

The Hard-Core Juvenile Offender

By
Raymond L. Manella

45150



NCJRS

FEB 21 1978

ACQUISITION

The Hard-Core Juvenile Offender

By
Raymond L. Manella
Associate Professor
Loyola College
Baltimore, Maryland

National Council of Juvenile Court Judges
University of Nevada
Box 8000
Reno, Nevada 89507

Copyright, 1977

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and its National College of Juvenile Justice wish to extend their gratitude and appreciation to the following for their support and encouragement of this monograph:

National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
US Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Max C. Fleischmann Foundation
Reno, Nevada

This monograph, *The Hard-Core Juvenile Offender*, was prepared under Grant Number 76-JN-99-0016 from the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice.

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Max C. Fleischmann Foundation.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	v
Introduction	1
The Issues	5
Who is the Hard-Core or Hyperaggressive Delinquent?	15
What are the Programmatic Needs of Hard-Core Delinquents?	18
What is Being Done About Hard-Core Delinquency?	20

Editorial Advisory Board

JUDGE MARGARET C. DRISCOLL
Bridgeport, Connecticut
President, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges

JUDGE R. KENNETH ELLIOTT
Liberty, Missouri
Chairman, Publications Committee
National Council of Juvenile Court Judges

LOUIS W. MCHARDY
Reno, Nevada
Executive Director,
National Council of Juvenile Court Judges
and Dean of the National College of Juvenile Justice

N. CORINNE SMITH
Editor

This monograph is published primarily for use in training programs of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. Views expressed in this monograph are not to be taken as the policy of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges unless clearly indicated.

**National Council of Juvenile Court Judges
Violent and/or Repeated Offender Committee**

SECTION HEAD, JUDGE EUGENE ARTHUR MOORE, MICHIGAN
CHAIRPERSON, JUDGE ROMA E POWELL, GEORGIA
JUDGE ROLAND ANDERSON, UTAH
JUDGE GLADYS BARSAMIAN, MICHIGAN
JUDGE DIXIE CHASTAIN, FLORIDA
JUDGE ADDELAIR GUY, NEVADA
JUDGE THOMAS MAHER, MICHIGAN
JUDGE BERTRAM POLOW, NEW JERSEY
JUDGE ALFRED WEINER, NEW YORK

Foreword

For whatever known or unknown reasons, there appears to be an increase in the numbers of hard-core juvenile offenders. Unlike many juvenile offenders, the hard-core juvenile offender seems to be resistant to the standard sanctions imposed by the juvenile and family courts. This category of offender is equally resistant to the treatment efforts of the state and community programs normally associated with efforts to moderate delinquent behavior.

While young in years, the hard-core juvenile delinquent often commits crimes which seriously threaten lives and property of our citizenry. If apprehended, these same young people place unusual stress on the system developed for their care and treatment. If placed in facilities designed for the majority of more amenable delinquents, their behavior tends to be disruptive and infective.

In terms of their impact on the community, the number and seriousness of the offenses committed by this group is disproportionate to their numbers. Yet because of the nature of their offenses and the repetitive character of their behavior, they arouse reactive demands from the community to come down harder on all delinquents. This makes it difficult for the courts and especially for the legislature to develop less restrictive kinds of programs and facilities for the vast majority of low risk delinquents.

This monograph by Ray Manella analyzes our current situational problem with the hard-core juvenile offender, the principle characteristics of this group, and Manella gives some helpful suggestions regarding the special needs of this troublesome category of delinquents. It is possible that many of them may eventually be reintegrated into the mainstream of community life. However, Manella states that we need to recognize the programmatic essentials needed to control and to modify the behavior of hard-core delinquents. The regular community and state facilities for delinquents have not been adequate for this group. Further, this monograph indicates that very few states have developed programs that can be identified as successful in this area.

His suggestions are worth considering if we are going to have an impact on this growing problem.

Gerald P. Wittman
Training Director
National Council of Juvenile Court Judges

INTRODUCTION

THE PROBLEM

Against a backdrop of rising juvenile arrests for serious crimes,¹ a resurgence of criminal youth gangs,² increases in the use of hard drugs and firearms by juveniles,³ violence in the nation's schools,⁴ a series of benchmark decisions impacting the juvenile courts,⁵ and a commendable effort to reduce the populations of juvenile institutions under a Congressional mandate;⁶ comes an urgent and vital reexamination of an old but most vexing juvenile justice problem — the hard-core juvenile offender. Even President Ford, in an address to the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Miami on September 27, 1976, spoke of juvenile violence and the need for strong corrective action.

The New York Coalition for Juvenile Justice and Youth Services reported that "one of the major areas of concern for the Legislature this year (1976) is responding to a small number of violent juveniles who have created a public clamor and intense debate as to how the juvenile justice system should be modified to cope with them."⁷ The New York Legislature passed a bill directed at violent crime by juveniles which was signed into law by the Governor. Other states have taken steps to deal with hard-core delinquency,⁸ but no single philosophy or policy has been adopted at any level of government. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals neglected to deal seriously with hard-core delinquency.⁹ The Commission may in fact have contributed to some of the current confusion over its nature and possible remedies by urging the phasing out of state training schools — a recommendation in opposition to that of two Presidential Commissions,¹⁰ one prestigious Task Force,¹¹ numerous judicial, mental health, correctional, law enforcement, and prosecutorial agencies.

During 1976, two National Conferences on Juvenile Justice were held in San Francisco and New Orleans under the aegis of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and the National District Attorneys Association.¹² These conferences were attended by many respected jurists, educators, law enforcement officers, prosecutors, mental health experts, correctional officials, and citizen leaders who debated the problem of hard-core delinquency and the issues that surround it. Consensus was reached on the gravity of the problem and the need for speedy and effective action. The conferences, however, were unable to resolve the various issues which this monograph

addresses. Like the larger problems of violence in America out of which it comes, the more specific problem of hard-core delinquency eludes precise definition and fast, cheap, and simple solutions.

A few of the current conceptions of hard-core delinquency are presented below. Over the years, however, the burden of dealing with these juveniles has been carried in the main by superintendents and staffs of juvenile correctional institutions. One of these administrators, in an article for a psychiatric journal, stated succinctly that "in each training school the presence of a small group of highly disturbed boys constituted a threat to the open program and comparative freedom of the cottage system, which, through the years, had come to be accepted as the basic pattern for the institutional treatment of delinquents."¹³ The juveniles this superintendent describes are not those whose cases should be waived from juvenile to criminal courts, a speedy solution advocated by some. Rather, they are youths who meet the general legal and treatment criteria for placement in a juvenile facility,¹⁴ but they present one common characteristic. They will not, or cannot, respond to supervision, control, and treatment in an open custody institution.

FACTS AND FACETS: HARD-CORE DELINQUENCY

To develop a better understanding of the nature and scope of hard-core delinquency, it is essential that the problem first be located in the context of juvenile crime in America. Two relative indices of the volume and rate of juvenile crime are the annual reports of the FBI on juvenile arrests and of HEW on delinquency cases referred to the nation's juvenile courts. The responsibility for reporting on delinquency cases at the court level was transferred in 1975 from Health, Education and Welfare to the Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

In 1975, the FBI reported that more than 1,680,000 juveniles under eighteen years of age were arrested with the most frequently arrested American being a sixteen year-old boy.¹⁵ Some experts believe that juveniles in the fifteen to seventeen year age range require major attention because of the rate at which they commit serious crimes against persons and property.¹⁶ "The number of 15-17 year old boys arrested for violent crimes increased 122% between 1964 and 1973."¹⁷

In 1975, the police disposed of 44.7 percent of all juveniles arrested within the law enforcement structure. Another 47.7 percent were referred to juvenile courts, while the remainder were not formally processed.

As to juvenile court cases, data are not yet available on the 1975 experience, but in 1973 HEW reported that over 1,143,000 cases, excluding traffic, were referred to the courts. Of this number

522,600 or forty-six percent were given full judicial review and about nine percent were placed in institutions or other residential facilities.¹⁸

Because most of the efforts to deal with hard-core delinquency have occurred at the state level, the thrust of this monograph is that the logical point of departure for a fuller study of the problem and the issues is at the level of state and local government. Rightly or wrongly, serious architectural, policy, staffing, programmatic, and legal developments are now part of the history of juvenile justice in America. This fact must be taken into account by the officials and agencies involved in the further evolution of concepts and programs related to hard-core delinquency.

On July 1, 1975, 28,601 juveniles were reported under care in state juvenile correctional institutions; a substantial decrease from the 43,447 reported in 1969.¹⁹ The Childrens Bureau estimates that among incarcerated juveniles at any one time five to fifteen percent are hyperaggressive.²⁰ The important thing to remember about these juveniles is that while their numbers are small they generate an impact on the total juvenile justice system far out of proportion to their numbers.²¹ They pose a continuous threat to the institutions where they live and to the adjacent communities. They raise anxiety levels of other delinquent youths and of institutional staff and community law enforcement, judicial, and business officials. The general public becomes alarmed as the media gives major attention to the behavior of these youths. The history of many juvenile correctional institutions, a few of which meet the recommended standards for treatment,²² is dotted with legislative, grand jury, media, judicial, administrative, and other types of investigations and inquiries triggered by the acts of these delinquents.²³

These adolescents, in mental health terms, are homicidal, suicidal, present property-destroying tendencies, and require care in architecturally restraining facilities. For them special programs of an educational and mental health nature are needed. The response to the problem of hard-core delinquency has been extremely varied and some of the approaches are discussed below. One discouraging finding is that little definitive research has been conducted into the causes of hard-core delinquency and that most of the planning, policy, architectural, and programmatic approaches have been based on narrow, pragmatic, and expedient assumptions which are subject to serious question as to their validity.

This monograph is limited in scope to selected facts and impressions. It does not deal with the use of drugs in the diagnosis and treatment of hard-core delinquency; with the neurological aspects, nor the newer modalities which offer some hope for success in caring for juveniles in the hard-core category. It does provide a general profile

of the hyperaggressive delinquent for possible use by policy makers, decision makers, and planners. One section addresses the type of programs which might be designed for hyperaggressive delinquents. An attempt was made to identify and briefly discuss the major issues which must be resolved if the problem of the hard-core delinquent is to be solved.

It has been reported that eighty-seven percent of incarcerated juveniles are boys.²⁴ Boys far outnumber girls in the hard-core category, and they may be significant differences between the sexes in the analysis of causative, diagnostic, and treatment variables. This complex area, however, must await future research initiatives and is beyond the scope of this monograph.

The American Correctional Association, HEW's Office of Education, and LEAA's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention are becoming more concerned, and some initiatives have been launched which might bear fruit in the years ahead. LEAA has assigned hard-core delinquency a high priority for 1977 and will provide financial and technical assistance to eligible agencies who undertake to deal seriously with the problem.

A final word with regard to the need to protect the community from juvenile violence. Two contradictory forces are at work in America which will require resolution. On one hand, well-intentioned reformers advocate the closing of juvenile institutions and the greater use of community-based facilities, services, and programs. On the other hand, the general public becomes increasingly fearful of serious crimes by juveniles. As the pressure for greater reliance on non-institutional approaches mounts in the nation, the tolerance level of the public for hard-core delinquency is certain to be lowered. Greater demands than ever before will be urged to get tough with hard-core juveniles, to incarcerate them for extended periods of time, and to funnel their cases to the criminal courts despite evidence that this approach will exacerbate the problem in the long run rather than solve it. These two forces may jeopardize the status of open juvenile institutions that were never intended to rehabilitate hard-core delinquents.

Every state regardless of its geography, demography, and socio-culture must cope with hard-core delinquency in varying degrees. A major task facing policy and decision-making officials and agencies in the years ahead is in the designing of reliable instruments for measuring the extent of hard-core delinquency. The Rand Corporation in a report on hard-core juveniles to LEAA's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention found little agreement and much confusion among officials and agencies as to the nature of the problem. Some concerns have been expressed that while the general juvenile population in America is expected to decrease by 1980, it is entirely

possible that violent juvenile crime may increase if present trends continue.²⁵

New York, Ohio, Maryland, and the District of Columbia have accumulated experience in the planning of facilities for delinquent boys presenting special problems of control. At the local level more attention is being paid to hard-core delinquents depending on the number of youths involved and the public fears. For example, the Honorable Joseph B. Williams, Chief Judge of the Family Court of New York, doubts whether placement of juveniles in prisons would be effective and draws attention to the fact that juveniles from poor communities are now occasionally victimizing middle and upper-class citizens. The fact that juveniles commit violent crimes in better neighborhoods has created much of the furor.²⁶ Carol Parry, New York City's Human Resources Administration Assistant Commissioner estimated that the truly violent juveniles in the population at any one time numbered less than 500.²⁷ The upper delinquency age in New York is sixteen for boys, however, while in most of the states the upper age is eighteen or older.

How many hard-core delinquents remain in the community under some type of supervision or are undetected adds to the complexity of census-taking. One assumption which state planning and other agencies have made, however, is that hard-core delinquents require continuous care in juvenile, adult penal, and mental health institutions. Until more reliable studies are conducted, planning for the care of these delinquents will continue to be based on this type of empirical assumption.

The federal government could play a dynamic role in the organization and funding of such studies and also could include appropriate state and local governmental officials and agencies. A moratorium might be declared on the deinstitutionalization trends until such studies are completed.

THE ISSUES

Merely to identify the major issues which arise in considering hard-core delinquency is no mean task. No single legal, architectural, or programmatic philosophy has emerged. Because research efforts have failed, no validated theories have been formulated which lend themselves to use by policy and decision makers. Except for recent initiatives by LEAA's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and earlier efforts by the Children's Bureau, little guidance, financial, and technical assistance has come from the federal sector. The office of Education in HEW provides financial assistance for educationally deprived children in institutions. These funds are used for youths who are the most disadvantaged educationally, and this group includes hard-core delinquents.

Despite the fact that momentum has been reported in the movement to close juvenile correctional institutions and to limit their use to adjudicated delinquent youths who commit crimes, the leaders of the movement have failed to answer the question of hard-core delinquency — a most serious national concern in 1977. This monograph will serve a useful purpose if it stimulates leaders at all levels of government to consider the gravity of the problem of hard-core delinquency and to develop plans for a coordinated attack. Only if existing knowledge and resources are more imaginatively and effectively utilized will the threat to the nation of hard-core delinquency diminish in the years ahead.

The issues below are discussed under the general headings of definition, policy, planning, research, legal aspects, and program. Other issues can be identified which merit serious study, including explanation of hard-core delinquency on the basis of neurological rather than psychosocial factors; the role of drugs in the diagnosis and treatment of hard-core delinquents; and the effect of the media—particularly television on juvenile violence in the nation.

THE ISSUE OF DEFINITION

A tentative clinical profile of the hard-core delinquent is presented below but this should not be construed as a fully validated description of the phenomenon. While law enforcement, judicial, and correctional officials have reached some general agreement on the external nature of hard-core delinquency; it is evident that much confusion exists as to its more specific legal, clinical, sociological, and administrative dimensions. Juveniles who commit serious crimes are seen by criminal justice professionals who work with them on a day-to-day basis as older adolescents with long histories of law-violating behaviour, habitual recidivists who behave in a manner which creates special problems of control and discipline in the community and institutions. They are hyperaggressive, emotionally unstable, impulsive, and runaway risks. At the two National Conferences on Juvenile Justice alluded to earlier, it was interesting to find that even within this general view of the hard-core delinquent definitions ranged from those of a simplistic type which focused on the behaviour of the delinquent to more complex definitions of an interdisciplinary nature.

A cursory review of the literature on juvenile justice disclosed a wide range of terms and semantic labels being used to identify the hard-core delinquent. In addition to the terms hard-core and hyper-aggressive delinquent are terms, such as serious juvenile offender, violent juvenile offender, acting-out boy, recalcitrant offender, emotionally disturbed juvenile, and defective delinquent.²⁸ Learned social scientists (Wolfgang, Vedder) have studied the violent offend-

er, and one National Commission conducted a study of violence in the nation. However, few definitive studies of hard-core delinquency among juveniles have been undertaken. The time has come for a halt to tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee measures. Hard decisions should be made and the sooner the better. Until the basic studies are completed on the nature and causes of hard-core delinquency, government leaders should urge as a national policy a pragmatic approach to hard-core delinquency which recognizes the need for many of these juveniles to be incarcerated. This might mean a moratorium on the closing of juvenile correctional institutions and a recognition of the need to protect the community against juveniles who habitually assault persons and property.

As to the issue of definition itself two views of the phenomenon were selected. The first was developed by a respected law enforcement agency which states that, "the hard-core delinquent classification includes those children who are a danger to themselves and society. Such children may have psychological disorders, may have failed to respond to previous correctional and rehabilitation programs or may be 'young criminals' who indicate no desire to pursue socially acceptable goals. For juvenile offenders with these problems institutionalization remains the only realistic answer for the protection of society."²⁹ The second definition comes from an eminent social scientist who states that, "there is no doubt that the hard-core group of offenders against whom society must be protected cannot be ignored. But the need to guard against such people works two ways: that is they must be identified and kept out of community programs as well as prison."³⁰

One source of fuller definitions of hard-core delinquency which has not been fully tapped is available to researchers in the form of many state administered reception and diagnostic centers which are used for the care of delinquents committed by the courts to state agencies of the youth commission or youth services type. These centers, however, vary in their approaches to diagnosis. Some lean toward psychoanalytical models while others have social work or behavioural orientations. Tests administered to youths placed in these centers are medical, neurological, educational, and psychiatric in nature. Again, however, no single diagnostic philosophy or procedure has been formulated which is in general use. The tests being administered and the accumulated experience of these centers is believed by this writer to have major implications for the better understanding, control, and treatment of hard-core delinquency in the nation.

Legal definitions of hard-core delinquency are either non-existent in most state jurisdictions or they vary widely making it impossible to recommend at this time any single philosophy or definitive stand-

ards. The different states tend to view hard-core delinquency narrowly and to base any legal or administrative policies on the basis of local experience and views of judicial, law enforcement, and correctional officials. Before the New York General Assembly passed a hard-core delinquency bill and the Governor signed it into law, a lengthy debate took place within and without the halls of the legislature. The Committee on Child Care of the Legislature recommended in its report that a special legal category be established for juveniles who commit violent crimes and specific felonies, such as murder, rape, and assault. The Committee also recommended that juveniles in the violent classification be incarcerated for longer periods of time than is presently done and that the state agency responsible for the care of these juveniles be prohibited from transferring them to other facilities or to release them under aftercare supervision without court order. Some of these recommendations were adopted in the new New York statute. What other states will do, however, remains very uncertain. Again, the need for federal leadership and initiative is imperative in the efforts being made by local and state legislative bodies to define hard-core delinquency in more pragmatic terms.

The mental health definition of hard-core delinquency in terms of a tentative profile is presented below. It may be useful to judicial, legislative, and administrative agencies, which must struggle with the hard-core delinquency problem in the months ahead. Caution is urged, however, in accepting the profile as conclusive. It requires further development based on hard research findings if it is to lend itself to general application in the juvenile justice field.

Few sociological and administrative definitions of hard-core delinquency have been formulated. In sociological terms hard-core delinquents tend to come from a small group of adjudicated delinquents living in inner-city slum areas where there are large concentrations of racial and ethnic minority groups. They are generally alienated from society, and their peers, and many have adopted a criminal life style.

Administratively a few of the states have formulated policies and procedures for the care of youths who require greater attention and care in architecturally restraining correctional facilities or systems — either facilities on the grounds of a training school or some adjacent site.

THE ISSUES OF POLICY AND PLANNING

No national or state level policy for the care of hard-core delinquents has been formulated nor has any acceptable strategy been developed at any level of government. In the current rush to produce more definitive standards for juvenile justice, as stipulated in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, little

mention has been made of hard-core delinquency. Some of the standards proposed by the American Bar Association and other agencies would, if generally adopted, further limit the powers and jurisdiction of the juvenile courts. This writer would caution those who are developing the standards to do so with the full participation of those professionals who carry day-to-day responsibility for the care and supervision of delinquent youth and those in danger of becoming delinquent. Further, unless a degree of flexibility is provided, the various states may find it legally, fiscally, and administratively impossible to adopt the standards whether through legislation or on an administrative basis.

The issue of policy is deeply interrelated with the type of legislation which governs the care and treatment of delinquents. The traditional federal role has been in the development of guides and standards which state and local agencies could utilize as they planned and legislated. Except for federal agencies which are directly responsible for the institutional care of delinquent youths, such as the Bureau of Prisons and the Office of Education with its Title I Program in institutions, it would seem advisable for federal agencies and funds to be utilized in assisting state government agencies in efforts to plan and operationalize better programs for the care of hard-core delinquents. Federal assistance should also take the form of sponsoring operational and basic research efforts; of providing training and staff development support to the states; and of offering technical assistance over the wide range of architectural, personnel, programmatic, legislative, fiscal, and related matters.

Policy is sometimes formulated by action of a state legislature in appropriating funds for the advance planning of a high-security facility for boys which occurred in Missouri, or actual construction which occurred in Maryland. The Maryland legislature appropriated 8.6 million dollars for construction of a new high-security facility for 100 boys, but failure to locate a suitable site, coupled with the active opposition of anti-institution groups has delayed this project despite strong support from law enforcement, correctional, and mental health leaders.

This writer doubts whether any acceptable standards can be developed for hard-core delinquency before the formulation of basic policy. Two undesirable practices mentioned elsewhere in this article have eluded any general resolution. These are the transfer of juveniles to state penal institutions on an administrative basis and the direct commitment to prisons of juveniles by juvenile courts. It is to be hoped that in the development of a national policy on hard-core delinquency the states will adopt the provision in HEW's Model Acts for Family Courts and State-Local Programs which states that "no child whose legal custody is vested in the department (state or local

agency) shall be confined by the department in any facility used for the confinement of detention of persons accused or convicted of crime."³³

The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, in concert with the National District Attorneys Association, the American Correctional Association, LEAA's Office of Juvenile Justice, and other prestigious organizations should give serious consideration to designing an action project which would focus on policy analysis for hard-core delinquency in America. The need for such an analysis is acute and should not be delayed, but unless the right leadership is provided it is unlikely that much will be achieved in the years ahead.

With regard to planning considerations, one encouraging development has occurred in such states as Maryland and Missouri where with LEAA funds efforts were made to systematically identify delinquent boys in the hard-core or hyperaggressive category before proceeding with architectural and other planning initiatives. Other states — New York and Ohio — have already pioneered in the general area of high-security for delinquent boys, and their experience should be useful in the further development of legal and administrative policies.

Planning, however, must be based on solid facts and valid assumptions. Regrettably, no formula has been devised for the accurate census-taking of hard-core delinquents. The attempts to date have been very modest and extremely limited in nature.

The Missouri Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency found in its 1971 study of hard-core delinquency, that on any given day 122 institutionalized delinquent boys were in the hyperaggressive category. The Task Force recommended that two regional high-security schools be constructed for the care of these juveniles.

While more knowledge regarding delinquency is available than ever before, it will be many years before this knowledge is integrated into theory and before policy will be based on it. Because a relatively small percentage of boys are habitually delinquent, and tend to commit the more serious crimes, the design of a census on hard-core delinquency should be carefully developed. The number of hard-core delinquents at any one time in any state should be estimated as accurately as possible and not left to fuzzy speculation. Planning for them, however, should be undertaken in the context of overall community planning. The success or failure of an entire juvenile justice system may well depend upon the extent to which the planning addresses hard-core delinquency. All facilities, services, and programs for delinquent youth should be appraised. The writer does not envy the planners because there is a "general lack of reliable comprehensive and comparable information about juvenile justice and corrections practices across the nation."³⁴ Yet a start must be made somewhere, and the writer hopes that in the near future action will be

substituted for rhetoric and that acceptable hard-core delinquency census techniques will be developed.

THE LEGAL ISSUES

In other sections of this monograph references have been made to some of the legal aspects which are of major importance in any serious consideration of hard-core delinquency. A few of the states, such as New York, Missouri, and Maryland, have established legal policies which are intended to better protect the community from the violent acts of juveniles while they are under supervision and control, either in institutions or in the community. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, with the support of the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the American Bar Association, have established the need for definitive standards in the field of juvenile justice — many of which have major implications for the care and control of hard-core delinquents.

State planning agencies have been involved in the development of standards and guides under the impetus of P.L. 93-415, but to say that judges, correctional officials, law enforcement officers, and segments of the general public are in agreement with the standards proposed would be extremely naive. As a matter of fact, thirteen of the states have withdrawn from participation in the implementation of P.L. 93-415 because of provisions on status-offenders, deinstitutionalization policy, and related matters.³⁵

It will be a long time before any single legal policy for hard-core offenders will emerge. To this writer more time will be required and greater research efforts must be launched. The difficulty with the promulgation of standards on a national basis in the area of juvenile justice is that few of the states have developed their programs, facilities, and services for juveniles on a historically comparable basis. The states vary widely in terms of their readiness for governing standards. The one unifying thread is the concept of the juvenile court and its role in the prevention, control, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Yet the critics of the juvenile court are urging changes which could well destroy its special and unique role in American society, a special role which prompted the late Roscoe Pound to refer to the juvenile court as the greatest advance in the history of human justice since Magna Carta.

One positive step which might be taken soon, which P.L. 93-415 did not encompass in a positive way, is the careful review of all state juvenile codes for the purpose of developing in each state a fuller and more modern legal basis for the care of children and youth in conflict with the law. Within this broad initiative the special problem of hard-

core delinquency and the issues surrounding it could be placed under study. Some of the general guides are already available in the model acts, the standards advocated by the Childrens Bureau, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and other organizations. A few of the states have recently revised their juvenile codes, and their actions could be useful to other states planning legal changes. In addition to clearer definitions of hard-core delinquency alluded to elsewhere, the revision of juvenile codes could address the issues of administrative transfer of juveniles from juvenile to adult penal institutions, of age, and of the nature of the state program for the institutional and community care of delinquent youth and those in danger of becoming delinquent.

RESEARCH ISSUES

"Adequate research on this small group of delinquent youth is lagging. This creates serious planning as well as legal, administrative, and program problems. Since these hyperaggressive delinquents eventually move out of the juvenile correctional system into community life or adult penal or mental health institutions, there is obvious need for research into the aftercare phase of their experience."³⁶ Any research efforts should address the cases of who make successful adjustments following release, as well as the failures. The fact is that in the general field of juvenile corrections "research findings are ambiguous and fragmentary, leaving policy makers with a great number of unanswered questions."³⁷

Again there are a few hopeful signs. Already alluded to was the recent study by the Rand Corporation of current strategies for the handling of hard-core delinquents. New agencies such as the institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention have been established at the national level with a mandate for research across the whole juvenile justice spectrum. The National Council of Juvenile Court Judges established the National Center for Juvenile Justice which has developed a research capability which lends itself to serious studies of hard-core delinquency — its causes and treatment. Finally, state planning agencies with LEAA funds have taken the initiative in planning studies of hard-core delinquents which involve university research experts.

Much remains to be done, however. Because most of these hard-core juveniles are adolescents, research studies are needed to ascertain at what phase of their development they acquired their hyperaggressive behavior patterns. One persistent criticism of juvenile institutions is that they contribute to the crime problem, rather than control it. How many hard-core and hyperaggressive delinquents become that way after exposure to the criminal justice and juvenile correctional systems merits study also.

Research is needed into the neurological aspects of violent behaviour by juveniles, into the use of drugs, and into the current diagnostic approaches used in, California, Maryland, and New Jersey. Diagnosis and treatment of hard-core delinquency at the earliest possible time should result in considerable savings to the taxpayers if fewer juveniles are incarcerated and the length of stay can be shortened without danger to the community.

Some evaluation should be made of tests presently being used on delinquents in state administered reception diagnostic centers. Recent parole prediction experiments in states like Michigan endeavor to identify high-risk and dangerous offenders and offer some hope.

Finally, legal research is needed. As stated above, current juvenile codes governing the care of delinquent children should be placed under study and further impetus given to such studies. As long as there is confusion among judges, police, state agency officials, social scientists, clinicians, and the general public about these hard-core delinquents and their needs little progress will be made in solving the problem.

One of the obstacles to designing significant research is the failure of national and state juvenile justice agencies to agree on relatively simple baseline data for collection and analysis. "It is impossible to trace the course of developments and to examine the main directions of program development across the nation without more adequate and systematic longitudinal data."³⁸ To this the writer of this monograph adds a loud "Amen".

ARCHITECTURAL AND PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

In their attempts to better plan for the care and control of hard-core hyperaggressive delinquents state and local government agencies have experimented with a variety of approaches described below. In the absence of any direction from the national level the agencies which carry the day-to-day responsibility of caring for juveniles in the hard-core category have adopted design and construction principles which vary widely. The type of facility used for the confinement of hyperaggressive delinquents, its location, its size, its relationship to other institutional structures and to the larger juvenile correctional system are factors which have not produced any pattern or generalized concept. The difficulty faced by some of the states in dealing with the problem of security is exemplified by the *Annual Report of the California Youth Authority of 1975*. The Department began a number of programs in 1975 designed to improve security arrangements in institutions. Two approved for funding by the California Council on Criminal Justice were a renovation of security arrangements in all institutions. The Council "also funded the institutional violence re-

duction project which has rearranged staffing patterns in an experimental program at the Preston School.³⁹

One issue of design which is far from settled is whether new institutions for hyperaggressive delinquents should be of the traditional cottage type or single structures. Within this larger question of design are myriad of other questions which relate to location and the program planned for the facility, as well as the staffing pattern and security features. The perimeter defenses in use vary from electrified manned fences to jeep patrols or conventional chain link fences with hardware cloth and barbed wire tops. Some of the suggestions for confinement of juveniles in the hard-core category include conversion of former military installations, penal facilities no longer used for convicted adults, and to camps of the concentration type. Except for states like Missouri, the planning has not been systematic, thorough, or based on the best available knowledge. The writer believes that the design of facilities for the care of hard-core juveniles is critical to the success or failure of these institutions. For this reason, it is logical to ask appropriating bodies, such as the state legislature, to allow sufficient planning time and to appropriate initially only funds for the development of preliminary plans and outline specifications.

The programmatic issue is another critical component in planning for the care of hyperaggressive or hard-core delinquents. A section of this monograph has been devoted to the planning of program but the approach suggested has not had any general acceptance. In addition to the residential program which must be designed, there are the matters of preadmission or diagnostic services to aftercare or parole considerations. One sensitive area in the program area is the sub-issue of how long hard-core juveniles require care in a physically restricting facility. Different philosophies abound. Some experts argue for a highly flexible limited length of stay (Missouri), while others feel that the more serious the behavior of the juvenile the longer his incarceration should be (New York). One of the useful analyses of the complexity of length of stay as a treatment variable was developed by the Urban Institute in its study of deinstitutionalization. The Institute also urged caution in wholesale closing of juvenile institutions.

The educational program, in the judgement of this writer, should be assigned a high priority in any planning of facilities of the hard-core type. Some of the stigma which ordinarily attaches to correctional institutions with security features would be less damaging if the facilities were defined as schools, rather than maximum-custody junior prisons or lockups. Unless an early commitment to quality special education for youngsters placed in these facilities is secured from the responsible agencies and officials in advance, it is doubtful

if all the other programming elements can compensate adequately.

Finally, the social sciences and behavioural disciplines have developed new treatment modalities which may have special significance in caring for hard-core delinquents in the community and in institutions. Among these modalities are positive peer culture, transactional analysis, behaviour modification, reality therapy, and mutual agreement programming. In its study of positive peer culture at the Missouri State Training School for Boys, the Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency found that this approach to rehabilitation was appropriate for many boys but recommended a multi-disciplinary diagnostic and treatment program on the basis that not all delinquents can or should be required to participate in programs of the positive peer culture type.

As to the parole or aftercare program provided hard-core delinquents, it should be assigned a high priority by planners and should incorporate the best principles, practices, and standards.⁴⁰ No matter how much money is spent constructing special treatment facilities for hard-core delinquents, no matter how dedicated and trained the staff of the facility once it becomes operational and no matter how effective its program, unless aftercare services, facilities, and programs are available and under strong leadership, it is unlikely that many of the hard-core delinquents released from residential facilities will succeed in their efforts to lead law-abiding lives. Some evidence has been collected which suggests that caseloads for hard-core delinquents should be much smaller than those for other delinquents.

WHO IS THE HARD-CORE OR HYPERAGGRESSIVE DELINQUENT?

Although each hard-core delinquent has undergone a developmental process which shaped his behavior tendencies as a result of his own unique set of experiences, a few basic generalities can be applied to the hard-core or hyperaggressive group. The profile etched below is tentative, based upon empirical data and observations accumulated over the years in studies of state juvenile correctional institutions.⁴¹

THE PROFILE SUMMARIZED IN GENERAL TERMS

Hard-core, hyperaggressive delinquents are adolescents who:

1. Are burdened with special additional problems as they grow and develop to full maturity.
2. Have long histories of delinquent, criminal, and deviant behavior.
3. Have acquired deeply-rooted, anti-social values and attitudes.
4. Are agitated personalities with character defects and are unwilling or unable to control themselves in group settings.

5. Are hostile, alienated personalities.
6. Are habitual law violators, runaways, and from families well known to police, mental health, welfare, and court-correctional officials.
7. Are sometimes superficially passive and suave, concealing but not visibly acting out their hostility.

1. ADOLESCENTS WHO ARE BURDENED WITH SPECIAL PROBLEMS

These special problems may be physical, social, emotional, intellectual, and educational in nature. They tend to be intensified during the maturation process. These juveniles often feel inadequate, have serious identity problems, and find it difficult to relate to other youths and adults. Their problems of identity and relationship are brought with them to the institutions where they are placed and are manifested in visible hyperaggressive behaviour. They tend to form cliques and gangs and invent or embellish stories of their delinquent behaviour as compensatory devices for their anxieties. Media violence often reinforces and inspires their aggressive behavior.

2. HAVE LONG HISTORIES OF DELINQUENT, CRIMINAL, AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Although a few of these hard-core delinquents have avoided official detection until late in their adolescence, the large majority have been identified earlier because of the nature of their hyperaggressive behaviour. Most of these juveniles come from physically or psychologically broken homes where consistent supervision and discipline have been denied them. A few have been encouraged by their parents or relatives to engage in criminal activity. A disproportionate number are societal rejects. This alienation adds to their feelings of anger, loneliness, and frustration. In sociological terms these juveniles are teenagers, members of racial-ethnic groups living in overcrowded urban slums.

3. HAVE ACQUIRED DEEPLY-ROOTED ANTISOCIAL ATTITUDES AND VALUES

In the socialization process these juveniles have acquired values, norms, and attitudes which conflict with those of the larger society. They are cynical, selfish, and indifferent to law-abiding civic responsibility. They utilize immediate, anti-social mechanisms for the purpose of relieving tensions and for gratification. Because their conflict with authority figures as continuous, they react to stimuli in a hostile patterned way. They justify their actions by citing the negative behaviour of officials in positions of public trust and by the over emphasis which the American culture places upon monetary, rewards rather than on law-abiding behaviour.

4. ARE AGITATED PERSONALITIES WITH CHARACTER DEFECTS

It is difficult for these hard-core delinquents to mask or conceal their hostility. They indulge in tantrums, oral and physical attacks on persons and property. They are malicious, highly unpredictable, and in group settings, because of self-induced isolation, are extremely difficult to restrain and control. Their reactions to even mildly provocative stimuli are trigger-like and their mood swings are severe. Their frustration tolerance thresholds are extremely low and result from lifelong disappointments and failures. They are unable to respond calmly to any affront and operate on a highly infantile pleasure principle. They crave and demand immediate satisfaction and are unable to defer or postpone it.

5. ARE HOSTILE, ALIENATED PERSONALITIES

Hard-core delinquents are usually loners. They have been left to their own devices for many years because of their inability to relate positively to peers and superiors. In the process of alienation from the larger society they become detached and isolated and their becomes a marginal role. The classic vicious circle of frustration-rejection - anger - hostility - frustration takes hold. The rejection intensifies their agitation and their hostility takes the form again of destructive behaviour.

6. ARE HABITUAL LAW VIOLATORS AND RUNAWAYS

Hard-core juveniles are chronic repeaters of anti-social behaviour. They are well known to law enforcement, court welfare, and correctional agencies. Their dossiers are filled with long accounts of their deviant behaviors, ranging from less serious to more serious crimes. Along with an established pattern of recidivism is one of instability which expresses itself in the runaways or escapes they attempt or successfully execute — from institutions, hospitals, jails, detention centers, and from the custody of law and correctional officers. Some of the most serious crimes committed by these youths occur before, during, or immediately after a runaway or escape. Because of their inability to remain under care in an open custody facility, as stated previously, they require control in a facility with architectural restraints.

7. ARE SOMETIMES SUPERFICIALLY PASSIVE AND SUAVE

While most hard-core juveniles behave in a highly visible assaultive manner, a few are suave, at times very articulate and manipulative, while concealing their hostility. They are deceptive in a cool,

relaxed manner while manipulating other youths and adults as they implement their schemes for retaliation.

WHAT ARE THE PROGRAMMATIC NEEDS OF HARD-CORE DELINQUENTS?

In addition to a facility designed with architectural restraints, hard-core delinquents need exposure to a new milieu where the predominant values and norms reflect those of the larger society. The total institutional climate, philosophy, and operation should incorporate and stress these values and norms. Diversified therapies or modalities should be available to the management of the institution to insure that an individualized and highly flexible approach to treatment will be possible.

The daily program activities should be planned carefully and every opportunity given the juveniles to participate. Because most of these juveniles are physically hyperactive, a balance should be struck between big-muscle, sports and physical education types of activities of a quieter, relaxed nature. The design of the facility should include fully developed outdoor site improvements with recreational sports features. All activities should be realistic and within the capabilities of the youths, thus providing a means for them to achieve better emotional stability and control. Because of their previous failures in sports, these juveniles should receive special encouragement to participate and a system of rewards and incentives should be established.

Staff members responsible for the planning and supervision of activities should be properly trained and understand that these are juveniles with excess physical and emotional energy and that program activities are needed to drain off this energy. Staff members should also be versatile and sensitive to the needs of these youths, able to withstand extreme behaviour incidents without losing control. Again, sound architectural features will relieve staff of a pure custodial function while behaviour is kept within realistic limits. Aggressive behaviour by hard-core juveniles should be recognized by staff for what it is, a threat to the safety and welfare of other individuals, and dealt with in a non-punitive but firm way. Staff members should also be alert to the rich counseling opportunities afforded by critical incidents caused by hard-core delinquents.

As the juvenile responds to program and supervision, he should strengthen and improve his relationships with others and be better able to identify with authority figures. He will be better able to join constructive peer groups and participate more fully. Staff members, in order to help the juvenile avoid regression to violent behaviour, should be trained to recognize those situation and factors which tend

to trigger behaviour explosions. Here again prevention is the goal. Every effort should be made by the management and line staff of the facility to create a relaxed climate. If the design of the facility is imaginative and functional, this critical matter of a relaxed climate can be better achieved. The supervision given the youngsters under care should be of a protective nature but firm and fair. Special techniques should be used by staff members in relaxing symptoms of hyperactivity and hypersensitivity. Staff members should carefully guard against any tendency to condone, satisfy, or bribe these youths and their incidental whims.

Like normal adolescents, hard-core juveniles need self-respect, self-esteem, and self-worth. Their outer facade of toughness should be understood as compensatory behaviour for dealing with their problems. They will respond to encouragement but will need protection and assistance. Older boys should be given opportunities to communicate with and relate to members of the opposite sex through co-educational activities. Abnormal interest in sex and preoccupation with it are common among these adolescents, and they may need more intensive care and treatment.

Finally, staff members should be alert to the small number of suave hard-core delinquents and their manipulative behaviour. They should develop skill in recognizing the advance symptoms of such behaviour even before it occurs. The youths need to understand that their behaviour can be detected, is understood, and that there are alternatives available to them of a social rather than an anti-social nature.

Along with the more specific aspects of program planning for the hard-core delinquent, attention must be paid to the contribution which the general institutional environment or milieu can make to his treatment. It is essential that a properly designed and located physical plant be available of a non-penal character with suitable aesthetic characteristics. The facility should meet all design and construction standards and have varying degrees of security. It is unlikely that all the juveniles will require the highest degree of security at all times. For those youths nearing the end of their stay, thought should be given to a less restrictive physical environment. At least one of the units, however, should be designed with total outerwall and inner defenses. This high-security area could relate to the other units with lesser degrees of security and allow more detailed utilization of diagnostic data in the daily program. It will enable staff to test a youth's increasing ability to accept responsibility for his behaviour and his freedom. Some juvenile institution administrators believe that a youth should be removed from high-security facilities at the earliest possible time.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT HARD-CORE DELINQUENCY?

CURRENT LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPROACHES

In current efforts to deal with hard-core delinquency the courts resort to various practices. Perhaps the most prevalent is the action of the court in waiving or certifying a juvenile for trial by a criminal court. Little reliable information is available, however, on the criteria used by the various courts in determining which cases to waive. Within a single state, it was found that different courts vary widely in the number of cases waived in a single year and the circumstances of the cases. Many variables, however, enter into these decisions, perhaps the most important being the extent to which the community has developed resources for the care of its hyperaggressive delinquents. Over the years the model acts for family and juvenile courts have provided for the transfer or waiver of juvenile cases — generally in the sixteen to eighteen year old age range — to the criminal courts. One easy solution to the hard-core delinquency problem, espoused by some concerned officials and legislators, is the blanket waiver of all felony cases involving juveniles to the criminal court.

A second legal practice in some states, considered undesirable by some experts in juvenile justice, is the action of a juvenile court in committing a juvenile directly to a state prison or youthful offender facility.⁴² No estimates are available of the extent of this practice or the number of juveniles involved. The writer believes that one useful study would be directed at the number of juveniles under care in penal institutions and the circumstances of their commitment or sentencing or placement. Those who argue for a get-tough policy for hard-core juveniles often urge lengthy confinement in prison facilities despite the evidence that such a policy affords the community no long-range protection.

Another undesirable administrative practice is that of transferring a juvenile from a juvenile to an adult prison facility or even a mental health facility by a non-judicial agency such as a youth authority, a division of juvenile services, or a youth commission. While the administrative transfer of juveniles *within* a juvenile correctional system is practiced in many states and has considerable support, the practice of transferring juveniles from the custody of juvenile correctional agencies to those responsible for adult prisons is subject to question on many grounds. The practice has been legally challenged but it continues in some states.

Some correctional administrators and institutional superintendents feel that hard-core juveniles, regardless of their ages should not be placed in juvenile facilities. They contend that adult prisons or mental hospitals should care for these adolescents. It is the opinion of this writer, and many of his colleagues, however, that the care and

custody of juveniles *not* waived by the juvenile courts should rest with the agency which administers the state's delinquency control program. Judges expect, however, that these agencies provide the necessary physical plant, staffing, and programmatic resources which will enable them to control hard-core juveniles while they undergo treatment.

ARCHITECTURAL APPROACHES

Because hard-core delinquents are too unstable and disruptive to remain under care in an open training school type setting, the agencies responsible for their care have resorted to several architectural solutions. These range from completely new, high-security institutions with sophisticated inner and outer features for defense purposes, to single buildings on the grounds of existing juvenile correctional institutions, to the conversion of single rooms or living units to security facilities.

SINGLE SEGREGATION ROOMS

Perhaps the most prevalent architectural plan for the care of hard-core delinquents in correctional institutions is that of the single room or cluster of rooms which enable these delinquents to be physically isolated from the other juveniles. The names assigned these rooms vary widely and labels, such as segregation, isolation, meditation, security, and adjustment, are in use. The youths placed in these rooms use other names such as lockup, pokey, jug, and clink. How many rooms are being used, where they are located, and the practices which are followed vary widely with individual superintendents. Some are most severe and are little more than jail cells, while others are located in regular cottages, in hospitals, in administration, or school buildings. Youths placed in these rooms remain for varying periods of time from overnight to even months. Release is often determined on the basis of a reported change in a youth's attitude, his behavior in whatever activities are afforded him, and his readiness for release. No standard pattern for food service, medical, educational, recreational, and other services has evolved. Generally, because of the concern over security the program for youths in these rooms is severely restricted.

SPECIAL TREATMENT UNITS AND ANNEXES

Some juvenile correctional agencies have constructed new or converted existing facilities into separate facilities for the care of hard-core delinquents. The structure may be converted cottage or infirmary, a wing to a cottage or hospital, or a separate new structure. Some are self-sufficient and operate on a twenty-four-hour-a-day, 365-day-

a-year basis. Medical, nursing, dining, recreational, educational, religious, sleeping, and other facilities are included in the design. In some cases, although the structure is separate from other structures on the training school campus or nearby, these units are not self-sufficient and make use of central dining, recreational, and educational facilities and services.

The size, design, location, staffing, and programming approaches vary widely. Some of these units are used only for youths who have first been screened by a staff committee, while others are used by institutional superintendents on an emergency type basis. The time spent in these units varies from a few days to months. Release policies and practices also vary a great deal. Youths are generally returned to the regular training school program, but some are returned to court or are administratively transferred to adult penal or mental health facilities.

SEPARATE HIGH-SECURITY INSTITUTIONS

In a few states, new high security institutions have been constructed for the care of hard-core delinquents or an existing facility has been converted to this type of utilization. Again, the variations in design, location, type of staffing pattern, program, and governing policies and practices, are extreme. All, however, have been provided with basic architectural security features whether they are designed on a cottage, decentralized, or single structure basis. Restraints include fences, walls, security doors, windows, sashes, and hardware. In some cases, closed circuit television and modern communication systems have been installed. Some are clearly penal in their architectural character, while others might be more appropriately typed as a mental health design.

Youths admitted to these new or converted institutions usually are selected for placement by juvenile correctional officials. The institutions operate generally on a transfer basis, and the policies and the practices governing their day-to-day operation vary widely. One sensitive area which has been alluded to in another section of this monograph is the general exclusion of the courts and other agencies from the process of deciding which juveniles are to be transferred and the length of stay and release of these juveniles.

Footnotes

¹*Crime in the United States*, Uniform Crime Reports (Washington, DC: Dept. of Justice, Nov. 1975).

²*LEAA Newsletter*, "Youth Gangs Increase Dramatically," Vol. 5, No. 10 (1976).

³*Juvenile Justice Digest*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (1976), (Annadale, Va.: Washington Crime News Service).

⁴Juvenile Delinquency in Schools Act of 1975, *Congressional Record*, Thursday, April 17, 1975; Bernard Greenberg, "School Vandalism: Its Effects and Paradoxical Situations," *Crime Prevention Review* (California Attorney General, 1974); *Hearings on School Violence and Vandalism*, Senate Subcommittee of the Judiciary to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Senator Birch Bayh, Opening Remarks, April 16, 1975.

⁵*In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967); *Miranda vs Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1967); *Kent vs United States*, 383 U.S. 541 (1966); *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358 (1970).

⁶*The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974* P.L. 93-415.

⁷*Legislative Report*, New York Coalition for Juvenile Justice and Youth Services, June, 1976.

⁸*High Security Training Schools for Youth in Trouble*, Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, Missouri Law Enforcement Assistance Council (1971).

Juvenile Justice in Missouri, Report of the Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, Missouri Law Enforcement Assistance Council (1972).

⁹*National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals*, (Washington, D.C. 1973).

¹⁰*The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967).

¹¹*High Security Training Schools*.

¹²*Criminal Law Reporter*, 19 Cal 2045 (Washington, D.C. April, 1976).

¹³Benjamin D. Hill, "An Experiment in Treating Seriously Disturbed Juvenile Delinquent Boys," *The Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement* (1953).

¹⁴*Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Childrens Bureau, Publication 415.

¹⁵*Crime in the United States*.

¹⁶Franklin E. Zimring, "Dealing with Youth Crime" (unpublished LEAA Paper, Washington, D.C.: LEAA, September, 1975).

¹⁷*Ibid.*

¹⁸*Juvenile Court Statistics*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Youth Development, March, 1973.

¹⁹"Juvenile Corrections in America," *Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization* (A Preliminary Report, University of Michigan: National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1975).

²⁰Raymond L. Manella and George H. Weber, "The Institutional Care and Treatment of Older, Hyperaggressive Delinquent Children," *Facts and Facets #19*, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Childrens Bureau.

²¹*Ibid.*

²²*Ibid.*

²³*Ibid.*

²⁴Jeffrey Koshel, *Deinstitutionalization-Delinquent Children*, (Urban Institute, December 1973.)

²⁵Zimring's "Dealing with Youth Crime."

²⁶*Corrections Magazine*, Vol. 11, No. 4, June 1976.

²⁷*Ibid.*

²⁸Ruth G. Newman, "The Acting Out Boy," *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 22, No. 5 (Feb. 1956).

²⁹Richard W. Kobetz and Betty B. Bosage, *Juvenile Justice Administration*, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1973.

³⁰Lamar Empey, *Studies in Delinquency Alternatives to Incarceration*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1967.

³¹Raymond L. Manella and William E. Amos, *Delinquent Children in Juvenile Correctional Institutions State Administered Reception and Diagnostic Centers*, (Springfield, Illinois: Thomas Co.)

³²*Ibid.*

³³*Model Acts for Family Courts and State-Local Childrens Programs*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975.

³⁴"Juvenile Corrections in America."

³⁵*Time Out: A National Study of Juvenile Correctional Programs*, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, University of Michigan, 1976.

³⁶*Youth Alternatives*, Vol. III, No. 8, National Youth Alternatives Project, Washington, DC.

³⁷Manella and Weber, "The Institutional Care and Treatment."

³⁸*Time Out.*

³⁹Annual Report, (Sacramento, Calif.: Dept. of the Youth Authority, 1975).

⁴⁰Raymond L. Manella, *Post-Institutional Services for Delinquent Youth*, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Childrens Bureau, Publication 455, 1967.

⁴¹*Institutions Serving Delinquent Children: Guides and Goals.*

⁴²*Children in Penal Institutions*, Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Childrens Bureau, Publications 415, 1964.

END