

62934

X A PRELIMINARY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF
SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS

BY

DAVID J. BERKMAN
CHARLES P. SMITH

OCTOBER 31, 1979

PREPARED FOR THE
U.S. NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR
JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

BY THE
NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER
AMERICAN JUSTICE INSTITUTE
1007 - 7TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
916-444-3096

62934

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Table</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1	A-1
<u>COMPARISON OF SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS</u>	2	A-2
Type of Institution	2	
Months of Operation	2	
Annual Volume	2	
Finances	2	A-3
Major Goal	2	
Intake Decision	3	
Eligibility Criteria	4	
Major Referral Sources	4	A-4
Number of Inmate Participants	4	
Program Approach	4	
Evaluation	5	A-5
<u>DISCUSSION</u>	6	
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	10	A-6
<u>APPENDIX A - TABLES</u>	12	
<u>APPENDIX B - SUPPLEMENTAL LIST OF JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS</u>	19	
<u>APPENDIX C - SOURCES</u>	22	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
A-1 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: LOCATION AND CONTACT(S)	13.
A-2 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: START DATE, MONTHS OF OPERATION, AND ANNUAL VOLUME OF JUVENILES	14
A-3 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: PROGRAM GOALS, INTAKE DECISION RESPONSIBILITY, AND JUVENILE PARTICIPANT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	15
A-4 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: MAJOR JUVENILE REFERRAL SOURCE(S)	16
A-5 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: EVALUATION STATUS AND EVALUATOR	17
A-6 SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, SUCCESS CRITERIA, AND MAJOR FINDINGS	18

A PRELIMINARY COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

This preliminary comparative analysis of selected juvenile aversion programs has been prepared by the National Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center (NJJSAC) of the American Justice Institute for the U.S. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Although there are such programs apparently in existence or being planned in some 38 States,* this paper concentrates on seven such programs geographically dispersed among six States in the East, Midwest, and West. Included are programs at Rahway Prison (New Jersey), San Quentin State Prison (California), Susanville Conservation Center (California), Virginia State Penitentiary, Queensboro Correctional Facility (New York), Graterford State Correctional Institution (Pennsylvania), and Jackson State Prison (Michigan). Detailed information on the location and contacts for each of these programs are contained in Table A-1, page 13. In addition, a list of 15 other such programs is contained in Appendix B.

Although there are many different programs with minor differences in procedures and approaches, most of these programs use a short-term direct confrontation in a group setting between participant inmates and 10 to 20 juveniles. These sessions are usually supplemented with a tour of the institution. Some programs additionally fingerprint, strip search, and lock up the visiting juvenile in a cell for a short time in order to increase the reality and emotional impact of the experience.

The information contained in this paper was obtained from materials collected by NJJSAC and the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), and a telephone survey conducted by the National Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center during October 1979.

The paper includes a description of the seven selected programs, major aspects of the programs, a general discussion of juvenile aversion programs, and some general conclusions.

*Testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Human Resources by Jerome G. Miller and Herbert H. Hoelter, National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, June 4, 1979.

COMPARISON OF SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS

Type of Institution

Five of the juvenile aversion programs are located in adult maximum-security institutions (Rahway State Prison, San Quentin State Prison, Virginia State Penitentiary, Graterford State Correctional Facility, and Jackson State Prison). Two programs are located in medium-security adult facilities (Susanville Conservation Center and Queensboro Correctional Facility).

Months of Operation

The longest running program is the Squire's Program at San Quentin, California. This program originated in June 1964 and has run for 185 months. The newest program in the group is the Insider's Group at the Virginia State Penitentiary in Richmond, Virginia. The Insider's Group started in September 1978 and has run for 13 months. The average period of operation was 49 months for the seven programs selected (see Table A-2, p. 14).

Annual Volume

The Insider's Group at Virginia State Penitentiary has the largest annual volume of juvenile participants with approximately 9,600 juveniles involved. Annual volumes of the programs range from 240-9,600 with a mean of 2,805 juveniles per year (see Table A-3, p. 15).

Finances

Except for the Juvenile Awareness Program at Rahway State Prison, all of the programs are financed by inmate funds or donations. The Rahway program is partially financed by State grants of \$2,000 for expenses and \$15,000 for one guard to serve as tour guide and program liaison. The Rahway funds are also supplemented by donations from the public and royalties from the "Scared Straight" film.

Major Goal

The major goal of the programs is the deterrence of future criminal behavior. Some programs consider deterrence in terms of subsequent criminal offenses; others have a more general goal of terminating all illegal behavior (i.e., criminal, status, and "hidden delinquency") and motivating juveniles toward a more "law-abiding" life style (see Table A-1, p. 13). The lack of

specific and measurable goals is a major weakness of all the programs. This deficiency has created difficulties for objective evaluations. It can be argued, for instance, that the Juvenile Awareness Program's goal is more to make the juvenile more "accessible" for subsequent counseling and interaction than to deter the juvenile from crime. However, this goal is not clearly stated in measurable terms, nor is it made a mandatory programmatic requirement. Therefore, although increasing accessibility to the juvenile following exposure may be an important goal of these programs, it has not been systematically exploited through a formal system of follow-up counseling and evaluation.

The general goal of deterrence as used by all these programs is too broad as an indication of success or failure. It also is generally undefined by the programs. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for the programs to maintain the goal of improving communications between probation officers or parents and juveniles subsequent to participation in the institutional component of the program. This goal could be enhanced by directly involving counselors and parents in the confrontation dimension of the program to help establish a more effective relationship and facilitate more open and honest communication. To continue to evaluate these programs only in terms of deterrence (recidivism) is too simplistic. While a two- to three-hour exposure may be insufficient by itself to have a lasting impact on the delinquent juvenile's behavior, when coupled with other types of approaches, such as long-term counseling and other community supports, it may prove to be a useful element of a total delinquency reduction program. Unfortunately, none of the programs reviewed utilized the institution exposure as part of a comprehensive approach to delinquency prevention or reduction.

Intake Decision

One of the most important elements of any program is the intake decision. Who applies the intake eligibility criteria in specific cases to determine which juveniles enter the program is also a major factor affecting the program's outcome. A review of these programs indicates that in most cases the intake decision is a joint decision involving the referral source (e.g., probation officer, juvenile court judge) and institutional administration. In a few programs, the intake decision is made exclusively by the probation officer and the juvenile court judge (see Table A-3, p. 15).

Eligibility Criteria

Basically, the programs use three types of criteria for determining a juvenile's eligibility for the program: sex, age, and juvenile offense history (see Table A-3, p. 15). Four of the seven programs are limited to males. The programs generally consider juveniles 12-19 years old as eligible, although exceptions are made for younger, more mature juveniles and older juveniles or young adults who are believed to possibly benefit from the program. Three of the programs consider nonoffenders as eligible; however, the majority of the programs limit eligibility to offenders adjudicated or in detention. The JOLT Program has the additional requirement that the juvenile must be accompanied by a parent or legal guardian. The Insider's Group requires a psychiatric and health screening evaluation before admission.

Major Referral Sources

Generally, all the programs accept referrals from juvenile justice system personnel. The Knights of Henri Christophe will accept juveniles referred by the juvenile probation officer and the juvenile court judge of Delaware County only. The Squire's Program will consider juveniles referred by community agencies and parents, in addition to juvenile justice system referrals. Referrals from schools are accepted by the Youth Aversion Program and the Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program (see Table A-4, p. 16).

Number of Inmate Participants

The range of inmate participants is from a low of ten (Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program) to a high of 45 (Squire's Program). The average number of inmates per program is 21.

Program Approach

All the programs use a form of direct confrontation, although the type of confrontation (language, intensity, and style) may vary from program to program. Generally, the confrontation is accomplished through the use of intimidation by using abusive language and threatening demeanor. Taken

together, this approach attempts to challenge the juvenile's prior delinquent behavior and attitudes during an intense two- to three-hour group encounter with approximately 20 juveniles and 12 inmates. Many of the programs supplement the confrontation encounter with audio-visual materials, tours of the facility, and a follow-up one-to-one rap session prior to departure. On the other hand, the Squire's Program consists of a series of three sessions on consecutive Saturdays, some of which include parents and counselors. The Juvenile Awareness Program has also added a Parental Awareness Program held on Saturdays; however, this program component does not necessarily involve the parents of juveniles who have gone through the program.

Evaluation

The evaluation information relating to these programs will be discussed in regard to their methodology and findings. Table A-5 (p. 17) summarizes evaluation status and identifies the name of the evaluator. Table A-6 (p. 18) summarizes evaluation and methodology, success criteria, and major findings.

1. Methodology

Three of the programs have been evaluated. The CDC Youth Aversion Program and the Insider's Group are in the process of being evaluated. Two of the completed evaluations used an experimental design (Squire's Program and JOLT Program). The Juvenile Awareness Program and CDC Youth Aversion Program used a quasi-experimental design (no matched randomly selected experimental and control groups). The Juvenile Awareness Program and Squire's Program evaluation include both attitudinal and behavioral criteria of success.

2. Findings

The Juvenile Awareness Program evaluation found a significant positive attitudinal difference in the experimental group in only one of nine categories (i.e., attitudes toward crime and deterrence). The evaluation also found that more experimentals than controls committed more crimes, which were also more serious, after exposure to the program. The Squire's Program evaluation reports a "more positive" attitudinal

change in the experimentals (the behavioral portion of the evaluations is not completed). The JOLT Program evaluation did not find significant differences in recidivism; however, it also did not find the negative effect of the program upon experimentals as did the Juvenile Awareness Program evaluation.

Taken together, the evaluations of juvenile aversion programs provide a mixed picture of success. In contrast to the overwhelmingly positive portrayal of these programs by the media, the public, and some personnel from the criminal justice community, the few evaluations available indicate that juvenile aversion programs are far less an answer to delinquency prevention or deterrence. The Juvenile Awareness Program evaluation further suggests that these programs can be counterproductive (i.e., they may actually increase the likelihood of recidivism). Based upon the limited evaluation results to date, juvenile aversion programs as they are currently operated may offer very little as deterrent programs; however, coupled with other programs which use traditional forms of counseling and community supports, they may be able to contribute to the overall efforts for certain juveniles at a specific stage in the rehabilitation process. Prior to the initiation of such programs on a wide scale, more careful evaluation of existing programs should be undertaken.

DISCUSSION

A review of juvenile aversion programs indicates that although some of the programs have been evaluated, the methodology of these evaluations places a limitation on their credibility and usefulness in determining the success or failure of these programs. In addition to the small sample size and factors related to sample selection, the evaluations generally fail to consider many of the dimensions and full potential of these programs. Analysis of recidivism rates taken as an indication of the deterrent effect of the short (two- to three-hour) confrontation of these programs may, in fact, miss the most significant aspects of the program, as well as superimpose a goal that is unreasonable. Future evaluations will need to better match the program's intended goals with those examined by the evaluator. Perhaps the goals of the juvenile aversion programs need to be scaled down

to a more reasonable level. For example, instead of expecting the program to result in a reduction of delinquent behavior, it might be more reasonable to expect the program to help break down the protective shell of juveniles which has developed and thus facilitate accessibility and more honest interaction between the juvenile and counselors or parents.

It is also important for future evaluations to consider the impact of these programs on the participant inmates. An opportunity to provide a valuable service to the community as well as to constructively work together on a project that is capable of helping others may, in fact, serve as therapy to the inmates through the rehabilitation principle which states that one also helps oneself by helping others. In addition, the public awareness of these programs serviced by inmates has given them positive visibility and exposure; however, some inmates have the fear that portrayals of them as brutes and institutions as "hellholes" can eventually backfire and cause greater community isolation and fear. It would be useful to examine these aspects in future research.

Juvenile aversion programs as they currently operate generally provide little or no pre-entry orientation to juveniles. Except for a few programs, there is no psychiatric or health screening of the potential participants. Few of the programs directly involve the parents or counselors or a formalized process of follow-up counseling which could build upon the juvenile's experience from the program. These are major design deficiencies of the programs. Perhaps it would be useful to consider these programs within a more comprehensive (orientation, participation, long-term follow-up, counseling) program of prevention and delinquency reduction. Another modification worthy of examination would be to expose parents instead of juveniles to the program and evaluate the results.

Juvenile aversion programs raise important issues in relation to the concept of deterrence in general. Although a large quantity of literature exists on deterrence, especially in relation to capital punishment, the state of knowledge regarding deterrence (what it is, how it operates, how effective it is) is limited. According to the best knowledge, it is somewhat effective when the target group is rational and calculating; however, research on crime and delinquency has shown that often a decision to commit a criminal or delinquent act is impulsive or situational. Perhaps it would be appropriate to first train juveniles to be more rational and calculating in their decisions before employing aversion techniques. A significant

contribution could be made to the body of knowledge on criminal and delinquent behavior through the study of the many complexities of deterrence (e.g., when does it work, how, why, with what group of individuals, and how long does it last with and without reinforcements?)

Finally, the reactions of the public, legislators, and criminal and juvenile justice personnel to the publicity surrounding these programs is a significant issue worthy of further consideration. Aversion programs, especially those that may appear cruel or harsh, raise important ethical and moral issues. Just how far is society willing to go in the use of physical or psychological pain to change attitudes and behavior? Evidence from the public's reaction to the "Scared Straight" film suggests that, probably out of desperation, many parents, legislators, and justice personnel would be willing to subject juveniles to a psychologically painful experience if it could prevent or change delinquent behavior. In a few cases, expansions of the program have been suggested based upon the logic that if a two- to three-hour experience is effective, then perhaps a two- to three-week experience might be more effective.

On the other hand, reactions to these programs have not been all positive. On May 18, 1979, the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NAC) announced that it will discourage State legislators from creating programs similar to the Rahway prison program until validity and reported success of such programs can be firmly established.*

At the request of Congressman Hollenbeck of New Jersey, Jerry Miller of the National Center for Institutions and Alternatives, and others, the U.S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Human Resources held public hearings on June 4, 1974 to investigate the veracity of the "Scared Straight" film, determine whether the claimed success rate for the program was real, and to consider the possible harm that could or is being caused by the program's actions and policies made in response to the film. On June 7, Congressman Ike Andrews, chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, issued a statement in which he conditionally supported the juvenile aversion programs:

I simply have become convinced that certain selected juveniles can be assisted substantially by being temporarily subjected to a prison setting and by being confronted with inmates who have spent a long time in the prisons and who have no expectation of being permitted to leave

*"Federal Committee Acts on 'Scared Straight.'" News release, May 18, 1978.

for yet years to come. I think these carefully screened young people can profit from getting some feeling--as distinguished from verbal description--of the possible end of the road on which they may be traveling or tempted to travel. I think it is simply unjust of us not to show them this reality. Its benefits can be substantial, and its costs should be minimal.*

Congressman Andrews, in his statement, also recognizes the importance of the program to the inmates and prison authorities. It is the impact of the program on the inmates and their sincere and honest efforts to deter juveniles from criminal careers that makes these programs unique.

It also occurs to me that probably many of the kids who go through the program are never confronted with people they conceive as being quite as honest and selflessly motivated--and perhaps as highly motivated--as those truly tough guys who have fought the system and lost--lost so much--and now care so deeply that their loss has no gain except if it might help the kid each [inmate] somewhat see[s] as himself at the crossroad...**

In spite of Congressman Andrew's conditional support of juvenile aversion programs, the correctional community responded in August 1979 with a warning against the proliferation of such programs. In a policy statement titled, "Juvenile Awareness Program's 'Scared Straight'" adopted August 1979 by the Delegate Assembly of the American Correctional Association (ACA), it was urged that if such programs as the Rahway Juvenile Awareness Program are implemented, they should include:

- a "monitored" research design to evaluate the impact of such a program
- procedures which are sensitive to the participants and the security needs of the institution
- careful selection of both the adult offenders and juvenile participants
- a commitment from involved juvenile supervisory agencies to provide follow-up counseling services

*U.S. House of Representatives. Subcommittee on Human Resources. Statement of Congressman Ike Andrews, Chairman, June 7, 1979, p. 9.

**Ibid., p. 10.

- provisions in the program for adult offenders to develop positive motivation and constructive behavior significant to their own habilitation.*

This policy statement also raised concern that programs of this type promote simplistic approaches to complex problems. The fear of the delegates was that an emphasis on aversion programs ignores the obvious needs of committed offenders to be protected from each other, and concern over improperly operated correctional institutions. According to the ACA Delegate Assembly, such an omission might cause legislators to be misled into believing that adequate funds for correctional institutions to establish meaningful programs, and to reduce violence in prisons are not necessary.

CONCLUSION

While the two major questions most often asked regarding juvenile aversion programs (e.g., does it work, and is it harmful to juveniles) are discussed extensively, many questions have not been even raised. The answer to the first question--does it work--cannot be adequately answered yet, due to the incompleteness of the evaluations done so far. The second question can be answered by conjecture in that juvenile aversion programs could be harmful if the wrong juveniles are exposed and that exposure is too severe. Beyond these questions, the territory is relatively unexplored.

It is the unexplored nature of these programs (e.g., experimenting with program modifications; more complete evaluations which are able to relate to an accumulated body of knowledge and theory of delinquency causation, prevention, and deterrence; and their operation within a more comprehensive educational and counseling program) which could make a valuable contribution. To merely dismiss these programs as simplistic or as misdirected efforts, and hope that they will go away, would be a loss of a potentially significant opportunity to learn more about juvenile delinquency, counseling techniques, and community efforts to do something about juvenile crime. Furthermore, the impact of the program upon the inmates needs to be explored. If, in fact, there is a positive effect resulting from inmate participation,

*Policy statement, "Juvenile Awareness Program's 'Scared Straight.'" Adopted August 1979 by the Delegate Assembly of the American Correctional Association.

then perhaps it could be more fully exploited as part of a correctional program as well as modified to involve juveniles who have been exposed to the confrontation later in the program as "givers" rather than as "receivers" of the program's intensive interactions. Therefore, considering all the potentially useful aspects of these programs, further careful experimentation, research, and evaluations should be undertaken.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table A-1

SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
LOCATION AND CONTACT(S)

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>CONTACT(S)</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison Rahway, New Jersey	Administrator: Sergeant August (201-547-2510) Inmate: Robert Jones
Squire's Program California State Prison San Quentin, California	Administrator: Officer H. Perryman (415-454-1460)
Youth Aversion Project, Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center Susanville, California	Administrator: Dan Vasquez (916-257-2183) Inmate: Steve Pearson
The Insider's Group Virginia State Penitentiary Richmond, Virginia	Administrator: Ms. S. L. Kennedy, Assistant Superintendent (804-796-2101)
Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program Queensboro Correctional Facility Long Island, New York	Administrator: Elaine Meyers Psychologist (212-361-8920, ext. 299) John L. Clarke, Deputy Officer (Program) Inmate: Leroy Mitchell
The Knights of Henri Christophe State Correctional Institution at Graterford Graterford, Pennsylvania	Administrator: Thomas Stachelek (215-489-4151) Inmate: Gregory Thomas
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison Jackson, Michigan	Administrator: James Yarborough, Director of Research, Michigan Department of Corrections Lansing, Michigan (517-373-0273)

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, 1979).

Table A-2

SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
 START DATE, MONTHS OF OPERATION, AND ANNUAL VOLUME OF JUVENILES

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>MONTHS OF OPERATION</u>	<u>ANNUAL VOLUME</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison Rahway, New Jersey	59 Months (Started: September 1976)	3,257
Squire's Program California State Prison San Quentin California	185 Months (Started: June 1964)	700
Youth Aversion Project, Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center Susanville, California	20 Months (Started: February 1978)	480
The Insiders' Group Virginia State Penitentiary Richmond, Virginia	13 Months (Started: September 1978)	9,600
Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program Queensboro Correctional Facility Long Island, New York	30 Months (Started: April 1977)	4,800
The Knights of Henri Christophe State Correctional Institution at Graterford Graterford, Pennsylvania	19 Months (Started: February 1978)	560
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison	18 Months (Started: May 1978)	240

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, 1979).

Table A-3

SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
PROGRAM GOALS, INTAKE DECISION RESPONSIBILITY, AND
JUVENILE PARTICIPANT ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>Major Goal</u>	<u>PROGRAM OBJECTIVES</u>	
		<u>Intake Decision (by)</u>	<u>Eligibility Criteria</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison	Deterrence and Accessibility	Referral Agency	Male/Female; 12-19; Juvenile Offender
Squire's Program California State Prison, San Quentin	Deterrence	Referral Agency and Administrative Staff	Male; 13-18; Offenders and Nonoffenders
Youth Aversion Program, Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center, Susanville	Deterrence	Selection Committee: Consists of Probation Officer, Superintendent of Juvenile Hall, and Administrative Staff	Male; 14-19; Offenders and Nonoffenders
The Insider's Group Virginia State Penitentiary	Deterrence and Motivation	Administrative Staff	Male/Female; 13-18; Some type of court contact and psychiatric evaluation
Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program Queensboro Correctional Facility	Deterrence	Administrative Staff	Male; 16-18; Offenders and Nonoffenders
The Knights of Henri Christophe State Correctional Institution at Graterford	Deterrence	Probation Office and Juvenile Court Judge (Delaware County only)	Male; 14-18; Adjudicated, in detention, or placed or about to be placed
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison	Deterrence	Not Available	Male Arrested or petitioned for criminal offense--must be accompanied by parent or guardian

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, October 1979).

Table A-4

SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
MAJOR JUVENILE REFERRAL SOURCE(S)

<u>PROGRAM</u>	<u>MAJOR REFERRAL SOURCES</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison Rahway, New Jersey	Police, Courts, Probation, Community Agencies
Squire's Program California State Prison San Quentin, California	Police, Courts, Probation, Community Agencies, Voluntary
Youth Aversion Project, Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center Susanville, California	Group Homes, Boys' Ranches, Probation, Courts, Continuation Schools
The Insider's Group Virginia State Penitentiary Richmond, Virginia	Courts, Probation, Parole
Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program Queensboro Correctional Facility Long Island, New York	Police, Courts, Probation, Community Agencies, Department of Education
The Knights of Henri Christophe State Correctional Institution at Graterford Graterford, Pennsylvania	Probation Officer and Juvenile Court Judge (Delaware County only)
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison	Juvenile Court Personnel

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, 1979).

Table A-5

SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
EVALUATION STATUS AND EVALUATOR

<u>PROGRAM*</u>	<u>EVALUATION STATUS</u>	<u>EVALUATOR</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison Rahway, New Jersey	Evaluation Completed	James Finchenauer Rutgers University Newark, New Jersey
Squire's Program California State Prison San Quentin, California	Phase I (Attitudinal) evaluation completed; Phase II (Behavioral) to start soon.	Roy Lewis California Youth Authority Sacramento, California
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison	Evaluation Completed	James Yarborough Director of Research Michigan Department of Corrections Lansing, Michigan
Youth Aversion Project Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center Susanville, California	Evaluation in Progress	Ron Shinn Chief of Research California Department of Corrections Sacramento, California
The Insider's Group Virginia State Penitentiary Richmond, Virginia	Evaluation in Progress	Helen Hinshaw Planning and Research Department of Corrections Richmond, Virginia

*The Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program and The Knights of Henri Christophe Program have not been evaluated.

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, October 1979).

Table A-6

**SELECTED JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS:
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY, SUCCESS CRITERIA, AND MAJOR FINDINGS**

<u>PROGRAM*</u>	<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	<u>SUCCESS CRITERIA</u>	<u>MAJOR FINDINGS</u>
Juvenile Awareness Program Rahway Prison Rahway, New Jersey	<u>Quasi-experimental</u> Sample size: 81 Selection: judgment Follow-up: 6 months	Attitudinal and behavioral change, no involvement with juvenile justice system	<u>Essentially negative:</u> (1) Attitudes toward crime and deterrence in experimentals only measure showing improvement (nine measures tested) (2) <u>More</u> experimentals committed new offenses which were also <u>more</u> serious than controls
Squiro's Program California State Prison San Quentin, California	<u>Experimental</u> Sample size: 69 Selection: random Sample: institution- alized males at 2 sites Follow-up: 6 months (limited to 2 counties)	No commission of subsequent status or delinquent offenses	<u>Positive attitude:</u> Experimentals have "more positive" attitudinal change than controls
JOLT (Juvenile Offenders Learn Truth) Michigan Department of Corrections Jackson State Prison	<u>Experimental</u> Sample size: 227 Selection: random Follow-up: 3 & 6 months	No commission of <u>criminal</u> offenses	<u>Neutral:</u> No difference in recidivism between experimentals and controls. No negative effect of program upon experimentals.
Youth Aversion Project Dead End Center Project California Conservation Center Susanville, California	<u>Quasi-experimental</u> Sample size: 200 Selection: judgment Follow-up: 3 years	Attitude change, no new offenses (status or delinquent)	Not available
The Insider's Group Virginia State Penitentiary Richmond, Virginia	<u>Experimental</u>	Not available	Not available

*The Juvenile Intervention and Enlightenment Program and The Knights of Henri Christophe Program have not been evaluated.

Source: Table constructed by the NATIONAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ASSESSMENT CENTER (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, October 1979).

APPENDIX B
SUPPLEMENTAL LIST OF JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS

SUPPLEMENTAL LIST OF JUVENILE AVERSION PROGRAMS

In addition to the seven programs discussed in the report, the following juvenile aversion programs have been identified:

The Glimmer of Hope Juvenile Counseling Program
Lifers, Inc.
Missouri State Penitentiary
Jefferson City, Missouri

The Juvenile Education Program
Lifers Group
Lansing, Kansas State Prison

Y.O.U. (Your Opportunities are Unlimited)
Federal Penitentiary
Leavenworth, Kansas

Project Conway
Rochester, New York
Coordinating agency for programs at Albion Correctional Institute, Auburn Correctional Institute, Elmira Correctional Institute, and Attica Correctional Institute

Community Involvement Group (CIG)
James River Correctional Center
State Farm, Virginia

Inner Voices
Lorton Institution
Washington, D.C.
Lawrence Gayot, Director

Juvenile Awareness Program of Connecticut
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Robert Auk, Coordinator
(Inmates from Fishkill Prison, Beacon, New York)

JAIL Program (Juveniles Avoiding Institutional Lock-Up)
Southern Ohio Correctional Institution at Lucasville

Youthful Offenders Visiting Program
Birmingham, Alabama
(Sponsored by Kiwanis Club of Birmingham)

Juvenile Awareness Program
Raiford State Prison, Florida

Eddyville State Penitentiary Program
Eddyville State Penitentiary
Paducah, Kentucky

Project Teen-Alert

West Virginia Penitentiary

Moundsville, West Virginia

(Operated by Convicts Against Delinquents in Society,
Dr. Ralph S. Warner and Charles Burnett, Coordinators)

Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program

New York City Correctional Facility (Tombs)

Arthur Lambert, Director

Juvenile Awareness Project

Chester County Farms Prison

West Chester, Pennsylvania

Thomas G. Frame, Warden

Day in Jackson Program

Jackson State Prison

Jackson, Michigan

Ms. Jackie L. Currie, Commissioner

Charles Anderson, Warden

APPENDIX C

SOURCES

SOURCES

- Berkman, David J., Principal Investigator, National Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center. "The Deterrence of Juvenile Crime: A Comparative Analysis of Juvenile Aversion Programs." Presentation at the California Association for Criminal Justice Research, Sacramento, California, October 25, 1979.
- Dellinger, R. "Scared Straight! But for How Long?" Human Behavior, April 26-27, 1979.
- "Does Scaring Work?" Newsweek, May 14, 1979, p. 131.
- "Evaluation Raises Doubts About 'Scared Straight.'" Child Protection Report, May 3, 1979, p. 5.
- Fauver, William H., Commissioner, New Jersey Department of Corrections. Testimony to the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the House of Representatives, June 4, 1979.
- Finchenauer, James O., Associate Professor, School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University. Testimony before Subcommittee on Human Resources, June 4, 1979.
- Finchenauer, James O. and Storte, Janet R. "Juvenile Awareness Project Help, Evaluation Report No. 1." (Newark, N.J.: Rutgers University, School of Criminal Justice, December 1978).
- Finchenauer, James O. and Storte, Janet R. "Juvenile Awareness Project, Evaluation Report No. 2." (Newark, N.J.: Rutgers University, School of Criminal Justice, April 18, 1979).
- Gilman, Lawrence and Melin, Richard K. "An Evaluation of the Lifer's Group Juvenile Awareness Program, New Jersey State Prison, Rahway, New Jersey." (Trenton, N.J.: State Department of Corrections, July 1977).
- "Governors, Legislatures Advised Not to Rush 'Scared Straight.'" Juvenile Justice Digest, June 1, 1979, pp. 2-3.
- Hill, Sam, Assistant Professor, Department of Administration of Justice and Public Safety, Virginia Commonwealth University. Testimony prepared for the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Human Resources, June 4, 1979.
- "How Straight is 'Scared Straight'? Doubts Grow About Effect of Rahway Prison Project." Youth Alternatives, May 1979, p. 7 and p. 12.
- Krajick, Kevin. "Lifers Try to Scare the Crime Out of Juveniles." Corrections, December 1977.
- MaGuire, William J., District 22, New Jersey. Testimony before Subcommittee on Human Resources, House Committee on Education and Labor, June 4, 1979.

Michigan. Department of Corrections. "Evaluation of JOLT as a Deterrence Program," by James C. Yarborough, Program Bureau. July 18, 1979.

Miller, Jerome G. and Hoelter, Herbert H., National Center on Institutions and Alternatives. Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Human Resources, June 4, 1979.

National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. "Federal Committee Acts on 'Scared Straight.'" News Release, May 18, 1979.

"Policy Statement: Juvenile Awareness Program's 'Scared Straight.'" Adopted August 1979 by the Delegate Assembly of the American Correctional Association.

"Rahway Prison Program Lauded During Congressional Hearing." Juvenile Justice Digest, June 15, 1979, pp. 8-9.

Rahway State Prison. Lifer's Group. "Aims and Objectives." n.d.

Reynolds, John T., Executive Vice President, Golden West Television. Testimony before Subcommittee on Human Resources, House Committee on Education and Labor, June 4, 1979.

"Scared Straight Jolted Again." Institutions, Etc.: Investigative Newsletter on Institutions/Alternatives. National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Washington, D.C.

"Scared Straight Hearings Set for June 4th on Capitol Hill." Network News, May-June, 1979.

"Scared Straight: The Politics of Fear." Network News, March-April, 1979.

"Scared Straight: A Second Look." Pamphlet by National Center on Institutions and Alternatives, Washington, D.C., n.d.

Shapiro, Arnold, Director, Motion Pictures and Special Projects, Golden West Television. Producer, Director and Writer of "Scared Straight." Testimony for the Subcommittee on Human Resources, House Committee on Education and Labor, June 4, 1979.

Smith, Charles P. and Berkman, David J. "A Preliminary Assessment of Rutgers University Evaluation Rahway State Prison Juvenile Awareness Project ('Scared Straight')." (Sacramento, CA: American Justice Institute, National Juvenile Justice System Assessment Center, May 4, 1979).

Tunney, Roul. "Don't Let Them Take Me Back." Reader's Digest, January 1978.

U.S. House of Representatives. Subcommittee on Human Resources. Statement of Congressman Ike Andrews, Chairman, June 7, 1979.

END