

© 2012

Ellen Patricia McCann

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EXAMINING EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS FOR DEEP-END YOUTH IN THE
JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

by

Ellen Patricia McCann

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-Newark

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Criminal Justice

written under the direction of

Mercer Sullivan, PhD

And approved by

Newark, New Jersey

May, 2012

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Examining Effective Interventions for Deep-End Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

By ELLEN PATRICIA McCANN

Dissertation Director:

Mercer Sullivan, PhD

While much is known regarding effective interventions for low-level juvenile delinquency, there is still a lack of knowledge regarding elements that are successful in helping more serious youthful offenders. Life-Course theory provides a basis for various ecological approaches. Program elements utilized for offenders of a less serious nature have been shown effective, many stemming from the ecological approach. This study was intended to assess the effect of taking those interventions proven effective for lower-level offenders and appraise whether they are still effective elements when applied to more serious youth in Juvenile Day Reporting Centers in New Jersey. Intervention performance was assessed, and youth experiencing programs showed no significant differences in odds of reoffending or of violating their parole. Also, there was no difference in community tenure. Some interesting differences were found in offense type selection for youth who recidivated after the test period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the long course of this work, I have spent time with many people who have influenced me, taught me, and supported me in innumerable ways. I wish I could say in a few words how much that has helped me on this road, but at the very least it is important that I thank my daughter for being her amazing self, my mother and father, and my sisters and brother for being so wonderful. And for them and everyone else who knows me – my friends, my colleagues, my students – for not letting me back down so many times when I thought I was beaten. You all have inspired me, and you still do.

To my many professors over the years who believed I could do it enough for both of us, and my most recent mentors for helping me close this chapter; thank you as well for your time, attention, and real passion for this important work we all get up every day to complete.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Juveniles in the context of a flawed system	3
Life Course Theory	5
Existing interventions for offending youth	13
Crime seriousness and specialization	36
Making the connections	45
Methodology	53
Sampling	54
Sites and respective interventions	56
Data collection methodology	59
Research Questions	60
Analysis Plan	64
Analysis	67
Hypothesis Testing	83
Hypothesis 1	83
Hypothesis 2	88
Hypothesis 3	93
Hypothesis 4	94
Hypothesis 5	96
Discussion	103
Conclusions	113
References	117

Appendix A: Services by Program	121
Appendix B: Standard Conditions of Parole and Post-Incarceration Supervision	122
Curriculum Vitae	125

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: General Interventions Offered at DRCs	57
Table 2. Analysis Plan for Each Hypothesis	65
Table 3. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups	67
Table 4. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for Comparison 1	68
Table 5. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for Comparison 2	69
Table 6. Characteristics of Program Type Comparison Groups	70
Table 7. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for all youth with at least 90 days follow-up	73
Table 8. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for all youth with at least 300 days follow-up	75
Table 9. Group Differences on Outcomes for Comparison 1 Groups	76
Table 10. Group Differences on Outcomes for Comparison 2 Groups	77
Table 11. Group Differences on Outcomes for Program Type Comparison Groups	78
Table 12. Youth in Time 2 Treatment from a DRC County but did not Attend the DRC	80
Table 13. Logistic Regression for Comparison 1 on Any Arrest	84
Table 14. Logistic Regression for Comparison 2 on Any Arrest	85
Table 15. Group Difference on Outcome for Comparison 2 “Intent to Treat” Groups	86
Table 16. Logistic Regression for Comparison 2 “Intent to Treat” groups	86
Table 17. Group Difference on Outcome for Time 1 and Time 2 Treatment Youth From Newark and Camden DRCs	87

Table 18. Logistic Regression for Time 1 and Time 2 Treatment Youth from Newark and Camden DRCs	87
Table 19. Logistic Regression for Comparison 1 on Parole Violation	88
Table 20. Group Differences on Outcomes at 3 months for youth with no less than 90 days follow-up	89
Table 21. Group Differences on Outcomes at 3, 6, and 9 Months for Youth With No Less Than 300 Days Follow-Up	90
Table 22. Comparison of 4 groups for Violating Parole	91
Table 23. Comparison of 2 Treatment Groups for Violating Parole	91
Table 24. Comparison of Treatment Youth With 3 or More Months Time at Risk for Violations Within the First 3 Months of Release	92
Table 25. Cox Regression for Comparison 1 Time to First Arrest	93
Table 26. Cox Regression for Comparison 2 Time to First Arrest	94
Table 27. New Offense Type for Comparison 1 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested	94
Table 28. Different Offense Type for Comparison 1 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested	95
Table 29. New Offense Type for Comparison 2 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested	95
Table 30. Different Offense Type for Comparison 2 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested	96
Table 31. Logistic Regression for Program Type on Any Arrest	100
Table 32. Logistic Regression for Program Type on Violations of Parole	101

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile Day Reporting Centers (DRCs) are a relatively new phenomenon, following similar models to the Adult Day Reporting Centers that have been around for some time. But as everyone knows, juveniles are different. The juvenile system is one based on an ideal of rehabilitation, and as such juveniles require different interventions to find success. While we know quite a bit about what works for serious adult offenders, and great deal about what works for lower-level juvenile offenders, we do not know enough about what works for serious juvenile offenders.

Because nearly all youthful offenders, serious or otherwise, will eventually return to society, their successful re-entry should be a focus of attention. The general juvenile offender population has been served in various ways over the past one hundred years, and recently some strategies have shown promise for effecting change in their lives. Day reporting centers combine various strategies for youth that are at the deepest end of the juvenile system, and in New Jersey the population served by DRCs includes primarily youth who are committed to, and later released by, the Juvenile Justice Commission. These juvenile DRCs are promising programs that can possibly answer some of the bigger questions about the toughest young offenders. It is important to know not just if they work, but also why. Additionally, understanding the delinquent patterns of these youth can aid in uncovering ways to better help them succeed. If programs like DRCs can interrupt those offending patterns, then we are one step further in solving the puzzle of reducing risk to public safety and helping youth at the same time.

Juveniles have been served in a separate system of justice since the first Juvenile Court was founded in Cook County, Illinois, in 1899, and reformers have struggled to find best practices for all of the years since to help the most troublesome youthful offenders. Today, juvenile justice systems across the United States are not beyond repair, but they need attention, order, and improvement so as to serve offending youth in more effective ways. The Annie E. Casey Foundation refers to this more appropriately as the “juvenile justice non-system” (Steinhart, 1999). And from that non-system, nearly 100% of juveniles that enter secure, residential, juvenile facilities will eventually be released, unlike similarly situated adults.

Knowing that nearly all juvenile offenders will eventually be released, it is important to consider what the system can do to better prepare those youth to be productive and law-abiding adults. Nationally, in 2006, 92,854 youth were in residential placements, and in New Jersey, there were 1,704 youth in residential placements at a census that year. And a large majority of these New Jersey youth (55%, or 936) were 17 years old and older (Sickmund, Sladky, & Kang, 2008). That means that many youth in residential placements are nearing adulthood when they reach the deepest end of the system, and of course need to be ready for the real world when they are released.

Preparation for reentry comes in various forms such as DRCs and other programming.

Understanding the criminal patterns of these youth to further assist in their successful reentry means researchers must also examine the reasons these youth are in custody. In a study of youth in custody nationally in 2003, researchers found that 43% were in custody with a persons offense as their most serious current offense, including murder, rape, kidnapping, robbery, and assault with or without a weapon. Additionally,

for 26% the most serious current offense was a property offense, and for 10% it was drug offenses (Sedlak & Bruce, 2010). It seems that both violent and non-violent offenders find themselves in the deepest end of the juvenile system, in the custody of the state and in need of re-entry care and supervision. The system must then be better prepared to serve many types of youth in a more suitable structure.

Theory and literature over the last several decades have painted a picture of a flawed system that has some tools to help these juveniles, but still needs more work to assemble an arsenal of functional and effective interventions, and offer them to youth in accessible and meaningful ways. Reentry planning is not beyond reach. It can be improved by examining what is already known about existing models such as DRCs to find methods to help these kids. If we look first at the system as it exists, examine the patterns of the youth that enter that system, and finally consider what works with some youth, we may in fact find that successful reentry is possible for the most serious youthful offenders.

Juveniles in the Context of a Flawed System

Thomas Bernard's book *The Cycle of Juvenile Justice* (1992) lays out many pertinent arguments regarding the course the system has taken over the last two hundred years, as well as some theoretical suggestions as to how it might work better going forward. He makes a strong argument that in fact that we need to apply what works in a more effective system for the right delinquent youth.

One of Bernard's main points is that the public is ill-informed regarding the success of the programs and policies that they vote to fund. Instead he posits that they

continue to politically and financially support those programs that simply sound as though they should yield desired results. He suggests, in this same vein, that practitioners are so immersed in the system that they have not taken the time to look at the context or the history of the Juvenile Justice System in order to better assess its worth and purpose. Bernard says we know what to do, but that the system and its officials need to first see the forest for the trees.

With the social Darwinism of immigrant Chicago during the Industrial Revolution, and before the Juvenile Courts were formed in 1899, the conversation was brought to a head during a time when Cesare Lombroso was writing about the Criminal Man (1876), telling readers that a criminal was an evolutionary throwback with a wide brow. In doing so, he made criminality biological and, therefore, something to be treated and prevented, knowing from whence it comes. The Juvenile Court came around shortly thereafter, dealing with the individual needs of the offender, rather than the punishment meted out based on the offense in the adult courts (Bernard, 1992). This was the first point, a result of the Progressive Era, that laid the groundwork for modern attempts to help youth find success.

Bernard also points out the need to recognize the target populations for intervention. Delinquents do not only come from marginalized groups; all juveniles are naïve risk-takers, and many learn from the risk that is created, while others require formal system involvement to learn those lessons. For Bernard, it is a matter of natural human development to experiment with the rules, and to find out where the limits lie. “This system makes sense if its purpose is to communicate to naïve risk-takers that actions have consequences. It makes no sense at all if it is to punish hardened criminals for their

offenses” (Bernard, 1992, p.173). The system should rest on this notion, rather than assuming youth motivation tantamount to that of adults. Policymakers must find a way to make the system work while accepting that some youth will always violate the law. The responses must be those which will support their transition away from further deviance, rather than scaring them into submission. Bernard puts forth the general idea that we will always have delinquency, but at the same time, when this is recognized, it is also true that the youth that are most in need can be helped.

All this is to say that the Juvenile Justice System is one that plays a key role in American society, intervening to rehabilitate youth, rather than punish them, readying them for the real world. The facts remains that youth will always take risks and behave badly. Added to this is the reality that all youth that enter this system will eventually be released. Naïve risk takers, or deep-end delinquents, all of these youth can be shown the road to success. What is done with those young men and women while they are in the custody of the Juvenile Justice System may be the key to improving their long-term outcomes.

Life Course Theory

Individual criminal patterns of youth that lead them to the deep end of the system must be understood in order to figure out what works for each type of youth and each particular pattern. Understanding their motivations and their trajectories will help reveal where they went awry of the system, and perhaps at what point that path can be righted.

Life Course Theory, according to Benson (2002), assumes that there are three main trajectories within each person that affect one another and affect one’s life. These

are biological trajectories, psychological trajectories, and social trajectories. Within each there are developments and each can also affect the other trajectories, as can outside factors such as conditions of one's society or the point in history at which one exists.

Benson makes a strong argument for understanding the context in which one exists using the "principle of contextualism, which holds that human development cannot be separated from the context in which it occurs" (Benson, 2002, p.7; emphasis added). The life stage principle adds to this important concept, in that the developmental age at which different things occur is as important as the nature of the things that occur. Life events are experienced differently at different ages. Therefore, "What may be an effective intervention strategy for an adult criminal may not work as well or at all for a troubled adolescent on the way toward becoming a juvenile delinquent" (Benson, 2002, p.9). And in the examination of different approaches to work with serious delinquent youth, such as Multi-Systemic Therapy, Drug Courts, Intensive Aftercare, and DRCs, it is important to recognize the importance of both the context and the full ecology of each youth in order to find success for him.

Benson points out that the criminal careers that some of these adolescents are on the way to beginning are affected by many major factors that are intertwined in their influence: age of onset, frequency, seriousness, career length, and age of desistence. And each of these factors has elements that influence it, such as the increase and decrease of frequency of delinquent acts (Benson, 2002). All of these factors are frequently seen in the literature as strong predictors for crime seriousness and frequency. Benson's point is well-taken, in that each element of a young person's existence plays a role and must be considered when trying to influence a youth's trajectory with interventions, even at the

deep end where DRCs are utilized. In many methods, this is not always taken into account.

Timing interventions through proper reentry programming for delinquent youth could also perhaps lead to their transitioning out of such a lifestyle, or possibly reducing the seriousness of criminal involvement. Transitions in one's life and their timing are important. These include finding a good job at the right time, or acceptance into college, which may aid in one's desistance from delinquency, crime, and other deviance. And it is important to remember that individual traits interact with the environment before an outcome can be reached, and this is intimately involved in how a trajectory will play itself out in an individual's life (Benson, 2002). Hence, the interventions must take into account one's trajectory, and the full ecology of his life and transitions.

The average age of onset for arrest is 15-17 years old, according to Benson (2002), at which point most begin a short criminal trajectory. Risk-taking often is associated with this time in one's life due to increases in physical strength, as well as the change in hormone levels, and greater freedom from direct adult supervision. At the same time, this stronger youth with raging hormones is one that is not quite capable of mature thought. Variations in time and place in the age-crime relationship further support contextualism, according to Benson. He cites Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin's cohort research to point out that chronic offenders made up less than 7% of the group, and they in fact committed more than half of the crime committed by the group, including a large portion of the violent personal crimes recorded (Wolfgang, et al, 1972, cited in Benson, 2002). This aids life course theory in proposing three distinct groups of juveniles: the

non-offenders; the non-serious offenders; and, the chronic and serious offenders. And of course, each group has a different trajectory.

While we cannot reliably predict which group a particular youth will be a part of, we can examine that participation retrospectively, and consider if addressing his criminogenic factors would have interrupted the trajectory. Serious, chronic delinquents need to have specific and quite different interventions than do the more age-limited delinquents. “Many life course theorists recognize that individuals vary in underlying propensities toward offending, but they argue that events and turning points in the life course nevertheless influence how propensities are expressed” (Benson, 2002, p.81). The trajectories of these different groups vary for many reasons. “Causes of antisocial behavior change over the life course” (Benson, 2002, p.81). Different factors lead to crime at different ages of onset, and it is very important that intervention strategies are timed with an understanding of these concepts – they must be age-appropriate and needs-specific to be effective.

A similar approach to understanding the needs of different offenders is that of the dual-delinquent model posited by Moffitt. She proposes that there are two types of offenders: the smaller group that comprise the “life course persistent” offenders; and, the larger group made up of “adolescent-limited” offenders. The life course persistent offender is one who starts earlier and proceeds to the most serious of offenses quickly, continuing to offend throughout his life (Moffitt, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002). Early on in life, Moffitt notes that between 4 and 9% of male youth stand out from their peers as difficult or unmanageable, and similarly this is the approximate percentage of the male population that eventually becomes the life course persistent offenders. Each has a flat

trajectory, committing offenses at various points in his life course, and consistently does so, creating that invariant trajectory (Moffitt, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002).

As a youth, and eventually as an adult, with different needs and ecology, the life course persistent offender is one that may even start out in a different biological trajectory, and frequently his life brings added factors such as incapable parenting and/or other disadvantage that exacerbates the situation and his negative trajectory. The problem then compounds itself through the misbehavior. Deviance places further barriers in the road for this youth, where it is hard, if not impossible, to conform due to a reduction in opportunities to access positive trajectories and to have associated positive outcomes (Moffitt, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002). Proper interventions for these youth when they reach the deepest end of the system must hone in on this knowledge, addressing social, personal, familial, and other needs, such as blocked opportunities.

Conversely, the adolescent-limited offenders comprise the majority group, evidenced by the average age of onset between 15 and 17 mentioned above, because this group starts around 14 or 15, with a very sharp upgrade in the criminal trajectory at this age, and one that also drops off very quickly with just 2 or 3 years of offending behavior. These youth may begin by mimicking the behavior of life course persistent offenders if they see the latter as socially successful – achieving the maturity that is so desired at this age. They commit delinquent acts in this mimicry, but at the end of adolescence, the adolescent-limited delinquent discovers there are other roads to mature status, and those roads open up at this point in their lives with college, jobs, marriage, and other conformist responsibilities (Moffitt, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002). “The rewards of crime decline while its costs increase. Desistance becomes the rational thing to do” (Benson,

2002, p.88). Their intervention needs are different through programming, as the opportunities are not as likely blocked, and they are not as likely to find themselves in the paroled population of juvenile delinquents, in need of reentry planning and programming. This means that what works for less serious youthful offenders may not be entirely the best strategy for transitioning the most serious delinquents.

Benson also credits Sampson and Laub in their discussion of informal social control for contributing to the discussion on variation in turning points in one's life and its affect on criminal careers. Sampson and Laub note that different stages are subject to different forms of informal social control, and this varies by the bonds people have to them, whether bonds are with family, peers, or school (Sampson & Laub, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002). "Persistent, underlying differences in temperament and criminal potential" are explained via structural (external) variables such as discipline, supervision, and interaction. School and peers also vary by the effects of structural variables according to these theorists. If one is delinquent as an adolescent, he is less likely to progress toward adult trajectories that move one toward informal forms of control such as marriage and jobs, and are then more likely to move forward on a criminal trajectory (Sampson & Laub, 1993, cited in Benson, 2002). But this also means that "social processes can cause even seriously delinquent individuals to desist from crime...even for very committed offenders, change is possible" (Benson, 2002, p.91). These social processes are those that should be most at the core of our reentry interventions for these, the youth with greatest need for redirection from their criminal trajectories.

Another relevant discussion includes Hagan and his concept of Criminal Capital, as this plays a role in the more effective interventions for serious delinquents. Social

capital allows people to pursue goals and meet their needs. It is represented by the degree of trust within a neighborhood or a group that aids its members, so it can be used to pursue legitimate or illegitimate goals. Capital disinvestment in minority communities has led to a reduction in legitimate opportunities, and increased reliance on illegitimate markets to provide employment and income (Hagan, 1991, cited in Benson, 2002). This means that one uses negative, or criminal, capital to pursue ones goals if that is what is available to him.

Through depopulation of inner cities after the 1970s, minority groups were trapped through segregation in these environments where there were fewer jobs in the legitimate economy. Pay and educational differences fed on each other, and jobs began to require more technical knowledge, further marginalizing inner city residents. And the concentration of poverty meant that once a person had money, whether through work or through social programming, he or she would leave these impoverished areas and take his money with him (Hagan, 1991, cited in Benson, 2002).

The result is criminal, rather than conformist, social capital. Recapitalization leads to a reliance on available resources to create opportunities within illegal services and commodities (such as drugs and the sex trade) in order to get social capital from these illegitimate services. Criminal embeddedness comes from generations of separation from the legitimate economy and from conventional education. This creates continuity in this trajectory across generations, and leaves little room for individual variation, or an “environmental determinism” for this marginalized population (Hagan, 1991, cited in Benson, 2002). Resulting from this progression, there are generations of minority youth that have seen blocked access to legitimate social capital, and thus legitimate

opportunities. There is, then, an overrepresentation of minority youth with a deep investment in deviance. Reactions and interventions for these youth must include programming that serves to help these youth who know little of the legitimate system and know even less about how to access it through legitimate job training, traditional employment and traditional market participation. This part of their trajectory can be interrupted through legitimate capital and legitimate opportunities.

Together, these Life Course theorists tell a story of youth who begin life at some disadvantage, whether social, biological, or psychological. They are youth who take specific trajectories that are in part determined by the context, and find themselves more and more cornered into these lives by the limits delinquency places on their avenues to change their trajectories. And more importantly, their interventions must differ because the elements that set them on the more serious paths were different from other youth.

Benson points out that many career criminals start very young, and yet that does not mean that all is lost for these youth by the teen years. He cites programs such as Job Corps that show promise for youth in reducing violent criminality. Not all teens that become embedded in criminal lifestyles are doomed to adult crime according to Benson, as he notes Multi-Systemic Therapy as a promising avenue to present youth with the necessary transitions from criminal to non-criminal trajectories (2002). Therefore, it is known, at least theoretically, how to design interventions for the most worrisome youthful offenders. They must first be transitioned from criminal to non-criminal careers through legitimate opportunities, while taking into account their individual environments and needs.

Existing Interventions for Offending Youth

Proper interventions for lower-level delinquents may give some base information regarding how to approach the more serious youth. We begin with intermediate sanctions. The three most researched and talked about intermediate sanctions can show quite a bit about what does and what does not work for youth in various stages of the system. The lessons learned from these programs are important for guiding efforts to take those applications to the next level and understand how to work with those youth most entrenched in the system.

Boot Camps

The first, currently waning in popularity, is the juvenile Boot Camp. These have been used with varying popularity over the last 30 years in response to a public outcry for the system to take a tougher stance against criminals, young and old. The model teaches some lessons about harshness, punishment, and why rehabilitation is the best approach for juveniles. It shows that juveniles react poorly to models that take them out of their element and poorly to program-centered, rather than needs-centered, models. DRCs can heed these lessons in planning and implementation to find greater success.

The Juvenile Boot Camp has been around nearly as long as the adult model. When it began as a dispositional option for adults in the 1980s, it was seen as tougher than the rehabilitative intermediate sanctions that were around in the 1960s and 1970s, programs that the voting public deemed responsible for a need to have swift and severe responses to a rising crime rate. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, when we turned away from rehabilitation and toward incapacitation, society called for a get-tough on crime

approach that echoed throughout the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems. In 1983, the first adult Boot Camp programs opened in Georgia and Oklahoma, and soon after Louisiana opened the first juvenile boot camp in 1985, with others not following suit until the 1990s (Meade & Steiner, 2010). As of 1995, there were 75 adult and 30 juvenile boot camps between state and local agencies, as well as 18 boot camps in local jails. These quickly declined, however, dropping to just 51 total camps in 2000 (Parent, 2003).

The boot camp model for any age group has been seen as having some major shortcomings. First, there is no set model for boot camps, and they are therefore hard to compare in research (Parent, 2003). Most are the typical image of a military model, with many staff having military experience and a confrontational style of daily activity and of discipline. Most are three to six months in duration, and act much like shock incarceration, to change attitudes and behaviors (Meade & Steiner, 2010). However, it is important to bear in mind that programs are quite varied in their daily activities and in their underlying goals.

Second, as is seen in much of the research in both adult and juvenile programs, there is insufficient attention paid to the reentry of the offender (Parent, 2003; McKenzie, Gover, Armstrong, & Mitchell, 2001; Borque, Cronin, Felker, Pearson, Han, & Hill, 1996; Meade & Steiner, 2010). He or she will eventually have to return to a home, one with less support and regimentation than was the case in any boot camp environment. Borque's study found that in a one-year follow up 50-71% of youth had failed, and most for new offenses – including youth that were in an added aftercare program in Ohio (1996).

In 1996, Borque and colleagues set out to evaluate three juvenile boot camp programs that were funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) in Ohio, Colorado, and Alabama. The stated goals of these programs were to save money, endorse discipline, inspire morality and work ethic, promote educational achievement, reduce substance abuse, encourage positive citizenship, and seek accountability. The youth in the programs had demonstrated school and social dysfunction, but only the Ohio program made therapy a central tenet of the agenda. Among these three, they found that in-program there were improvements in attitude, academics, behavior and fitness. But “without the 24 hour surveillance and regimentation of Boot Camp, youth soon reverted to old patterns of behavior” upon their release (Borque, et al, 1996, p.7). The programs generally had the confrontational environment and lacked therapeutic components almost entirely, except of course in Ohio, as stated. The youth had not learned to function positively in their own environments, only that of the boot camp.

MacKenzie and colleagues actually found that youth in boot camps had a hard time transitioning back to society after their terms, much like that of youth in traditional incarceration settings (2001). This study compared outcomes to secure facilities, and while they expected that boot camps might breed disdain for authority or the system, this was not the case. Their findings showed that the outcomes were no better or worse for youth in either setting, but the juveniles and staff reported more positive perceptions of the boot camp than those in traditional facilities. MacKenzie’s study suggested that they would find a safer environment for youth in the boot camp facility. However, it was found that youth in both situations lived in a similar fear of violence – traditional-system

youth feared violence from other youth, while boot camp youth feared violence from staff (2001).

Another criticism levied is that the “confrontational environment” runs counter to what is known about the rehabilitation and development of juveniles, and fails to deal with individual needs of youth (MacKenzie, et al, 2001). MacKenzie noted some concern over the reduced social bonds. As theory suggests, improved social bonds may reduce delinquency and deviance more generally. In 17% of the facilities studied, the boot camps did not allow any visitation at all, and for those that had visits, there were fewer hours allotted per week. “Juveniles in both types of facilities reported a weakening in their social bonds to family, school and work while they were institutionalized,” and with reduced visitation, one would expect even greater bond weakening for boot camp youth (MacKenzie, et al, 2001). It seems that the confrontational environment may in fact negate therapeutic effects even when they are provided.

MacKenzie’s study concluded that neither secure nor boot camp facilities did a good job of tracking follow-up information about prior residents (2001). The focus of studies was the measurement of reduction of recidivism above all else. However, studies that had access to follow-up information found little conclusive evidence of any difference. In a meta-analysis of juvenile boot camp studies, Meade and Steiner conclude that “Boot camps, by themselves, typically do not have an effect on participants’ odds of recidivism” (2010, p. 841). In this military model they found that some programs had other treatments built in, such as substance abuse or other counseling, as well as some with after-care components. They conclude that boot camps fail to target causes of delinquency, and may even be engaging in net widening – including some youth in

programs that otherwise would not have been incarcerated. In the meta-analysis, they found that 14 of 23 studies showed no recidivism difference with control groups, and in four studies they actually found higher recidivism for boot camp youth. Of the five studies that showed reduced recidivism for boot camp youth, all had an unspecified treatment component involved (Meade & Steiner, 2010). Oddly enough, of the 14 that showed no difference, 12 had a treatment component.

This can teach a valuable lesson about how and where to deliver needed services and teach positive citizenry to youth. The confrontational environment is not a good place to teach youth or to treat youth. Even when individualized services are offered in this setting, it was less than successful because it did not allow for the youth to learn how to function in his own world, and did not allow for that world to be part of his treatment. The minimal and debatable cost savings may not justify the programs, evidenced by the drop in their use to just 11 states by 2009 (Meade & Steiner, 2010). Generally, if the overarching purpose is to reduce delinquency and offending, then this goal is not served. At worst, these programs are feared to lead to abuses of the excessive power and unchecked disciplinary power (Meade & Steiner, 2010). The most valuable lesson we learn here is that service delivery not only can be done for lower cost outside of secure facilities, but that these services could in fact be delivered in community environments if they are to be most effective.

Drug Courts

Boot camps for serious youthful offenders, who would otherwise be incarcerated, obviously do not meet the needs within the most suitable environment. As a pre-trial

intervention or diversion in most models, the Juvenile Drug Court is a model that we can learn quite a bit from as well. The models are fairly consistent, and they intervene with drug- and crime-involved youth using a combination of treatment, skills, family strengthening, and accountability, all in the environment within which the youth normally functions. This approach has thus far been widely popular, spreading in use throughout the country. And while different from our NJ-DRC population because of the place the intervention is located in the system, lessons learned from drug courts can help us better understand how to help youth generally. This gives credence to the argument that a youth must be served in his environment, addressing his entire ecology and the needs within it.

The first Drug Court opened in Miami in 1989, and since then there have been 1,500 adult drug courts opened nationwide. It was initiated as a pre-trial diversion to end the “drug-crime nexus,” according to Barnes-Miller and Miller (2009, p. 351). They note that all Drug Courts require hearings, use graduated sanctions that are less intense as the offender improves, and “aim to reduce the prevalence of substance abuse for non-violent offenders” (2009, p. 351). The first Juvenile Drug Courts opened in 1995 and 1996, and the models vary a bit by eligibility, treatment modality, and intensity (Barnes-Miller & Miller, 2009). By the end of 2004 there were more than 357 Juvenile Drug Courts implemented, and by 2009 there were more than 500 (Hiller, Malluche, Bryan, DuPont, Martin, Abensur, Leukefeld, & Payne, 2010; Halliday-Boykins, Schaeffer, Henggeler, Chapman, Cunningham, Randall, & Shapiro, 2010).

The Drug Court model, much like a Day Center, is one that includes treatment coordination and extensive monitoring. Juvenile Drug Courts differ from adult Drug Courts in some ways. They generally require parent involvement and target the personal,

social, and home life of the youth. School performance is a key element, and the system treats the juvenile as a client, rather than as an offender. The point is much like that of the juvenile system more generally, to rehabilitate and divert youth, and to address some of the ecology of the youth, instead of simply determining guilt and punishment (Barnes-Miller & Miller, 2009), while not sacrificing accountability.

According to Rodriguez and Webb (2004), the Juvenile Drug Court model adds a few elements: family needs, addressing negative peers, supervision for the youth and family, and multi-system coordination. Sloan, Smylka, and Rush note that the point is to reach effective dispositions in a system that is rehabilitation-driven, so the Juvenile Drug Court model is one that seeks to combine monitoring with a hands-on team approach of the courtroom workgroup, while at the same time taking a treatment approach. It involves judicial activism, in which the judge as team leader is the key to the model (2004). They go on to state the goals of drug court:

1. To provide immediate intervention, treatment, and structure in the lives of juveniles who use drugs through ongoing, active oversight and monitoring;
2. To improve juveniles' level of functioning in their environment, address problems that contribute to their use of drugs, and develop/strengthen their ability to lead crime-free and drug-free lives;
3. To provide juveniles with skills that will aid them in leading productive substance-free and crime-free lives, including skills that relate to their educational development, self-worth, and capacity to develop positive relationships in the community;
4. To strengthen families of drug-involved youth by improving their capability to provide structure and guidance to their children; and
5. To promote accountability of both juvenile offenders and those who provide services to them (Sloan, Smylka, & Rush, 2004, p. 96).

Henggeler and colleagues point out some other program features, including frequent urinalysis, incentives, and sanctions consistently used in a timely manner

(Henggeler, Halliday-Boykins, Cunningham, Randall, Shapiro & Chapman, 2006). With all of the available elements, there seems some program fidelity, since there is a base model that is generally observed. According to Hiller and colleagues, there has been a general dearth of literature reviewing their success, but studies so far “show promise for effecting positive outcomes in the lives of youth and their families” (Hiller et al, 2010).

In a 2004 study, Rodriguez and Webb conducted a three-year evaluation of an Arizona model examining recidivism and drug use. They included tests of guardian stability, education, and legal variables, and used urinalysis and self-report tools to determine recidivism and drug use. They found that Juvenile Drug Court participants were less likely to recidivate than a control group. Also, school enrollment reduced recidivism. As is common, they found that youth with the more extensive delinquent histories were most likely to recidivate. The biggest indicator that showed promise for this particular study was that “Drug Court participants were significantly less likely than youth in the comparison group to commit a delinquency offense once in treatment” (Rodriguez & Webb, 2004, p.306). This means that while in the program they were less likely to be involved in additional criminal activity.

Sloan, Smylka, and Rush compared youth in Juvenile Drug Courts and youth in the Adolescent Substance Abuse Program [ASAP] (2004). The difference between the two populations, as both programs were Family Court functions, was that ASAP was for the lower-level drug offenders, and if a youth failed ASAP, he might have been referred to the Drug Court. This means that youth in the Drug Courts were older, had more felonies, and had more (and more serious) drug use. Accordingly, they found that the Drug Court youth were more likely rearrested within 24 months of termination and failed

faster, but with no random assignment – the worse youth fared worse as would be expected.

The most positive finding of the study, though, was that there was no significant difference in re-offending for the two groups. This means that, once controlling for other variables such as age, gender and race, successful completers of the Drug Court were as likely to stay out of trouble (not recidivate) as lower-level offenders who went through the ASAP program (Sloan, Smylka, & Rush, 2004 (Sloan, Smylka, & Rush, 2004)). The lack of difference in recidivism rates for these two groups is actually a positive and important finding. More serious youth can have similar outcomes to youth at earlier points in the system such as those in ASAP, so this is a step toward bridging the gap and applying an intervention model for use the next level up in the hierarchy of offending severity.

In a more complicated study, Henggeler and colleagues (2006) compared several permutations of the Juvenile Drug Court Model. They compared outcomes for 161 youth in four possible conditions: 1) Traditional Family Court; 2) Juvenile Drug Court; 3) Juvenile Drug Court with Multi-Systemic Therapy; and, 4) Juvenile Drug Court with Multi-Systemic Therapy and Contingency Management. Multi-Systemic Therapy is seen as an evidence-based therapy that shows long-term decreases associated with drug use and delinquency – they used it here to see if it would enhance Drug Court Outcomes. Additionally, they used Contingency Management, which is an approach with a strong focus on substance abuse such as “drug refusal skills” (Henggeler, et al, 2006).

To determine youth outcomes, Henggeler and colleagues used urinalysis and self-report for drug use, and examined re-arrest and self-report for criminality. Additionally,

they asked both the mental health caregivers and the participants about mental health symptoms. In the first 2 groups, there was little difference in criminality, but the Drug Court youth had lower rates of anti-social behavior more generally. This means that Drug Court by itself had some effect on deviance. In addition to these findings, they more interestingly found that “the use of evidence-based treatments within the Drug Court context improved youth substance-related outcomes,” though MST did not lead to any reductions in re-arrest (Henggeler, et al, 2006, p. 51). Self reported delinquency showed real differences between Family Court and Drug Court even though the arrest data did not, and this suggests that the lack of findings may have been due to surveillance effects.

This leads the reader to believe that Drug Court can improve anti-social behavior generally, and adding therapeutic approaches to the model can improve substance abuse outcomes – yet another anti-social behavior. From over a century of research and work with juvenile delinquency as its own field, it is commonly accepted that reducing deviance is directly linked to reducing related offending. Any reduction in deviance can be seen as a victory.

Moving further away from criminality, and discussing general risk-taking behavior, Ruiz, Stevens, Fuhrman, Bogart and Korchmaros examined the relationships between delinquency, substance use, and risky sexual behavior (2009). Using the 16 strategies that were laid out by the Department of Justice in 2003 for use by Juvenile Drug Courts, the study focused on an Arizona program. For three nights each week, the program used intensive case management, parent training, and individual and family therapy. Their findings showed that long-term treatment and involvement had the best outcomes. “Youth participating in the Drug Court evidenced positive changes in

substance-related issues, delinquency, and juvenile justice involvement, and sexual risk behaviors” (2009, p.416). Again, these findings suggest that taking the Drug Court model and offering more specific therapeutic services can lead to overall reductions in delinquency and deviance. The model can help youth improve in all realms if in fact an ecological approach is taken, which is the hope with the DRC model.

In the Hiller, Malluche, Bryan, DuPont, Martin, Abensur, Leukefeld, and Payne’s study (2010), they found once again that program completers had lower recidivism than program dropouts. Their study examined behaviors during the program for up to one year and looked at three urban Juvenile Drug Courts. Their findings suggest that, once again, finishing the program keeps youth out of trouble for the duration of their involvement (Hiller, et al, 2010).

Finally, Halliday-Boykins, Schaffer, Henggeler, Chapman, Cunningham, Randall, and Shapiro (2010) examined the trajectories of marijuana use for Juvenile Drug Court involved youth. They compared three conditions: 1) Juvenile Drug Court; 2) Juvenile Drug Court with Multi-Systemic Therapy; and 3) Juvenile Drug Court with Multi-Systemic Therapy and Contingency Management. Much like the findings discussed above in an earlier study, there were definitely differential effects. A major finding was that youth whose parent or guardian reported they had used marijuana were themselves nine times more likely to test positive for drugs during the programs. There was also a stronger effect for this variable than there was for youth drug use or youth arrest history in predicting continued marijuana use. This reveals an important fact: parents must buy into the Drug Court Model and Multi-Systemic Therapy in order for positive effects to occur for youth. Having the family involved in these models is apparently key in bringing

it all together in successful models, and presents a sharp contrast to their absence in less successful programs such as boot camps.

“The lack of family involvement in Juvenile Drug Courts is a major contributor to treatment failure and ... effective family interventions are one of the most frequent needs among Juvenile Drug Court Programs” (Halliday-Boykins, et al, 2010, p. 327). The parent must set an example for the youth, restrict youth access to drugs, be more competent and mindful parents, and be more involved in the Juvenile Drug Court process; these things are most likely for parents that are not drug-involved.

Overall, then, the findings tell us some promising things about Juvenile Drug Courts, and intervening in the delinquent trajectory more generally. First it is evident that these Courts are based on the adult model, but add to it elements fundamental to the juvenile justice system. Additionally, studies show promise in that program completion can reduce in-program and after-program deviance and delinquency, and in-program and after-program substance use. These effects are also seen more prominently when the Drug Court Model is further enhanced with additional therapeutic, and therefore rehabilitative, elements from evidence-based programs outside of and in addition to the Drug Court Model, such as Multi-Systemic Therapy and/or Contingency Management. The Juvenile Drug Court model shows evidence that taking a full-ecology approach to working with delinquent youth is effective in reducing deviance and delinquency, and it is hoped that this can be taken to the next level to help youth that are more deeply entrenched in the system with more serious offending histories and more serious immediate offenses.

Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

Ultimately, it is important to find a model that can work for all youth, but because of the variation in criminal involvement, and in individual backgrounds, that model must be one that can be reactive to individual needs, and can obviously teach the youth how to survive in the real world. Boot camps have shown immediate reductions in behavior problems, but not in the real world afterwards; and Drug Courts show that when we work with less serious youthful offenders in their world and work to improve their constellation of life, we can find success. This next step may be found with Multi-Systemic Therapy, an ecological approach that has shown promise in dealing with various types of youthful offenders, including those in need of reentry interventions and programming.

Multi-systemic therapy (MST) comes from a social-ecological model, cited in Huey, Henggeler, Brondino, and Pickrel (2000), and stems from Bronfenbrenner's 1979 model of human development that posits that problems come from various systems within the person's social environment. The nine principles of MST "aim to impact antisocial behavior by altering key aspects of the youth's social context in ways that promote pro-social behavior, rather than anti-social behavior" (p.452).

On the family level, MST seeks to improve structure, skills and resources, and monitoring and discipline of the youth. On the peer level, MST aims to promote youth associations with pro-social peers, while at the same time giving the families the tools to interrupt the associations the youth has with negative, anti-social peers (Huey, et al, 2000). "Social ecological models are defined by their understanding delinquent behavior as a product of multiple, oftentimes interactive, individual, familial, social, and cultural

determinants” (Hunter, Gilbertson, Vedros, & Morton, 2004, p. 179). The model is one that takes a youth in his own context and aims to treat the ills in all of his systems. It empowers the youth and his support system with the tools to solve problems on their own, rather than always needing outside help managing in tough situations.

Various studies have examined the successes in using MST to treat serious and violent youthful offenders who need the system’s attention. It is a treatment modality that adapts well to various applications and various offender types. For example, Hunter and colleagues found that MST reduces hospital stays and incarceration of youth, while at the same time lowering the long-term overall costs of care. Their study was specific to sex-offending juveniles, and shows that MST can be specialized and tailored to different seriously aggressive youth populations (Hunter, et al, 2004).

This individualized approach may be effective in reducing short and long-term recidivism in serious, violent youth. Schaeffer and Borduin (2005) studied the effects of MST on two groups in a randomized clinical trial of MST treatment versus individual treatment (IT), with a 13 year follow up on recidivism. Overall they found that just 50% of the MST group re-offended, and 81% of the IT youth re-offended. Additionally, the MST group had 54% fewer arrests, 57% fewer days incarcerated, and 43% fewer days on adult probation. These 176 youth in the study were all serious and violent offenders, where they had all been incarcerated before they were assigned to this study, and they averaged 3.9 felony arrests for a felony, with half having an arrest for a violent offense. Their findings show that MST is “effective in preventing longer term criminal activity among serious juvenile offenders because such youth are... at the greatest risk for committing additional serious crimes” (Schaeffer & Borduin, 2005, p. 445). There were

significant differences in survival times, and when examining survival times by specific crime type, they found that there was lower risk for re-arrest for youth that received MST after a violent crime, a non-violent crime, or a drug crime. The broad-spectrum of offenders with which it is effective suggests that this a very useful approach in understanding similar components in DRCs and other programs.

Similarly, Glisson and colleagues studied 615 youth randomly assigned to MST, ARC (availability, responsiveness, and continuity), MST with ARC, or the control group receiving traditional interventions, in order to understand the effects of various individual approaches with youth. ARC is a community-based mental health services management system that aims to assist rural communities in delivery of needed services. In this study, they followed six-month treatment outcomes and 18-month custody follow-ups to gauge youth success. They found that there was a reduction in problem behavior that was most noted in the group that had MST with ARC, and the same group entered state-custody out-of-home placements less frequently – 16%, compared to 34% in the control group. The researchers noted that the rural areas made service delivery harder due to isolation, making it difficult to establish effective and supportive community-based services. “Youth who received MST in the ARC counties improved [clinically] at a faster rate during treatment, resulting in statistically and clinically significant six-month treatment outcomes” (Glisson, Schoenwald, Hemmelgarn, Green, Dukes, Armstrong, & Chapman, 2010, p.547). This further demonstrates that MST, as well as other individualized interventions, can be tailored to fit the needs of different youth and different communities by augmenting it with other evidence-based systems.

Huey, Henggeler, Brondino, and Pickrel (2000) examined more than whether or not MST works; they went further to test what the mechanisms of change were, an important component for filling the existing arsenal of approaches with more tools for change. They found specifically that the more a therapist adheres to MST, the better the outcomes are in the family functioning. Further, they found that not only was family investment important, but also that having a family come to participate but then not engaging them actually led to negative outcomes. Buy-in is important at all levels of MST in ensuring positive outcomes. And empowering (Hunter, et al, 2004), engaging (Huey, et al, 2000), and strengthening families are all important elements of the success of MST.

Finally, in an examination of existing research, Woolfenden, Williams and Peat conducted a meta-analysis of existing studies of family and parenting interventions more generally (2002). They compiled data on 749 youth from 8 studies on youth 10 to 17 years old. “The evidence suggests that family and parenting interventions for juvenile delinquents and their families have beneficial effects on reducing time spent in institutions and their criminal activity” (Woolfenden, et al, 2002, p.251). While the study was mostly focused on youth with conduct disorder combined with delinquency, and MST was one of many approaches that they examined, they found that MST specifically reduced self-reported delinquency, and family-centered interventions generally led to less time in custody, reduced risk of re-arrest, reduced rate of re-arrest, and, surprisingly, reduced sibling delinquency. Woolfenden and colleagues cement for researchers the need to focus on the role of the family in the success of youth in the long term. This element

was missed by the Boot Camps, but was an important piece according to the research on Juvenile Drug Courts, so this further bolsters the ideals of the ecological approach.

“By treating target youth in groups with their anti-social peers, or simply ignoring the peer context altogether, current interventions often fail to alter the anti-social trajectory...or exacerbate it” (Huey, et al, 2000, p.462). The trajectory must be addressed in all of its forms, and interventions must take into account all of what goes into the decision by a youth to continue down a delinquent career path, or to make the transition toward becoming a conforming citizen and adult.

Summary Points for Intermediate Sanctions

From this review, there are elements found in Boot Camps that are less than helpful:

- Violence
- Fear
- Regimen without re-entry planning and services
- Net-widening

On the other hand some things hold promise. Multi-Systemic Therapy and Juvenile Drug Courts offer various useful elements:

- Immediate interventions
- Constant monitoring
- Dealing with the causes of deviance
- Avoidance skills
- Family inclusion and structure
- Accountability
- School enrollment
- Interventions beyond the first offense

- Combining effective interventions
- Use of incentives
- Promoting pro-social peer associations
- Giving caregivers an invested role
- Drug-free families
- Community-based services
- Treating the entire ecological system of the youth
- Family and parenting interventions

The studies range in findings, but the general theme is that serious, repetitive, and even violent offending can be amenable to treatment with the right approaches, and non-criminal deviance can also be reduced. It is invariably important that the system address the youth in his own environment. Studies of effectiveness of similar programming for more serious offenders gives more reason for us to believe these interventions can be effective for deeper-end youth.

Intensive Aftercare and Community-Based Services

Moving beyond what is known about intermediate sanctions for lesser offenders including boot camps, drug courts, and MST, let us now turn to the state of knowledge on dealing with youth after institutionalization, like the population of interest here. Bouffard and Bergseth (2008) point out that there are two main components to aftercare for institutionalized youth that make it important for youthful offenders. These are community restraint in the form of surveillance and interventions that come into play as needed services, and both components act in models such as the Intensive Aftercare Program and the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative. The consensus appears to be that there must be more than just community restraint alone. Aftercare and

reintegration programs seem to be the key to successful reentry, and positive effects have been found for many elements, such as mentoring and other services.

Fagan (1990) pointed out the need for attention to rehabilitation and reintegration because in the 1980s many suggested that rehabilitation of juvenile courts was not appropriate for more serious and violent young offenders. This came on the heels, as he points out, of the “nothing works” mindset of the late 1970s and the idea set forth in the 1980s media of the youthful super-predators. He pushed in his writings for policy and politics to look at serious youthful offenders and find ways to help them learn to live within society and how to reduce their threat to public safety. Fagan concurs that intensive supervision for serious delinquents cannot be enough (1990).

Intensive programming in the community, with or without institutionalization as a precursor, can frequently lead to surveillance effects. Two things come from intensive supervision in the community according to Sontheimer and Goodstein (1993). First the hope is that intensive supervision will offer rehabilitation, with lower offending in the hope that aftercare reduces one’s propensity to be delinquent as a possible link to that rehabilitation. The second, and sometimes less desirable, outcome is that there will be what is referred to as a system-response effect, where youth have few chances to reoffend due to the quick response of a system that is watching them so closely. If there are system response findings only, you have a deterrent effect, rather than a rehabilitative one that we would hope for (Sontheimer & Goodstein, 1993).

Mentoring in many studies has been found to have a more rehabilitative effect, rather than deterrent effect, as it addresses acceptance, learning, and control factors. Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring (2004) had success with their intensive aftercare

program that incorporated a heavy dose of mentoring, since youth were always going to go back to the same sullied environments. If the program could help youth goal-set, and seek out options for non-criminal behaviors and lifestyles with the support from members of their own communities, they might adopt new behaviors. They might then be rehabilitated, changing their inclinations, rather than simply deterred because they are being watched by system representatives (AIM, 2004). The success of their program was measured and they found mentoring to be a key component among many. Youth participating in the program had fewer arrests and convictions, longer survival times, and less serious offenses when they did get into trouble.

Even earlier than Indiana's attempts, OJJDP decided that with rising juvenile crime and rising rates of youth institutionalization, there was a great need for more effective reentry services, and they acted to develop a model starting back in 1987. They then selected four states as demonstration locations for a program called Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) in the early 1990s. The model basics were founded on the need to plan for reentry transition, starting while incarcerated, and the program focused on the youth with the highest rates of recidivism and the highest needs that complicate successful reentry (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994). They used strain, social learning and social control theories, and worked to progressively teach youth responsibility while providing services, as needed, during community adjustment. Family and community perspectives were fully involved in the individualized case plans, and there were intensive levels of supervision and services provided by workers with small caseloads. They attempted to carefully balance incentives and sanctions (Weibush, McNulty, & Le, 2000; Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994), and link community resources and social networks

(Wiebush et al, 2000). In keeping with growing consensus in the field, they assumed that focusing solely on social control was not going to work, and that they must also include service provision (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994).

The point of IAP was that the programs would be “providing enhanced ... programming during both the institutional and aftercare phases and creating a blend of control and treatment strategies during aftercare” (Wiebush et al, 2000, p. 10). And the goals were to protect the public, maintain individual accountability standards, and offer treatment and supportive services (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994). However, many programs lacked complete fidelity to the model. There were varied offense types from one site to another, so it was being used for youth with varying behaviors. And while using structured and gradual release most sites offered some form of day-center treatment and structure, there was not much consistency in program implementation, as youth were monitored anywhere from daily to once per month depending on their location. The services during the aftercare are supposed to vary from one case to the next needing different services. Overall they served the purpose even when lacking model integrity as such, as they all referred to services through community networks and service providers. For example, in Virginia they even created new services where they were needed. Generally, youth were more likely to have received more and varied services than control groups that received traditional care. During the first month of aftercare, youth received varied services based on needs, including education, employment, mental health/ counseling, substance addiction treatment, and life skills training (Weibush et al, 2000). This brings out the point that while recidivism rates were not lowered by the programs as measured, there was little fidelity and, therefore, it is difficult to say that the IAP model

should be deserted when findings are based on assessment of inconsistent and sometimes improperly implemented programs.

In an assessment of similar programming, Bouffard and Bergseth (2008) set out to compare process elements and outcomes, measuring also service delivery, since model integrity issues are cited in many studies, including the above implementation descriptions cited above. They looked at differences in total contact, referrals, and services. In the first six months after reentry, 37% of their experimental group had official contact, and 28.6% had official criminal contact, while 49% of the control group had official contact, and 42.9% of the control group had official criminal contact. They state that "...the preliminary results... provide reason to speculate that the addition of comprehensive reentry services can improve both intermediate adjustment to the community and success in desisting from crime and delinquency, even for relatively serious juvenile offenders" (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008, p. 315).

It seems overall from their assessment of IAP and similar models, that any reentry services, whether Day Reporting or otherwise, may be more effective than nothing in a youth's long term outcomes such as time to failure and likelihood of failure (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008). In agreement is Jeffrey Fagan, who pointed out that according to decades of research "...the early period after released from secure care seems to be critical in avoiding crime" (1990, p. 237), as the highest failure rates are found in the first year. Reintegration and related programming is the key, and the combination of elements is the only black box that still needs to be uncovered and understood. IAP and similar models must be examined with more rigorous research as well before a true decision can be reached regarding their impacts.

Fagan suggests an integrated theory of strain, control, and learning theories in the Violent Juvenile Offender (VJO) programs, which “emphasized the development of social bonds and the “unlearning” of delinquent behaviors along with development of social competence and skills applicable to a natural neighborhood setting” (1990, 239). While four sites implemented this model suggested by Fagan, only two were found to have strong program integrity. The two strongest models, in turn, found significant differences between experimental and control groups for numbers of re-arrests and days to first arrest, in favor of the experimental group in this study (Fagan, 1990).

The Day Reporting Center model, or any other model that follows, can take this next step on the same path as AIM, IAP and VJO, where very different community models took advantage of strengths in their neighborhoods and made them available to youth. Aftercare programs should all include the elements identified in both intermediate sanctions and the intensive aftercare models: education, employment and life skills, using the strengths of their home communities to succeed on their own turf.

Understanding what approaches work for the most serious youthful offenders is important in the various contexts of juvenile reentry planning. Basing a strategy on what is known to work is important, but it is important to also come to terms with the notion that many offenders are recidivists, regardless of the programming, interventions, and various other steps taken to avoid this fact. As such, other ways must be sought to attain some measure of success.

Crime Seriousness and Specialization

If youth do in fact continue to participate in delinquent behavior, can programs increase their survival time or reduce the seriousness of the criminal involvement? If youth are going to keep being delinquent, we should at least be able to change their trajectories, through proper transitions, to reduce the seriousness of the offense categories in which they choose to participate.

There is some debate as to whether or not the crime type matters in the progression of offense within an individual criminal career or if there is even selection that occurs. For some criminologists, delinquency is delinquency, and being involved is all that matters, since there are likely no patterns to be found. For others, the crime type that one engages in is just as significant as the criminal trajectory itself. For these theorists, offenders select the types of crimes in which they will engage. To the extent that that is the case, perhaps our interventions can change the patterns of serious offending to trajectories of lesser harm.

First we must decide whether or not selection of crime type exists in the first place, in order to determine if there might be affected change through interventions such as DRCs and specific models of such. The literature surrounding crime-type continuity, and more specifically crime type “specialization,” varies in its findings, which are frequently dependent upon the statistical methods employed. There has been research in the last four decades that further our knowledge in the area of criminal careers, and can inform sentencing and offender-related policies. And if such specialization occurs, rather than random offending as proposed by the General Theory of Crime, then our interventions must be geared to reduction of severity of offense and deemed at least

partly successful if they achieve that goal. There must be a finding of specialization if we are to assume that we can change criminal choices, rather than non-specialization where it is simply a choice to be criminal at all.

Early on in specialization research, Blumstein and Cohen proposed that it was important to know about crime type selectivity, because “such knowledge about individual criminal careers is basic to our understanding of individual criminality, and in particular, to our understanding of how various social factors operate on the individual either to encourage or inhibit criminal activity” (1979, p.561). These researchers point out that we should look at the burglary rate for burglars, the theft rate for thieves, and so forth.

The research on this specialization goes down two possible paths. As Lo, Kim, and Cheng aptly point out (2008), it is possible to look at either probabilistic specialization or sequential specialization, and it seems most studies to date have done one or the other. Probabilistic specialization posits that we can predict the probability of committing another similar offense from a history of offense choices. Alternately, sequential specialization aims to predict what the next type of crime an individual will commit based on the knowledge of what his last offense was. And Lo and his colleagues point out that the “analysis of individual criminal careers has generated empirical support for” both types of specialization (2008, p.347).

In an early and rudimentary study, using official FBI arrest records of index offenses in Washington DC in 1973, Blumstein and Cohen used ANOVA to look at the adult arrest rates and gauge how they vary by age, crime type, number of priors, and time at risk. It has long been recognized that criminal activities vary in intensity by age of the

offender; therefore, they controlled for this and other relevant factors. Additionally, using cohort data from Washington DC in the 1960s, they found that “crime type is the only variable that is significant in determining individual arrest rates” (1979, p. 575).

Within this same examination, they found that arrest rates increase with age for a few specific crime types. Additionally, they found that there were higher arrest rates for those who chose to commit larceny and burglary, and the lowest arrest rate for those who committed aggravated assault. They did in fact find crime type specialization, with one’s highest rates within a particular type of crime, though there was “still substantial switching between consecutive arrests” (Blumstein & Cohen, 1979, p.581). The most specialized group they found were those who commit property offenses, and they also found that the drug offenders committed a large portion of the property offenses. The most important general finding of this study for the current endeavor is that there was some tendency to specialize within crime types, rather than just in specific criminal acts.

Osgood and Schreck took on the question of criminal stability in 2007, using item-response theory measurement through a multi-level regression model.

Using data from three different studies, [they] found substantial levels of specialization in violence, considerable stability in specialization over time, and several significant and relatively consistent relationships of specialization to explanatory variables such as gender, parental education, and risk-seeking (Osgood & Schreck, 2007, p.274).

Calling into question the General Theory of Crime and Social Control Theory, these authors put forth that studies show different specialization types for adults and juveniles. They note that if in fact specialization exists, it also might be possible to improve system approaches through detention and treatment policies and practices.

Osgood and Schreck examined probabilistic specialization in overall offense patterns. They began with the idea that there must be meaningful individual differences in offenders' tendencies to commit violent offenses as opposed to non-violent ones (2007). Across three studies, they found that those they designated the violent offenders committed 55 to 79% of the violent offenses found in the samples, while this group only committed 15 to 34% of the non-violent offenses. Similarly, they found that non-violent offenders committed just 8 to 26% of the violent offenses, and from 53 to 77% of the non-violent offenses. These group differences were also statistically significant.

In two of the three datasets, measures were made at two different times, and they found substantial probabilistic specialization. Both of those studies also showed significant measures of stability in the violent offenders over time (Osgood & Schreck, 2007). These findings convincingly support the idea that there is both overall specialization in patterns in offending, as well as continuous specialization from the first measurement to the next, or sequential specialization. Hence an effective intervention may be one that is capable of helping shift crime choices to those that are less severe after treatment. Tying this in to Life Course Theory, this becomes a way to change one's criminal choices and trajectories.

The transition from serious offenses is really the hope as we seek successful interventions. In 1988, Tontodonato discussed the transition from crime types. She looked at both arrest rates and transition from one arrest to the next in a study of juvenile offenders. She cites the Panel on Research on Criminal Careers of 1986, which "suggested that our knowledge in this area is incomplete in that factors such as drug use, unstable employment, early onset of delinquency, and high frequency of prior offending

are potentially important correlates of high-rate offending” (Tontodonato, 1988, p.440). In her study, she used Markov’s transitional model to study the shift from one event to the next, each being a criminal event in linear succession, or in the Markovian sense, from ‘State A’ to ‘State B.’ Tontodonato examined the likelihood that the transition, much like that which is hoped for with interventions for serious youthful offenders, would lead to a different type of offense at ‘State B.’ She points out that in the ten years since the Blumstein and Cohen study (1979), research supported variables such as age, crime type, and record length affecting transitions in much the same manner as they effect individual crime rates.

In applying a Cox Proportional Hazards Model to transition rates in this study of sequential specialization, Tontodonato found some interesting things about crime type continuity. First, she found that if the youth used a weapon, they were less likely to switch to larceny; second, early onset of delinquency leads to more subsequent arrests and higher arrest rates; and third, that an earlier third arrest meant a higher rate and number of arrests in total by one’s 18th birthday, especially for serious offense types (Tontodonato, 1988). She found some support for both sequential and probabilistic specialization herein, demonstrating overall the connection between crime type, life trajectory, and the possibility of a transition. This means that there is a relationship between one’s crime-specific choices and the trajectory on which he is traveling.

More recently, Deane, Armstrong, and Felson (2005) used a marginal logit model to demonstrate that the reason some research fails to show real support for specialization is due to the fact that all criminal activity is to some degree correlated, and this must be controlled in an accurate model. They point out first that there has been some research

supporting a tendency to specialize, but that none of the researchers can come to an agreement about the degree of specialization that occurs, or what the characteristic differences are between different types of offenders. In controlling for the co-variation of all criminal activity they “show that violent offenders are more likely to engage in additional violent offenses, non-violent offenders are more likely to engage in additional non-violent offenses” (p.956). The statistics used do in fact make a difference, and when we control for the interrelation between different types of offending is controlled, we find that there is support for the notion of specialization, and therefore criminal trajectory patterns.

While the General Theory of Crime posits that there is versatility because it is about social control preventing any deviance rather than about crime type, some studies do in fact show that there is some crime type predictability (Dean, et al, 2005). And if we can predict crime type, then some rationale must exist for different causal mechanisms. Deane and colleagues counter the argument that crime choice can be explained by environment and opportunity, in that the evidence of criminal versatility is “consistently flawed” in methodology, and the research is then biased to finding for support of the General Theory of Crime, and not specialization (2005).

Using the AddHealth survey of 7th through 12th grade students, Dean and his colleagues used a categorical measure of offending, rather than frequency, and the baseline model included family and demographic characteristics. They found that violent offenses had a positive effect of two to seven times in magnitude, increasing the probability of another violent offense ever occurring. “Non-violence dramatically increases the odds on all non-violent offenses” as well (Dean, et al, 2005, p. 976).

Interestingly, they considered armed robbery a 'bridge offense' including both property and violence, and as such found it had an equal effect on the odds of violent and non-violent other offenses.

In addition to other relevant findings, they generally found support for specialization, at least in violent versus non-violent offending.

[Their] results imply that violent offenders are different, and therefore that some of the causes of their behavior are likely to be different. In addition, [they] find that the effects of social-demographic variables vary in strength and even direction, depending on the specific offense. The results suggest that some special causal processes are involved in specific offenses and that we ought to be more cautious about making sweeping generalization about the effects on crime or violent crime (Deane, et al, 2005, p.983).

There are various findings here that support the conclusion that we must further investigate crime specialization over criminal versatility. These findings tell us that if there is specialization rather than versatility, the system must address the crime choices that lead youth down these differing paths, or trajectories, and the interventions that can interrupt those routes.

Of interest here is specifically whether we can use these interventions to interrupt the pathways of serious offending for youth after incarceration. In studying 3,068 male sexual assault offenders in England and Wales in 1973, with a tracking period of 1963 to 1994, Escarela and colleagues found 14.1% were reconvicted of a sexual offense, while 31.2% were reconvicted of a different type of offense entirely. They concluded after lengthy analysis that they were not beyond hope, and that "young, chronic offenders are recovered more quickly with any type of offense" (2000, p. 407). Age also was found to have a direct effect, where younger offenders were least likely to sexually re-offend.

Their study contributes to the state of knowledge on both amenability to rehabilitation and on crime types in that it acknowledges an ability to salvage young, serious offenders.

The ecology of the youth, as addressed by MST and other ecological approaches, is important in understanding specialization as well. McGloin, Sullivan, Piquero, and Pratt (2007) further the question by testing offense specialization against local opportunity, life structures, and environments. They point out that while much research supports crime type specialization over versatility, and that specialization diminishes over time, the reason why is unknown. With a Life Course approach, they attempted to measure if life circumstance had an effect on crime specialization using a diversity index. They in fact found that “short term changes in local life circumstances matter” (p. 335).

More specifically, and of further relevance, they found that variations were affected by “changes in community supervision, marriage, and drug and alcohol use” (McGloin, et al, 2007, p.335). Local life circumstances effected crime frequency too. This means that while a change in life circumstances can make the difference in crime type choice, perhaps we can change outcomes by working with youth through programs that change life circumstances in a way that helps make other choices available. If local life circumstances play a role in criminality, then perhaps it is possible that they play a role in desistance as well. Addressing a person’s ecology can do exactly that, especially when this intervention is delivered in an appropriate and effective way through in-community models.

In their study of sequential specialization in 2008, Lo, Kim, and Cheng examined whether or not individual characteristics could help explain criminal specialization, and if so, can ‘crime 1’ in fact be used to help predict ‘crime 2.’ Using a Life Course

perspective as found above, they note that some research suggests criminal diversity from adolescent-limited offenders, and more specialization from life-course persistent offenders, the group more likely to be the target of deep end youth interventions.

In this study they looked at the sequential specialization model to look at the relationships between current and most recent offenses, as well as gender, location, education, race, and age. They found significant evidence that “offense specialization among this group of adult arrestees [18 to 25] was certainly supported by the evidence because the numbers of their past offenses of particular types significantly predicted their current offenses of same types” (Lo, et al, 2008, p. 360). These authors posit that this should effect sentencing policy, treatment approaches for drug offenders, and education, since it is most linked to declining criminality (Lo, et al, 2008).

Studies support a focus on crime offense specialization. First, there are several studies that show some measure of probabilistic prediction of offense type, where one offense type occurring increases the probability that one will commit a similar offense at some point in their criminal career. Second, there is limited but significant support for the sequential specialization of criminality. From one criminal event to the next, there is a predictable likelihood that it is going to be a similar crime type. If this is in fact the case, then we can fashion our approaches to offender treatment and sentencing in ways that might address the characteristics leading to these criminal choices. If crime type is predictable, then there can be some intervention targeted at those characteristics that lead to these events by attempting to facilitate transitions in the criminal trajectory. It is an opportunity to perhaps reduce the severity from the committing offense to the offense that occurs post-treatment through methods that address the ecology of serious delinquent

in a community setting. If in fact specialization does occur, this lends credence to the idea that the proper interventions might then reduce the seriousness of offense selection from pre-treatment to post-treatment offending.

Making the Connections

Youth coming out of Juvenile Justice Commitments such as Training Schools and residential programs are the same youth that can benefit the most from research into effective interventions for deep-end youth. They go into the Day Reporting Centers because they are the youth that are either embedded in criminal lifestyles or committing the most serious offenses. Known effective programs address the whole ecology, including education, positive peer associations, family issues, and employment that otherwise would not have been available to these youth. Meanwhile, Day Reporting Centers also work on individual deficiencies such as anger management and drug and alcohol dependence that keep youth from re-directing their deviant and delinquent trajectories. This study examines whether the DRC model functions in some of the same ways as do other intermediate interventions with lesser offenders, and looks at whether the model addresses the constellation of needs for a particular youth in his own environment. The benefits of this are suggested by the literature on intermediate sanctions, but the dearth of research on juvenile DRCs makes it unclear how DRCs fit into this picture.

It is hoped that we can take what is known about the system, what can work, and what is known about criminal careers and youthful offender trajectories, and put them together to create a more effective approach to serious delinquency. Exploring these

questions is possible by examining data that was collected and analyzed during the Juvenile Justice Commission contracted study of the DRCs in New Jersey. The existing literature on Juvenile DRCs thus far is limited at best, and does not provide the same level of comparisons or the extensive measures of program effect that will be used in the current examination.

DRCs have been around for some time for adults. The British developed their first adult model in the 1960s, but did not fully institute their use until the 1980s. The United States followed suit by opening the first stateside adult DRC in 1986 in Springfield, Massachusetts (Roy & Grimes, 2002; Marciniak, 1999). Little juvenile DRC evaluation research has been conducted, but there are some studies of the effectiveness with adults. As of 1998 there were about 114 adult DRC programs in the US, which "...vary in (a) selection criteria, (b) size, (c) type, (d) goals, (e) requirements, and (f) termination rates" (Bahn & Davis, 1998, p. 139).

Generally speaking, an adult DRC "...can be defined as a highly structured non-residential program utilizing supervision, sanction, and services coordinated from a central focus" (Roy & Grimes, 2002, p.44). Programs vary from one jurisdiction to the next: some are surveillance based, others treatment; most serve a primarily substance abusing clientele; all serve as diversion from jail or prison; some accept referrals only from court, others from parole boards and probation officers; and length of programming varies anywhere from 3 to 12 months (Roy & Grimes, 2002). The variation in program is also seen just as readily in their successful completion rates, varying from as low as 13.5% for one center studied in North Carolina (Marciniak, 1999; Marciniak, 2000), to 84% successfully completing in Florida (Roy & Grimes, 2002).

Another important point to take into account for this variation is that Day Reporting is a highly versatile system of interventions that can be used in various ways for different populations, with pre-trial, sentenced, and post-incarceration groups. For pre-trial release, it can be used to accomplish goals such as reduction in substance abuse, improvement in court appearance rates, and keeping offenders occupied to keep them out of trouble (McBride & VanderWaal, 1997; Roy & Grimes, 2002). If someone is found guilty, Day Centers are used in various ways: as a sole sentence, as a program that is enhances probation or intensive probation supervision, or as a post-release function with parole, each with varying degrees of success (Roy & Grimes, 2002; Mair, & Nee, 1992; Marciniak, 2000). The idea was that the close-contact relationships that develop in Day Reporting can result in deterrence and informal social control, and in reduced offending – rather than that effect being achieved by merely the increased supervision provided by the programs. In this case it was seen as an intermediate sanction for adult offenders, and while they had low success rates, such minimal positive response to programming was still considered a positive outcome. The high-risk offenders that they were placing were receiving the services that otherwise would have been provided inside of the prison, but at a lower cost, and in a community setting (Craddock, 2000). The researchers reported officials felt that if even a handful of the serious offenders benefited from the programming, it was doing its job. Also, the programs were extending the time it took to fail. Mair and Nee report of one Center in the United Kingdom that, because they were dealing with a very high-risk group, they would look at time to failure to see if there were any differences. They found that only 9% were reconvicted in the first 3 months, and 14% between 3 and 6 months, the point at which most DRC orders are completed, and

once they are out of the DRC they are much more likely to re-offend (Mair & Nee, 1992). One program reported that while in the Day Center, adult offenders were more likely to stay off of drugs, more likely to stay out of trouble, and less likely to miss court hearings (McBride & VanderWaal, 1997). For offenders in this program, the bigger problem was recognized as the reintegration after services ended. Community-based resources were not integrated into the services at the DRC, and the offender then was incapable of following treatment and other needs after services were shifted to the community.

One rather large study of Juvenile DRCs was undertaken by Fraser (2004). This study evaluated the effectiveness of the 24 Juvenile Structured Day Programs (JSDPs) at that time in North Carolina, where they selected 11 for analysis and 4 for in depth research. “The findings point to three conclusions: 1) JSDPs can fill an important gap in providing community-based services to adjudicated youth and youth at-risk of becoming involved in the juvenile justice system; 2) JSDPs can be cost-effective...” (Fraser, 2004, p. 7-8). Their study focused on the adjudicated youth that were served, though the programs also served others, as the programs were developed as part of an initiative to further develop alternative education around the state. From 2000 to 2004, one location served 176 youth and had a 69% successful discharge rate, with programs that included recreational outings and internal programming, intensive supervision at all times to prevent behavior problems, and sanctions, incentives, and monitoring as techniques for managing behavior. They offered:

Multi-faceted services addressing a multiplicity of needs...[including] academic programming and supplemental tutoring, behavior management, anger management, conflict resolution, substance abuse prevention education, violence prevention education, school counseling, cognitive-behavior therapy, individual and group mental health counseling, recreation, enrichment activities, parental

involvement, life/social skills, character education and computer literacy education (Fraser, 2004, p. 36).

The program served so many functions, that every youth could be addressed in his constellation of needs, and in the context of his environment. The juvenile DRC goes beyond what is offered for adults. In this model, it presents opportunities to pursue family involvement and other ecological approaches.

Overall, the adult DRCs show great versatility in use for various levels of offender, and with various program models. The interventions frequently included those that would address the entire constellation of needs for a serious adult offender, and the highest risk offenders saw some limited benefits from the programs. The juvenile evaluation shared here demonstrates that it is a model suitable for various issues and for various populations. It served some youth effectively and kept their re-offending low while they were in the program, while had some limited statistical effect improving other needs areas that also are known to reduce deviance generally, such as school enrollment and substance use desistance.

The limits of the existing research on juvenile DRCs necessitates a more rigorous examination of such interventions. In the literature on other sanctions, it is often evident which elements are most effective. Day Reporting includes some of those things, but not all. The DRC is one which provides various interventions that work among the intermediate sanctions such as substance abuse counseling, anger management programming, and employment counseling. However, it is not clear what role the other effective intermediate sanction elements are at work in the DRCs, such as family involvement, life skills, and social skills. At this point it is hoped that we can expand our

knowledge of the effects of this assemblage of interventions by examining both the program typologies as they relate to those offered by well-researched intermediate sanctions, as well as variant effects on youth outcomes beyond simple measures of recidivism, in a more rigorous, comparison-group study that goes beyond the available knowledge to establish what truly is known about intervening with the most serious juvenile offenders in community-based settings.

Because little research exists on juvenile DRCs and other deep-end interventions, it is important to understand what, if anything, is known about other sanctions and how they affect youth. Looking at sanctions, such as Boot Camps, Juvenile Drug Courts, Intensive Aftercare, and Multi-systemic Therapy, it is possible to learn which approaches, and which of their elements, may have an effect, positive or negative, on youth in different stages of the system. If in fact various interventions have different effects on deep-end youth, then perhaps by examining these new approaches more can be learned about what works, and why.

With this examination, it becomes clear that some interventions lead to greater degrees of success for youth in the earlier stages of delinquent careers. Programs such as drug courts have been subjected to evaluation and show that some components, such as adding case management or enhancing with MST, can increase overall success rates, or decrease in-program deviance, such as drug use. As suggested by Life Course theorists, explanations proposed for these successes include an ecological approach, such as that generally adopted by MST, or a case-by-case approach that is tailored to the needs of the individual offender such as that found in some drug courts – and perhaps found in other activities of this nature.

The ecological approach demonstrates that youth are best served by addressing the issues in a fuller way. The philosophy behind this, which is the foundation of Multi-Systemic Therapy, is that one can work with someone to deal with substance abuse problems, or anger problems, but one must do so in the context in which he faces those issues. If a problem includes the interaction with the family, then the family becomes part of the treatment group. The approach holds that addressing a youth's issues in an office or clinical setting does not help the person heal and learn how to deal with those difficulties in a realistic setting, nor does it help change the environment in which that problem exists.

Youth Drug Courts take a case-management approach in many successful programs, which acts much in the same ecological fashion. When an individual's needs are addressed via referral or direct services, there is a greater degree of individual success evidenced in lower recidivism and lower in-program technical violations, including substance violations. The needs-based approach seems to lead to higher rates of program compliance, program completion, and long-term success.

These examples stem from evaluations of intermediate sanctions intended for youth that have not been committed to state Training Schools, but they are also of value for understanding what approaches have met with success for youthful offenders generally. These elements, when examined more closely, resemble the approaches offered in varying levels at different programs, and may vary from one intervention strategy to the next.

Another point of interest for the effectiveness of these juvenile interventions is whether or not they can reduce offending severity for the worst juvenile offenders. If it is

possible to reduce the seriousness of offenses committed by using effective interventions, then perhaps there can be some measure of success, even if it is not to say one would completely desist from offending. The General Theory of Crime and Social Control Theory both posit that deviance is deviance, and that the type of offenses one engages in is less important than the fact that the person is being deviant. These theories then contend that there is no crime continuity, and thus one switches crime choice without discrimination, cafeteria style. Deviance is then inherently caused or is a result of a lack of control, rather than a specific type of deviance manifested by crime-type choices.

Alternately, many criminologists argue that there are specific crime trajectories within crime type choices. Once involved in a certain type of deviance, that person would then continue to be involved in similar, if not more serious, offenses. If this were the case, then further research might indicate strategies to change not only the likelihood of remaining criminal, but also reduce the seriousness of offenses one chooses and improving public safety at the same time. This second option leads one to believe that perhaps the right interventions may already be out there and in use.

METHODOLOGY

Rationale

Examining the reasons for the success of approaches such as drug court and MST for lower level delinquents, and the reasons for successes of approaches such as Day Reporting Centers for serious adult offenders may help in understanding the dynamics of effective reentry for serious youthful offenders. DRCs provide specific case management, serving individual needs to varying degrees based on the model utilized. While each has specific programming they were expected to offer, some variation occurred due to the model employed. This intensive programming, may work for the most serious juvenile offenders, aiding in the long-term understanding of how the system can help youth in the deepest end of the juvenile system, the over-arching goal of this research endeavor.

The objective is to first look at the effectiveness of the approaches in addressing serious delinquency by examining youth failure in terms of deviance and new offenses, and by examining youth successes in terms of increased community tenure and reduced offense seriousness when reoffending. Additionally, this study examines the types of youth involved and the types of programs that work best for them, navigating the programs and attempting to discern some basic program model types to see if there is a program approach best suited to deep end youth. I anticipate that the specified program interventions that mimic effective intermediate sanction elements and intensive aftercare interventions will result in reduced re-offending, improved survival times for these more serious offenders, and decreased severity of new offenses; and, second, that a typology might aid in assessing which types of programs are most rehabilitative for serious offending youth.

The Day Reporting Center Study

In order to examine the interventions suggested by research, data was obtained from the New Jersey Juvenile Day Reporting Center study. This study seems most appropriate due to the various approaches taken by the ten different centers, taking on intervention strategies and other activities in this same vein that represent some of the successful services in the literature reviewed here. The data were originally collected by researchers as a program evaluation. Up until 2005, NJ had 2 Juvenile DRC locations in urban areas, and then expanded the program to an additional 8 sites, the point at which the research team was brought on to evaluate the effects of this expansion. That year, Mercer Sullivan was contracted by the NJ Juvenile Justice Commission to evaluate the ten Juvenile Day Reporting Centers around NJ, including both old and new sites. In the course of that endeavor the research team collected information on all juveniles released from the New Jersey Training Schools during the test period, as well as information in interviews with staff regarding intervention strategies employed at the various sites.

Sampling

The population that was targeted were those youth released from the NJ Training School during two time periods, and resulted in four distinct groups. As the data collection was aimed at studying the pre- and post-expansion time periods, the two time periods were selected from distinct time frames. The first time frame was September 28, 2004, through March 31, 2005. All youth that were incarcerated by the state of NJ and then released during these time periods were included in the dataset for the program

evaluation. In both time periods some youth were sent to a DRC while many others were not, creating two groups within each time frame.

It is important to note that the assignment to receive the DRC treatment or not to receive that treatment program was not a random selection, as that was not possible for the evaluation study. Youth went to a DRC if they were released home to a city or town that had a program available. “In both periods, day reporting center participation has been concentrated in urban areas” explain Sullivan and colleagues in the unpublished report of the original evaluation (Sullivan, McCann, Angiello, & Veysey, 2008). The reason it was concentrated so heavily was that, first of all, the population of youth that are targeted for such re-entry planning is essentially low-income, inner city youth, who come from high-crime areas, and second, because when you have a concentration of needs, providing those services in a centralized location is the most economical use of available programming and dollars. The analysis creates controls for this issue, first through regression analysis to control for variation between the groups, second with a separate comparison between control sample members from time one and experimental group members from time two in which all from the same towns. If the programs are effective, then there would be a great difference between these control and treatment groups. This is done in order to eliminate a large portion of the selection bias expected from demographic differences.

The data from the NJ-DRC program evaluation is rich and can be examined here as an independent analysis because it lends itself to further, more in depth analysis considering the theoretical rationale for programmatic successes sought. While initially collected as a program evaluation by the research team, the data go beyond that purpose

and allow for this theoretical examination. It allows for a look beyond the actual DRCs in an evaluative endeavor and provides a window to test which elements, stemming from related theory and research, appear to work for these youth, and hopefully why they work.

Sites and Respective Interventions

The two locations that already existed were in Newark and Camden, the two highest crime areas in the state, as well as among the most densely populated with the some of the lowest income residents. Initiating programs in these locations made the most sense in light of the above points regarding concentration of needs. Information was collected on the original 2 sites, plus in the new sites located in Atlantic City, Elizabeth, Plainfield, Jersey City, Paterson, Freehold, Princeton, and an additional site in Camden.

Each program supervisor was interviewed to provide information regarding operating hours, program capacity, and individual elements of the interventions offered. In various forms, all ten sites offered education, whether with tutoring, GED programs, or school re-entry assistance for alternative or traditional schooling. All ten also offered job-seeking assistance, and many offered follow-up training on how to keep such a job by dressing appropriately, being respectful to supervisors, etc. Finally, another service that all ten sites met was that of social skills development. Many took the form of learning how to deal with social demands such as relationships with friends and families, or other life skills focal points such as general life skills.

Other needs areas were not served by all sites. Only half of the sites indicated that they actively engaged the youth in case management. In nine of the ten sites, there were

drug and substance abuse counseling and services rendered or referred, with some sites actually teaching drug abuse resistance, alcohol and drug use monitoring with breathalyzers and urinalysis, and one-on-one counseling. Also in nine sites there were anger management interventions, frequently fulfilling court-required programming for such. In eight sites physical and/or mental health services were offered, including counseling, referrals to medical practitioners, and assistance finding court-ordered related services. Finally, in eight of ten sites, legal services were offered, usually in the form of advocates for the youth that were present for all court hearings. Staff members that were appropriately trained would attend hearings to represent the youth's interests and to also report to the court on the youth's progress in his reentry services. Other ecological elements such as family involvement were attempted, but unsuccessfully.

Table 1: General Interventions Offered at DRCs (N=10 programs)

Intervention/Service	Number of Programs
Education	10
Case Management	5
Employment	10
Physical/Mental Health	8
Drug/Substance Abuse	9
Social Skills	10
Legal Services	8
Basic Needs	9
Anger Management	9

Source: Sullivan, et al, 2008

Table 1 gives a very generalized look at the elements at the programs. Overall the programs were intervening most in the areas of education, work, and substance abuse.

Not only are many of these areas critical to successful reentry, they are frequently areas

the court requires as set out in the standard or special conditions of parole or post-incarceration supervision. Others services were offered in different locations based on the needs of the youth attending, as well as the resources that were available at the program site.

Locations operated for up to 10 hours, though youth were required as few as 5 hours per week in some sites, and as many as 8 hours per week in other locations. If a youth had a job, his reporting requirements were accommodating to the job, hence the need for centers to remain open later than usual class and service hours. Additionally, all programs maintained site and sound separation for any adjoining programs conducted for adult offenders, as several in fact did this. All provided food during mealtimes as well, many commenting on the great food that was made available to youth. Staff members in most programs were bilingual – we found staff that spoke Spanish, Russian, and even Filipino. Programs accommodated as few as 5 youth at a time, to as many as 25, depending on the contract that was held for their location and on the needs of the community of youth they were serving.

All supervision and services offered to youth in Day Reporting Centers were in addition to those already being provided to both treatment group and control group youth through traditional post-incarceration supervision and traditional parole. In New Jersey, level of supervision is determined both by a youth's custody level at the time of his release and by the seriousness of his offense. All youth, however, are subject to the same standard conditions in Appendix B. These include staying out of trouble, reporting as required by the parole officer, attending school or being employed, drug testing, etc. (NJ Juvenile Justice Commission, 2005). Youth at DRCs were under tighter scrutiny for

maintaining these standards, as well as other requirements of their programs for attendance and participation.

Data Collection Methodology

In the course of this endeavor, the research team collected prior history and new offense data from the NJ Administrative Office of the Courts, via the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS). The resulting data yielded information for four groups:

1. Those that participated in the DRCs during the pre-expansion time frame (n=128);
2. Those youth released from the Training School during the pre-expansion time frame that did not attend a DRC (n=318);
3. Those that participated in the DRCs during the post-expansion time frame(173); and,
4. Those youth released from the Training School during the post-expansion time frame that did not attend a DRC (n=353).

Juvenile variables collected included:

Date of birth
 Gender
 Race
 Home county
 Date of intake to the DRC
 DRC attended
 Type of intake to DRC
 Incarceration location prior to their inclusion
 Date released from incarceration
 Type of release
 Number of disciplinary infractions
 Most severe committing offense
 Most severe prior offense
 Number of prior adjudications
 Number of aggressive or assaultive prior adjudications
 Type of discharge from the DRC
 Where new offense, date of incident

Type of new offense
Where new offense as adult, date of incident
Type of new adult offense

The follow-up data collection examined having a new offense docketed by the courts for juvenile or adult offenses. The follow-up period varied from 3 to 8 months post-release in the post-expansion group, and from 15 to 20 months for the pre-expansion group. This follow-up time period was based on the amount of time allowed by the funding agency to produce findings. While some researchers suggest that time at risk should not be included in a logistic regression, the planned analysis here (see Maltz, 1984), here I will control for it in different ways, through group creation based on time of follow-up for youth.

Research Questions

First, I examine here the effectiveness of the interventions by measuring both negative and positive measures of successful outcomes. It is proposed that if the model delivers effective intervention to high-risk youth offenders then Day Reporting Center participants will exhibit lower recidivism rates, and lower rates of parole violation, than those who did not participate. Second, it is proposed that if the model delivers effective intervention to high-risk youth offenders, then those youth who do reoffend will have longer survival times and will experience a reduction in the severity of offending after program release, compared to youth who did not participate in the intervention. In a separate vein, different types of programs are compared to one another on recidivism, parole violations, seriousness of offending, and survival times. It is possible that there might be program differences in outcome measures, suggesting one program model to be more effective in accomplishing these goals.

The question posed here is whether or not appropriate interventions improve the chances of success for juveniles. It is important to look at success in various ways, because using recidivism as a gauge of success presents a limited picture. Here, I first measure recidivism using a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not a new offense was docketed (in the juvenile system or the adult system) for the youth during the follow-up period.

I then compare youth using a dichotomous independent variable indicating program participation. While there are various levels of participation to consider (whether one is assigned and never shows up, whether one goes and does not participate, or even whether one goes and simply does not subscribe to the interventions offered), the current endeavor will use this simple dichotomy because the available data is limited in the consideration of levels of exposure to the treatment. Intensity and dosage of the treatment are important factors, but this is a known and accepted limitation of this data. For example, if a youth goes only once, his case will be in the treatment group with other youth who attended and took advantage of the services offered. This may in fact bias the findings in favor of no group difference. Notwithstanding this shortcoming, it is hypothesized here that youth in the treatment group will be less likely to have new offenses docketed in either the juvenile or the adult systems.

In addition to re-involvement in the juvenile justice system as a measure of success, I measure success in this analysis based on program compliance and/or violation of supervision. This would be another way to measure success of the intervention in that program compliance can be considered a form of conformity in addition to any violation of law. I measure violations of this sort with a dichotomous variable that indicates

whether or not a youth had a violation of parole during the follow up period. As above, in order to compare the outcomes based on the interventions, I compare these youth using the same dichotomous independent variable indicating program participation. It is hypothesized here that youth in the treatment group will be less likely to have a bench warrant issued for violation of parole. A finding in either direction may be telling to future research. The first possible outcome, rejecting the null hypothesis, would tell us that deviant behaviors are reduced by program participation. However, a finding of acceptance of the null here would tell us another important fact related to controlling for surveillance effects. As noted in the literature earlier, surveillance effects are important as well by demonstrating deterrence and reduced ability to reoffend due to system response and timing of reducing chances for real and serious delinquency to occur, meaning that should a surveillance effect be discovered, it is not necessarily a negative finding. The closer youth are watched, where DRCs create another layer of surveillance as a consequence of program participation, the more violations may be discovered.

Another common way to measure youth success in programs is to consider time in the community (i.e. survival time). If in fact a youth experiences positive effects from interventions aimed at his or her successful reentry, he or she may in fact take longer to recidivate, even if that youth eventually does become re-involved in the system, showing a more rehabilitative effect of the programming. Using community tenure as a pro-social measure of success is important because there is a distinct and implicit difference between a youth that gets back into trouble immediately following release, compared to the youth who delays his re-involvement due to possible failed attempts at conforming. In order to measure community tenure, I have developed a variable that indicates the

number of days a youth was not incarcerated and was without a new offense, counting the number of days from incarceration release to new offense or parole violation for the DRC group, and counting the number of days from incarceration release to new offense for the non-DRC group. If a youth did not commit a new offense, the case is censored in the analysis so that it does not artificially lower the survival time ceiling for the group to which this youth belongs. As above, in order to compare the outcomes based on the interventions, I compare these youth using the same dichotomous independent variable indicating program participation. It is hypothesized that youth in the treatment group will experience a higher number of days from release to new offense, compared to the control group's number of days on average from release from incarceration to new offense.

Because there is a great deal still to be learned about crime type continuity and specialization, and assuming that one does in fact create a pattern of similar offending during a trajectory of offending, it is also necessary to examine if the treatment has an impact on crime selection. The committing offense occurs, the youth enters a program, and then the youth commits a new offense. If the intervention successfully changes the youth's trajectory, as well as rehabilitates him by changing his proclivity to choose serious delinquent behavior, it is important to consider if activities of this nature successfully reduced the severity of offending in which the youth elects to participate. In this study I measure this dependent variable of offense severity by looking at the committing offense and the new offense and creating a categorical variable indicating whether the youth committed the same category of offense, a more serious category of offense, or a less serious category of offense from time 1 to time 2. As above, in order to compare the outcomes based on the interventions, I will compare these youth using the

same dichotomous independent variable indicating program participation. It is hypothesized that program participants will commit less serious offenses when they reoffend more often than the control group participants.

Finally, in an effort to uncover what makes a program successful, it is important to consider typology. Differing DRC components may be related to success or failure of youth when compared to similar components in existing studies of intermediate sanctions. In this interest I conduct here a qualitative program analysis, where I classify programs by their characteristics and develop a dichotomous variable of program type. There are two apparent types of DRCs that emerged in the original study, with some differences that might lead me to find that components and approaches may have led to different outcomes. Also, if in fact a youth is offered components similar to successful intermediate sanction programs and yet has no change in behavior, this may in fact be due to how deeply that youth has become entrenched in the system. It is hypothesized that there will be differences found in new offenses, violations, survival times, and offense severity between different types of programs.

Analysis Plan

The analysis here follows two courses of comparison. The first is a traditional comparison that compares the outcomes in control and treatment groups, controlling for selectivity bias by performing regression analysis. The second is a group comparison between control group time 1 youth that live in the places that had DRCs during time 2, and youth that live in those same locations and went to those DRCs during time two. This second comparison is done because if I simply examine control versus treatment, I leave

out the possibility that there are differences between youth that live in areas with a DRC and youth that live in areas without a DRC. New Jersey only contracted for DRCs in locations where they would serve the largest numbers of youth, so it was important to find a way to include some comparison of youth from similar demographic and geographic backgrounds.

Table 2. Analysis Plan for Each Hypothesis

Hypothesis/Question	Analysis Proposed
Program participation and recidivism	Multivariate analysis using logistic regression
Program participation and violations	Multivariate analysis using logistic regression
Program Participation and time in the community	Survival analysis with Cox Proportional Hazard and Kaplan-Meier
Program Participation and Severity of offending changes	Chi Square analysis
Program Typology	Qualitative analysis of programs and comparison on all hypotheses questions

In order to measure the relationship between program participation and the odds of having a new offense docketed in either the juvenile or the adult system, logistic regression is most appropriate because it allows the dichotomous variable of the presence of the intervention, while controlling for other important factors such as age and others as continuous variables. Measuring the relationship between program participation and likelihood of a parole violation resulting in a bench warrant follows the same logic, using logistic regression as the method of analysis.

Assessing the effects of program participation on community tenure requires survival analysis with Cox Proportional Hazard and Kaplan-Meier. These tests allowed

me to censor the cases that did not fail, and avoid their biasing the findings to a lower survival time, while at the same time gauging the effect of dichotomous group membership on the continuous variable of survival time, meanwhile including control variables. Survival analysis more generally allows an examination of the change in competing risks. The analysis allows the researcher to look at competing risks for failure in essential a variation of time-series analysis, and when the risks are reduced through an intervention, I anticipate that survival times will increase.

Chi square is used to test change in offense seriousness so that I can attempt to predict the likelihood of there being a change from time 1 to time 2. In this case I am assessing the likelihood of a reduction of severity from time 1 to time 2. This approach allows for this comparison, testing the significance of the relationship between group membership and change in offending type for youth who are re-arrested.

Finally I have undertaken a qualitative analysis of the ten programs to try to uncover patterns of programming, looking for an underlying program strategy of one type versus another. In the earlier analysis of this material, it was determined that two program types emerged, and I went further with that analysis here. Once developed, I used this dichotomy to examine the likelihood of successes in all hypotheses above for youth within the different typologies of programs.

ANALYSIS

Data Description:

The data includes all youth released from secure Juvenile Justice Commitment during the time periods September 28, 2004, through March 31, 2005 (time 1), and September 28, 2005, through March 31, 2006 (time 2). This sample is comprised by 972 youth. This includes 923 males (95.0%) and 49 females (5.0%), with a racial composition of 670 African American (68.9%), 140 White (14.4%), 153 Hispanic (15.7%), and 9 (0.9%) other race youth. Of these 972 youth, 301 went through a Day Reporting Center (31.0%), while 671 did not (69.0%).

Table 3. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups (n=972)

	Control Group Time 1 (n=318)	Treatment Group Time 1 (n=128)	Control Group Time 2 (n=353)	Treatment Group Time 2 (n=173)	Total (n=972)
Gender					
Male	97.2%	91.4%	94.1%	95.4%	95.0%
Race					
Minority	82.7%	88.3%	82.2%	96.0%	85.6%

For the initial analysis, the treatment and control groups have been merged into just two independent groups, called control and treatment groups. This is the set of groups that will be used in the first set of comparisons in all of the hypothesis tests, referred to hereafter as the “Comparison 1” tests. There will be some work in this analysis that examines some time comparisons as well.

Table 4. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for Comparison 1 (n=972)

	Control (n=671)	Treatment(n=301)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Gender				
Male	95.0%	93.7%	$\chi^2=1.472(df=1)$.267
Race				
Minority	82.4%	92.7%	$\chi^2=17.8(df=1)$.000
Age at Release				
	Mean	Stand. dev.		
Control	17.6	1.5	t=1.627	.104
Treatment	17.4	1.2		
Number Priors				
	Mean	Stand. Dev.		
Control	5.7	3.6	t=2.487	.013
Treatment	5.1	3.5		
Most serious Committing Offense				
Control	2.83	1.7	t=-.335	.738
Treatment	2.87	1.7		
Most Serious Prior Offense				
Control	3.54	1.5	t=-.778	.437
Treatment	3.63	1.3		

A second set of comparisons was created, referred to hereafter as “Comparison 2” tests. This grouping includes youth from the same seven counties that eventually had DRCs opened during the second time frame; therefore, it compares youth in these counties from the time 1 control group compared to youth in these locations from the time 2 treatment group. This allows for a control that limits selection bias based on demographic differences of youth from different locations. This comparison is the geographical comparison group, and is used in the second set of comparisons in all hypothesis tests.

Table 5. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for Comparison 2 (n=226)

	Control (n=151)	Treatment(n=75)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Gender				
Male	98.7%	89.3%	$\chi^2=4.76$ (df=1)	.042
Race				
Minority	92.1%	97.3%	$\chi^2=2.404$ (df=1)	.151
Age at Release				
	Mean	Stand. dev.		
Control	17.6	1.4	t= -.554	.580
Treatment	17.7	1.4		
Number Priors				
	Mean	Stand. Dev.		
Control	6.1	3.6	t= -.576	.565
Treatment	6.4	4.6		
Most serious Committing Offense				
Control	3.2	1.7	t= 1.49	.137
Treatment	2.8	1.8		
Most Serious Prior Offense				
Control	3.7	1.5	t= -.164	.870
Treatment	3.8	1.5		

A third comparison was created through a qualitative analysis of the program typologies. I went through the elements of the programs and all qualitative observations of the locations that I made, and organized the information into logically occurring themes. This grouping resulted in two program types, the individualized treatment approach and the regimented treatment approach, a typology that sprung naturally from this qualitative examination of the field notes.

Table 6. Characteristics of Program Type Comparison Groups (n=301)

	Individual (n=254)	Regimented (n=47)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Gender				
Male	94.1%	91.5%	$\chi^2=.455$ (df=1)	.513
Race				
Minority	92.5%	93.6%	$\chi^2=.070$ (df=1)	.791
Age at Release				
	Mean	Stand. dev.		
Control	17.4	1.2	t= -.703	.483
Treatment	17.5	1.6		
Number Priors				
	Mean	Stand. Dev.		
Control	4.8	3.0	t= -3.66	.000
Treatment	6.8	5.3		
Most serious Committing Offense				
Control	2.9	1.7	t= -.177	.860
Treatment	2.9	1.8		
Most Serious Prior Offense				
Control	3.6	1.3	t= -2.07	.039
Treatment	4.0	1.6		

Group Differences on Predictor Variables

To compare the group characteristics for the independent variables, a basic chi-square test of the differences of the Comparison 1 groups on gender and race show that there is no significant difference in the group make-up for gender, but for race there is a significantly different distribution of minority and non-minority youth ($p = .000$). Seen in Table 4, this is likely a result of more minority youth living in the urban areas in which Centers were opened, and is no surprise. It is hoped that there will be no such difference found when the geographical comparison and treatment groups are examined below.

Table 5 shows chi-square tests of Comparison 2 group differences on gender and race. There is a significant difference in the representation of males and females in these

two groups ($p=.042$); however, there is now no significant difference in minority youth representation. As hoped and noted above, the comparison of youth from similar places with and without treatment helps to remove the racial differences in the two groups. The gender difference is based on there being only 2 females in one of the groups, making the chi-square comparison less meaningful.

Finally, for the two treatment type comparisons, chi-square tests of group differences on gender and race show that there are no significant differences in the racial or gender compositions of the two groups (see Table 6). Beyond these basic demographics, it is important to try to find out if the groupings vary significantly on the other variables included in the models throughout the hypothesis tests. If in fact the two groups do not vary this removes the need for further group creation to level out the characteristics of the two groups to make them more comparable.

The next step is to look at the variation between means between the comparison groups on the continuous independent variables. The first set of tests compares the means of groups for Comparison 1, seen in Table 4. In simple t-tests, comparing the means of the two groups on age at release, most serious offense for which they were committed (measured using the severity of offense scale created by the State of NJ), number of prior adjudication, most serious offense prior to their commitment, and time at risk, only the prior number of adjudications resulted in a significant difference of the means of the control and treatment groups ($p=.013$).

I then compared the means for these same variables for the Comparison 2 groups in Table 5. Of the continuous independent variables, none resulted in significant differences. The variable for time at risk was not included, as research noted above

(Maltz, 1984) suggests it confounds results in logistic regression, the analysis planned following these bivariate comparisons.

Overall, these analyses show that there are very few differences for the two groups on either demographics or on variables that are supported as predictors of criminality and propensity to re-offend. Our groups significantly differ on only a few variables, and that is indicative of perhaps no need to create a matched-pair or propensity score matched set of groups to control for selection bias, though more variables would have been desirable.

A final comparison that utilized t-tests is that comparing the continuous variables for the individualized versus regimented treatment groups in Table 6. These are the groups that resulted from the qualitative survey of the field notes. These t-tests showed that age at release and most serious committing offense were not significantly different between the two groups. However, most serious offense prior to this commitment and prior number of adjudications were both significantly different between the two treatment types ($p=.039$ and $p=.000$ respectively). It might be necessary to equalize the two groups based on a matched pairing so that these group differences no longer create a sampling bias, though further reducing these already small group sizes in order to create matched pairs may simply frustrate the process. With one group having just 47 youth, a matched pairing without replacement would make the groups both just 47 youth if each had a comparable partner in the other group.

Factoring in Time At Risk

According to several valid arguments posed by researchers (see Maltz, 1984 for example), it is ill-advised to include time at risk in a logistic regression. However, there are other ways to assure that I have accounted for the differences that can be found when there is a youth that has over a year on the streets to get into trouble versus a youth that has only been out a few months. In order to have comparable groups, I have opted to compare youth with similar time on the streets for their fail rates within those time frames. The data already includes a variable that measures whether or not a youth was arrested by 3 months out, 6 months out, etc. I have created additional variables to include parole violations by those times. Then I am truly comparing youth with the same times at risk for their failures within the same time from release, while avoiding the pitfall of including time at risk in the analyses.

Table 7. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for all youth with at least 90 days follow-up (n=915)

	Control (n=603)	Treatment (n=276)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Gender				
Male	95.7%	94.1%	$\chi^2=1.171(df=1)$.317
Race				
Minority	82.4%	92.7%	$\chi^2=16.910(df=1)$.000
Age at Release				
	Mean	Stand. Dev.		
Control	17.62	1.45	t=1.843	.066
Treatment	17.43	1.26		
Number Priors				
Control	5.71	3.57	t=2.554	.011
Treatment	5.06	3.39		
Most Serious Committing Offense				
Control	2.83	1.70	t=.052	.959
Treatment	2.83	1.69		
Most Serious Prior Offense				
Control	3.54	1.46	t=-.810	.418
Treatment	3.63	1.34		

First, looking at all youth that had at least ninety days on the streets, whether in a Day Center or not, I have compared here the control and treatment populations on their bivariate statistics. While this grouping includes almost all of the youth in the sample, there was a small group that had follow up for less than 90 days (5.9% of the sample). This left me with 915 youth. The treatment and control youth differed little for these two groupings. Table 7 above shows that there was significant difference between control and treatment groups only on race and number of priors, though looking at the percentage of minorities and the number of priors the groups do not seem to have large differences in their numeric values to justify further matching, as the groups match well on the other variables of interest here.

The next step I took was to compare only those youth that had a follow up time of 300 days or more, a point at which half of the overall sample is included. This turns out, logically of course, to include more prominently the group from the earlier time period (89.5% of this group was comprised of Time 1 youth). The control and treatment group bivariate analyses are shown below in Table 8.

Table 8. Characteristics of Control and Treatment Groups for all youth with at least 300 days follow-up (n=497)

	Control (n=351)	Treatment (n=146)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Gender				
Male	96.6%	92.5%	$\chi^2=3.957(df=1)$.060
Race				
Minority	82.6%	89.7%	$\chi^2=4.018(df=1)$.055
Age at Release				
	Mean	Stand. Dev.		
Control	17.66	1.46	t=2.02	.044
Treatment	17.39	1.15		
Number Priors				
Control	5.97	3.56	t=4.393	.000
Treatment	4.45	3.06		
Most Serious Committing Offense				
Control	2.97	1.69	t=-.149	.881
Treatment	2.99	1.71		
Most Serious Prior Offense				
Control	3.63	1.43	t=1.44	.151
Treatment	3.43	1.36		

The two groups have some significant differences, but like the comparison above for youth with 90+ days at risk, the differences are visually small, such as the average at all release differing by just two months. I do find it interesting that youth in the treatment group, those from the most urban areas and those that would be presumed to have more serious records, have a significantly lower number of prior adjudicated offenses.

Group Differences on Outcomes

Returning back to the main comparisons of this project, Comparison 1 and Comparison 2, the next set of bivariate analyses is indicators of group differences on the dependent variables as a precursor to more complicated tests of group outcome differences. Chi-square comparisons of group and outcome provide rudimentary tests, without controls for other predictor variables, for the differences between the groups.

Then, Kaplan-Meier tests for survival analysis provide details for our outcomes on community tenure for the youth.

Table 9. Group Differences on Outcomes for Comparison 1 Groups (n=972)

	Control (n=671)	Treatment(n=301)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any Arrest				
Yes	53.1%	53.8%	$\chi^2=.049$ (df=1)	.835
Parole Violation				
Yes	18.2%	23.6%	$\chi^2=3.816$ (df=1)	.056
Time to Arrest				
	Mean	Stand. Error		
Control	341.01	11.13	Log rank= .001 (df=1)	.977
Treatment	344.15	16.59		

The chi-square test of the Comparison 1 groups for arrest following release from detention, seen in Table 9, resulted in no significant difference for the two groups. The chi-square for the Comparison 1 groups and whether or not they violated their parole after the treatment yielded no significant differences either. For the Comparison 2 groups in Table 10, the chi-square for being arrested after release from incarceration was significant, indicating that there is a difference in the two groups for their outcomes on any arrest ($p=.000$). However, the chi-square for the Comparison 2 groups on violations of parole was not significant.

Table 10. Group Differences on Outcomes for Comparison 2 Groups (n=226)

	Control (n=151)	Treatment(n=75)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any Arrest				
Yes	72.8%	46.7%	$\chi^2=14.94$ (df=1)	.000
Parole Violation				
Yes	27.2%	22.7%	$\chi^2=.529$ (df=1)	.520
Time to Arrest				
	Mean	Stand. Error		
Control	321.63	20.07	Log rank= .873 (df=1)	.350
Treatment	189.68	12.68		

This means that without controlling for other factors such as prior record, youth in the control and treatment groups in Comparison 1 did not have significant differences in their outcomes for either being rearrested or violating their parole. Also, without controlling for other things, youth in the control group did not significantly differ on parole violations from the treatment group in Comparison 2. However, it is possible that there is a difference in the odds of re-arrest for youth in the treatment versus control groups in Comparison 2, without controlling for outside influences.

The Kaplan-Meier comparisons for these groups show similar outcomes. The Log Rank test for Comparison 1 groups on time to any arrest in Table 5 reveal no significant differences in estimates of survival time to any arrest. The Log Rank comparison for Comparison 2 groups on time to any arrest similarly showed no significant differences in survival time, found in Table 10. This means that there is likely no difference in survival time for either the Comparison 1 groups or the Comparison 2 groups on time to any arrest, where neither group had a longer estimate for community tenure.

Table 11. Group Differences on Outcomes for Program Type Comparison Groups (n=301)

	Individual (n=254)	Regimented (n=47)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any Arrest				
Yes	55.9%	42.6%	$\chi^2=2.84$ (df=1)	.111
Parole Violation				
Yes	24.4%	19.1%	$\chi^2=.609$ (df=1)	.575
Time to Arrest				
	Mean	Stand. Error		
Individual	350.08	17.56	Log rank= 1.06 (df=1)	.303
Regimented	192.31	15.55		

Finally, it is necessary to compare the outcomes of the two subcategories that are created for the two different types of centers that emerged from qualitative evaluation detailed below, with findings above in Table 11. Chi-square analysis of the two treatment types compared on being re-arrested after the treatment time showed no significant differences between these two subgroups. Similarly, the subgroups did not have a significant difference on the odds of violating their parole. Finally, the Kaplan-Meier test showed no significant difference in community tenure between the two treatment subgroups.

Data Cleaning and Coding Notes:

First, it is important to note that there was some preparation of the data that was necessary to make sure it was ready for analysis. It is also important to qualify at this point some of the decisions made regarding the coding of the variables. These coding decisions included offense coding and typing.

It was first necessary to create a variable that would group the subjects in order to create the Comparison 2 group detailed above. The data covers two time periods: a period in which only two DRCs existed in the major urban centers of the state referred to here as Time 1, and a later period in which eight new centers were added to the existing two. The DRCs were only located in the places where the most youth could be served, so in order to reduce selection bias stemming from geography, a third path of analysis was developed. I plan to compare the youth that lived in the locations during Time 1 that did not have a DRC and were in the control group, to those youth who lived in the same locations in Time 2 that later had a DRC. This means that we have Time 1 control youth versus Time 2 treatment youth that are from the same high-crime, high-need places. These are referred to as Comparison 2 control and treatment youth.

The data presented some challenges in creating Comparison 2 control and treatment groups. The data only captures the county in which a youth resided at the time of commitment. I compared the treatment youth in Time 2 that went to DRCs in the counties in which they resided, and only 4 of the 173 youth in this group went to a DRC outside of their home county. Therefore, I decided to use the county as the determinant for group membership in the Time 1 control group, in the interest of being consistent in case selection. If I am looking at the types of municipalities youth are coming from and the municipalities they live within, then selecting youth from the same counties is the closest estimation that can be made in this dataset.

Also of note in the creation of the Comparison 2 groups is that 77 youth in the total data set were missing county information. They were, however, dispersed around the control and treatment groups. Forty-seven were youth from the contemporary control

group, meaning that they would not have been in consideration for this grouping anyway. Ten youth with no county information were from the time 1 treatment group, and again not youth eligible for the Comparison2 grouping. Finally, there were 13 from the time 1 control group, which is just 4.1% of the time 1 control group that were not able to be included in the Comparison2 analysis due to this missing information. There were 10 youth that were from out of state in the entire dataset. These youth would not be eligible for this comparison either, as the point is to compare youth from similar home counties.

Overall, I created two groups for this contrast in Comparison 2: youth in time 1 control groups that were from the seven counties in which the new centers were later opened; and, youth in time 2 treatment groups that were from these same seven counties. Of note, there were 112 youth in time 2 that were from these seven counties that did not in fact go to a DRC during time 2. This means that there may be a confounding difference between the two time period groups.

Table 12. Youth in Time 2 Treatment from a DRC County but did not Attend the DRC

County	Youth in County that did not Attend DRC
Atlantic County	10
Hudson County	19
Mercer County	30
Monmouth County	8
Passaic County	31
Union County (2 DRCs)	14

This could be confounding because, for example, youth in the second time period that lived in Hudson County, but did not live near Jersey City, would not have gone to the Day Reporting center. But that same youth in time 1, who lived in Hudson County, but not near Jersey City, would be counted as a member for this comparison group since I

cannot differentiate actual municipalities of residence for the sample. Unfortunately, this cannot be controlled for any further than the county level. One way to deal with this issue is to do a more conservative comparison of the groups, in an ‘intent to treat’ comparison. This includes all youth in Time 2 that lived in a DRC county – whether treated or not – and all youth in Time 1 that lived in those same counties.

One additional set of variables was also needed in order to facilitate the Kaplan-Meier Survival Analysis and the Cox Regression. In order to be sure that the data was analyzed properly, it was necessary to create new variables for time to any arrest and time to any technical violation. For the time to arrest adjusted variable, the value would be the number of days to any arrest if an arrest had occurred, and for those who the arrest had not occurred, the number of days at risk was the inserted value. The same logic was used to create a time to technical violation variable. This is so that the computation of the values would not discount the community tenure of youth who did not experience a failure manifested by arrest or by parole violation. It would negatively impact the data if it only included those who actually failed.

In order make the offense variables comparable to one another, and to make them analyzable ordinal variables, I needed to use a standard scale ranking the severity of the offenses from low to high. The New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission (JJJ), the agency sponsoring the investigation when it was initially conducted, had a scale in use at that time that ranged from least to most serious offenses, and was created for ranking crime seriousness based on state legislation. This scale was utilized here. In addition, I created a crime type category for offenses for the comparison of criminal acts before and

after treatment for Hypothesis #4. The JJC also indicates in their scale used above the offense types for every offense in the state codes, using the following categories:

- Persons Offenses
- Weapons Offenses
- Property Offenses
- Drug Offenses
- Public Order Offenses

This typing strategy was utilized to code both most serious, original, committing offense, as well as to type the offense for which they may have been arrested at the follow-up check.

For the change in offense seriousness, I then used the variables described here and created a new one that indicates, based on the crime types created above, whether the new offense was of a less serious category, of the same category, or of a more serious category. The order of the seriousness of categories follows the same coding scheme laid out, based on statute, in the NJ JJC scale of offenses. This led to a 3-category variable, with categories: more serious category of offense, offense of same category, or less serious category of offense.

The creation of a variable that distinguishes between program types was part analysis, and part data cleaning; therefore, this is written up within the hypothesis testing section for the fifth hypothesis that relates to this item. This qualitative analysis is laid out in detail below.

Hypothesis Testing:

- I. Youth in the treatment group will be less likely to have a new offense docketed in either the juvenile or the adult systems than youth that are in the control group.

The first test of this hypothesis was a Multivariate Analysis with Logistic Regression, with the treatment condition as a variable in the equation (Comparison 1). This analysis, much like any regression analysis, tries to fit a model to predict a value for the outcome variable based on knowledge we have from theory and from existing data. The independent variables, or variables that theoretically would predict the outcome, included here are:

- Age at release
- Group
- Most serious committing offense
- Most serious offense prior to commitment
- Number of priors
- Race
- Gender

And the dependent variable here, or the outcome I am attempting to predict based on this knowledge, is being arrested after the treatment period, whether with adult or juvenile charges.

The method for entering these variables into the equation is the “Enter” method for variable inclusion in the model. Using the “enter” method is preferred when entering variables that are included due to their theoretical importance, rather than stepwise methods that are used with exploratory analyses. Stepwise includes variables one at a time and adding to the model progressively until there is no additional explanatory

power. In this case, however, theory supports the inclusion of all of the variables, so I have elected to use “enter” so as reduce any minor bias in the estimates.

The model is an attempt to improve that prediction. In doing so, it tests to see if inclusion of additional variables significantly improves prediction over not knowing the values of those variables. This logistic regression shows that the model, including age at release, race, gender, most serious committing offense, number of prior offenses, most serious offense prior to commitment, and treatment significantly improves the prediction of the outcome of any arrest ($p < .001$).

The model as a whole shows a very small relationship between the predictors and the variable I am attempting to predict, shown by a Nagelkerke R^2 of .083, which ranges from 0 to 1. But more specifically, we find that treatment and the offense for which they were initially committed do not contribute significantly to the model (see Table 13 below).

Table 13. Logistic Regression for Comparison 1 on Any Arrest (n=973)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Race	-.504	6.077	.014	.604
Gender	1.621	16.105	.000	5.059
Most Serious Prior to Commitment	.036	.757	.384	1.037
Most Serious Committing Offense	.124	5.851	.016	1.133
Number of Priors	.059	7.820	.005	1.060
Age at Release	-.131	6.674	.010	.877
Treatment	-.026	.031	.860	.974

The second test of the first hypothesis is Multivariate Analysis with Logistic Regression with Control group time 1 from counties that later opened DRCs compared to treatment group time 2 youth from those same counties (Comparison 2). This analysis revealed more of the same findings. The groups created, as described above, resulted in

151 control group youth in time 1 that lived in the locations that later had DRCs, and 75 treatment group youth in time 2 that lived in those 7 locations.

The variables in the equation, as above, included gender, race, most serious committing offense, number of prior adjudications, most serious offense prior to commitment, age at release, and this time their group membership for Comparison 2 analysis. First, the model significantly improves prediction ($p < .001$). The Nagelkerke R² test shows a moderate relationship between the predictors and the predicted variable with a value of .188. And, as seen in Table 14, treatment has a significant impact on the prediction with the model.

Table 14. Logistic Regression for Comparison 2 on Any Arrest (n=226)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Race	-1.022	2.963	.085	.360
Gender	.619	.490	.484	1.857
Most Serious Prior to Commitment	.018	.040	.842	1.018
Most Serious Committing Offense	.120	1.088	.297	1.128
Number of Priors	.075	2.816	.093	1.077
Age at Release	-.302	7.249	.007	.740
Treatment	1.220	14.783	.000	3.387

In Table 14, group membership for Comparison 2 stands out as one of the variables that would contribute to the effectiveness of the model. The exp(b) shows the odds of any arrest decreases significantly ($p < .001$) when one is a member of the treatment group. This means that if a youth does not go through treatment, then his odd of any arrest increases 3.387 times. This requires some further exploration. As mentioned above, a more conservative ‘intent to treat’ comparison can be undertaken as well. Comparing youth that were treatment-eligible during time 2 with youth that would have been treatment-eligible had their counties had a DRC during time 1 shows the same outcomes.

Table 15. Group Difference on Outcome for Comparison 2 “Intent to Treat” groups (n=338)

	Control (n=151)	Treatment(n=187)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any Arrest				
<i>Yes</i>	72.8%	47.6%	$\chi^2=22.01$ (df=1)	.000

The Bivariate test shows that the youth in the second time period that would have been eligible for treatment had a lower likelihood of re-arrest than youth in the first time frame in those same counties.

Table 16. Logistic Regression for Comparison 2 “Intent to Treat” groups (n=338)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Race	-1.273	5.667	.017	.280
Gender	.641	.795	.373	1.897
Most Serious Prior to Commitment	.118	1.747	.186	1.126
Most Serious Committing Offense	-.035	.244	.621	.966
Number of Priors	.071	4.185	.041	1.073
Age at Release	-.276	9.119	.003	3.402
Treatment	1.224	23.542	.000	30.498

The multivariate analysis of this relationship in Table 16 shows the same. In addition to race, number of priors, and age at release, youth that were in a place that had a DRC had a lower odds of being rearrested than youth that lived in those same places just a year earlier when there was no treatment available.

Finally, in order to rule out a period effect, I have tested Time 1 Newark and Camden treatment youth with Time 2 Newark and Camden treatment youth, as these two groups always had a DRC available. This test allows me to make sure that there is

nothing going on between Times 1 and 2 (outside any treatment effect) that might have led to this reduction in arrest for the Comparison 2 initial findings.

Table 17. Group Difference on Outcome for Time 1 and Time 2 Treatment Youth From Newark and Camden DRCs (n=208)

	Time 1 (n=116)	Time 2 (n=92)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any Arrest				
<i>Yes</i>	69.0%	44.6%	$\chi^2=12.55$ (df=1)	.000

The bivariate analysis of this history effect (Table 17) shows in fact that for those youth in a place that always had a DRC, there was a significant change in odds of arrest from Time 1 to Time 2.

Table 18. Logistic Regression for Time 1 and Time 2 Treatment Youth from Newark and Camden DRCs (n=208)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Race	-1.208	3.692	.055	.299
Gender	2.154	6.187	.013	8.623
Most Serious Prior to Commitment	.138	1.213	.271	1.148
Most Serious Committing Offense	-.094	.983	.322	.910
Number of Priors	.038	.381	.537	1.038
Age at Release	-.073	.270	.603	.930
Time 1	1.406	18.021	.000	4.080

And looking at table 18, the multivariate analysis shows more of the same. In addition to gender, Time 2 treatment kids had significantly lower odds of re-arrest than Time 1 treatment kids in places that had DRCs in both time periods. This means that for the above listed tests, I cannot in fact rule out a period effect. Something changed for these

kids, while the treatment did not. This could be changes in crime rates, social factors or forces, and even reforms in juvenile justice during this time period.

- II. Youth in the treatment group will be less likely to violate their parole than the members of the control group.

As above, the first test of this hypothesis was a Multivariate Analysis with Logistic Regression, using the treatment and control groups as a predictor variable in the equation (Comparison 1). The independent variables are the same as those included above in tests for any arrest following the treatment period. This test changes only the dependent variable, attempting to model a prediction for technical violations of parole for these same youth.

The model created here significantly improves prediction of the outcome of violating one's parole ($p < .001$), though the Nagelkerke R² is quite small again with a value of just .044. The model shows that the only variables that play a significant role in predicting parole violation for Comparison 1 are most serious offense prior to commitment and number of prior adjudications. Table 19 shows that treatment does not in fact have a significant impact in prediction of violations of parole.

Table 19. Logistic Regression for Comparison 1 on Parole Violation (n=973)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Race	-.214	.665	.415	.807
Gender	1.154	3.588	.058	3.170
Most Serious Prior to Commitment	.092	3.422	.064	1.097
Most Serious Committing Offense	.131	4.278	.039	1.140
Number of Priors	.058	6.385	.012	1.060
Age at Release	.036	.349	.554	1.037
Treatment	-.321	3.367	.067	.725

The third test of the violation hypothesis is Multivariate Analysis with Logistic Regression with Control group time 1 from counties that later opened DRCs compared to treatment group time 2 youth from those same counties (Comparison 2). This test revealed that the model was not a significant improvement in predicting the odds of violating one's parole. This means that no variable in the equation was significant.

At this point I want to consider what effects the time a youth is on the street might have on youth outcomes, as time at risk is an important element. Rather than diving into more complex analysis, I first present here the basic analysis of the impact of time at risk. I first looked at the differences between these two groups on the outcome variable that I am interested in specifically here: new offenses and parole violations at 3 months from release for all youth that were out for 3 months or more.

Table 20. Group Differences on Outcomes at 3 months for youth with no less than 90 days follow-up (n=915)

	Control (n=603)	Treatment (n=276)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any arrest at 3 months				
Yes	21.3%	21.0%	$\chi^2=.012(df=1)$.911
Parole Violation at 3 months				
Yes	8.3%	10.1%	$\chi^2=.855(df=1)$.211

Looking at Table 20 above, it becomes obvious that there are no differences in this comparison, as with the regular Comparison 1 groups on violations or new arrest. This group differs very little from Comparison 1, so that is no surprise. Knowing this, I have opted to move forward with looking at a comparison that better models the time at risk control I am seeking out, as further analysis, such as logistic regression, of these differences is highly unlikely to yield any different results.

The differences between control and treatment groups that had at least 300 follow-up days on failure at 3, 6, and 9 months, since all youth in this group had been on the street at least that long at the time of the examination, are shown below in Table 21.

Table 21. Group Differences on Outcomes at 3, 6, and 9 Months for Youth With No Less Than 300 Days Follow-Up (n=497)

	Control (n=351)	Treatment (n=146)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Any arrest at 3 months				
Yes	10.3%	9.6%	$\chi^2=.051(df=1)$.872
Parole Violation at 3 months				
Yes	8.3%	8.2%	$\chi^2=.000(df=1)$.999
Any arrest at 6 months				
Yes	36.2%	34.9%	$\chi^2=.070(df=1)$.838
Parole Violation at 6 months				
Yes	21.1%	21.2%	$\chi^2=.001(df=1)$.999
Any arrest at 9 months				
Yes	51.6%	47.9%	$\chi^2=.541(df=1)$.491
Parole Violation at 9 months				
Yes	27.1%	32.2%	$\chi^2=1.33(df=1)$.276

This table shows no significant differences for these variable comparisons either. What is most interesting here is that there is a growing gap between the behavior of the control group and the behavior of the treatment group at 3 months compared to at 6 months, and then again at 9 months. The difference in the percent that had a new arrest at 3 months was less than one percentage point, and at 6 months it was just over one percentage point, and finally at 9 months it was almost 3 percentage points. While not significant, the measurement shows a trend in the changes. The same is seen in the control group behavior versus the treatment group behavior from 3 months, 6 months and 9 months when violating parole. The difference in the two groups was tiny at 3 months, and at 6 months as well, but at 9 months the difference was over 5 percentage points. Again, these are not significant differences, but point to a trend.

These findings, put together with those in Table 20, show that there are no group differences in outcome measures when examining time at risk in this way. Time on the streets also can have some history effects as well, and that is an important point to consider. One further test might yield something interesting though, based on the qualitative data notes, and I feel it is important to compare here. The program staff indicated that from Time 1 to Time 2 there was a policy change, where Parole Officers in Time 1 did not make a practice of violating kids for not going to a DRC, while during Time 2 it was considered grounds for such a violation. This would show an increase in the surveillance effect from the first to the second time period (and possible net widening), and justifies perhaps another look at the findings when examining the parole violations. This did not in fact yield what I would have anticipated though.

Table 22. Comparison of 4 groups for Violating Parole (n=972)

	Time 1 Control (n=318)	Time 1 Treatment (n=128)	Time 2 Control (n=353)	Time 2 Treatment (n=173)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Violated Parole	75.8%	73.4%	87.3%	78.6%	$\chi^2=18.875(df=3)$.000

This tells us that there is a significant difference in violation rates, and by merely considering the percentages shown, the Time 2 control group in fact had the highest violation rate. Comparing the two treatment periods, there was little difference in their parole violations. However, it is important to find out more specifically if this is a significant difference, and in fact evidence of net widening.

Table 23. Comparison of 2 Treatment Groups for Violating Parole (n=301)

	Time 1 Treatment (n=128)	Time 2 Treatment (n=173)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Violated Parole	26.6%	21.4%	$\chi^2=1.093(df=1)$.337

The difference in Time 1 and Time 2 enforcement of attendance through violations of parole was not significantly higher, and that the significant difference seen in the larger cross-comparison in Table 23 above came from the control groups. However, this comparison might be more meaningful if considered in light of the tests done above for including time at risk. So looking at youth in Time 1 treatment who had 90 or more days on the streets and comparing them to youth in Time 2 treatment who had 90 or more days on the streets for parole violations within 3 months might be more fruitful. The comparisons above may show no difference because the Time 1 treatment youth had more time on the streets to fail, thus creating the illusion of similar parole violation rates for both time periods.

Table 24. Comparison of Treatment Youth With 3 or More Months Time at Risk for Violations Within the First 3 Months of Release

	Time 1 Treatment (n=128)	Time 2 Treatment (n=158)	Test Statistic	Sig.
Violated Parole	8.6%	11.4%	$\chi^2=.608(df=1)$.555

This table (24), however, furthers confirms the finding. In the first 3 months following release and subsequent entry into a DRC, the Time 2 treatment group members were not significantly more likely to violate parole than were youth in the Time 1 treatment group, despite staff indicating a greater propensity of Parole Officers to formally violate youth for not showing up to a Day Reporting Center.

III. Youth in the treatment group will experience more days from release from detention to new offense, compared to members of the control group.

In order to test this hypothesis it is necessary to first compare treatment and control groups in a survival analysis while censoring for cases in which there was no arrest. The Cox Regression analysis predicts the time to the occurrence of an event – in this case any arrest, and the predictor variables included are the same as they were in earlier equations herein. The Cox Regression evidences a significant model that helps predict time to any arrest ($p < .001$).

Unfortunately, while the model is effective in predicting the odds of time to arrest, the variable of participation in treatment is not a significant part of the model, as shown in Table 25 while all of the other variables do contribute to the model.

Table 25. Cox Regression for Comparison 1 Time to First Arrest (n=973)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Gender	1.269	12.583	.000	3.558
Race	-.476	10.249	.001	.622
Most Serious Committing Offense	.023	.692	.106	1.023
Most Serious Offense Prior	.069	3.926	.048	1.071
Number of Priors	.045	13.142	.000	1.046
Age at Release	-.113	11.607	.001	.893
Treatment	-.053	.301	.583	.948

The second test of this third hypothesis is a Cox Regression to try to predict time to any arrest, and this time comparing youth in Control group time 1 from counties that later opened DRCs compared to treatment group time 2 youth from those same counties (Comparison 2). The chi-square test of this model was significant ($p < .001$), but once again the treatment variable was not a significant part of the model, in Table 26 below.

Table 26. Cox Regression for Comparison 2 Time to First Arrest (n=226)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Gender	.583	.640	.424	1.791
Race	-.741	3.579	.059	.477
Most Serious Committing Offense	.036	.528	.467	1.037
Most Serious Offense Prior	.088	1.947	.163	1.092
Number of Priors	.051	5.211	.022	1.053
Age at Release	-.146	5.775	.016	.864
Treatment	-.155	.061	.459	.856

IV. Program participants will commit less serious offenses when they reoffend more often than will the control group.

The variable of new offense seriousness compared to original offense is laid out above in the data cleaning and notes section. I used a cross-tabulation with a Chi-Square statistic to see if there is a relationship between treatment group membership and change in offense seriousness. For Comparison 1 the findings show that in an initial comparison, the groups show some interesting differences. The chi-square test shows that the differences between the groups is significant ($p < .04$), so there is value to knowing about treatment in predicting offense seriousness following treatment.

Table 27. New Offense Type for Comparison 1 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested (n=504)

	Control Group (n=344)	Treatment Group (n=160)	Total
Committed Worse Offense	41.9%	47.5%	43.7%
Committed Offense of Same Category	31.7%	20.6%	28.2%
Committed Less Serious Offense	26.5%	31.9%	28.2%

$\chi^2=6.677$ (df=2); sig=.035

Beyond the significance of this comparison, it is important to further note that when examining those youth that committed a new offense after the treatment period, this

shows that a higher percentage of treatment youth committed a less serious offense (31.9%) than did the control group (26.5%), as well as a higher percentage committing a more serious offense.

Table 28. Different Offense Type for Comparison 1 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested (n=504)

	Control Group (n=344)	Treatment Group (n=160)	Total
Committed Different Offense Category	68.3%	79.4%	71.8%

$\chi^2=6.602$ (df=1); sig.=.011

Perhaps the DRC has the effect of training youth to not commit the same offense, but they may in fact commit other more or less serious offenses. There is a more than 10% difference between youth committing different offense types when they went through the DRC, compared to those who did not. The chi-square test of Comparison 2 groups yields a significant result as well of course ($p<.01$).

Table 29. New Offense Type for Comparison 2 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested (n=144)

	Control Group (n=109)	Treatment Group (n=35)	Total
Committed Worse Offense	38.5%	51.4%	41.7%
Committed Offense of Same Category	33.0%	14.3%	28.5%
Committed Less Serious Offense	28.4%	34.3%	29.9%

$\chi^2=4.629$ (df=2); sig.=.099

Comparison 2 for this question of offense seriousness produces less useful findings. If this comparison controls for geographical differences in selection, and its resultant selection bias, then there is no significant difference in offense seriousness for those youth who experience Day Programming versus those who do not. However, when

I examined this as a simple comparison of same or different offense category, as suggested above, the chi-square was significant ($p < .035$). Table 30 shows the group differences in this more basic comparison.

Table 30. Different Offense Type for Comparison 2 Youth Who Were Re-Arrested (n=144)

	Control Group (n=109)	Treatment Group (n=35)	Total
Committed Different Offense Category	67.0%	85.7%	71.5%

$\chi^2=4.569$ (df=1); sig.=.034

This table tells just a bit more of the same as above. The selection bias control furthers the argument that the Day Reporting Center may in fact drive youth away from committing within the same offense category, though not necessarily less serious offenses.

- V. There will be differences found in new offenses, violations, survival times, and offense severity between types programs.

In the course of the quantitative data collection, I also performed environmental surveys of the locations and interviewed program supervisors regarding the program models, missions, and goals. This resulted in extensive notes from each of the ten locations, which I hand coded looking for themes that would set the programs into subgroups.

At first blush, the programs seems to fall into two categories that are comprised by those that are from nationally established organizations and those that are local, start-up, community based groups that are looking to get involved in the work. However, after

going through the field notes carefully, it seems that even some of the more national types of organizations fall into a different type of categorization.

There are two program types that seem to emerge from this review. First there are the programs that are model-driven, and they are regimented with little room for alteration to meet individual needs. These programs are set as to what youth will do during their day at the center, and offer all youth the same programming. The second type of program that surfaces is the individualized program, one that shows greater flexibility to the youth's needs and adapts to those needs.

The four regimented programs, as they will be referred to from here forward, include three that are from the same organization, and they all spring from a national model of Day Reporting from their central home base, a Day Reporting model developed for adults. At all three of their sites, they require four hours of school in the morning, followed by an hour of social responsibility training, and then a variety of anger management, team building, life skills and job readiness. A daily schedule is actually set out in the program handbook that clients are given at intake. Additionally, older youth go into drug relapse prevention, while younger clients go to drug awareness. These locations use a breathalyzer test on everyone that comes in the door, every day, and they also conduct random drug screening.

One program supervisor stated that the program is not changed for an individual, but if something seems like it would “work better overall, they will alter it for all of them” (Elizabeth, NJ, 4/7/2006). The accommodations they make are more considerate than programmatic, such as someone who needs to change their attendance schedule for child care. At this same location they noted that at all three of their centers, “if someone has

special needs or special issues that need to be dealt with... they have a sit-down with [the supervisor] when the problem or need arises” (Elizabeth, NJ, 4/7/2006).

A fourth location that fell into the same pattern of regimentation was a Center that was from a different type of national organization, and they base their model very closely on an adult model as well. They offer a very specific schedule for youth every day: case management, reasoning and rehabilitation, and job readiness. And while the case management portion of their day seems to offer the individualized programming, it is only one hour of their day. Any help that a youth needs outside of that which is offered at the site, is referred out and is done on outside time for these youth.

These four regimented programs also give the impression of being longer-term than their counterparts. The three locations that are from the same organization plan around youth staying much longer than the 90-day minimum, with little work around helping youth re-enter traditional schools due to a lack of the schools “wanting them back” (Atlantic City, NJ, 4/4/2006). The fourth location has their program set out for a full year of planning, where the first month gets them into a schedule and sets forth their plan for the full year. This seems a bit counter to the re-entry time-frame that the JJC sets out for youth, with post-incarceration supervision and parole terms that are over long before these regimented program lengths would have them released.

The other six programs tend to fall more into an individualized pattern of programming, one even using the phrase that “it is not a cookie cutter treatment plan. Individuals are not cookie cutter, and they each need an individual treatment plan” (Camden, NJ, 5/11/2006). Both of the programs that had been in existence at the time of the expansion fall into this grouping of individualized, as they both seemed to have tried

being regimented and had found it was not working for the youth. One location holds a “general problems group” at which they get together and talk about everyone’s problems, and work together to find solutions. The models at these sites are more fluid, and are frequently based on information coming from employees who have worked with court-involved juveniles for many years. The Jersey City location noted that they came from an adult Day Center model, but all that they stated seemed to counter that regarding actual programming for the youth (4/11/2006). At their location “their program is based on phases, but it is more client specific; they focus on client needs. They first determine their job and educational needs and their individual needs, then they program that way.”

These locations discharge youth when they and the Parole Officer agree that a youth is ready, many being “up to 90 days” instead of planning to keep them in the longer term. One example given was a youth who “one month in, he came here for school, was transitioned back to his school, he got job counseling, and we had no need to keep him” (Monmouth, 3/31/2006). This program length issue seems to reflect an additional note on the level of individualized services – only keep a youth in the program as long as he needs to be there, rather than setting out program length without individual consideration of needs. The existing program in Newark had been operating for two years at the time of the interview, and they had realized that the regimentation “was not working for everyone and their individualized scheduling needs especially.” Upon arrival on the juvenile’s first day at the Center “they have individual interviews and evaluations by the social worker, the life skills coaches, the employment specialist, and the administrative assistant” (Newark, 6/22/2006).

Another important finding here is that the individualized programs placed more weight on and had more success with gaining family involvement in the programming. The regimented programs admitted the need for their involvement as readily, but had less success with it, and seemed to place less emphasis on this need and more on following their program model and mission statements.

All this is to say that there are two main models that seem to emerge here: individualized and regimented, and the data is coded as such to perform all of the above hypothesis tests for this comparison to see if a more individualized plan is more effective, as would be dictated by the research. The individualized programs had a total of 254 youth, while the regimented programs served just 47, so all analysis must be taken with some measure of understanding that the group sizes are small.

Related Hypothesis Tests

The first test is to see if one program model over the other produces fewer arrests. The logistic regression for this comparison shows a model that does significantly improve prediction of any arrest ($p < .036$). Table 31 shows, however, that the treatment type received did not have a significant effect on the prediction of the model.

Table 31. Logistic Regression for Program Type on Any Arrest (n=301)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Gender	1.689	6.529	.011	5.415
Race	-.195	.157	.692	.823
Age at Release	-.090	.820	.365	.914
Most Serious Committing Offense	-.030	.165	.685	.971
Most Serious Offense Prior	.092	.848	3.57	1.096
Number of Priors	.008	.049	.825	1.008
Regimented	.638	3.499	.061	1.894

The next question was whether or not we can improve prediction of a technical violation of parole based on group membership. This logistic regression model also has a significant chi-square for improving prediction of any violation of parole ($p=.013$). However, we again find, in Table 32, that the variable of treatment type is not what creates that significant effect.

Table 32. Logistic Regression for Program Type on Violations of Parole (n=301)

Variable	logit	Wald	Sig.	OR
Gender	19.94	.000	.998	4.54
Race	-.274	.197	.657	.760
Age at Release	.003	.001	.978	1.003
Most Serious Committing Offense	.090	1.102	.294	1.094
Most Serious Offense Prior	.088	.553	.457	1.096
Number of Priors	.092	5.011	.025	1.096
Regimented	.651	2.171	.141	1.917

The third question, that of offense seriousness, yields more of the same. When testing to see if the different program types led to less serious offenses, offenses of the same level of seriousness, or more serious offenses, the chi-square test was not significant, and the percentages of youth in the different program types were almost indistinguishable. Further, when looking to see if program type might lead to different offenses, rather than more or less serious, the finding was not significant either. This is not surprising. If the programs are leading to similar results in other analysis, it is not likely that offense changes would differ from one program to the next regardless of approach.

The fourth question is that of survival time. The Cox Regression on survival times for youth in the different program models included controls for the multiple predictor variables laid out here, including race, gender, age, number of priors, and most serious

prior and current offenses, while testing the effects of the treatment differences on survival time for these youth. The Cox Regression showed again that this model does not help us predict time to failure; therefore, neither program type offers longer community tenure to youth. The entire model was not significant.

DISCUSSION

Overall the analysis did not meet the expectations of many hypotheses outlined, but still provides some very interesting theoretical and programmatic insight. The program typologies turned into a very interesting element of the work. And the findings are truly of theoretical importance when understanding juvenile offending patterns and effective re-entry.

First, the sample gathered was a diverse group of youthful offenders, and the control and treatment groups did not differ in significant ways. The overall treatment and control groups, described in Comparison 1, are quite comparable, as are the two groups in Comparison 2. This makes the analysis less likely confounded by selection bias, even though they come from different geographical locations in most cases.

The first hypothesis to be tested was whether youth receiving treatment would commit fewer offenses than youth who were in the control group. This was conducted in two steps, with a general control and treatment group comparison, and then by a comparison of control group youth in time 1 who lived in places that later had a DRC opened versus youth from those counties in the treatment group during time 2. Bivariate tests of this question showed no reduced offending for treated youth in Comparison 1, and significant reductions in offending for youth in Comparison 2.

Further tests of this became necessary so that I could control for other factors that are known to effect re-offending, including age, race and gender, as well as elements that indicate the seriousness of criminal history and involvement, including number and seriousness of prior offenses, and seriousness of the offense that landed them in this

sample. This meant using a logistic regression that controlled for all of these things, while testing the effect of being in the treatment. The multivariate analysis revealed the same thing – that youth in Comparison 1 showed no significant offending differences regardless of treatment, while treated youth in Comparison 2 were significantly less likely to reoffend.

This finding led me to conduct further tests that made it even more interesting. First a treatment eligible in Time 1 group compared to a treatment eligible in Time 2 group showed the same – treatment reduced offending. However, because the treatment group in Comparison 2 is always youth during the later time period, and the control group in Comparison 2 is always youth in the earlier time period, it is necessary to control for possible period effects. In doing so, I was not able to rule out history effects in this outcome, leading me to question the finding of treatment effect found here.

The second hypothesis predicted that youth in treatment would have lower rates of parole violations. The basic comparisons of treatment and control groups on this outcome showed no significant group differences, but further controlled tests were conducted anyway to ensure the most exhaustive conclusion on this question. In the logistic regressions there were also no significant findings for the effect of treatment on parole violations for either Comparison 1 or Comparison 2.

Across both the first and second hypotheses it was important to find a way to factor in time at risk, or how long from the time a youth was released from incarceration to the time at which follow-up data was collected on him. This is because the first time period youth would naturally have more time to fail. Statistical limitations meant that I could not include the time at risk in the regression, but I found other ways to control for

it. Comparing youth who had been out at least 3 months on their failure rate in the first 3 months of their community tenure I found no differences in arrest or violation. Then I compared all youth who had a follow-up of at least 300 days, and 3 months after their release, 6 months after their release and 9 months after their release, none had a significant difference in odds of re-arrest or in odds of violating their parole.

This was quite a surprise. When I equalized the time at risk, I expected, due to conversations I had with program staff, that youth in time 2 would have a greater rate of parole violations. During the second time period, youth were more actively violated for not showing up, according to staff members. However, youth who went through a DRC during time 1 had no difference in odds of a parole violation in their first 3 months on the street than youth who went through the DRC during time 2. The policy change did not result in a net widening, punishing kids more harshly, or perhaps simply setting up a new way to fail parole, during the more recent time period than in the time before DRC use was expanded.

The third hypothesis predicted that youth in the treatment group would experience longer community tenure than youth who were in the control group. Tests of this model using Kaplan-Meier showed no significant differences in time to failure for either Comparison 1 or Comparison 2. However, I elected to continue with tests that controlled for other variables to ensure further verification of this. Cox regressions for Comparison 1 and Comparison 2 both showed that there was no significant difference in the survival times for control and treatment groups even when controlling for variables that could influence them, as above.

The fourth hypothesis proposed that youth in treatment groups would commit less serious offenses than youth in control groups due to the effects of treatment. This, however, proved untrue as well. However, while they did not consistently commit less serious offenses, they did in fact commit significantly different types of offenses than the category for which they were committed and later treated. This translates into the possibility that, for both comparisons, the DRC had the effect of changing criminal choices, so as to reduce the odds that a youth would continue down the same path of delinquency. Rather, they would still reoffend, but they would offend in different ways.

The final hypothesis projected that different types of treatment groups would lead to different outcomes, more specifically that there would be differences in re-arrest, parole violation, community tenure, and re-offending patterns based on the type of treatment model. Logistic regression for re-arrest and logistic regression for violations of parole showed that, after controlling for other known factors, there was no significant effect of treatment type on these outcomes. There was no significant difference for offending types for youth who were re-arrested. And Cox regression for survival times also showed no significant differences. It seems that the type of program approach does not lead to differential outcomes for youth, notwithstanding the fact that there were few differences found between treated and untreated youth discussed in the other hypotheses.

The study did have some limitations that must be borne in mind when considering the findings laid out herein. These include generalizability, youth-level information, follow-up time frames, town-level data, and dosage. These present some caution for interpretation of the findings in the larger picture of theory.

The study is limited to only those youth living in the state of New Jersey at the time of the study. This means that the findings cannot be generalized beyond how a Day Reporting Center operates and affects youth in this state. The time periods were specific to the program, rather than randomly selected as well.

Limits were also present due to youth level information. The centers were only located in those places with the highest need for the sites, so the youth who went to centers were youth who lived in high-crime, low-income, likely urban areas. This makes them quite demographically and socially different from youth who did not have a DRC in their town or vicinity. The group comparison on bivariate analyses show that the groups do not differ greatly on criminogenic factors, but there are many things that can cause differences that are not listed here, such as family income, family constellation, and other social and historical influences not available in the data that may be significantly different in the control versus the treatment groups.

Many studies also follow treatment and control group members for extensive periods of time. This study, however, only followed up for 3 months for many youth. This was due to the limits placed on the study by the funding agency. While the follow-up time varied from one youth to the next, as noted above, I created some limited controls for this variable by comparing youth failures for their first 3 months on the streets, and their first 300 days on the streets, to get some idea of the things youth are involved in during those time frames regardless of the time period in which they were released.

Town level information on youth was a very specific variable that would have provided more lean dichotomies in the analysis done for Comparison 2. As explained in that section, youth were compared in two time frames for the same counties. The first

time frame that was used was the group of control group youth in time 1 from the counties that had a DRC open in them the following year in an effort to reduce some selection bias from geography. The second group for this comparison was youth from those same counties in the treatment group for time 2. Town level data would have allowed me to make an even more refined selection of the control group for this analysis, as many youth living in given counties were not sent to DRCs even when there county had a center – due to their living somewhere further away in the same county.

Finally, a very key shortcoming must be considered. Treatment dosage was not measured in this data. If a youth was assigned to a DRC, he or she was then placed in the treatment group. And if he or she was not assigned to a DRC, then he was placed in the control group. This means that if a youth never showed up, or a youth stayed in the program for weeks, there was no distinction made between them other than time to failure. Assessing survival, or community tenure, does something to control for this problem, but it is important to remember for future research that dosage can play a key role when considering the effect of any treatment, program, or intervention.

Bringing the Findings Back to Theory

Juvenile offenders nearly always return to society, so it was a task undertaken here to better understand the role of programming in assisting successful reentry for serious offending youth. This dissertation has examined various approaches to this reentry, starting with intermediate interventions undertaken with less serious delinquent youth, including drug court and Multi-Systemic Therapy. Additionally, this project has

outlined programs used for more serious youth in the system, such as boot camps and Intensive Aftercare. These approaches have some common successful elements that are shown in research to help reduce various measures of recidivism. These include: immediate intervention, youth accountability, problem solving, family inclusion, family roles, family involvement, education, incentives, pro-social peers, and involvement by the community.

These elements stem from logically connected theory that would have youth progress out of criminal thinking and criminal lifestyles through changing their environments and their delinquent trajectories. Youth must be understood in their context, on their terms, in order to intervene in negative lifestyles. Successful transitioning from criminal to non-criminal lifestyles requires important and environment-wide changes for any youth. The youth's needs and ecology must be a large part of the interventions according to Life Course Theory, and the most successful programs are those that include these considerations.

Examining the services actually provided by the various DRCs in the study, there were two types of treatment offered – individualized and regimented. This differentiation led to no differences in youth outcome. So that leaves us with the question of youth ecology. The intention of the DRC model was to provide some of these similar elements, though many that were intended were never quite fulfilled. For example, several sites attempted to include families in different activities, getting at the family involvement piece. They commonly struggled with finding ways to get families to come out and wanting to be involved, where several gave up on the idea after their failed efforts. This and other related program shortfalls translate to a missed opportunity to truly affect youth

outcomes. If program participation does not reduce arrest rates, nor does it reduce parole violation, and it does not increase community tenure, then we must ask: what are they in fact doing?

One finding was that the programs are changing criminal choices, if not the choice to commit delinquent acts, following treatment. While this presents a bit of an enigma, it may in fact make some sense. Only a handful of programs offered the regimented approach, so the more widely utilized individualized programming in the remainder of the DRCs was very tailored, not to what the youth tested for on an assessment or on an examination, but rather it was tailored to what the program knew about the youth – their offenses and their histories, their drug use, and their court orders for things such as anger management. If programming was developed to deal with those needs in particular, then other criminogenic factors were possibly overlooked. The very specific interventions offered to a drug offender, for example, might steer him away from further involvement in drugs and the illegal market. However, those same interventions do little to create a transition away from delinquent behavior more generally. This offers some hope. If crime-specific intervention can work, then perhaps more general, anti-delinquency curricula might accomplish the similar but larger goal of reducing crime seriousness, or reducing criminal involvement at all.

Theories surrounding crime specialization, as enumerated in the literature earlier in this text, fall into two camps. The first school of thought is that delinquency is simply delinquency, and that being involved in crime does not beget choosing a certain type of offense in which to specialize. The second school of thought spells out both probabilistic

and sequential specialization, where offenders generally commit within patterned offending types.

This data may in fact support the first school of thought, where “cafeteria style offending,” as it is called, means that offenders switch from one offense to the next, rather than sticking with one type. This would assume, though, that the committing offense is not indicative of a pattern prior, and that the switching would have occurred with or without the intervention. If that were the case, then youth without the intervention, those in the control group, would not have significantly different outcomes on crime switching.

The analysis here supports that sequential specialization can in fact be interrupted, that from prior commitment to subsequent arrest, crime type may in fact switch. The direction in which they switch, however, has not been affected by DRC interventions in the current study. If the one-time measurement of committing offense available in the current data is an indicator of specialty, then the specialization exists and can in fact be altered. The research posed in earlier chapters supports that there are patterns of offending, rather than cafeteria style selections. And this in fact is supported further by the current research.

As a separate points, surveillance effects may be argued to be either good or bad, but that is a matter of theory and perhaps something to be cleared up in future research. The finding that there were one of the control groups evidenced the highest violation of parole rates presents us with a question as to what the surveillance led to in these programs. If youth knew they would be violated if they did not show up, then maybe

there was some level of deterrence for absenteeism. This is problematic. Youth who lived in places with DRCs are automatically – by virtue of geography – at a greater level of surveillance and under greater scrutiny. If we are to help youth, it should be by giving them opportunities to succeed, not new ways in which to fail.

Overall, the DRC model affects youth in some unexpected ways. We must consider the costs and benefits of the model before deciding if it is worth the effort, and the tests here offer us little promise. There are limited positive findings, and if we are to decide about spending more time and effort on a DRC program or similar, the studies must be greater in scope. The tests here offer some hope, some chances to intervene, and some opportunities to learn from a now-expired application of the ideas founded on adult DRCs and adapted to delinquent youth in the state of New Jersey, but perhaps NOT an opportunity that should be taken to further widen the net and increase youth restrictions and rules in places around NJ where youth tend to already be at a structural and social disadvantage.

CONCLUSIONS

Young people that are entrenched in the deepest end of the juvenile justice system are not beyond hope. Perhaps that is the lesson herein. The work here has examined theories, intermediate sanctions, and interventions more broadly in an effort to understand what works, and just as importantly, why it works.

The juvenile system has been flawed, but not broken, and it can be improved. When it intervenes to rehabilitate offending youth, it is doing that for which it was created – not punishing criminals, but changing the course of youthful behavior. Life Course theory posits that this is not only possible, it is also necessary if the system is to be successful in reforming youth in the long term.

Life Course also holds that the context of the youth, his environment, is the key to his trajectory – the course his life will follow. Interventions by the juvenile system must be timed well, and planned taking into the account the ecology of the youth served. And whether it is for an adolescent limited offender, or it is for a life-course persistent delinquent, deviance happens in the context of the youth. We must intervene effectively by taking what we know about deviant trajectories, and address individual needs to help change the overall path a young person chooses to follow.

Reviewing first the approaches taken with less-serious offending youth, some basic things are revealed. It was uncovered here that the confrontation and regimentation of boot camps are not always the solution. Meanwhile, juvenile drug courts and multi-systemic therapy show some promise specifically for their individualized, intensive, and ecological methods that address the youth in his environment. And of course, looking at

methods attempted with more serious offending youth in the intensive aftercare model showed similar factors to be as important.

Understanding that there is some notion of what works and why, the next step is to examine assessing the successes of new approaches, and how closely they follow successful examples. If in fact recidivism is a negative measure of a pro-social intervention, other variables help in further understanding the mechanisms of success. If a program or an intervention more specifically is effective – if it reaches the target audience and send the right messages – one might still have a youth that reoffends. Just because a youth wants to do the right thing does not mean he always will. And there is arguable a sizeable difference between the youth who reoffends the day he is released compared to the youth who tries to conform but is unsuccessful. The second set of young people are ones for which we might deem the program effective, even if not in completely avoiding criminal behavior. That second youth is one who not only takes longer to reoffend, he is also one who might offend in less serious ways because perhaps he has redirected his trajectory. This assumes that there is some selection of delinquency that occurs when a youth acts out, and theory does support this to an extent. Further, if youth are rationally selecting the offenses they will participate in, then perhaps they are also capable of being shown the error in those choices, and redirect their paths.

This study has undertaken to measure all of these things when looking to fill out the list of what works with these youth. First I have examined recidivism by looking at new offenses docketed, and then by looking at parole violations. Then I moved on to look at community tenure. And finally, I measured change in crime type selection to see if

there was some alteration in the criminal selectivity as a result of the programs' interventions.

The findings were still somewhat insightful on some of these things. First, involvement in a Day Reporting Center did not positively impact recidivism for any of the comparisons made. Second, program interventions did not lead to youth surviving on the streets any longer than youth who were simply released to parole. And finally, crime specialization leaves us with more questions than answers. Youth who participated selected different classes of crimes, but not necessarily less serious ones.

The current study had its limitations. Longer follow-up times in studies of similar populations are generally more fruitful. And surveillance effects are necessarily important to consider here as well. But all told, if the DRC presents more ways for a youth to fail if he lives in a selected high-crime area, then we might simply making the outcomes of a disadvantaged subgroup worse. Before continuing to consider such programs around the country, more thorough study of more model-restricted programs is warranted. In juvenile justice, the most successful programs in the last several years have been those that open the door and make it an attractive transition to a new trajectory of behavior; those that use mandatory programming and rules that result in additional marks on a young person's record are not helpful.

The programs redirected youth from committing their presenting offenses, so we know that the programs might be effective if directed more generally toward deviance, rather than toward the immediate offenses. But it is also evident that the Day Reporting Centers only tapped into only some of the effective elements outlined in the text here, leaving some key pieces aside such as family involvement, school re-entry, and a full

ecological approach. . Perhaps a better model might be one that includes these successful elements, and does so in a more rigorous way.

Further research should address the limitations of the current study, including the the time frames allotted for following up on youth sampled. And this is not to ignore the lack of information on dosage, where level of program exposure was merely a dichotomous participation variable, one that might serve research better if measured in a continuous variable. It is possible to redirect youth, as is seen with the change in crime choices. Existing in a time when we are reassessing our approaches to kids who commit crimes means that we have the unique opportunity to take what we know and make it available – but not mandatory – for those kids that want to change their lives.

REFERENCES

Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring [AIM] (2004). AIM: Indiana's Juvenile Reentry Program, Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring: Annual Report 2004. Retrieved December 26, 2011, from http://aim.spea.iupui.edu/AIM_annual_report.doc

Altschuler, D.M., & Armstrong, T.L. (1994). Intensive Aftercare for High-Risk Juveniles: A Community Care Model. Washington, DC: USDOJ, OJP, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Bahn, C., & Davis, J.R. (1998). Day reporting centers as an alternative to incarceration. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 27: 139-150.

Barnes, J.C., Miller, H.V., & Miller, J.M. (2009). Identifying leading characteristics associated with juvenile drug court admission and success: A research note. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 7: 350-360.

Benson, M. L. (2002). Crime and The Life Course: An Introduction. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Bernard, T.J. (1992). The Cycle of Juvenile Justice. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Blumstein, A., & Cohen, J. (1979). Estimation of individual crime rates from arrest records. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 70: 561-585.

Borque, B.B., Cronin, R.C., Felker, D.B., Pearson, F.R., Han, M., & Hill, S.M. (1996, Feb.). NIJ Research in Brief: Boot Camps for Juveniles: An Implementation Evaluation of Three Demonstration Programs. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Bouffard, J.A., & Bergseth, K.J. (2008). The impact of reentry services on juvenile offenders' recidivism. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 6: 295-318.

Craddock, A. (2000). Exploratory Analysis of Client Outcomes, Costs, and Benefits of Day Reporting Centers – Final Report. Terre Haute, IN: Indiana State University.

Deane, G., Armstrong, D.P., & Felson, R.B. (2005). An examination of offense specialization using marginal logit models. Criminology, 43: 955-988.

Fagan, J.A. (1990). Treatment and reintegration of violent juvenile offenders : Experimental results. Justice Quarterly, 7: 233-263.

Fraser, J.C. (2004). Juvenile structured day and alternative learning programs: Impact and process study. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Urban & Regional Studies, for The Governor's Crime Commission.

Glisson, C., Schoenwald, S.K., Hemmelgarn, A., Green, P., Dukes, D., Armstrong, K.S., & Chapman, J.E. (2010). Randomized trial of MST and ARC in a two-level evidence-based treatment implementation strategy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 78: 537-550.

Henggeler, S.W., Halliday-Boykins, C.A., Cunningham, P.B., Randall, J., Shapiro, S.B., & Chapman, J.E. (2006). Juvenile drug court: Enhancing outcomes by integrating evidence-based treatments. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 74: 42-54.

Hiller, M.L., Malluche, D., Bryan, V., Dupont, M.L., Martin, B., Abensur, R., Leukefeld, C.V., & Payne, C. (2010). A multi-site description of juvenile drug courts. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 54: 213-235.

Huey, S.J., Henggeler, S.W., Brondino, M.J., & Pickrel, S.G. (2000). Mechanisms of change in multisystemic therapy: Reducing delinquent behavior through therapist adherence and improved family and peer functioning. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68: 451-467.

Hunter, J.A., Gilbertson, S.A., Vedros, D., & Morton, M. (2004). Strengthening community-based programming for juvenile sex offenders: Key concepts and paradigm shifts. Child Maltreatment, 9: 177-189.

Lo, C.C., Kim, Y.S., & Cheng, T.C. (2008). Offense specialization of arrestees: An event history analysis. Crime and Delinquency, 54: 341-365.

Lombroso, C. [(1876)(2006 reprint)]. The Criminal Man. NC: Duke University Press.

MacKenzie, D.L., Gover, A.R., Srmstrong, G.S., & Mitchell, O. (2001, Aug.). NIJ Research in Brief: A Naitonal Study Comparing the Environments of Boot Camps with Traditional Facilities for Juvenile Offenders. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Mair, G., & Nee, C. (1992). Day centre reconviction rates. British Journal of Criminology, 32: 329-339.

Maltz, M.D. (1984). Recidivism. New York: Academic Press.

Marciniak, L.M. (1999). The use of day reporting as an intermediate sanction: A study of offender targeting and program termination. The Prison Journal, 79: 205-225.

- Marciniak, L.M. (2000). The addition of day reporting to intensive supervision probation: A comparison of recidivism rates. Federal Probation, 64 (1): 34-39.
- McBride, D., & VanderWaal, C. (1997). Day reporting centers as an alternative for drug using offenders. Journal of Drug Issues, 27: 379-397.
- McGloin, J.M., Sullivan, C.J., Piquero, A.R., & Pratt, T.C. (2007). Local life circumstances and offending specialization/versatility. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 44: 321-346.
- Meade, B., Steiner, B. (2010). The total effects of boot camps that house juveniles: A systematic review of the evidence. Journal of Criminal Justice, 38: 841-853.
- NJ Juvenile Justice Commission (2005). Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services Policy & Procedure: Levels of Supervision, Contact Standards, and Case Reviews. [Policy #: 03JPTS:III-6]. Effective date: 12/7/05. Provided by Public Information, NJ Juvenile Justice Commission, January, 2012.
- Osgood, D.W., & Schreck, C.J. (2007). A new method for studying the extent, stability, and predictors of individual specialization in violence. Criminology, 45: 273-312.
- Parent, D.G. (2003). NIJ Research for Practice: Correctional Boot Camps, Lessons from a Decade of Research. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Rodriguez, N., & Webb, V.J. (2004). Multiple measures of juvenile drug court effectiveness : Results of a quasi-experimental design. Crime & Delinquency, 50: 292-314.
- Roy, S., & Grimes, J.N. (2002). Adult offenders in a day reporting center – A preliminary study. Federal Probation, 66 (1): 44-50.
- Ruiz, B.S., Stevens, S.J., Fuhriman, J., Bogart, J.G., & Korchmaros, J.D. (2009). A juvenile drug court model in southern Arizona: Substance abuse, delinquency, and sexual risk outcomes by gender and race/ethnicity. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 48: 416-438.
- Schaeffer, C.M., & Borduin, C.M. (2005). Long-term follow-up to a randomized clinical trial of multisystemic therapy with serious and violent juvenile offenders. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73: 445-453.
- Sedlak, A.J., & Bruce, C. (2010). Youth's Characteristics and Backgrounds: Findings from the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement. Washington DC: Office of Justice Programs, OJJDP. [NCJ#227730]

Sickmund, M., Sladky, T.J., & Kang, W. (2008). Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Database. [Online] Available: www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/ojstatbb/cjrp

Sloan, J.J., Smylka, J.O., & Rush, J.P. (2004). Do juvenile drug courts reduce recidivism? Outcomes of drug court and an adolescent substance abuse program. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 29: 95-115.

Sontheimer, H., & Goodstein, L. (1993). An evaluation of juvenile intensive aftercare probation: Aftercare versus system response effects. Justice Quarterly, 10: 197-227.

Steinhart, D. (1999). Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform: Planning for Juvenile Detention Reforms [volume 1 in series]. Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Sullivan, M.L, McCann, E., Angiello, E., & Veysey, B. (2008). Evaluation of Juvenile Day Reporting Centers: Summary Report to the New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission. [Unpublished study]

Tontodonato, P. (1988). Explaining rate changes in delinquent arrest transitions using event history analysis. Criminology, 26: 439-459.

Wiebush, R.G., McNulty, B, & Le, T. (2000). OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin July 2000: Implementation of the Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program. Washington, DC: USDIJ, OJP, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Woolfenden, S.R., Williams, K., & Peat, J.K. (2002). Family and parenting interventions for conduct disorder and delinquency: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Archives of Disease in Childhood, 86: 251-256.

Appendix A:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total	Total Progs	
Education												10	
Subject Specific Collaboration wLocal H.S.	*		*	*	*		*	*		*	8		1 Mon
Collab w Adult Lrng Ctr	*	*	Y	Y		*	Y		*	*	5		2 Comm Sol
Computer Training			Y	Y				*			1		3 BI-E
Cooperative Ed Program			Y				*				1		4 BI-P
Case Management												8	5 BI-A
Case Management		*	*	*	*	*	Y		*	*	7		6 VOA
Employment												10	7 CAP
Job Readiness		*	Y	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8		8 OFA
Job Certification Programs	*			Y					*		3		9 TEEM
Job Placement		*	Y	Y		*	Y	*	*		3		10 Kintock
Supported Employment			Y	Y		*					1		
Pre-Apprentice Program				Y			*				1		
Physical/Mental Health												8	
Psy/Mental Health Tmt				Y			*				1		
Cog Thinking-Counseling		*	Y	Y				*		*	2		
HIV/AIDS Awareness		*	Y	Y			Y	*	*		2		
HIV/AIDS Prevention			Y	Y			*	*	*		2		
Therapy Plans			*	N	*			*		*	4		
Drug/Substc Abuse												9	
Sub Abuse Prev/Awars	*	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	*	9		
Urine Analysis			*	*	*		Y	*		*	5		
Breathalyzers			*	*	*			*		*	5		
Social Skills												9	
Problem Solving	*	*	Y	Y			Y	*		*	2		
Reasoning and Rehab			Y	Y		*	Y			*	2		
Communication Skills	*		Y	Y			Y	*	*	*	3		
Coping Skills	*	*	Y	Y			Y	*	*	*	3		
Improve Fam Mgmt. Skills	*	*	Y	Y			Y				1		
Soc Responsibility Training		*	*	*	*		Y	*			3		
Life Skills Training		*	*	*	*		Y	*	*	*	5		
Team Building		*	*	*	*		Y				3		
Legal Services												8	
Community Service	*		*	*	*		*				5		
Wkly Case Conf w/ PO			*	*	*		Y		*	*	5		
Court Advocacy			Y	Y		*					1		
Basic Needs												9	
Referrals to Community Svcs		*	*	*	*		Y		*	*	6		
Breakfast & Lunch Daily		*	Y	Y			L		*	*	3		
Transport to/from Prog	*	*	*	*	*						5		
Stipend						*					1		
Other												6	
Family Night/Day	*		*	*	*		Y			*	5		
Rewards/Sanctions			*	*	*		Y			*	4		
Faith Based Mentoring						*	Y				1		
Anger Management	Y	*	*	*	*		Y	Y	*	ref	*		

Appendix B:
Standard Conditions of Parole and Post-Incarceration Supervision for NJ Youth

GENERAL CONDITIONS OF PAROLE

1. You are required to obey all laws and ordinances.
2. You are to report in person to your Juvenile Justice Commission's District Parole Supervisor or his/her designated representative, immediately after you are released on parole from the institution or program, unless you have been given other written instructions by a designated representative of the Board, and you are to report thereafter as instructed by the Juvenile Justice Commission's District Parole Supervisor or his/her designated representative.
3. You are to notify your Parole Officer immediately after any arrest, immediately after your being served with or receiving a complaint or summons and after accepting any pre-trial release including bail.
4. You are to immediately notify your parole officer upon the issuance by the appropriate court, pursuant to the Prevention of Domestic Violence Act, N.J.S.A. 2C: 25-17 et seq., of an order granting emergency relief, a temporary or final restraining order or an order establishing conditions of release or bail in a criminal matter or offense arising out of a domestic violence situation. You are to comply with any condition established within the respective order until the order is dissolved by the appropriate court or until a condition is modified or discharged by the appropriate court.
5. You are to obtain approval of your Parole Officer:
 - a. Prior to any change in your residence
 - b. Before leaving the state of your approved residence
6. You are not to own or possess any firearm, as defined in N.J.S.A. 2C:39-1f, for any purpose.
7. You are not to own or possess any weapon enumerated in N.J.S.A. 2C:39-1r.
8. You are to refrain from the use, possession or distribution of a controlled dangerous substance, controlled substance analog or imitation controlled dangerous substance as defined in N.J.S.A. 2C:35-2 and N.J.S.A. 2 C:35-11.
9. You are required to make payment to the Juvenile Justice Commission Office of Parole and Transitional Services of any assessments, fines, penalties, lab fees or restitution imposed by the sentencing court.
10. You are to register with the appropriate law enforcement agency and upon a change of address, register with the appropriate law enforcement agency if you are subject to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 2C:7-2.
11. You are to refrain from behavior which results in the issuance of a final restraining order pursuant to the Prevention of Domestic Violence Act, N.J.S.A. 2C:25-17 et seq.
12. You are to waive extradition to the State of New Jersey from any jurisdiction in which you are apprehended and detained for violation of this parole status and you are not to contest any effort by any jurisdiction to return you to the State of New Jersey.
13. You are to submit to drug or alcohol testing at any time as directed by the assigned parole officer.

14. You must attend school on a full-time basis if you are under 16 years of age.
15. You are not to operate a motor vehicle without a valid driver's license.
16. You are to immediately notify your parole officer of any change in your employment status.
17. You are to submit to a search conducted by a parole officer, without a warrant of your person, place of residence, vehicle or other real or personal property within your control at any time a parole officer has a reasonable, articulable basis to believe that the search will produce contraband or evidence that a condition of supervision has been violated, is being violated or is about to be violated and permit the confiscation of any contraband.

On the homepage for Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services for the JJC, Parole is described as:

The Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services is designed to achieve a balanced approach to reintegrating juvenile parolees into their communities after the completion of their sentences. That approach utilizes state-of-the-art supervision techniques necessary to maintain public safety, as well as individualized services essential to personal development and responsibility.

Understanding that all juveniles in the Commission's care will eventually return to their community at the end of their court-imposed sentence, individual plans for parole begin immediately and continue to evolve until a juvenile is paroled. Prerelease planning ensures that each juvenile receives continued services as necessary after his or her release.

The Commission's primary goal is to ensure that public safety is maintained through a system of case management that incorporates the use of goals and objectives which are reviewed with each youth and their family on a regular basis.

Each juvenile is assessed according to the level of need, risk, supervision and services required. Four levels of supervision are applied to the monitoring of youths: intensive, maximum, medium and minimum. As youth demonstrate progress, they advance to a lower level of supervision and greater independence. Each level of supervision contains standards for monthly contacts, curfew, drug and alcohol screens and community service.

Special offenders whose behavioral history is dominated by violence, sex offending, or drug trafficking are intensely monitored.

Supervision teams also collect court-ordered financial obligations from the youth. Payments toward restitution, fines and penalties are collected and disbursed to the proper recipients.

Law on Post-Incarceration Supervision: NJ statutes title 2A:4A-44 ss d.5

(5) Every disposition that includes a term of incarceration shall include a term of post-incarceration supervision equivalent to one-third of the term of incarceration

imposed. During the term of post-incarceration supervision the juvenile shall remain in the community and in the legal custody of the Juvenile Justice Commission established pursuant to section 2 of P.L.1995, c.284 (C.52:17B-170) in accordance with the rules of the parole board, unless the appropriate parole board panel determines that post-incarceration supervision should be revoked and the juvenile returned to custody in accordance with the procedures and standards set forth in sections 15 through 21 of P.L.1979, c.441 (C.30:4-123.59 through C.30:4-123.65). The term of post-incarceration supervision shall commence upon release from incarceration or parole, whichever is later. A term of post-incarceration supervision imposed pursuant to this paragraph may be terminated by the appropriate parole board panel if the juvenile has made a satisfactory adjustment in the community while on parole or under such supervision, if continued supervision is not required and if the juvenile has made full payment of any fine or restitution.

Ellen P. McCann

Email: emccann72@aol.com

19-B Rector Place

Red Bank, NJ 07701

(732)383-7456 fax (732)539-0389 cell

Objective: To acquire a position conducting, overseeing, and sharing research in Criminal or Juvenile Justice policy, practice, programming, and change.

Education:

Rutgers University, Newark, NJ- *May 2012 expected graduation*
Ph.D. student in Criminal Justice – Prospectus defense completed November 8, 2011; Dissertation defense in March, 2012.

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN; *transferred out 2002*
Ph.D. student in Sociology (3 years)

Primary Specialty area: Criminology

Sub-Specialty area: Statistics and methodology

UNC-Charlotte, Charlotte, NC; June, 1999

Master of Science in Criminal Justice

Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC; May, 1997

Bachelor of Science - Honors Associate, Summa Cum Laude

Double Major in Psychology and Criminal Justice

Related Experience:

NJ Juvenile Justice Commission (February 2007-current)

- **Detention Specialist**, evaluation of local justice system policies, procedures and progress; extensive data collection and analyses; long-term planning for systems change in collaboration with local stakeholders; work on acquisition of grants for programs and their evaluation; coordination of risk assessment for juveniles; development of new alternatives to secure detention and funding of such; building and utilizing databases for local use for tracking violations of probation, program utilization, and management of staff.

Rutgers University

- **Junior Faculty & Internship Coordinator** (September 2011 – current) Criminal Justice Program
- **Adjunct Faculty** (Fall 2008 – September 2011) Criminal Justice Program

Rutgers University-Newark

- **Research Assistant** (December 2005- April 2007)
 - o Juvenile Day Reporting Center Evaluation-JJC Grant; Qualitative and Quantitative data collection and analysis on process and outcome.
 - o Data Manager: Interim Process Evaluation of Family-Oriented Juvenile Reentry Programs-JJC Grant; Qualitative and Quantitative data collection

- **Teaching Assistant** (September 2005- Spring 2007), School of Criminal Justice
- **Visiting Lecturer** (Summer 2004, 2005, 2006, Fall 2007), Department of Criminal Justice

The College of NJ

- **Assistant Professor**, Department of Criminology & Justice Studies (Fall 2004-Spring 2005)
- **Adjunct Professor**, Department of Criminology & Justice Studies (Fall 2005, Spring 2008)

Hudson County Court – Family Division, (2004)

- **Research Intern**, Juvenile Justice Disparities Study
Analyzing court processing and census information in Hudson County Court jurisdiction, reporting to division head for preparation and submission of state required summary of findings. Survey design, focus group development and implementation, and data analysis.

University of Tennessee (Fall 1999-Summer 2002)

- **Teaching Assistant & Adjunct Professor**, Department of Sociology

Grant Activities:

- Background research, analysis, and collaboration for various grant-funded projects in Essex, Somerset and Middlesex Counties (2007 – present).
- Assisted in the attainment of grants and aided in the reallocation of Juvenile Justice spending across three counties totaling :
 - \$951,750 in 2008
 - \$1,025,000 in 2009
 - \$1,343,000 in 2010
 - \$1,375,300 in 2011
- Created and led collaborative working groups to create grant-funded youth programs serving as pre-dispositional detention options for the Courts, as well as creating program-monitoring databases and analyzing/evaluating ongoing program outcome measures.

Government Research Report:

Sullivan, Mercer L., Ellen P. McCann, Elizabeth A. Panuccio, & Bonita Veysey (2007). "Evaluation of Juvenile Day Reporting Centers: Summary Report to the New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission." 9 pages, 3 figures, 1 table. Newark, NJ: Rutgers School of Criminal Justice.

Master's Thesis:

McCann, Ellen P. (1999). Sexual Activity and Sexual Victimization. Charlotte, NC: University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Conference Presentations:NJ-JDAI All-Sites Conference 2011

- Facilitator: Innovations in Juvenile Probation
- Facilitator: Using Data to Make Smart Changes in Detention Alternatives

NJ Juvenile Justice Commission Quarterly Social Workers Meeting 2011

- The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

Conference of Alabama Judges 2009

- Using Data to Make Smarter Policy

NJ-JDAI All-Sites Conference 2009

- Facilitator: Juvenile Risk Screening Tool Evaluation and Progress

ASC, 2006, Los Angeles

- Juvenile Day Reporting Centers in New Jersey

ACJS, 2001, Washington, DC

- Teacher and Community Attitudes and School Violence

Southern CJA, 2000, Charleston, SC

- Teacher Attitudes and School Violence

ASC, 1998, Washington, DC

- Gangs and the Military

ACJS, 1997, Louisville, KY

- Gangs, Small Towns and the Media

Honors and Involvements:***Community (current and ongoing):***

Breast Cancer Research Foundation: Fundraising & Participant, Women's Triathlon
 American Cancer Society: Fundraising and participation, New Jersey Marathon
 New Jersey Marathon Volunteers for Children's Charities
 Saint Mary's Athletic Association: Volunteer Youth Soccer Coach
 Soldiers' Race Team Member: Collection of Gift Packages for Troops overseas
 Covenant House of NY/NJ: Fundraising & Participant, Ironman Triathlon

Ph.D.: UT-Knoxville:

Graduate Teaching Seminar Participant, Fall 1999
 Advanced Graduate Teaching Seminar Participant, Spring 2000
 Graduate Teaching Consulting Service Workshop Participant, Spring 2000
 New Graduate Student Peer Mentor, 2000-2001
 Graduate Teaching Seminar Panelist, Fall 2000 - "Sensitive Issues in the Classroom"
 Sociology Department Graduate Teaching Assistant Panelist, Fall 2000
 Graduate Teaching Associates' Mentoring Program Participant, 2000-2001

Master's: UNC-Charlotte:

N.C. Tuition Grant Recipient
 Dean Reep Memorial Graduate Scholarship for Studies in Crime Prevention

Undergraduate: WCU:

Honors Program (1995- 1997)

Dean's List (1995-1997)

NC Sheriff's Association Scholarship (1996-1997)

Accreditation Committee Psychology Department (1997)

Accreditation Committee Criminal Justice Department (1997)

Student Advisory Committee to the Dean of the College of Applied Sciences (1996-1997) Who's Who Among American Colleges and Universities

National Dean's List (1996)

Innovative Teaching Committee (Spring 1997)

Most Outstanding Senior Criminal Justice Dept.(1997)

Most Outstanding Undergraduate Psychology Dept. (1997)

Most Outstanding Undergraduate at a Four Year College or University for the State of N.C., Awarded by the N.C. Criminal Justice Association