

1983

An investigation of juvenile probation officers' correctional models in Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk counties

Franka U. Undiandeye
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1983 Franka U. Undiandeye

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Undiandeye, Franka U., "An investigation of juvenile probation officers' correctional models in Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk counties" (1983). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3523.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3523>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

An investigation of juvenile probation officers' correctional models in Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk counties

Abstract

Like other government run institutions, the American juvenile justice system is in trouble. Since the passage of the first Juvenile Court Act in Illinois in 1899, a great discrepancy between the intended goals and the practical reality still remains. As Richette (1969) pointed out: It seems paradoxical that a nation otherwise obsessed with childrearing techniques should treat so casually the official machinery it set up to deal with children who get into trouble or need protection (p. 5). Meanwhile, delinquency rates continue to rise at an alarming pace and each of the components of the juvenile justice system seemingly continues to operate largely independent of one another. There seems also to be a lack of confidence and interaction between the delinquent [sic] youth and the correctional officers who direct their daily activities. Such behavior is detrimental to the officers, the youths, the parents and the society to which the youth ultimately return.

AN INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS' CORRECTIONAL MODELS
IN BLACK HAWK, LYNN AND POLK COUNTIES

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Department of Educational
Administration and Counseling
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Franka U. Undiandeye

March 1983

This Research Paper by: Franka U. Undiandeye

Entitled: An Investigation of Juvenile Probation Officers'
Correctional Models in Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk Counties

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts.

Robert T. Lembke

4/26/83
Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

Norman McCumsey

4/28/83
Date Approved

Second Reader of Research Paper

Robert T. Lembke

4/26/83
Date Received

Graduate Faculty Adviser

Robert Krajewski

4/28/83
Date Received

Head, Department of Educational
Administration and Counseling
Services

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.	2
Research Methodology.	4
Implications of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	5
2. Review of Related Literature	7
Punishment Model.	7
Rehabilitation Model.	10
Justice Model	13
Logical Consequence Model	14
3. Procedure and Analysis of the Findings	16
Procedure	16
Analysis.	18
4. Summary and Recommendation	24
Summary of Data	24
Recommendation.	25
Bibliography	26
Appendix A	28
Personal Data - Entirely Confidential.	28
Questions for Study: Methods of Juvenile Treatment.	29
Appendix B: Subjective Responses.	31

LIST OF TABLES

Table Number	Page
1. Ratings of Effectiveness by Sex of Juvenile Correction Models by Juvenile Probation Officers in Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk Counties	18
2. A Comparison of Ratings of Effectiveness of Various Models of Treatment of Juvenile Offenders by Selected Juvenile Probation Officers	19
3. How Have Your Ideas Changed in the Time You Have Dealt With Juvenile Offenders?.	20
4. How Do You Treat the Youths Who Do Not Respond To the Rules of Your Chosen Method?.	21
5. What Role Do You Believe Your Philosophy Will Play in the Future?.	22

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Like other government run institutions, the American juvenile justice system is in trouble. Since the passage of the first Juvenile Court Act in Illinois in 1899, a great discrepancy between the intended goals and the practical reality still remains. As Richette (1969) pointed out:

It seems paradoxical that a nation otherwise obsessed with childrearing techniques should treat so casually the official machinery it set up to deal with children who get into trouble or need protection (p. 5).

Meanwhile, delinquency rates continue to rise at an alarming pace and each of the components of the juvenile justice system seemingly continues to operate largely independent of one another. There seems also to be a lack of confidence and interaction between the delinquent youth and the correctional officers who direct their daily activities. Such behavior is detrimental to the officers, the youths, the parents and the society to which the youth ultimately return. Approximately 1.8 million juvenile cases involving 1.3 million children, were handled by the juvenile courts in the United States in 1980 (Uniform Crime Report, 1980). These youths represented about 3% of all children, age ten through seventeen, in the country. An alarming 90% of all prisoners in the United States have juvenile records. An effective correctional system must necessarily, therefore, involve strict policy implementation at the local community levels. This calls for a regular evaluation of the federal/state policies at the community level.

Due process for juveniles and the utilization of policy models seem to remain distant from goals, judging from the continuous sharp increases in juvenile crimes. This state of affairs may have existed in the past, due to the manner in which probation officers administer their respective duties and functions. It should be pointed out, however, that the utility of these correctional policy models is not without some questioning among juvenile justice practitioners and other community counselors. There are basically two schools of thought: one group favors the informal, unofficial treatment oriented approach, referred to as a "casework" or "therapeutic" approach; the other favors a more formal and constitutional approach, referred to as a "legalistic" or "formalistic" approach (Task Force Report, 1967).

Some scholars view the total juvenile justice system as one of the major causations of juvenile delinquency:

Processing of a young offender through the juvenile court may even strengthen his delinquent tendencies by stigmatizing him in the eye of his friends, relatives and neighbors; by reshaping his self concept to that of a delinquent; and by throwing him in with other juvenile delinquents from whom he learns delinquent patterns and attitudes. The juvenile court has not achieved its major objectives: rehabilitation, justice and compassion (Winslow, 1968, p. 129).

The objectives can only be achieved within each local juvenile institution. This achievement is a function of the administrative philosophies of the governing body of the institution and individual correctional styles of the probation officers.

Statement of the Problem

The nature of the juvenile justice system is critically shaped by the local correctional practitioners, a practice which can escalate or alleviate the problems of the system. Such correctional services

influence the basic life conditions of youth. If professionals are antagonistic toward the youth, it is very likely that the youth will react in similar ways. The responsiveness of the community correctional practitioners determines the youth's social adjustment in a free society (Cressy and McDermott, 1973).

In many human endeavors, theoretical formulations often differ from practical undertakings or realities. It is one thing to set goals or make rules and another to have them translated into achievements. In the world of juvenile corrections, four standard correctional models have been identified: Punishment, Rehabilitation, Justice and Logical Consequence models (Bartollas and Miller, 1978). These models arise out of a quest to improve understanding of correctional philosophies in the American juvenile institutions and protect the rights of the juvenile offenders.

The application of these models as a yardstick of juvenile corrections has raised many questions:

... studies and critiques in recent years raised serious questions as to whether actual performance measures well enough against theoretical purpose to tolerate the immunity of the process from the reach of the constitutional guaranties that there may be grounds for concern that the child receives the worst of both worlds: that he gets neither protection accorded to adults nor the solicitous care and regenerative treatment postulated for children (Kent, 1966, pp. 555-56).

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Task Force Report (1967) has reached a similar conclusion:

Correction today is characterized by an overlapping jurisdiction, a diversity of philosophies and a hodgepodge of organizational structures which have little contact with one another. It is a grown piecemeal...lacking consistent guidelines and the means to test programs effectiveness, legislators continue to pass laws, executive mandate policies and both cause large sums of money to be spent on ineffective correctional methods (p. 27).

Research Methodology

The research was an attempt to investigate juvenile officers' correctional philosophies in three Iowa counties: Black Hawk, Lynn and Polk counties. These three counties ranked second, third and sixth in the volume of juvenile crimes committed in Iowa in 1980 (Uniform Crime Report, 1980). The area thus includes some of the major juvenile crime-prone counties in Iowa. The geographical areas delineated represented three of the most industrialized regions in Iowa. Since industrialization has been found to correlate highly with juvenile criminality (Friday and Stewart, 1977), it is no wonder that these areas have some of the highest juvenile crime rates in Iowa.

A survey method was utilized to gather pertinent data for the analysis. A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was sent to the Chief Administrators of the respective juvenile institutions for onward dispatch to probational officers. A 100% response was achieved. Since the questionnaire was not intended to evaluate the character or administrative leadership style of the respondents' supervisors, the question of internal validity as it affects this research does not arise. The questionnaire was divided into two parts:

Part A was designed to gather personal information of the respondents - sex, age, educational level, etc. Part B was designed to provide information on the use of the correctional models. Specifically, the respondents were asked to rank (on a scale of 1 to 4) which model best described or matched their correctional styles.

Implications of the Study

This study is not an indictment of the management staff.

Rather, the study was foreseen to have four potential functional implications: (1) it may help influence policy, and therefore, it has political implications; (2) it may help awaken the communities as to what services are available to their youth; (3) it may help improve program planning and content; and (4) it may have implications for staff development and training.

Definition of Terms

Delinquency - The violation of a federal law or a law of another state which constitutes a criminal offense if the case involving that act has been referred to the juvenile court.

Juvenile Offender - A person under 16, 18, or (in some states) 20 years of age who has been found guilty of having committed offenses against the law.

Probation Officer - The individual responsible for the supervision of those who have been granted probation.

Probation - A conditional sentence which avoids the imprisonment of an offender provided that he agree to and abide by court imposed requirements.

Restitution - A sentence requiring the offender to make some sort of repayment to his victim.

Punishment - Any pain, penalty, suffering, or confinement inflicted upon a person by authority of the law and the judgement and sentence of a court, for some crime or offense committed by him, or for his omission of a duty enjoined by law.

Rehabilitation - One of the objectives and goals of corrections. This goal implies that the criminal can be rehabilitated from his antisocial lifestyle into a more productive and acceptable life.

Justice - A criminal procedure where the judge (or other practitioners in the system) see that the game is played fairly according to the rules of the procedure laid down in the law and in court decisions.

Logical Consequence - A new treatment method in juvenile corrections. Corrective measures are made logically to relate to the offense so that the juvenile is made aware that there is a price for irresponsible behavior.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

The four basic models that are being used in Probation as well as Parole in dealing with juvenile and adult offenders are the Punishment Model, Rehabilitation Model, Justice Model and Logical Consequence Model.

Punishment Model

Throughout history, it was believed that criminals should be punished according to the severity of their crimes. In ancient societies, punishment was meted out to wrongdoers in various forms. For instance: when a man was killed, his relatives and friends would retaliate against the enemy or his tribe. As we entered the Middle Ages, things got brutal. However, the eighteenth century was seen as the most brutal age for punishing criminals. Corporal punishment, flogging, and the death penalty were some of the methods which were instigated.

In the later part of the eighteenth century, the classical school of criminology was developed. It did much to change punishment from the brutal and sadistic practices of the Middle Ages:

The purpose of punishment is to deter persons from the commission of crime and not to provide social revenge. Not severity, but certainty and swiftness in punishment best secure this result. Punishment must be sure and swift and penalties determined strictly in accordance with the social damage wrought by the crime. Crimes against property should be punished solely by fines, or by imprisonment when the person is unable to pay the fine. Banishment is an excellent punishment for crimes against the state. There should be no capital punishment. Life imprisonment is a better deterrent. Capital punishment is irreparable and hence makes no provision for possible mistakes and the

desirability of later rectification (Barnes and Teeters, 1959, p. 285).

According to Rennie (1978), Jeremy Bentham (who further developed the classical school philosophy) believed that if punishment were made appropriate to the crime it would deter criminal behavior. He saw punishment as having four objectives: (1) to prevent all offenses, if possible; (2) if a person chooses to commit an offense, to persuade him to commit a less rather than a more serious one; (3) when a person has made up his mind to commit a particular offense, to dispose him to do not more mischief than is necessary to his purpose, and (4) to prevent the crime at as cheap a rate as possible (p. 22).

Bentham and other founders of the classical school rejected theological determinism and argued instead that men have free will to do whatever they choose and so should be held responsible for their behavior.

In the mid-1970s, the punishment concept was again revived since crime was seen as getting out of control. The public was shouting for correctional officers and institutions to "get-tough" with criminals. This get-tough approach was evidenced in the way the media portrayed crime problems and ways to restrain it. "The Public, (said John Grides, former director of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections) would like you to dig holes in the ground, lower the inmates into the hole on a rope ladder, and then pull up the ladder" (Atkins, 1978, p. 11).

The get-tough approach is extended to include juvenile offenders. Other methods of treating youthful offenders had failed and discipline and punishment were seen as the most effective means of deterring juvenile crime.

After the age of 13, juveniles should be treated as adults for indictment, trial, and sentencing purposes. Once they are in penal institutions or in confinement, they may be held separately and treated differently...To be sure, most juvenile offenders come from particularly trying backgrounds and home situations. However, there is no evidence that such home situations have become worse compared with what they were 20 years ago. Yet there are more offenders among juveniles. They are the product of the leniency of the law - of the privilege granted them - as much as anything else (Van den Haag, 1975, p. 249).

Proponents of the punishment model believe that youths are responsible for their behavior and that severity of punishment will decrease crime. They believe that punishment should be efficient, fair and fast and; therefore, fit the crime. If a youth is punished for his criminal behavior, it shows clearly to other youths what will happen to them if they violate the law. Advocates of this model argue that the highest priority is to protect the community so juvenile offenders should not be kept in the community.

Offenders deserve punishment for the social harm they have inflicted upon society because they have free will, and have freely chosen to violate the law. Van den Haag (1976), one of the proponents of punishment model, expressed it this way:

It is easy, though unfashionable, to see why justice must disregard the different needs and general disparities of temptation among persons and groups. A frustrated man rejected as repulsive by the sexual partner he craves may be more tempted to rape than another person better endowed or stimulated; an irritable person is more disposed to assault than a phlegmatic one; a poor and deprived man may be more tempted to steal than a wealthy one. But the prohibition against rape must be applied equally to repulsive (and frustrated) individuals and to attractive (and unfrustrated) ones; the prohibition against assault to the ill - and to the eventempered; and the prohibition against stealing to the rich and poor alike. Else the forbidden act would be prohibited only to those not inclined or tempted to commit it, which won't help. The purpose of the law is to forbid what some people are tempted to do, by character or by circumstance. The threat of punishment is meant to discourage those who are tempted, rather than those who are not, regardless of whether the temptation comes from within (motivation, inclination) or from without

(opportunity, stimulation, deprivation) (pp. 44-45).

However, there are critics of the Punishment model. They challenge its brutal response to criminals and claim that a repressive response to crime has not worked in the past and will not work in the present or future. Critics also claimed that proponents of the Punishment model neglect the social conditions that lead to crime. It has been a common view that crime will always be a problem in American society, until the social problems leading to crime are looked into and property dealt with. Judge David E. Bazelon stated:

If you look at the problem (of crime) in the United States, you don't have to be an expert to see the bottom line is poverty. I'm not saying that poverty equals crime. What I'm saying is that poverty creates the conditions that make crime more likely.

Poverty is more than money. It's a whole subculture that sees the world differently, that is kicked around and doesn't see any chance of improving. It is not right to grow up in poverty. It is not right that parents can't put food on the table for their children. The poor have the same problems facing the rich, but they don't have the resources or the time to cope (Bartollas, 1981, p. 105).

The fact that the Punishment model has regained popularity today is seen throughout the nation. Policymakers appear to believe that punishment for criminal behavior will result in a reduction of crime in society.

Rehabilitation Model

It was commonly believed in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s, that a major function of corrections should be to rehabilitate offenders. The intent of the Rehabilitation (or medical) model was "to treat the disease of criminality and help offenders resolve the underlying conflict that drove them to crime. The rehabilitation philosophy is sometimes limited to the medical model; but because the reintegration

and adjustment models are also committed to change, they all come under the inclusive terms of "rehabilitation philosophy". The definition of the medical model, according to MacNamara (1977) is:

In its simplest (perhaps oversimplified) terms, the medical model as applied to corrections assumed the offender to be "sick" (physically, mentally, and/or socially); his cry for help...Basic to the medical model, although rather surprisingly denied by many of its proponents, is that the criminogenic factors are indigenous to the individual offender and that it is by doing "something" for, to or with him that rehabilitation can be affected (pp. 439-440).

Allen (1964) clarified the basic assumptions of rehabilitation philosophy: "(1) "that human behavior is the product of antecedent causes"; (2) that it is the obligation of the scientist to discover and to describe these causes; (3) that knowledge of these antecedent causes makes it possible to control human behavior; and (4) that measures employed to treat the offender "should be designed to effect changes in the behavior of the convicted person in the interest of his own happiness, health, and satisfaction"" (p. 26).

Proponents of the medical model believed that crime was caused by factors that can be identified, treated and cured. Punishment should be avoided because it does nothing to solve offenders' problems and it only reinforces the already negative concept that they have themselves. The medical model also assumed that the criminal lacked the ability to exercise freedom of choice or to use reason (Bartollas and Miller, 1978).

In the late 1960s and 1970s it became clear that the policy of limiting the rehabilitation ideal to the medical model was unacceptable to some proponents of the rehabilitation philosophy. Although such advocates of the rehabilitation ideal concur that offenders are

different from nonoffenders, need to be treated, and can be given the "cure" by the scientific expert. They place more emphasis on the present than on the past and believe that offenders are still able to be responsible and make law-abiding decisions (Bartollas and Miller, 1978). Some of the treatment modalities used are Transactional Analysis (TA), Guided Group Interaction (GGI), positive peer culture (ppc), and Milieu Therapy (MT).

According to the Task Force Report (1967) of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice:

The task for corrections, therefore, includes building or rebuilding solid ties between the offender and the community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into community life, restoring family ties, obtaining employment and education, securing in the large sense a place for the offender in the routine functioning of society. This requires now only efforts directed toward changing the individual offender, which have been almost the exclusive focus of rehabilitation, but also mobilization and change of the community and its institutions (p. 7).

Reintegration and adjustment components of rehabilitation philosophy focused on treating offenders in the community where these problems started and should then be resolved in the community.

The challenges to the "good intentions" of the rehabilitation philosophy by critics and the poor management of such programs further contributed to the decline of these two approaches.

The Director of the California Youth Authority, added a pessimistic note:

We don't kid ourselves that we treat kids. They treat themselves and rehabilitate themselves if they want to...In the last few years we've been trying to work more toward a justice model than a treatment model.

If there is an example of unfairness in the system, it's probably in how discipline is handled in correctional

institutions, particularly with juveniles, because we're supposed to take on the parent role. Whether the most elementary elements of due process are provided is entirely accidental (Breed, 1974, p. 48).

In his Correctional Outcome: An Evaluation of 100 Reports, Bailey (1957) concluded that there seemed to be little evidence that correctional treatment was effective. His explanation of why treatment had not been effective was that much of what is called treatment is really not treatment, that some forms of treatment may be effective with some types of offenders (but no measure of this phenomenon is available), and that treatment could be based on incorrect assumptions about the causes of delinquent and criminal behavior.

Justice Model

Fogel (1975) first developed the Justice model. Fogel and some of his proponents (such as John Conrad and Norval Morris) believed that society should create a more humane correctional process as it punishes offenders for their crimes.

In the early 1970s, there was a growing popularity of the concept that punishment should fit the crime. This led Fogel to also question the rationale, methodology, and coerciveness of the rehabilitation philosophy: that offenders are manipulated to play games in order to convince their "keepers" that they have been rehabilitated (Fogel, 1975).

The rise of the field of victimology in the early 1970s which took seriously the plight of the victim, and made him realize that "justice is fairness" required that citizens be protected from predatory offenders. Offenders, on the other hand, should pay restitution of the social harm done to the victim.

Proponents of the Justice model are discouraging the wide spread use of informal juvenile probation, because this extension of the informal system has been subjected to so much abuse in the past (Bartollas, 1983).

The theoretical assumptions for "mission building" in corrections according to Fogel (1975) are:

To pursue justice - as fairness rather than rehabilitation.

To provide expended opportunities for offender's self-improvement.

To provide state level corrections to care for only the residual, dangerous offender.

To abandon the fortress of prison structure (pp. vii-viii).

Logical Consequence Model

The Logical Consequence model is an emerging model in juvenile probation (Bartollas, 1984, p. 13). This model proposes to make offenders aware that there is a cost to negative behavior so youthful offenders should be aware of the "specific consequences" of socially unacceptable behavior.

Assumptions about the Logical Consequence model as a crime deterrent are:

1. that juveniles only modify their negative behavior when the cost of that behavior becomes too high.
2. that juveniles do not take seriously regular supervision of probation (ie. reporting on a regular basis to the probation officer) and that it is necessary to put teeth in probation services in order to work effectively with juvenile offenders.
3. that youthful offenders have free will and, therefore, should

be held responsible for their behavior (Bartollas, 1984, p. 14).

Proponents of this model claim that putting a cost on behavior when juveniles first come into the Justice System results in reducing the number of youths who must later be placed in juvenile institutions.

The Hennepin County Juvenile Probation Department (Minneapolis, Minnesota) designed its mission around the Logical Consequence model and defined its principles as:

- the juvenile offender should be held accountable for his/her behavior;
- the court's disposition should be seen as a logical consequence of the committee offense;
- there should be consistency and continuity in case disposition and case processing;
- the probation officer should carefully explain to probationers the consequence of future unacceptable behavior (Mimeograph, 1981, p.1).

Extensive studies have not been done in this area as to the effectiveness of this approach in working with juvenile offenders. However, there is little evidence that any one of these models result in less recidivism of offenders or accomplish any other desirable benefits.

So far there has been considerable evidence that correctional treatment has promised too much but has come short of actually changing the juvenile offenders. They are still looking out for new approaches that may emerge some day and offer the "magic" of "curing" juveniles of their criminal behavior. If the "nothing works" attitude is allowed to dominate in corrections, then there is every possibility that the correctional system will go back to what it was in the "Dark Ages".

CHAPTER THREE

Procedure and Analysis of the Findings

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the utilization of the specific correctional models in dealing with juvenile offenders. The data was received on the questionnaire from 23 (14 male and 9 female) Juvenile Probation Officers in three Iowa Counties - Polk, Lynn and Black Hawk.

Procedure

With the help of the researcher's Academic Adviser, the Chief Administrators were contacted requesting their cooperation in distributing and collecting the questionnaire. They were then mailed back by Mr. Paul Nelson of Lynn County, Mr. Gary Ventling of Polk County, and Mr. Paul Smith of Black Hawk County.

The questionnaire which was developed by the researcher contained the following:

Personal Data

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Years of Experience
4. Highest academic qualification

Questions for Models of Juvenile Correction

1. Rank the following approaches to juvenile correction in the order of effectiveness.
 - a. Punishment:
— Making the corrective measures sufficiently severe to discourage future offenses.

- b. Rehabilitation:
Making the corrective measures therapeutic in treating problems that lead to delinquency.
 - c. Justice:
Making the corrective measures fair and proportional to the offense while equipping juveniles with alternatives to delinquent behavior.
 - d. Logical Consequence:
Making the corrective measures logically related to the offense so that the juvenile is made aware that there is a price for irresponsible behavior.
2. How have your ideas changed in the time you have dealt with juvenile offenders?
 - a. become more lenient
 - b. stayed about the same
 - c. become more severe
 3. Do you feel that youth crime has been reduced because of the method you chose to deal with it?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 4. How do you treat the youths who do not respond to the rules of your chosen model?
 - a. change the method
 - b. intensify the method
 - c. refer the offender to someone else
 - d. keep trying the method in hope of its eventual success
 5. What is a good definition of your philosophy of dealing with juvenile offenders, including some specific methods you use in dealing with them?
 6. Can you cite examples of how your treatment worked to restore the individual to being a productive member of society.
 7. Would you hire ex-offenders to work in your institution? Why or why not?
 8. What role do you believe your philosophy (Punishment, Rehabilitation, Justice or Logical Consequence) will play in the future?
 - a. will be used more frequently
 - b. will be increased just in certain areas of the country
 - c. will fall into disuse
 - d. will be modified or changed

Table 1

Ratings of Effectiveness by Sex of Juvenile Correction Models
by Juvenile Probation Officers in Black Hawk, Lynn
and Polk Counties

Model	Rating of Effectiveness				Total Response
	Most Effective 1	2	3	Least Effective 4	
	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)
Punishment	1 1 (2)	1 3 (4)	2 2 (4)	10 3 (13)	14 9 (23)
Rehabilita- tion	4 0 (4)	3 2 (5)	5 5 (10)	2 2 (4)	14 9 (23)
Justice	3 2 (5)	8 3 (11)	3 2 (5)	0 2 (2)	14 9 (23)
Logical Consequence	7 5 (12)	5 3 (8)	1 1 (2)	1 0 (1)	14 9 (23)

1 = Most Effective
4 = Least Effective

M = Male T = Total
F = Female

Analysis

An examination of Table 1 shows that 12 (52.2%) of the juvenile probation officers rated Logical Consequence as the most effective model for juvenile correction. Only 2 (8.7%) rated the Punishment model as most effective, while 4 (17.4%) rated the Rehabilitation model as most effective and 5 (21.7%) rated the Justice model as most effective.

Table 2

A Comparison of Ratings of Effectiveness of Various Models of Treatment of Juvenile Offenders by Selected Juvenile Probation Officers

Model of Treatment	Mean Ratings		
	Male	Female	Total
Punishment	3.50	2.77	3.28
Rehabilitation	2.50	3.00	2.62
Justice	2.00	2.44	2.17
Logical Consequence	1.75	1.55	1.65

1 = Most Effective

4 = Least Effective

An evaluation of Table 2 reveals that the Logical Consequence model was considered the most effective method and Punishment the least effective model of correction of juvenile offenders.

Table 3

How Have Your Ideas Changed in the Time You Have Dealt With Juvenile Offenders?

Response	Method of Correction				Total
	Punish- ment	Rehabili- tation	Justice	Logical Consequence	
	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	
Become more lenient					(0)
Stayed about same	1 (1)	4 (4)	2 1 (3)	4 2 (6)	(14)
Become more severe	1 (1)		2 (2)	3 3 (6)	(9)

M = Male F = Female T = Total

Table 3 indicates that no probation officer that chose the Punishment model became more lenient with juvenile offenders. Fourteen of the officers that chose the various other models stayed about the same while nine (including six from Logical Consequence model) became more severe in dealing with juvenile offenders.

Table 4

How Do You Treat the Youths Who Do Not Respond To the Rules of Your Chosen Method?

Response	Years of Experience				Total
	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10+	
	LC R J P	LC R J P	LC R J P	LC R J P	
Change the method	2	1 1		1 3	(8)
Intensify the method	3 1	1 1 1	2	1 1	(11)
Refer the offender					(0)
Keep trying the method			1		(1)

LC = Logical Consequence model

R = Rehabilitation model

J = Justice model

P = Punishment model

Table 4 shows that when youths did not respond to the rules of the method of treatment, the majority (eleven) of the probation officers intensified the method, while eight changed the method.

Table 5

What Role Do You Believe Your Philosophy Will Play in the Future?

Response	Philosophy				Total
	Punish- ment	Rehabili- tation	Justice	Logical Conse- quence	
	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	M F (T)	
Will be used more frequently	1 1 (2)	2 (2)	1 (1)	5 5 (10)	(15)
Will be increased just in certain areas of the country		1 (1)			(1)
Will fall into disuse					(0)
Will be modified or changed		1 (1)	1 3 (4)	2 (2)	(7)

M = Male F = Female T = Total

According to Table 5, the majority (15) of probation officers thought that their method would be used more frequently in the future; however, 7 felt that their method would be changed or modified.

An examination of the written comments (see Appendix B) shows that the majority of probation officers believe that putting consequences on irresponsible behaviors of juvenile offenders would cause the offenders to become more responsible for their own behavior. When the juvenile offenders first come into the court system, they are made aware of the

rules and requirements of probation. It is the duty of probation officers to help the offenders improve their self-concept and self-worth so they can look positively at themselves and not commit more crimes. Every juvenile offender is treated as an individual consistently and fairly, depending on his/her problems or needs.

Some probation officers used punishment on hard-core offenders. Those who were repeat offenders were either sent to prison or training schools. Though the probation officers tried to rehabilitate juvenile offenders, they still felt that the punishment should fit the crime: that juvenile offenders are responsible for their behavior and so should be held accountable when they violate the laws.

Community service work and restitution are some of the alternatives that probation officers offer to juvenile offenders. Some offenders are asked to apologize to the victim or work at a job and pay in cash the damages inflicted on the victim. Some juvenile offenders are placed in foster homes and they turn out to be responsible and productive members of society.

Some juvenile offenders who make it through probation could be hired to work in some state institution programs of the juvenile court system depending on the type of crime they committed. There are some probation officers who feel ex-offenders, if hired, could show bad examples to other youthful offenders in their care.

For more understanding of the responses to the questions the reader is encouraged to review the subjective responses in Appendix B.

CHAPTER FOUR

Summary and Recommendation

The study was designed to investigate Juvenile Probation Officers' Correctional Models in three Iowa Counties (Lynn, Polk and Black Hawk).

The information was secured from a questionnaire which contained structured items (see Appendix A).

The questionnaire was mailed to the Chief Administrators of their respective institutions for distribution to their Juvenile Probation Officers. The Chief Administrators were requested to collect and return the questionnaire. A total of 41 completed questionnaires were returned.

Summary of Data

Based upon the responses of the juvenile probation officers who participated in the study and the review of related literature, the following conclusions were reached:

1. The majority of juvenile probation officers (52.2%) ranked the Logical Consequence model as the most effective method of working with juvenile offenders.
2. The Logical Consequence model was considered the most effective method and the Punishment model the least effective method of correction for juvenile offenders.
3. The majority (14) of probation officers, after working with juvenile offenders, continue to use the same method with which they started treatment. However, (9) changed to more severe treatment, while no one changed to less severe treatment.
4. When youths did not respond to the rules of the method of treatment, the majority (11) of the probation officers intensified the method, while (8) changed the method. One probation

officer kept trying the method; however, no probation officer referred the offender.

5. The majority (15) of probation officers thought that their method would be used more frequently in the future; however, (7) felt that their method would be changed or modified, and none thought it would fall into disuse.

Some of the probation officers tend to use a method that fits the crime. The Correctional model used dependent upon the type and seriousness of the crime committed. Usually youths are reminded of the consequences of irresponsible behavior and, if they choose to go contrary to the rules of prescribed behavior, they have to pay the price.

Sex and years of experience of the probation officers did not make any specific difference on what correctional or treatment model was chosen in dealing with juvenile offenders.

Recommendation

The majority of probation officers chose the Logical Consequence model. Since the Logical Consequence model is an emerging model, and very little research pertaining to this model of juvenile corrections is available, more research should be done and analyzed to determine the long-term effectiveness of the model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Francis A. The Boarderland of Criminal Justice. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Atkins, G. Prisons: A Look Behind the Walls. Illinois Issues. 4 (March, 1978). 11.
- Barnes, H.E. and N.K. Teeters. New Horizons in Criminology. (3rd ed.), Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1959.
- Bailey, Walter C. Correctional Outcome: An Evaluation of 100 Reports. The Journal of Law Criminology and Police Science. 50 (June, 1957), 153-160.
- Bartolas, Clemens. Introduction to Corrections. New York, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1981.
- Bartolas, Clemens. Correctional Treatment: Theory and Practice. (In Press 1984).
- Bartolas, C. and S.J. Miller. The Juvenile Offender Control, Correction and Treatment. Boston, Massachusetts: Holbrook Press, 1978.
- Breed, A. Corrections Magazine. I (September, 1974), 48.
- Cressy, D. and R. McDermdermott. Diversions from the Criminal Justice System. Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, 1973.
- Fogel, D. We are a Living Proof. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company, 1975.
- Friday, Paul C. and L. Stewart. Youth Crime and Juvenile Justice: International Perspective. New York, New York: Praegar, 1977.
- Macnamara, E.J. The Medical Model in Corrections: Requiescat in Pace. Criminology. 14 (February, 1977), 439-440.
- "Proposed for Planning Study to Establish an Accountability Focused Service System" (Mimeographed Planning Statement Circulated Among Probation Administrators of Hennepin County), June 1981, 1.
- Richette, Lisa A. The Throwaway Children. New York, New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1969.
- Rennie, Y. The Search for Criminal Man: A conceptual History of the Dangerous Offender. Lexington, Massachusetts: Health Publishing Company, 1978.

Task Force Report: Corrections. President's Commission in Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Uniform Crime Reports. Des Moines, Iowa: State Printing, 1980.

Van den Haag, Ernest. Punishing Criminals. New York, New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Winslow, R.W. Juvenile Delinquency in a Free Society. Encino, California: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL DATA - ENTIRELY CONFIDENTIAL

1. How old are you?

- A. 19 - 24 _____
- B. 25 - 29 _____
- C. 30 - 34 _____
- D. 35 - 49 _____
- E. 50 - 59 _____
- F. 60 - + _____

2. Male _____ Female _____

3. How many years have you been working with juvenile offenders?

- A. 1 - 3 _____
- B. 4 - 6 _____
- C. 7 - 9 _____
- D. 10 and over _____

4. Which degree applies to you?

- A. High School Graduate _____
- B. Bachelor's Degree _____
- C. Master's Degree _____
- D. Other _____

5. Would you consent to an interview regarding some of your specific cases and methods of dealing with juvenile offenders?

Yes _____
No _____

If you said "yes" to the above question I will be contacting you. Please put a phone number where I can reach you during the day below. _____

QUESTIONS FOR STUDY: METHODS OF JUVENILE TREATMENT

1. Rank the following approaches to juvenile correction in the order of effectiveness (1 = most effective to 4 = least effective).
 - ___ a. Punishment:
Making the corrective measures sufficiently severe to discourage future offenses.
 - ___ b. Rehabilitation:
Making the corrective measures therapeutic in treating the problems that lead to delinquency.
 - ___ c. Justice:
Making the corrective measures fair and proportional to the offense while equipping juveniles with alternatives to delinquent behavior.
 - ___ d. Logical Consequence:
Making the corrective measures logically related to the offense so that the juvenile is made aware that there is a price for irresponsible behavior.

2. How have your ideas changed in the time you have dealt with juvenile offenders? (Circle one)
 - a. become more lenient
 - b. stayed about the same
 - c. become more severe

3. Do you feel that youth crime has been reduced because of the method you chose to deal with it?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

Comment on Specific Cases: _____

4. How do you treat the youths who do not respond to the rules of your chosen method?
- a. Change the method
 - b. Intensify the method (For example in the punishment method become more severe)
 - c. Refer the offender to someone else
 - d. Keep trying the method in hope of its eventual success

5. What is a good definition of your philosophy of dealing with juvenile offenders, including some specific methods you use in dealing with them?

6. Can you cite examples of how your treatment worked to restore the individual to being a productive member of society.

7. Would you hire ex-offenders to work in your institution. Why or why not?

8. What role do you believe your philosophy (Punishment, Rehabilitation, Justice of Logical Consequence) will play in the future?

- a. Will be used more frequently
- b. Will be increased just in certain areas of the country
- c. Will fall into disuse
- d. Will be modified or changed

Thank you for your assistance!

APPENDIX B

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSES

Do you feel that youth crime has been reduced because of the method you chose to deal with it?

Probation officers using Punishment model:

"I could easily have chosen pure punishment routes of action that would have quickly dealt with a kid and put him back in society in a short time with no positive change made. I feel my approach may take longer but also keeps responsibility on the juvenile which may take longer involvement but cut the number of referrals down."

"First of all, it believed that by removing a dangerous or serious offender from the community and incarcerating him that juvenile crime, at least in his case, is going down. Many who continue to violate stop once being plugged into the system. These are the ones who can see beyond their noses."

"By removing from the community and placing them (Juvenile offenders) in a correctional facility they learn the consequences of their actions by being locked up."

Probation officers using Logical Consequence:

"I try to impress upon the juvenile that there will be consequences for irresponsible behavior. It is their choice of decision making that puts them back in our office as a repeat offender. I try to alert them to the fact that future referrals will result in more restrictive consequences. For a good number of juveniles, this approach works. For the more hard core, it has little impact. I do try to follow through on my recommendations so that the juvenile is aware that it's not just an empty threat."

"With a reality oriented/logical consequences orientation, I feel it necessary to hold anyone accountable for their actions. It is towards the end that I attempt to modify old behavior in each case."

"I have found that by dealing with a juvenile consistently and fair emphasizing that the juvenile is being held accountable has proved most effective."

Probation officers using a combination of models:

"On one I helped send him to lock-up therapy reducing the crimes he could commit. Another I kept out of an institution to continue working with him in community-he's now making an honest living."

"The 'system' differs from my method. Until the system changes youth crime will not be reduced. Further, until you get social workers out of the system, it will not change."

"It depends on the youth's family in terms of support and love that is expressed in the home. Also, the youth must recognize he's made a mistake and is willing to change his behavior."

"Too many, some stop, some go to prison, some go straight."

What is a good definition of your philosophy of dealing with juveniles offenders, including some specific methods you use with them?

Probation officers using Logical Consequence:

"I put as much responsibility on them as possible with my role being that of giving alternatives of imposing consequences depending on the choices made by the juveniles. I try and add a touch of 'cheerleader' by trying to motivate kids through positive stimuli and strokes--something that is often lacking, (Low self-esteem is a major symptom of juvenile offenders)."

"I try to have the juvenile be responsible as possible for his actions. I encourage them to complete any required activities for probation, such as restitution, tour of training school or adult prison, work project hours etc. In this way, they can experience some positive strokes in how they are responsible for their behavior and helps them have a positive outlook on how probation can help them."

"I attempt to place the responsibility for each individual act on the person that does the act."

"They are responsible for being in the place they are at. They are also responsible for getting out or in."

"Attempt to assist juveniles become more emotionally mature and more responsible for their own behavior. Counseling, consequences, consistency making assistance to parents regarding parenting the child, family therapy, education in the sense of some how tos. Whenever possible warm, firm guidance."

"I attempt to be fair, predicable; help them realize the world is not, however, always fair; help them realize that the world will not pace itself to the child even though our system and those service providers in it try and tailor-make programs for kids-- this may not be the case in such a life--help children learn to cope with stress and learn their desires are not always immediately gratified. Help them value their own problems rather than rely on someone else or avoid it altogether by running away or other forms of escapism."

"Make them aware of the realities of the situation--that is, what the court will do if they continue the behavior. Indicate to them that I will not hesitate to take them back into the court to let the judge decide what should be done and that I will recommend harsher treatment of the problem at the time."

"Aimed at improving the child's attachment to legitimate institutions. Improve self-concept and self-worth where possible. Often, little can be done with behavior disorders except logical consequences and to protect community.

Probation officers using Punishment:

"My method has become more severe--punishment for offenses is more severe than it used to be. They get one chance on probation. Revocation of probation is the next step followed by commitment to training school on serious offenses."

"Try to make them understand the problem they have created for themselves and the best way to get out from under that problem. Try to make them understand 'the error of their actions' and the consequences that can result from continued delinquent activity. First punish for the action leading to the court being involved then use logical consequences for continued delinquent activity."

Probation officers using a combination of models:

"The philosophy that I adhere to is a combination of rehabilitation and logical consequence depending on each case so each person is treated as an individual. Each client is to accept the responsibility and accountability for his/her actions and behavior. They are to own their own problems."

"The most important philosophy to maintain in working with juvenile offenders is she or he must see you as an authority figure. You must also be firm at all times and yet express love and caring."

"My philosophy of dealing with juvenile offenders is to blend justice making the dispositional measures fair and proportional to the offender by looking at logical consequences with the main focus of rehabilitation. Keeping in mind that not all youth will be able to attain the goal--thus punishment must be implemented."

"Being consistent, fair, placing responsibility for their behavior with the juvenile."

The philosophy of the juvenile court is rehabilitation of the offenders. In practice, rehabilitative measures involve punishment especially when children are placed outside their homes. Other methods are probation, restitution, community service and referral to adult court."

"Help them help themselves."

"Fairness, honesty, consistency."

"Putting the problem in their laps--getting parent and child to be responsible."

"Each case is different. In dealing with juvenile offenders the type of crime, juvenile's attitude in regard to the crime and number of referrals are determining factors. Probation will work for some. Out of home placements are necessary and beneficial for others. Best approach is firmness and fairness."

"Identification of problems, areas of needs, causes of problems. Identification of resources to appropriately address needs and final implementation of plan."

"If you do the crime, you do the time. Check on and report to the court."

Can you cite examples of how your treatment worked to restore the individual to being a productive member of society?

"Impossible to answer, whatever is done it is still up to the individual to make decision, we can only offer consequences, alternatives and assistance."

"Having juveniles apologize to victims, do restitution or community service work."

"We are never sure whether success with our cases is due to the interventions we use or to the process of change and maturation in youths."

"One person had a curved spine that was repaired. He has no problems. Another was placed in foster home with loving parents and has succeeded for four years."

"Scared straight type of trip to Anamosa, Iowa."

"It doesn't in most cases unless you've been raised this way to begin with. Your use of 'restore' assumes the kid ever was a productive member of society in the first place. Many, even most are not."

"Yes, many--sometimes it does and sometimes it does not."

"Yes. There is specific data to support the method on a case by case basis."

"Once they realize the consequence is severe enough, they may alter their behavior. This doesn't always work, however."

"Juvenile referred for 5th degree theft charges. Background: divorced parents, mother has custody of children, father has not had contact with family and is unknown to child. Child is the oldest of five children and mother placed child in charge of raising young siblings while she was out running around. (no parental supervision) obtained relative resource for child--child now attending school--active in school sports and activities. Juvenile has not been referred to court since placement. Justice was proportionate to the offense, juvenile was made aware that a price had to be paid, an alternative was found."

"Many--but sometimes it doesn't work. If we take the attitude we are going to save the world and people from themselves we would go crazy."

"Success is hard to define. I can tell you of kids that have gone on to function well, kids who though not the best were helped to survive adolescence which may have made the situations irreparable and finally I can tell you of kids who know the consequences have been given every opportunity available and all are not productive but have no one to blame but themselves. Successful because they are responsible."

"Several serious offenders completed all probationary requirements and remained free from further law referrals. After their release from supervision, they have not been referred to probation again. A number of offenders have completed on large amounts of restitution owed."

"Once the individual owns his own behavior--they choose what occurs from there on. If they choose to remain in the system so be it."

"Each person is responsible for his/her own behavior. A person owns his own problems. Once this is understood, changes occur if they are wanted."

Would you hire ex-offenders to work in your institution? Why or why not?

"Yes, why wouldn't I hire them. Juvenile law is different than criminal law for a reason. My not feeling ex-offenders could successfully work in this system would be a contradiction to the whole philosophy of juvenile justice. As stated in the code one must have 'belief in the capacity of people to change for the better.'"

"Yes. Their background experience could provide needed insight into needs and problems of juveniles."

"Yes. I would give him/her the same opportunity as anyone else as long as his criminal behavior had discontinued previously."