



USC

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

# social science research institute

Police Juvenile Units  
Under New Juvenile Justice Legislation  
Malcolm W. Klein  
University of Southern California  
Volume VII of XI  
Implications of California's 1977  
Juvenile Justice Reform Law

99815

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/NIJDP  
US Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

99815

99813

Police Juvenile Units  
Under New Juvenile Justice Legislation

Malcolm W. Klein  
University of Southern California

Volume VII of XI  
Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law  
1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .

ABSTRACT . . . . .

1. Introduction . . . . . 1

    1.1 General Aims and Procedures . . . . . 1

    1.2 Early Suggestive Trends . . . . . 6

    1.3 Indications from Pilot Interview . . . . . 7

    1.4 Personnel Adaptations . . . . . 8

    1.5 Corrective Legislation . . . . . 10

2. The California Study . . . . . 12

    2.1 Size and Structure . . . . . 13

    2.2 Juvenile Police Functions . . . . . 15

    2.3 Direct Perceptions of AB3121 Impact . . . . . 17

    2.4 Perceived Causes of Change . . . . . 19

    2.5 Some Implications of the California Data . . . . . 21

3. The National Study . . . . . 25

    3.1 Methods . . . . . 25

    3.2 Specialization . . . . . 28

    3.3 Functions of Juvenile Units . . . . . 30

    3.4 Types of Offenses . . . . . 32

    3.5 Summary . . . . . 34

APPENDIX A: Interview Guide for California Study . . . . .

APPENDIX B: Interview Guide for National Study . . . . .

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1	Number of Stations Reporting Changes in Specialization . . . . .	31
---	--	----

## ABSTRACT

The enactment and implementation in 1977 of Assembly Bill 3121, California's major juvenile justice legislation, signaled significant shifts in juvenile justice policy and practice. While other research concerning AB3121 has been concerned with assessing the effects of this new law on the actions of juvenile justice personnel, the study reported herein was concerned more with a question of organizational response per se. Specifically, it was designed to assess changes in the structure and function of police juvenile operations as embodied in juvenile units or juvenile bureaus.

Because the operations of police juvenile units correspond to functions that are associated with both core and peripheral priorities in traditional police work and philosophy, there were reasons to expect both functional and structural alterations in juvenile units following the passage of AB3121. This comprehensive legislation both encouraged the application of core police priorities (case investigation and preparation for criminal prosecution) and reduced more peripheral priorities which had developed in juvenile units over the past few decades (prevention programs; screening and diversion activities for minor and "status" offenders).

In the very broadest sense, we expected both thrusts of the legislation to work in the same direction on police juvenile units, reducing unit size and altering the balance of investigative and dispositional functions to contact, screening, and prevention functions. Accordingly, an interview study was undertaken in 31 California police departments to determine the extent to which the anticipated alterations in juvenile unit characteristics did indeed accompany the new legislation, and the extent to which these alterations might be attributable directly to AB3121.

Further, since AB3121 was believed to embody many changes in the philosophy of juvenile justice on a national scale, a second interview study was undertaken in 88 police departments sampled from 24 states. Some of these states had enacted new legislation incorporating some of the changes in the California law and some had not enacted such legislation. Our purpose in this second study was to assess the generality of the California findings and to position ourselves to suggest whether or not acknowledged legislative changes were in fact related to a general retrenchment in police juvenile operations.

Data from the California study generally supported our expectations, although the trends were not outstanding. There was evidence of decreasing juvenile specialization. Investigative priorities increased relative to prevention. The juvenile unit is indeed in a period of retrenchment. Data from the national study, based on a comparison of states with and without new legislation of the California variety, generally contained the patterns noted in the California study. Since this form of legislation is more the rule than the exception, it seems reasonable to suggest, generally, that juvenile bureaus in police departments will continue to pull back from the emphasis on prevention and diversion, and will either concentrate more on investigative activities or will reduce their size or be eliminated as juvenile investigation functions are taken over by detective divisions. The heyday of the police juvenile unit may be in our past.

## 1. Introduction

This report departs somewhat from the thrust of the other volumes in this series. First, this research was expected to be more tentative, more suggestive than its counterparts which had more clearly defined evaluative intentions. Second, more than the others, this research concerned itself with a structural question rather than a question of altered organizational behavior. Finally, it was designed to extend beyond the confines of California and that state's particular new juvenile legislation, AB3121.

### 1.1 General Aims and Procedures

The thoughts underlying the juvenile unit research were relatively simple and straightforward. For some years, it has been apparent that two trends in juvenile justice philosophy have been gaining support, harsher and more adult-like treatment of serious offenders and the relinquishing of official controls over status offenders. These were the major trends embodied in AB3121.

While the two trends might seem mutually conflicting, they have in fact developed in parallel tracks, almost independently of each other. It occurred to the researchers, after a number of years of contact with police juvenile units, that the two trends might act in very much the same way, or at least in complementary fashion, in their impact on juvenile units. The enactment of AB3121, embodying these trends, offered the opportunity to investigate this impact. Further, because AB3121 was thought to be prototype legislation which mirrored emerging trends in the nation as a whole, it seemed likely that juvenile unit changes revealed in California might be reflected in juvenile units elsewhere in the country. If changing philosophies are enacted in new legislation and if this new legislation can yield predictions for organizational changes in the juvenile justice system, then the principal intake point of that system--the police juvenile unit--should be sensitive to those changes. Our prior work with juvenile

units led us to expect changes and to consider several forms these changes might take (to which we will turn later in this report).

Following the landmark Gault Decision, police juvenile bureaus were reorganized and downgraded as functional units in many large police departments. In Los Angeles County, for example, this occurred in both the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. This in turn led to a decline in community referrals for juveniles, and an increase in petition rates. With the advent of legislation like AB3121, history could well repeat itself.

We already knew of two juvenile bureaus which had been eliminated in the wake of AB3121. It seemed clear in such instances that parents, school officials, and others would have to seek other sources to obtain help in dealing with dependent/neglected youngsters and with status offenders (see Little, 1981; Gordon, 1981).

At the police level, there are two primary contact and decision points for juveniles--patrol and the juvenile unit. We chose to concentrate on the juvenile unit for two reasons. The first is strictly practical--a study of patrol structures requires too many resources and the proportional quotas of juvenile matters is quite small. Second, and more critically, the juvenile unit is a fragile structure. A recent innovation, being a creature of mid-century, it has waxed and waned in favor and importance. It has been a point of controversy between paternalistic and legalistic philosophies of juvenile justice, between generalists and specialists. If AB3121 were to effect structural change, then common sense and Lewinian theory would agree that the juvenile unit was the place to look. Lewin taught us about social systems that they have natural structures and natural "fracture points"<sup>1</sup> or boundaries where study can be most fruitful. The juvenile unit is such a fracture point.

---

<sup>1</sup>Not Lewin's term.

Fortunately, Rovner-Pieczenik's recent national survey of police juvenile units provides precisely the kind of analytic framework appropriate to assessing the impact of legislation like AB3121.<sup>2</sup> This study finds enormous variety in juvenile unit goals, structures, and functions. It suggests that the trend of current juvenile legislation may well reduce the need for juvenile units. And, it outlines three major functions exercised, sometimes separately and sometimes together, by juvenile units. These three are (1) the investigative function, (2) the screening function, and (3) the program (prevention and/or rehabilitation) function.<sup>3</sup>

The Rovner-Pieczenik study makes several points of particular pertinence to the context of the AB3121 situation. First, the juvenile unit has no essential purpose and is therefore fragile:

. . . the juvenile unit does nothing which cannot be handled elsewhere in the department or justice system. . .

Second, the contemporary departmental context and changes within it are affected by changes in overall policing patterns and perceived recent changes in crime patterns. As to the first, Rovner-Pieczenik notes,

. . . current trends in policing--team policing, departmental decentralization, the generalist officer--are undermining the role and autonomy of the juvenile unit.

As to the second, Rovner-Pieczenik suggests,

. . . the reality of juvenile unit operations is that many units currently have to compete for cases with other departmental divisions. . . as juvenile offenders become increasingly responsible for the more serious crimes in an area . . . we would speculate that the criminal investigations division will investigate even more of these cases.

*Anthony Telle - 1112 on reference*

<sup>2</sup>Draft report (available through the Police Foundation; funded as an NEP Phase I study by N.I.L.E.C.J. and O.J.J./N.I.J.J.D.P. 1977

<sup>3</sup>This latter function, in turn, has been stratified into four common variations in use among juvenile bureaus in California. See California State Plan for Criminal Justice, 1977, 280-281.

Again, both of these situations form a context in which the juvenile unit has of late become more vulnerable. The special needs of juvenile offenders which called forth the special interests, skills, and training of juvenile officers are being supplanted by more pressing needs. Added to the situation is the rapidly increasing number of legislative changes which are redefining the status and responsibility of juveniles and thus providing fertile ground for the growth of AB3121-initiated changes in the structure of juvenile units;

. . . legislative trends . . . are further limiting unit jurisdiction. Although the influence is direct, legislation which removes status offenders from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, or mandates that certain groups of juvenile offenders, by virtue of their offense and age, be handled by the courts as adults, are decreasing the units' business. 4

Given these comments--and they generally parallel much of what we had been seeing in the early AB3121 research--we speculated on several directions, perhaps already ongoing, in which juvenile units might move. First, they might place more emphasis on the investigative function and, as a consequence, on more serious (602) offenders to the relative exclusion of attention to 601 (status) and 300 (dependent/neglect) cases. This might in turn lead to the greater absorption into the investigative division, or movement toward team policing, or assignment of juvenile cases by crime types (burglary, auto, robbery teams). During the earlier project, this trend had indeed been noted. Thus the original reduction in processing of 601s and 602s could be exacerbated by this change in juvenile unit orientation.

Second, juvenile units might become more limited to the prevention functions--"Policeman Bill," school resource officers, cadet programs, etc.--which, in turn, might well lead to the development of a civilian unit within the department (in-house diversion programs of this sort already exist).

4 Roman ~~Handwritten~~  
p. —

Third, we might see a narrowing of focus to the screening function, where special expertise in investigative, processing, and dispositional skills could still be claimed without a necessary operational capacity in all these areas. That is, the screening function represents a possible compromise position--one needs knowledge of investigative procedures (but need not practice them), familiarity with interacting components of the system, and yet can avoid the "Kiddie Corps" stigma of the program function. The Los Angeles "Intercept" officers and the San Bernardino "Quick Draw" officers are prototypes, even though they come from probation; these are liaison probation officers placed in police stations to increase efficiency of screening and disposition decisions.

In any case, one thing is clear. Under AB3121, the juvenile unit could not remain totally unchanged. It was being called upon for more careful investigations (more prosecutable cases), it was turning away a substantial number of status offenses and dependent/neglect cases, and it was getting more backing from the District Attorney in the handling of serious juvenile felonies than it had ever gotten before. We proposed to study the impacts and directions of changes not only because we would thereby learn more about legislative impacts, but also because we might then be able to anticipate changes of considerable proportions in other states as the current legislative trends continued.

We had in mind a three phase operation. In Phase 1 we would interview juvenile officers, unit commanders, and chiefs in the same sample of departments in Southern California in which we had collected file data in the earlier project. These were to be focused (structured) interviews concentrating on the investigative, screening, and program functions both before and after AB3121.

Phase 2 was to employ the results of Phase 1 to develop a mailed questionnaire to be sent to all other police department in the USC/CYA eight counties.

*5. Consider changes in handling juvenile...*

Phase 3 was to consist of a modified version of the same mailed questionnaire, sent to a national sample of departments. We anticipated the possibility of employing the same sample developed for the Police Foundation study, thus maximizing the value of both.

### 1.2 Early Suggestive Trends

During the development of the juvenile unit project, several indications appeared to confirm our judgment that functional and structural changes in juvenile bureaus were accompanying the implementation of AB3121. Within the 31 departments selected for study in other aspects of the larger study, two completely disbanded their juvenile bureaus and several others, we were told, were reducing their personnel. Also, several departments seemed to be concentrating greater effort on special kinds of problems, e.g., child abuse and gang intelligence, which signaled a shift in investigative focus.

Further, analysis of data from the earlier project yielded patterns thought highly likely to affect the nature of juvenile operations. Three of these in particular seemed important: (a) there was a precipitous decrease in police arrests of status offenders, approaching 50 percent following the enactment of the new legislation. Such a decrease could reasonably be expected to be reflected in views of police priorities and in the shuffling of workload responsibilities; (b) there was evidence of "relabeling" of status offenders as dependents or as delinquents in order to circumvent the status offender non-detention provision of AB3121. This signaled an orientation toward control that might be embodied in structural changes; (c) finally, there was evidence that the mandated insertion of the District Attorney into petition decisions and into delinquency hearings was leading to more careful and extensive investigating at the police level. Such a trend would reasonably be expected to change juvenile bureau priorities away from non-investigative (preventive) activities.

### 1.3 Indications from Pilot Interviews

Needless to say, the early hints noted above, combined with our own expectations based on general trends in juvenile policing, had much to do with the directions our research procedures would take. Added to these, however, were the results of pilot interviews with juvenile officers and commanders in departments other than the 31 to be employed in the juvenile unit survey. The pilot interviews, carried out both personally and by phone, were designed to alert us to unconsidered issues and to assess the feasibility of our proposed research procedures. What we learned forced some revisions in our methodological plans. Four points are particularly pertinent.

First, we found a wide variation in the immediate availability of administrative data across the departments. This forced the adoption of an interview or questionnaire procedure that allowed for a delay in some data acquisition in some departments (an invitation, of course, to data attrition).

Second, our need for data on periods both preceding and following the enactment of AB3121 proved quite taxing in a number of departments. Turnover and record-keeping procedures were such that requests for data about 1975 (the pre-AB3121 year selected for study) had to be curtailed, and respondents with longevity in juvenile bureau matters were required. This led to a higher than anticipated proportion of command level respondents.

Third, we found that questions concerning departmental or bureau philosophies and practices tended to elicit "by the book" responses, practiced rhetoric that often reflected public relations stances more than they reflected actual working views and actions. As a result, some peripheral topics were omitted from the ensuing research. Also, the decision was made to adopt a personal interview approach; interviews would provide an opportunity to challenge superficial response patterns.

Fourth, the pilot interviews confirmed experiences during the earlier project that, despite its direct and highly controversial impact on police juvenile practices, AB3121 was not clearly understood nor similarly interpreted by a number of bureau officials. We would not be able to assume definitional clarity, nor common knowledge of what was mandated (or not) in the various provisions of the legislation. Rather, knowledge of the contents and implications of AB3121 would properly become one of the foci of our research. Confirmation of this state of affairs can be found in Margaret Little's report (1981) on factors affecting police interpretations of the status offender provisions of the legislation.

So far, then, we have described two sets of factors influencing the directions of the juvenile unit study, beyond those conceptually derived interests which initially framed our intentions. A group of early trends helped to confirm our expectations and provide suggestions for types of changes to be expected. In addition, experience in pilot research alerted us to data problems that necessarily changed some of our plans for data collection. We turn briefly now to project staff matters, since these too effected some changes in the form of the study.

#### 1.4 Personnel Adaptations

At the outset of the study, we felt extremely fortunate to secure the full time services, to carry out the study, of an experienced police trainer. Given his experience and his familiarity with the philosophical and administrative context of juvenile bureaus, he was "given his head" and encouraged to shape and expand the study in line with his own interests and understandings.

This he did, but at precisely the time that the study was preparing to go into the field with the California survey--far beyond the time originally scheduled--this individual resigned. Because remaining staff was fully committed to other

duties and could not take up the responsibilities of a full-time project director, several major adjustments were required to achieve project completion and meet our original project aims.

First, Phases 1 and 2, which involved interviewing in Southern California and then expansion to all 31 pre-selected departments throughout the eight project counties, were combined. Thus Phase 1 became the California study.

Second, the decision to carry out interviews in each department, with telephone follow-ups in selected instances, was modified. Instead, an intensive program of team interviews was carried out in each of the 31 departments.<sup>4</sup>

Third, the national study (now Phase 2) was modified through procedure and through sampling. The preliminary analysis of the California data permitted us to design a brief (15 minute) telephone interview which was responsive to our original interests but not to all of those included in the California study. Additionally, the original plan for sampling departments nationally was modified. The new procedure narrowed our focus to a specific set of states in which legislation, similar in some way to AB3121, had been enacted and a set of states in which no such legislation had been enacted. This pinpointing of target areas decreased the time required in legal searches, decreased the number of departments to be sampled, and directed the national study more concretely at the issue of legislative impact.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>The project benefitted enormously at this point from the generous cooperation of our colleague Robert M. Carter. Staff members Klein and Little were joined in this crash interview procedure by Carter and his colleagues Robert Brown, Ray Coffin, Steve Enfield, and Mary Harrison.

<sup>5</sup>Here, the project benefitted from the energetic response of two advanced graduate assistants, Joseph A. Styles and Carole Snow.

### 1.5 Corrective Legislation

AB3121 is best known for its status offender deinstitutionalization provisions. Because political and legislative attempts to counteract these provisions emerged almost immediately upon the passage of AB3121--most particularly in the form of Assembly Bill 958--we agreed with NIJJDP to follow the progress of this attempt at legislative correction. The details of this enterprise can be found in Maxson (1981).

We can add one point of some significance here. Throughout our interviews in the 31 California departments we kept alert in particular to the police response to AB958 because, when enacted in 1978, it permitted status offender detention to be reestablished for periods of 12, 24, and 72 hours under very limited circumstances. The police had themselves been prime movers in the development and passing of AB958.

The significant point is that the police, by their own report, made almost no use of AB958 after its provisions were available to them. Indeed, some juvenile bureau members were unaware of AB958. But more typically, they were aware of it yet made little or no use of it.

This paradox seems to be explained principally by several factors. Overtly, some police told us that detention was difficult in the absence of community programs which could accept status offenders.<sup>6</sup> Less overtly, we sensed that some police generally had come to live comfortably with the deinstitutionalization provisions of AB3121 and did not see much advantage in returning to earlier detention practices.<sup>7</sup> AB3121 had allowed them to discard some aspects of their

---

<sup>6</sup>However, it should be noted that this was no less true prior to AB3121 when police detention of status offenders was a common practice.

<sup>7</sup>An interesting example comes from a very large metropolitan department which had interpreted AB3121 with a departmental order limiting all status offender detentions to no more than five hours. Following enactment of AB958, another order stated specifically that this five-hour limit was to remain in effect.

roles about which they had always been ambivalent, i.e., the "care and feeding" of status offenders. Relieved of much of this unwanted responsibility by AB3121, they were not inclined to reverse direction when given the opportunity by AB958.<sup>8</sup>

Additionally, however, it seems clear that AB958 provided only a minimal return to the earlier, less restrictive detention opportunities available to police. The new detention criteria are restrictive and the limits on detention time are seen as quite limiting. Further, new requirements to separate status from delinquent offenders created problems for both police and probation detention facilities. Thus, while some juvenile officers had learned to live comfortably with the absence of status offender detention, others who would have welcomed the return of detention found that the new detention provisions were frustrating to their goals. The net effect was that AB958 did not result in a return to pre-AB3121 detention practices.

---

<sup>8</sup>For expanded comment on this issue, see Malcolm W. Klein and Margaret Little, "Changing Functions of Police Juvenile Bureaus" in Robert G. Rubel (ed.), Law Enforcement Initiated Prevention: Emerging Perspectives in the 1980s, in press.

## 2. The California Study

In California, the juvenile unit project was carried out in the same 31 departments that had been utilized in various other components of the overall research project (Teilmann, 1981). We were concerned principally with (a) changes in size or structure of juvenile units, (b) changes in types of programs operated, (c) changes in priorities among the principal functions of screening, investigation, and prevention, (d) perceptions of the impact of AB3121, and (e) perceptions of the causes of any changes in the above.

The interview employed in the California study can be found in the appendices to this report. It was set up by telephone calls to elicit departmental cooperation and establish who the most appropriate (knowledgeable) respondent would be. These ranged from juvenile officers to Deputy Chiefs. No department declined to participate and in most instances cooperation was achieved easily. The interview itself was carried out in almost every case by a two-person team of interviewers (one to interview, one to record), but in fact the operation often turned into a comfortable three-way "conversation." The interviewers were very experienced in issues of juvenile police work.

As can be seen from the appended interview form, the general procedure was to seek comparisons between two periods, 197<sup>6?</sup> and 1979, before and after the enactment of AB3121 on January 1, 1977. We sought to learn what changes had taken place and to what extent these changes could reasonably be attributed to AB3121.

Quite obviously, research in one state, and in only 31 departments within that state, cannot be definitive. Thus, we do not present tabular data in this report; the small numbers can easily be communicated in prose format. Rather we viewed this as a pivotal case study, an instance in which we expected to find trends, not overwhelming change. Because of the nature of new legislation and

and of AB3121 in particular, we felt that such trends, if identifiable, would suggest directions to be seen elsewhere in the nation as similar legislation was enacted elsewhere. By the same token, should expected trends not be identified in the California situation, which seemed to us so well primed for change, then our own conceptual approach would require considerable modification and Phase 2, the national study, would not be justified.

## 2.1 Size and Structure

The interviews reflect some change in juvenile unit size and structure, but aggregate amount of change is not great. Eighteen of 26 departments report a change in the number of full-time sworn personnel assigned to juvenile operations (the other five had no full-time assigned officers in either 1975 or 1979). Of these 18, 11 decreased the number while seven increased it. Two of the 11 decreases represented total abandonment of juvenile bureaus, while three of the seven increases were in stations (precincts) within a single large department. Thus the direction of decision-making is clearly but not decisively in the direction of reducing the assignment of full-time personnel to juvenile operations.

This issue was approached in a second manner in the interview (see items 3 and 4). Four levels of juvenile specialization were specified, ranging from "no juvenile specialization" to a "full-time, formal juvenile unit." Respondents were asked to designate which of the four best characterized their situation in 1975 and in 1979. Responses revealed no change in 17 instances, and there were six departments that started with no specialization and remained that way. The remaining eight cases of change were all cases of a reduction in specialization (including the two instances of disbandment noted earlier). Where change did occur, it was only in the direction away from juvenile specialization. However, we must be cautious in attributing these changes to AB3121. In the eight interviews revealing reduction in specialization, a question seeking the reasons for

this elicited AB3121 as the cause in only one instance. Budget strictures (e.g., the property tax cuts of Proposition 13) and new chiefs were more commonly mentioned as causes.

We now have two indications of change, both in the predicted direction of a reduction in specialized juvenile operations. When we asked what types of activities were changing along with this tendency toward reduction, interesting patterns emerged. Given eight common types of specialized activities (see item 7), seven of the eight show an increase. Most of these are insignificant in size (only two mentions each), but there were four mentions of increase in child abuse operations, five mentions of probation-police liaison operations, and 11 mentions of increased gang intelligence operations. For now, we ask the reader only to note these cases, but we will return to them later because they suggest one important direction that may be taken by juvenile police operations in the future as reasonable "compromises" between prevention and investigative functions.

These increases in special types of programs are limited primarily to those commonly associated with juvenile work (see the list in item 7). Thus there is no necessary conflict between their expansion and the overall trend toward reduction in juvenile unit size. Indeed such special programming might go hand-in-hand with a reduction in the more standard police activities of investigation and case disposition. Questions on the context of changes from 1975 to 1979 provide some support. One of the questions designed to aid in understanding alterations in juvenile operations dealt with overall departmental changes. Twenty-three of the departments reported significant departmental reorganizations since 1975. Clearly, then, this was seen as a period of considerable overall change. Since most of this took place in 1977 or later according to our respondents, it would be difficult to disentangle the specific impacts of

AB3121.

However, pertinent to the earlier point about types of change within juvenile bureaus is the fact that the impact of these organizational shifts, according to our respondents, was on their case disposition and investigation operations far more than on contact, prevention, or other activities. This is at least suggestive of AB3121 impact, given that legislation's general thrust toward less involvement with status offenders and more with serious criminal offenders.

One further bit of evidence is available. Respondents were asked not only about their own departments but also about other agencies in or connected with the juvenile justice system. In this case, 25 of 31 respondents reported significant shifts in the organization or structure of other agencies. The majority of these were reported as taking place in 1977 or later, and 1977 (the first year of AB3121) was most commonly cited as the year of significant shifts. Further, our respondents specified the types of changes which they perceived. These tended to be of the sort expected from AB3121; District Attorney involvement in court petitions and hearings, more diversion programs for status offenders, and so on. Thus, while the caution suggested earlier about attributing change specifically to AB3121 is still very much in order, the likely impact of the legislation seems more than mere speculation. We have some construct validation that AB3121, at the very least as part of a general movement, has contributed to changes in amount and type of juvenile police organization and activity.

## 2.2 Juvenile Police Functions

The functional activities carried out by juvenile officers were broadly categorized into five areas; contact, disposition, investigation, prevention, and administrative duties. Contact and disposition were seen as separable components of the screening function set forth by Rovner-Piecznik as noted earlier. Respondents were asked (see items 17 and 18) to indicate changes in departmental

priorities among these five functions between 1975 and 1979.

Of 29 respondents who could make the comparison, eight reported shifts in priorities. While it is risky to speak of trends in the face of small numbers, a predominant pattern does emerge. There were five cases of increased investigative priorities and three of increased disposition priorities. These came principally at the expense of prevention programs (four cases) and street contact (three cases).

Asked the reasons for the changes noted (even if absolute shifts in priorities were not involved), respondents provided a veritable cafeteria of responses. However, what emerges is that they see reductions in the priority of contact as deriving mainly from changes in status offender handling<sup>9</sup> and increases in the priority of dispositions as resulting from various diversion programs. These latter, it should be noted, were established prior to AB3121.

Respondents more often than not attributed changes involving status offender handling to AB3121, but in the case of delinquents, changes in processing (principally in the investigative functions) were attributed as well to organizational changes within departments. It seems here, as noted elsewhere, that police viewed AB3121 as primarily an unfavorable status offender bill despite its numerous provisions aimed at more serious offenders. Philosophically dissonant provisions presumably command more attention than those which are found relatively compatible. Beyond this, the reader should note the implication in these California data that the investigation and disposition functions increased at the expense of the contact and prevention functions. The incompatibility of these two sets of functions may well mirror a more fundamental philosophical ambivalence in juvenile police work which is highlighted by the new wave of

---

<sup>9</sup>This perception is very much in line with the dramatic reduction in post-AB3121 status offender arrests reported in other volumes in this series.

legislation such as AB3121. This is a theme to which we will return later in this report.

### 2.3 Direct Perceptions of AB3121 Impact

As noted earlier, there is a context of change--or at least, perceived change--which tempers our respondents' views of the effect of AB3121. For instance, half of the respondents, 15 of 31, report significant changes in the population characteristics of their jurisdictions during the 1975-1979 period. Twenty-three report significant changes in departmental organization and an equal number report changes, usually reduction, in available resources. Twenty-five of 31 mention changes in other components of the juvenile justice system with which they must interact.

Under these circumstances, it would be unwise to single out AB3121 as the major factor affecting juvenile units. What does seem reasonable, as we have noted, is to understand that legislation is both cause and effect; it is part of the ongoing change, but a significant and symbolic part which in one place captures the several spirits of ongoing change.

Thus, while 27 of 31 respondents report changes since 1975 in the handling of status offenders, 21 of these attribute these changes to AB3121. Of considerably less perceived importance are other legal changes or rulings, changes in departmental resources, and changes in other justice agencies. Some of these last, presumably, also stem from AB3121. Status offender changes are assigned principally to AB3121, but by no means exclusively.

What other impacts of AB3121 are given prominence? Detention criteria and contact policies are next in line. Significantly, these also pertain primarily to status offenders (to the restrictions on secure detention and the consequent reluctance to "bother" with street contacts and arrests of status offenders). It becomes clear, then, that the police view of AB3121 is first and foremost

constructed of the very few provisions most directly related to status offenders.

Of somewhat less salience to our respondents are the perceived impacts of AB3121 on changes in other agencies, the role of the District Attorney in juvenile court, and certifications of juveniles to adult court. Fewer than half our respondents mention each of these items which pertain principally to delinquent rather than status offenders. The only factor assigned lower impact is that of alternative dispositions, reflecting the minimal community agency response to the new legislation (see Gordon, 1981)

In sum, then, the data suggest a possible three-level model concerning the perceived effects of AB3121. First, it affected police actions directly when its mandated changes referred to the handling of status offenders and closely related practices of contact policy and detention criteria. These have their effects principally upon the contact and disposition functions.

Second, the legislation more indirectly affected the investigative function. This came about, presumably, largely through changes in other justice agencies such as the District Attorney's increased presence in court and demands for better investigations in order to "make" his case.

Finally, it should be noted that little effect on prevention functions has been seen as attributed to AB3121. Since we noted earlier that special prevention programs within juvenile units had undergone some change, we must speculate that such changes are due to factors other than AB3121, or are not recognized by police as flowing from that legislation. Since the prevention function is an important part of our concern, we shall return to this issue later in the report as we speculate on the future of police juvenile operations.

Two anomolous findings, perhaps related to such speculations, should be noted here. The first is that our respondents reported a significant increase in community referrals of status offenders between 1975 and 1979. Since they

have already indicated that AB3121 did not have heavy impact in this area, and since Gordon's research clearly fails to find support for such impact, we must speculate that this reported change in the disposition function is attributable to factors other than increased community referrals. One candidate is the probation-run SODA program<sup>10</sup> in Los Angeles County which, while operated by a justice agency, did place youngsters in community facilities. Second, diversion programs had by the mid-seventies become so prevalent throughout California that these might have been responsible for the police perception of significant increases in dispositional alternatives.

The second anomaly is that while investigations of status offense cases predictably were reported to be lower in 1979, investigations of dependent/neglect cases were reported to have increased. This report tends to confirm suggestions, in other volumes in this report series, of changes in response to dependent/neglect cases resulting from AB3121, even though that legislation does not specifically refer to changes in the processing of such cases. Our speculation is that these investigations are of child abuse cases, and that the reason for this is less an increase in these cases and more that they represent a "compromise" between the disappearing prevention function and the more acceptable investigative function. This, too, is a point to which we will return in later pages.

#### 2.4 Perceived Causes of Change

The factor singled out by our respondents as most influential in bringing about changes in the juvenile bureau was, in fact, AB3121. Eleven respondents made this choice. But immediately following, with 10 mentions, was changes in departmental organization (including the advent of new chiefs). Other sources of

---

<sup>10</sup>The Status Offender Detention Alternative program of temporary shelter care was initiated prior to AB3121 and was heavily employed by police within Los Angeles County (see Volume V in this series).

cchange, when combined, almost equalled each of these first two. These included resource changes and other legal rulings in particular.

Another way of approaching this issue is to pull from all sections of the interview any mention of the cause of specific changes, such as unit size or structure, handling of status offenders, detention criteria, time to investigations, and so on. This process yields much larger numbers of causal attributions, but this time AB3121 emerges as the clearly dominant impetus to change. One hundred twelve attributions of impact to AB3121 are provided (primarily, as noted earlier, pertinent to status offender matters). Next in the order of mentions are other legal rulings (67), departmental resources and organizational change (62), changes in other agencies (54), and changes in the make-up of the local community or juvenile population (40).

Two points emerge from these data. First and most obvious is that our police respondents see AB3121 as a major source of change in their own operations. The juvenile unit has clearly felt the impact of this legislation, especially with respect to status offender issues.

Second, AB3121 is not alone in effecting change, but is part of a pattern of change. Even without the bill, some significant alterations in juvenile unit functioning between 1975 and 1979 would probably have taken place. Legislation like AB3121 symbolizes, energizes, structures, and accelerates change. Its roles as true initiator versus catalyst probably cannot be disentangled clearly. Time series analyses, of a sort not possible in this particular study, may be the only available procedure for dealing with such disentanglement. For our purposes, however, it is sufficient to document the change and report the perceived acceleration in change associated with various provisions of the new legislation. Beyond this, there is still room for some informed speculation about patterns of change, both predicted and uncovered, and it is to such

speculations that we now turn prior to a review of the national study.

## 2.5 Some Implications of the California Data

One reasonable expectation from the California data was that reductions in the size of juvenile units would be manifest. The expectation was borne out, including the report that two of 31 units had been disbanded. The direction of expected has been established.

Another reasonable expectation, given the specific nature of the provisions of AB3121, was that one might see an increase in the priority assigned to the investigative function, probably in conjunction with a loss in priority assigned to the program or prevention function. Our data, as we have shown, also tend to bear out this expectation. They also reveal that investigation and disposition functions tend to change in concert, as do the prevention and contact functions. The parallel to the terminology of reactive and proactive police work is obvious; investigation and disposition are reactive, while contact and prevention are more proactive and more discretionary.

Still, one might question why the trends revealed in our data were not stronger. If changes in police juvenile philosophy and practice are as discernible as we have claimed, and if AB3121 was as important a piece of legislation as has been suggested in other volumes in this report series, why haven't police juvenile units been more affected?

A major clue to this question is contained in the size of juvenile units. An early problem we encountered in this research was that of defining the term "juvenile unit." Pilot interview data led us to construct the four-fold categorization used in item 3 of the survey: (a) no juvenile specialization; (b) sworn officers assigned part-time to juvenile; (c) full-time juvenile officer(s), no formal unit; (d) full-time, formal juvenile unit. Our analysis of the 31 interviews revealed that even this categorization failed to mirror the situation adequately.

A revised system used three categories: (a) no juvenile unit, but this could include part-time juvenile officers; (b) centralized juvenile unit, with one or more full-time juvenile officers; (c) complex juvenile unit, where the units in particular stations are connected with a central administrative unit at department headquarters. Quite obviously, this categorization rather directly reflects the size and complexity of the departments and their municipal jurisdictions.

Within our sample of 31 stations<sup>11</sup> in California, nine were categorized as not having juvenile units in 1975, 15 as having central juvenile units, and seven as having complex juvenile units. When we examined data on reported changes in these three sets of stations separately, we found that nearly all changes occurred within the 15 stations having central units in 1975.

Departments without central juvenile units, even though they may have officers who serve as juvenile specialists, are likely to have less invested in such specialization in the first place and less to gain from shifting priorities between functions. Further, it would be more difficult to discern such shifts in these situations. By way of contrast, very large departments with several centralized units are more likely to be insulated from changing trends in juvenile specialization and more responsive to major organizational patterns in the department as a whole. The department with a central juvenile unit, lying somewhere between these two poles, appears most immediately vulnerable to the winds of change.

Within the 15 stations with central units in 1975, eight reported shifts in functional priorities, six of these involving a relative increase in the investigative function.

---

<sup>11</sup>At this point it is pertinent to state that we interviewed in 31 stations. In several instances this included more than one station in a large department.

In terms of size and structure, 11 of the 15 reported change. This included both instances of disbanding the unit (reductions of 30 to 0 and 7 to 0 officers) and two others in which units were reduced to part-time specialists.

Of those retaining their units, three increased their concentration on investigations. Four others shifted investigative responsibilities to the detective division and retained for themselves only the program or prevention functions. Both of these shifts represent increases in departmental attention to investigation even though the impact on the juvenile unit per se is quite different.

The remaining four central units revealed no appreciable change in size, structure, or function. Similarly, the non-unit stations revealed no significant patterns. However, there were indications of one kind of change in the complex units. A pattern may be emerging in these larger departments which consists of (a) returning most investigative functions to the detective division, (b) relinquishing to other agencies (or abandoning outright) a number of program or prevention functions, and (c) reserving to the juvenile bureau certain "compromise" types of cases. A compromise case is an instance of juvenile behavior which (a) requires either special investigative skills (e.g., child abuse, or a missing child with suspicion of foul play) or (b) is justified as directly preventing serious criminal activity (e.g., anti-burglary truancy sweeps, and gang intelligence). This form of compromise would serve to continue the existence of the juvenile specialization but would serve to decrease the "diaper dick" image associated with it and legitimate its activities within more acceptable stereotypes of police operations. Our sample of California departments was too small to reveal anything more than a suggestion of this trend, but the larger sample of the national study included a test of the "compromise" option.

Overall, then, the California data indicate that change has occurred in a significant portion of the police stations, primarily in medium size departments with centralized juvenile units. The change took several forms; in most cases it occurred in the expected direction of decreasing juvenile specialization and increasing traditional police functions. The priority assigned to investigation has increased relative to prevention, accompanied by a decrease in full-time staffing of juvenile units. Thus the changes in juvenile justice philosophy discernible nationally, and encapsulated in AB3121, are becoming institutionalized, however slowly, in the police departments of California. The case study of this one state thus justifies a broader look at the situation across the country. We turn now to the national study.

### 3. The National Study

#### 3.1 Methods

Information sought in the national study was limited to the questions of juvenile unit size, principal functions, the handling of status and delinquent offenses, and the relationship of these issues to department size and legislative context. Similar to the California Study, the approach was to ask knowledgeable police officials to consider changes between 1979 and five years prior, a period of considerable change in juvenile philosophy and legislation throughout the country.

Departments were sampled within two sets of states, those with new laws during or following 1974 and those without such laws. The laws in which we were interested were those which embodied major provisions similar to one or more of those found in California's AB3121. Thus we were interested in legislation which limited status offender detention, decriminalized status offenses, or in other forms decreased the justice system's jurisdiction and control over minor offenses. Similarly, we were interested in states with new legislation facilitating the prosecution of delinquent offenders, giving more discretionary power to prosecution officials, lowering the age of majority, or facilitating the waiver of serious delinquent offenders to adult court. Finally, we sought states whose new legislation stressed the guarantee of adult-like rights and/or imposed adult-like responsibilities on juvenile offenders.

Ideally, we would have preferred states which, like California, had incorporated all these trends in their new legislation. However, only the state of Washington, with House Bill 371, fit this same omnibus pattern. Information on the legislative status in other states was sought from law libraries, the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and several research and information centers around the country. While these

sources were not unproductive, we learned quickly that there is no current, updated central repository of information on juvenile law in the United States. Both lack of salience of juvenile matters and the current, rather rapid pace of change contribute to this situation.

On the other hand, we were fortunate to have included on the Advisory Committee to our original project the former judge of the Denver Juvenile Court, H. Ted Rubin. Rubin also was involved in developing model juvenile legislation for the American Bar Association, in the process of which he had familiarized himself with legislative trends in virtually every state. At our request, Rubin provided a list of states which had enacted the types of legislation we had in mind, and also a list of states which had not as yet undertaken significant movement in these directions. Cross-checking Rubin's lists with the information we had gathered from other sources, we found no conflicting nominations but also found Rubin's lists to be somewhat more extensive. This process yielded a set of 17 states with relevant new legislation (post-1973) and seven states with no such legislation, and these were accepted for the purposes of our survey. For the sake of brevity, we will refer to these two sets of states, and the departments sampled within them, as new-law and old-law states, respectively.

The purpose of stratifying departments by their presence in new-law and old-law states was to maximize the opportunity to test for the changes we found in the California Study. This is quite a different goal from trying to represent the level of change in the nation as a whole. Our purpose is not to describe what now exists, but seek a basis for predicting what is likely to exist in the future as California-style legislative provisions are adopted in other states.

The 17 to 7 ratio of new-law to old-law states certainly confirms the direction of legislative activity generally acknowledged by experts in various fields.

To this legislative stratification variable we have added departmental size because of the indication in our California data that most of the changes noted there took place in the medium-size departments, those most likely to have "centralized" juvenile units. After perusing the data available from the 1975 Uniform Crime Reports published by the F.B.I., we chose four strata within both sets of states on the basis of the population served by the department. Stratum categories suggested by the California data were used. Ten departments were chosen in each set of states, from jurisdictions of (a) 25,000 to 49,999, (b) 50,000 to 99,999, (c) 100,000 to 249,999, and (d) 250,000 and over. Four strata times 10 departments times two sets of states yields a total sample of 80 departments.

We also pilot-tested the interview in eight departments, seven new-law and one old-law. When we found that the interview procedure required absolutely no changes as a result of this piloting, the data from the eight interviews were added to those from the original sample. Since there was only one refusal to participate in the research process, the final interview total was 87; 47 of these were in the 17 new-law states and 41 were in the seven old-law states.

The interview form may be found in Appendix B. It was administered by telephone in a process that typically lasted about 15 minutes. All interviews were administered by the same individual. The pilot interviews and selected others were observed (on the interviewer's end) by a senior staff member (usually openly but on a few occasions without the interviewer's knowledge) and judged to be handled very professionally without implicit bias based upon project hypotheses.

Respondents constituted a diverse group. Most were juvenile officers (by various titles), but a number of non-juvenile investigators and detectives also were interviewed. Ranks ranged from officer or investigator, through sergeants, Bureau Commanders, Division Chief, Assistant Chief, to Chief in two instances. Also included were a secretary to the Chief (who proved, indeed, to be very

knowledgeable), and two respondents who insisted that their most appropriate title was "Paper Shuffler."

Respondents in the new-law states were somewhat more experienced, having handled juvenile matters for a median of between eight and nine years. Old-law respondents had median juvenile service between five and six years. In both cases, however, the experience level is quite extensive and served well to provide us with the perspectives needed for this research. It is our impression, nonetheless, that this experience did not uniformly translate into high knowledge levels of relevant state legislation about juvenile matters. Indeed, the level of conflicting information among respondents within individual states was often quite striking. At their best, some respondents could quote "chapter and verse;" at their worst, some had no knowledge of the relevant legislation, new or old.

### 3.2 Specialization

Overall, if one compares reports about 1979 with those about five years prior, the predominant picture is one of no change. Questions 1 and 2 of the national interview asked for a characterization of the department as to five degrees of juvenile specialization, ranging from none to "A central juvenile unit, but with juvenile units also in outlying precincts." (See Appendix B.) Of 87 respondents, 62 report no change in the structure of juvenile units over the five-year period. Further, among the remaining respondents there is not much of a trend. Sixteen respondents report an increase in specialization and nine report a decrease.

However, when we look separately at old-law and new-law states, a pattern of change emerges. Similarly, departmental size, as suggested by the California data, also patterns the national data.

As to size, twice as many of the stations reporting a structural change (either increase or decrease) are below the median in department size, i.e., it

is the smaller stations (by a ratio of 18 to 7) which account for changes in specialization. And while stations reporting decreased specialization are equally likely to be above and below median size (five above, four below), those reporting increases in specialization are far more likely to be among the smaller stations (13 above the median, three below). Thus, smaller stations are most likely to have undergone change and are most likely to have exhibited an increase in specialization.

Since our predictions were in the direction of decreased specialization, one might think from these data that such predictions were quite incorrect, but such is not the case. It is correct, as noted, that no change is the predominant pattern. But where change exists, it is clearly in the predicted direction in the new-law states as opposed to the old-law states. Further, it is important to remember that while we have sampled equally from the two sets of states, it is in fact the new-law states which are becoming the predominant type. What we find in the new-law states is, presumably, the wave of the future and what we find in the old-law states is, equally presumably, the residue of the earlier growth pattern among police juvenile units.

And what we find is that increasing specialization in juvenile unit structures is principally a function of the old-law states. Among these, there are 11 reports of increasing specialization, and only one of a decrease. In contrast, the new-law states yield five reports of increased specialization but eight reports of decreases. While the 5 to 8 ratio is not strong, it is very different from the 11 to 1 ratio in the old-law states.<sup>12</sup> What the data suggest, then, is that we have obtained snapshots which freeze a moment in time of two contrasting trends. In old-law states, the pattern of increased juvenile specialization of the 1950s and 1960s is continuing, perhaps in response to the continuing rise

---

<sup>12</sup>Fishers' Exact Test yields a probability level of .01.

in delinquency rates. This is principally true among police stations serving communities with populations below 100,000. But where states have adopted new laws which reduce the sanctioning of minor offenders or increase the sanctioning of serious offenders--or both--this trend has been reversed.<sup>13</sup>

The more detailed data from the California study, in which the legal changes have been of both kinds and have demonstrated considerable levels of implementation, suggest that this halting or reversal of the older trend toward specialization goes hand-in-hand with the philosophical underpinnings and the intent of the new legislation, and is in turn bolstered by them. It is reasonable to expect this California picture to be exhibited nationally, and the remainder of the national data to be reported here, while far from conclusive do seem to corroborate this expectation

### 3.3 Functions of Juvenile Units

The national interview asked whether more, the same, or less importance was now being accorded to each of four functions; screening prior to station handling, investigation, case disposition, and prevention (see questions 5, 6, 7, and 8). About equally, responses were predominantly "more" or "the same" importance. There was certainly no indication here of a shift away from according importance to any of these various functions.

Yet, as before, the seeds of change emerge when new-law and old-law states are compared. Stations in new-law states are more likely to report decreased levels of importance for all four functions. The trend is most pronounced under

---

<sup>13</sup> Respondents were asked what accounted for the changes in specialization, but their responses exhibited little discernible patterning. Manpower level, crime rates, personnel and policy changes within the department, and legal changes were commonly mentioned in new-law and old-law states, and in stations with increases and with decreases in specialization. The same rationale could be used to account for both directions of change. Additionally, legal changes did not seem of importance. Either our respondents were not aware of them (and this seemed quite common) or the legal changes were merely one of many factors distinguishing between new-law and old-law states.

TABLE 1. Number of Stations Reporting Changes In Specialization

	New-Law States		Old-Law States		Totals
	Increased Specialization	Decreased Specialization	Increased Specialization	Decreased Specialization	
Above Median Size*	0	4	3	1	8
Below Median Size*	5	4	8	0	17
Totals	5	8	11	1	

\*where median is based on all 88 stations

the category of "less importance" now assigned to these functions; by ratios of 7 to 0, 6 to 1, 6 to 1, and 10 to 5, new-law stations report less importance given, in that order, to street screening, investigation, disposition, and prevention. The trend is slight but consistent. However, the questions posed to our respondents were very general; and unlikely to yield definitive trends if, indeed, there were any to be yielded. Thus, we moved to the specifics of particular types of offenders.

### 3.4 Types of Offenses

By referring to interview item #10 (in the Appendix) the reader will see that we asked respondents whether they typically handled each of 11 types of juvenile activity currently, and five years before. Five of these--robbery, burglary, vandalism, petty theft, and assault--were chosen to typify juvenile criminal offenses. Three--runaway, truancy, and incorrigibility--were chosen as typical status offenses. Three others--child abuse, gang intelligence, and very young missing--were "compromise" cases which emerged from our experience in the California Study. As activities with strong investigative (or "real detective") components, we felt that they might be given greater prominence in an era which tended to denigrate juvenile police activity.

The data reveal, for all offense types, a predominant pattern of no change over the five-year period. Most of the listed offenses were typically handled by juvenile units in both the early and late 1970s. This was particularly true of the criminal offenses, but less so for status offenses which were somewhat less often handled by juvenile units in either period. The only clear exception to the overall pattern, however, was gang intelligence, a function not found in the majority of stations in either time period.

Quite obviously the lack of change from the earlier to the later period reduces the chance for noting differential change rates by offense types or type of

state. For instance, no differential patterns among the "compromise" cases emerge; our prediction of increased attention to these cases, based on the limited hints in the California data, was not upheld.

With respect to status offenses, the secondary trend (beyond the absence of change in the majority of cases) was toward a decrease in the handling of status offenses. Where any change was reported (by 87 stations with respect to any of the three status offenses), it was by a ratio of 8 to 1, decreases to increases. This was more true in new-law than in old-law states, as expected, but the numbers are so low that little meaning can safely be attributed to the difference.

With respect to the criminal offenses, the numbers are even smaller because no change is the clearly predominant pattern. Nonetheless, where change is reported it is in opposite directions in the two sets of states. Old-law states reveal a trend toward increased handling of specific criminal offenses (14 to 7 ratio among the five offenses in 41 stations); new-law states report a trend toward decreased handling of the same offenses (0 to 18 ratio in 47 stations). Again, the numbers are deceiving; in this instance, any one station can account for five of the reports. We can discern the trend, but we cannot label it a strong one.

Still, if we take the data on status and criminal offense together, the overall picture may be interpreted as supportive of the emerging changes in juvenile unit activity. There is evidence of a turning away from status offenders in both new-law and old-law states, reflective of the national trend toward diversion of mompr offenders and decriminalization of status offenses. There is also evidence that the new laws are associated with some reduction in the handling of criminal offenses as well. Our best guess, based on close observation of the California situation, is that this reflects the growth of two patterns of policing.

The first is a greater reliance upon specific investigative teams (e.g., the robbery detail, the narcotics squad) which do their work irrespective of the age of the suspect. The second is the pressure toward better investigative work (see Teilmann, 1981) which favors the intrusion of the detective division into juvenile matters.

### 3.5 Summary

Both the status offense and the criminal offense patterns noted above, if reliable, are of course predictive of a diminishing reliance on trained juvenile officers, and a consequent reduction in size and functional breadth of police juvenile units. We have one other means, with our very limited national telephone survey data, to seek validation of the trends. The survey provided two opportunities (questions 3 and 4 and a probe at the end of the interview) for the station respondents to comment more freely on any changes noted and possible causes of these.

In reviewing these responses separately from the new-law and old-law states, two patterns strike one in particular. First, although the separation is far from perfect, it is clear that differences in legislative changes in particular are salient. Nineteen new-law in contrast to 11 old-law stations attribute to changes in handling of status offenders to a new laws. The difference is almost perfectly balanced by the attribution of change to department philosophy in eight of the old-law stations but in only one new-law station. A lesser but similar pattern is found with respect to criminal offenses. This is a pattern which speaks to awareness of ongoing sources of change in practice.

The second pattern, particularly discernible if one has been exposed to police philosophy and practice for an extended period of time, is the difference between new-law and old-law respondents in their attitudinal stances toward juvenile police work. Reading the comments, one gets from the old-law states a sense of

being in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There is pride in the juvenile unit's growth in size and function, with an attendant frustration over inadequate resources. Emphasis is placed on diversion programs and the need to be more involved in counseling activities in order to head off serious delinquent careers. And, very much to the point, there is resentment expressed toward the increasingly adult-like apparatus of the juvenile court because the legal trappings prevent effective work with juveniles. The juvenile specialist is legitimized in these survey responses.

In contrast, the new-law respondents note decreased unit size and specialization, a change not accompanied by frustration over inadequate resources. They express less desire to divert and counsel offenders. The increasing adult-like characteristics of the juvenile court are recognized but not so pejoratively as among the old-law respondents. The reduction of attention to minor or status offenders is the most commonly reported change, but the report of the change is not accompanied by comments of frustration, or regret. One gets little sense of role deprivation from these respondents. Despite the philosophical significance of the current legal changes, our interviews suggest that the changes are taking place in congenial contexts in the juvenile police world. Philosophical resonance is relatively high between police attitude and legal change.

What will happen when new laws of the California type are introduced into what we have called old-law states? Will the police be a source of resistance, pitting their 1970 philosophical stances against 1980 codes? If California is any predictor, the answer is that resistance will be short-lived. While juvenile officers in that state voiced some trepidations about being more closely accountable to the district attorney in the case of delinquent offenses with the advent of AB3121, their performance afterward showed a pattern of compliance. And while they expressed strong, sometimes vitriolic resistance to their loss of control

over status offenders, and led the fight to repeal the ban on secure detention of status offenders, their behaviors have in fact failed to confirm their initial resistance.

California police have dramatically reduced their activities with status offenders. Further, they have failed to take advantage of the reinstatement of temporary detention for status offenders. Juvenile officers, have, if anything, accepted with some relish the reduction of their "diaper dick" image and reacted positively to the narrowing of their functional role to correspond more to traditional expectations of police activity. It is very conceivable that the core police role, the investigator stereotype, will prevail over the accepted functions of the juvenile officer in the face of pressure from the current national trends in juvenile legislation. What we have termed the "old-law" states, at least in the realm of juvenile police work, may be expected to be more an historical depiction than a functionally secured category. Not long ago, our "new-law" states were old-law states, and their juvenile officers in all likelihood believed firmly in the prevention, screening, and diversion practices in which they then engaged.

## References

- Gordon, M. The Impact of Juvenile Justice Reform Law on Community Service Providers. Volume V of Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law, 1981.
- Little, M. The Impact of Ab3121 on Status Offenders and Their Parents. Volume II of Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law, 1981.
- Maxson, C. Corrective Legislation: Prediction and Process. Volume IX of Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law, 1981.
- Teilmann, K. Changes in Status Offender Handling. Volume III of Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law, 1981.
- Teilmann, K. and M. Heim. Delinquent Careers of Status Offenders, Volume X of Implications of California's 1977 Juvenile Justice Reform Law, 1981.

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide for California Study

Code # \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

Start \_\_\_\_\_

End \_\_\_\_\_

POLICE-JUVENILE OPERATIONS INTERVIEW

Social Science Research Institute  
University of Southern California

AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_

RESPONDENT (name) \_\_\_\_\_

(rank/position) \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Remarks: (note additional respondents)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



7. Now, I'm going to name some specialized juvenile programs--tell me which currently in existence?

1979

1975

- a. grant funded juvenile unit  a.
- b. specialized juvenile training  b.
- c. specialized school programs  c.
- d. specialized child abuse programs  d.
- e. specialized substance abuse programs  e.
- f. specialized gang programs/operations  f.
- g. police-probation liaison programs  g.
- h. diversion or community referral programs  h.

8. Were any of these operating in 1975?

- a.  no
- b.  (see list above)

9. Are there any other juvenile-related programs operating now?

a. 1979	1975	Y	N
b. 1979	1975	Y	N
c. 1979	1975	Y	N

10. Were they operating in 1975?

11. Can you think of any significant programs that were operating in 1975 and are not operating today?

- a.  no
- b.  yes - (and they are)

(Interviewer - IF THE DEPARTMENT HAS HAD NO JUVENILE SPECIALIZATION FOR BOTH 1975 AND 1979 PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE)

12. What about the rank and division or unit of the officer responsible for commanding juvenile operations?

1979 Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Division/Unit \_\_\_\_\_

13. What was it in 1975?

Same (OR) Rank \_\_\_\_\_ Division/Unit \_\_\_\_\_

14. (a) What is the current total number of sworn personnel working juvenile operations?  
 (b) How many of these are full-time? Part-time?  
 (c) How many non-sworn or civilian personnel are working juvenile operations?  
 (d) How many of these non-sworn are full-time? Part-time?
15. (a) How many full and part-time sworn personnel were working juvenile in 1975?  
 (b) How about non-sworn personnel in 1975?

% of personnel time/effort

1979		1975	
full-time	part-time	full-time	part-time

- |       |       |       |       |   |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | a. # of total <u>sworn</u> juvenile personnel |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | b. # of <u>civilian</u> juvenile personnel    |

16. Take a look at Card #1, and, as best you can, let's fill in each category.

1979		1975		FUNCTIONAL ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL
sworn	nonsworn	sworn	nonsworn	
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	a. investigation
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	b. patrol
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	c. prevention programs
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	d. administration/support
_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	_____ %	e. other (specify) _____
100%	100%	100%	100%	

17. Looking now at Card #2, which of these five functional areas is most critical in terms of its current priority to the department? What is next most important? And the next?

1979

1975

    a. contact with juveniles (decision to pick-up juveniles

    a.

    b. disposition decision making by patrol and juvenile officers for juvenile contacts/arrests

    b.

    c. investigation of juvenile cases

    c.

    d. juvenile prevention programs

    d.

    e. administrative activities involving juvenile personnel, records, policymaking, etc.

    e.

18. Have these ratings change since 1975?

    Yes          No

If so, how would they have looked in 1975? (Go to 1975 column above)

(Interviewer - if there are changes from 1975 to 1979)

- 19. What do you think are the reasons for the differences between 1975 and 1979 (interviewer - note these on change summary card K)

---



---



---

(Interviewer - just pick up copies of monthly and annual reports if available.)

The next phase of the interview involves some basic statistical information about the community, general department operations, and juvenile operations activities. If you have that kind of information handy we can fill it out right now; otherwise I can leave this page with you and we would very much like to get it back within the next week (there is a stamped, addressed envelope for you to use).

Now, I need to find out whether your reporting period for both law enforcement activity and juvenile activity is by calendar or fiscal year?

(Interviewer - confirm starting and ending dates of the period)

- 20. Starting date \_\_\_\_\_ Ending date \_\_\_\_\_

In looking over the statistical page, do you have any questions about the categories or terms?

- 21. If so, how do you interpret these (list below) terms?

---



---



---

(Interviewer - go for 1975 data wherever possible, but disregard if it becomes a barrier to responses)

22. DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_

a. Jurisdiction population

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

b. Department size

total full-time equivalent sworn employees

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

total full-time equivalent civilian employees

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

c. Depart budget (EXCLUDE NON-VEHICLE CAPITAL EXPENDITURES)

Fiscal year

Fiscal year

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

d. Law enforcement activity

TOTAL ARRESTS

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

FELONY ARRESTS

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)

CALLS FOR SERVICE

\_\_\_\_\_ (1979) \_\_\_\_\_ (1975)



23. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION (i.e., REORGANIZATION)?

a.  No (if no, proceed to page 12)

b.  Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

24. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

25. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

26. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific case or legal area)

---

---
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

27. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

a.  One Shot

b.  Continual

28. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

a.  No

b.  Yes (specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_)

29. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____ _____ _____

30. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in  
PROFILE/CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JURISDICTION'S JUVENILE POPULATION?

- a.  No (if no. proceed to page 15)
- b.  Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

31. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

32. What exactly is the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

33. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

34. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

35. Do you antitipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No            b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

36. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in

37. THE ORGANIZATION OR STRUCTURE OF OTHER JUVENILE JUSTICE AGENCIES  
(e.g., Probation, Courts, etc.)

a.  NO (if no, proceed to page 18)

b.  YES (if yes, continue with items below)

38. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

39. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

40. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

41. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

42. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

a.  No                      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

43. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way? .

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in

44 THE ORGANIZATION OR STRUCTURE OF OTHER JUVENILE JUSTICE AGENCIES  
(e.g., Probation, Courts, etc.)

a.  NO (if no, proceed 21)

b.  YES (if yes, continue with items below)

45. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

46. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

47. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

48. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

49. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No            b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

50. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

51. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in  
THE HANDLING AND/OR PROCESSING STATUS OFFENDERS?

a. \_\_\_\_\_ No (if no, proceed to page 24)

b. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

52. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

53. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

- 54 . Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

55. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

56. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No              b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

57. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

58. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in

THE POLICY AND/OR PROCEDURES GOVERNING CONTACTS WITH JUVENILES AND PICKING UP JUVENILES?

a.  No (if no, proceed to page 27)

b.  Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

59. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

60 What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

61. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

62. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

63. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No              b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

64. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

65. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in  
THE DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE FOR JUVENILE CONTACTS?

- a.  No (if no, proceed to page 30)
- b.  Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

66. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

67. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

68. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

69. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

70. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No                      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

71. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

72. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in

THE JUVENILE PETITION/COURT REFERRAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF THE  
PROSECUTOR/DISTRICT ATTORNEY?

a. \_\_\_\_\_ No (if no, proceed to page 33)

b. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (if yes, continued with items below)

73. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

74. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

75. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

76. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

77. Do you antitipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No                      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

78. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

79. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in  
THE CRITERIA AND/OR PROCESS FOR JUVENILE CERTIFICATION TO ADULT COURT?

a. \_\_\_\_\_ No (if no, proceed to page 36)

b. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

80. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

81. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

82. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

83. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

84. Do you anticipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No                      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

85. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

86. Since 1975 have there been any significant changes in  
THE CRITERIA AND/OR PROCESS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION?

(Interviewer - note distinction between detention alternatives for status  
vs. delinquent offenders)

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ No (if no, proceed to Next Section - page 39)
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Yes (if yes, continue with items below)

87. In what year did this change become effective? Year \_\_\_\_\_

88. What exactly was the nature of this change - could you describe it more  
specifically?

---

---

---

---

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

89. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---
- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---
- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

90. Do you think this change is a one-shot situation or is it an area that has been subject to continual modification or "fine tuning"?

- a.  One Shot                      b.  Continual

91. Do you antitipate any additional changes in this area in the future?

- a.  No            b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

92. What do you think has been the impact of this change on the department's juvenile operations? Card B lists some functional aspects of juvenile operations - have any of the functional areas listed on the card been particularly affected? If so, in what way?

(Interviewer - if more than one area is selected, solicit a ranking)

	Description of impact
<input type="checkbox"/> a. NO IMPACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> b. SCREENING-CONTACT	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> c. SCREENING-DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> d. INVESTIGATION	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> g. OTHER (specify)	_____
	_____
	_____

93. Looking at Card C, which of those items is currently most critical in the initiation of contact with juveniles or making the decision to pick up a juvenile?

What would be the second (2nd) and third (3rd) priorities?

1979

1975

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. age/gender of the juvenile                         | <input type="checkbox"/> a. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. physical/emotional appearance of the juvenile      | <input type="checkbox"/> b. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. location/time of the contact with the juvenile     | <input type="checkbox"/> c. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. type of juvenile offense                           | <input type="checkbox"/> d. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. knowledge of prior contact with the juvenile       | <input type="checkbox"/> e. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. availability of personnel/resources                | <input type="checkbox"/> f. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. admissability of evidence                          | <input type="checkbox"/> g. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h. attitude of the juvenile                           | <input type="checkbox"/> h. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> i. attitude of the juvenile's parents/guardians       | <input type="checkbox"/> i. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> j. intake criteria/receptiveness of referral agencies | <input type="checkbox"/> j. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> k. other (specify) _____                              | <input type="checkbox"/> k. |

94. Do you think those factors were any different in 1975?

- a.  no                      b.  (go to 1975 column)

How would you rank the top three factors in 1975?

95. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

- a.  no                      b.  yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 41)

96. Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

97. Once contact has been made with a juvenile, and again looking at Card C, which of the items is currently most critical in choosing the type of disposition for the juvenile (e.g., counsel and release, community referral, etc.)?

What would be the second (2nd) and third (3rd) priorities?

<u>1979</u>		<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	age/gender of the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	physical/emotional appearance of the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c.	location/time of the contact with the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d.	type of juvenile offense	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e.	knowledge of prior contact with the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> e.
<input type="checkbox"/> f.	availability of resources/personnel	<input type="checkbox"/> f.
<input type="checkbox"/> g.	admissability of evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> g.
<input type="checkbox"/> h.	attitude of the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> h.
<input type="checkbox"/> i.	attitude of the juvenile's parents/guardians	<input type="checkbox"/> i.
<input type="checkbox"/> j.	intake criteria/receptiveness of referral agencies	<input type="checkbox"/> j.
<input type="checkbox"/> k.	other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> k.

(Interviewer - be prepared to note changes based on type of offense when asking for second and third priorities)

98. Do you think those factors were any different in 1975?

a.  no      b. (go to 1975 column)

How would you rank the top three factors in 1975?

99. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

a.  no      b.  yes (specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no changes in 1975 proceed to page 43)

(Interviewer - if more than one of the items below is chosen, obtain prioritization, i.e., which one was most significant)

100. Take a look at Card A - it lists a set of possible sources of change. Which of these items do you think stimulated or caused the change you previously described?

(Interviewer - add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW (note specific ase or legal area)

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION (note specifics of the change)

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (note specifics and define to be sure of response's difference from categories above)

---

---

101. Now, let's take a look at some dispositions available for various kinds of juvenile cases. Card D shows three dispositions for dependent or neglected juveniles. Which of these was used most frequently?

Which was used next most frequently? And least frequently

<u>1979</u>	<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a. counsel and release	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b. refer to community agency	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c. request protective detention of juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d. no action/not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e. other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> e.

102. Do you think these rankings were different in 1975?

- a.  No
- b.  (go to 1975 column)

If so, how would you rank the frequencies for 1975?

103. Would the frequency rankings change for first contacts versus chronic contacts?

- a.  No
- b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

104. Do you anticipate any changes in these frequency rankings in the future?

- a.  No
- b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 45)

105. Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

106. Card E now shows some dispositions available for status offenders. Which of these is used most frequently?

Which was used next most frequently? And least frequently?

1979

1975

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. counsel and release                          | <input type="checkbox"/> a. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. refer to community agency                    | <input type="checkbox"/> b. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. petition/file - request non-secure detention | <input type="checkbox"/> c. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. petition/file - request secure detention     | <input type="checkbox"/> d. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. no action/not applicable                     | <input type="checkbox"/> e. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. other (specify) _____                        | <input type="checkbox"/> f. |

107. Do you think these rankings were different in 1975?

- a.  No      b. (go to 1975 column)

If so, how would you rank the frequencies for 1975/

108. Would these rankings change for first contacts versus chronic status offenders?

- a.  No      b.  Yes (specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

109. Do you anticipate any changes in the frequency rankings in the future?

- a.  No      b.  Yes (specify \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 47)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

111. Card F shows some dispositions available for delinquent offenders. Which of these is currently used most frequently?

Which is used next most frequently? And least frequently?

<u>1979</u>		<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	counsel and release	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	refer to community agency	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c.	petition/file - release to parents	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d.	petition/file - request secure detention	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e.	no action/not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> e.
<input type="checkbox"/> f.	other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> f.

112. Do you think these rankings were different for 1975?

a.  No      b. (go to 1975 column)

If so, how would you rank the frequencies for 1975?

113. Would these rankings change for first offenders versus chronic offenders?

a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

114. Do you anticipate any changes in these rankings in the future?

a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 49)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

116. Moving to the investigation area and looking at Card G, which of those items is currently most critical in making the decision to file a juvenile case or request a petition?

What would be the second (2nd) and third (3rd) priorities?

<u>1979</u>		<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	category of the offense	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	age/gender of the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c.	prior contacts with the juvenile	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d.	court intake and/or prosecutorial case screening criteria	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e.	prior success of court dispositions of similar cases, expectations for court action	<input type="checkbox"/> e.
<input type="checkbox"/> f.	investigative workload	<input type="checkbox"/> f.
<input type="checkbox"/> g.	admissability of evidence	<input type="checkbox"/> g.
<input type="checkbox"/> h.	other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> h.

117. Do you think those factors were any different in 1975?

a.  No      b. (go to 1975 column)

If so, how would you rank the top three factors in 1975?

118. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 51)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

120. Card H lists four areas in which juvenile investigation workloads could be allocated. Which of the four areas occupies the most investigative time and effort?

Which area occupies the next most time? And the least time?

<u>1979</u>		<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a.	investigation of dependent/neglect cases	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b.	investigation of status offense cases	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c.	investigation of delinquency cases	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d.	investigation of cases involving certification to adult court/jurisdiction	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e.	other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> e.

121. Do you think the allocation of this workload was different in 1975?

a.  No      b. (go to 1975 column)

If so, how would you change the allocations for 1975?

122. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 53\_\_)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

124. Card I now gets us into activities that might be called prevention programs or prevention efforts. Which of the six items commands the most attention, time, and/or effort from department personnel?

What has the next most participation? And the next?

<u>1979</u>	<u>1975</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> a. counseling, status offenders	<input type="checkbox"/> a.
<input type="checkbox"/> b. counseling, delinquent offenders	<input type="checkbox"/> b.
<input type="checkbox"/> c. educational presentations, schools	<input type="checkbox"/> c.
<input type="checkbox"/> d. community presentations regarding juveniles	<input type="checkbox"/> d.
<input type="checkbox"/> e. police-sponsored recreation programs	<input type="checkbox"/> e.
<input type="checkbox"/> f. other (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> f.

125. Do you think the allocation of this workload or involvement in juvenile-related activities was different in 1975?

a.  No

b. If so, how would you change the allocations for 1975?

126. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 55)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

- \_\_\_ a. AB3121  
(if this is picked)  
Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

- \_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

- \_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

- \_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

- \_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

- \_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

127. Finally, Card J deals with administrative or organization maintenance functions. Which of the listed items demanded the most time and effort by department personnel?

Which demanded the next most? And the next?

1979

1975

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a. review of individual officer/investigator handling of juvenile contacts/cases             | <input type="checkbox"/> a. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. department meetings/briefings regarding juvenile operations                               | <input type="checkbox"/> b. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. meetings with other juvenile justice agencies and the community regarding juvenile issues | <input type="checkbox"/> c. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. juvenile-related training and staff development   | <input type="checkbox"/> d. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. other (specify) _____   | <input type="checkbox"/> e. |

128. Do you think the allocation of this workload or involvement in juvenile-related activities was different in 1975?

- a.  No
- b. If so, how would you change the allocations for 1975?

129. Do you anticipate any changes in the future?

- a.  No      b.  Yes (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

(Interviewer - if no change in 1975 proceed to page 57)

Looking again at Card A that lists possible sources of change, what do you think accounts for the changes between 1975 and now?

(Interviewer - obtain prioritization of factors and add/indicate on Card K)

\_\_\_ a. AB3121

(if this is picked)

Can you think of any particular provisions or aspects of AB3121 that were most significant or had major impact?

---

---

\_\_\_ b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW

---

---

\_\_\_ c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES

---

---

\_\_\_ d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY

---

---

\_\_\_ e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION

---

---

\_\_\_ f. OTHER (specify)

---

---

131. Just to wrap up all of this information--you have listed the following factors as having the most impact on your juvenile operations over the past four years. (Take a look at Card K)

---

---

---

---

Would you agree? a.  No b.  Yes

132. Which do you pick as the most significant of these factors? Why?

---

---

---

---

133. Generally, what do you see as the most significant impact of AB3121 on your department? Why?

---

---

---

---

134. Is there anything I didn't ask that I should have?

---

---

---

---

FUNCTIONAL ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL

% of Personnel Time/Effort

<u>1979</u>		<u>1975</u>		
<u>SWORN</u>	<u>NONSWORN</u>	<u>SWORN</u>	<u>NONSWORN</u>	
____%	____%	____%	____%	a. investigation
____%	____%	____%	____%	b. patrol
____%	____%	____%	____%	c. prevention programs
____%	____%	____%	____%	d. administration/support
____%	____%	____%	____%	e. Other (specify _____)
<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	

- A. CONTACT WITH JUVENILES (DECISION TO PICK-UP JUVENILES)
- B. DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING BY PATROL AND JUVENILE OFFICERS FOR JUVENILE CONTACTS?ARRESTS
- C. INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE CASES
- D. JUVENILE PREVENTION PROGRAMS
- E. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES INVOLVING JUVENILE PERSONNEL, RECORDS, POLICYMAKING, ETC.

SOURCES OF CHANGE

- a. ASSEMBLY BILL 3121
- b. OTHER LEGAL CHANGE OR CASE LAW
- c. DEPARTMENT CHANGE OR CHANGE IN RESOURCES
- d. CHANGE IN SOME OTHER AGENCY
- e. CHANGE IN THE COMMUNITY OR JUVENILE POPULATION
- f. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

IMPACT ON FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS OF JUVENILE OPERATIONS

- a. NO IMPACT
- b. SCREENING - CONTACT (of juveniles - decision to pick-up juveniles)
- c. SCREENING - DISPOSITION DECISION MAKING
- d. INVESTIGATION
- e. PREVENTION PROGRAMS
- f. ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES
- g. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

- A. AGE/GENDER OF THE JUVENILE
- B. PHYSICAL/EMOTIONAL APPEARANCE OF THE JUVENILE
- C. LOCATION/TIME OF THE CONTACT WITH THE JUVENILE
- D. TYPE OF JUVENILE OFFENSE
- E. KNOWLEDGE OF PRIOR CONTACT WITH THE JUVENILE
- F. AVAILABILITY OF PERSONNEL/RESOURCES
- G. ADMISSABILITY OF EVIDENCE
- H. ATTITUDE OF THE JUVENILE
- I. ATTITUDE OF THE JUVENILE' PARENTS/GUARDIANS
- J. INTAKE CRITERIA/RECEPTIVENESS OF REFERRAL AGENCIES
- K. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

DISPOSITIONS FOR DEPENDENT/NEGLECTED CASES

A. COUNSEL AND RELEASE

B? REFER TO COMMUNITY AGENCY

C. REQUEST PROTECTIVE DETENTION OF JUVENILE

D. NO ACTION/NOT APPLICABLE

E. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

DISPOSITIONS FOR STATUS OFFENDER CASES

- A. COUNSEL AND RELEASE
- B. REFER TO COMMUNITY AGENCY
- C. PETITION/FILE - REQUEST NON-SECURE DETENTION
- D. PETITION/FILE - REQUEST FOR SECURE DETENTION
- E. NO ACTION/NOT APPLICABLE
- F. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

DISPOSITIONS FOR DELINQUENT OFFENDER CASES

- A. COUNSEL AND RELEASE
- B. REFER TO COMMUNITY AGENCY
- C. PETITION/FILE - RELEASE TO PARENTS
- D. PETITION/FILE - REQUEST SECURE DETENTION
- E. NO ACTION/NOT APPLICABLE
- F. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

INVESTIGATIVE DECISION CRITERIA

- A. CATEGORY OF THE OFFENSE
- B. AGE/GENDER OF THE JUVENILE
- C. PRIOR CONTACTS WITH THE JUVENILE
- D. COURT INTAKE AND/OR PROSECUTORIAL CASE SCREENING CRITERIA
- E. PRIOR SUCCESS OF COURT DISPOSITIONS OF SIMILAR CASES,  
EXPECTATIONS FOR COURT ACTION
- F. INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD
- G. ADMISSABILITY OF EVIDENCE
- H. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOADS

- A. INVESTIGATION OF DEPENDENT/NEGLECT CASES
- B. INVESTIGATION OF STATUS OFFENSE CASES
- C. INVESTIGATION OF DELINQUENCY CASES
- D. INVESTIGATION OF CASES INVOLVING CERTIFICATION TO ADULT COURT/JURISDICTION
- E. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

PREVENTION PROGRAMS

- A. COUNSELING, STATUS OFFENDERS
- B. COUNSELING, DELINQUENT OFFENDERS
- C. EDUCATIONAL PRESENTATIONS, SCHOOLS
- D. COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS REGARDING JUVENILES
- E. POLICE-SPONSORED RECREATION PROGRAMS
- F. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATION MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES

- A. REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL OFFICER/INVESTIGATOR HANDLING OF JUVENILE CONTACTS/CASES
- B. DEPARTMENT MEETINGS/BRIEFINGS REGARDING JUVENILE OPERATIONS
- C. MEETINGS WITH OTHER JUVENILE JUSTICE AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITY REGARDING JUVENILE ISSUES
- D. JUVENILE-RELATED TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT
- E. OTHER (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

For

CARD K

Sources of Change	Note item where cited and priority
a. AB3121 (provision)	
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	
(4)	
b. other legal change or case law	
c. departmental change or change in resources	
d. change in some other agency	
e. change in community or juvenile population	
f. other	
g. other	
h. other	
i. other	

APPENDIX B  
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR NATIONAL STUDY



1. Which one of the following five statements best describes the way your department handles juvenile work today?
  - a. No juvenile specialization
  - b. Sworn officer(s) assigned part-time to juvenile
  - c. A full-time juvenile officer, but no formal unit
  - d. A full-time, formal juvenile unit
  - e. A central juvenile unit, but with juvenile units also in outlying precincts.
  
2. Which one of the following five statements best describes the way your department handled juvenile work five years ago?
  - a. No juvenile specialization
  - b. Sworn officer(s) assigned part-time to juvenile
  - c. A full-time juvenile officer, but no formal unit
  - d. A full-time, formal juvenile unit
  - e. A central juvenile unit, but with juvenile units also in outlying precincts
  
3. In the last five years, have there been any significant changes in the way your department handles status offenders, or not?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

If Yes, ask:

  - 3a. What is the change?
  - 3b. What accounts for this change:
  
4. In the last five years, have there been any significant changes in the way your department handled juvenile criminal offenders, or not?
  - a. Yes
  - b. No

If Yes, ask:

  - 4a. What is the change?
  - 4b. What accounts for this change?

- 5. As far as the initial screening of juveniles on the street, in schools, or even in their homes is concerned, would you say your department places:
  - a. more importance,
  - b. the same importance,
  - c. or less importance on this than it did five years ago?
- 6. As far as investigating cases in which juveniles are suspects is concerned, would you say your department places:
  - a. more importance,
  - b. the same importance,
  - c. or less importance on this than it did five years ago?
- 7. As far as deciding on dispositions for juveniles is concerned, would you say your department places:
  - a. more importance,
  - b. the same importance,
  - c. or less importance on this than it did five years ago?
- 8. As far as prevention activities regarding juveniles--such as lectures, police-sponsored youth activities, school liaison work--is concerned, would you say your department places:
  - a. more importance,
  - b. the same importance,
  - c. or less importance on this than it did five years ago?

Ask the following questions only if the answers to questions 1 and 2 were (c), (d), or (e).

- 9. I am going to read a list of different types of juvenile offenses. Today, do you typically handle these types of cases, or not? (Read list and mark answers.)
- 10. I am going to read the same list again. Think back and tell me if, five years ago, your department typically handled these types of juvenile cases, or not? (Read list and mark answer.)

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Today?</u>		<u>Five Years Ago?</u>	
a. Runaway	Yes	No	Yes	No
b. Robbery	Yes	No	Yes	No
c. Child Abuse	Yes	No	Yes	No

<u>Offense</u>	<u>Today?</u>		<u>Five Years Ago?</u>	
d. Burglary	Yes	No	Yes	No
e. Vandalism	Yes	No	Yes	No
f. Truancy	Yes	No	Yes	No
g. Petty theft	Yes	No	Yes	No
h. Assault	Yes	No	Yes	No
i. Incurrigibility	Yes	No	Yes	No
j. Gang intelligence	Yes	No	Yes	No
k. Very young missing	Yes	No	Yes	No

Juveniles, or juvenile cases when there's a suspicion of foul play?

11. Is there a title which best describes your job?

What is it?

12. How long have you been working juvenile?

Informal probes at end

--explain purpose of interview

--ask: have there been changes in juvenile police work?

As respondent for own opinions as an authority

--There are lots of changes in California--has there been change there?