

Project '75
Nine Year Follow-Up



Report No. 305
January 1985

PROJECT '75
NINE YEAR FOLLOW-UP

by
PATRICIA K. KAWA'A

Direction and Supervision by
Youth Development and Research Center
School of Social Work
University of Hawaii-Manoa

Jack T. Nagoshi, Director
Keith Y. Kameoka, Educational Specialist
Meda Chesney-Lind, Researcher

January 1985
Report No. 305

MAHALO

There are many individuals to whom I owe my sincere thanks for help in this research study. I am grateful to Mr. Jack Nagoshi, Director of the Youth Development and Research Center for overall direction and supervision as well as revising and editing the drafts. Educational Specialist Keith Kameoka provided guidance in designing the data collection instrument, programming the data and numerous valuable insights throughout this effort.

Data gathering would have been impossible without permission from Chief Douglas Gibb and the cooperation and enthusiasm of the Honolulu Police Department, particularly Lt. Wilson Sullivan, Sgt. Arthur Freedle, Det. Walter Kawa'a and M. P. Officer Gayland Niblock. Clerk Madeline Kama obtained the necessary arrest records, patiently explained unfamiliar terminology contained therein and generally made data gathering an interesting experience.

Lanette Yoshioka facilitated the duplication of the data gathering instrument and typed the drafts and final copy of the research report in her competent and affable way. Thanks to student Ellen Chung who helped with the time consuming task of data entry.

Finally, thank you to Dr. Meda Chesney-Lind for her valuable comments and to Judge Betty Vitousek for her continued support of Project 75.

Mahalo a nui loa.

Patricia K. Kawa'a

Me kealoha, e ho'omāhanahana i neia mōhai
aloha ia Georgina Kaliko Kawa'a, ko'u makuahūnōwai
wahine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Mahalo	i
List of Tables	iv
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Method and Procedure	16
Results	19
Summary and Conclusions	27
References	29
Appendix A: Data Gathering Instrument	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Recidivism by Treatment Categories	20
Table 2:	Comparison of Recidivism by Ethnicity at Three Years and Nine Years	20
Table 3:	Comparison of Recidivism by Ethnicity in Treatment Categories at Three Years and at Nine Years	22
Table 4:	Total Felony and Misdemeanor Arrests	23
Table 5:	Number Arrested for Felonies by Treatment Category	23
Table 6:	Number Arrested for Misdemeanors by Treatment Category	24
Table 7:	Number Arrested for Burglary by Treatment Category	24
Table 8:	Comparison of Burglary Arrests at Three and Nine Years	25

ABSTRACT

This study is a nine year follow-up of Project 75 of the Family Court, First Circuit which included 193 first time, juvenile burglarly offenders randomly assigned to three treatment categories: (1) Intake worker handled referrals as if it were any other case assigned to intake, (2) Intake worker prepared for mandatory court hearing regardless of findings of social investigation, (3) Intake worker took no action aside from mailing a letter to the juvenile's parents or guardians. No contact was maintained unless services were requested by the youth's parents.

A follow-up study conducted in 1979 determined that there was no significant difference in the rate of re-referrals among the three categories at the three year follow-up.

The present nine year follow-up study was designed to ascertain the impact, if any, of this unusual experiment on adult criminal behavior. Data was collected during a one week period for the study population (N=193) having an adult arrest record (N=85) at the Identification Section, Honolulu Police Department. The results indicated that recidivism rates by arrests among the categories are remarkably similar, suggesting that the no-intervention approach (Category 3) is just as effective as the more traditionally oriented juvenile justice process, as reflected in adult arrests.

INTRODUCTION

Signs of the Times in 1984 claimed that close to 40 million Americans, nearly 1 out of 5 citizens, have been arrested for an act more serious than a traffic code violation. Further, most inmates in American prisons are male (96%) and young (63% under 29 years of age). Response to criminal activity involves deterrence, incarceration, restitution, parole, diversionary programs and verbal warnings. Despite concerted effort, Siegel (1981) maintains that the juvenile justice system has - by and large - been unsuccessful in rehabilitating the adjudicated youth.

By and large, the history of the past 75 years in American juvenile justice demonstrates a growing and steadfast effort to divert an increasing number of youthful offenders from the criminal courts and into special courts and various social programs and agencies (Schneller, 1981). Though laudable, by the 1960's a growing awareness of the reality of the juvenile justice system revealed that the realization of its original purposes and lofty goals was largely an illusion (Cullen, 1983). The political and social upheaval of the mid-sixties helped to illumine the continued existence of racism, sexism and inequality frequently tolerated and sometimes supported by the judiciary. The notion that the state would unvaryingly endeavor to foster the betterment of youth in its charge became untenable. Efforts were made to limit the authority of the state to interfere in the lives of the delinquents (Kittrie, 1973; Rothman, 1978). The vast majority of young people, it was discovered, grow out of the troublemaking period on their own, or at least sans court intervention (MacGillis, 1983).

Strasburg looked at a number of studies that examined the records of delinquents placed in institutions and found that between 50 and 95% did not need such confinement (MacGillis, 1983). Worse, it was suggested that there was a relationship between formal court processing and future delinquency caused by stigmatizing and labeling (Severy, 1982).

Labeling Theory

Labeling theory roots can be found in the 1938 book, Crime and Community by Frank Tannenbaum. Writing on social deviance, Lemert reflected his predecessor by claiming that being processed as a certain kind of deviant - officially and formally as in the justice system - causes serious and long standing secondary deviance (Schneller, 1981). The implication of this kind of labeling (Severy, 1982), is that significant others may begin to treat the stigmatized youth as if he or she has some kind of decreased capacity or participates in socially inappropriate behavior. They treat the youths in a manner according to the label. Additionally, this perspective would seem to indicate that the entire adjudication process alters the self-image of the juvenile offender and they begin to live up to the labels given them (Hintzen, Inouye & Iramina, 1979). The frightening implication of the above is that contact with agencies of control and the concomitant acquisition of a criminal or delinquent label, may very well push a number of youths into committing repetitive delinquent acts because being treated in terms of the stigmatizing label makes deviant behavior difficult to avoid (Schneller, 1981). A theoretical foundation for labeling theory is role theory.

Role Theory

Role theory proposes that the structure of a social system may be described as a network of roles. The term role refers to the socially expected behavior prescribed for a person occupying a particular social status or position in a social system (Compton & Galaway, 1979). This is relevant for labeling delinquents in that there may very well be appropriate behavioral expectancies.

The "social norms" for the juvenile offender within the criminal justice system provide guides for the feelings, attitudes and behaviors that are permitted, expected and even prohibited for the youth filling that role. This simply means that the milieu of the juvenile criminal justice system sets norms and expectations for the juvenile offender (role occupant). Patterns of expected role behavior stem from a need to maintain the system itself and to effectively interact with other systems (e.g., welfare department). This is not necessarily supportive of the individual youth who may experience great stress upon being placed in that role set. Involvement in the juvenile justice system "tells" the youth and society-at-large that the youth is delinquent/deviant/bad (stigma of the criminal justice process). The role the youth must assume given these expectations (labels) will not fulfill certain prescribed behaviors for a socially acceptable (non-delinquent) role set in the greater society.

The youth, therefore, is involved in two different role sets in two different systems and the expected behavior of the roles involved is defined so that the two roles cannot be simultaneously filled satisfactorily by one person. The youth cannot be both bad AND good. Also supporting the labeling theory is social-learning theory.

Social-learning Theory

Outlined in Steinmetz (1977), this theory suggests that:

"man, in a social-learning approach is neither buffeted helplessly by environmental influences (behaviorist view) nor driven by inner forces (drive theorist view). Rather psychological functioning is best understood in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling conditions" (p. 18).

If youngsters come to believe that they are being denied the right to rewards and achievements according to socially acceptable or legal avenues, they may adopt socially unacceptable/illegal means for such gratification (Severy, 1982).

Contact with the criminal justice system, whether it results in prosecution or referral to an alternative program, may infringe on a juvenile's constitutional rights due to arbitrary practices of police, courts and correctional agencies. Indeterminant sentencing statutes often place juveniles under dispositional authority until they reach their majority. This, of course, assumes (1) the continued need for treatment and rehabilitation until the child reaches majority and (2) has created a growing despair about the dispositional effectiveness of the juvenile courts (Siegel, 1981).

Thwarted in achieving their goals by what may be perceived as an unfair/unjust system and isolated from the company and influence of socially conforming and law abiding individuals, the youths create a group within which opposition to their perceived persecutors can be mounted and encouraged. This results in increasing involvement with other juveniles exhibiting delinquent behavior and a growing commitment to "deviant norms and values" (Schneller, et al., 1981).

In reaction to labeling theory, Edwin Schur in his book Radical Non-Intervention, argues that self-report studies:

"have encouraged and strengthened the radical non-intervention response (that they have assisted in), repudiating the notion that delinquents are basically different from non-delinquents (and in showing that) delinquency is wide-spread among all segments of the society" (Hindelang, 1981, pg. 211).

It should be noted that policy plays a critical role in delinquent labeling because such labeling takes place when a youngster is arrested and therefore enters the juvenile justice system. It is the individual police officer who makes the determination whether to arrest, refer to a social agency or simply warn and release. Austin (1982) maintains that the majority of criminal justice personnel don't support the idea of reducing incarceration, valuing imprisonment instead. However in a study by Schneller, Perez-Reilly, Blankenship and Sadler (1981) concerning the police officer's role in the disposition of juveniles, it was discovered:

"Most officers subordinate their personal attitudes toward juveniles to the department's need to divert. The extent to which referral or support for new agencies is preferred is defined by his submitting to organizational demands, the police department's policy as communicated by the supervisor" (p. 183).

This would seem to limit the discretionary power of the individual officer.

Hirschi (1973) takes exception to Tannenbaum and other labeling theorists insisting that Tannenbaum's version of labeling theory was not based on research results, because no evidence was

presented directly relevant to his theses that attempted to control delinquency, merely intensify or amplify it. Material presented seriously questions - or at least - reduces the importance of Tannenbaum's labeling hypothesis (Gove, 1980). Further, in a 1970 study by Black and Reiss, it was learned that the pattern of disposition for juvenile offenders followed the offenses hierarchy found in adult criminal law. Police, it was found, generally release youths in the field, however when they do make an arrest, they most always have evidence of some type (Gove, 1980). Individuals such as Hirschi insist that the juvenile justice system more often labels the guilty as innocent. Those youngsters who are labeled delinquent - deserve it (Gove, 1980)!

Rehabilitative Efforts

Counseling and rehabilitation programs (usually after-the-fact) have yielded dismal results. Johnson and Goldberg utilized a before and after experimental-control group design with subjects who were matched, paired and randomly assigned to experimental and control groups (N=176, 14-17 yr. old delinquents from intake to follow-up). Experimentals participated in a treatment program designed to provide vocational rehabilitation services to foster the development of work and social adjustment. Comparison of experimental and control groups indicated that vocational rehabilitation did not significantly enhance experimental's vocational development, self-esteem (the Roseberg Self-Esteem Scale), or attitude toward authority (Sentence Completion Test) and made no significant difference in reducing recidivism.

Doleschal and Klapmuts reported in 1973:

"True success in rehabilitation has been virtually non-existent. A survey of all studies of correctional treatment published between 1945 and 1967 found that the present array of correctional treatment efforts has no appreciable effect - either positive or negative - on the recidivism rates of convicted offenders" (Gove, 1980).

Joel Fisher, in a 1973 review of research on the effectiveness of professional casework services, revealed that a lack of effectiveness seemed to be the rule. Clients receiving casework services tended to deteriorate in about 50% of the studies reviewed. Wolfgang (1979) claims that as research accumulated from the late 1960's to the mid-1970's, the countries of Sweden, Finland, Norway, England and the United States concluded that little or none of the rehabilitation programs made any difference in the rates of criminal recidivism.

Not everyone agrees. Ramsey Clark (1970) believes that an intensive supervisory effort will achieve a high level of rehabilitation and that corrections can rehabilitate. Cullen (1983) concludes that rehabilitation will remain a dominant correctional ideology in the area of juvenile justice.

However, a California prison study in which inmates were randomly selected to participate or not participate in group counseling and 'group living' demonstrated that the experimental group did not have lower parole violation rates (Sutherland & Cressey, 1974). In his 1983 report on crime in America, MacGillis noted that few experts in the area of criminal justice put much stock in the ability of programs to rehabilitate. And, Andrew von Hirsch, Rutgers University Criminologist, laments:

"There are all sorts of reasons why people give up crime. But very few people, to our knowledge, quit because they've been put into some counseling program while in the prison or one in the probation services. And it's not that nothing works, but, not very much works very well" (MacGillis, 1983).

Diversion

Siegel (1981) feels that the failure of the juvenile justice system to rehabilitate youths exists because the courts and correctional agencies have not been successful with their dispositional and sentencing approaches. He advocates the concept of diversion as an alternative to formal judicial action. Supported by the American Bar Association, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards & Goals and Presidential Commissions, diversion became popular with the passage of the Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (O'Donnell, Manos & Chesney-Lind). Unfortunately, diversion has no one precise meaning. It can simply refer to the deflection of youths away from the juvenile justice system or the development of alternative programs or strategies to deal with youths sans formal juvenile court proceedings (Jensen, 1980). Diversion can occur at the following times:

- 1) Prior to Police Intervention - Citizens can learn to accept a wider variety of youthful behavior and thereby reduce the number of complaints to police stations.
- 2) At the time of Police Intervention - Individual officer can exercise discretion, viewing arrest as a last resort, preferring such alternatives as disciplining, counseling, aiding, informing, directing, etc. first.

3) Intake at Juvenile Court - Informal remedies such as grounding may be utilized.

4) Judicial Discretion - Judges can use considerable variability in sentencing practices (Jensen, 1980).

He believes that evaluation of diversion programs must address the issue of establishing criteria of success or failure. Recidivism - the number of new arrests incurred - is usually the dependent variable in evaluation research. As previously noted, supporters of diversion insist that involvement in the juvenile justice system stigmatizes youths and helps to reinforce anti-social/deviant behavior, ultimately resulting in re-arrest.

Evaluation of the programs/research have yielded mixed results. The well known Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study revealed the programs of intervention risk harming the very youths that they are designed to assist (McCord, 1978). Racism was woven into the fabric of the New Jersey Conference Committees, a diversion project which grew out of a plan devised in 1945. A disproportionate number of low status or minority youths were sent to juvenile court, whereas white, middle-class juveniles were diverted to citizen committees. And in California, Project Crossroads, the Los Angeles County Diversion Study and the Juvenile Referral Project revealed that the referral process actually increased, rather than decreased recidivism rates (Jensen, 1980)! Success was difficult to find in the East too. Deborah Denno, reporting on a delinquency prevention (diversion) program in South Philadelphia (1980), noted that it was impossible to demonstrate that the Youth Service

Center was significantly decreasing juvenile delinquency. Disappointing results also came from outside the country. Although it was claimed that increased cautioning diverted substantial numbers of juvenile offenders from court appearance in England and Wales, it was discovered that police cautioning resulted in a great increase in the number of officially processed youths and were no more successful than findings of guilt in preventing recidivism. In effect - the introduction of police cautioning had a more undesired than desired outcome (Farrington, 1981).

Quay and Love (1977), however, related success for a diversion program based on the random assignment of 568 youth (436 to treatment, 132 to control). Davidson (1971) also claims success regarding a police referral diversion program in which youths referred to the project were superior to the randomly selected controls in frequency and seriousness of police contacts and seriousness of court petitions filed. A diversion program affiliated with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's greatest impact was unfortunately, that of widening the net (Severy, 1982).

Most interesting is the viewpoint of Margo Andriessen of the Netherlands who was highly critical of all but one of the California diversion programs she examined:

"That the judicial system often has an undesirable effect on its clients is a fact that has become increasingly clear to workers in the Dutch Penal System. (However American) diversion does not deal with youths whom we would classify as delinquents; instead, it is limited to runaways and others who present small risk to the justice system. Those staffing diversion projects believe no one can be happy unless counseled the right way. The American obsession with therapy has now reached

the justice system. Diversion counseling is mainly directed at the middle class. Material help is much more important than counseling" (Andriessen, 1980).

In a bold experiment in 1975, the Family Court, First Circuit, Honolulu, Hawaii attempted to determine whether there would be any difference between court handled and non-court handled cases regarding rate or incidence of recidivism of 193 first time burglary offenders randomly assigned to three treatment categories.

- CATEGORY A: Intake worker handled referrals as if it were any other case assigned to intake. The cases were handled by Informal Adjustment (closed without filing a petition or a court appearance) or processed for a court hearing if the worker believed it to be necessary. The course of action was left to the intake worker's discretion.
- CATEGORY B: Intake worker prepared for mandatory court hearing regardless of findings of social investigation. Intake worker had no discretionary options in case handling aside from being required to take the case to court.
- CATEGORY C: Intake worker took no action aside from mailing a letter to the juvenile's parents or guardians. Case was formally closed. No contact was maintained unless services were requested by the child's parents. For public information purposes, the youth had no formal record.

Partial results of this Oahu, Hawaii study determined at a follow-up period from 6-12 months revealed:

1. "Category A, the worker's decision, resulted in the highest recidivism rate (43.3%) but the lowest burglary rate (7.69%).
2. Category B, mandatory court appearance, resulted in the lowest recidivism rate (25.0%) and a burglary rate of 25%.
3. Category C, no treatment, resulted in a recidivism rate of 22.85%, slightly higher than Category B, and the highest burglary rate" (31.4%) (Hintzen, Inouye & Iramina, 1979).

Follow-up at three years, however, concluded that referrals were less for Category C (no treatment) than the other categories (Hintzen, et al, 1979).

Follow-up at three years, however, "safely concluded that referrals for Category C (no treatment) was less than the other categories (Hintzen, et al, p. 38)."

In a similar study, the Memphis-Metro Youth Diversion Project (MMYDP) analyzed data based on 2279 youths assigned (after meeting eligibility criteria for mixed offenses) to three treatment modalities:

1. "Treatment With Services. The 'with services' group was assigned to community-based service providers based on individualized needs assessments performed by MMYDP personnel.
2. Treatment Without Services. The 'without service' youth and their parents attended a brief interview with MMYDP personnel during which the nature of the project was explained. (Parents) were informed that the offense would receive the disposition of diverted and nothing further would be done.
3. Treatment Through Traditional Processing. These youth proceeded through traditional processing, experiencing a range of dispositions, including probationary supervision and commitment to state-operated correctional programs" (Severy and Whitaker, 1982).

Some problems existed, such as the fact that project personnel noted that the youths participating in the diversion program and their parents were unable to distinguish whether they were diverted or still involved with the court. Also, the identification of any youth as delinquent had already occurred prior to diversion. Nevertheless, this diversion approach appeared to be just as effective as the more traditionally oriented juvenile justice

process. The without service modality was the most cost-efficient, of course. More than two thirds (67.17%) of youths in that category were successful in not being rearrested. Severy entertains the possibility that Schur's radical non-intervention approach may very well be the most appropriate method for processing some youths.

The results of the last two studies can have a massive impact on our future response to delinquent behavior, programming in the criminal justice system and funding for those programs deemed worthwhile. Finally, the impact of no treatment of youths on adult crime must be studied. Van Dusen's study (1983) based on 396 youths revealed that there is a close relationship between juvenile and adult delinquency. An analysis was conducted to investigate the probability of one conviction being followed by another, for the first through the tenth conviction. She concluded that:

- The peak age for most offenses is within a year or two of the youth's 17th birthday, though shoplifting and stealing from machines seem to peak earlier and fraud later.
- The probability of one conviction following another reaches a peak of about .90 for juveniles with six or more convictions, and finally,
- Juveniles first convicted at the earliest ages (10-12) are the most persistent offenders.

Considering the last finding, one can only wonder about the outcome had a diversion or no treatment "program" been instituted

instead of convictions. It merits more than wonder, of course; it merits research.

The Present Study

The present study is a nine year follow-up of Project 75, a Family Court, First Circuit experiment which dealt with first time burglary offenders in the City and County of Honolulu. As explained previously, the study was an attempt to test hypotheses regarding deterrence and diversion theory. It was a demonstration limited to first time juvenile offenders who were arrested and referred to Family Court for burglary during the calendar year of 1975. The judges maintained that formal court hearings had a preventive and deterrent effect, therefore the policy existed whereby all such cases would experience a formal court hearing. Proponents of diversionary methods believed that recidivism increased in direct proportion to the degree of exposure and "penetration" into the juvenile justice system. Project 75 was an effort to discover whether there was any difference in the rate, incidence and type of law violation among those juvenile offenders who were subjected to varying degrees of formal court processing procedures and those who received "diversionary intervention".

In June, 1979, a three year follow-up study of Project 75 was conducted by including comparative data on recidivism for the three 'treatment categories'. Attempts were made to delineate factors or variables associated with recidivism. All offenders who had reached the age of eighteen before completing six months in the project were excluded since subsequent arrests would be under the jurisdiction of the adult courts. Five cases were thus eliminated.

By October 1984, nearly all the juvenile offenders in the original Project 75 study, had reached adulthood. The present study, a nine year follow-up of Project 75, is an attempt to determine whether the manner in which these juvenile burglary cases were handled (court handled or not) had, if any effect upon subsequent criminal behavior.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Research Questions

"Project 75", and the Three Year Follow-up study have garnered some interest among individuals within the criminal justice system and state policy makers in general. The follow-up study of 1979 revealed no significant difference in recidivism for the three "treatment categories". The present study then is designed to ascertain the impact, if any, of this unusual experiment on adult criminal behavior.

The following research questions have been formulated for the present study:

1. Will the results of this nine year follow-up study in terms of recidivism by arrest be essentially the same as the Three Year Follow-up Study?
2. Will the recidivism rate of Category A (worker's decision) be significantly less than Category B (mandatory court appearance) or Category C (no treatment/non-intervention)?
3. Will the recidivism rate of Category B (mandatory court appearance) be significantly less than Category A (worker's decision) or C (no treatment/non-intervention)? If so, the logical conclusion will be that the greater exposure to the court system, the greater the deterrent effect. This is consistent with the general premise of deterrence theory (Tittle, 1975). This will lend support to the belief that "intrusion" of the criminal justice system into the life of the juvenile offender has a positive, i.e., deterrent effect upon future adult criminal activity.

4. Will the recidivism rate of Category C (no treatment/non-intervention) be significantly less than Category A or B? If so, the results will support the perspective of the labeling theory that public identification of a youth as a delinquent may have negative effects on his/her self image, and that the greater exposure to the court system, the more harmful the effect on the youth, (and ultimately, on the adult).
5. Of the former youthful offender population who have obtained an adult arrest record, how many have been arrested for burglary, in total and based upon "treatment category"?

Procedure

Permission was obtained from the Senior Judge of the Family Court, First Circuit and the Police Chief of the city and County of Honolulu to Adult Identification Section of the Honolulu Police Department. Data collection was performed during off duty hours to insure the least amount of disruption to the daily operation of the section.

A data collection instrument, "Record Abstract Project 75 Continued - Nine Year Follow-Up", was developed incorporating some of the desired information from the instrument utilized in the Three Year Follow-Up study (see Appendix A). Data were collected during a one week period in mid-October, 1984 for the study population (N=193) having an adult arrest record (N=85). Information was extracted from each record manually. Since only

the Honolulu Police Department's records were utilized for this study, data obtained focused primarily on arrests.

Data for the present study and that previously collected during the three year follow-up of Project 75 were separately entered into the computer at the University of Hawaii Computing Center. Thereafter, both data sets were merged together matching identification numbers that were assigned to the subjects at the time of the three year follow-up. The resulting data set included 193 subjects with information from the three year follow-up of Project 75 and the arrest data collected for the present study. The computer analysis performed utilized the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The data contained in this research project represents a study of 193 cases.

RESULTS

Data analysis of the 193 first time burglary offenders randomly assigned to three treatment categories in 1975 includes variables for the total population as well as the adult recidivist population. These are youths who have attained the age of majority and were arrested for law violations as adults.

Although the total population remains 193 subjects, this nine year follow-up includes 77 Hawaiian/Part Hawaiians vs. 76 in the three year follow-up as well as a decrease in the Oriental population by one. The Honolulu Police Department's Records Division identified 84 of the 193 subjects as having an adult arrest record. Unfortunately, the identification numbers of two of the adult offender population could not be matched with the previous data set and were therefore, deleted.

Recidivism

Data on recidivism of the total population indicated that 84 (43.5%) were arrested at least once as adults. Table 1 presents this data by the three treatment categories which reveal that 30 or 15.54% of those who were arrested were in Category A (worker's decision), 28 (14.5%) in Category B (mandatory court appearance) and 26 or 13.47% in Category C (no treatment). It can be said that those who recidivated, i.e., were arrested as adults, the subjects in Category C (no action) recidivated slightly less than the other categories.

Table 1

Recidivism By Treatment Categories
(Adult Arrest)

		Category A		Category B		Category C		Total	
		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Recidivism	Yes	30	15.54	28	14.51	26	13.47	84	43.52
(adult	No	36	18.65	37	19.17	36	18.65	109	56.48
arrest)	Total	66	34.20	65	33.68	62	32.12	193	100.00

Ethnicity

Recidivists and non-recidivists by ethnic background are presented in Table 2. Among ethnic groups, Filipinos had the highest adult arrest rate, 14 out of a total of 23 or 60.87%; followed by Hawaiian/Part Hawaiians, 42 (54.55%) out of 77 individuals or 54.55%; others (including Samoans, Puerto Ricans, Blacks and Portuguese), 6 out of 17 or 35.29% of their "population"; Orientals, 12 out of 39 or 30.77%; and finally, Caucasians 10 out of 37 or 27.03%.

Table 2

Comparison of Recidivism by
Ethnicity at 3 Years and 9 Years

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>At 3 Year Follow-Up</u>			<u>At 9 Year Follow-Up</u>		
	Number of Residents <u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	Total at 3 Years <u>N</u>	Number of Residents <u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	Total at 9 Years <u>N</u>
Hawaiian/ Pt Hawaiian	44	57.9	76	42	54.55	77
Oriental	21	52.5	40	12	30.77	39
Caucasian	15	40.5	37	10	27.03	37
Filipino	5	21.7	23	14	60.87	23
Other	12	10.6	17	6	35.29	17
Total	97	50.3	193	84	43.52	193

Although there was only a difference (decrease) of 3.35% from the 1978 follow-up recidivism rate of Hawaiian/Part Hawaiians, there was a 21.73% decrease for Orientals, a 13.47% decrease for Caucasians and a 35.31% decrease for the "Other" group. Interestingly, there was a 39.17% increase (9 more subjects) in the number of Filipinos arrested from the three year follow-up report.

A comparison of recidivism by ethnicity in treatment categories at three years and at nine years (see Table 3), indicates a general DECREASE in recidivism of all ethnic groups in the three categories except Filipinos. A decrease in recidivism occurred in Categories A & B, 10.65% and 9.22% respectively while Category C remained the same. All ethnic groups in Category C demonstrated a decrease in recidivism, however, a large increase (by 57.13%) in recidivism within the Filipino population offsets the decreases in the other ethnic groups. Due to the relatively small population for comparison, caution should be exercised in interpreting this result.

Severity of Adult Arrests

The 84 individuals identified as having an adult arrest record accumulated a total of 455 arrests, both misdemeanors and felonies. Violations, e.g., loitering, jaywalking, littering, were not included in this number. The number of total arrests ranged from one arrest (25 subjects) to 25 arrests (2 subjects) with a mean of 5.41 arrests per subject.

One hundred thirty-five (135) felony arrests were made with a range of 0-21. Forty-four (44) subjects (52.4%) had no felony arrests and one subject had 21 with a mean of 1.6 felony arrest

Table 3

Comparison of Recidivism by Ethnicity
in Treatment Categories at
3 Years and at 9 Years

	3 Years (Juvenile Arrests)			9 Years (Adult Arrests)			% of DECREASE in Recidivism Rate	% of INCREASE in Recidivism Rate
	N	%	Total N	N	%	Total N		
Category A (worker's decision)								
Hawaiian/ Pt Hawn	14	60.9	23	13	54.17	24	6.73	
Oriental	7	53.8	13	4	30.77	13	23.03	
Caucasian	5	50.0	10	4	40.00	10	10.00	
Filipino	3	27.3	11	6	54.55	11		27.25
Other	8	88.9	9	3	37.50	8	51.40	
Total	37	56.1	66	30	45.45	66	10.65	
Category B (mandatory court)								
Hawaiian/ Pt Hawn	15	51.1	29	15	51.72	29	5.38	
Oriental	9	69.2	13	5	41.67	12	27.53	
Caucasian	6	42.9	14	2	14.29	14	28.61	
Filipino	1	20.0	5	3	60.00	5		40.00
Other	3	75.0	4	3	60.00	5	15.00	
Total	34	52.3	65	28	43.08	65	9.22	
Category C (No treatment)								
Hawaiian/ Pt Hawn	15	62.5	24	14	58.33	24	4.17	
Oriental	5	35.7	14	3	21.43	14	14.27	
Caucasian	4	30.8	13	4	30.77	13	.03	
Filipino	1	14.3	7	5	71.43	7		57.13
Other	1	25.0	4	0	0.00	4	25.00	
Total	26	41.9	62	26	41.94	62	0.00	
Grand Total	97		193	84		193		

per subject. Nearly half or 47.6% of the recidivist population were arrested for 1 or more felonies.

There were 322 misdemeanor arrests with a range of 0-19 arrests per subject. Eight (8) subjects (3.6%) had no misdemeanor arrests and one had nineteen (19) arrests, with a mean of 3.83 arrests per person. Nearly all (96.4%) of the recidivist population had at least one misdemeanor arrest.

Table 4
Total Felony and Misdemeanor Arrests

Felony Arrests	N (of subjects)	%
Yes	40	47.6
No	44	52.4
Total	84	100.0

Total Number of Felony Arrests: 135

Misdemeanor Arrests	N (of subjects)	%
Yes	76	96.4
No	8	3.6
Total	84	100.0

Total Number of Misdemeanor Arrests: 322

Felony arrests by treatment category are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Number Arrested for Felonies by Treatment Category

Felony Arrests	Category A (worker's decision)		Category B (court appearance)		Category C (no treatment)		Total	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	16	8.29	12	6.22	12	6.22	40	20.73
No	50	25.91	53	27.46	50	25.91	153	79.27
Total	66	34.20	65	33.68	62	32.12	193	100.00

There was only a very slight difference in the number of felony arrests among treatment categories, with Category A (worker's decision) having a slightly higher percentage (2.07%) of felony arrests than Categories B and C.

Misdemeanor arrests by treatment categories are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Number Arrested for Misdemeanors by Treatment Category

	Category A (worker's decision)		Category B (court appearance)		Category C (no treatment)		Total	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Misde- meanor Arrests								
Yes	25	12.95	26	13.47	25	12.95	76	39.38
No	41	21.24	39	20.21	37	19.17	117	60.62
Total	66	34.20	65	33.68	62	32.12	193	100.00

Once again, there was only a slight difference among treatment categories regarding misdemeanor arrests with Category C (no treatment) having the least number of misdemeanor arrests (2.08% compared to the highest Category, "A").

Adult Burglary Arrests

The number of subjects arrested for burglary by treatment groups is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Number Arrested for Burglary by Treatment Category

	Category A (worker's decision)		Category B (court appearance)		Category C (no treatment)		Total	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Arrested for Burglary								
Yes	6	3.11	6	3.11	7	3.63	19	9.86
No	60	31.09	59	30.57	55	28.50	174	90.16
Total	66	34.20	65	33.68	62	32.12	193	100.00

Neither the numbers arrested for burglary nor the percentages reveal a significant difference among treatment categories. Category C (no treatment) had only one more arrest than Categories A and B. It is important to note that arrests for crimes "related" to burglary, i.e., Robbery 1st, 2nd and 3rd degree, Theft 1st, 2nd and 3rd degree as well as possession of burglary tools would not be reflected in the above table although such arrests may be considered "somewhat similar" in nature and there were such arrests made within the recidivist population. Auto theft is a separate offense and not included among any of the aforementioned offense categories. There were arrests made for auto theft within the recidivist population.

A comparison of burglary arrests at three and nine years (post Project 75) is found in table 8.

Table 8

Comparison of Burglary Arrests at 3 and 9 Years

	Category A (worker's decision)		Category B (court appearance)		Category C (no treatment)		Total	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
*3 Year Follow-Up	9	13.6	9	13.8	8	12.9	26	13.5
9 Year Follow-Up	6	9.1	6	9.2	7	11.3	19	9.8

*Based on juvenile arrests

A comparison of total burglary arrests reveals a 3.7% decrease in burglary arrests from the third to the ninth year follow-up. The "no treatment" category, Category C, revealed a 1.6% decrease over time, but still had a slightly higher percentage of burglary

arrests among the treatment categories. Since the number of subjects not arrested is nearly the same in all three categories, it must be that Category A and B subjects have been arrested to a larger extent than Category C, for offenses other than burglary.

Further, there is actually no difference between Categories A and B because workers handling cases in Category A directed a majority to court hearings in 1975.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This nine year follow-up of Project 75 generally supports the findings of the three year follow-up study. There were essentially no significant statistical differences among the treatment categories with Category C (no treatment) experiencing somewhat less recidivism than Categories A and/or B.

Recidivism rates among the categories were remarkably similar, demonstrating no significant statistical differences. The recidivism rate for Category B (mandatory court appearance) was not significantly less than Category A (worker's decision) or C (no treatment/non-intervention). Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the greater the exposure to the court system, the greater the deterrent effect. The outcome of the present study does not support the belief that intrusion by the criminal justice system into the life of the juvenile offender has positive, deterrent effect upon future adult criminal activity.

As noted on page 9, there is little if any, difference between Categories A and B because the great majority of Category A (workers decision) cases were processed for adjudication. This was done because workers felt the severity of the charge (felony) warranted such "formal processing" (Tawara 1977).

As already presented, burglary arrests tended to decrease over time, though Category C tended to decrease less. The reality of this study suggests that the non-intervention approach offered is just as effective as the more traditionally oriented juvenile justice process, as reflected in adult arrests. Certainly it is more cost effective. Given the tenor of the times, i.e., high

cost of government services, backlogged court schedules, a decrease in funding of publicly supported "treatment programs", the radical non-intervention approach championed by Edwin Schur may very well be the most appropriate method for processing some youths (Severy, 1982).

REFERENCES

- Andriessen, Margo. "A Foreigner's View of American Diversion", Crime & Delinquency, Vol. 26, No. 1 (January 1980).
- Austin, James and Barry Krisberg. "The Unmet Promise of Alternatives to Incarceration", Crime & Delinquency, Vol. 23, No. 3 (July 1982).
- Black and Reiss. Cited in Gove.
- Clark, Ramsey. Crime In America. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970.
- Compton, Beulah and Burt Galaway. Social Work Processes. Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1979.
- Cullen, Francis T.; Golden, Kathryn M. and John B. Cullen. "Is Child Saving Dead? Attitudes Toward Juvenile Rehabilitation In Illinois", Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 11 (1983).
- Denno, Deborah. "Impact of a Youth Service Center: Does Diversion Work?", Criminology, Vol. 19, No. 3 (November 1980).
- Farrington, David P. and Trevor Bennett. "Police Cautioning of Juveniles in London", British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 21, No. 1 (January 1981).
- Fischer, Joel. "Is Casework Effective?", Social Work (January 1973).
- Gove, Walter R. ed. The Labelling of Deviance, 2nd ed., Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980.
- Hindelang, Michael J.; Hirschi, Travis and Joseph G. Weis. Measuring Delinquency, Vol. 23, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1981.
- Hintzen, Rachel; Inouye, Keith and Beryl Iramina. A Three Year Follow-Up Study of Project '75. Honolulu, Hawaii: Social Welfare Development & Research Center, June, 1979.
- Hirschi, Travis. Cited in Gove.
- Johnson, B. Delia and Richard T. Goldberg. "Vocational and Social Rehabilitation of Delinquents: A Study of Experimentals and Controls". Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, Vol. 6, No. 33 (Spring 1982).
- Kittrie. Cited in Cullen.
- MacGillis, Donald. Crime in America: The ABC Report. Pennsylvania: Stonesong Press, Inc., 1983.

- McCord, Joan. "A Thirty-Year Follow-up of Treatment Effects", American Psychologist, Vol. 33 (March 1978).
- O'Donnell, Clifford R.; Manos, Michael J. and Meda Chesney-Lind. "Diversion and Neighborhood Delinquency Programs: A Social Network Interpretation". (unpublished manuscript)
- Rothman. Cited in Cullen.
- Sagarin, Edward ed. Criminology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1979.
- Schneller, Donald; Perez-Reilly, Mario; Blankenship, Ralph and Jay Sadler. "The Police Officer is a Determining Factor in the Disposition of Juvenile-Police Contacts", Califor-Sociologist, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Summer 1981).
- Schur, Edwin M. Radical Non-Intervention. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Severy, Lawrence J. and J. Michael Whitaker. "Juvenile Diversion an Experimental Analysis of Effectiveness", Evaluation Review, Vol. 6, No. 6 (December 1982).
- Siegel, Larry J. and Joseph J. Senna. Juvenile Delinquency. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1981.
- "Crime and Its Victims", Signs Of The Times (July 1984).
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K. The Cycle of Violence. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Sutherland, Edwin Hardin and Donald R. Cressey. Criminology. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974.
- Tawara, Melvin T. "Project 75: A Family Court Experiment." Unpublished manuscript, (Spring 1977).
- Van Dusen, Katherine Teilmann and Sarnoff A. Mednick, ed. Prospective Studies of Crime and Delinquency. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff Publishing, 1983.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. Cited in Sagarin.

RECORD ABSTRACT

PROJECT 75

CONTINUED

1. Name	_____				
2. Project I.D. #	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. DATE OF BIRTH	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. SEX	<u>1</u> - Male <u>2</u> - Female	_____			
5. ETHNICITY:		_____			
	1-Caucasian 8-Korean				
	2-Hawaiian N-Negro				
	3-Part Haw'n S-Samoan				
	4-Chinese 9-Other				
	5-Filipino Z-Unknown				
	6-Japanese				
	7-Puerto Rican				
6. Age at time of first adult offense.	_____	_____			
7. STATE I.D. #	_____				
FIRST ARREST					
8. ARREST DATE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. ARREST CHARGE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. REPORT NUMBER	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. DISPOSITION DATE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. FINAL CHARGE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. FINAL DISPOSITION	_____				
14. FINE AMOUNT	_____	\$	_____	_____	_____
15. FINE SUSPENDED	_____		(yes)		
16. CONFINED	_____				
	D = DAYS M = MONTHS Y = YEARS	DAYS	_____	_____	_____
	1 2 3	MOS.			
		YRS.			
17. CONFINEMENT SUSPENDED	_____	DAYS	_____	_____	_____
		MOS.			
		YRS.			
18. PROBATION?	_____	YES			
19. RESTITUTION?	_____	YES	\$	_____	_____
20. SUSPENDED SENTENCE?	_____	DAYS	_____	_____	_____
		MOS.			
		YRS.			

SECOND ARREST

21. ARREST DATE _____

22. ARREST CHARGE _____

23. REPORT NUMBER _____

24. DISPOSITION DATE _____

25. FINAL CHARGE _____

26. FINAL DISPOSITION _____

27. FINE AMOUNT _____ \$ _____

28. FINE SUSPENDED _____ (yes)

29. CONFINED _____

D = DAYS M = MONTHS Y = YEARS

1 2 3

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

30. CONFINEMENT SUSPENDED _____

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

31. PROBATION? _____ YES

32. RESTITUTION _____ YES

33. SUSPENDED SENTENCE? _____

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

THIRD ARREST

34. ARREST DATE _____

35. ARREST CHARGE _____

36. REPORT NUMBER _____

37. DISPOSITION DATE _____

38. FINAL CHARGE _____

39. FINAL DISPOSITION _____

40. FINE AMOUNT _____ \$ _____

41. FINE SUSPENDED _____ (yes)

42. CONFINED _____

D = DAYS M = MONTHS Y = YEARS

1 2 3

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

43. CONFINEMENT SUSPENDED _____

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

44. PROBATION? _____ YES

45. RESTITUTION? _____ \$ _____

YES

46. SUSPENDED SENTENCE? _____

DAYS
MOS.
YRS.

FOURTH ARREST

47. ARREST DATE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
48. ARREST CHARGE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
49. REPORT NUMBER	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
50. DISPOSITION DATE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
51. FINAL CHARGE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
52. FINAL DISPOSITION	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
53. FINE AMOUNT	_____	\$	_____	_____	_____	_____
54. FINE SUSPENDED	_____		(yes)	_____	_____	_____
55. CONFINED	_____			_____	_____	_____
D = DAYS M = MONTHS Y = YEARS				DAYS	_____	_____
1 2 3				MOS.	_____	_____
				YRS.	_____	_____
56. CONFINEMENT SUSPENDED	_____			DAYS	_____	_____
				MOS.	_____	_____
				YRS.	_____	_____
57. PROBATION?	_____			YES	_____	_____
58. RESTITUTION?	_____			YES	_____	_____
					\$	_____
59. SUSPENDED SENTENCE?	_____			DAYS	_____	_____
				MOS.	_____	_____
				YRS.	_____	_____
60. AS AN ADULT ARRESTED BY THE POLICE:						
a. Total # of referrals to court:	_____					
b. Total # of misdemeanors:	_____					
c. Total number of felonies:	_____					
d. Total # of referrals for burglary:	_____					
61. Referred to district court:						
a. Total # of referrals:	_____					
b. Total # of referrals for burglary:	_____					