

96623

✓
SELECTED SUMMARIES OF RESEARCH REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS FROM
THE EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL JUVENILE
RESTITUTION INITIATIVE

January, 1983

Peter R. Schneider
Institute of Policy Analysis
Eugene
Oregon 97401

Anne L. Schneider
Department of Political Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

96623
funding for this report and research was provided by Grant Nos. 77-NI-99-0005,
AX-0009, and 82-JS-AX-0025 from the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration, OJJDP/NIJJD, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Points
of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors, and
do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the
Department of Justice.

PREFACE

This document contains selected summaries and abstracts of research
reports and other materials prepared by the Institute of Policy Analysis
as part of the National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative.
Included is a complete list of products from the evaluation. Copies of
full reports or additional information about the evaluation can be obtained
from the co-principal investigators:

Peter R. Schneider
44 W. Broadway, Suite 401
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(503) 485-2282

Anne L. Schneider
Department of Political Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
(405) 624-5570

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the
person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated
in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily
represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of
Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been
granted by

~~Public Domain/NIJ/OJJDP~~
~~U.S. Dept. of Justice~~
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permis-
sion of the copyright owner.

RESTITUTION REQUIREMENTS FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS: A SURVEY OF THE PRACTICES IN AMERICAN JUVENILE COURTS*

The study reported in this paper examined the restitution practices of a random sample of American juvenile courts. The study was conducted to meet the informational needs of the National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative, and represented the first nationwide, systematic survey and analysis of the operation of restitution programs in juvenile courts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to obtain information on the scope and history of restitution in American juvenile courts and to illuminate major issues pertinent to the use of restitution as a disposition for juvenile offenders. The survey instrument developed for the study explored (1) the nature of the restitution process (e.g., types of restitution, the role of the victim, enforcement procedures, compliance rates); (2) the relationship of restitution to other criminal sanctions and to offender contact with the court; and (3) judges' and juvenile court officials' perceptions of restitution's goals and effectiveness.

Findings

The surveys captured the variety of restitution programs that have been implemented and, at the same time, revealed similarities across the different approaches. There exists, for example, considerable agreement on the purposes of restitution, how it should be combined with other sanctions, what criteria should be used in establishing requirements, and the levels of estimated compliance. On the other hand, programs varied considerably with respect to such things as the type of restitution ordered, methods of enforcement, and the role of parents in paying restitution. The following are highlights of the findings and conclusions:

- Restitution was used in all but 14 percent of the courts surveyed, with the average program having been in existence for almost 17 years.
- The vast majority of judges and juvenile court officials expressed support for restitution and belief in its effectiveness. While courts that used restitution were more supportive than those that did not, a majority of courts in the latter category viewed restitution favorably.

*Schneider, P. R., A. L. Schneider, P. Reiter, C. Cleary (1977). Restitution Requirements for Juvenile Offenders: A Survey of the Practices in American Juvenile Courts. Juvenile Justice 28 (November): 43-56.

- Approximately 70 percent of the respondents estimated compliance rates of greater than 90 percent.
- Estimates of compliance did not differ with the socioeconomic characteristics of the area, the proportion of cases in which restitution was required, or the type of program used.
- Belief in the effectiveness of restitution for reducing recidivism and improving victim attitudes toward the system was high and was not confined to court personnel from white, middle-class areas who use restitution only in a limited number of cases.
- The degree of belief in restitution effectiveness was greater for courts that used it than for those that did not, and tended to be higher in courts that had more types of restitution available, including work restitution and community service.

AN OVERVIEW OF RESTITUTION PROGRAM MODELS IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM*

The study presented in this paper was undertaken at the request of OJJDP in preparation for the implementation and expansion of the use of restitution in juvenile courts, and was designed to explore the alternative approaches to restitution developed by a selected group of juvenile courts that had had considerable experience with requiring juveniles to make restitution to victims.

Information from an IPA survey of 133 randomly selected juvenile courts and from the in-depth study of 15 jurisdictions in 12 states was used to identify seven major organizational dimensions of restitution programs. These were: (1) the goals and purposes of the program; (2) the types of restitution available; (3) the scope of eligibility; (4) the procedures for developing the restitution plan; (5) the range and types of offender services available; (6) the number of services available to victims (other than restitution itself); and (7) the source of responsibility and control for the restitution process. Each of these dimensions is a continuum, and a restitution program could be located at any point on the continuum. Each dimension also represents the types of decisions that a jurisdiction would have to make if it were intending to implement a restitution program.

Using the dimensions presented above, seven general models of restitution programs which illustrate the range of models that might be used (and which have the closest fit to the 15 sites included in the study) were described in detail. The restitution program models presented in this paper were derived primarily from three of seven organizational dimensions: victim-oriented activities; offender-oriented activities; and the type of offender activities (service-oriented or deterrence-oriented). These do not exhaust the models that could be developed and jurisdictions intending to implement restitution programs could mix and combine the models in a variety of ways.

*Schneider, A. L. (1980). An Overview of Restitution Program Models in the Juvenile Justice System. Juvenile and Family Court Journal 37 (1): 3-22.

THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION EVALUATION: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES*

The National Juvenile Restitution Initiative launched in 1978 was designed to promote and experiment with the use of restitution in juvenile courts. A total of 85 projects were funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, with a total commitment of approximately \$30 million over three years. The objectives of these restitution projects, according to the program announcement, would be to (1) reduce incarceration of juveniles, (2) reduce recidivism, (3) bring about a greater sense of responsibility on the part of young offenders, (4) provide some redress or satisfaction to the victims of juvenile crime, (5) promote community confidence in the juvenile justice process, and (6) increase knowledge about the feasibility of restitution in terms of its cost-effectiveness and its impact on juvenile offenders and the juvenile justice process. These objectives provide the primary guidance to the research questions being asked and the propositions being examined by the national evaluation.

The National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative is divided into three major components:

Component I: Impact Assessment

The first major component is designed to assess the impact of restitution on offenders and victims. So that the unique effects of restitution could be isolated, experimental research designs—involving random assignment to experimental and control groups—were established in six project sites. This segment of the evaluation focuses on outcome measures such as rates of recidivism and shifts in attitudes, and involves comparisons between restitution and nonrestitution dispositions; programmatic restitution and nonprogrammatic restitution; and restitution as a sole sanction vs. restitution combined with other sanctions and/or treatments. The research plan calls for four major analyses:

- incarceration/seriousness analysis
- juvenile offender attitudinal analysis
- recidivism analysis
- victim satisfaction analysis

*Schneider, P. R., and A. L. Schneider (1979). The National Juvenile Restitution Evaluation: Experimental Designs and Research Objectives. Paper presented at the Third National Symposium on Restitution, Duluth, MN, September.

Component 2: Process Evaluation

The second major component is designed to document the progress of the initiative, describe the projects in terms of program and treatment models, and determine the extent to which the initiative is serving its targeted population of serious offenders. In this component of the evaluation, the data collection procedures are expanded to include all 85 restitution project sites. The studies that make up the process evaluation are as follows:

- progress of the initiative in terms of short-term
- performance measures
- description of projects and restitution program models
- community and professional surveys
- target population analysis

Target population analysis. The analysis of the target population involves the collection of data on every youth referred to every project in the entire initiative, and is probably the largest single component of the evaluation. It has three major purposes: (1) to document the number and types of offenders referred to restitution projects; (2) to monitor the operation of the individual projects; and (3) to gather data on short-term performance measures such as successful completion rates, in-program reoffense rates, amount of victim loss recovered through restitution, and so forth. Data for this analysis is collected through the Management Information System (MIS) instituted at each of the restitution sites.

Component 3: Policy Studies

The third component of the evaluation consists of a series of policy studies relating to the adjudication and incarceration of juvenile offenders, different strategies for funding a federal initiative, and the costs of operating juvenile restitution projects. These studies are approached through the use of aggregate data (rather than individual or case-by-case data) and pose choices for decision makers that have system-wide ramifications. The studies planned for this component are as follows:

- analysis of trends in incarceration/adjudication rates
- statewide vs. local funding study
- cost-effectiveness analysis

POLICY EXPECTATIONS AND PROGRAM REALITIES IN JUVENILE RESTITUTION*

Social policies can fail to achieve intended goals due to inadequate resources to properly operationalize program models, or because the theoretical rationale underlying the reform is inaccurate. However, even when program models are appropriate and are based on adequate theories, policy goals may not be realized if programs are not implemented in a manner sufficiently consistent with the intent of the reform to achieve its major goals. In examining the implementation of projects funded by the National Juvenile Restitution Initiative, the research reported in this paper gives major attention to this third cause of implementation failure. Using preliminary information about the implementation of the 85 projects funded as part of the federal initiative, the analysis focuses on the following questions:

1. To what extent are the project components and operations consistent with the theory linking restitution to improvement in juvenile behavior (e.g., to reducing recidivism)?
2. To what extent are the project components and operations consistent with those one would expect are needed in order to increase victim satisfaction with the juvenile justice system?
3. Do the clients of the restitution projects meet the criteria for the target population, as specified by the OJJDP guidelines for the initiative (e.g., are projects receiving referrals who otherwise would have been incarcerated)?

Discussion

The data suggest that local juvenile justice systems understood and accepted the theory of restitution, and that there was substantial agreement at both the local and federal levels concerning the types of program components that represent restitution. Judges were holding youth accountable by ordering restitution, and restitution projects were receiving the targeted population of adjudicated, serious offenders. Compliance with specific goals of the initiative can be summarized as follows:

Offender accountability. Most projects funded by the initiative began receiving referrals in early 1979. Through the end of July, 1979, 65 percent of the cases were ordered monetary, or monetary and community service restitution, while 40 percent were ordered community service only.

*Schneider, A. L. (1980). Policy Expectations and Program Realities in Juvenile Restitution in B. Galaway and J. Hudson (eds.), Victims, Offenders, and Alternative Sanctions. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

There had been concern that juveniles would either fail to comply with restitution requirements, or that the orders would be "adjusted" into nonexistence by probation. On the contrary, the data indicated that most of the original restitution requirements were met in full (82 percent), four percent had been adjusted (usually downward) prior to closure, and only seven percent had been terminated due to noncompliance. The remainder of the cases were determined ineligible, or were closed for reasons unrelated to the requirement (e.g., the youth moved away). Another fear--that payment by parents could thwart the impact of restitution by undermining the accountability/responsibility and punishment aspects of paying restitution--was also substantially averted. Only 11 percent of the total dollars paid in restitution through the end of July, 1979, had been provided by parents.

Victim satisfaction. The rationale linking restitution to improved victim satisfaction is that victims who receive compensation for their losses are more likely to be satisfied with the way the juvenile justice system handled the case than victims who are not. The data show that of the cases that had already been closed through July, 1979, about 80 percent of the dollars ordered had been paid. However, other project components thought to contribute to victim satisfaction--in addition to actual payment of restitution--were not well represented in the projects. Less than one percent of the cases referred through the end of July, 1979, had victim service orders, and less than one-fourth of the projects intended to include victim services such as property return, advocacy, and counseling. The relative absence of victim services may reflect that the initiative originated from an offender-, rather than victim-oriented agency, and that the victim components are often expensive to operate. In addition, agencies responding to the OJJDP solicitation tended to be those traditionally involved with offenders, not victims.

The target population. The OJJDP guidelines specified that no preadjudicated cases were eligible for the federally funded restitution projects. In addition, OJJDP preferred that the target population consist of youth who would have been incarcerated if they had not been referred to the restitution project. Implementation of the guideline specifications of the target population presented more problems than any other single aspect of the initiative. Reasons proposed for this difficulty are the following:

(1) Lack of philosophical/ideological agreement regarding who the appropriate target should be (e.g., minor offenders who would otherwise have been diverted vs. serious offenders who would otherwise have been incarcerated).

(2) Differences between local and federal perceptions of what was needed. It is suggested that from the federal perspective there were a huge number of incarcerated juveniles, and the goal was to reduce incarceration. From the perspective of many local juvenile courts, however, the number of "would-have-been-incarcerated" youth was too small to justify a full-fledged restitution program that would be restricted to this serious-offender category.

(3) The absence of a clear and measurable definition of the target population. No guidelines were developed as to how project personnel could demonstrate that incarceration would have been the disposition in the absence of the restitution project. Eventually, OJJDP required that each project demonstrate a percentage reduction in incarceration. This solution was viewed as problematic, first because it assumed the availability of adequate and comparable data from individual jurisdictions; second, the criterion measurement, incarceration rates, would not be available for at least two or three years after implementation.

Since reduction in incarceration rates was a major goal of the initiative, it was important that the national evaluation have some means of ascertaining the proportion of referrals who might have been incarcerated. The approach taken was to develop five alternative standards for assessing the appropriateness of referrals. These standards re based on the seriousness of the current offense and the youth's pattern of prior delinquent behavior. Although there is no information available to permit an estimate of the probability of incarceration for juveniles within each of the standards, the analysis indicates that almost one-third of the referrals to the initiative met the most stringent standard (which counts as appropriate only repeat offenders who have committed a very serious crime), and less than 10 percent of the referrals were in the truly minor categories of offenders (e.g., victimless or minor first offenders).

It appears, then, that in spite of the lack of a clear and measurable definition of the target population, projects were accepting youth who would have been incarcerated, and for the most part, were avoiding the acceptance of referrals for youths who generally would have been diverted rather than adjudicated.

LEGAL ISSUES IN THE OPERATION OF RESTITUTION PROGRAMS IN A JUVENILE COURT*

The purposes of this paper were to examine the logical and constitutional problems posed by different methods of ordering restitution, and to discuss the numerous legal issues that arise in the operation and design of restitution programs, with special emphasis given to the unique problems presented by ordering restitution in a juvenile court setting.

Authority for Restitution Programs

The first question that is addressed is whether there is any legal authority for restitution or community service programs. The legal authority of the juvenile court to order restitution has been challenged in the past on the ground that a disposition that promotes personal responsibility also serves rehabilitative goals. The argument that restitution is not rehabilitative has been further diffused by the recent trend away from a rehabilitation, toward a more accountability-oriented approach to juvenile justice.

Due Process Issues

A multitude of due process issues attend the ordering of restitution for youthful offenders. The first that is addressed concerns protecting the constitutional rights of juveniles when formal court procedures are bypassed, or the youth is "diverted." There are substantial legal problems to requiring a youth to pay restitution at the preadjudication stage. Some states have resolved this problem with provisions which allow a diverted youth to enter into a restitution agreement only after the youth has made an informed decision to waive the right to a formal adjudication hearing.

Other due process issues associated with the ordering of restitution include: (1) the method of determining the amount of damage for which the youth will be held responsible; (2) the youth's pro rata share of the amount when there are multiple offenders; (3) the method of valuing the amount of damages; (4) the method of repayment; and (5) the requirement imposed by the court to assure that the restitution order is complied. A review of state laws and court rulings are used to examine each of these issues in terms of the factors that must be considered in developing procedures that balance the interests of the youth with those of the state.

*Feinman, H. F. (1979). Legal Issues in the Operation of Restitution Program in a Juvenile Court, in J. Hudson and B. Galaway [eds.], Victims, Offenders, and Alternative Sanctions. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath.

SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF RESTITUTION ORDERS IN THE JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS*

This report examined the rate at which juveniles referred to restitution projects successfully complete the court-ordered requirements. Based on data from more than 7,000 youths who were admitted to and later terminated from restitution projects, the rate of successful completion was estimated at 88 percent and forecast to continue at about the same level. The analysis indicated that the youths most likely to successfully complete the restitution requirements were those who are white, in school, have higher family incomes, fewer prior offenses, and whose current offense was of a less serious nature. In addition, youths whose restitution payments were subsidized and those with comparatively smaller orders were also more likely to complete. Finally, offenders required to make restitution as a sole sanction, and who were not placed on probation or given a suspended commitment, were more likely to complete restitution successfully.

*Griffith, W. R., A. L. Schneider, and P. R. Schneider (1980). Successful Completion of Restitution Orders in the Juvenile Restitution Initiative: A Preliminary Analysis. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, November.

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPACT OF PRIVATE INSURANCE ON RESTITUTION AS A SANCTION FOR CRIMINAL OFFENDERS*

Restitution is an increasingly popular disposition in juvenile courts. It has received widespread support in the criminal justice community from persons with very different philosophical and ideological perspectives, yet there exist many differing and strongly held views on the operation and implementation of restitution as a sanction. One of the areas of sharpest difference is whether restitution payments should be used to pay insurance companies.

This paper explores the legal rights and responsibilities involved in paying restitution to insurance companies. The focus is on the legal interaction between the insurance company and the victim, the offender, and the courts. The paper concludes with an exploration of some of the theoretical and philosophical issues a court or program must face in deciding whether or not to pay restitution to insurance companies.

A review of case law and court policies indicate that opinions regarding the payment of restitution to insurance companies is strongly divided. Major national evaluations of restitution in adult and juvenile courts being undertaken hopefully will shed light on whether restitution is more or less effective in meeting its stated goals and purposes when the offender is ordered to make payment to an insurance company. This paper concludes that courts and agencies that prohibit restitution payments to insurance companies should have defensible rationales for this policy, and should develop reasonable alternative sanctions.

*Feinman, Howard F. (1980). Theoretical and Practical Impact of Private Insurance on Restitution as a Sanction for Criminal Offenders (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

IN-PROGRAM REOFFENSE RATES FOR JUVENILES IN RESTITUTION PROJECTS

A preliminary analysis of in-program reoffending rates in the juvenile restitution initiative was prepared approximately midway through the initiative to provide timely information to program managers regarding the probability of reoffending for various subgroups of juveniles under different program conditions. Referrals from January, 1979 through April, 1980 were included in the analysis. The major findings were as follows:

- An estimated 8.4 to 8.8 percent of the youths referred to the restitution projects reoffended during the time they were under the auspices of the projects. The average amount of time spent in these programs was 6.2 months.
- The likelihood of reoffending was higher for youths who had a history of prior criminal acts than for first offenders. The proportion expected to reoffend within six months of referral was six percent for first offenders, eight percent for youths with one prior offense, nine percent for those with two priors and 13 percent for those with three or more prior offenses.
- The likelihood of reoffending was not found to be related to the seriousness of the immediate offense. Youths committing the more serious offenses were no more likely to reoffend than those committing minor offenses.
- An analysis of the relationship between reoffenses and the sex, race, and age of the youths revealed only minor differences and no differences substantial enough or consistent enough to warrant concern in terms of program operation.
- There were some differences in the reoffense rates of youths in different income categories, with the persons in the lower income groups reoffending at a rate of about eight to ten percent in six months compared with reoffense rates of seven to eight percent for persons in the higher income groups.
- Youths attending school on a regular basis were slightly less likely to reoffend than those who were not in school. The six month reoffense rate of the former is 7.5 percent compared with nine percent in the latter group.

*Schneider, A. L., P. R. Schneider, and S. G. Bazemore (1980). In-Program Reoffense Rates for Juveniles in Restitution Projects (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

- Comparisons of the reoffense rates for youth under three different types of sanctions from the juvenile court were undertaken. Juveniles for whom restitution was the sole sanction reoffended at a rate of 5.7 percent in six months; those with restitution plus probation reoffended at a rate of 8.1 percent in six months; and those with restitution and suspended commitments reoffended at an even higher rate--13.2 percent in six months. This relationship could be due to the fact that youths with suspended commitments tend to be more serious offenders. Even though controls for prior offenses did not diminish the observed relationship, additional analysis will be undertaken before drawing any definitive conclusions about the relationship between reoffending and the juvenile court disposition.

THE APPLICATION OF STATISTICAL POWER ANALYSIS TO EXPERIMENTAL FIELD RESEARCH: SOME EXAMPLES FROM THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION EVALUATION*

This paper discusses the application of statistical power analysis to experimental research in field settings—especially those settings in which the subjects for research "trickle in" through a case-flow process rather than being identified and selected prior to the experiment, as in classic laboratory research. The paper suggests that statistical power (defined as the probability that a significant effect can be found when an effect actually exists) can be useful in making four types of decisions: (1) initial decisions to undertake experiments; (2) decisions about the length of time an experiment need continue in order to produce enough cases for a viable study; (3) various decisions concerning assignment of subjects to experimental and control groups; and (4) decisions concerning the appropriate time to end an experiment by discontinuing random assignment. All of the examples in this paper are drawn from the National Evaluation of Juvenile Restitution Initiative; however, the application of statistical power analysis is considered relevant for any field experiment in which subjects become available for observation by the flow of clients into an agency or program.

*Medler, J. R., P. R. Schneider, and A. L. Schneider (1981). Statistical Power Analysis and Experimental Field Research. Evaluation Review 5 (6): 834-850.

JUVENILE RESTITUTION AS A SOLE SANCTION OR CONDITION OF PROBATION: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS*

An important issue in the use of restitution as a sanction for juvenile offenders is whether it should be used alone or in conjunction with other sanctions. Arguments for the combination of restitution with other sanctions focus on the need to impress offenders with the consequences of their actions, provide them with guidance and enforce the payment of restitution or the successful completion of whatever the court has ordered. The objectives underlying these arguments are to (1) reduce recidivism, (2) bring about a greater sense of responsibility on the part of young offenders, (3) promote community confidence in the juvenile justice process, and (4) assure that victims are compensated for their losses.

Restitution as a sole sanction, on the other hand, usually has been advocated only for less serious, nonviolent offenders with the primary justification being cost-effective. A few researchers, however, also have promoted the use of sole sanction restitution under research conditions so that its unique effectiveness—apart from the impact of probation—can be examined. This paper, based on data from more than 10,000 juvenile court cases involving restitution, compared the outcomes of cases in which offenders were sentenced to restitution as a condition of probation with those in which offenders were ordered to make restitution as a sole sanction.

The degree of court control had a surprising impact on successful completion and reoffense rates. Contrary to expectations, successful completion rates were higher (by 10%) and reoffense rates were lower (by 6%) among referrals required to make restitution as a sole sanction. Moreover, these differences existed among all categories of offenders. Even when offense seriousness, number of prior charges, and socioeconomic background characteristics were taken into account, the youths making restitution as a sole sanction still had higher rates of completion and lower rates of reoffending.

While the reasons for these relationships can only be speculated upon, two possible explanations are offered here. The first involves positive labeling, and posits that youths respond favorably to the confidence and trust indicated by an order of restitution without probation as an enforcement mechanism. Another explanation holds that the simpler the sentence, the better. It appears that the more requirements that are placed on a youth, the more likely it is that the youth will fail. An experimental study is in progress on the effectiveness of sole sanction restitution vs. a combined disposition and will inform the findings of this study.

*Schneider, P. R., W. R. Griffith, and A. L. Schneider (1982). Juvenile Restitution as a Sole Sanction or Condition of Probation: An Empirical Analysis. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 19 (1): 47-65.

TWO-YEAR REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: AN OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM PERFORMANCE*

The two-year report on the National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative documents the progress and accomplishments of the initiative as a whole during the first two years. Based primarily on data collected through the Management Information System, this document examines progress according to short-term performance measures of project activity and offender behavior. Information is presented on (1) the characteristics of offenders, (2) number and types of offenses committed, (3) the amounts of different kinds of restitution ordered and paid, (4) the proportion of restitution orders successfully completed, and (5) the proportion of youth who commit new offenses while still in the project.

In addition, the report addresses several policy issues associated with the initiative. Organizational, implementation, and cost questions are explored utilizing data collected through three waves of questionnaires administered to project staff in the 85 sites.

The evaluation component designed to assess the unique impact of restitution on both victims and offenders, focuses on outcome measures and involves comparisons between experimental and control groups established in six project sites. The data for this component are currently being analyzed and reports will be available in early 1983.

*A 17-page executive summary of the two-year report is available. This concise report presents highlights of the activities of the initiative, the characteristics of its clients and their victims, the accomplishments of the restitution projects, and the conclusions of the assessment regarding the feasibility of restitution as an alternative disposition for juvenile offenders.

RATES OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF RESTITUTION REQUIREMENTS IN JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROJECTS: A MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS*

One of the most important short-term performance measures of restitution as a disposition for juvenile offenders is the rate of successful completion of restitution requirements. The National Juvenile Restitution Initiative was intended both to develop meaningful alternatives to the incarceration of youthful offenders and to provide redress to the victims of crime. For restitution programs to meet these objectives, youth for whom restitution is ordered must be able to complete their requirements. Two related policy issues are: "What types of offenders are most likely to complete their requirements?" and "Can and will serious offenders complete court-mandated restitution?"

The study presented in this paper employed a four-factor model of successful completion to address these questions. The analysis was based on individual-level data collected through the Management Information System (MIS) on the reason for case closure, and on data collected in three annual questionnaire waves on the characteristics of projects (COPS) in which youth were ordered restitution.

Preliminary data analysis suggested that whether a youth is successful in completing a restitution order can be viewed as a function of (1) the difficulty of the restitution order, (2) the amount of assistance that the project and others, such as parents, can provide the youth, (3) the incentives and sanctions available, and (4) the background characteristics of the youth. Independent variables were selected from the MIS and COPS data to operationalize each of these four factors. Multiple regression analyses were then used to determine the individual effects of each of the independent variables.

The major findings of this analysis of successful completion rates were:

- The overall rate of successful completion, for closed cases, in the first two years of the restitution initiative was 86.2 percent. Generally, it was found that youths from all types of restitution projects with all types of characteristics, receiving all types of assistance and sanctions, had been successfully completing their restitution orders with great frequency.

*Griffith, W. R., A. L. Schneider, and P. R. Schneider (1982). Rates of Successful Completion of Restitution Requirements in Juvenile Restitution Projects: A Multivariate Analysis (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

- The lowest successful completion percentage for any subgroup examined was 76.9 percent for youths ordered 75 or more hours of unpaid community service.
- The multivariate model revealed that neither the background characteristics of youth nor the available sanctions/incentives consistently accounted for significant amounts of the variance in successful completion when the difficulty of the restitution order and the presence or absence of assistance (job subsidy) were statistically controlled.
- The analysis strongly suggested that the answer to the question, "Can and will serious offenders complete court-mandated restitution requirements?" was an unequivocal "Yes."

IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE
IN SIX STATES: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF
INTERGOVERNMENTAL POLICY ADOPTION*

An issue addressed by the policy-oriented component of the national evaluation was the funding and implementation of restitution programs. It called for a comparison of projects funded at the state level (which, in turn, subcontracted with local jurisdictions within their states) and projects directly funded at the local level. The research reported in this paper compares and contrasts the implementation strategies of the six state agencies funded by the restitution initiative.

The analysis of state grantees in the federal juvenile restitution initiative was undertaken in order to better understand intergovernmental policy implementation in the context of a policy conceived at the federal level, adopted and structured at the state level, and actually implemented at the local level. Recent studies of implementation have led to the realization that numerous program failures can be directly attributed to inadequate implementation. Yet, the overall improvement of program implementation requires the identification of concepts and factors relevant to implementation success or failure. The specific objectives of this research were to (1) specify a number of implementation concepts, (2) suggest probable interrelationships among these concepts and, finally, (3) test these relationships empirically.

Information pertinent to implementation of initiative projects was collected at several levels and points in time. The program announcement (federal level) was the first source of information, followed by preapplications, final applications, and grant awards. In addition, interviews were conducted with the state-level program directors during the start-up phase of the initiative. Finally, a local implementor questionnaire was developed and mailed to local project respondents approximately 18 months after the first programs began accepting referrals. Data collected through IPA's Management Information System (MIS) was used for the measurement of program performance.

Discussion and Conclusions

A general conclusion of the study was that a number of identified concepts—as operationalized—were indeed related to implementation performance. The data indicated that the following factors were associated with one or more of the implementation performance measures used. These were: (1) state grantee implementation strategies; (2) communication of initiative-related program information; (3) the extent of change to the local juvenile justice system perceived to have been caused by the new project; (4) the program-specific training of local implementors; and (5) the perceived receptivity of existing local agencies to the project.

*Sumi, D. (1981). Implementing the National Juvenile Restitution Initiative in Six States: An Empirical Analysis of Intergovernmental Policy Adoption (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

Start-up Phase. One of the most convincing findings concerned the relationship between the state implementation strategy and the amount of start-up lag time. It was found that centralized implementation strategies were strongly associated with longer delays in local project start-up. Further, if a state attempted to implement a greater number of local sites, the delay problem was aggravated. This finding is attributed to the number of actors and agencies involved which, in turn, produce greater intergovernmental complexity and higher decision costs. The data also suggest, however, that when two levels of government are highly integrated and the number of actors minimized, intergovernmental complexity and associated decision costs can be overcome.

RESTITUTION OR REBATE: THE ISSUE OF JOB SUBSIDIES IN JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROJECTS*

The issue of utilizing employment subsidies in juvenile restitution projects has been one of the most controversial topics in the national juvenile restitution initiative. Proponents argued that employment subsidies were necessary in order for more youths to participate in restitution programs. Specifically, since a youth's ability to pay was typically a screening criterion for monetary eligibility, job subsidies would increase the number of youths eligible for this type of restitution. Moreover, proponents contended that job subsidies made more hard-core, disadvantaged youth eligible for restitution--exactly the type of offenders at which the initiative was targeted.

Opponents of subsidies argued that job subsidies were not restitution--that the payment of public money to juvenile delinquents in subsidized jobs in order to pay back the victims of these delinquents shifted the focus away from restitution toward victim compensation. Also, since youths frequently would be allowed to keep a portion of the money they earned from their subsidized employment, it was argued that job subsidies would actually reward offenders referred to restitution projects.

In 1980, officials at OJJDP decided that job subsidies were allowable for two main reasons:

1. Subsidies "offer a means of initially distributing the financial responsibility of employing youths between the project and local public and private sector employers. As a result, projects can develop cooperative relationships with local and private business and industry, and in turn can secure employment for restitution purposes;" and,
2. "These funds help guarantee equal treatment to all juvenile offenders, regardless of their ability to pay restitution" (OJJDP, 1980).

OJJDP also attached specific limitations on how subsidy monies could be spent. Specifically, subsidies could not be used to make payments to victims before the restitution had been earned by the juvenile; they could not be used to pay third party expenses (e.g., insurance companies); they could not continue after a youth had completed his or her restitution (in most situations); and a youth could not keep more than 50 percent of the subsidized earnings, up to a maximum of \$500.

*Griffith, Wm. R. (1983) Restitution or Rebate: The Issue of Job Subsidies in Juvenile Restitution Projects (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

The OJJDP criteria for offering subsidies resulted in two major types of employment subsidization. In the public sector employment subsidies involved youth being paid by the court for work done in public service jobs. In the private sector subsidies were used for providing incentives to private businesses to hire delinquent youth.

Summary of Research Questions and Conclusions

The issue of employment subsidies is embodied by four questions. Drawing upon individual-level data collected at each of the 85 federally funded restitution projects, these questions and the summarized answers to them are presented below.

1. How do referrals to projects that offer subsidies differ from referrals to projects that do not? Referrals to subsidy projects tend to have larger monetary restitution orders, slightly higher levels of offense seriousness, more priors, and lower household incomes. Referrals to projects that do not offer employment subsidies tend to be slightly older, with more nonschool youth and nonwhites.

2. In projects offering subsidies (N = 51), which factors influence whether or not individual youths would receive subsidization? The major factors taken into account in the decision to provide subsidization appear to have been the level of offense seriousness (referrals with more serious levels received subsidies), age (younger offenders tended to receive subsidies more often), and size of the monetary restitution order (large orders were subsidized more frequently than small).

3. What were the effects of subsidies on the performance of these youth in restitution projects? Subsidies produced, on the average, about a 12 percent increase in the level of successful completion of restitution requirements, and subsidies did not appear to have a significant effect on the level of in-program reoffending.

4. What types of offenders benefitted most from the receipt of employment subsidies? In terms of the successful completion of restitution requirements, youth who had a higher probability of failing their restitution requirements tended to receive the greatest benefit from the provision of a subsidy.

It must be emphasized that the findings presented in this paper are not based on data collected from a true experimental design. The decisions to provide or not to provide subsidies to these youth were not based on the random assignment of youth into or out of a subsidy treatment, rather the decisions were based on both systematic and idiosyncratic criteria. Thus, while these findings are cogent and make some degree of intuitive sense, they must be regarded as suggestive. Additional research containing true experimental research designs is needed to make a definitive determination of the effect of subsidies on the performance of youth in juvenile restitution programs.

THE JUVENILE OFFENDER INSTRUMENT: ADMINISTRATION AND A DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS*

As part of the National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative, six of the 85 participating sites were selected for intensive, experimental evaluation. In addition to the Management Information System (MIS) data systematically collected in all sites, information was gathered (through the use of official court records and several surveys of youths and victims) in the intensive sites for the testing of specific hypotheses regarding the impact of restitution programs. The present report provides a site-by-site descriptive summary of data collected during the administration of a particular experimental site survey: the Juvenile Offender Instrument (JOI). The purpose of each summary is to organize and display information gathered by the JOI in much the same manner as that accomplished by the series of Monthly Evaluation Reports for MIS data. A further intention of this report is the partial documentation of survey issues (response rates, random assignment violations, etc.) needed for the eventual analysis of this experimental data. No attempt, then, is made here to analyze the findings in terms of specific hypotheses nor are explanations offered for observed differences between experimental and control groups. In this sense, the report is purely descriptive.

The JOI survey was administered by IPA staff to both experimental and control group youths upon completion of their respective treatments. This survey was constructed to obtain information on five general topics of interest. These are:

1. Background characteristics of the youths (e.g., demographics, employment history, living situation, etc.),
2. Factual and attitudinal information about the offense, cooffenders (if any), and victim,
3. Opinions about the fairness and severity of juvenile court sanctions,
4. The youth's perceptions as to labeling by teachers, parents, and peers of him/herself, and
5. The self-rated likelihood of future criminal behavior.

As each of the six intensive sites constituted a separate experiment, descriptive information regarding these topics is presented in a series of chapters covering individual sites. In this way, each of the site-specific chapters constitutes a reasonably self-contained presentation of JOI information for that site. Additionally, these

*Wilson, M. J. (1983). The Juvenile Offender Instrument: Administration and a Description of Findings (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: Institute of Policy Analysis.

chapters follow the same organizational framework. The chapters begin with a description of the treatment groups established in the site, proceed to a summary of issues related to JOI administration (dates of administration, random assignment violations, group sizes, etc.), briefly discuss the salient descriptive points, and, finally, present the descriptive tables themselves.

The discussions of particular sites are preceded by a more general documentation of the JOI data collection effort. The extent of survey coverage (as measured by response rates), the frequency of random assignment violations, the experimental design used, and the size of groups available for experimental comparison are reported in this section.

RESEARCH REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FROM THE EVALUATION
OF THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE

1. Schneider, P. R. and A. L. Schneider.
EVALUATING JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROGRAMS: A PRELIMINARY
DESIGN. August 1976.
2. Burcart, J. M.
MEASURING DELINQUENCY THROUGH SELF-REPORT INSTRUMENTS: A
BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY. January 1977.
3. Schneider, P. R., A. L. Schneider, P. D. Reiter, and C. M. Cleary.
RESTITUTION REQUIREMENTS FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS: A SURVEY OF
THE PRACTICES IN THE AMERICAN JUVENILE COURTS. June 1977.*
4. Schneider, A. L. and P. R. Schneider.
AN OVERVIEW OF RESTITUTION PROGRAM MODELS IN THE JUVENILE
JUSTICE SYSTEM. May 1978.*
5. Schneider, P. R. and A. L. Schneider.
EVALUATING JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROGRAMS: A SUMMARY OF THE
PRELIMINARY DESIGN FOR THE NATIONAL EVALUATION. July 1978.
7. Schneider, P. R. and A. L. Schneider.
IMPLEMENTATION AND POLICY ISSUES IN THE NATIONAL JUVENILE
RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: A SIX-MONTH REPORT. August 1979.
8. Schneider, P. R. and A. L. Schneider.
THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION EVALUATION: EXPERIMENTAL
DESIGNS AND RESEARCH OBJECTIVES. September 1979.*
9. Schneider, A. L. and P. R. Schneider.
POLICY EXPECTATIONS AND PROGRAM REALITIES IN JUVENILE
RESTITUTION. September 1979.*
10. Feinman, H. F.
LEGAL ISSUES IN THE OPERATION OF RESTITUTION PROGRAMS.
September 1979.*
13. Feinman, H. F.
A REVIEW OF STATE LAWS RELEVANT TO JUVENILE RESTITUTION.
August 1980.

*Summary included in this document.

14. Griffith, W. R., A. L. Schneider, and P. R. Schneider.
SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF RESTITUTION ORDERS IN THE
JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS.
September 1980.*
15. Feinman, H. F.
THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPACT OF PRIVATE INSURANCE ON
RESTITUTION AS A SANCTION FOR CRIMINAL OFFENDERS. September
1980.*
16. Schneider, A. L., P. R. Schneider, and S. G. Bazemore.
IN-PROGRAM REOFFENSE RATES FOR JUVENILES IN RESTITUTION
PROJECTS. October 1980.*
17. Medler, J. F., P. R. Schneider, and A. L. Schneider.
THE APPLICATION OF STATISTICAL POWER ANALYSIS TO
EXPERIMENTAL FIELD RESEARCH: SOME EXAMPLES FROM THE
NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION EVALUATION. October 1980.*
18. Schneider, P. R. and W. R. Griffith.
JUVENILE RESTITUTION AS A SOLE SANCTION OR CONDITION OF
PROBATION: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS. November 1980.*
21. Schneider, P. R.
CRITICAL ISSUES IN THE JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: SOME
PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL EVALUATION. March
1981.
22. Wilson, M. J.
IN-PROGRAM REOFFENSE RATES: A COMPARISON OF
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP PERFORMANCE IN VENTURA,
CALIFORNIA. June 1981.
23. Schneider, P. R., A. L. Schneider, and W. R. Griffith.
MEASURES AND PREDICTORS OF SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN JUVENILE
RESTITUTION: SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL
EVALUATION. September 1980.
24. Schneider, P. R. and S. G. Bazemore.
PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF RANDOM ASSIGNMENT
PROCEDURES IN FIELD EXPERIMENTS: A DESCRIPTION OF FOUR
"SUCCESSFUL" IMPLEMENTATIONS. March 1981.
25. Feinman, H. F.
USE OF RANDOM SELECTION PROCEDURES IN PROGRAM
EVALUATION IN COURT SETTINGS: LEGAL AND ETHICAL ISSUES.
October 1981.

28. Institute of Policy Analysis.
A COMPENDIUM OF DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS PREPARED
FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION
INITIATIVE. September 1980.
29. Schneider, P. R., A. L. Schneider, W. R. Griffith, and M. J. Wilson.
TWO-YEAR REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE
JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: AN OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE. June 1982.*
30. Griffith, W. R., A. L. Schneider, and P. R. Schneider.
RATES OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF RESTITUTION
REQUIREMENTS IN JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROJECTS: A
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS. October 1982.*
31. Schneider, P. R., A. L. Schneider, W. R. Griffith, and M. J. Wilson.
TWO-YEAR REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE
JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE: AN OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM
PERFORMANCE--EXECUTIVE SUMMARY. October 1982.*
32. Sumi, D.
IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL JUVENILE RESTITUTION INITIATIVE IN SIX
STATES: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL POLICY
ADOPTION. April 1981.*
33. Griffith, W. R.
RESTITUTION OR REBATE: THE ISSUE OF JOB SUBSIDIES IN JUVENILE
RESTITUTION PROJECTS. January 1983.*
34. Wilson, M. J.
THE JUVENILE OFFENDER INSTRUMENT: ADMINISTRATION AND A
DESCRIPTION OF FINDINGS. January 1983.*
35. Schneider, P. R.
RESTITUTION AS AN ALTERNATIVE DISPOSITION FOR SERIOUS
JUVENILE OFFENDERS, December 1982.

MONTHLY EVALUATION REPORTS, from March 1979 through May 1981.

PROJECT DATA REPORTS, quarterly from August 1979 through ____.

END