

105476

105476

F. Kopelman and S. Moyer
The Research Group
Suite 501
720 Spadina Avenue
Toronto, Ontario

CONTRACTOR

105476

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

Ministry of the Solicitor
General/Canada

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

JUVENILE PREVENTION AND
DIVERSION PROGRAMS IN
CANADA

No. 1985-16

NCJRS
MAY 21 1987
ACQUISITIONS

This working paper was prepared under contract for the Research Division in August 1984 and is made available as submitted to the Ministry. The views expressed are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. This working paper may not be published, cited or reproduced without permission of the Ministry.

This working paper is available in French. Ce document de travail est disponible en français.

084283

SUMMARY

This report focusses on the issues raised and the operational problems encountered by community-based pre-disposition prevention and diversion programs for young persons. In view of the broad range of conceptual issues and programming efforts, it is not within the scope of this report to address all aspects of prevention programming with equal emphasis. In the case of diversion, the projects described in this report tend to be federally supported ventures, utilizing compensatory or accountability strategies; in prevention, primary prevention approaches emphasizing community development and secondary prevention projects which aim to treat the individual youth have been also been examined. The impending Young Offenders Act, which makes provision for alternative measures, suggests that an assessment of post-charge accountability strategies is of considerable topical interest. The absence of comparable information on this approach to diversion has prompted the concentration on this type of intervention.

The targetting policies and underlying premises of primary, secondary and tertiary (diversion) prevention activity were examined. The implications of these policies for client identification, recruitment and engagement were discussed in Chapter 2 to underline the problems associated with each of these approaches to targetting young persons for programming.

Primary prevention can be seen to derive from sociological theories which attribute delinquency to deleterious social structures and processes, and thereby indicate these structures and processes as the appropriate target for change. The community development approach identifies the community as

the target of prevention efforts, albeit largely with an improvement rather than a reform orientation. By attempting to recruit all the youth of a selected area -- through schools or other community efforts or, more often, by self-selection -- primary prevention avoids the difficulty of maintaining juvenile participation or engagement, and the allegedly detrimental segregation and stigmatization produced by specifically designating individuals for services. However, this approach encounters difficulty in recruiting the most vulnerable youth, as these may be the least likely to avail themselves of the activities provided.

By contrast, secondary prevention, which assumes delinquents to be differentiated from non-delinquents by certain traits, identifies youth characterized by indicators or predictors of delinquency as the target of intervention. This approach can rely on community agencies and individuals to identify and refer these so-called high risk juveniles, thus facilitating program access to the most vulnerable juveniles. However, this approach has brought problems of over-prediction, maintaining juvenile participation, and purported harm as a result of stigmatization.

An integration of primary and secondary prevention has been proposed to incorporate the advantages and circumvent the problems of each approach: increased community awareness of youth problems, and the organization of local youth-serving facilities to enable family members and others to identify vulnerable youth, in order to get those young persons to participate in conventional activities with a general group of their peers.

Diversion of apprehended offenders, the aspect of tertiary prevention dis-

cussed in this report, is premised on labelling and deterrence theories, as well as public policy priorities for cost reduction, victim satisfaction, and community absorption of some types of juvenile misbehaviour. These diverse conceptual underpinnings imply different targetting strategies.

The assumption that the imposition of a consequence on apprehended young offenders provides a deterrent to delinquency suggests the need for visible sanctions. On the other hand, this need may undermine the long-term objective of increasing community tolerance for misbehaviour without recourse to a publicly visible consequence, such as court sanctions or diversion. While deterrence relies on the public sanction, absorption proposes to dispense with it.

Furthermore, while labelling theory suggests non-coercive pre-charge intervention (or, rather, non-intervention), the ethical, due process, engagement and net widening concerns encountered by this approach have increasingly prompted a shift to a post-charge, conditional approach to diversion targetting, as well as the adoption of other measures (e.g., admission of guilt, legally sufficient evidence, offence-based eligibility criteria), to meet ethical and due process objections.

Despite these measures, the net widening concerns have not been adequately dealt with, as these mechanisms do not address the discretionary elements in police decision-making. Consequently, the recruitment practices of diversion projects may not be fulfilling the cost-reduction rationale. However, the emphasis of the accountability model on targetting property

offenders, as opposed to troubled youth, does address the policy priority of victim satisfaction.

Chapter 3 examined program intervention strategies in the context of the objectives they are designed to achieve. This framework points out the confusion surrounding much treatment oriented programming, for a single intervention strategy often is applied to a number of objectives.

Professional counselling of juveniles and family therapy to remedy the individual and interactional problems presumed to be precursors of delinquency, are costly and require community abdication of responsibility to the professional child-serving agencies. These strategies have the potential for stigmatization. More practically, they have encountered problems of engaging youth and their families. Parental training or instruction, and volunteer counselling -- especially an informal approach to encourage legitimate activities by the juvenile -- can circumvent these difficulties to some extent. In addition, activities which do not merely consume leisure time, but which provide opportunities to be useful, to belong, and to interact with community members and non-delinquent peers, may be able to foster positive self-images, bonding and conventional socialization: the lack of these attributes are considered structural causes of delinquency.

Community participation in direct service work with juveniles, and increased community awareness of youth problems and available resources, may be able to produce a more informal approach to youth advocacy. This type of advocacy would assist in reducing the reliance on professional referrals.

The integration of strategies for the development of increased community responsibility for juvenile delinquency prevention with juvenile "treatment" strategies (i.e., interventions which focus on the structural correlates of delinquency) may be more effective than individual treatment strategies.

Diversion programs tend not to be based on the theories of delinquency causation, but on the need for societal management or control of delinquent behaviour. Nevertheless, accountability diversion strategies may be able to benefit from an integration of the proactive prevention approach with reactive social control objectives.

Victim-offender reconciliation is designed to inculcate attitude change in young offenders and is therefore considered "therapeutic". However, the admission of guilt, acceptance of responsibility for the harm done, and evidence of remorse, apparently expected of juveniles in a panel or mediation committee setting, may be as destructive to the juvenile's self-image as the court process is presumed to be.

Victim satisfaction may not be achieved through reconciliation, as victims of property offences are seemingly more interested in recompense than in abstract notions of juvenile rehabilitation, consensual dispute settlement, and justice. Community satisfaction may well be negligible, as the community remains largely uninvolved in, and unaware of, the reconciliation process.

Victim restitution encounters similar difficulties for achieving community

satisfaction, although it fulfills the objective of victim satisfaction. While the strategy of restitution addresses the desire for sanctioning, it entails little "therapeutic" value for the youth. By contrast, compensation to the community through community service work may be better able to provide a constructive opportunity for the youth. Finally, if a community placement can remunerate the juvenile in order that she or he can pay back the victim, victim restitution can be achieved without undermining the potential for community satisfaction, and perhaps offender change goals as well.

Chapter 4 focussed on the organizational features of prevention and diversion projects which impinge on the day-to-day functioning of the program and hence the quality of the interventions.

Different administrative structures, with differential reliance on in-house or community resources entail diverse administrative tasks, organizational linkages, and raise attendant practical problems.

The diffusion of authority among justice system, social service and funding agencies, the community, the outside evaluator, and the project director can foster ambiguity -- and sometimes conflict -- in the control over program direction. This can impede policy formulation and the clarification of staff and volunteer roles, as well as the provision of services to the project's clientele.

Given the invariable need for organizational links with the justice system, funding sources, and the community, programs have developed various methods

to promote these linkages. The methods used can impact on the administrative structure (e.g., the tasks assigned to volunteers) and on the locus of control (e.g., the composition of the board of directors) of the program.

Staff of even small scale diversion or prevention projects must juggle a variety of tasks -- logistical coordination and arrangements (e.g., contacting all participants for the mediation meeting), liaison and public relations, monitoring and documentation of practices, recruiting, training and supervision of volunteers, and project justification for self-perpetuation.

The allocation of personnel resources to these tasks, in addition to providing service to juveniles, has often proved problematic, resulting in an overburdened staff, role confusion, and staff/volunteer dissatisfaction.

The practical necessity of obtaining and maintaining financial support, the delays in obtaining funding, and the short term nature of the support may all interfere with the achievement of objectives.

In view of the many reviews of the effectiveness of treatment oriented prevention and diversion programs available in the American and Canadian literature, Chapter 5 is limited in scope to an examination of the more recent accountability model of diversion programs.

Anecdotal program descriptions and process evaluations are the most common source of information on the effectiveness of accountability programs. However, the less frequent quasi-experimental and experimental designs are

required to draw any conclusions about the effectiveness in achieving their objectives; only by comparisons between diverted youth and their non-diverted counterparts can the impact of program strategies be reliably ascertained.

A brief review of the findings of some Canadian evaluations highlighted the relationship between objectives and strategies, and pointed to the methodological problems encountered in undertaking outcome or impact evaluations. The financial, ethical and operational problems in obtaining matched or randomly assigned comparison groups suggest selective use of such designs.

The information needs of the audience for program assessments can be addressed, in part at least, by routine project monitoring. While the priorities of the users of information on juvenile accountability programs may vary, there are some common information needs among those involved -- policy development personnel, program planners, project staff, and the research and academic community.

Chapter 5 concludes with some specific recommendations as to the type of data that should be routinely collected by programs which employ the accountability model of intervention. While the project staff may find the collection of such data time consuming and antithetical to the community-based character of the project, it is argued both that the burden of data collection on project staff can be minimized, and that the benefits to the users of monitoring information outweigh the disadvantages. In addition, the funding agency has an obligation to disseminate summaries of aggregate data that

it receives from participating programs to the audience for information on juvenile programs.

In Chapter 6, a number of recommendations are made that emerged from the discussion of juvenile prevention and diversion programs. Among the recommendations are:

- Secondary prevention efforts, which treat predelinquents, are risky at best, producing over-prediction and encountering related problems of cost-inefficiency and potential inappropriate labelling.
- Activities which encourage "normalization" should be integrated with the secondary prevention tactic of focussing on high risk juveniles.
- Victim-offender reconciliation should be de-emphasized as a strategy of accountability programs, especially the involvement of victims in mediation meetings.
- Restitution should be the priority of the accountability project if the goal of victim satisfaction is most salient.
- If attitude change is perceived as more important than victim satisfaction, community service work should be the preferred program strategy.
- The public awareness functions of accountability programs should be directed towards increasing community acceptance of the specific project, not towards less well defined community responsibility goals.
- Consideration should be given to funding programs that explicitly focus on so-called high risk repeat offenders, where there is greater likelihood that system costs and corrections workload would be reduced by their diversion to a community-based alternative.

- With regard to the transferability of diversion programs, a needs assessment is recommended before mounting a project in order to discover if there is a client pool available (e.g., heavy court workloads of minor property offenders).
- The absence of monitoring data prevents generalizations about the effects of the community on programs; any future federally supported programs should be contractually obligated to provide the funding agency with data on their clientele and program activities.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 2 CLIENT SELECTION	1
2.1 Introduction	1
2.2 Primary Prevention	3
2.2.1 Target Identification	3
2.2.2 Client Recruitment and Participation	7
2.3 Secondary Prevention	11
2.3.1 Target Identification	11
2.3.2 Client Recruitment and Participation	14
2.4 Tertiary Prevention	18
2.4.1 Target Identification	18
2.4.2 Client Recruitment and Participation	24
2.5 Summary	28
Chapter 3 INTERVENTION STRATEGIES	1
3.1 Introduction	1
3.2 "Treatment" Intervention Strategies	4
3.2.1 Individual and Interactional Rehabilitation	5
3.2.2 Structural Rehabilitation	9
3.3 Accountability Intervention Strategies	15
3.3.1 Mediation and Reconciliation	19
3.3.2 Compensation to the Victim	23
3.3.3 Compensation to the Community	26
3.4 The Development of Community Responsibility	30
3.4.1 Introduction	30
3.4.2 The Costs of the Justice System	31
3.4.3 Victim and Community Satisfaction	34
3.4.4 The Community Role in Defining Deviance	35
3.4.5 The Deterrent Value of Community Sanctions	37
3.4.6 The Relationship between Community Structure and Interaction and Delinquency	38
3.4.7 Community Development Strategies	39
3.5 Summary	46

Table of Contents

Chapter 4 ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	1
4.1 Introduction	1
4.2 Administrative Structure	3
4.3 Authority and Direction	5
4.4 Community and Organizational Linkages	8
4.5 Staffing Practices	11
4.6 Funding Requirements	15
4.7 Summary	18
Chapter 5 THE MEASUREMENT OF DIVERSION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND THE NEED FOR MONITORING	1
5.1 Introduction	1
5.2 The Information Available on the Effectiveness of the Accountability Model	4
5.3 The Audience for Program Assessments of Accountability Programs	16
5.4 Monitoring Requirements for Juvenile Accountability Programs	24
5.5 Summary	33
Chapter 6 RECOMMENDATIONS	1
6.1 Targetting and Intervention in Primary and Secondary Prevention Programs	1
6.2 Options for Juvenile Accountability Programs	2
6.3 The Transferability of Programs	8
6.4 Monitoring Juvenile Diversion Programs	9
BIBLIOGRAPHY	1

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This report will examine major themes and practical operational contingencies which have influenced the direction of community-based juvenile delinquency prevention and diversion programs in Canada.

Juvenile misbehaviour has characterized every period of recorded history, and the youthful flaunting of adult standards has probably not increased over the centuries [1]. Changes in the societal perceptions and definitions of this misbehaviour, and in the assumptions regarding its causation, have however prompted changes in social reactions and priorities for the prevention and control of delinquent behaviour.

The numerous definitions of "delinquency" and the assumptions regarding its causation have fostered diverse academic, public policy, and popular views as to what constitutes delinquency prevention and how it may best be achieved. Discussions of "prevention" in the criminological literature are routinely prefaced by a complaint about the nebulosity and confusion surrounding the meaning of the term.

With each of the major criminal justice subsystems as well as several noncriminal justice systems being committed to crime prevention, the concept must have wide temporal and behavioral scope -- so wide, in fact, that it is of dubious value without definitional refinement.

Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 287.

To some extent, the focus here on pre-disposition community-based efforts provides a "definitional refinement" of delinquency prevention into a distinct category of programming amenable to meaningful discussion. However, given the wide range of themes addressed in the academic literature, the matching of prevention efforts to the conceptual issues has often been tenuous. This report attempts to integrate an examination of recent Canadian community-based programs -- based on program descriptions, evaluations, and site visits -- into a discussion of the thematic concerns of the American and Canadian literature. It has therefore selectively appropriated frameworks for clarifying delinquency prevention in order to facilitate this integration.

In Chapter 2, the selection of clients for community-based programs has been categorized into primary, secondary and tertiary efforts. The targetting policies and theoretical and policy assumptions of each selection strategy are discussed with a view to their practical implications for client identification, recruitment and "engagement".

The program intervention strategies, discussed in Chapter 3, are classified according to the "treatment", "accountability" and "community responsibility" objectives they are designed to achieve. This framework emphasizes the extent to which various strategies address each stated objective and its underlying

conceptual rationale, as well as the associated operational problems.

Chapter 4 focusses on the organizational and administrative features of community-based programs, and the manner in which these impinge on day-to-day project operations. This examination elucidates the extent to which practical problems encountered by prevention and diversion programs may affect the achievement of objectives.

In Chapter 5, we review the various sources of information and measures used to gauge the effectiveness of accountability programs in achieving their major goals. The audience for information on diversion programming indicates the importance of routine monitoring by program staff. The chapter concludes with a presentation of some data elements appropriate for project monitoring.

Chapter 6 concludes the report with recommendations for prevention targetting and intervention strategies, the most viable options for accountability programs for juveniles, the degree to which such programs are transferable to other locations, and the need for regular monitoring by program staff.

In view of the broad range of conceptual issues and programming efforts encompassed by the term "delinquency prevention", it is not within the scope of this report to address with equal emphasis all aspects of prevention programming. The projects described in this report tend to be federally supported ventures, utilizing the accountability-related strategies advocated by the funding agency. The impending Young Offenders Act, which provides for "alternative measures", suggests that an assessment of the accountability strategies is of considerable topical interest. Finally, given the innovative

nature of the accountability model (as compared to the more traditional service-oriented projects), the absence of comparative information on the former prompts the need to concentrate on this approach to diversion programming for juveniles.

NOTES

1. Empey, 1978, cited in Johnson, et al, 1979: 19.

Chapter 2

CLIENT SELECTION

2.1 Introduction

The selection of clientele for a community-based program is fundamental to program design and implementation. The decision regarding which juveniles to target for prevention efforts implies assumptions as to the causation of delinquency, and thus which youth are most susceptible to future illegal behaviour and most in need of intervention. In addition, targetting policy reflects prevailing policy priorities regarding the broader needs and interests of society and, thus, which juvenile offenders are appropriate for diversion alternatives to court processing or outright release.

The targetting policy delimits the client recruitment practices of the program, as the nature of the target population obviously guides the way in which the program can obtain access to their clientele. Thus, the targetting strategy has implications for the day to day operation of the program, such as the personnel and community linkages required.

Furthermore, the targetting strategies, and premises underlying them, orient

program objectives and intervention methods: the determination of who is at risk and why, places limits on goals and the means for achieving these goals. The intervention strategies are also affected by the recruitment methods and the means necessary to "engage" the clientele's participation.

The often used typology for distinguishing programming into primary, secondary and tertiary efforts provides a useful framework for examining the conceptual and practical issues in client selection. This chapter examines the targetting assumptions and policies of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention, the strategies for client identification, recruitment and "engagement", and the practical implications of these methods for Canadian prevention and diversion programs.

2.2 Primary Prevention

Primary prevention identifies a selected area -- its social environment and youth population -- as the appropriate target of program initiatives.

2.2.1 Target Identification

This targetting orientation "proceeds from an assumption that offenders are not basically different from non-offenders" in personal traits [1] but rather that all youths subjected to deleterious social environments are susceptible to delinquent responses.

Self-report studies in which youth are asked to report anonymously on the nature and extent of their law violating behaviour have tended to support this tenet with findings that a large proportion of juveniles commit acts for which they could have been adjudicated delinquent in juvenile court. For example, a survey of Illinois youth found that, with variations dependent on the ethnicity and sex of the respondents, between 77% and 89% of youths reported "improper behaviour" such as truancy, between one quarter and one-fifth admitted illegal drug use, three-fifths or more had consumed or purchased alcohol, and two-fifths reported theft [2].

The implication drawn from such research is that delinquency is a reasonably

"normal" phenomenon among the youth of a community, and is not necessarily correlated with individual characteristics. One interpretation of this finding suggests that delinquency is a transitory phenomenon characteristic of adolescence and the maturation process to which society should therefore not over-react [3]. Many sociological theories, however, attribute the prevalence of delinquency to flawed community structures and deprived social settings and processes.

Strain and opportunity theories have located the source of delinquency in the frustration and alienation produced by a misalignment in the social structure whereby populations of youth are denied access to legitimate opportunity for achieving desirable goals [4].

Subcultural and differential association theories identify the roots of delinquency in normative differences among segments of the population, where the norms of conduct learned may conflict with social definitions dominant elsewhere [5].

Bonding and control theories locate the source of delinquency in the inadequacy of community social mechanisms to maintain juvenile affiliations with the conventional moral order and induce a stake in conforming to its dictates [6].

This identification of the sources of delinquency in social institutions and interactions points primary prevention planning towards social or community reform. In the past, however, programming efforts have largely been devoted to remedial efforts for selected populations of juveniles "afflicted" by these detrimental social settings [7].

The proposition, derived from social theory, that communities which do not adequately address and fulfill the needs of youth thereby propagate delinquent, rather than legitimate, conventional responses, has been construed to imply that the juveniles of these communities (and not the community itself) are the appropriate target of preventative intervention to counter these harmful effects.

Some operators have adopted "the language of delinquency prevention as social change without making any corresponding modification of their actual practice" [8]. Johnson cites an Ohio State University study (1975) which investigated the expressed objectives and activities of staff personnel in delinquency prevention programs. This study found that, although the staff of several programs posited delinquency as a product of social environments, the activities of these projects were directed to the treatment of individual youth [9].

The pattern of short-term funding arrangements for prevention programs and the resultant need for immediate and visible results to justify the expenditure, further promotes this approach. This remedial practice has thus been self-perpetuating as the "history of this kind of response...provides a repertoire of project designs that can be implemented on short notice to address urgent local needs" [10].

Recent shifts in policy priorities have increasingly fostered a "community development" approach to delinquency prevention, consistent with the implications of the sociological theories of delinquency. This orientation emphasizes the community as the target of programming, and delinquency

prevention efforts are directed at "improving the quality of life in the community" [11].

However, this new policy approach has not consistently re-oriented the targetting strategy, as practitioners may once again adopt the language of community reform without any corresponding modification of their policy. Thus, it has been argued that while the "shift to prevention and community development ... is valid, it should take place in the context of programmes that employ the main part of their resources with young people from the 'at risk' target group" [12]. The desire for immediate and visible remedial efforts tends to foster the view that "community development programmes should work on concrete short term goals" and "maintain a concrete service element for children" [13], which entails a less direct application of delinquency causation assumptions and their targetting implications.

Primary prevention efforts, then, are comprised of two targetting strategies: a community development approach oriented towards improving the resources and social milieu of the local environment; and a remedial approach directed at the juvenile population of the community.

Selection of the target community is typically based on presumed indicators of a deleterious social environment extrapolated from delinquency causation theories. These include: the prevalence of subsidized or public housing, broken homes or single parent families, alcoholism, unemployment, low socioeconomic status, restricted educational opportunities, and lack of recreation facilities or youth services. Native communities -- "surrounded by a predominantly white

culture," with receding "ties to their own traditions" and experiencing "the negative aspects of modernization" on their culture and "racial discrimination and stereotyping" in the white system -- are often targetted for primary prevention programs as well [14]. However, it has been suggested that projects may be mounted, "not because the problem ... is greater in one community than in others, but because there was a community group that decided to obtain funding and was successful in doing so. Local needs, therefore, have not always been the precipitating factor" in target identification [15].

Demarcation of the target community is often problematic. Rural communities with geographical limits, or metropolitan areas with well defined historical, ethnic, or socio-economic boundaries may pose less difficulty, while large, non-homogeneous urban neighbourhoods with transient populations may be less amenable to such demarcation. In addition, the organizations and agencies with which programs must continually liaise typically serve more broadly defined areas or regions, impeding a narrower target focus. The optimal size of a target area, then, is a function of these various community characteristics, as well as the nature of the intended programming and the resources to be utilized. Experimental efforts to determine the size of area or community most amenable to targetting, given the various relevant factors, has been undertaken by Otherways, Belleville, and further efforts in this direction would prove illuminating and should therefore be encouraged.

2.2.2 Client Recruitment and Participation

A community development approach to primary prevention attempts to mobilize

community involvement, and recruitment is therefore directed at community agencies, organizations and local residents. These recruitment procedures are detailed in the discussion of strategies for community development, below. The focus here is restricted to an examination of primary prevention practices for recruiting juvenile participation.

The primary prevention policy of targetting the juvenile population of a selected area has practical implications for client recruitment. Insofar as programming efforts are directed at all the youth of the area, a school-based approach facilitates access to a juvenile service population. Presentations in the context of the formal class structure (as employed by police-school liaison programs) can achieve fairly comprehensive juvenile participation. However, extra-curricular activities cannot rely on such "compulsory" attendance. Furthermore, the primary prevention policy of targetting the general youth population precludes formalized individual identification and referral procedures. Rather, programs typically rely on self-selection by juveniles to obtain their clientele. As such, primary prevention projects promote themselves through street work, media campaigns, and high-profile visibility in order to gain access to juvenile participants.

A recent youth program evaluation indicated that 52% of its juvenile clientele found the project themselves, 44% were informed by friends, 2% by family, and none were recruited via the media [16]. It is unclear from these results whether the community was not adequately made aware of the program and therefore unable to direct youth to it, or whether the adult community is not regarded by youth as a credible source of recommendations for desirable juvenile pursuits. Given

the self-selection recruitment procedure, the perceived legitimacy and desirability of the program largely determine the service population of the project. Thus, in order to entice participation, many primary prevention programs use recreation as a method of client recruitment.

However, although recreation has been regarded as an effective "tool to motivate youth into service", ironically the Regent Park Teen Centre discovered the converse to be the case: "the service ... motivate[d] the youth into recreation programs" [17]. Results of the forementioned program evaluation tend to confirm the notion of recreation as a recruitment method, indicating that 33% of the juveniles attended the program for its organized activities and games, 33% to see and talk with friends, and 26% simply because "it's fun" -- not because of the "service" being provided [18].

The policy of targetting the general youth population of an area further affects client recruitment insofar as frequently, if not invariably, the project professes the broad goal of youth development, thereby avoiding the public designation of "delinquency prevention." This enables the program to circumvent the problem of intimidation of prospective participants and that of negative labelling of the recruited clientele. However, in providing services towards this broadly defined goal (though commendable in its own right), the program may not be obviously directed towards its "preventative" function, a factor which in turn may introduce difficulties in program justification to funding sources.

The self-selection method of obtaining a service population poses further problems for fulfillment of a preventative role as the most vulnerable juveniles

may be the most difficult to recruit and not well represented in the resultant population of juveniles served. It is posited that "those youth with the least prior opportunity, the lowest bonding to conventional lines of action and, therefore, the highest probability of delinquent behaviour also may be the youth least likely to seek access to the program" [19]. In fact, it has been indicated that "even where facilities were readily available, youngsters we saw were frequently such that they needed to be led by the hand in order to begin participating" [20].

It has been suggested that adequate resources to flood the target community with sufficient services may ensure appropriate, if not comprehensive program-youth contact [21]. While this may be feasible in small homogeneous communities or neighbourhoods, it is less practical in large urban areas. Furthermore, it appears that relying on self-selection may not be effective for recruiting "vulnerable" juveniles, but rather that some encouragement or impetus is required to direct these juveniles to existing programs. A marriage of primary and secondary targetting practices is thus proposed. The most vulnerable juveniles need not be visibly singled out, thereby avoiding the "peculiarly of giving these youth something good because they have been or may be troublesome" [22]. Nevertheless, they can be encouraged by deliberate program attentiveness to attracting these juveniles in the general advertisement and recruitment campaign. Furthermore, community awareness of these facilities may motivate family members and others identifying "vulnerable" youth to prompt or instigate participation by these juveniles.

2.3 Secondary Prevention

Secondary prevention identifies young persons deemed "at risk of becoming delinquent", "delinquency prone", or "predelinquent", as the appropriate target of program initiatives.

2.3.1 Target Identification

This strategy proceeds from a dualistic assumption of delinquents as differentiated from the youth population at large by certain personality or demographic traits. The early identification of juveniles characterized by these traits, or indicators of delinquency potential, is thus proposed as the most effective targetting policy for prevention efforts.

Various theoretical, intuitive, and impressionistic formulations have suggested links between delinquency and individual characteristics, thereby providing a set of predictors by which to identify predelinquents. Some of these propositions and their implied indicators, such as "alooping foreheads", are no longer in vogue. Psychological propositions and those derived from sociological theory are currently the most prominent, though biological/physiological propositions suggesting that disorders, such as learning disabilities and impaired vision contribute to delinquency, do recur. Psychological theories

have pointed to personality disorders as correlates, if not determinants, of delinquency. Sociological theories have been interpreted as suggesting a relationship between the low socioeconomic status, ethnicity, family structure and other characteristics of the individual, and delinquency.

Empirical evidence has not consistently supported the contention of a correlation between individual characteristics and delinquency. The erratic and often contradictory research results, and rationales for these results, have caused many to challenge the assumptions underlying early identification as a "dualistic fallacy" [23]. This has undermined the basic premise of the procedures for early identification of delinquency-prone juveniles. It is not surprising then, that the "state of the art of prediction techniques which can reliably identify who is predelinquent or who will become delinquent is dangerously inconclusive" [24], [25].

One potentially harmful consequence of this method of client targeting is overprediction -- the false identification of juveniles as delinquents. The possibly "uncomfortably large" [26] numbers of "false positives" poses the problem of the prohibitive expense of providing services to all juveniles identified. The expense is further exacerbated as the targeting policy must be repeated with every rising generation of youth. Thus, "individual approaches alone will become permanent features of our society, will be costly because of this, and, in the long run, will be relatively ineffective" [27]. Nevertheless, when resources are limited, it appears economical to restrict the focus to high risk juveniles. Furthermore, the short term commitment of funds imposes the need for "immediate and visible results" to justify the project. Service

delivery to juveniles identified as "problem youth" provides an immediate and visible remedy to reassure concerned communities, as well as funding agencies.

The high incidence of "false positives" raises legal and ethical issues as well as financial ones. "An actuarial statement that a given child has a high probability of future delinquent behaviour (variously defined) carries with it the danger that it may be used to justify an intrusion into his life or family environment" [28]. While this intervention may be considered warranted for some youth in the context of delinquency prevention, for those juveniles erroneously identified it is "seriously prejudicial and libelous" [29], contravening the right to privacy and other civil liberties.

The targetting practice of secondary prevention is condemned for its broader legal, ethical and practical implications, with the allegation that early identification may propagate rather than predict delinquent behaviour. It is argued, especially by labelling theorists, that expectations and reactions of others to the "labelled" juvenile may, in fact, contribute to the delinquent responses, thereby constituting a "self-fulfilling prophecy". To protect participating youth from the possibility of negative repercussions, many have argued the need for "normalization" in targetting policy. These critics advocate the integration of vulnerable youngsters with a general group of their peers in conventional activities, rather than isolating them in stigmatizing programs for "bad kids" [30]. This assimilation approach suggests adopting the beneficial aspects of primary prevention without endangering access to the intended target population [31].

2.3.2 Client Recruitment and Participation

Despite the controversy surrounding prediction of delinquency, practitioners remain persuaded of the efficacy of early identification and rehabilitation of juveniles. The Children's Services Division of the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services recently professed the prevention priority of early identification and treatment of youngsters considered to be "at risk" [32]. This policy of targetting juveniles based on predictive traits enables secondary prevention programs to rely on others -- parents, teachers, police, social agencies, merchants, etc. -- to identify and refer the appropriate juveniles.

It has been alleged that "the most important sources capable of identifying potential delinquent behaviour are the elementary schools and the police", as "school personnel are able to identify early signs ... through daily contact", while "the police, on patrol 24 hours a day, have many contacts with youngsters in a wide variety of [delinquency-related] situations" [33]. While it is "presumed that children acting out in school are quite likely acting out at home" [34], families are apparently not considered as capable of identifying "problem" youth, or of directing youth to needed community services.

This reliance on referrals has the practical effect of reducing project responsibility for direct client recruitment, and thereby facilitates access to "problem youth" [35]. However, in abdicating responsibility for client recruitment, secondary prevention projects have little control over the

identification criteria employed in the subjective determination of referral sources. Thus, Cardarelli and Smith noted a "virtual absence of consistent identification criteria" in the prevention programs they visited [36].

While programs may assess and screen the juveniles referred, they are not typically cognizant of the factors which impinge on the initial referral decision. As such, secondary prevention programs tend to describe clientele recruitment in terms of the observed characteristics of the ultimately constituted service population and the broadly defined reasons cited by referral sources, rather than in terms of specific behaviour or predictive traits employed in the designation of a juvenile as "predelinquent".

Thus, while the juveniles referred are often friends and younger siblings of program clients, from single-parent families, lacking financial resources, residing in subsidized housing, performing poorly at school, etc., these characteristics do not adequately account for identification and referral decisions. Individual problems thought to be precursors of, or escalate into, delinquency are typically cited as the basis for referral. However, it is often difficult to elicit what specifically constitutes such "emotional, behavioural, or social difficulties" [37].

In order to offset the lack of accountability in, and control over, identification criteria, prevention projects may provide referral sources with guidelines for decision-making.

The Etobicoke After Hours Referral Service provided the Youth Bureau with such a guideline, asking the referring officer to check as many reasons as were

applicable to the situation. The reasons listed and percentage of each guideline checked included: family/youth crisis situation, 57%; the youth and/or family is requesting immediate help, 64%; the situation suggests that the youth and/or parents cannot cope, 66%; the youth is requesting not to return home, 14%; the parent(s) indicating they do not want the child to return home, 7%; lack of communication among the parent(s), youth and/or officer involved, 36%. The program concluded that "the reasons that were identified for referral fall mainly into two categories: runaways (36%) and parents unable to cope, or general child management problems (42%)" [38].

The Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau cited "mal-adjusted behaviour" and "family related problems" as the basis for referrals. However, the "Behaviour Checklist" provides greater specificity of behaviour to be considered, including: aggressiveness, arguing, bed wetting, complaining, crying, defiance, irritableness, noisiness, non-compliance, fearfulness, pouting, talking back, whining, etc. [39].

It is, of course, unclear the extent to which these guidelines influence the referral decision or merely serve as post facto rationales for earlier decisions. Nevertheless, they are an attempt to regulate identification criteria, necessitated by the referral procedures for client recruitment employed by secondary prevention programs.

A further implication of the referral method of client recruitment is the issue of "engagement" -- involvement of juveniles for a sufficiently long time so that the mode of intervention could have an impact. Whereas primary prevention

largely recruits on the basis of desirable programs, juveniles referred to programs by various agencies may be resistant to the less appealing services deemed appropriate for them. The problem of keeping uncoerced participants tolerant of "the ministrations of the treatment providers" [40] may entail a "skimming" process whereby secondary prevention programs only manage to deal with the "best of the bad kids" [41].

2.4 Tertiary Prevention

Tertiary prevention efforts are directed at juveniles already identified as offenders through contact with the criminal justice system and "involves intervention in their lives in such a fashion that they will not commit further offenses" [42].

2.4.1 Target Identification

This targetting strategy proceeds from the assumption that the consequences of apprehension will both specifically deter the juvenile from continued delinquency and generally prevent delinquency in the population at large. Thus, "prevention before the fact", by remedying the causal factors related to delinquency, is supplanted by an emphasis on societal response to, and management of, detected illegal behaviour. The basis of target selection for prevention efforts is shifted from the "proactive stance", derived from assumptions of delinquency causation, to a "reactive" approach derived from deterrence theory [43].

While this constitutes the basis for tertiary prevention measures in general, diversion of juveniles from the criminal justice system (the only tertiary prevention measure within the parameters of this report) [44] is not ostensibly premised on deterrence. Rather, the diversion approach is generally attributed to the labelling proposition that continued or increased delinquency in

juveniles results from deviant self-images induced by the stigmatizing effects of formal justice processing (though there are several theoretical perspectives supporting the diversion concept, including social learning theory and differential association theories) [45]. Diversion is therefore designed to avoid the negative effects of formal processing.

However, in addition to these conceptual underpinnings, diversion is explicitly premised on a public policy concern with broader societal needs in response to delinquency. Diversion is designed:

to promote community tolerance and community responsibility for the management of some types of criminal behaviour; to promote more effective use of criminal justice resources; to foster the restoration of social harmony between the victim, the offender and the community.

Solicitor General of Canada, Federal Discussion Paper, 1979.

While empirical support for labelling theory is inconclusive, the assumptions are "intuitively appealing" with an "apparent inherent logic" [46]. However, in addition to inconclusive evidence, the application of labelling theory in diversion is criticized by those who allege that the apprehension, segregation and intervention are as stigmatizing as formal processing [47]. Nevertheless, insofar as labelling propositions propose a targetting strategy consistent with the approach advocated by contemporary public policy, labelling theory continues to provide a theoretical rationale for the diversion of apprehended offenders.

Despite this shared approach of targetting apprehended offenders, the distinction between the labelling, and public policy underpinnings of diversion entails a distinction in the concerns implied by each rationale. While the

former addresses the needs of juveniles, the latter addresses the "needs and interests of the victim and society" [48]. It would seem, then, that the "restricted segments of juvenile misbehaviour most attractive [as] targets of diversion" would vary according to which conceptual orientation is addressed.

All diversion programs are designed to target apprehended offenders and intervene to circumvent the expense and stigmatization of formal court processing. While labelling theory suggests diverting offenders prior to any formal processing, the "net widening" encountered by this approach undermines the public policy objective of cost reduction. Diversion does not necessarily target juveniles apprehended but not charged by the police. Rather, it typically entails juveniles charged and referred by the police, though it is not always restricted to post-charge pre-court intervention, but may include court referrals at any stage of processing [49].

The selection of first offenders or juveniles with few prior offences prevails in diversion, insofar as they have not yet been "labelled" and are perceived to pose less threat to the community's safety. This practice of targetting first offenders is so entrenched, it is employed even when the project goal is a reduction in training school commitments or diversion of juveniles from the adult justice system [50].

However, several projects have focussed on, or at least included, repeat offenders in their targetting policy. In fact, the Waterloo-Wellington Attendance Centre found that the "comparative advantage" of its intensive attendance program was "most apparent with higher risk juveniles -- those with

prior charges or longer records, and those who are older" [51].

Juveniles committing crimes of violence, have been typically excluded from eligibility for diversion programs. These higher risk "hard core" offenders have not been considered "amenable to counselling" or other treatment services [52]. Furthermore, violent offences exceed the bounds of community tolerance for misbehaviour and "represent serious violations of public interest" [53]. Even when not officially excluded, violent offenders are typically not referred for diversion [54].

Status offenders, especially those "whose offences are reflective of emotional disturbance", such as drug or alcohol abuse, have, in the past, been considered the preferred target of "treatment" diversion programs insofar as these juveniles appear most suitable for this type of service [55]. The assumption of an "escalation" of delinquency from minor status offences to "real" criminality [56] underlies this rationale of early intervention for these juveniles as most effective for delinquency prevention. Furthermore, community standards are considered able, and indeed are encouraged, "to absorb and tolerate" [57], these misbehaviours through community involvement in diversion programs.

The public policy concern for the compensation of the victim has led accountability-type diversion programs to prescribe eligibility in terms of property offences. In limiting diversion candidates to first time property offences, accountability model programs "are not likely to be dealing with deeply troubled kids" [58]. While vandalism and minor shoplifting offences initially prevailed as preferred eligibility criteria, increasingly more serious

juvenile ignorance of the available options -- the nature and duration of the diversion commitment as compared to outright release (i.e., pre-charge diversion), or the likely (and potentially less onerous) outcome of court processing of the offence (i.e., post-charge diversion). In the latter instance, the youth may perceive that admission of guilt leading to diversion may be a less "drastic intervention than denial and a court referral, thus pressuring him or her to acknowledge complicity in the offence" [63]. The uncertain status of this guilty plea as admissible evidence in court becomes a controversial issue given the conditional nature of post-charge diversion. This threat of referral back to court is decried as coercive and possibly in violation of "double jeopardy" protections. Diversion is further criticized if there are no procedural safeguards to protect against an arbitrary determination of unsatisfactory participation in diversion with the resultant referral to court. As a result, Nejedlski concludes, "voluntary diversion is a contradiction in terms. The coercive power of the state and the court is always present in diversion" [64].

Consequently, only "real" noninterventionist diversion -- diverting juveniles from all legal proceedings without the imposition of any intervention -- can truly attest to voluntariness. Nonetheless, various measures have been instituted by diversion programs to remedy the alleged infringements of juvenile rights. Admission of guilt is typically required of diverted juveniles so that intervention is "justified" by the factual or moral guilt of the juvenile, even if not by the legal determination of such. Legally sufficient evidence to substantiate the charge laid against the juvenile is often a prerequisite for

property offences such as break and enter are being included as well.

This emphasis on offence type as the basis for diversion eligibility attempts to redress the allegation of discriminatory and unequal access to diversion. Critics have pointed to the "informality and inherent degree of discretion involved in diversion" [59] and alleged that "old" biases traditionally used in the court screening process -- such as character and family stability -- have been adopted by the diversion movement [60]. This implicit focus on offence type reflects an attempt at fair and non-discriminatory selection criteria. However, juvenile ineligibility for diversion may be based on lack of parental consent, or the victim's decision to lay a private complaint. The parents' and victims' right to thereby force a judicial disposition of the case poses additional problems for equal access to diversion [61].

This concern for the protection of juvenile rights has also precipitated increased attentiveness to the role of due process safeguards in diversion. One implication of the diversion strategy of targetting apprehended offenders prior to, and in lieu of, court adjudication, is that even when legal proceedings have been initiated by the laying of a charge, the intervention is not authorized by a formal determination of guilt nor governed by statutory guidelines [62]. The ramifications of this targetting approach have thus raised a considerable number of controversial issues.

While diversion as a freely chosen option is widely accepted, and virtually all programs attest to the voluntariness of participation by juveniles, it is nonetheless argued that voluntary and informed consent is often precluded by

police referral, to protect against unwarranted admission of guilt. As well, the advice of legal counsel is encouraged, if not provided, by some programs in order for the juvenile to ascertain what would be entailed by court processing of the charge (since it may be argued that the judicial sentencing of a first offender might well be more lenient than the often onerous sanctions imposed by the diversion alternative). The nature and extent of the diversion commitment and the repercussions of default are typically stipulated in a contract signed by all parties, thereby enabling a more informed choice for the juvenile. Finally, informal agreements precluding court testimony regarding juvenile involvement in diversion have been attempted in order to minimize double jeopardy [65].

The forthcoming Young Offenders Act includes statutory provisions for these currently improvised procedures for "alternative measures". However, this formalization of diversion by the application of legislation and due process proceedings may destroy one of the conceptual bases for diversion, since formalization "may be incongruous with minimizing formal labelling" [66].

2.4.2 Client Recruitment and Participation

The diversion policy of targetting apprehended juvenile offenders implies a reliance on police referrals to obtain the program clientele, although merchants, businesses and victims in general are sometimes also encouraged to refer detected offenders. However, recruitment practices and problems vary

according to the point of intervention -- "pre" or "post" charge.

Pre-charge diversion programs encountered difficulties in recruiting the intended population. It was widely noted that police tended to refer juveniles "who otherwise might have been cautioned and released" [67], thereby undermining the objective of diverting offenders from court and calling into question the ethical basis of intervention for juveniles not liable for legal processing. In addition to this allegation of "net widening" and its "effectiveness" and "ethical" implications, pre-charge diversion raised due process concerns. In Peel County, Ontario, "the office of the Crown Attorney...established a policy...[to] prevent any pre-court disclosure of information regarding juveniles", believing this disclosure "presupposes the juvenile's guilt, denying him/her the possibility of due process" [68]. This precluded pre-charge consultation between police and project staff for assessment of juvenile eligibility for diversion. Finally, pre-charge intervention initiatives found that without the existence of the court processing alternative, the diversion program lacked leverage or "clout" in dealing with or "engaging" participants. These drawbacks have prompted a general shift in diversion programming to post-charge intervention.

While post-charge diversion relies on police referrals for direct access to participants, it is also routinely dependent on prosecutorial agreement to terminate the legal proceedings initiated by the police, with the withdrawal or stay of the charge. The Crown may also be consulted for approval of a proposed referral to ensure that no juvenile is diverted "that would not ordinarily go to court if diversion did not exist" [69]. The attitudes of these criminal justice

personnel to diversion in general, as well as to the particular project within their jurisdiction, will therefore have a considerable impact on the diversion program's clientele.

Justice personnel's perception of diversion as an inappropriate alternative to court processing may foster reluctance to refer juveniles over whom they would no longer have jurisdiction [70]. To avoid this discretion, programs have developed rather detailed eligibility criteria. Nonetheless, all candidates qualifying for diversion may not be referred. The Saint John Youth Project noted this occurrence, with concern as to whether it merely reflected administrative inefficiency ("mechanical problems") in referral procedures, or more significantly, was the unauthorized screening of diversion candidates by the police or prosecutor [71]. The latter possibility underlines the problem of accountability in client recruitment procedures: if the eligibility criteria specified by the program do not strictly define selection practices, the factors determining juvenile referral to diversion remain unknown. Furthermore, if a project cannot guarantee that all who meet the eligibility criteria will be recruited for diversion, it cannot attest to fair and equal access to diversion for the juveniles within its jurisdiction.

Police attitudes to a diversion program developed within their jurisdiction, and the resulting referral practices of the division, have considerable impact on client recruitment for the project. A new project is often initially "tested out" to assess its stability (given the short-term nature of funding) as well as its capacity to deal effectively with referred juveniles [72]. While an initially low referral rate can be anticipated and taken into consideration in

planning staffing needs, subsequent "vast fluctuations in referral numbers [present] problems at the operational level" for diversion programs [73].

Few diversion programs exclude candidates referred to them, and attrition is generally due to juvenile (or parental) refusal of the diversion option. However, efforts may be made to determine whether the juveniles meet the eligibility criteria and have voluntarily accepted diversion. To refuse juveniles referred by the police may not be seen by program staff as prudent tactics in political terms, especially when police cooperation has been difficult to achieve.

Police cooperation and support is a prerequisite for successful diversion recruitment, and projects must therefore establish good working relations with the police to elicit this support. Post-charge diversion programs can thereby ensure stable access to a service population, without the problems of ensuring continued "engagement" or participation of clients that are faced by other recruitment methods.

2.5 Summary

Chapter 2 has examined the targetting policies and underlying premises of primary, secondary and tertiary (diversion) prevention efforts. The implications of these policies for client identification, recruitment and "engagement" procedures were discussed to underline the problems associated with each of these targetting approaches.

Primary prevention can be seen to derive from sociological theories which attribute delinquency to deleterious social structures and processes, and thereby indicate these structures and processes as the appropriate target for change. The community development approach identifies the community as the target of prevention efforts, albeit largely with an "improvement" rather than a "reform" orientation. Nevertheless, the dominant thrust of primary prevention programming targets the juvenile population of a "flawed" community, rather than the community structures and processes. By attempting to recruit all the youth of a selected area -- through schools or other community efforts, and, more often, self-selection, primary prevention efforts avoid the difficulties of maintaining juvenile participation or "engagement", and the allegedly detrimental segregation and stigmatization produced by specifically designating individuals for services. However, this approach thereby encounters difficulties in recruiting the most vulnerable youth in fulfillment of the preventative function, as these youth may be the least likely to avail

themselves of the activities provided.

By contrast, secondary prevention which assumes delinquents to be differentiated from non-delinquents by certain traits, identifies youth characterized by these indicators or predictors of delinquency as the target of intervention. As such, this targetting approach can rely on community agencies and individuals to identify and refer these "high risk" juveniles, thereby facilitating program access to the most vulnerable juveniles. However, as a result, this recruitment practice entails the purportedly harmful segregation and stigmatization of these "high risk" juveniles as well as the problem of maintaining juvenile "engagement". In addition, it raises financial, legal and ethical concerns.

An integration of primary and secondary prevention policies has therefore been proposed to incorporate the advantages, and circumvent the problems of each approach: increased community awareness of youth problems and the various local facilities for juveniles can enable family members and others to identify "vulnerable" youth and to prompt them to participate in these conventional activities with a general group of their peers.

Diversion of apprehended offenders, the aspect of tertiary prevention addressed in this report, is premised on labelling and deterrence theories, as well as public policy priorities for cost reduction, victim satisfaction, and community tolerance and absorption of some types of juvenile misbehaviour. These diverse conceptual underpinnings imply different targetting strategies.

The assumption that the consequence of apprehension provides a deterrent to delinquency implies the need for visible sanctioning of juvenile offenders.

This may undermine the long-term objective of increasing community tolerance and absorption of some types of juvenile misbehaviour, without recourse to a publicly visible consequence, such as court sanctions or diversion. While deterrence relies on the public sanction, absorption proposes to dispense with it.

Furthermore, while labelling theory suggests non-coercive pre-charge "intervention", the ethical, due process, "engagement" and "net widening" concerns encountered by this approach have increasingly prompted a shift to a post-charge, conditional basis for diversion targetting, as well as the adoption of various other measures (e.g., admission of guilt, legally sufficient evidence, offence based eligibility criteria), to address ethical and due process concerns. This more formalized, post-charge approach undermines the labelling rationale for diversion, suggesting that in practice it has largely been abandoned.

Despite these measures, the "net widening" concerns have not been adequately dealt with insofar as these mechanisms do not address the discretionary elements of police decision-making. As such, diversion recruitment practices may not be fulfilling the cost-reduction rationale. However, the accountability model programs' emphasis on targetting property offenders as opposed to "troubled" youth, does address the policy priority of victim satisfaction.

NOTES

-
1. Johnson, Bird and Little, 1979: 23.
 2. Cited by Laurence and Shireman, 1980: 8-11.
 3. Platt, Schur.
 4. Merton, Cloward and Ohlin.
 5. Cohen, Miller, Sutherland, Cressey.
 6. Hirschi, Matza.
 7. Bell, 1979: 12.
 8. Johnson, et al, 1979: 32.
 9. Ibid.: 166.
 10. Ibid.: 23.
 11. Wilton, "Saint John Youth Project", 1980: 27.
 12. Evaluation of Youth Action Project, Downaview, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 37.
 13. Ibid.: 38; 7.
 14. Evaluations of L'il Beavers, and Burleigh Falls Youth Programme, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 28, 52.
 15. Moyer, 1982: 9-10.
 16. Jennings, "Evaluation of Drop-in Centre Youth Recreation Program", 1980: 14.
 17. Holmes, Outline of Proposal for the Regent Park Teen Centre, 1976: 1, 10.
 18. Ibid.: 12, 14.
 19. Johnson, et al, 1979: 146.
 20. Hall, "East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program", 1979: 20.
 21. The Wincroft Project in Britain may have accomplished a kind of service flooding within a particular neighbourhood, and this flooding may have been a

factor in the project's 'success' (Berleman, 1980: 124.)

22. Johnson, et al, 1979: 149.

23. Ibid.: 7.

24. B. C. Juvenile Crime Prevention Committee, Policy Paper Outline, Appendix D, 1980: 22.

25. For a review of research on early identification and prediction see Wedge, 1978; Johnson, et al, 1979.

26. Wedge, 1978: 24.

27. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1977: 64.

28. Venezia, 1971, cited in Wedge 1978: 25.

29. Berleman, 1980: 125.

30. Lawrence and Shireman, 1980; Johnson et al, 1979; Normandeau, et al, 1979, etc.

31. Normandeau, et al, mention that such efforts have already been made in Quebec, as well as in Denmark and Yugoslavia (1979: 46).

32. Programme Priorities for Children's Services, 1978, cited in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 14.

33. Clarke, "The Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau, n.d.: 12.

34. Ibid.: 12

35. As noted earlier, the Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau opted for police referrals to facilitate access to an appropriate clientele.

36. Cardarelli and Smith, 1979: 353.

37. Evaluation of Youth Assisting Youth Project, Scarborough, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 39.

38. Etobicoke After-Hours Referral Project: First Annual Report, 1979: 1.

39. See S. Clarke, n.d., Appendix to report for Consultation Centre.

40. Berleman, 1980: 144.

41. Cardarelli and Smith, 1979: 353.

42. Brantingham and Faust, 1976: 290.
43. B.C. Juvenile Crime Prevention Committee, Policy Paper Outline, Appendix D, 1980: 27.
44. Tertiary prevention measures encompass the whole range of social control and corrections activity of the criminal justice system. However, this report is restricted in scope to pre-disposition community-based programs and is therefore limiting its focus here to diversion.
45. This interest in causal factors as an instrument for identifying specific juveniles deemed "at risk" tends to affiliate diversion with secondary prevention (e.g., Brantingham and Faust). However, in the context of target identification, the reactive focus on apprehended offenders subsumes diversion within the framework of tertiary prevention.
46. Reamer and Shireman, 1980.
47. It is argued that only "true" non-interventionist diversion is implied by labelling theory and the current diversion practices are a distortion and not a derivation of labelling propositions.
48. Klapauts, 1974: 129.
49. In some cases, diversion programs also provide a dispositional alternative for a sentencing judge.
50. E.g., Pre-court Intervention Program, Chatham, in A.R.A. Consultants, 1983.
51. Brown, "An Evaluation of the Waterloo-Wellington Attendance Centre", 1983: Abstract.
52. Cressey and McDermott, 1973: 33.
53. John Howard Society of Saskatchewan Mediation Diversion Program, 1980: 14.
54. Barrie Community Service Order Program in A.R.A. Consultants, 1983.
55. Moyer, 1980: 89.
56. While research by Thomas (1976) cited in Moyer, 1980: 88, found that status offenders were not, in fact, so different from violators of the criminal law, Rojek and Erickson (1981/2: 24) concluded that the "notion of a progression of delinquent career from status to criminal offences was not supported".
57. Harlow, 1970: 161.
58. Wilton, 1980: 170.
59. Davidson, et al, in Roesch and Corrado, 1981: 107.

60. Moyer, 1980: 87.
61. Davidson, et al, in Roesch and Corrado, 1981: 109.
62. Rojek and Erickson note the operational problem arising from the lack of statutory provision for diverting arrested offenders to community agencies, and the ironic result that the Juvenile Court was forced to mediate the diversion referrals from police to community resources (1981/2: 245).
63. Moyer, 1980: 85.
64. Nejelski, 1976b: 116.
65. Morton, et al, "Summary of a Research Evaluation of the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Programme", 1980: 2.
66. Davidson, et al, in Roesch and Corrado, 1981: 111.
67. Sone, "Evaluation of the East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program", 1979: 20.
68. Peel Diversion Project, Program Description, n.d.: 1.
69. Wilton, 1980: 163.
70. Moyer, 1980: 84.
71. Wilton, 1980: 163.
72. Picard-Brown, "Youth Alternative Project, Progress Report" 1979: 1.
73. Hall, 1979: 5.

Chapter 3

INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

3.1 Introduction

The wide variety of intervention strategies employed by delinquency prevention programs prompts the need for a framework to describe, assess and compare diverse approaches. Such "a system for organizing and conceptualizing delinquency prevention efforts" would promote a cumulative knowledge base, facilitating a "technology of delinquency prevention" to aid policy and planning [1]. Several typologies have been proposed to conceptualize delinquency prevention; however, while useful to that end, they are unsuitable for the classification of actual programming initiatives.

Prominent classifications of prevention efforts into primary, secondary and tertiary, or mechanical, punitive and corrective [2] are too broad to allow for meaningful distinctions between the programming techniques employed. More detailed typologies based on the mode of intervention utilized do not distinguish these techniques according to the presumed causes of delinquency they are designed to address [3]. As a result, strategies purporting to address quite disparate causes of delinquency are aggregated within a single category,

limiting the usefulness of such a typology for integrating and comparing prevention efforts.

The logic of directing prevention activities towards factors or conditions believed to be causative of delinquency is generally accepted [4]. However, theories of delinquency causation are often stated at a level of abstraction that rarely provides clear, unambiguous guidelines for program development. A single theory may generate divergent intervention strategies, while a single strategy may be consistent with divergent theories. This "lack of unitary correspondence between theories of delinquency and prevention approaches limits the utility of theories for directly classifying delinquency prevention approaches" [5]. Thus, Hawkins and his associates have formulated an alternative typology which distinguishes prevention strategies according to elements presumed to cause delinquency, rather than full-blown causation theories. However, this cause-focused framework is only applicable for classifying prevention strategies when the presumed causes of delinquency which they address are explicitly articulated. Given the infrequency of explicitly articulated assumptions by prevention practitioners, this typology is currently of academic interest only. Furthermore, this classification, by looking at the causes of delinquency, does not account for the public policy concerns to reduce "official" delinquency, or official processing -- a factor which also orients prevention activities. It does, however, suggest a useful variation for classifying program initiatives.

While practitioners rarely state their causal assumptions, the objectives of the program are typically stated, even if only to satisfy the requisities of

"grantsmanship". The stated objectives can be used to distinguish, albeit somewhat grossly, the component techniques employed by prevention programs. This framework too has its limitations. A single program may use an array of intervention techniques to accomplish a host of stated objectives without a clear understanding of the logical linkages between each strategy and goal. The congruence must then be "ferretted out" in order to allow for classification. Furthermore, a single intervention strategy may be employed to achieve more than one objective, thereby subsuming this strategy within more than one category, and denying the mutual exclusivity of the classifications. Nevertheless, this classification of intervention strategies according to the objectives they are designed to achieve provides a useful framework for examining the fundamental components of prevention programs: the conceptual rationales and assumptions underlying a proposed objective, the variety of techniques utilized to attain each objective, and the distinct implementation practices and problems associated with the pursuit of this stated goal.

While projects uniformly state a desire to "prevent", "reduce", "curtail", or "deter" delinquency -- hence, their designation as "delinquency prevention programs" -- they typically posit a host of more specific "subordinate" goals to that end. Three prevalent orientations can be identified from this catalogue of goals: the treatment of juveniles who are, or are "at risk" of becoming, delinquent; the promotion of juvenile accountability to the victim and the community for the delinquent acts committed; and the development of community responsibility for the management of juvenile misbehaviour.

3.2 "Treatment" Intervention Strategies

The "treatment" orientation of prevention programming is premised on the need to provide rehabilitative services to juveniles to remedy the presumed causes of delinquency. Researchers and academicians are critical of this fundamental assumption underlying the remedial approach, arguing that, because contemporary theories of delinquency "are at best imprecise and, at worse, contradictory...it is not unreasonable...to suggest that if we do not know what causes delinquency it is extremely difficult to prevent it" [6]. However, the term "delinquency" denotes a tremendous range of prohibited activities and it is perhaps inappropriate to expect that one theory can "explain" the full spectrum of misbehaviour that falls under the "delinquency" rubric. Prevention practitioners, therefore, do not often rely on the strict tenets of a single theory to guide program policy or implementation, but, rather tend to allude to a host of intuitive assumptions of delinquency causation as well as propositions from a variety of theories in formulating treatment objectives. Diverse rehabilitative services addressing individual, interactional and structural problems are thus provided to remedy "any areas of offender needs which seem to be a contributing factor to continuing behaviour which is liable to result in conflict with the law for the offender" [7].

3.2.1 Individual and Interactional Rehabilitation

Various intervention strategies are used to deal with the intertwined problems of the individual juvenile and his/her relationship to society and others.

Emotional and psychological problems exhibited by juveniles are often presumed "to be precursors of delinquency" [8]. Consequently, intervention strategies have been oriented towards the "treatment" of these individual problems with the provision of professional help -- assessment, counselling, psychotherapy and social casework. While occasionally programs, such as Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau, provide in-house counselling by professional project staff (typically, trained social workers) most projects do not have the resources to enable this, especially given the wide range of specialized services required by the juvenile. Rather, professional project staff usually assess the juvenile client and provide referrals to community resources for the treatment required [9]. This function of coordinating existing social agencies to increase juvenile access to needed services -- a recurringly stated objective -- has occasionally proved problematic and frustrating where inadequate project-agency liaison has engendered confusion and ambiguity as to the specific nature of the treatments provided by each agency. One proposed solution to this difficulty in locating the appropriate service is the coordination of a broad range of services within a central multi-service unit [10]. Alternatively, "Clarification of Service" agreements or contracts between prevention projects and community agencies have been initiated [11] in order to specify the treatments provided by, and the clientele appropriate to, each agency and thereby underline any gaps in services in the community [12].

One such gap has been recognized in the unavailability of social services on evenings and weekends for crisis intervention. The frustration engendered "when the need is urgent but due to the working of the bureaucracy the service is not available because the need did not correspond with the times the service is available" [13] provides a rationale for "after hours" services, such as was initiated by the Etobicoke After Hours Referral Program.

The treatment of individual problems is not necessarily confined to professional personnel. The Preventative Intervention at the Pre-Court Level Program in Sault Ste. Marie provides short-term intensive counselling by trained volunteers in addition to an agency-brokerage function. Project Intervention in Windsor does not rely on "professional helping people but rather experienced lay people who can act as models and friends for young people" [14]. Partnerships -- whereby individual juveniles are paired with selected volunteers -- provides intensive help for juveniles on a one-to-one basis without incurring the expense of professional expertise, though programs must invest a considerable amount of time in the recruitment, screening, training, matching and monitoring of the volunteers.

The development of "healthy, concrete relationships" with adults is emphasized as a therapeutic component of interventions such as skills instruction, supervised recreation, wilderness programs, etc. Furthermore, the use of teenage volunteers in partnerships was successfully implemented by Youth Assisting Youth in Scarborough, as well as Bedford Road High School in Saskatoon, and peer counselling is being considered elsewhere. However,

individual counselling through friendship, support and advice is not necessarily "pre-planned" and deliberately programmed but "may take the form of individual counselling on an informal basis...spread throughout the staff and volunteer time as it is seen to be needed" [15].

"The theory that problems such as delinquency do not result simply from failings in the individual young person but from problems in the interaction between the young person and social institutions" underlies intervention techniques oriented to juvenile interactional processes [16].

Youth advocacy -- whereby an adult acts as a liaison and support person for a juvenile in order to facilitate the "system's" accommodation of the juvenile's needs and perspectives is an example of this interactional approach. However, youth advocacy thus defined encompasses a broad range of functions including legal representation and referral to a social agency. On the other hand, the North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project considered that "counselling, friendship, support, advice and involvement with some constructive activities are all important aspects of individual advocacy" [17]. It is not surprising, then, that programs rarely advocate on behalf of the juvenile, but rather tend to provide advice, guidance, support and role models for juveniles.

The "theory of juvenile misbehaviour which sees family dynamics as the central locus of serious problems and control" underlies family therapy and parent training intervention strategies [18]. This therapeutic approach attempts "to improve the family communication processes" considered to cause delinquency, rather than treating the situation as "a question of blame to be dealt with by

some external factor" [19]. Nevertheless, prevention and diversion programs have encountered difficulty in "engaging" families for counselling [20].

An alternative to therapy for improving family dynamics is parental instruction through newsletters, seminars, meetings with project staff and other parents, as well as participation in volunteer training programs with the intention of working with their own children [21]. Insofar as many juveniles in prevention programs are from single-parent families, this training has been found to provide personal support to parents in addition to ameliorating family interactions.

Labelling theory's focus on the delinquency producing effects of negative self-images, especially as induced by juvenile interaction with, and "labelling" by the criminal justice system, has fostered the diversion objective of avoiding the "stigmatizing" or "labelling" effect of the court process. Diversion of apprehended offenders out of the system, with no treatment or other services, is believed to achieve this goal, and is advocated by many labelling theorists. Nevertheless, police, community and government support would not likely be forthcoming if diversion were operationalized as "outright release". Consequently, diversion programs typically intercede with a range of intervention strategies. In this section, we will limit the discussion to those with "treatment" objectives.

However, in implementing these treatment-oriented diversion programs, the underlying assumption of the diversion movement (i.e., the negative effects of poor self-concepts resulting from "labelling") is often neglected. Thus, the

Peel Diversion Project found that participants referred to counselling services indicated concern "about being viewed as 'crazy'"; it was concluded "that the stigma is not avoided but merely redefined" [22]. In contrast, projects employing intervention techniques such as skills instruction, wilderness programs, community service work and restitution "in kind", have suggested that these constructive activities "help [the juvenile] with his/her self-concept" [23]. Project Intervention instituted a procedure specifically addressed to this end by awarding a "certificate of accomplishment" to each participant successfully completing the community service program. "It was felt that in some cases a positive stroke in the form of a certificate might help these young people in establishing a more positive self-image and thereby help to prevent further negative ways of acting out" [24].

3.2.2 Structural Rehabilitation

The often stated assumption of negative self-image as related to, if not causative of, delinquency does not exclusively rely on labelling theory (i.e., stigmatization) to explain the source of these poor self-concepts. Rather, prevention and diversion programs sometimes rely on the propositions of other major sociological theories in locating the source of poor juvenile self-concepts in the lack of structured opportunities and the resultant lack of bonding to the community and its norms. The evaluation of the Rediscovery Program of the Queen Charlotte Islands found that, given limited recreational facilities, restricted educational opportunities and high unemployment rates, "many young people are out of school, out of work, and roaming the streets

without motivation, direction or even the most basic sense of self-worth" [25]. Similarly, Youth of Otonabee in Peterborough concluded that juveniles with "nothing to do [and] no direction or involvement in the community...end up committing acts of vandalism" [26]. Strategies are therefore designed with the objective of creating "constructive and worthwhile modes of behaviour, rather than destructive and meaningless acts which sometimes take place when youth have too much spare time and nothing to do" [27].

Recreation is a preferred strategy of delinquency prevention programs as it is both appealing to juveniles (thereby functional in attracting a service population) and allegedly therapeutic in alleviating the "boredom" presumed to be causative of delinquency. A variety of organizational approaches and activities are employed within the context of a recreational strategy.

"Youth" or "drop-in" centres, such as instituted by the Harbour Boys' Club Youth Services and O'Lokal in Ste-Hyacinthe, Quebec, provide facilities for recreation which are often lacking in the community. Alternatively, programs may keep "informed of recreational activities within the community in an effort to involve juveniles in constructive activities that make better use of their free time" [28]. Special activities, outings, and events are organized by project staff, by elected juvenile representatives (as in the Drop-In Centre Youth Recreation Program, Charlottetown), or by community members (as exemplified by the Burleigh Falls Youth Program). However, it has been suggested that "simply consuming a young person's time will not reduce delinquent behaviour" [29]. As such, the Drop-in Centre Youth Recreation Program in Charlottetown attempted to provide an opportunity for juveniles to feel a sense of "responsibility" and

"ownership" of the centre and its program through planning input, fund raising responsibilities and authority over rules and their enforcement [30]. Projet 80 in Montreal, attempted to provide "creative" and "educational" leisure activities [31].

Wilderness expeditions, such as implemented by the Rediscovery Program, attempt a more intensive and supervised activity, providing a one-time experience for a limited number of juveniles rather than a generally available, ongoing recreational strategy.

Supervised recreation with greater continuity is provided by a "partnership" approach such as employed by Youth Assisting Youth in Scarborough, in which "Senior Youth" (16 to 18 years) recruited from high schools are paired with "Junior Youth" (6 to 12 years) on a Big Brother model. Otherways in Belleville has developed more structure in one-to-one recreational pairing with the provision of a therapeutic playroom setting.

However, while enabling greater direction and supervision of the young person, neither wilderness training nor "partnerships" brings the youth into contact with the broader social environment, and the potentially positive experiences fostered by association with non-delinquent peers in a recreational setting.

The Waterloo-Wellington Attendance Centre illustrates an integrated approach with a structured and intensive recreational strategy. The program involves sessions of recreation and goal-oriented activities -- both in a group as well as a supervised one-to-one context -- each weekday evening over a period of eight to twelve weeks, with a day-time program replacing the evening one during

the summer months. In addition, staff members work with the juveniles to find appropriate placements in such community activities as sports groups, where progress is monitored by project staff for approximately one year.

Skills instruction, such as incorporated into the Harbour Boys' Club Youth Services in Thunder Bay, with the Whiskey Jack Programme, is a more specialized strategy for promoting constructive and meaningful use of leisure time. In addition to providing the juveniles with a specific skill of interest to them, progress in acquiring the skill provides the juvenile with a "sense of accomplishment and an increase in self-esteem" [32]. While, typically, these skills are recreational (music, skiing, canoeing, archery, camping), they can also have a more practical, vocational orientation (woodworking, car mechanics, television production), in the expectation of improving the employment prospects of the juvenile. Furthermore, it is hoped that the general learning skills developed by this strategy transfer to academic, employment and social settings.

Some programs, however, specifically address the educational and employment needs of juveniles, although evidence is inconclusive as to the effectiveness of such strategies in reducing delinquency [33]. Insofar as juveniles, especially delinquents, are considered to have "insufficient social and technical skills" required for success in the job market, the resulting "frustration and idleness could develop anti-social behaviour, low self esteem and conflict with the law" [34]. Various strategies are initiated in an attempt to remedy the lack of employment opportunity for young persons.

The Durham Region Police Youth Bureau, in conjunction with the Durham Board of Education, proposed supervised life skills and job skills training in a real work situation for delinquent youths. In addition to fostering "personal development", "communication skills and self awareness", the project was designed to promote "proper work habits and employment skills" to allow juveniles "to become productive and self-sufficient citizens of the community from an early age" [35]. Project Intervention keeps informed of employment opportunities in the community to assist the juveniles in the program. Youth Guidance/Lifeline Program in Windsor instituted a "work for camp" fund raising project, whereby part-time employment was arranged for juvenile members to provide them with work experience. Community service work may provide valuable opportunities to this end as well. (Unfortunately, all too often, the scarcity of suitable placements, especially for younger juveniles, entails community service tasks which do not provide any constructive or meaningful work experience.)

Educational opportunities are less comprehensively addressed. Tutoring in school subjects is often provided, although usually on an informal basis as deemed necessary by project staff, volunteers and "partnership" relationships. In addition, projects such as Perspective Z in Montreal, may disseminate information on drugs and sexuality to educate youth [36].

This individual-focussed approach for addressing structural problems may serve to improve the circumstances and prospects of individual juveniles, though it runs the risk of segregating and labelling these youth. School-based prevention efforts can avoid this by incorporating such opportunities within the curriculum

available to all students. Legal education and police-school liaison have been integrated into the compulsory curriculum, for it has been argued that juveniles' perceptions of the police and the justice system can affect delinquent behaviour [37]. Academic upgrading, vocation skills, and work experience, however, have largely been directed at selected targets of "high risk" juveniles [38], and have therefore not avoided the potential of stigmatizing program participants.

3.3 Accountability Intervention Strategies

The objective of promoting offender accountability to the victim and the community for the delinquent act committed, by definition, restricts its application to the diversion of apprehended offenders. This objective of diversion programming is premised on divergent rationales. While it incorporates both a "corrective" and a "deterrence" orientation, it is not exclusively "offender-oriented", but introduces, as well, a "victim orientation" to delinquency prevention.

The treatment approach, which attempts to prevent delinquency by remedying its presumed causal factors, has prevailed in diversion programming. Recently, however, a "general disenchantment with traditional rehabilitation programs" has fostered a decline in the rehabilitative orientation [39].

This decline, in conjunction with perceived community anger and frustration "at the lack of visible restraints and controls of young offenders" who appear to "'get off easy' and return to criminal and illegal activity immediately" has fostered the adoption of a reactive approach in a manner similar to that of the criminal justice system [40]. This "apprehension-consequence" model advocates consequences for detected delinquency as a deterrent to such acts [41].

Despite this shift in emphasis, diversion programmers have been reluctant to entirely abandon the labelling underpinnings of the diversion movement in favour

of a whole hearted embrace of the deterrence perspective, and have instead often merely incorporated the two. Thus, the adoption of an "apprehension-consequence" rationale for diversion has not supplanted the delinquency causation formulations of labelling theory. As a result, diversion programming is currently based on a marriage of the "labelling" and "deterrence" propositions, despite the inherent conflict between them -- while the former posits reaction to delinquent acts as a necessary deterrent to continued delinquency, the latter regards such reaction as a source of continued delinquency.

This conceptual confusion is exacerbated by the introduction of a victim-orientation in diversion programming. Increased awareness of the suffering of crime victims -- who "have generally been a disenfranchised group" [42] -- has fostered the public policy priority of attentiveness to, and compensation for, the victims of crime.

The concept of accountability is invoked to address all three of these orientations:

- accountability to the victim requires that the juvenile compensate the victim for the loss or damage incurred, thereby lessening victim distress;
- simultaneously, the same strategy of compensation, in combination with public censure, acts as a "consequence" and deterrent to future delinquent behaviour; and finally,
- the young person's acceptance of responsibility and the contact or

reconciliation with the victim and the community is seen to have
"corrective" value by promoting attitude change in the diverted youth.

The accountability model has been commended for integrating and incorporating the divergent rationales for diversion: "By steering a middle course between the philosophical perspectives of punishment and treatment...[it can] strike a balance between these two diametrically opposed ideologies", incorporating "the objective of reparation to the victim without jeopardizing or conflicting with the...desire for deterrence" [43].

However, this conceptual convergence is alleged to prove practically problematic. Insofar as the "major goals and purposes" of the project orient the selection and the implementation of intervention strategies, an incorporation of divergent objectives and consequently diverse strategies may generate operational confusion as to the intended direction or aim of a particular intervention technique.

A policy decision to emphasize one of the orientations in the accountability configuration has been suggested as providing less confusing and ambiguous guidelines for strategy implementation and direction.

Focus on victim compensation would narrow program concern to ensuring full reparation to the victim for losses or damages incurred by the offender. The dual goals of offender accountability and victim compensation would encourage strategies providing the opportunity for victim-offender reconciliation, and negotiation of the amount of restitution. Greater emphasis on offender rehabilitation would entail program implementation of compensation strategies of

therapeutic value (e.g., community service work), which attempt to remedy the perceived individual, interactional and structural causes of delinquency. Finally, a shift in emphasis to deterrence, and juvenile responsibility to the community, would involve the community in the negotiation through "accountability panels" as well as juvenile compensation to the community through service work [44].

In fact, it has been suggested that "each diversion program has a tendency of giving priority to one of the above goals" [45], as shown by the objectives stated by Canadian projects. Entente in Montreal "encourages the acceptance of responsibility and active retribution for an offense" and is thus (ostensibly) primarily compensation-oriented [46]. Project Intervention in Windsor seemingly stresses the precepts of deterrence in providing "an opportunity for youngsters to learn the realistic norms of their society 'when you do something wrong there is a consequence for that action'" [47]. The Sudbury Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program apparently adopts an emphasis on attitude change, with its goal of "remorse and responsibility" [48].

However, programs apparently characterized by differential policy emphasis on one component of the accountability configuration do not significantly differ from each other in the intervention strategies employed. Nor are they significantly distinguished from their counterparts (such as the Saint John Youth Project, and the Saskatoon Diversion Project) which address all the component orientations, or those (such as the Fredericton Juvenile Diversion Program) which do not articulate the specific nature of the "accountability" objective. Rather, the differential emphasis for a given offender is tailored

by an assessment of the individual needs and circumstances of the juvenile case at hand and not by the program's policy emphasis.

These diversion intervention strategies to promote juvenile "accountability" will be examined with a view to underlining the circumstances appropriate to the application of each alternative strategy and the practical problems encountered in the selection and implementation of this strategy.

3.3.1 Mediation and Reconciliation

The diversion process is initiated with a meeting or hearing to formalize juvenile participation in the program. This meeting typically involves the alleged offender, his/her parents, and a "diversion committee" which is variably constituted by each project, and may include the project director or coordinator, other project staff, professional personnel such as probation officers and social workers, representatives of various community agencies, and "lay" volunteers, on a permanent or intermittent basis. The victim may be present on occasion. This meeting provides a forum for the "voluntary" acceptance of the diversion option by the juvenile (occasionally upon advice from legal counsel provided by the program), as well as formal (signed) consent of the parents to juvenile participation in the program. However, this initial hearing may not merely serve an administrative function. While some programs separate the administrative proceedings from the subsequent mediation and reconciliation process -- preferring a seemingly less stigmatizing "one-on-one" encounter to a formal meeting of a screening committee, other projects avail themselves of the occasion, and presence of the victim and community

representatives, to achieve this accountability objective.

A fundamental component of diversion participation is the need for juvenile "remorse" and admission of "responsibility" for the offence. It is felt that "ownership of the alleged offence fosters a responsible and accountable attitude" in the juvenile offender, thereby constituting an essential technique for achieving the "rehabilitation" objective [49], [50]. The presence of the victim and community representatives at the meeting, providing "an opportunity to discuss events relating to the offence", is deemed to further promote this reconciliation and attitudinal rehabilitation [51]. The juvenile is encouraged to discuss the motivation for, and underlying circumstances of, the offence thereby accounting to the victim and the community for the wrong done. Furthermore, in learning from the victim and the community representatives the implications of his/her behaviour, the juvenile is made aware of the extent of his/her responsibility for the harm done.

However, this strategy of juvenile reconciliation with the victim and the community has proved somewhat problematic. Programs adopting one-on-one mediation between the offender and the project member, obviously cannot thereby achieve this reconciliation. Furthermore, projects relying on a committee-structure for mediation hearings have encountered some difficulties in attempting to recruit lay volunteers. This has, at times, entailed a reliance on professional committee members as community representatives, persons perceived to be less representative of the community at large [52]. Similar difficulties have been expressed in achieving victim attendance at diversion meetings to enable this face-to-face reconciliation [53]. Finally, doubt has

been raised regarding the effective achievement of this reconciliation function by diversion hearings. The Research Evaluation of the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Programme indicated that "victims were equivocal in terms of satisfaction"; they "seemed overwhelmingly most interested in recompense rather than the more abstract goals of justice" [54]. Preliminary results of the evaluation of the Saskatoon Diversion Project have indicated:

that the youths feel that they are learning less about the victim than they would if they had gone through court. The implication of this finding is that reconciliation between the youth and the victim (one of the goals of the program) has not had an opportunity to take place. Other data indicating that the youth feels there is no animosity between he/she and the victim, suggests the contrary--either reconciliation has already taken place on the basis of the minimal amount of information available, or it was not necessary in the first place.

Fischer and Jeune, July 1981: 6-7.

Subsequent to this reconciliation process, the diversion meeting focuses on the development of a strategy which will "allow the child to be actively involved in undoing his wrong" [55].

The development of a compensation strategy is not exclusively oriented to the complainant and full reparation for losses or damage. In view of the low earning power of juveniles, the average restitution to the victim does not even closely approximate the average amount of loss. "Perhaps more importantly, the principle is not full compensation but rather the act of compensation whereby the youth becomes aware of the consequences of his delinquent behaviour" [56]. Thus, the negotiation of a consensual agreement by the victim and the offender, enabling a "compensatory contract" within the resources and capabilities of the juvenile, is seen as a therapeutic technique for instilling in offenders an

appreciation of their accountability for the harm done and "a sense of having been treated fairly" [57].

The participation of community representatives and lay volunteers in the arbitration and negotiation process provides community censure for the delinquent act, and is thereby seen as generating juvenile accountability to the community. This component of a committee mediation process becomes more salient when restitution to the victim is not an applicable strategy (because of the victimless nature of the offence, the lack of cooperation of the victim, or the fact that full recovery of the goods stolen has already achieved reparation to the victim). As a result, the negotiation process encourages juvenile reconciliation with, and responsibility to, the community -- typically culminating in a strategy of juvenile compensation to the community through community service.

The involvement of project staff and professional "child-service" personnel at the meeting (and perhaps even more so the personal contact of a less formal one-on-one mediation approach) enables an individual assessment of the referred juvenile. Some projects rely on such an assessment to individually tailor restitution strategies "according to the child's capabilities and needs", [58] insofar as it is felt that "service plans should meet the needs of the alleged offender rather than be based on the offense" [59]. The attention to individual needs and capabilities, however, introduces "sentence" disparities between juveniles with similar "legal" circumstances (e.g., prior record, nature of offence, extent of damage, etc.). Other projects adopt an offence-based view of compensatory strategies positing that "diversion agreements must deal with the

individual on the basis of the offence and not on the basis of potential future delinquency" [60].

Thus, while some projects may divorce "child welfare" matters from the offence-related diversion hearing, relegating the discussion of social problems to an optional supplementary meeting [61], others adopt a less legalistic "holistic" approach, invoking an individual assessment of the juvenile in the mediation of the "consensual contract" [62]. Consequently, a "treatment" intervention strategy may be proposed in the latter instances, in addition to, or in lieu of, a compensatory arrangement, as deemed appropriate to the juvenile.

As these "treatment" intervention strategies have been examined in the preceding section, the remainder of this section will focus on the strategies employed for achieving juvenile accountability and compensation to the victim and the community.

3.3.2 Compensation to the Victim

Juvenile accountability to the victim may not involve tangible reparation by the offender. Offence-related circumstances (e.g., full recovery of stolen goods), personal characteristics (especially age), and perceived needs of the juvenile may indicate that such compensation is not appropriate. Rather, the principle of juvenile accountability and responsibility may be deemed paramount. As such, victim-offender reconciliation or "symbolic restitution" to the victim through

face-to-face encounters and written or verbal apologies may be seen to suffice in achieving juvenile accountability. This strategy is often incorporated into the diversion or mediation hearing (as discussed earlier), though it may be alternately scheduled. However, most often the victim chooses not to be present at these meetings [63]: "they are not interested in rehabilitation, they have more important things to worry about, they don't want to see the youth again" [64]. Consequently, the therapeutic impact of juvenile accountability through "symbolic" restitution and reconciliation with the victim is often impeded.

In other instances, full or partial monetary restitution to the victim may be deemed appropriate. This may take the form of a direct cash transfer, a contribution to the charity of the victim's choice, or a deferred payment, involving project referral of the juvenile to a community work setting, where the accrued earnings are allocated to financial compensation for the victim.

More often, "as most young people are rarely in a position to pay money, work becomes the more likely alternative" [65]. As such, a negotiated number of hours of personal service work to the victim -- in the form of lawn mowing, snow shovelling, general household chores or maintenance work, etc. -- is undertaken by the juvenile as compensation for the harm done.

However, eliciting the cooperation and participation of the victims of juvenile crime has proved problematic for many diversion programs. It is recurrently noted that "few victims were interested or able to provide and supervise a task for the young offender", and although "appreciative" of being informed of the action taken in response to the offence, victims are often reluctant to

participate in the process [66].

Thus, private individuals, tend not to be "willing to have the offender work for them" [67]. Of greater impact, merchants and other business establishments -- by far the most common victims, given an apparent program preference for targeting shoplifters and minor property offenders -- are often resistant to program participation. Preoccupation with other problems such as declining business, and concern regarding liability insurance coverage, have been mentioned by programs as reasons often cited for victim refusal to allow the offender to do service work as restitution. Similarly, park facilities -- frequent victims of mischief related offences -- have been alleged to erect "red-tape" barriers, with both the administration and the unions disclaiming and deferring responsibility for the decision [68]. By contrast, cooperation from schools is usually readily forthcoming, with principals arranging work service with their own maintenance staff, and accepting responsibility for supervision and monitoring of the juveniles [69].

Consequently, the need to encourage more victims to participate in diversion programs is a recurrently stated project priority. Increased community awareness of the diversion program and its aims are seen to foster supportive attitudes. It has been noted that persistent project liaison can culminate in cooperation. The obstruction of official resistance can be circumvented by contact with sympathetic individuals. One such contact can then serve as a "precedent" enabling more fruitful negotiations with reluctant administrations [70]. It is therefore asserted that "victims of crime, be they large businesses or private individuals, should be better informed" about diversion [71].

Business mediation (as stressed by the North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project) and public relations (as emphasized by the Youth Alternative Project in Halifax) are thus crucial components of compensatory initiatives which should not be neglected. This can be a "slow process" requiring "constant follow up visits to gain the necessary confidence and respect" [72].

3.3.3 Compensation to the Community

Compensation to the community -- typically in terms of community service work -- is a strategy implemented to achieve several objectives. Whereas restitution to the victim instills juvenile accountability for the specific harm to the victim, juvenile accountability to the community demands reparation for the delinquent behaviour which, regardless of the extent or nature of the financial loss, detracts from the smooth, harmonious functioning of the community. As with restitution, community compensation is felt to have a deterrent function. Compensation to the community is also seen to serve a therapeutic role, addressing presumed causes of delinquent behaviour, such as boredom, disaffiliation and alienation. Community service becomes a forum for healthy juvenile interaction with adults who can serve as positive role models for youthful offenders. Finally, the participation of juvenile offenders in such constructive activity can promote in them "a sense of usefulness and self-worth they never had before", thereby alleviating the negative self-images considered causative of delinquency [73].

Despite the positive merits of community compensation -- of broader scope than the more limited benefits of compensation to the victim -- community service work is often expressed as an alternative to victim restitution, used when the latter is not appropriate [74]. Thus, ironically, practical contingencies, not the perceived advantages, are more readily cited reasons for implementing a community compensation strategy in preference to a victim restitution "contract".

Compensation to the community usually involves project referral of the juvenile to a community placement to perform a fixed number of hours of service work in fulfillment of the negotiated diversion "contract". A wide variety of non-profit community resources are employed, including churches, hospitals, day care and community action centres, the Humane Society, Red Cross, Salvation Army, etc. Interestingly, a recent survey of the compensatory placements used by a diversion program indicates a virtually exclusive reliance on business establishments for placements. It is unclear whether the two "community" agencies involved accommodated all CSW assignments, whether the program emphasized direct restitution to victims to the exclusion of CSW, or whether businesses were considered as venues for community service work [75].

The diversion program is responsible for soliciting and maintaining contacts with community agencies which are willing to accept the diverted offenders, and able to provide and supervise service work tasks. The community liaison activities necessary to fulfill this function are increasingly being recognized as crucial to effective service delivery. From among these resources, the project selects the venue and task most appropriate to the offender and the

offence, given the constraints of juvenile age and capabilities, supervision requirements, etc. The program, often through the placement supervisors, then monitors the juvenile's progress. Failure to fulfill the assignment may result in renegotiation of the diversion agreement, or a court referral. Project endorsement of successful completion of the compensatory task terminates the diversion process, as well as all legal proceedings against the juvenile.

The extent of the commitment of project resources needed for attending to community relations and liaison functions has often been underestimated by diversion projects. As a result, budgetary allocations may not be able to accommodate a staff adequate to the demands of program responsibilities. This situation has fostered adaptive measures to cope with the pressure on program staff.

A variant of the standard approach (program-assignment of community placement) was undertaken by Project Intervention, which initiated a "self-task form" so that the juvenile finds a task himself, thereby alleviating project responsibility for arranging community placements. While it is recognized that this approach is not appropriate for all juveniles, it has therapeutic advantages in addition to its practical appeal: promoting juvenile awareness of family members or neighbours -- especially the elderly -- who need assistance, involving the family more directly in the rehabilitation process, fostering juvenile initiative, and allowing flexibility in the scheduling of tasks to suit the juvenile.

Increasingly, lay volunteers are being recruited from the community to aid in

the monitoring of juvenile offenders. This can free the project coordinator's time for community liaison, as this responsibility requires continuity of contact and full-time accessibility and is therefore less amenable to appropriation by volunteers.

Community involvement in the diversion of juvenile offenders addresses both the principle of juvenile accountability to the community, as well as the practical need for sustaining effective achievement of that objective. In addition, it returns responsibility to the community for the management of juvenile misbehaviour, with the attendant benefits for the community of active involvement and increased cohesion. The various strategies for promoting the objective of community involvement and accountability will now be examined.

3.4 The Development of Community Responsibility

3.4.1 Introduction

Earlier sections have underlined the extent to which the practical operation of delinquency prevention programs is contingent upon the cooperation and support of the community. "If delinquency prevention programs are to succeed, they must be integrated into community activities rather than developed in isolation from neighbourhood residents or agencies [76].

However, the concept of the "community" is variably operationalized. Diversion and prevention programs are said to be "community-based" whether under the auspices of a sector of the juvenile justice system (law enforcement or corrections), child service agencies or professionals, or local residents, because they are alternatives to formal processing and/or rely on non-system resources or personnel in the implementation of the prevention goal.

The objective of promoting involvement in, and responsibility for the management of juvenile misbehaviour derives from the convergence of several interrelated themes in contemporary practice, research and public policy: rising costs of the formal system; the needs of the victim; the community role in defining deviance and its excessive reliance on the formal system for resolving minor misbehaviour; the potential deterrent value of community sanctions; and, the effects of community social structure and interaction on delinquency. Each of

these themes raises issues with regard to program implementation. Following a brief discussion of these themes, we will examine the community development strategies utilized by delinquency prevention and diversion programs in Canada.

3.4.2 The Costs of the Justice System

The rising costs and workloads of the criminal and juvenile justice systems have prompted concern for reorganization of delinquency prevention and control measures "to promote more effective use of criminal justice resources" [77]. The delegation of greater responsibility to the community for the management of delinquency, and the anticipated increase in community tolerance can reduce the need for system handling of juvenile problems, possibly creating a more cost-effective use of resources.

All program efforts, insofar as they are directed towards prevention, are ultimately oriented to reducing "official delinquency" and criminal justice processing of young persons. In both diversion and prevention programming, similar strategies -- the use of volunteers, discussed below -- have been used to decrease the costs to the formal system. However, several issues related to program implementation have been raised which question the potential for cost reduction.

The diversion of apprehended juvenile offenders from official court processing to community-based programs may well reduce court workloads, but in order for programs to achieve that objective, one essential condition must be present:

juveniles recruited to the program must have been liable to formal processing. If legal proceedings would not otherwise have been initiated against them, the diversion process does not constitute an alternative, but rather an addition, to the formal process. Despite efforts to ensure that diverted juveniles would have otherwise been officially processed -- through post-charge intervention, admission of guilt, acceptance of the need for legally sufficient evidence of culpability, etc. -- these mechanisms do not totally address the discretionary elements of the police decision-making. Juveniles legally liable for court processing may have been released with a 'warning' in the absence of the diversion option. The Frontenac program evaluators suggested that a "re-examination of police discretion might well be a more effective, easier administered, and much cheaper approach to reducing the numbers of juveniles in the justice system" [78].

The same evaluation reported that even before the program started, the police charge rate in the Frontenac area was low; that is, an unusually small number of juveniles, in relation to the youth population, actually went to juvenile court. This finding raises another important question with regard to cost savings: why implement a diversion program in an area where the formal system is not overburdened with cases? The answer is, of course that the community (or its agency representatives) responded to a felt, but not an actual cost-related, need for diversion. In many instances, programs may be established because of the interests and ability of the local community to mount a diversion project, not because a need for one existed in terms of rising system costs. This argues for an initial "needs assessment" before programs are funded.

Diversion to services -- a model on the decline in Canada (at least among federally funded projects) -- has also been questioned. While system costs may be reduced by diversion, costs to the agencies in the community may be increased by the influx of a newly tapped source of cases. Despite program efforts at "service brokerage" and "youth advocacy", community social agencies may be reluctant to accept the increase.

A related point is raised by community-based prevention programs that aim to coordinate community youth services. In this capacity, they sometimes can provide a "third option for the police" [79] in dealing with problem youth, in those instances when legal proceedings are initiated largely in order to try to get the youth to needed services. Service system coordination may be able to reduce essentially "child-welfare" referrals to juvenile court. This strategy can also reduce the duplication of such resources by the formal justice system.

However, some programs have indicated that the pursuit of this approach has "proved to be a constant frustration. In reality a small demonstration project does not have any political or financial power to enlist the aid and cooperation of larger, more established agencies necessary to ensure such coordinated efforts" [80]. As a result of agency resistance and lack of "clout", short term, small scale prevention projects on occasion have had to abandon the admirable objective of agency liaison and coordination [81].

3.4.3 Victim and Community Satisfaction

Awareness and concern that victims of crime have largely been a "disenfranchised" group within the criminal justice system has prompted a policy commitment to providing some means of redress for the victim. Community accountability programs, by restoring "social harmony between the victim, the offender and the community" [82], are seen as being able to maintain, and perhaps increase, the public's confidence in and respect for the formal system.

Victim dissatisfaction with the operation of the formal system has been related to the lack of compensation for loss or damaged property, the delays of the system, lack of knowledge of the outcome, and the time lost from work for court appearances (more prevalent in the case of offences by adults). With the exception of the "knowledge" and compensation issues, juvenile accountability programs generally do not deal with these factors in victim dissatisfaction. (Originally, the projects in the U.S. diversion movement did have speedier processing as an explicit objective, but this is an infrequent objective of Canadian programs.) Limited data from Canadian programs indicate that the victims are informed in most instances about the outcome of the diversion process, and appreciate that information.

With regard to victim satisfaction, it has already been noted that victim participation in juvenile accountability programs has often been self-interested, with reconciliation with the offender less desired than monetary compensation for the offence and/or some action being taken against the offender. The

experience of more broad-based community mediation programs (such as the Kitchener Mediation Service) suggests that the mediation process works best with persons who have a pre-existing relationship (neighbours, relatives, landlord and tenants). The victim-offender reconciliation urged by some accountability projects may be an unrealistic objective when the offender is unknown to the victim, as probably occurs among most minor property offenders which are the majority of diversion clients.

At the same time, the purpose of victim involvement appears to be a symbolic one for the public at large. The compensation of the victim becomes a visible symbol for the fairness of the system. The consequence to the offender imposed by the program is seen by the community as one that has some value for future deterrence. However, in order for community satisfaction with the operation of the system to be increased, the public must be informed that its grievances against young offenders are being redressed in a meaningful way, and that "the law", after all, is functioning in its interest.

3.4.4 The Community Role in Defining Deviance

One impetus for the development of the "community responsibility" orientation was the assumption that too much minor misbehaviour was being referred to the formal system for resolution and/or sanctioning, and that programs should be developed to assist the community in dealing with minor matters themselves.

Among diversion programs, there have been a number of approaches taken,

including basically pre-charge community projects (e.g., the Kitchener Community Mediation Service, Neighbourhood Justice Centers in the U.S.), in which community members are used to negotiate between disputing parties. Another program element has been "business mediation", where local merchants are encouraged to make referrals to the informal settlement of shoplifting incidents (e.g., the North End Project in Halifax in the late 1970's). Such programs are seen as an intermediate step in the education of the community to handle "disputes" without recourse to the formal system.

Post-charge juvenile programs using the "accountability" model may employ this rationale, but operationally, accountability has been defined as offender accountability, not community accountability, for delinquency prevention. The emphasis has been on the deterrent and victim compensation aspects of diversion. The trivial nature of much delinquent behaviour has been, if anything, downplayed in the focus on expiation, public acknowledgement of responsibility for the offence, and on the "consequences" of delinquent behaviour. In spite of some lip service to labelling theory, most programs have ignored the possibility that the accountability program type may merely replace the official label of "bad" by a community one.

It is feasible that the accountability program may increase individual victim tolerance for, or at least understanding of, the individual offender in those cases where there is a face-to-face discussion of the offence and the surrounding circumstances. On the other hand, if the extent of community and victim involvement is restricted to a few volunteers and a small proportion of victims, the goal of "absorption" of delinquent behaviour by the community

becomes a difficult one to achieve. Furthermore, the goal may conflict with the objective of victim and community satisfaction, since publicly visible "consequencing" seems to be an element of that satisfaction.

3.4.5 The Deterrent Value of Community Sanctions

A further assumption has been that community participation in delinquency prevention and control may prove effective in fulfilling the goals of individual deterrence and attitude change. It is believed that the local context for "teaching" norms of conduct and sanctioning transgressions may be more relevant and meaningful to juveniles and, hence, more effective in deterring delinquency. In accountability programs, there is an attempt to inculcate a sense of responsibility for the harm, as well as establishing sanctions in proportion to the needs and circumstances of the offender.

The heightened visibility of the "consequences" for delinquency, and of the fairness of this consequence, can then serve not only as a deterrent sanction to the juvenile, but also to promote community confidence in, and respect for, the system -- an attitude which can then (somehow) be transmitted to local youth. For this to occur, it becomes essential that public awareness and information campaigns are salient program strategies.

3.4.6 The Relationship between Community Structure and Interaction and Delinquency

Major sociological theories attribute the source of juvenile delinquency to deleterious community structures and interaction. In practice, these theories have been translated into programs which increase access to services and/or create new, more attractive community services; and prevention programs which attempt to raise the "quality of life" in the neighbourhood via community mobilization. For this latter strategy to achieve community improvements via local initiatives, it is important to have a sense of community pre-existing in the area selected, or the first task of the community developer must be to create this "sense of community" or "neighbourhood".

Despite the implicit or explicit reliance on sociological theories of delinquency as program underpinnings, the programs oriented towards increasing access to services (by advocacy and brokerage, etc.) have often remained individually focussed -- that is, the improved treatment of the individual is the end sought, not the improved ability of the community to control delinquency by improving the interactions and structures of the area.

3.4.7 Community Development Strategies

Strategies used to promote the involvement of the community in delinquency prevention and control are often similar for diversion and primary and secondary prevention programs: volunteer recruitment, public information and awareness campaigns, brokerage of services, community advocacy, and the facilitation of community action. The two latter strategies tend to be the preserve of primary prevention programs, although occasionally diversion programs are combined with a broader based community development approach [83].

The increasing cost of service delivery and a belief in the importance of integrating programs into the community to meet objectives of community absorption, effective local sanctioning, and altering community interactions, have all served as impetus for enlisting the assistance of volunteers.

A variety of approaches have been used to solicit volunteers. Local university and college students have provided a readily available pool of candidates, given the incentive of course credit for the experience; however, some coordinators have found that a year round commitment is more desirable [84]. Increasingly, the advantage of recruiting high school students has been recognized, in view of the influence of peer pressure on juveniles. Interested residents in the community at large are enlisted, often through media campaigns, and church and other social organizations. Among treatment-oriented prevention programs, the value of recruiting parents of program participants has brought increased focus in this direction. Some difficulty in recruiting male volunteers has been

encountered, and the resulting preponderance of females has caused concern, especially given the larger proportion of male program participants [85]. Greater efforts should be made to encourage male volunteers.

The importance of establishing guidelines for volunteer involvement was noted by the Calgary Police Service Citizen Volunteer Program, which developed guidelines for "legitimate" volunteer expectations including clear delineation of responsibilities and requirements, program support, legal, emotional and physical protection, recognition and evaluation of the service provided [86].

Increased program reliance on "lay" participation in direct service work with juveniles -- in "partnerships", counselling, skills instruction, recreational supervision, play therapy, etc. -- directly involves individual community members in youth development. The strategy is employed in part to inculcate community norms and standards in the youth, and to promote in them a sense of affiliation or "bonding" to the community. In a similar way, community participation in accountability programs -- as mediators and supervisors of compensation agreements -- is seen to enable offender reconciliation with the community, rather than isolating and alienating him/her.

Community representation on advisory councils and management boards of prevention and diversion programs serves a slightly different function. In this case, the local representation is believed to allow the formalizing of community input into the program's planning and management. "Community" representation, however, has often entailed "agency" rather than "lay" participation [87], in part because of the difficulties in recruiting the latter. Pressure from

funding sources [88], in conjunction with increased awareness of the program benefits of local involvement, has prompted a greater emphasis on "lay" representation. Inexperience in administrative and service delivery matters may foster a reliance on professional agency board members, and thereby undermine the community "representativeness" of the "lay" delegates [89]. Nevertheless, the longer term goal of producing local citizens skilled in program planning and management indicates the need to encourage local citizen participation.

A significant investment of project staff time is required for recruitment, screening, training, and supervising volunteers. In the past, training (ranging from occasional workshops to an intensive program spread over twelve weeks) was largely restricted to volunteers assigned to counselling functions; increasingly, the value of instruction in communication and decision-making skills is being recognized for volunteers in all capacities. The monitoring and supervision of volunteers is usually undertaken through periodic meetings to provide support and recognition, as well as guidance and direction.

Despite the demands on staff time, volunteers can relieve project resources and decrease the cost of service delivery, while at the same time helping to "bring a sense of community care and humanizing and individualizing influence directly to the young person", qualities which are not "easily duplicated in a professional and bureaucratic organization" [90]. There are, however, practical constraints on what volunteers can do; administrative and liaison tasks usually must remain the responsibility of full-time personnel [91].

Public relations and awareness strategies are an additional method of promoting

community involvement. Much of the promotional activity has been achieved as a by-product of the liaison required to enlist community participation in direct service work. Perhaps less attention has been paid (by diversion programs, at least) to the mobilization of the community by increasing public awareness of juvenile-related issues and problems; understandably, diversion programs tend to focus primarily on program-specific public education, rather than on more general dissemination of information on juvenile problems.

Specifically, the strategies for public relations have included: media coverage, displays at shopping malls, the circulation of newsletters and brochures describing the program, and presentations to service and church groups, city council members, social service agencies, school employees, police and juveniles.

Prevention programs often attempt to identify gaps in community youth services in their capacity of coordinator or broker of local resources, sometimes by soliciting resident views (e.g., at neighbourhood meetings or contacts with special interest groups) and creating a forum for the discussion of local concerns (e.g., the North End Diversion Project). In other instances, service system coordination involves only the project staff, who assess the resources available, and attempt to inform police, agencies and the public of the existence and location of the youth serving agencies. These efforts attempt to increase the likelihood that youth will avail themselves of community resources and that those regularly in contact with young persons (teachers, families, and perhaps even the police) can identify and direct juveniles who may benefit from services.

Some prevention programs assume a community advocacy strategy, which does not merely identify needed resources, but also attempts to fill these gaps. Methods to achieve these ends include program submissions for funding to provide additional services or develop a new project, coordinating community agencies to incorporate the needed service into their existing mandate, and working with local groups to organize and plan programs. Community advocacy thus works to improve local resources and the utilization of these resources by young persons.

A more facilitative strategy has been undertaken by some primary prevention programs. Such programs require community residents to take back some social responsibility and control for their community from the professional service providers [92]. The involvement of professionals is seen as perpetuating the problem that

the community, generally speaking, has abdicated its responsibility in solving its own problems. Instead it has developed a multitude of outside agencies and 'specialists' to take care of these problems. [Consequently] there is a decreasing sense of the community as something that belongs to its residents and over which they have the responsibility and power to exercise some control. As a result communities have become very impersonal uncaring places in which people must live and nurture their children.

Wilton, 1980: 23-24.

This tactic to encourage community responsibility requires greater lay control over the assessment and fulfillment of local needs and the functioning of local facilities. Some prevention programs have perceived their role "as a resource in regard to [community] plans for action" [93], rather than an advocate acting on behalf of the community residents. By serving as a catalyst for mobilizing

community action and a channel for implementation by the community of these initiatives, the program may facilitate the community's self-sufficiency and responsibility for the quality of local life.

The goal of this form of community development is to transfer responsibility for program activities to the community. By integrating residents into the operation of the ongoing program, the staff enables volunteers to gain the experience necessary for continuing the tasks -- by transmitting "to the community knowledge and problem solving skills" [94].

An alternative model of community development is exemplified by C.O.D.A. in Hamilton, which implemented a project specifically designed to mobilize community residents into a representative group able to undertake their own initiatives. After the preliminary research, the single staff member mobilized a group of local residents through extensive liaison and advertising in the community and helped them to organize into a residents' association. Having thus established a core of "experienced residents who could assure the continuation of the organization and its work", the staff member withdrew from the project [95].

Some have suggested that self-sufficiency is an unrealistic objective because administrative and liaison functions require continuity and full-time accessibility of personnel, which cannot be expected of volunteers. While the C.O.D.A. attempt at community development did, in fact, find that "some plans and proposals were not carried through to completion due to a lack of consistent personnel", the "programme did seem to be successful in helping to organize

residents, initiating a major Legal and Community Services project ... and initiating some direct service programmes to young people and other community residents" [196]. It appears, then, with adequate opportunity to gain experience -- whether through a progression from direct service work to planning responsibility on advisory councils, or under supervision of a community development worker -- it is possible for local residents to assume responsibility. Perhaps recognition of, and inducement to, undertaking such responsibility and commitment through salaries and/or honoraria can provide a remedy for lack of continuity of personnel.

3.5 Summary

Chapter 3 has examined program intervention strategies in the context of the objectives that they are designed to address. This framework has thus required some repetition of project strategies within the discussions of several objectives. The redundancy underlines the potential of a single intervention approach to achieve a host of goals. These strategies will now be summarized with a view to assessing their impact on, and implications for the diverse program objectives and their underlying assumptions.

Professional counselling of juveniles and family therapy strategies to "remedy" the individual and interactional problems presumed to be precursors of delinquency, are costly and entail community abdication of responsibility to the professional child-serving community. Furthermore, these strategies segregate, and possibly stigmatize, these youth and their families, and have therefore encountered "engagement" problems. Parental training or instruction, and volunteer "counselling" -- especially an informal approach to encourage legitimate and constructive activities on the part of the juvenile -- can circumvent to some extent these difficulties. In addition, activities which do not merely consume leisure time, but which provide opportunities to be useful, to "belong", and to interact with community members and non-delinquent peers, may be able to foster positive juvenile self-images, "bonding", and conventional socialization: the lack of these attributes are considered structural causes of

delinquency.

A project strategy of youth advocacy may facilitate increased provision of, and juvenile access to, such youth-serving resources. Community participation in direct service work with juveniles, and increased community awareness of youth problems and available resources, may be able to foster a more informal advocacy approach. This type of advocacy would assist in reducing reliance on professional referrals and crisis intervention.

Thus, the integration of strategies for the development of increased community responsibility for juvenile delinquency prevention with juvenile "treatment" strategies can more effectively address assumptions of delinquency causation and the associated objectives of prevention programming. Community mobilization and involvement may ultimately lead to an increased sense of community identity and cohesion, for a generally improved local environment.

Diversion programming tends not to be cause-focused (i.e., based on the theories of delinquency causation), but is largely oriented by the need for societal management or control of delinquency. Nevertheless, accountability diversion strategies can benefit from an integration of the proactive "prevention" dimension, while still maintaining their reactive control objectives.

Victim-offender reconciliation is presumed to inculcate attitude change in young offenders and is thereby considered "therapeutic". However, the admission of guilt, acceptance of "responsibility for the harm done", and evidence of "remorse", expected of juveniles in a panel or mediation committee setting, may be as destructive to juvenile self-image as the court process it is allegedly

designed to avoid. Victim satisfaction may not be achieved through reconciliation, as victims of property offences are seemingly more interested in recompense than in abstract notions of juvenile rehabilitation, consensual dispute settlement and "justice". Community satisfaction may well be negligible, as the community remains largely uninvolved in, and unaware of, the process. Furthermore, reconciliation perpetuates community reliance on symbolic sanctions, rather than fostering and legitimating tolerance and absorption of some juvenile misbehaviour.

Victim restitution encounters similar difficulties for achieving community satisfaction, although it fulfills the objective of victim satisfaction. While the restitution "consequence" to the young offender addresses the desire for deterrence, it entails little "therapeutic" value for the juvenile. By contrast, compensation to the community through community service work may be better able to achieve community satisfaction. Furthermore, while providing a deterrent consequence to the offender, a suitable community placement can provide a constructive opportunity for the juvenile. Finally, if a community placement can remunerate the juvenile in order to recompense the victim, victim restitution can be achieved without undermining the potential for community satisfaction, and possibly offender change as well.

NOTES

-
1. Hawkins, et al, 1980: vii.
 2. Brantingham and Faust, 1976; Lakin's, 1967.
 3. Normandeau, et al, 1979; Cardarelli, et al, 1979; Romig, 1978; Walker, et al, 1975; Dixon and Wright, 1974.
 4. Elliot, 1980; Kelley, 1979; Krisberg, McCall and Munson, 1978.
 5. Hawkins, et al, 1980: 9.
 6. Lundman, et al, 1976: 308.
 7. Fredericton Juvenile Diversion Program, Project Description, n.d.: 3.
 8. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 14.
 9. In fact, however, even with a staff of trained professionals, the Langley Bureau refers clients to other agencies when appropriate, and considers its inter-agency coordinating role a major function of the project.
 10. Holmes, "Outline of Proposal for the Regent Park Teen Centre", 1976: 2.
 11. E.g., Peel Diversion Project, Etobicoke After Hours Referral Program.
 12. Though even this adaptive response has not proved an adequate solution when administrative representatives of agencies do not communicate to their professional staff the commitments undertaken in these contracts (Peel Diversion Project, Program Description, n.d.: 4.).
 13. Holmes, 1976: 1.
 14. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 8.
 15. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 17.
 16. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 15.
 17. North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project: Progress Report, n.d.: 18.

18. Morton and West, "Summary of a Research Evaluation of the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Programme", 1980: 19.
19. Clarke, "The Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau": 8.
20. Morton and West, 1980: 11.
21. Evaluations of Harbour Boys Club and Otherways, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978; Relations Parents-Enfants, in Normandeau, et al, 1978: 35.
22. Peel Diversion Project, Program Description, n.d.: 3.
23. Entente, Program Description, n.d.: 1.
24. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 11.
25. SexSmith, et al, "Rediscovery: An evaluation", n.d.: 1.
26. Youth of Otonabee, Program Description, 1979: 3.
27. Jennings, "Evaluation of Drop-In Centre Youth Recreation Program", 1980: 28.
28. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 5.
29. Johnson, et al, 1979: 70.
30. Jennings, 1980: 28.
31. Projet 80, in Normandeau, et al, 1978: 34.
32. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 17.
33. Dixon and Wright, 1974: 29.
34. Kay, "Youth Job Corps Project Submission", 1979: 2.
35. Ibid.: 1.
36. Perspective Z, in Normandeau, et al, 1978: 33.
37. Johnson, et al, 1979: 90.
38. Donovan, 1981: 20-22.
39. Shichor and Binder, 1982: 46.
40. Entente Program Proposal, n.d.: 1.
41. B.C. Juvenile Crime Prevention Committee Policy Paper Outline, Appendix D, 1980: 27.

42. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 11.
43. Doyle and Gaudet, 1979: 2.
44. Schneider and Schneider, 1980: 3-21.
45. Wilton, "Saint John Youth Project", 1980: 169.
46. Entente Proposal, n.d.: 2.
47. Gaspar, 1979: 8.
48. Sudbury Victim-Offender Reconciliation Program, in A.R.A. Consultants, 1983.
49. Hetherington, "Fredericton Diversion Program", 1980: 4.
50. The admission of guilt is also seen as circumventing, to some extent, the critical issue of the justifiability of intervention which is not statutorily authorized by a formal adjudication of guilt.
51. Picard, "Youth Alternative Project Information Package".
52. Wilton, 1980: 165; Morton and West, 1980: 19.
53. Morton and West, 1980: 19; Fischer and Jeune, Saskatoon Diversion Project Interim Report, December, 1981: 3.
54. Morton, et al, 1980: 19, 23.
55. Ibid.: 2.
56. Fischer and Jeune, "Saskatoon Diversion Project Interim Report", December 1981: 2.
57. Morton, et al, 1980: 2.
58. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 4.
59. Entente Program Description, n.d.: 10.
60. High Level Diversion Project Policy Statement, 1980: 5.
61. E.g., Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Programme.
62. E.g., North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project.
63. The Research Evaluation of the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Programme (1980) found that only a minority of victims of juvenile crime participated directly in diversion or official court hearings, although they did play more significant

roles in the former than the latter.

64. Fischer and Jeune, "Saskatoon Diversion Project Interim Report", December 1981: 3.
65. Hall, "East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program, Coordinator's Report", 1979: 21.
66. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 9.
67. Wilton, "Saint John Youth Project", 1980: 169.
68. Hall, 1979: 22.
69. Ibid.: 21.
70. Ibid.: 20-22.
71. Gaspar, "Project Intervention", 1979: 13.
72. North End Diversion Project, n.d.: 9.
73. Wilton, "Saint John Youth Project", 1980: 170.
74. E.g., Programme de Travaux Communitaires, 1980: 2.
75. Fischer, et al, 1983: Appendix K.
76. Cardarelli and Smith, 1979: 356.
77. Solicitor General of Canada, Federal Discussion Paper, 1979.
78. Morton and West, 1980: 23.
79. Preventative Intervention at the Pre-Court Level Program, Sault Ste. Marie, in A.R.A. Consultants, 1983.
80. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 23.
81. E.g., Peel Diversion Project, East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program.
82. Solicitor General of Canada, Federal Discussion Paper, 1979.
83. E.g., The Saint John Youth Project; the North End Project in Halifax.
84. Personal communication, Moyer, 1980.
85. Fischer and Jeune, December 1981: 2.
86. Calgary Police Service Citizen Volunteer Program, n.d.: 6.

87. Sone, 1979: 13.
88. Morton and West, 1980: 7.
89. Morton and West, 1980: 19.
90. Entente Program Description, n.d.: 7.
91. Sone, 1979: 11.
92. Solicitor General of Canada, "Good Neighbours", 1983.
93. North End Diversion Project, 1980: 18.
94. Ibid.: 12.
95. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 21.
96. Ibid.: 21, 50.

Chapter 4

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Introduction

The past history of delinquency prevention practices includes examples of procedures which today seem misguided, if not ludicrous, such as exorcism, sterilization, transmitter implants, etc. These measures were rendered obsolete and "targets of derision" only after an accumulation of evidence contradicting the presumed effectiveness of such measures [1] and the causal propositions underpinning them. The lesson from history underlines the need for continued evaluation of current prevention assumptions and practices, and adaptation of these in conformity with the empirical data, lest we relegate current measures to future derision.

There are two components to program evaluation: process evaluation -- an assessment of the efficiency of the implementation and operation of a prevention strategy; and outcome or impact evaluation -- an assessment of the effectiveness of programs in achieving their stated objectives. In this chapter, we will present some issues related to organizational efficiency as raised by Canadian process evaluations and program descriptions. In Chapter 5,

there will be a more general discussion of evaluation and monitoring, including some suggestions for the monitoring of diversion programs.

Prevention programs and practices may be designed and planned in conformity with an ideal model of service delivery. Invariably, however, "problems tend to become evident only when you become operational" [2]. The practical contingencies of implementation and operation, often initially unforeseen, can undermine efficient service delivery and hence the ultimate success of the prevention endeavour. Without an assessment of the implementation process and its problems, a prevention strategy may be dismissed as "ineffective" when it has not, in fact, been operational and not ready for an impact evaluation. As such, an examination of the practical obstacles for strategy implementation and operation can inform appraisals of the diverse prevention practices -- the potential for success and hence the advisability of replication. Furthermore, the operating experiences of prevention programs can alert practitioners and policy-makers to possible solutions to problems, thereby helping to increase the efficiency of both existing and future projects.

As shown by the discussion in the preceding chapters, the recruitment and intervention strategies of a prevention program orient the practical procedures employed to achieve the proposed objectives. The organizational features of the project further impinge on its day to day operations, and hence may affect the achievement of the proposed objectives. The administrative structure of the project, the ultimate source of authority and direction for programming efforts, the organizational and community linkages of the project, the staffing practices, and the funding requirements of the program are all interrelated,

necessitating program responses that impact on each other and ultimately on service delivery to juveniles.

4.2 Administrative Structure

There has been repeated mention in this report of the practical constraints and benefits of various administrative program structures on recruitment practices and intervention strategies. The specific organizational model of the project -- such as the extent to which projects rely on "in-house" facilities or on community resources -- affects the administrative tasks and the practical problems encountered by the program.

In prevention and diversion programs, the provision of "in-house" facilities for counselling of juveniles by trained staff incurs sizeable project expense. Furthermore, it may perpetuate project isolation from the community, and a lack of responsiveness to community direction or control. However, it circumvents, to a great extent, the difficulties of coordination and liaison with the local child-service agencies, tasks which are both time consuming and which may inhibit timely intervention and adequate monitoring of service delivery. A greater reliance on volunteers can reduce staffing requirements, although it introduces the administrative tasks of recruitment, screening, matching, training and supervision of these volunteers as well as the concomitant record keeping.

Two alternative organizational approaches have been adopted for project utilization of community child-service resources. The East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program enlisted five community agencies, each of which was to provide the equivalent of one day per week of staff time to the project. In practice, the inter-agency approach produced discrepancies in orientation and direction, and difficulties in coordination and supervision of staff, which resulted in unfulfilled commitments and disparity in service delivery. As such, it was concluded that this administrative model, and in particular the method of staffing, "does not provide a viable alternative" to a social service agency with centralized in-house personnel and supervision [3].

The "brokerage" approach to utilization of community child-service resources entails project referral of juvenile participants to such local facilities. Once the agencies to be used are identified, and the services they provide are categorized, project staff must proactively obtain cooperation. "Clarification of Service Agreements" have been used to facilitate liaison. However, as such arrangements tend to be negotiated with administrative representatives of each agency, project staff are even further removed from contact (and influence) with service providers, which can be a source of "frustration" to them [4].

Clarification of Service Agreements, while useful, do not necessarily ensure that line personnel will cooperate with the program. In particular, problems have arisen in terms of feedback to the program. In some U.S. programs of this type, it was found that referrals were not followed up -- either by the young person or the service providers.

A panel, or committee diversion structure entails organizational requirements (unnecessary for one-on-one mediation), such as committee member recruitment, training, and coordination (e.g., organizing venue and scheduling, trying to reduce disparity of orientation).

4.3 Authority and Direction

The locus and structure of authority and control of a prevention or diversion program influences the direction and efficiency of the ongoing operation through the clarification of project objectives and personnel functions.

Some projects are implemented under the auspices of an existing agency -- police or Youth Bureau, probation departments, John Howard Society, etc. -- and are essentially accountable to the governing boards, individuals, or specialized sub-committees of these organizations. Other programs have been implemented on an inter-agency or "umbrella" model, with authority vested in a board or committee comprised of representation from the component agencies as well as relevant "system" organizations. Finally, "independent" programs, initiated by interested professional or community groups may attempt a more broad-based "lay" structure, or rely on personnel from community and system agencies.

In addition to the differential configurations of system, social service and lay control, the invariable need for financial support for a program necessitates

accountability to funding agencies. The ongoing administrative supervision is typically vested in a project director or coordinator, while responsibility for research and assessment (if any) is usually the mandate of an outside evaluator. This diffusion of relative authority has often precipitated ambiguity, if not conflict, in the demarcation and exertion of control over program direction.

An inter-agency or "umbrella" program model may fail to distinguish its function or objective from those of the sponsoring agencies and as a result it is "never clear what [its]...role should be" [5]. Turnover of board participants, so that "members of the initial group which formulated the project are no longer members of the Advisory Committee, and those who currently represent the participating agencies may not fully share the intent or enthusiasm of the initial group", may inhibit a "clear understanding of the business at hand" and the "strong leadership" necessary to provide program direction [6]. A large diffuse committee may impede the establishment of "operational guidelines or philosophy" while a smaller committee, enabling "intensive and extensive involvement of all programme personnel", can "knit together a remarkably successful group of innovators in spite of their recurrent, not infrequent, often fundamental differences of opinion and philosophy" [7]. However, this advantage of small size for developing a "good working relationship...is problematic if you want to maximize community involvement" and control [8].

It has been suggested that the "desire to get on with the job" may prompt participating agencies with "quite different orientations towards youth services" to initially allow "policy issues...to remain unresolved" in the

formation of an "umbrella" approach [9]. Discrepancy in "goals and orientations" has also been attributed to "misunderstandings that arose...[as] a result of lack of communication" between the sponsoring agency, the funding body, the referral services and (on occasion) the evaluation consultant [10]. Furthermore, antagonism may be fostered by confusion or disagreement as to the relative role, responsibility and accountability of the various sources of authority: the project director vis-a-vis the evaluator [11]; the local community vis-a-vis the project and evaluation directors [12], or the community and "people actually working with young people" vis-a-vis the project "board structure" [13].

This ambiguity or conflict in the locus of authority and the demarcation of control can impede clear policy development and efficient operation. Changes in board personnel can disrupt "the consistency in outlook" necessary for efficient implementation of ideas and plans [14]. A diffuse "spread and mix of goals" may foster confusion as to "how staff activities relate to them" [15]. This lack of direction in objective and role clarification then places "project workers...in an awkward position" with "no clear set of guidelines" and thus poses "difficulties for them in working as a team, [and] in developing a consistent approach to the handling of cases" [16]. It further fosters staff (and volunteer) dissatisfaction, demoralization and a rate of turnover inimical to continuity, stability, and efficiency of program operations.

4.4 Community and Organizational Linkages

The extent to which client recruitment and the implementation of strategies are contingent upon program linkages with the justice system (the police and probation departments, the crown prosecutor, etc.), social service agencies, and the public, has been emphasized. Projects, which initially adopted a low profile approach, without adequate attention to the liaison required to establish good contacts and working relationships with the relevant organizations and the community, have invariably encountered operational difficulties. These problems underline the need to attend to public relations. The establishment and promotion of these linkages have been designated by some programs as explicit intermediate objectives.

The requirement of funding dollars imposes the need for additional organizational contact in the form of initial application, and subsequent accountability, to a funding agency.

In order to formalize and facilitate program links with the community, local representation may be co-opted into the governing structure. While "lay" residents are often desired, recruitment and scheduling difficulties have, at times, revised this ideal in favour of key influential citizens and delegates from other community organizations. However, expansion of the management

committee to incorporate a broader base of representation may detract from the cohesion fostered by a small committee or council [17]. In addition, it has been suggested that "lay" persons, unfamiliar with such proceedings, will rely upon "'older' professional committee members" and thereby lose much of their "layness" [18]. Distinct community boards such as the Community Advisory Committee, implemented at one time in Saskatoon, are often preferred to fulfill a "public awareness" or "public relations" function [19]. However, even such a "resource group of community members to act in an advisory capacity to the Project" has been claimed to be an "unduly cumbersome" means of eliciting community input for a small scale project [20].

The Frontenac evaluators concluded that the juvenile diversion program in Kingston -- despite its longevity (1975 to the time of the evaluation in 1979) and its prominence in the juvenile justice community across Canada -- was not widely known in the community.

In sum, the larger community has played a minimal role in the functioning of the programme, and in return appears to have been very little affected by it -- either in terms of patterns of victimization and responses thereto, or in terms of awareness or acceptance of alternatives to traditional juvenile justice processing.

Morton and West, 1980: 19.

It seems then, that the scale and visibility [21] of many projects limit the successful achievement of "community input" and awareness.

With regard to organizational linkages, representatives of "system" organizations and social service agencies are often recruited to entrench program linkages to these resources and facilitate smooth working

relationships. However, it has been suggested that these typically "administrative" representatives of their respective organizations may not significantly alter the practices of the line personnel regularly in contact with the program and its clients [22].

Such representation may serve an additional purpose, particularly for "independent" programs, though others may avail themselves as well. The experience, expertise, and credibility of those submitting funding applications, substantially enhance the prospects of acceptance and program subsidization. As such, programs may constitute their governing boards with persons with these characteristics. Depending on the funding source, it may be represented on the management committee.

Informal contacts with referral sources are of special importance to many diversion programs dependent on police referrals. Project coordinators often spend a considerable amount of time in contact with the line decision-makers -- in part to ensure that referral criteria are being followed, and in part to ensure that the referring officers are receiving sufficient feedback. Relations with referral sources may become too good. Police may respond by referring more youth than can be handled by the staff, "leading to the possibility of changing selection criteria" [23]. Over time, changes in the criteria being used by the police may occur gradually without the knowledge of program staff. Regular meetings with the referral sources assist programs in reducing the possibility of undesirable expansion in the type of clients being referred -- as does program monitoring of client characteristics.

4.5 Staffing Practices

Program staffing needs and practices are oriented by the program's objectives, recruitment practices, intervention strategies, as well as by the practical contingencies and administrative features of the venture. While the provision of services is the "raison d'être" of the project, the organizational need for logistical arrangements, liaison and public relations, monitoring and documentation of practices, research activity, personnel training and supervision, and project justification and perpetuation largely associated with funding needs, impinge on staff resources almost as much as do the program's services. This is of considerable concern given that many prevention and diversion programs are one or two person organizations supported by a group of volunteers. Inadequate staff resources required for each function (whether due to the small scale of the project, lack of foresight in planning and budgetary allocations, conflicts in management perspectives, or ambiguity in direction and supervision) has often proved problematic, resulting in inefficiency and overburdening of staff, as well as role confusion precipitating staff disorganization and dissatisfaction.

The logistical arrangements required to coordinate timely counselling and compensatory interventions has sometimes prevented speedy program response to juvenile referrals -- which may be a stated program objective. A substantial

part of the delay in organizing clinical assessments and compensatory negotiations has been attributed to the lengthy process of contacting the families and other relevant persons, issuing the relevant forms and notices, and arranging a suitable time for an interview or mediation meeting. A recent evaluation indicated that while juveniles usually appear in court within two to three weeks of being charged, the average time lapse between police charging and the diversion meeting was twenty-eight days [24].

The need for ongoing liaison to develop and maintain contacts with community resources, and match the diverted juvenile to these community placements for "treatment" or compensatory work, has, at times, only become evident once a program is operational. As such, the demands of the public relations function, as well as the administrative arrangements, may require the reallocation of staff resources, usually the coordinator's time [25]. .

Documentation of program practices is essential for ensuring completion of treatment or compensatory placements, project accountability to the community and funding agencies, and for the monitoring of the program's efficiency. However, the extent and the nature of the reporting necessary is often unclear. While some projects do not adequately attend to this function, excessive reporting procedures and requirements have also been noted. It has been suggested "that this task, plus other additional administrative details takes a great deal of time away from the children" and that "the administrative demands placed on staff" should be assessed, particularly with regard to the usefulness of all the information collected [26]. In addition, inadequate supervision and ambiguity as to the responsibility for, and the proper way of completing

records, has resulted in unsatisfactory and disorganized information collection procedures.

The dual demands of research activity and active service work on personnel resources have been noted in process evaluations. Over-emphasis on the former has detracted from staff availability for service work with juveniles and has caused this service work to be "determined by research needs rather than by the original concerns of the community in setting up the project" [27]. Conversely, orienting research activity to conform with the active component has raised methodological problems, as illustrated by the attempt to have research assistants actively participate in a volunteer capacity at diversion meetings, in order to alleviate the potential juvenile discomfort at encountering yet another stranger in the diversion process. This participation was found to be both an impediment to data collection for some juvenile cases, as well as methodologically unsound, as the role of the research assistant was seen to influence youth responses to post-meeting interviews [28].

The training and supervision of personnel may consume substantial staff resources. For example, Otherways (Belleville, Ontario) had an extensive training program which required one day of staff time per week, plus the assistance of a trained volunteer for each workshop session. However, each such session provided eight trained volunteers.

Continuous contact for feedback, recognition, and supervision is required, not only for volunteer staff (as advocated by Calgary Police Service Citizen Volunteer Program) but for professional staff as well. In addition to personal

contact, consistency can also be achieved by explicit operational guidelines for decision-making in individual cases (e.g., what are the procedures if the juvenile does not complete the compensatory agreement?). Smaller programs may disregard this aspect of program operations -- relying instead on the memory and abilities of the project coordinator to generate consistency. Program guidelines may also be rejected on ideological grounds: too many internal procedures smack of a bureaucratization which must be avoided if the program is to maintain its "community-based" character. At the same time, some projects have recognized that a mix of rigidity and flexibility is required to avoid staff and volunteers trying to fulfill too many roles simultaneously [29].

Program justification and perpetuation is an additional task required of program personnel. Fund raising campaigns and activities may consume staff time and interest, particularly when salaries are, to some extent, dependent on the success of such endeavours [30]. Similarly, a large investment of time may be allocated to preparing submissions and proposals for continued or new funding from funding agencies, particularly towards the end of the existing financial agreements. The generally short life of a demonstration project may induce staff to turn their attention to prolonging the project's existence to the detriment of service provision. Furthermore, because "the most effective planning for a project takes place with the staff who are eventually hired to run the programme as it begins to function, the use of staff time to prepare lengthy and numerous proposals for funding [of new projects] has a very low payoff" [31].

Varying degrees of expertise, accessibility, and continuity of personnel are

required by these diverse functions. This in turn determines the staffing expense incurred by a prevention project, as professional personnel command higher salaries than less qualified counterparts, and full-time positions require remuneration unlike volunteer staffing arrangements. The increased prevalence and sophistication of training programs has broadened the scope of functions appropriate to volunteers, thereby reducing the need for professional staff while potentially increasing the number of juvenile clients. However, it has been argued that full-time accessibility and continuity of involvement cannot be ensured by a fully volunteer arrangement. Recognition, in the form of increased responsibility and authority, as well as financial remuneration (salaries, or honoraria) may provide the inducement to sustained commitment and involvement of community residents in prevention programs. This may not only increase the cost-effectiveness of project personnel resources, but improve project responsiveness to local community needs.

4.6 Funding Requirements

Most prevention and diversion programs are heavily dependent on federal or provincial government financial support.

At project start-up, there is frequently a lengthy period of proposal writing. Proposals sometimes have to be written several times before the funder is satisfied that the program will meet their current priorities [32]. The

tailoring of the proposal to the funding agency's requirements has meant that there are a number of federally funded accountability programs with similar objectives and strategies operating in various locations across Canada.

Lengthy delays between initial interest and actual funding have meant that, occasionally, the initial planners (and their enthusiasm) have disappeared by the time the demonstration project starts. Community development projects have found that the delays in securing funds have left local plans and interested residents in "suspended animation" [33]. The resulting loss of momentum reduced commitment and thereby undermined the attempt at mobilization of the community.

Many diversion and prevention projects are funded on a short term demonstration basis. In the case of prevention programs in Quebec, Normandeau and his associates have observed that "one-third of the programmes in Quebec operate for only one year, probably because they are funded not primarily to prevent delinquency, but to create jobs for their personnel" [34]. Other problems are created by short term funding: "projects may have just begun to function adequately when funding runs out. Thus, approaches may be abandoned before they are adequately assessed" [35].

Also in view of the generally short life of projects, staff may turn their attention to prolonging the project's existence, sometimes to the detriment of service provision. In order to continue the project, lobbying with provincial officials (and other potential funders) often begins in the second year of program operations for a three year project. The results of one U.S. evaluation of demonstration projects suggest the possibility of the distortion of program

interventions to meet the needs of the potential funder.

Programmatic expectations of the federal funding agency were co-opted by local funding agencies. The intense competition for survival meant that vying for scarce resources and community attention was often more important than fidelity to the original mandate.

Rojek and Erickson, 1981-2: 259.

In Canada, it is not unknown for pre-court diversion projects to turn to the supervision of post-court compensatory dispositions, in order to gain credibility with provincial authorities and to supplement caseloads.

From the perspective of program staff, funding agencies sometimes have unrealistic expectations as to program operations [36], creating the need for staff time to negotiate with agency representatives.

Other ongoing features of the relationship between the funding agency and program staff involve accountability and program monitoring. This may require routine documentation and record keeping. It may involve contractual obligations for a research or evaluation component in accordance with funding agency specifications [37]. These and other contractual obligations to funding agencies may inhibit project autonomy over decision-making, which interferes with the program's adaptability and flexibility to "change procedures that are no longer appropriate" and integrate "new insights and new circumstances" into program operations [38].

Finally, the uncertainty about financial support has "sometimes resulted in confusion and impatience among referral sources ... about whether or not programs would remain in existence" [39]. Lack of confidence in the stability of

the project can then adversely affect the recruitment of clients, programming and placements.

4.7 Summary

While the preceding chapters have referred to the impact of client identification, recruitment, engagement and intervention strategies on program operations, Chapter 4 has examined the organizational features which impinge on the day-to-day functioning of diversion and prevention projects.

Different administrative structures with differential reliance on "in-house" or community resources for the implementation of intervention strategies entail diverse administrative tasks, organizational linkages, and attendant practical problems.

The diffusion of authority among justice system, social service and funding agencies, the community, the outside evaluators, and the project director can foster ambiguity, if not conflict, in the control over program direction. This can impede clear policy development and staff role clarification and, hence, the efficient achievement of the program objectives.

Given the invariable need for organizational linkages with the justice system, social service agencies, funding sources, and the community, programs have incorporated various measures to promote these linkages. These measures can

impact on the administrative structure and locus of authority of prevention and diversion programs. In addition, developing and maintaining these linkages require diverse administrative tasks -- logistical coordination and arrangements, liaison and public relations, monitoring and documentation of practices, research activity, recruiting, training and supervision of volunteers, and project justification for self-perpetuation. The allocation of personnel resources to these functions, in addition to service provision to juveniles, has often proved problematic, resulting in overburdening of staff, role confusion, staff disorganization and dissatisfaction, and can ultimately impede efficient fulfillment of program objectives. Furthermore, the practical contingencies entailed by the necessity to arrange and maintain financial support, the delays in obtaining funding, and the short term nature of such funding, may interfere with effective program achievement of its stated objectives.

NOTES

-
1. Johnson, et al, 1979: 22.
 2. Picard-Brown, "Youth Alternative Project Coordinator's Progress Report", 1979: 3.
 3. Sone, 1979: 14.
 4. Peel Diversion Project, Program Description, n.d: 4.
 5. Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 21.
 6. Sone, 1979: 9-10.
 7. Morton and West, 1980: 6-7.
 8. Wilton, 1980: 165.
 9. Sone, 1979: 18.
 10. Fischer and Jeune, July 1981: 7.
 11. Fischer and Jeune, December 1981: 3-4.
 12. North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project, 1980: 4.
 13. Evaluation of Youth Action Project, Downsview, Metro Toronto, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 38.
 14. Ibid.: 35.
 15. North End Diversion, 1980: 6.
 16. Sone, 1979: 10.
 17. Wilton, 1980: 165.
 18. Morton and West, 1980: 19.
 19. Fischer and Jeune, December 1981: 6-7.
 20. Collins, "First evaluation report on the Grande Prairie Community Reconciliation Project for Young Offenders, 1982: 4.
 21. For example, many juvenile diversion programs operate out of probation or

John Howard Society offices. With no physical facility of their own, community awareness may be difficult to achieve. The "public" may regard the project simply as an adjunct to the juvenile justice system.

22. Personal communication, Moyer, 1980.

23. Fischer and Jeune, December 1981: 6.

24. Fischer, et al, 1983: 49.

25. Sone, 1979: 11.

26. Evaluation of Youth Guidance/Lifeline, Toronto, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 44-45.

27. North End Diversion, 1980: 24.

28. Fischer and Jeune, July 1981: 8.

29. Personal communication, Moyer, 1980.

30. Evaluation of Youth Guidance/Lifeline, Toronto, in Beckett and Simpson, 1978: 44.

31. Ibid: 21.

32. Personal communication, Moyer, 1980.

33. Wilton, 1980: 185.

34. Normandeau, et al, 1979: 18.

35. Hawkins, et al, 1980: 6.

36. Personal communication, Moyer, 1980.

37. North End Diversion Project, 1980: 28.

38. Wilton, 1980: 167, 174.

39. A.R.A. Consultants, 1983: 4-5.

Chapter 5

THE MEASUREMENT OF DIVERSION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND THE NEED FOR MONITORING

5.1 Introduction

This chapter describes a number of issues related to the evaluation of juvenile diversion programs: the type of evaluations that have been performed in Canada and an overview of the research results; the audience for program assessments and evaluations and the commonalities of interest among them; and, finally, some suggestions for monitoring juvenile accountability programs.

This chapter is restricted to evaluations of juvenile "accountability model" diversion programs for several reasons. The results of evaluations of primary and secondary prevention programs and service-oriented diversion projects have been summarized many times in other sources [1] with inconclusive, if not outright negative, findings. We have no desire to add to the "nothing works" debate in this report. Instead, we have chosen to focus primarily on the smaller body of Canadian literature on accountability programs, where there is perhaps equal ambiguity in research results, but fewer widely available distillations of their evaluations. Finally, the emphasis in the Young

Offenders Act on alternative measures clearly necessitates a closer look at the practice and effectiveness of juvenile accountability programs.

There is now a large body of literature on the concept of juvenile diversion programming and how it has been implemented in the United States and Canada. Much of the writing is exhortatory, with writers varying widely in their perspective from enthusiastic appraisals to denunciations of the potential harm the diversion movement may wreak on the civil liberties of diverted youth. The issues raised and the research findings from United States programs are mainly geared towards the counselling and social service models and thus are inappropriate to Canada, where the focus has apparently turned from diversion to counselling services, to post-charge compensatory agreements as the dominant strategy.

Despite almost a decade of diversion programs using the accountability model, we still do not know the extent to which the model meets its objectives, or what program elements or strategies appear most beneficial to the youth and the community. Juvenile diversion programs in Canada are usually not established and operated with a major research component, although some superficial efforts, with minimal budget and resources, are often undertaken.

Most frequently found is a "process" evaluation of the program (i.e., the assessment of organizational efficiency) -- "is the program functioning as it was designed to do?" Less often is there an impact assessment, addressing the question: "to what extent is the program meeting its objectives?" While funding priorities and lack of interest on the part of evaluators have affected the

amount of evaluation research, the state of programming in the alternatives area has also inhibited the collection of empirical data on program operations and "success". Many programs function at a "pre-evaluative" level. Programs may not define their objectives precisely; even if there is a statement of objectives, there may be no logical link to interventions or day-to-day functioning.

For these and other reasons, some commentators have despaired of impact evaluations for most diversion and prevention programs. Rowe (1981) has suggested that impact or outcome evaluation be reserved for demonstration projects, and that only model programs be rigorously evaluated using an experimental design. Hackler (1978) has gone further and recommended that no attempts at rigorous evaluation be made, arguing that experiments are actually detrimental to innovative programs.

However, the majority view accepts the need for program evaluations, including experimental and quasi-experimental designs, as well as process evaluations. Proponents of evaluation and monitoring maintain that, in spite of the ethical and operational problems in undertaking program evaluations, the effort is still worthwhile, because only through these means can we advance knowledge of effective approaches to prevention and diversion (e.g., Corrado, 1981).

5.2 The Information Available on the Effectiveness of the Accountability Model

In view of the current Canadian emphasis on the accountability model of juvenile diversion, this section examines the program assessments made to date. The information has been drawn from anecdotal program descriptions, process evaluations, a few quasi-experimental designs and one experimental design. Each of these sources will be briefly described.

Anecdotal program descriptions, providing an overview of the program's objectives and strategies, and sometimes including brief statistical summaries of client characteristics and their program outcomes, such as completion rates, are the most common source of information on diversion programs. They are limited in their utility because of their unsystematic nature.

Process evaluations are more formal and systematic attempts to describe the initiation and functioning of the program, including the strategies used to achieve the goals, the relationships with related system personnel and social agencies, and changes in orientation and activities over time. Most process evaluations are undertaken by outside evaluators, although in some cases (e.g., the Saint John Youth Project), the project staff may attempt one.

The methods used in process evaluations include interviews with key personnel both on staff (coordinator, volunteers), and in the community (victims, police,

social agencies), and participant observation (e.g., at mediation meetings). On occasion, program participants (the "divertees") are also interviewed. In addition, the report may include monitoring data that is routinely collected by program personnel, often at the behest of the evaluator. The emphasis is usually on the organizational context in which the program is implemented, and the ability of the program to develop structures appropriate to its strategies and objectives.

Canadian programs which have had process evaluations include the Grande Prairie Community Reconciliation Project for Young Offenders [2], the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Program [3], the Saskatoon Juvenile Diversion Program [4], and the East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program [5].

Quasi-experimental designs: On occasion, the evaluation of outcomes has been attempted, using one variant of a quasi-experimental design in which the treatment group (program participants) is matched with a comparison group on key variables, usually for the analysis of recidivism, other juvenile impact measures, and program cost-effectiveness. Only by employing comparison groups or (preferably) a randomly assigned control group (see below) does it become possible to assess the effectiveness of the program in meeting its objectives. Without a comparison group, it is difficult to establish what changes would have occurred without the intervention of the program. The methodological difficulties and expense of obtaining a comparison group have tended to preclude this type of evaluation design. The evaluation of the Waterloo-Wellington Attendance Centre and the Saskatoon program provide examples of this approach. A similar method was attempted in the East Toronto project, but the evaluator

abandoned this component after encountering problems in developing a comparison group from Youth Bureau files.

Because of the large number of variables that potentially affect outcomes, and because of the practical difficulties in matching, the conclusions to be drawn from this research method have sometimes been limited.

Experimental designs: The random assignment of juveniles to treatment and control groups is generally accepted as the best means to ascertain program effects. Ethical and implementation problems, as well as the cost of research, have prevented experimental designs in Canadian diversion programs. Byles' 1977 evaluation of a therapeutic juvenile diversion program in Hamilton, and Morton and West's Frontenac evaluation (1979, 1980) are two major exceptions. The Frontenac evaluation is especially pertinent to this discussion, since the program was an early model for the subsequent development of "community-based" mediation using the "panel" or committee approach. Despite the cooperation of juvenile justice system personnel in Kingston, the random assignment of charged juveniles to the treatment and control groups did not proceed as expected: as a result of unanticipated decisions by system officials and the accused youth, less than one-half of the expected two-thirds in the "committee" group actually appeared there, complicating the design and impeding the analysis. The "real world" affected the experimental design. This was not happenstance, for similar evaluation problems have been reported extensively in the literature.

The small number of evaluated accountability programs illustrate the difficulty of drawing any generalizable conclusions as to the impacts of such programs on

the juvenile or the justice system. The objectives of accountability programs have almost always included one or more of the following:

- a reduction in the number of cases processed by the juvenile court;
- a concomitant reduction in costs to the juvenile justice system;
- attitude change on the part of the accused, including an increased sense of fairness, and of responsibility for the offence (versus those who appear in court);
- increased victim and community satisfaction with the handling of delinquent behaviour (compared to official processing); and,
- a reduction in official delinquency and/or delinquent behaviour among program participants (when compared to a similar group processed by the court).

Only inferential evidence as to program success in meeting these objectives can be drawn from program descriptions and process evaluations; the extent to which the program has met its intermediate objectives (such as obtaining an adequate number of referrals to impact on the courts, obtaining placements for community service) is information required in the interpretation of outcome data (and is also a pre-condition for an outcome evaluation). However, the need for comparison with officially processed cases means that only quasi-experimental and experimental designs can inform us with any certainty as to the effectiveness of juvenile accountability programs in achieving their objectives.

As indicated, the evaluations performed on juvenile accountability projects have been few in number and limited in scope. The available evidence on the achievements of the Canadian programs will now be examined for each of the major objectives outlined above.

Reduction in Juvenile Court Caseload and System Costs:

The Frontenac evaluators addressed the issue of the impact of the program on the local court, and concluded:

Since ... there is a more marked sharp decline in persons charged than in the age cohort, we suspect the programme may have actually reduced rather than widened the net of persons involved in juvenile justice; there is no clear evidence that the net has expanded, as in many American programmes.

Morton and West, 1979: 176.

In fact, there was a decline in the number of juveniles being referred to the court, but the change could not be attributed solely to the project: a drop in the "delinquency eligible population" [6] probably helped to account for the reduction.

However, the "time series" data for referrals to the Kingston court was insufficient to make any stronger statement on the impact of the Frontenac Diversion Program on court caseload. No data are available from other evaluations on the system impact of Canadian programs. In some cases,

evaluators have suggested that the project may have produced a "net widening" effect, especially in the pre-charge programs.

If system impact is an intended result of the program, pre- and post-program data on the number of referrals to court should be collected for a lengthy period. It is also desirable to obtain empirical data on the offences and offender characteristics during the "time series", in order to compare program caseload with that of the court.

If preliminary analysis indicate that program referrals constitute only a small proportion of police/court workload, it becomes unnecessary to collect system impact data. For example, the East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program, in its first year of operation received as program referrals only 3% of the total juvenile contacts in the two participating police divisions. In this situation, it is extremely unlikely that court workload would be affected in any substantial way, and system impact data are irrelevant.

It is also worth noting that data on court referrals are difficult to obtain unless there is an automated court information system (rare), or the community in which the program operates is a small one where a manual search of court records becomes feasible. Unfortunately, in the past at least, Statistics Canada juvenile court data has been of uncertain quality, limiting its use in ascertaining system impact.

No study in Canada has apparently addressed the issue of cost reduction, or the cost-effectiveness of juvenile accountability programs in contrast to system processing. It has been speculated that the restricted clientele of most

diversion programs will obviate substantial cost savings, for the minor first offender often does not receive a costly court intervention such as supervised probation. Diversion of higher_risk offenders may be cost-effective, but this rarely occurs in Canadian programs.

Data on program costs are usually routinely available [7], but the costs of system processing -- in particular, the processing of various kinds of offenders -- are hard to obtain. Their absence prevents the assessment of the relative cost-effectiveness of juvenile diversion programs, as does the absence of control or comparison groups dealt with in the normal manner by the system.

Effects on the Attitudes of the Young Offenders:

The assumptions that the alternative program will be perceived by the young person as more fair, and will, at the same time, inculcate in them a greater sense of responsibility for their actions have been made by many diversion programs. For example, the Saskatoon program had as two of its objectives: to "provide the opportunity for delinquent youth to acknowledge responsibility for their behavior in an informal, non-threatening situation" and to "encourage justice for both the victim and the offender" [8]. Two of the nine objectives of the Frontenac project were "to allow the child to be actively involved in undoing his wrong" and "to generate in offenders a sense of having been treated fairly (i.e., a sense of justice)" [9].

Using a post-test only design (with no interviewed comparison group), the Saskatoon program found that interviewed juveniles, on average, felt that they were treated "extremely fairly" and that they "definitely" should accept responsibility [10].

The Frontenac evaluation, on the other hand, did compare the attitudes of the treatment and control groups towards their experiences. Morton and West reported few significant differences in attitudes, including sense of stigma and justice, between court and committee appearing youth. The option of the committee appearance did seem "to enhance the juvenile's views of the justice system on a few measures" [11], but most of the attitudinal variables showed no significant differences between the groups.

The timing of post-participation interviews may affect the perceptions of youth. The court-appearing youth interviewed in the Frontenac research may have been interviewed as long as three months after their initial court appearance, because of time delays in court processing. The committee-appearing youth, on the other hand, would presumably have been interviewed rather closer to attendance at the diversion meeting (although the timing is not reported). Longer term attitude change has not been researched.

Furthermore, it is possible that immediate post-mediation interviews are subject to a "halo" effect introduced by the recent participation; feelings of relief, intimidation, embarrassment, etc. may be affecting responses to the interviewer's questions. Future evaluations interested in addressing the issues related to attitude change might consider deferring offender interviews until

completion of the diversion task -- or perhaps do two sets of interviews, immediately after the meeting and after fulfillment of the compensatory obligation. Collins (1982) cites an offender respondent: "one thought his restitution in service was too hard once he got to the store and found out what he had to do. He said he took 35 cents worth of milk and had to work extremely hard for 8 hours to pay for it" [12]. Since many diversion agreements may impose more burdens on the offender than would a court-imposed disposition, it is important to ascertain participant views subsequent to the completion of the agreement. Perceptions of fairness may well alter after this exposure.

Reduction in the Recidivism among Program Participants:

Some -- but by no means all -- accountability programs claim as one objective the reduction of delinquency among program participants. There is usually no distinction made between official delinquency and delinquent behaviour. Even if recidivism is not directly addressed in a project's statement of objectives, some [13] have argued that delinquency data must be collected routinely in diversion program evaluations because it is possible that accountability and other alternative programs generate, not reduce, delinquency among participants. The measurement of recidivism requires control or comparison groups, as well as a follow-up period from 6 months to (preferably) 2 years after program completion in order to assess long term effects. Comparisons are

required in order to eliminate, or reduce, other explanation of changes in the diverted group, such as maturation. Some program descriptions, most process evaluations, and all more sophisticated evaluation designs address the issue of recidivism. Only results from the latter method can be reported with any degree of confidence, consequently limiting the discussion to the Frontenac and Saskatoon programs.

In Frontenac, it was found that the court and committee assigned youth showed no difference in official delinquency (charges laid by the police) six months after completion of the program. Both groups had very low recidivism rates, at less than 10%.

In the Saskatoon evaluation, a matched comparison group of court referrals during the same time period as the project (1979-1981) was obtained. Using subsequent police contacts as the measure of recidivism, the authors reported a much lower recidivism rate for the diverted group than for the court referred young persons (26% versus 50%). There are limitations on the conclusions to be drawn from this finding, because of several methodological concerns: we cannot be sure that the diverted population would have been referred to court in the absence of the diversion project (police criteria to divert were oriented to the youth's attitude and parental control; no data on system impact were reported); the offence distribution of the two groups differs, with court referred youth tending to have committed more serious offences (break and enter, theft over \$200); the follow-up period was not necessarily equivalent for both groups; police contact data measure neither official delinquency nor delinquent behaviour, and may be an artifact of police recording practices.

Because official court statistics "seem to bear only a slight and very ambiguous relationship to actual commission of delinquent acts" [14], it is sometimes recommended that program participants and their comparison group be interviewed to obtain self report data on delinquent behaviour subsequent to program completion. The cost of doing so is usually seen as prohibitive; it is much less expensive to rely on police or court records than to locate and interview juveniles six months or more after program completion. The trade-off between cost and information value is almost always resolved in favour of the former.

Victim and Community Satisfaction:

Programs that incorporate victim compensation usually have objectives related to victim satisfaction and changing community attitudes to the handling of the juvenile offender. Those projects that attempt to actively involve the victim by mediating between offender and victim may have the ancillary objective of "victim-offender reconciliation".

Various research techniques have been employed to assess victim satisfaction: victim interviews; monitoring the nature and extent of victim compensation; and, monitoring victim attendance at the mediation meetings. Victim interviews have suggested that they are generally satisfied with the resolution of the diversion [15]. The Saskatoon evaluation team found that the loss to the victim tended to

be larger than the dollar value of restitution [16]. Both the Frontenac and Saskatoon evaluations reported that victims often did not attend mediation meetings.

According to the limited, and perhaps community specific, data on victim views of compensatory strategies, it appears that there is general acceptance of the compensation, but some hesitation with regard to the reconciliation component -- as shown by the reluctance to attend mediation hearings. This would indicate that the assumptions around victim-offender reconciliation may be misguided. The goal is one imposed on behalf of the victims, and not one apparently to which they would adhere. This is not to say, however, that the symbolic nature of restitution and community service agreements does not function as a means of renewing the community's respect for the criminal justice system.

Nor does the objective of increasing community responsibility for delinquency appear to have been met, in terms of victim's response to mediation:

Very few of even those who had been involved in hearings at which juveniles' cases have been dealt with or in the negotiation of restitution agreements seem cognizant of the objectives of the Programme to enhance relationships between offenders and victims and to encourage the community to accept responsibility for juvenile misbehaviour; those who are aware of the operations of the Programme seem to view it largely as an efficient means by which to achieve the self-interested ends of those who have incurred losses as a result of juvenile property crime.

Morton and West, 1979: 206.

5.3 The Audience for Program Assessments of Accountability Programs

In this section, the issues related to the audience for program evaluations and other empirical information on juvenile accountability and diversion programming will be examined. Who requires the information? Whose interests are served by evaluation? "Only when there is an awareness of why each audience might need the information can there be decisions regarding the most suitable form for evaluation, the role of the researcher, and the types of national level data that can reasonably be expected to emerge from the alternatives area." [17] Although the priorities of the various interest groups may differ, as may the degree of interest in valid and reliable empirical data, there are some common information needs among those involved: policy development personnel, program planners, program staff, and the researcher.

Policy Development Personnel:

Both short and long term public policy needs can be met by evaluation research. In the short term, and in the context of governmental priorities in implementing established policies, funding agencies require information on the most appropriate strategies -- drawn from a potentially wide range of possible

program interventions -- for fulfilling their policy objectives. "Appropriate" strategies may be defined as those that best meet the current policy priorities, and those that are practical, transferable to other locals, and that are within cost parameters that of necessity must be imposed on programs in times of restraint. Limited public resources require that choices must be made in decisions to fund. It is desirable that these decisions not be made in an information vacuum.

Once programs are operational, the public sector requires data to confirm that programs continue to meet the agency's stated policy and priorities. This suggests that there should be continued monitoring to ensure that the program fulfills the standards set by the funder. Private agencies may regard the imposition of monitoring as an unwarranted intrusion, disruptive to operations, and place low priority on the monitoring task.

Program evaluations are usually funded by the same agency that finances the program. The funder can therefore direct the nature and scope of the research. Not unnaturally, program personnel sometimes feel threatened by the evaluation process, even when the evaluation component was built into the initial proposal or contract with the funder.

Despite these potential conflicts of interests, funding agencies require empirical data to justify the allocation of public funds. For the purpose of accountability, they usually want information on program management and fiscal control and the degree to which the program meets objectives and priorities currently in place. For the purpose of longer term policy development, the

funding agency wants information on the nature of the programming, especially the volume of cases, target groups, and the strategies being employed.

Notwithstanding these needs, critics of the policy process such as Normandeau and his associates (1979), have noted that evaluation results have had a "negligible impact" on longer term juvenile justice policy making, attributing the lack of effect to:

- the unavailability of research results at the time they are needed for decision-making. It is not uncommon to find that the information needs of the funder are most crucial prior to the completion of the evaluation.
- "the insufficient dissemination of evaluation results, often caused by the tendency to classify potentially embarrassing results as confidential", or by administrative difficulties in distributing reports in an accessible form.
- "in criminal justice policy making as well as in other settings, established traditions, administrative needs, and vested interests prevent the implementation of research findings" [18].

Program Planners:

The second user category is the program planner, often a justice system worker, concerned with program design and implementation. One step removed from policy formulation (in one direction) and operations (in another), the program planner

assists in the design of the program's structure and strategies, and may offer ongoing advice during implementation. Information from other, similar programs is helpful to anticipate, and find solutions to, operational problems: e.g., how have other programs obtained placements for community service?; what mechanisms seem to work well to obtain male volunteers?; what training is needed by accountability panel members? Practical details on strategies is thus required by the planner. In addition, the planner may find effectiveness data valuable in selling the program to other components of the justice system (the police, the court) and to community groups.

The Program Staff:

The evaluation literature argues that program staff require empirical data on the functioning of the program in order to:

- make "mid-course corrections" when it becomes clear that original policies and/or strategies are not functioning as intended;
- guide staff development and decisions regarding individual cases, and to provide staff and volunteers with feedback on what they do;
- better argue for program funding, and to increase longevity of the program;
- increase credibility of the program among system personnel, by providing

them with aggregate data on the short-term outcomes of the program (e.g., number of community service hours completed, amount of money victims have been recompensed, program completion and failure rates).

However, according to program personnel, these needs may be imputed to them be researchers and others whose interests are served by empirical data, such as the funding agency. Personnel in small programs often regard quantitative data as irrelevant and unnecessary, believing that their daily contacts provide them with sufficient information to achieve the purposes listed above. This difference in viewpoint -- as well as the "intrusiveness" of evaluation and monitoring methods -- has had to be resolved by many evaluators. Because so many agencies involved in diversion and prevention programming are located in the private sector, there is a delicate balance in what funding agencies can expect of the projects, in the way of monitoring data in particular. It has been recommended that, during the funding negotiation phase, there be discussions between agency and funder about the monitoring information to be collected and that the resulting agreement be a collaborative one [19].

There is, however, another purpose to which information on project operations may be put. The alternative measures provisions of the Young Offenders Act would seem to demand that more good quality records be kept by diversion projects. Project records may have to become more detailed and "legalistic" in order to provide the courts with information on program failures. In cases of program termination and court referral, the project may have to provide sufficient evidence of non-fulfillment of the compensatory agreement to the youth court. While this requirement could be seen as a further move towards

bureaucratization by project staff, it may be an unavoidable one, if the alternative measures provisions of the new legislation are interpreted as applying to community programs.

The Research Community:

The research and academic audience for program evaluations in delinquency prevention and diversion require research in order to investigate fruitful avenues of theory construction, and to develop valid and reliable methods of operationalizing complex phenomena (e.g., measures of recidivism). In addition, in order for knowledge to be cumulative, it is important for the research audience to be provided with information on the way the program was designed and operated. Without such information, the program remains a "black box", unstudied and mysterious. It is frequently found that "we are neither explicit about how any program is constructed, nor do we study and describe what happens to it while it is in process" [20]. Without this information, it becomes impossible to replicate programs and experiments. As the evaluators of the Frontenac Program [21] concluded:

The external validity or generalizability of our research is extremely difficult to assess given the almost total lack of information available on Canadian juvenile justice. Baseline statistical information on the processing of cases accompanied by co-ordinated self-report studies and case studies of juvenile justice in a number of communities would have greater enhanced the interpretation of our results.

Other comparative studies on diversion projects would also provide some answers to questions which remain. Unanticipated effects of the local community, particular philosophies (such as non-intervention), and different styles of operational implementation conceivably radically affect a general policy such as diversion.

Morton and West, 1980: 21.

While consensus regarding information needs does not exist (indeed, perhaps to expect it would be unrealistic considering the natural, and possibly unavoidable tensions that exist between the public and private sectors), there is a common theme running through the above commentary: that there should be data available on the current practices of projects in the areas of juvenile diversion and prevention.

The Cost of Evaluation:

A related issue is the cost of evaluation in relation to project cost. Program evaluations of either the process or impact type are expensive and time consuming. Private sector programming in juvenile justice is often small scale, heavily dependent on volunteers, and rarely involves more than two or three staff members. How worthwhile is it to mount a process or outcome evaluation, when its cost may constitute a sizeable proportion of the project's annual budget, or even exceed it?

The answer is related to the purposes to which the evaluation is to be used.

When the evaluation is designed to test a model of programming to be implemented elsewhere if the research results are favourable, then it is presumably worthwhile to fund a thorough evaluation of program process and impact. If, on the other hand, the decision has been already taken, for policy or pragmatic reasons, to institute a specific form of social programming, then it does not seem worthwhile, from a funding agency perspective, to expend large sums on program evaluation [22]. It remains necessary to meet the more descriptive information requirements on current practice. In most instances, these needs can be met by systematic monitoring data provided by the programs themselves, supplemented by small scale process evaluations of selected program types in different communities.

In the next section, the basic monitoring or "information system" requirements needed to provide the basic minimum of data on functioning juvenile diversion projects will be examined.

5.4 Monitoring Requirements for Juvenile Accountability Programs

The monitoring or information system requirements of a program clearly vary by program type. In this section, we will concentrate on the accountability type of program, which has a compensatory agreement at the core of the program's strategies. First we will examine the type of data that should be aggregated on a regular basis, presumably monthly, and which could be used for purposes of accountability to the funding agency. These totals can be obtained by summing sections of individual records discussed next.

Aggregate Data

Number of juveniles referred this month and their characteristics:

- average number of charges/offences per juvenile
- offence types of the juvenile's most serious charge
- average number of days since offence
- age, sex, and race (Native vs. other) distribution
- percentage of juveniles with a prior referral to court

- percentage of referred juveniles who did not enter the project and why.

Service-related program activities this month:

- number of mediation meetings/compensatory agreements
- number of juveniles referred to other agencies.

Data on program completions/terminations this month:

- number of completions and unsuccessful terminations
- average number of days since offence, and since referral to program
- total number of service hours completed; average number per juvenile doing service
- total number of restitution dollars paid to victim; average per juvenile paying restitution
- percentage of juveniles unsuccessfully terminated this month and the reasons
- percentage of juveniles completing community service and/or restitution
- percentage of juveniles completing other diversion outcomes (e.g., apology only).

While crudely, these monthly statistics -- or variations of them -- can portray the volume and type of cases entering the program, the timeliness of the

intervention, the extent of program activity, and key characteristics of the interventions. The data would permit program monitoring of the main aspects of their operations related to service delivery. Changes over time could be readily ascertained if the monthly reports had the same format. The reports would not, of course, monitor such activities as public relations and awareness efforts, volunteer recruitment and activity, etc. While crucial (and time consuming) for everyday operations, such tasks are neither directly relevant to the issue of accountability nor easily summarized in a monthly report -- factors which may disturb program staff.

Client Characteristics

Most projects keep some record of the characteristics of the young persons entering the program. For purposes of comparability across projects, however, it is desirable for the same data to be routinely collected by all projects with similar intervention strategies. A client characteristics form should, if at all possible, be completed for all referrals -- so as to have data on the main personal characteristics of those who refused the program, or who for other reasons did not enter it. The following data are the minimum that accountability programs should collect on their clientele.

Background data on the juvenile referrals:

- age, sex, race (Native vs. other)
- in whose custody is the juvenile (parental, other)
- activity status (school, employed, neither)
- prior contact with the justice system (none; prior referrals to court/screening agency but no findings of delinquency; prior findings of delinquency)
 - * any previous diversions? yes/no.
 - * if any prior findings, how many?

Characteristics of offences in this referral:

- number of charges/offences
- offence types of charges, using a detailed breakdown of offences most commonly committed by juveniles: break and enter, theft over \$200 other than theft auto, theft under \$200 (shoplifting, theft of bicycle, theft from auto, other), wilful damage (damage less than \$50), mischief (over \$50), theft of auto, other property, other (common assault, drugs, weapons)
- total value of goods stolen or damaged
- victim (private citizen, business, government property, other).

Program activities of the juvenile:

- attend mediation meeting? yes/no.
 - * who was present? mother/father/guardian; number of volunteers; victim? yes/no; length of meeting.
- did juvenile receive legal advice (either before or at meeting)? yes/no.
- diversion outcome(s). Complete all that apply.
 - * apology in person or by letter to the victim
 - * restitution to the victim; dollar value; days to pay
 - * personal service to the victim; number of hours; number of days to complete task
 - * community service; number of hours; number of days to complete task; name of agency where placed
 - * other diversion/compensatory agreement (specify)
- other program activities:
 - * referral to community agency? name of agency; was contact made? yes/no. (if referral but no contact made by juvenile with referral agency, why not?)
 - * Other interventions (specify). For example, other contacts with project staff (counselling, etc.); number of hours of contact.

Completion of diversion agreement:

- did juvenile complete agreement satisfactorily? yes/no.
 - * if no, what aspect was not completed? why not? (e.g., juvenile refused task; did not pay restitution; juvenile re-offended, etc.)
- was victim contacted at program completion? yes/no.
 - * if yes, was victim informed of outcome and was victim satisfied?

FOR PROGRAM REFUSALS AND UNSUCCESSFUL TERMINATIONS ONLY:

- why did juvenile reject program? (For example, wanted to plead not guilty to the offence; preferred to go to court.) Note, too, that it is very desirable that a "Client Characteristics" form -- the Background data and Offence data sections -- should be completed for all referrals to the project, including those that refused entry into the program and program failures. Characteristics of program failures should also probably be routinely summarized in order to discover if there is a common thread in the background or offence characteristics among those who did not successfully complete the compensatory agreement. Because of the possible consequences to the juvenile of program failure (i.e., referral to court), a "termination report" should probably routinely be completed on the circumstances surrounding unsuccessful program completion. A written report would provide the basis for staff consistency in making decisions to terminate.

Other Program and Staff Monitoring

In addition to these minimal records, other program activities may have to be documented.

From the perspective of funders, researchers, and policy planners -- as well as the impending legislation's "need for" documentation -- the collection of other monitoring data would greatly enrich knowledge of how diversion programs "work".

This documentation should include: the minutes of the mediation meeting/accountability panels; signed consent forms by parent and juvenile; signed compensatory agreements; the number and type of attempts to contact victims of the project's clients, and the victim's responses to these contacts; methods used to ensure that victims were not overestimating the extent of their loss; the means used to secure placements for community service work; the type of supervision arrangements made at placements; records of number of hours of service work; receipts of payments to victims; volunteer hours and functions; staff hours needed to recruit, train and supervise volunteers; the methods used to monitor the referring agency's selection of clientele; and, public relations or awareness efforts (e.g., number of presentations to what type of audience).

In order to avoid the proliferation of paper files, it may be possible for some of this information to be recorded by case (i.e., the juvenile). On the other hand, case-based records make it difficult to access information on project

activities not directly related to clients, such as volunteers. It may be necessary to maintain at least two other information systems -- one based on staff/volunteer activities (e.g., hours available, training, supervision), and another on placements (number of juveniles the placement is willing to accept, when, supervision needs, etc.).

To minimize the burden on program staff, the records should be a "closed ended" format (i.e., "tick-off") wherever possible. Narrative records tend to be less accessible and more time consuming for project staff [23].

If funding agencies do request aggregate data, they should provide projects with the pre-printed data collection instruments (e.g., face sheet data on clientele and their outcomes; monthly reports or program activity), both to ease data collection costs for the project and to provide comparable information.

Centralized Information Systems

If a policy decision is made to collect data from federally funded programs, the funding agency has an obligation to summarize the information received from the projects and feed that data back to the audience most likely to use it -- the policy maker, the program planner, project staff, and the research community. These users require aggregate data in a format by which across-project comparisons can be made, and not just individual program descriptions and

reports.

The implication of this requirement is that the funding agency must develop a centralized information system in order to collate or summarize the reports submitted by the projects, and routinely disseminate summaries of those data to the users of the information. While regional monitoring may be needed to maintain ongoing contact with project staff, the dissemination of data on juvenile programs should be at a national level for policy and research purposes. Because of the short life of many demonstration projects, the dissemination of data should be done monthly, or at the least, quarterly. Unless there is a mechanism developed for this to occur, a major point of the projects' record keeping is lost.

A further benefit of the routine dissemination of summarized information on similar projects is that the regular feedback to project staff would provide a tangible incentive to monitor. If program staff become aware that their record keeping is to no immediate purpose -- that is, there is no "audience" for their monthly tabulations -- they might respond by placing a low priority on the completion of records.

In summary, if information on community-based juvenile programs is to be cumulative, the programs need to collect empirical data on their functioning, maintain it in an accessible form, and report aggregate data on clientele and program activities. In turn, it is the responsibility of the funding agency to summarize and disseminate data on the most relevant aspects of program operations.

5.5 Summary

In view of the many reviews of the effectiveness of "treatment" oriented prevention and diversion programs available in the American and Canadian literature, Chapter 5 is limited in scope to an examination of the more recent accountability model diversion programs, which use post-charge compensatory agreements as the main intervention strategy.

Anecdotal program descriptions and process evaluations are the most common source of information on the effectiveness of accountability-type programs. However, the less frequent quasi-experimental and experimental designs are required to draw any conclusions about the effectiveness of diversion programs in meeting their objectives; only by comparison between diversion participants and their non-participating counterparts can the impact of strategies be reliably ascertained.

A brief review of the findings of some Canadian evaluations highlighted the relationship between program strategies and objectives they are designed to address, as well as the methodological problems encountered in undertaking outcome evaluations. The financial, ethical and operational difficulties in obtaining matched or randomly assigned control groups suggest selective use of such designs.

The basic concerns and information needs of the audience for program assessments

can largely be addressed by routine project monitoring. While the priorities of the various users of information may vary, there are some common information needs among those involved -- policy development personnel, program planners, project staff, and the research and academic community.

Chapter 5 concludes with some specific recommendations as to the type of data that should be routinely collected by diversion programs which employ the accountability model of intervention. While the project staff may find the collection of such data time consuming and antithetical to the community-based character of the project, it is argued both that the burden of data collection on project staff can be minimized, and that the benefits to the users of monitoring information outweigh the disadvantages. In addition, the funding agency has an obligation to disseminate summaries of the aggregate data that it receives from participating programs to the audience for information on juvenile programs.

NOTES

-
1. Romig, 1978; Cardarelli, 1975; Johnson, et al, 1979; Dixon and Wright, 1974; Moyer, 1980.
 2. Collins, 1982.
 3. Morton and West, 1979.
 4. Fischer, 1983.
 5. Sone, 1979.
 6. Morton and West, 1979: 172.
 7. For example, Fischer in his 1983 report on the evaluation of the Saskatoon Juvenile Diversion Program reports that the average cost per youth over the 3 year life of the project was \$345.
 8. Fischer, 1983: 17.
 9. Morton and West, 1979: 5.
 10. Fischer, 1983: 59.
 11. Morton and West, 1979: 13.
 12. Collins, 1982: 34.
 13. See Moyer, 1982.
 14. Morton and West, 1979: 163.
 15. Fischer, 1983; Morton and West, 1979; Collins, 1982.
 16. Fischer and Jeune, December 1981: 1.
 17. Moyer, 1982: 13.
 18. Normandeau, et al, 1979: 51.
 19. Moyer, 1982: 15, 21.
 20. Empey, 1977: 10.
 21. The evaluation of the Frontenac Juvenile Diversion Program, by Morton and

West, included many details on the "black box" of that program and is one of the valuable exceptions to the general rule in experimental designs.

22. From the perspective of other users of evaluation material, this is probably not the case. However, in terms of the "pay-off" -- the use to which the information is to be put in funding or policy decisions -- then expensive and lengthy evaluations are probably not worthwhile.

23. This is not to preclude narrative comments entirely; qualitative description provides the context needed for the interpretation of the aggregate data.

Chapter 6

RECOMMENDATIONS

A number of recommendations have emerged from this discussion of juvenile prevention and diversion programs in the areas of: targetting and intervention in prevention programs, the viability of accountability program options, the transferability of programs, and the monitoring of juvenile accountability programs.

6.1 Targetting and Intervention in Primary and Secondary Prevention Programs

Research evidence indicates that the secondary prevention approach of identifying and treating "predelinquents" is risky at best, producing considerable over-prediction and encountering related problems of cost-inefficiency and potential inappropriate labelling. The efforts at "normalization" used by primary prevention programs should be integrated with the secondary prevention strategy of focussing on higher risk juveniles.

Constructive activities, which have the objective of "bonding" juveniles to conventional society are preferred to a reliance on professional counselling or therapy. The recruitment of peers and local volunteers by the prevention program facilitates the normalization and bonding processes among participating youth.

The primary prevention program is probably best suited to implement objectives of "community absorption" of, and increasing community tolerance for, juvenile

misbehaviour. Although many diversion programs have articulated these as long term goals, the community development and public awareness components of primary programs are the more appropriate avenue for the achievement of these goals.

6.2 Options for Juvenile Accountability Programs

The Young Offenders Act and the associated federal funding policy have prompted most federally supported diversion programs to use compensatory strategies, rather than counselling and remedial services. Most diversion programs are designated "post-charge" to minimize inappropriate referrals and concomitant net widening. Because of the emphasis on compensation to the victim, the diversion targets are primarily property offenders.

Within the compensatory approach, there remain a number of programmatic options. As a result of policy preference or practical contingencies, it is possible for the program to focus on victim-offender reconciliation, restitution to the victim, or community service work.

Victim-offender reconciliation has several purposes: to expand community tolerance by giving the victim a better understanding of the circumstances of the offence; to increase victim satisfaction with the justice system; and to create in the offender a sense of responsibility for the harm he has caused. The two methods used in reconciliation are victim attendance at a mediation meeting, and personal or written apologies by the offender to the victim.

Many accountability projects have encountered difficulties in obtaining the attendance of private citizens at mediation meetings. Victims are more interested in receiving compensation for the offence than in meeting with the offender to discuss the offence and decide on the sanction. Corporate victims, such as department stores, may attend mediation meetings with more frequency than the private citizen, but their participation (usually by store security personnel) is often pro forma and not likely to achieve either community or offender oriented goals. Furthermore, adult community mediation projects have tended to be most effective when there is a pre-existing (and continuing) relationship between the disputing parties -- a situation not usually found between juvenile property offenders and their victims.

There is less evidence with regard to the success of apologies to the victim as a means of reconciling the victim and the offender. Clearly, the strategy is most suitable for small business and individual victims. There is no specific research on the impact on the juvenile, although one evaluation did note that a sizeable proportion of juveniles were not aware of the victim's identity and did not remember meeting the victim, although in fact they had.

We recommend that victim-offender reconciliation strategies be de-emphasized or abandoned as a major orientation of diversion programming. In particular, efforts to bring private citizens to negotiate diversion outcomes with young strangers may be doomed to failure.

Program options for restitution include: direct payment of money to the victim;

the offender works off the damage or loss to the victim for a set number of hours, usually at the minimum wage ("restitution in service or in kind"); and, the project facilitates the finding of a temporary job so that the youth can earn money to repay the victim. Older juveniles (15 years and up) would seem to be most appropriate for restitution strategies.

If victim compensation is the priority of the accountability program (and compensation certainly appears to be a victim priority), then restitution to the victim should be the main strategy. The dollar value of the restitution should be closer to the actual loss than it apparently is at present. The amount of restitution should therefore be based on the offence, not on the offender. This logic indicates that project staff must find methods of establishing victim loss, and that a committee or panel meeting may not be the best venue for doing so. The administrative complexity of arranging a meeting with victim, parents, juvenile offender, and volunteer mediators may be unnecessary just to obtain victim input, for victim preferences can be obtained more easily by the project staff in personal contact.

If administering a sanction to the juvenile is the program's priority, there should be a consequence to the offender in proportion to the gravity of the offence. Victim loss -- with insurance coverage so prevalent -- may not adequately represent the seriousness of the offence. In that case, the advantage of the committee decision as to the amount of reparation is that the youth is present, is given the opportunity to participate, and is therefore able to see the way in which the amount is determined. Given that it is un-

likely that complete sentence parity is possible (because of youth, offender ability to pay, etc.), the committee or panel format may instill a sense of fairness not attainable by other means. The justly arrived at sanction is thus presumed to act as a deterrent to delinquency.

If attitude change (by increasing the offender's sense of "responsibility" to the community) is perceived as more important than victim satisfaction or deterrence, reparation can become a symbol or token of the harm done, and need not be proportionate to the extent of loss or damage. In these circumstances, community service work should be the preferred program strategy, because not only is there a "consequence" or sanction, but also the community work provides access to constructive activity not found in other reparative strategies. More pragmatically, community service is more feasible than restitution, when the juvenile is too young to work, when the victim is the community (e.g., schools) or uninterested in restitution, or when the dollar value of the loss is beyond the resources of the young person to repay.

The amount of community service should be determined by the gravity of the offence, and be constrained by the abilities and circumstances of the youth. There should be a policy of attempting to match the type of placement to the interests of the youth (to enhance the capability to learn from the community service experience) and, perhaps, to the nature of the offence. The administrative arrangements required to match juveniles to placements would take considerable staff time, suggesting that smaller programs might find this approach unrealistic.

The community work should provide the juvenile with the opportunity to feel of service to the community -- pointing towards the use of social service or other "people-serving" facilities (hospitals, senior citizen's residence, etc.) in many instances. The tasks arranged for the youth should be meaningful rather than time-wasting. Integration into a group of non-offender volunteers would also be desirable.

Theoretically at least, of the strategies of accountability programs, community service appears to offer the most likelihood of producing integration or "bonding" to the community.

Community responsibility for delinquency prevention is so vague a goal that it has fostered a variety of interpretations: to increase community absorption of delinquent behaviour by redefining delinquency, to promote awareness of the citizen's role in preventing victimization, to have the community take back responsibility for the improvement of local services for youth, and to promote "social harmony" among the victim, youth and the community.

By their nature accountability programs undoubtedly do offer community sanctioning as an alternative to the formal system's sanctions. However, the other interpretations of "community responsibility" are out of place in an accountability project, which is mandated to focus on responding (the proverbial "slap on the wrist") to delinquent behaviour. While the achievement of the sanctioning and offender attitude change goals may be feasible (though there is no conclusive evidence on the latter issue), the accountability program

probably cannot expect to deal with the community responsibility goal. At a minimum, the goal is a long term one, for the small scale diversion project cannot hope to involve more than a minute fraction of community members directly in the project. The public awareness functions of accountability programs should be directed towards increasing acceptance of the specific project. To scatter scarce resources on more general public education may be a waste of energy and budget.

Another issue related to diversion objectives is the cost of alternative programs. Further inquiry as to the cost of programs, in comparison to the formal system, should be made to discover if there are cost-saving benefits. In spite of the assumptions made about "post-charge" diversion, it is not necessarily true that diverted youth would have been referred to court in the absence of the program, or that their court experience would be more costly than diversion.

A concern associated with cost reduction and net widening is the type of clientele of accountability programs -- first time, minor property offenders. Consideration should be given to funding programs that explicitly focus on so-called high risk repeat offenders, where there is greater likelihood that system costs and corrections workload would be reduced by their diversion to a community-based alternative. Police resistance to the expansion of the target group may prove an impediment to this approach. If the accountability strategy were married with other diversion strategies (e.g., attendance centres), the community and the justice system might find this more palatable.

6.3 The Transferability of Programs :

Programs have usually been established on an ad hoc basis; their initiation has been dependent on the presence and interest of concerned residents or agencies, not necessarily on the need for diversion, such as heavy juvenile court workloads of minor property offenders. A "needs assessment" is recommended before mounting a diversion project in order to discover if there is a client pool available. This can be done by an examination of police and court statistics.

In addition, a "feasibility assessment" is also required. The main referral source -- the police -- should be contacted to ascertain whether they would participate in the project. These contacts should be followed up at regular intervals (up to and after project start-up), and should perhaps be formalized by placing a senior police representative on the managing board of the project.

The strategies of many accountability projects have not evolved from community needs and wishes. This situation may be a necessary by-product of the policy desire to fund projects that meet current policy priorities. On the other hand, because the main strategies have been externally imposed, the community-based character of the program may be reduced.

In addition, programs may have had operational problems specific to their community, but the absence of monitoring or comparable descriptive data has prevented generalizations about the effects of the community on diversion programming. This is especially unfortunate because of the similarity (or

the appearance of similarity) of strategies among the various federally funded accountability programs. If monitoring data had been routinely collected from the inception of the first program, a body of information would now be available on the types of strategies which seem to work best in various types of communities.

Thus, there is little or no evidence on the degree to which community characteristics (size, cohesion, social class, agency resources, police department organization, etc.) impact on the development and implementation of diversion projects.

6.4 Monitoring Juvenile Diversion Programs

Detailed recommendations for monitoring juvenile programs were made in Chapter 5. Diversion programs should be encouraged, indeed contractually obligated, to provide the funding agency with aggregate data on their clients and program activities. Monitoring is required for accountability to the funder, and because the information is needed for policy formulation, program planning and program evaluation.

In order to provide aggregate data, accountability and other juvenile programs have to develop record-keeping systems from which data can be summarized and reported to the funder. Programs should be provided with resources to assist them in monitoring, for example, printed forms for tabulating client characteristics and summarizing staff activity.

All programs should make efforts to collect information on juveniles who

reject the diversion option and, more importantly, those who are unsuccessfully terminated by the program. Information on program failures, perhaps in the form of a "termination report", should be routinely recorded by program staff in order to ensure staff consistency in making the termination decision, and to provide evidence needed for prosecution under the Young Offenders Act.

The public agency that requests monitoring data from social programs should develop information systems to collate and regularly disseminate summaries of the program information to the relevant audience for data, including participating program staff. These summaries should include (by project) the volume of cases, key characteristics of clientele and their outcomes, and the main program strategies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abadinaky, Howard. The status offense dilemma: Coercion and treatment. Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 456-460.
2. Agopian, Michael W. Politics of evaluating diversion programs. Evaluation Quarterly, 3, February 1979, 81-88.
3. Ahlstrom, W. and Havighurst, R.J. 400 Losers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
4. Altschuler, David M. and Lawrence, J.S. A review of selected research and program evaluations of police diversion projects. Chicago, Ill.: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing, University of Chicago, November 1979.
5. Andriessen, M. A foreigner's view of American diversion. Crime and Delinquency, 26(1), January 1980, 70-82.
6. A.R.A. Consultants. Alternative programs for juveniles in Ontario. A report to the Consultation Centre, Solicitor General of Canada, July 1983.
7. Aultman, Madelaine G. Group involvement in delinquent acts: A study of offense types and male-female participation. Criminology, 7, June 1980, 185-192.
8. Austin, Roy L. Race, father-absence, and female delinquency. Criminology, February 1978.
9. Bailey, W.C. Correctional outcome: An evaluation of 100 reports. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 57, 1966, 153-160.
10. Baron, Roger and Feeney, Floyd. Juvenile diversion through family counseling: A program for the diversion of status offenders in Sacramento County, California - An exemplary project. Washington, D.C.: Office of Technology Transfer, National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, 1976.
11. -----. Preventing delinquency through diversion. The Sacramento County Probation Department 601 Project: A third year report. Sacramento, Cal.: Sacramento County Probation Department, 1974.
12. Barton, W.H. Discretionary decision-making in juvenile justice. Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 470-480.

13. Beckett, Joan and Simpson, K. Evaluation of nine delinquency prevention programs in Ontario, 1975-1978. Toronto, Ont.: Children's Services Division, Ministry of Community and Social Services, August 1978.
14. Belkin, Alison M. (ed.) The criminal child. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publ. Co., 1978.
15. Bell, Michelle. Juvenile delinquency prevention: A framework for policy development. Seattle, Wash.: National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and its Prevention, Center for Law and Justice, University of Washington, October 1979.
16. Berkowitz, J. Keeping 601's out of the system. Youth Authority Quarterly, 28(3), Fall 1975, 27-32.
17. ----- . Pre-delinquent diversion project, Santa Clara County Juvenile Probation Department final report. Sacramento, Cal.: American Justice Institute, 1975.
18. Berleman, William C. Juvenile delinquency prevention experiments: A review and analysis. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, -U.S. Department of Justice, 1980.
19. Berleman, William C. and Steinburn, T.W. The execution and evaluation of a delinquency prevention program. Social Problems, 14, 1967, 413-423.
20. Binder, Arnold. The UCI Youth Service Program, at Irvine. Part of a final report made on the US program at Irvine, University of California. Final Report expected December, 1976.
21. ----- . Diversion and the justice system: Evaluating the results. In Alvin W. Cohn (ed.), Criminal Justice Planning and Development. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage Publications, 1977.
22. ----- and Newkirk, Martha. A program to extend police service capability. Crime Prevention Review, 4(3), April 1977, 26-32.
23. Binder, Arnold, et al. Diversion from the juvenile justice system and the prevention of delinquency. In J. Monohan (ed.), Community Mental Health and the Criminal Justice System. New York, N.Y.: Pergamon Press, 1976.
24. Bischoff, W. Interagency co-operation and delinquency prevention. Crime Prevention Review, 4(2), January 1977, 21-27.
25. Blankenship, R.L. and Scarboro, C.A. The social reality of juvenile justice: Protection and punishment. Preventing crime. Sage

Criminal Justice System Annuals, Vol. 10. Sage Publications, 1978, 205-232.

26. Block, Richard and Rosa, David. A technique for utilizing precoded variables for the review of programs in criminal justice research. In M. Riedel and D. Chappel (eds.), Issues in criminal justice: Planning and evaluation. New York, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1976.
27. Blomberg, Thomas G. Diversion and accelerated social control. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 68(2), June 1977, 274-282.
28. ----- . Diversion from juvenile court: A review of the evidence. Presented at the 1978 annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco. In F. Faust and P. Brantingham (eds.), Juvenile justice philosophy, 2nd edition, 1978.
29. ----- . Widening the net: An anomaly in the evaluation of diversion programs. In Malcolm Klein and Kathie Teilmaan (eds.), Handbook of criminal justice evaluation. Sage Publications, 1979.
30. ----- and Caraballo, S.L. Accelerated family intervention in juvenile justice: An exploration and a recommendation for constraint. Crime and Delinquency, 25, October 1979, 497-502.
31. Boehm, Richard G. Peer group counselling: A school-based juvenile diversion program. St. Louis, Miss.: Gateway Information Systems, Inc., August 1976.
32. Bohnstedt, Martin. Answers to three questions about juvenile diversion. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 15(1), January 1978, 109-123.
33. Boivin, Denis. Evaluation du "Project de dejudiciarisation de l'intervention sociale aupres de la jeunesse itinerante a Montreal: Ete '76". Montreal, P.Q.: Bureau de Consultation - Jeunesse, Inc., September 1976.
34. Boys' Clubs of America. National Manpower and Program Services Division. Alternatives to delinquency: 36 tested youth development programs. New York, 1975.
35. Brantingham, P.J. and Faust, F.L. A conceptual model of crime prevention. Crime and Delinquency, 22(3), 1976, 284-296.
36. Breed, Allen F. Prevention: Rhetoric or reality. Crime Prevention Review, 3(4), July 1976, 1-10.
37. Brennan, T. Evaluation and validation regarding the national strategy for youth development: A review of findings. Boulder, Col.: Behavioral Research Institute, 1974.

38. Brill, R.L. Implications of the conceptual level matching model for treatment of delinquencies. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 15(2), July 1978, 229-246.
39. British Columbia Juvenile Crime Prevention Committee. Policy Paper Outline and Appendix D. September 1980.
40. Bronx Neighbourhood Youth Diversion Program. Bronx (N.Y.)-Neighbourhood Youth Diversion Program Program Description. 1976.
41. Brown, Steven D. An evaluation of the Waterloo-Wellington Attendance Centre. A report prepared for the Research Division of the Solicitor General of Canada, July 1983.
42. Bullington, B. et al. Critique of diversionary juvenile justice. Crime and Delinquency, 24(1), January 1978, 59-71.
43. Burkhardt, W.R. Application of opportunity theory to delinquency prevention: Evaluation of a case study and critique of the literature. (Doctoral dissertation.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973.
44. Calgary Police Service Youth Involvement Unit and Citizen Volunteer Program. Program description, n.d.
45. California Department of Youth Authority. Evaluation of Youth Services Bureaus. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
46. ----- National study of youth service bureaus: Final report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973,
47. ----- Organizing for youth development and delinquency prevention: Youth development/delinquency prevention project - A second year report. Sacramento, Cal.: California Youth Authority, September 1974.
48. ----- The evaluation of juvenile diversion programs: 1st Annual Report. Sacramento, Cal.: California Youth Authority, September 1975.
49. ----- The evaluation of juvenile diversion programs: Survey of diversion programs. Sacramento, Cal.: California Youth Authority, November 1975.
50. ----- The evaluation of juvenile diversion programs: 2nd

annual report. Sacramento, Cal.: California Youth Authority, September 1976.

51. Cardarelli, Albert P. The theory and practice of delinquency prevention for the United States. Washington, C.D.: National Evaluation Program, Vol. 1, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, 1975.
52. ----- and Smith, Charles P. Delinquency prevention and control programs: The need for a conceptual framework and evaluation strategies. In How well does it work? Review of criminal justice evaluation, 1978. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, June 1979, 337-361.
53. Carlton, Richard P. The social environment of the school: Implications for delinquency prevention. Crime Prevention Review, 4(4), July 1977, 14-20.
54. Carter, R.M. and Klein, M.W. Back on the street - The diversion of juvenile offenders. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1976.
55. Carter, Timothy J. Juvenile court dispositions: A comparison of status and non-status offenders. Criminology, 17, November 1979, 341-359.
56. Casey, Lee R. and Shuman, John L. Police/probation shoplifting program in San Jose California: A synergetic approach. Crime Prevention Review, 6, January 1979, 1-9.
57. Clarke, Shelley. The Langley Youth and Family Service Bureau: A model project report. A report prepared for the Consultation Centre, Pacific Region, Solicitor General of Canada, n.d.
58. Clarke, Stevens H. Some implications for North Carolina of recent research in juvenile delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 12, January 1975, 51-60.
59. Clelland, Donald and Carter, I.J. The new myth of class and crime. Criminology, 18, November 1980, 319-336.
60. Cohn, Y. Delinquency prevention - A systems approach. Juvenile Justice, 28(3), August 1977, 15-23.
61. Collingwood, T.R. et al. Juvenile diversion: The Dallas Police Department Youth Services Program. Federal Probation, 40(3), September 1976, 23-27.
62. ----- . The effects of a police-based diversion program upon youth resource development. In R.R. Rosa and P. Gendreau (eds.),

- Effective correctional treatment. Toronto, Ont.: Butterworth, 1980.
63. Collins, Jean P. First evaluation report on the Grande Prairie Community Reconciliation Project for Young Offenders. April 1982.
 64. Colorado Division of Youth Services. Evaluation of state funded juvenile diversion programs. Denver, Col.: Department of Institutions, Division of Youth Services, January 1979.
 65. ----- . An assessment of services provided by state/locally funded juvenile diversion programs. Denver, Col.: Department of Institutions, Division of Youth Services, 1980.
 66. Cressey, David R. and McDermott, Robert A. Diversion from the juvenile justice system. Ann Arbor, Mich.: National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, June 1973.
 67. Croan, Gerald M. and Lees, J.F. Building effective coalitions: Some planning considerations. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, May 1979.
 68. Croan, Gerald M., et al. State options for supporting delinquency prevention: A working paper. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, April 1979.
 69. Crohn, Madeleine. Diversion programs: Issues and practices. Pretrial Services Annual Journal, 1979.
 70. Dade County Department of Human Resources. An evaluation of the impacts of five juvenile delinquency prevention/diversion programs. Miami, Fla.: Department of Human Resources, 1979.
 71. Davids, Leo. Delinquency prevention through parent training. Some observations and proposals. In P.C. Friday and V.L. Stewart (eds.) Youth Crime and Juvenile Justice. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
 72. Davidson, W.S. et al. Diversion of juvenile offenders - initial success and replication of an alternative to the criminal justice system. Presented at the National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation, Washington, D.C., February 22-24, 1977 and the American Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1978. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service (Microfiche), 1977.
 73. Davidson, William S., Snellman, Lynn and Koch, J. Randy. Current status of diversion research - Implications for policy and planning. In R. Roesch and R. Corrado (eds.), Evaluation and

criminal justice policy. Sage Research Profess Series in Criminology, Sage Publications, 1981, 103-121.

74. Dawson, Roger E. A study of the impact of diversion and community-based treatment on the Bucks County Juvenile Justice System, 1974-1979. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 33(4), November 1982, 67-83.
75. Denno, Deborah J. Impact of a youth service center: Does diversion work? Criminology, 18, November 1980, 347-362.
76. Duncan, J.T.S. Citizen crime prevention tactics: A literature review and selected bibliography. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, April 1980.
77. Dixon, Michael C. and Wright, William E. Juvenile delinquency prevention programs: An evaluation of policy related research on the effectiveness of prevention programs. Nashville, Tenn.: Peabody College for Teachers, October 1974.
78. Donovan, Maureen. An exploratory survey of school based delinquency prevention programs in British Columbia. Vancouver, B.C.: Resource Evaluation Unit, British Columbia Ministry of the Attorney General, 1981.
79. Douds, Alexander et al. Behavior contracting with youthful offenders and their parents. Child Welfare, 56(6), June 1977, 409-417.
80. Doyle, Paulette and Gaudet, Marsha. Community service orders: Justice in the community - The Prince Edward Island experience. Charlottetown, P.E.I.: Prince Edward Island Department of Justice, September 1979.
81. Dunford, Franklyn W. Police diversion - An illusion? Criminology, 15(3), November 1977, 335-352.
82. -----, et al. A national evaluation of juvenile diversion: Research design and preliminary findings. Paper presented at the meeting of the Western Society of Criminology, Newport Beach, California, February 1980. Boulder, Col.: Behavioral Research Institute, n.d.
83. Edelman, Sandra. Juvenile delinquency: The nature and scope of the problem. Vancouver, B.C.: Research Unit, Ministry of the Attorney General of British Columbia, April 1980.
84. Elliott, D.S. Recurring issues in the evaluation of delinquency prevention and treatment programs. In David Shichor and D.H. Kelly

- (eds.), Critical issues in juvenile delinquency. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books, 1980.
85. Elliott, D.S., et al. The long and short term impact of diversion programs. Behavioral Research and Evaluation Corporation and the University of Colorado, April 1976.
 86. ----- . Diversion - A study of alternative processing practices: An overview of initial study findings. Boulder, Col.: Behavioral Research Institute, July 1978.
 87. Enpey, LaMar T. A model for the evaluation of programs in juvenile justice. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, January 1977.
 88. Entente. A proposal for a collaborative project between the Montreal Y.M.C.A., Solicitor General's Department and the Department of Youth Protection (Ville Marie Social Service Centre), n.d.
 89. Entente. Program Description, n.d.
 90. Etobicoke After-Hours Referral Project: First annual report. Toronto, Ont., January 1980.
 91. Etobicoke After-Hours Program Report, 1979.
 92. Feldman, Ronald A., Caplinger, Timothy E. and Wodarski, John S. The St. Louis conundrum: The effective treatment of antisocial youths. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
 93. Fenster, Carol L. and Mahoney, Ann R. Juvenile justice in suburbia, Suburban Youth Authority, May 1980.
 94. Fischer, D.G. Evaluation of the Saskatoon Juvenile Diversion Program. A report to the Consultation Centre, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, July 1983.
 95. Fischer, D.G. and Jeune, F.A. Saskatoon Diversion Project Interim Report, July 9, 1981.
 96. ----- . Saskatoon Diversion Project Interim Report, December 9, 1981.
 97. Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. Preventing delinquency by community organization: A model of youth diversion in Puerto Rico. In P.C. Friday and V.L. Stewart (eds.), Youth crime and juvenile justice. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977, 172-181.

98. Flaherty, E.W., et al. Use of an unobtrusive measure for the evaluation of interagency coordination. Evaluation Quarterly, 2(2), May 1978, 261-274.
99. Fredericton Juvenile Diversion Program. Project Description, n.d.
100. Gaspar, Anne. Project Intervention (A support service for young people in trouble with the law). A Report for 1978-79. Windsor, Ont., n.d.
101. Gibbons, D.C. and Blake, G.F. Evaluating the impact of juvenile diversion programs. Crime and Delinquency, 22(4), October 1976, 411-420.
102. Gilbert, G.R. Alternate routes - A diversion project in the juvenile justice system. Evaluation Quarterly, 6(2), May 1977, 301-318.
103. Gordon, Thomas. Effectiveness training: A model for prevention of juvenile crime. Crime Prevention Review, 4(1), October 1976, 20-25.
104. Gottfredson, Michael R. Treatment destruction techniques. Journal of Crime and Delinquency, 16, January 1979.
105. Gross, Alan M. et al. Self-management and social skills training - A study of predelinquent and delinquent youths. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 7(2), June 1980, 161-184.
106. Hackler, James C. Evaluation of delinquency prevention programs: Ideals and compromises. Federal Probation, 31, 1967, 22-26.
107. ----- . Misguided wisdom: delinquency prevention programs and their evaluation. Criminologie Made in Canada, 3(1&2), 1975/76, 67-83.
108. ----- . The prevention of youthful crime. Toronto, Ont.: Methuen, 1978.
109. ----- . The dangers of political naivete and excessive complexity in evaluating delinquency prevention programs. Evaluation and Program Planning, 1(4), 1978, 273-283.
110. Hall, Debbie. East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program: Coordinators Report. Toront, Ont.: mimeo, August 31, 1979.
111. Harlow, Eleanor. Diversion from the criminal justice system. Crime and Delinquency Literature, 2, 1970, 163-171.
112. Hawkins, J.D. et al. Interpreting official records as indicators of recidivism in evaluating delinquency prevention programs. Criminology, 15, November 1977, 397-424.

- 113.----- . A typology of cause-focused strategies of delinquency prevention. Washington, D.C.: A report of the National Juvenile Justice Assessment Center, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1980.
114. Hawkins, J.D. and Wall, J.S. Alternative education: Exploring the delinquency prevention potential. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1980.
115. Hetherington, Michael. Fredericton Diversion Program: Coordinators Quarterly Report - July 1, 1980 to October 30, 1980.
116. Hickey, W.L. Programs for juvenile status offenders. Criminal Justice Abstracts, June 1979, 275-306.
117. Higgins, Paul S. Evaluation and case study of a school-based delinquency prevention program. Evaluation Quarterly, 2, May 1978, 215-234.
118. High Level Diversion Project Policy Statement. Submitted to the Consultation Centre, Prairie Region, Solicitor General of Canada, September 1980.
119. Hirachi, Travis. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1969.
120. Holmes, Sheila. Outline of Proposal for the Regent Part Teen Centre: Points for discussion with the Solicitor General's Office. Submitted to the Consultation Centre, Solicitor General of Canada, 1976.
121. Inuit Educational Project of the Quinuayooaq Society. Report/Funding Proposal. Submitted to the Consultation Centre, Prairie Region, Solicitor General of Canada, November 1977.
122. Janvier, Richard L., Guthmann, D.R. and Catalano, R.F. An assessment of evaluations of drug abuse prevention programs. (Reports of the national Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers.) Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, June 1980.
123. Jennings, Laverne. (DRAFT) Evaluation: Drop-In Centre Youth Recreation Program, Bayfield and Queen Streets, Charlottetown, P.E.I., 1 June 1980 - 31 August 1980. Submitted to the Prince Edward Island Department of Justice, 25 September 1980.
124. Jeronimus, J. An historical analysis of the community approach to

- delinquency prevention. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1978.
125. John Howard Society of Saskatchewan. The Mediation Diversion Program - A project report. July 1980.
126. Johnson, Grant, Cohen, Gloria and Bird, Tom. A guide for delinquency prevention programs based in school activities: A working paper. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, April 1980.
127. Johnson, Grant, Bird, Tom and Little, J.W. Delinquency prevention: Theories and strategies. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, April 1979.
128. Johnstone, J.W.C. Delinquency and the changing American family. In D. Schichor and D.H. Kelly (eds.), Critical issues in juvenile delinquency. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books, 1980.
129. Kassebaum, Gene C. Delinquency and social policy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
130. Kay, Sarkis. Youth Jobs Corp 1979 Project Submission (Durham Region). n.d.
131. Kelley, T.M. Delinquency prevention and control -- past, present and future. LAE Journal of the American Criminal Justice Association, 42, Winter-Spring 1979, 57-70.
132. ----- et al. The effectiveness of college student companion therapists with pre-delinquent youths. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 7, June 1979, 186-195.
133. Klapmuts, Nora. Diversion from the justice system. Crime and Delinquency, 6, March 1974, 108-129.
134. Klein, M.W., and Teilmann, K.S. Pivotal ingredients of police juvenile diversion programs. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, May 1976.
135. Klein, M.W. Issues and realities in police diversion programs. Crime and Delinquency, 22(4), October 1976, 421-427.
136. Klein, M.W., et al. Explosion in police diversion programs - Evaluating the structural dimensions of a social fad. In Malcolm Klein, Juvenile justice system. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.

137. Knudten, R.D. Delinquency programs in schools: A survey. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 2(4), December 1975, 346-357.
138. Kratcoski, P.C. and Kratcoski, J.E. The balance of social status groupings within schools as an influencing variable on the frequency and character of delinquency behavior. In P.C. Friday and V.L. Stewart (eds.), Youth crime and juvenile justice. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977, 160-171.
139. Krisberg, B., McCall, C. and Munson, J. Pioneering in delinquency prevention: The California experience. San Francisco, Cal.: NCCD Research Centre, 1978.
140. Krohn, Marvin et al. Social status and deviance. Class context of school, social status and delinquency behavior. Criminology, 18, November 1980, 303-318.
141. Ku, R. and Blaw, C.H. A university's approach to delinquency prevention: Adolescent Diversion Project. An exemplary project. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, 1977.
142. Lajeunesse, T. Innovative approaches to juvenile justice. 1982.
143. LaPrairie, Carol P. Diversion: Some theoretical considerations. Canadian Criminology Forum, 3, Fall 1980.
144. Lawrence, Janet S. and Shireman, C.H. The findings of self-report studies of juvenile misbehavior: A summary. Chicago, Ill.: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing, University of Chicago, April 1980.
145. LeBlanc, Marc and Biron, Louise. Status offenses: A legal term without meaning - An empirical demonstration. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, January 1980, 114-125.
146. Leblang, S. Diversion of juvenile drug offenders in San Diego (CA). Journal of Juvenile and Family Courts, 29(1), February 1978, 39-57.
147. Lejins, P. The field of prevention. In Amos and C. Wellford (eds.), Delinquency prevention. Englewood Cliffs, N.S.: Prentice-Hall, 1967.
148. Lemert, E.M. Instead of court: Diversion in juvenile justice. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, 1971.
149. ----- . Diversion in juvenile justice: What hath been wrought. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18(1), 1981, 34-36.

150. Levitt, J.L., et al. Achievement Place: The teaching family treatment model in a group home setting. Chicago, Ill.: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, n.d.
151. Lewis, Jack. A comprehensive approach to delinquency prevention and treatment. Child Welfare, 57(10), December 1978, 675-684.
152. Lipsey, M.W., Cordray, D.S. and Berger, D.E. Evaluation of a juvenile diversion program: Using multiple lines of evidence. Evaluation Review, 5(3), June 1981, 283-306.
153. Lundman, Richard J., et al. Delinquency prevention: A description and assessment of projects reported in the professional literature. Crime and Delinquency, July 1976, 297-308.
154. Lundman, Richard. Will diversion reduce recidivism? Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 428-437.
155. ----- and Scarpitti, Frank R. Delinquency prevention: Recommendations for future projects. Crime and Delinquency, April 1978, 207-220.
156. Major issues in juvenile justice information and training, grants in aid of local delinquency prevention and control services. 1981.
157. Maloney, D.M. et al. BIABH (Bringing It All Back Home) Project - Regional adaptation of the teaching-family model group home for adolescents. Child Welfare, 56(1), January 1977, 787-796.
158. Maron, A.W. The juvenile diversion system in action: Some recommendations for change. Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 466-469.
159. Mathews, K.E. and Geist, A.M. Effect of Seattle's (WA) community accountability program upon juvenile crime. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche, 1977.
160. Mayne, Carol and Garrison, Gordon. Summary of the study report on restitution: An analysis of the use of restitution during 1977 in Provincial Court, Charlottetown, P.E.I. and examination of the many aspects of restitution. Charlottetown, P.E.I.: Prince Edward Island Department of Justice, January 1979.
161. McCord, J. Early criminals: Hands-off vs. intervention. Human Behavior, 7(7), July 1978.
162. ----- . Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. Psychology, 37, September 1979, 1477-1486.

163. Morton, Mary E. and West, W. Gordon. A research evaluation of the Frontenac Diversion Programme. Prepared for the Research Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, March 1979.
- 164.----- . Summary of a research evaluation of the Frontenac Diversion Programme. Prepared for the Research Branch, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, July 1980.
165. Moyer, Sharon. Self-evaluation in community-based residential centres/Volume 1: Guide. Prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. Ottawa, Ont.: Communication Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1978.
- 166.----- . Diversion from the juvenile justice system and its impact on children: A review of the literature. Prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. Ottawa, Ont.: Communication Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1980.
- 167.----- . Community-based alternatives for juveniles: Program issues. Prepared for the Workshop on Diversion, Fredericton, N.B., November 1980.
- 168.----- . Highlights of the Workshop on the Evaluation of Community Alternatives in Canada, July 1982. Prepared for the Consultation Centre, Solicitor General of Canada, September 1982.
169. National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Juvenile justice and delinquency prevention: Report of the task force. 1976.
170. National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies. Performance standards and goals for pretrial release and diversion: Pretrial diversion. August 1978.
171. National Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention. Outstanding prevention programs: Descriptive overview. Seattle, Wash.: Center for the Assessment of Delinquent Behavior and Its Prevention, University of Washington, April 1980.
172. National Crime Prevention Institute. The practice of crime prevention. Volume 1: Understanding crime prevention. Louisville, Kentucky: School of Police Administration, University of Louisville, 1978.
173. National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Preventing delinquency: A comparative analysis of delinquency prevention theory. Volume I of IX. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1977.

- 174.----- . Annual report for fiscal year 1979 (October 1, 1978 to September 30, 1979. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1979.
175. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. National Evaluation Program: Phase II report - Evaluation of treatment alternatives to street crime. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, January 1979.
176. Nejeleski, Paul. Diversion: The promise and the danger. Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 393-410.
- 177.----- . Diversion: Unleashing the hounds of heaven? In M.K. Rosenheim (ed.), Pursuing justice for the child. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1976, 94-118.
178. New Brunswick Department of Justice, Correctional Services Division. Annual Report, 1979-1980. Fredericton, N.B.: Department of Justice, June 1980.
179. Newton, Anne M. Prevention of crime and delinquency. Criminal Justice Abstracts, June 1978, 245-266.
180. Normandeau, Andre and Ouellette, Chistiane. Repertoire des programmes Quebecois de prevention de la delinquance. Prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, October 1978.
- 181.----- and Hasenpusch, Bernard. Methods for crime prevention. Canadian Criminology Forum, 1, Spring 1979, 47-53.
182. Normandeau, Andre and Hasenpusch, Bernard. Prevention programs and their evaluation. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22, July 1980, 307-319.
183. Normandeau, Andre, Hasenpusch, Burkhard, Ouellette, Christiane. Review of methods for active crime prevention: Final report. Prepared for the Solicitor General of Canada, February 1977.
184. North End Diversion and Neighbourhood Justice Project: Progress Report July 31, 1979 - March 31, 1980. A report to the Consultation Centre, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, n.d.
185. Nunes, James R. A police operated diversion program. Crime Prevention Review, 3(2), January 1976, 8-16.

186. O'Brien, K.E. Returned to the streets: Legal issues raised by juvenile diversion programs. New England Journal on Prison Law, 3(2), Spring 1977, 381-436.
187. Orlando, F.A. and Rosof, R.A. Alternative to institutions - Victory at sea. Juvenile Justice, 27(3), August 1976, 25-29.
188. Ohio State University, Center for Vocational Education. The theory and practice of delinquency prevention in the U.S.: Review, synthesis and assessment. Criminal Justice Abstracts, June 1977, 188-191.
189. Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services. A review of alternatives to the incarceration of the youthful offender. June 1976.
190. Pabon, E. Here we go again - The child savers. Juvenile Justice, 28(1), February 1977, 41-45.
191. Palmer, Ted, Bohnstedt, M. and Lewis, R. The evaluation of juvenile diversion programs: Final report. Sacramento, Cal.: California Youth Authority, Winter 1978.
192. Palmer, Ted and Lewis, R. A differentiated approach to juvenile diversion. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1980, 209-227.
193. ----- . An evaluation of juvenile diversion. Cambridge, Mass.: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, 1980.
194. Paternoster, Raymond, et al. The stigma of diversion: Labelling in the juvenile justice system. In P.L. Brantingham and T. Blomberg (eds.), Courts and diversion. Sage Research Progress Series in Criminology, 14, 1979, 127-142.
195. Peel Diversion Project Report of July 15, 1979.
196. Peel Diversion Program Description, n.d.
197. Phillips, John C. and Kelly, Delos H. School failure and delinquency: which causes which? Criminology, 17, 194-207.
198. Picard, Cheryl. Youth Alternative Project coordinator's report, 1979.
199. ----- . Youth Alternative Project information package, n.d.
200. Picard-Brown, Cheryl. Halifax County Youth Screening Authority: Coordinator's Progress Report. Submitted to the Ministry of the Solicitor General, December 10, 1979.

ADMINISTRATIVE ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of the predominant themes and practical operational problems which have influenced the direction of community-based delinquency and prevention programs in Canada.

The targetting and client selection policies of primary, secondary and diversion efforts are described, with the implications for recruitment of clients and their engagement by the program emphasized. The strategies of prevention programs are examined in terms of the causes of delinquency they are designed to address -- individual and interactional dysfunction and social structural problems, including the deleterious social environment. In the case of diversion programs, the focus is on post-charge accountability projects which employ reparative strategies of victim-offender reconciliation, restitution to the victim, and community service. The organizational features of such programs that impinge on the efficiency of day-to-day functioning of projects are examined.

From an examination of the sources of information on Canadian accountability programs and the evaluation results to date, it is concluded that there is a need for monitoring data to fill the information vacuum that exists at present. The audience for empirical data on these programs require information for a variety of purposes, but have a common need for basic data on the volume of cases, client characteristics and program strategies. While program staff should be encouraged, and perhaps contractually obligated, to provide monitoring data to the funding agency, it is also the responsibility of the funder to summarize and disseminate that information to the major users.

The report concludes with a series of recommendations on targetting and interventions in prevention programs, the viability of the main strategies of accountability programs, the transferability of such projects to new locales, and the monitoring requirements of accountability projects.

201. Price, C., Price, R.P. and Toomey, B. Predelinquent girl -- does a volunteer friend program help? Adolescence, 15, Spring 1980, 55-64.
202. Programme de Travaux Communautaires (Montreal). Project Demonstration. September 1980.
203. Quay, H.C. and Love, C.T. Effect of a juvenile diversion program on rearrests. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 4(4), December 1977, 377-396.
204. Rankin, Joseph H. Investigating the interrelations among social control variables and conformity. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 67(4), 1976, 470-480.
205. Reamer, F.G. and Shireman, C.H. Alternatives to the juvenile justice system. Their development and the current 'state of the art'. Chicago, Ill.: School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, 1980.
206. Reker, G., et al. Juvenile diversion - conceptual issues and program effectiveness. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22, January 1980, 36-50.
207. Reynolds, D. Education and the prevention of juvenile delinquency. In Norman Tutt (ed.), Alternative strategies for coping with crime. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
208. Roesch, Ronald. The evaluation of pretrial diversion: A response. Crime and Delinquency, 25, October 1979, 503-508.
209. ----- and Corrado, R.R. (eds.). Evaluation and criminal justice policy. Sage Research Progress Series in Criminology, Sage Publications, 1981.
210. Rojek, D.G. and Erickson, M.L. Reforming the juvenile justice system: The diversion of status offenders. Law and Society Review, 16(2), 1981-82, 241-264.
211. Romig, Dennis A. Justice for our children: An examination of juvenile delinquent rehabilitation programs. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1978.
212. Rossbrook House, Inc. Diversion at the Neighbourhood Level. Presented at the Conference on Diversion: A Canadian Concept and Practice, Quebec City, October 1977. Winnipeg, Man.: Rossbrook House, Inc., 1977.
213. Rothenberger, D.M. and Shepherd, J.R. Police juvenile diversion - A summary of findings. Police Chief, 46(6), June 1978, 74-77.

214. Rowe, Wendy E. A process evaluation of a juvenile prevention program: Youth and family services. Vancouver, B.C.: Research Evaluation Unit, Policy Planning Division, Ministry of the Attorney General of British Columbia, 1981.
- 215.------. The evaluation of 'operational' social service programs: Major issues and implications for juvenile delinquency prevention programs. Vancouver, B.C.: Research and Evaluation Unit, Policy Planning Division, Ministry of the Attorney General of British Columbia, May 1981.
216. Rutherford, A. and McDermott, R. Juvenile diversion - Summary Report - National Evaluation Program - Phase I. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, September 1976.
217. Scharf, P. Towards a philosophy for the diversion of juvenile offenders. Journal of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 29(1), February 1978, 13-20.
218. Schneider, Anne and Schneider, Peter. An overview of restitution program modes in the juvenile justice system. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, February 1980, 3-21.
219. Schur, Edwin. Radical non-intervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
220. Seidman, Edward et al. Adolescents in legal jeopardy: Initial success and replication of an alternative to the criminal justice system. Presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1976.
221. Servant, Gilles. Programme de judiciarisation juvenile via mesures de compensation, restitution et travail communautaire. Centre de Services Sociaux de l'estrie, 29 November, 1978.
222. Severy, Lawrence J. and Whitaker, J. Michael. Juvenile diversion: An experimental analysis of effectiveness. Evaluation Review, 6(6), December 1982, 753-774.
223. SexSmith, Vicki et al. Rediscovery: An evaluation. n.d.
224. Shakman, Theresa M. Legal protections in diversion of juveniles. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, April 1979.
225. Shichor, David and Binder, Arnold. Community restitution for juveniles: An approach and preliminary evaluation. Criminal Justice

Review, 7(2), Fall 1982, 46-50.

226. Shichor, David and Kelley, D.H. (eds.). Critical issues in juvenile delinquency. Lexington, Mass.: Heath Lexington Books, 1980.
227. Shore, Milton F. Evaluation of a community-based clinical program for anti-social youth. Evaluation, 4, 1977, 104-107.
228. Smith, C.P. et al. Reports of the National Juvenile Assessment Centers - A preliminary national assessment of the status offender and the juvenile justice system: Role conflicts, constraints and information gaps. Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, April 1980.
229. Smith, Peggy et al. Juvenile diversion evaluation: Report of an experimental study. Pre-trial Services Annual Journal, 1979, 118-140.
230. Solicitor General of Canada. National inventory of diversion projects. Ottawa, Ont.: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
231. ----- . Diversion - A Canadian concept and practice - A report of the First National Conference on Diversion, October 23-26, 1977 at Quebec City. Ottawa, Ont.: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1978.
232. ----- . Diversion information resource package. Ottawa, Ont.: Communications Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1978.
233. ----- . National inventory of diversion projects - An update. Ottawa, Ont.: Communications Division, Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada, 1979.
234. ----- . Federal discussion paper on post arrest/charge pre-court adult diversion, May 30, 1979.
235. Sone, Ian. Evaluation of the East Toronto Diversion/Prevention Program. A report to the Advisory Committee by Ian Sone and Associates, Ltd. Toronto, Ont.: June 1979.
236. Stehno, Sandra M. and Young, Thomas M. Young women and the juvenile justice system. An examination of national data and summaries of 14 alternative programs. Chicago, Ill.: National Center for the Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing, University of Chicago, February 1980.
237. Teal, Stewart E. A companionship approach to delinquency prevention. Crime Prevention Review, 5(4), July 1978, 35-45.

238. Thomas, Charles W. Are status offenders really so different? A comparative and longitudinal assessment. Crime and Delinquency, 22, October 1976, 438-455.
239. Tittle, Charles and Villemez, W.J. Social class and criminality. Social Forces, 56, December 1977, 474-503.
240. Tutt, Norman. Alternative strategies for coping with crime. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
241. U.S. Department of Justice. The Neighbourhood Youth Resources Center. An exemplary project. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, 1975.
242. Vera Institute of Justice. Further work in criminal justice reform: A five year report, 1971-1976. New York: Vera Institute of Justice, 1977.
243. Wade, Terry C. et al. A family crisis intervention approach to diversion from the juvenile justice system. Juvenile Justice, 28(3), 1977, 43-51.
244. Walker, Jerry P., Cardarelli, Albert P. and Billingsley, Dennis. The theory and practice of delinquency prevention in the U.S. Ohio State University, The Center for Vocational Education, 1975.
245. Wall, John S., et al. Juvenile delinquency prevention: A compendium of thirty-six program models. Seattle, Wash.: National Center for the Assessment of Delinquency Behavior and Its Prevention, University of Washington, Center for Law and Justice, 1980.
246. Ward, F. Prevention and diversion in the United States. In V.L. Stewart (ed.), Changing faces of juvenile justice. New York: New York University, 1978.
247. Wedge, R.F. Review of the literature on the early identification of delinquency-prone children. Sacramento, Cal.: California Department of the Youth Authority, 1978.
248. Weinrott, Mark R., Jones, Richard R. and Howard, James R. Cost-effectiveness of teaching family programs for delinquents: Results of a national evaluation. Evaluation Review, 6(2), 1982, 173-201.
249. Weis, J.G., et al. Jurisdiction and the elusive status offender: A comparison of involvement in delinquent behaviour and status offences. Washington, D.C.: Reports of the Juvenile Justice Assessment Centers, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,
U.S. Department of Justice, June 1980.

250. Wenk, Ernst A. Delinquency prevention models in schools. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 29(3), August 1978, 17-27.
251. ----- (ed.). Delinquency prevention and the schools - Emerging perspectives. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage Publications, 1975.
252. West, W.G. and Morton, M.E. Evaluating a diversion programme. Presented at the Conference on Diversion: A Canadian concept and practice. At Quebec City, October 24-26, 1977.
253. Whitney, W.M. Evaluation of a community-based delinquency prevention program on the basis of group and individual employment. (Doctoral Dissertation.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974.
254. Wilson, James Q. The police and the delinquent in two cities. In Stanton Wheeler (ed.), Controlling delinquents. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1968, 9-30.
255. Wilson, L.C. Diversion - The impact on juvenile justice. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 18(2), April 1976, 161-167.
256. Wilton, David B. Annual Report: Saint John Youth Project (January 1979 to July 1980).
257. Wolfgang, M., Figlio, R. and Sellin, T. Delinquency in a birth cohort. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
258. Woodson, Robert L. A summons to life: Mediating structure and the prevention of youth crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1981.
259. Wright, W.E. and Dixon, M.C. Community prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency: A review of evaluation studies. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, January 1977, 36-67.
260. Youtec Consulting. Evaluation report, community agencies' satisfaction with the Etobicoke After Hours Referral Program. January 1980.
261. Youth of Otonabee Limited. Program Description. Peterborough, Ont.: 1979.
262. Zaffran, Ronald J. First offenders: A deferred prosecution program. Juvenile Justice, 27(3), 1976, 41-50.