seem nervous and ill-at-ease or comfortable during the interview?

   ____ nervous (a) Any apparent reason? _____

   comfortable _____

2. Was the interviewee able to communicate well?

   ____ no

   ____ yes

3. Did he seem to understand the questions readily?

   ____ no

   ____ yes

4. Describe briefly the setting for the interview.

5. Describe briefly the interviewee.

6. R interviewed:

   ____ alone

   ____ others present

   who? _____

7. R agreed to answer:

   ____ voluntarily

   ____ only after offer of pay

Ending time _____

7

END