

✓

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume VI

Number 2

JUNE 1972

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

A quarterly journal devoted to the promotion of research, theory,
and creative programming of volunteer services.

EDITOR

Marvin S. Arffa, Ed. D.
Department of Mental Health
Wakefield, Mass.

MANAGING EDITOR

Joanne I. Theriault
P. O. Box 242
Wakefield, Mass.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Robert McCreech
Boston, Mass.

ADVISORY EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John H. Cauley, Jr.
Director, Volunteer
Programs
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Martha Mass
Supervisor, Volunteer
Services
Rockland State Hospital
Orangeburg, New York

Miriam Karlins
Director, Mental Health
Information
Education and Volunteer
Services
St. Paul, Minnesota

Jane Phillips
Consultant, Volunteer
Services Program
Illinois Department of
Mental Health
Chicago, Illinois

Glenna B. Kent
Coordinator of Volunteer
Services
Indiana Department of Mental
Health
Indianapolis, Indiana

Herbert Rooney
Chief, Citizen Participation Branch
National Institute of Mental Health
Chevy Chase, Maryland

Mary C. Mackin
Staff Assistant
Veterans Administration
Volunteer Service
Washington, D.C.

David Horton Smith
President, Assoc. for Voluntary
Action Scholars
Washington, D. C.

MANUSCRIPTS: Address all correspondence concerning manuscripts to the Editor, VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION, P. O. Box 242, Wakefield, Massachusetts 01880.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Subscriptions are \$6.00 per year. Checks should be made payable to VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION.

ADVERTISING SPACE AVAILABLE

Write the Editor for further information.

VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION

Volume VI

June 1972

Number 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial Note	3
----------------------	---

✓ Decisions! Decisions! Decisions!	4
--	---

BERNARD M. KAPELL

Volunteer Bureaus and the Volunteer as an Advocate	12
---	----

MICHAEL LANGLEY

✓ Delinquency Prevention and College Student Para-Professionals: A New Approach for our Juvenile Courts	22
---	----

THOMAS M. KELLEY
DANIEL B. KENNEDY

✓ Training Design for Volunteers in Juvenile Court Services	42
--	----

EDWARD A. BODANSKE

EDITORIAL NOTE

I have commented previously* that "the concept of voluntarism, including its organization and administration, is imbedded in a sociological framework which defines the place of the volunteer in our existing social system, how he got there, and in what ways he may be expected to develop." In other words, the context within which the administrator and the individual volunteer finds himself is as important as the specific volunteer program or service itself. The articles in this issue represent, in part this notion.

Bernard Kapell discusses the management context within which decisions must be made. The principles of a decision-making process are generic and the administrator must understand that process and interpret it as it relates to what their volunteer programs can and will be. Professor Langley is concerned with the nature of communities, the human services to be delivered to people in the community, and how the Volunteer Bureau, as an agency of the community fits into the context of human service advocacy. Thomas Kelley and Daniel Kennedy provide an elaborate sociological research framework concerning the ineffectiveness of juvenile delinquency prevention and how volunteer programs have evolved out of frustration but can become viable alternatives which may positively effect the total system of Juvenile Court procedures. Finally, Edward Bodanske discusses the training of volunteers in Juvenile Court services within the context of the court sub-culture. Training as action-oriented, involving the trainees in basic communication skills which affect all aspects of their lives, not only with specific tasks.

Marvin S. Arffa

* Arffa, Marvin S. A. continuing education program for Coordinators of Volunteer Services, *Volunteer Administration*, 3(1), 1969, 19-21.



DECISIONS! DECISIONS! DECISIONS!

Some observations and guidelines for Volunteers
and Staff on Decision-Making and Problem-Solving.

BERNARD M. KAPPELL

Training Director, American Heart Association

As individuals, each one of us is always making decisions. We make at least a dozen, sometimes several dozen decisions a day. Many are in our personal lives; some are relatively major decisions, many are minor. We make them without measure in our work.

We may consider our personal decisions our most important ones, but very often the decisions we make on the job condition the kinds of decisions we must make in our personal lives. Notwithstanding the considerable differences between making personal decisions and decisions we make in our work-a-day life, the principles behind decision-making, per se, are the same in one's private life as they are in one's professional environment.

This article does not deal with personal decisions. It is concerned only with Decisions, Decision-Making and Problem-Solving in our work situation as volunteers and staff in the agency or organization with which we are associated.

Decisions, in a real sense, are prognostications about the future. What we have to realize is that when we think about the future we are no longer dealing with validated ascertainable facts. The process of forecasting evokes hesitation and doubts. It also generates controversy and often compromise. We begin to see half rights and half wrongs. We get caught up in much plodding work with only an occasional sudden brilliant insight to relieve the tedium. Often we are tempted to leave well enough alone. Sometimes we have an urge to rush in where angels fear to tread. And always we know that there is no certainty except in retrospect.

Since we cannot consult a Delphic Oracle, we must condition ourselves to think in terms of the future. Possible future obstacles must be foreseen. To make decisions in terms of existing conditions only is to face the problem of rushing from one crisis to another.

We live by a constant flow of day-to-day and moment-by-moment decisions. The ability to make wise decisions and to get them accepted requires a skill that can be equated with an individual's personal success and leadership qualities. The possession of this skill is frequently the barometer by which one can measure the volunteer's capability for the assumption of greater responsibility for a staff worker's promotional potential.

The professional literature is weighted down with interpretations of the decision-making process and how volunteers and staff make decisions that influence their own work situations and the activities of those with whom they interact on the job. We shall examine some aspects of this subject.

Decision-Making in the Organization

The core of the administrative process in an agency rests on making decisions and having them carried out. What decisions are made, and how they are made, determines the quality of the administration. *The most basic decisions an administrator or a supervisor makes are those related to Delegation, Assigning Responsibilities, and Giving Authority Commensurate with those Responsibilities.* These are all central to his ability to function efficiently and effectively.

The flow of decision-making places the responsibility for carrying out assignments on the person or persons who was employed or assigned to that job on the basis of training and/or experience. If delegation of responsibility is thoughtfully made, and if authority is likewise delegated, most of the operating decisions will be made at the operating level. There is a decision-making role for the Executive or Supervisor, but it is reserved for those problems where there is difficulty in interpretation, when unusual circumstances obtain, or where the nature of the decision is commensurate with his own responsibility and authority.

Decision-making and action are inevitably intertwined in all organizational behavior. The very reason for making a decision is to chart a course of action. Therefore, every volunteer and professional staff member may reinforce his decision-making skills if he has a better understanding of the process by which decisions are made.

Chester I. Barnard, in his book, *The Functions of the Executive*, made a perceptive and cogent statement on the decision-making process:

"The fine art of executive decision consists in not deciding questions that are not now pertinent, in not deciding prematurely, in not making decisions that cannot be made effective, and in not making decisions that others should make."

We can transpose Mr. Barnard's statement into a set of positive precepts to chart our own style and manner in making and timing decisions:

— Decisions should be made only if they are pertinent to the concern of the individual making the decision, and to the concern of the agency involved.

— Make only those decisions that are now called for. If there is time, delay your decision; new facts may become available or circumstances may change.

— Make only those decisions on which effective action can be taken.

— Make the decisions which are your responsibility; if someone else is charged with responsibility for making a particular decision, permit him to do so.

The Nature of a Decision

In a logical transaction let us now consider the question: *What is the nature of a decision?*

All behavior involves a conscious or an unconscious choice of certain actions, or decisions, as we call them. When a person follows one course of action he has rejected other courses of action. Every action is selected from a set of possible alternatives. Some choices are merely reflex actions; others call for study or deliberation. Some choices require a simple response; others call for a series of steps which call for a plan or design.

The work of voluntary agencies, no less than the work of other organizations, involves decisions of many types, and demands continual choice-making. Ideally, volunteers or staff members are selected or appointed on the basis of established qualifications. Someone has made a judgment that the individual is capable of executing the responsibilities that go with the job. That individual either has the background and experience to make the choices — or decisions — that the job requires or can and should be trained to make them.

Making decisions is a joint process in any organization. Few decisions are really made by any one line in the hierarchy. Every decision is likely to affect many other people, and most decisions are based on what other people think and what they do. *The decision-making process is far more collaborative than is generally realized*, because decisions tend to build on previous decisions which have been effective or which have already started the course of action to meet the problem or situation with which the agency or organization is coping.

In the Voluntary Agency field good decisions are frequently joint decisions, because they are based on knowledge and opinions of several persons who are involved, and they are therefore more likely to be correct decisions because they combine the reflective thinking and judgment of more than one person. Decisions made on this basis are more likely to gain acceptance, and probably are therefore more effective. Every decision contains some element of the value-system of the decision-maker, but decisions should be based on the goals and objectives of the Department and the Agency or the Organization. What a person is trying to accomplish will influence what he decides to do — what course of action he selects.

The choice may be made from a number of goals or objectives. Occasionally, the decision-maker can reconcile two of these objectives but generally he has to select one over others. The possible effect on the agency's program must be taken into consideration, and at this point the volunteer or staff member may have to involve his supervisor. At this point the decision is appropriately shared at a higher level in the hierarchy.

Decisions are always inter-related. It is almost impossible to make one decision in an organization without affecting other decisions. For example, in making decisions about budgets the agency is undeniably greatly influencing not only its staff but also the people being served and the type and quality of the service which it will provide to the community.

Decisions in one Department or on one level of the agency almost invariably affect other Departments and/or other levels.

Staff in positions of lesser responsibility, by their choice of alternatives, shape the decisions of their superiors. In some cases they may even help shape organizational policy.

Participative Decision-Making

Having introduced the values of joint decision-making, this is a good point in time to examine participative decision making in some detail. Behavioral scientists have stressed that wide participation in decision-making is both valid and desirable in all types of organizations. We believe this has high applicability to voluntary agencies, because in their very essence they work on a participative basis. Three basic reasons are easily identified:

- Participation involving volunteers and staff insures that the agency maintains its relevance to the community it serves. Participation stimulates the professional growth and improves the morale of both volunteer and staff.

- Participation utilizes each person's individual abilities and skills to a greater extent and thus achieves more significant input to the decision-making process.

Sometimes a conflict develops between the ideal of wide-spread participation and the need for a prompt and appropriate decision. It is postulated that the participative process can unduly delay needed decisions. Participation, like democracy, takes time, and some decisions must be made promptly to avoid more serious problems. Clearly, too, some participants lack the necessary experience and ability to share in making certain decisions. We must, therefore, recognize the negative factors and guard against them to make sure that they do not impede the positive values of participation in the decision-making process.

It is true that our decision-making must be reasonably prompt if our work is to be effective. However, the very purpose of many of our decisions is to assist staff members to develop professionally and to grow on the job. Thus the participative process is vital if the decision-making process is to be effective in furthering the goals and objectives of the agency.

Dr. Norman R. F. Maier, Professor of Psychology at Michigan University, and a well-known researcher in the field of human behavior, has taken a realistic look at participative decision-making and has developed a concept for appraising which decisions should be made by the participative process and which are more appropriately made by the "leader" — the supervisor, the administrator, the department head, etc.

According to Dr. Maier, decisions that require group acceptance should be made by the persons involved, if possible, and not by the supervisor — no matter how capable he may be. However, realities dictate that there are decisions which must be made where there is no place for group consensus; the person or persons possessing the relevant knowledge or specific factual information may be the most qualified to make that kind of decision, and this is the supervisor, at whatever level he may be.

Making effective decisions, therefore, depends upon the nature of the problem. Decisions that concern feelings and attitudes profit from group participation, whereas decisions that depend on objective facts requiring specialized knowledge can best be made by experts. The common error is either to assume that group decisions are superior to leader decisions regardless of the problem, or to assume that people who know the most should make all decisions for others.

Dr. Maier maintains that the first consideration in decision-making is to decide whether the success of the decision will depend primarily upon the support it receives or on how effectively the objective facts are obtained and utilized. This requires skill in diagnosis. In the event that both objectives are needed, either persuasion or discussion-leading skills will be essential. It follows, therefore, that we cannot entirely avoid the need for management skills in decision-making.

In summation, then, participative decision-making is critical to the effective functioning of a voluntary agency because it improves morale, stimulates professional growth, utilizes each staff member's abilities and skills, and maximizes the work output of the entire staff, meanwhile releasing the supervisor's time and ability for those decisions and functions which are correctly his.

Decision-Making as Problem-Solving

We will now consider decision-making as it relates to the problem-solving process. The ability to make a decision finds its greatest expression in the problem-solving process. A decision is not really a decision until it is expressed in action. The entire problem-solving process can be viewed as an exercise in decision-making — decision-making with a purpose. A problem-solver is one who makes a sequential series of decisions and is therefore a decision-maker. The several factors inherent in the process need to be followed. These become apparent as the problem-solving process is analyzed. For purposes of brevity, these factors are listed in a step-by-step order:

— Problems are not solved if they are not recognized, or if they are ignored. They do not go away of their own accord. One has to be aware that a problem exists.

— The problem must be defined, and this requires objective thinking. It will help uncover the real problem much more quickly. The actual problem is seldom that which is most apparent, and very often objective analysis is required to pinpoint it accurately. A person who permits his emotions and feelings to become involved risks becoming a part of the problem instead of being the problem-solver.

— The relative importance of the problem must be assessed, and a target date set for its solution. When that target date is reached the solver must make his decision on the basis of the information at hand, even if he realizes that he does not have all the facts. This is the risk he must take, because not to try for any solution may in effect create a bigger problem.

— The problem-solver must know the objectives which he is striving to attain in the solution of the problem. He must have a clear sense of what precisely has to be accomplished. He will then be in the position to establish standards against which he will measure the alternatives that he will have to consider.

— The problem-solver must attempt to acquire the most complete, meaningful, and relevant data that he can assemble to help him frame the alternatives. One simple, effective device for acquiring information is to learn the art of questioning. Learn to ask, "Who, What, When, Where, How, and Why?"

— Having assembled the relevant information, the problem-solver now subjects it to creative analysis. He translates this information into all the possible alternatives, no matter how unusual they may seem at first glance. Alternatives are not summarily dismissed.

— The competent problem-solver avoids jumping to obvious conclusions. Additional facts or a closer examination may establish that the obvious is not so obvious. He guards against stereotyped conclusions and personal biases or prejudices. He also makes sure that his current reactions are not unduly colored by the conclusions of a previous experience.

— The problem-solver helps himself in his task if he can examine all the options in the light of what might happen if each were exercised. A useful question for this kind of self-testing is, "What

could happen if such-and-such were done, and what could happen if thus-and-so were not done?"

— He is now ready to list all alternatives, including the alternative to do nothing. He is not satisfied with two or three alternative solutions, even if one or two look good. He continues his examination until he has uncovered the maximum number of alternatives. A good rule for any problem-solver is to list all the possible solutions before making a decision.

— These alternative solutions are now subject to critical analysis. It is at this point that many of the creative and theoretical opinions prove to be impractical. Under certain circumstances consideration should be given to consulting a qualified fellow-professional for his opinion and judgment. An interested listener may provide valuable feedback which will give the problem-solver additional insights.

— The next step is to make the decision, and the best solution is selected.

— The decision must now be implemented. What the problem-solver has done so far is to "make the decision" about what solution is best for meeting the problem. He must now put it into effect. Failure to act upon his decision is to have gone through an exercise of possible enlightenment but consequent frustration.

Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the impact of decision-making in our work lives, decision-making in an organization, the nature of a decision, and participative decision-making. It has also delineated the steps involved in decision-making as problem-solving. The intent was to present a brief overview of this skill area as it applies to our agency output.

Business leadership is very concerned with effective decision-making, because its profits depend upon sound decisions. Should not service-oriented agencies, not in the business sector, be equally concerned? A trust has been placed in our hands; good decision-making and problem-solving adds up to wiser expenditures of monies, more effective job performance and greater service to the people the agency serves.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barnard, Chester I., *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1956, Chapter XII The Environment of Decision, pp. 185-199.
- Johns, Ray, *Executive Responsibility*. New York, N.Y.: Associated Press 1954, Part III, Chapter 14, pp. 172-181.
- Maier, Norman R. F., *Problem Solving Discussions and Conferences*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw Hill 1963.
- Maier, Norman R. F., *Psychology in Industry*. New York, N.Y.: Houghton-Mifflin 3rd Edition.
- Newman, William H. and Summer, Charles E. Jr., *The Process of Management-Concepts, Behavior, and Practice*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1964, Part Three: Planning Elements of Decision-Making, pp. 253-341. Part Four: Planning: Decision-Making in an Enterprise, pp. 357-438.
- Odiorne, George S., *Management Decisions — By Objectives*. Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1969.



VOLUNTEER BUREAUS AND THE VOLUNTEER AS AN ADVOCATE*

MICHAEL LANGLEY

Asst. Prof. of Sociology

Univ. of Tenn. at Chatt.

If there is one image which has stuck with the organized volunteer effort in this country, it is the image of a volunteer as "Lady Bountiful." Briefly, this phrase refers usually to the white, fairly affluent female who gives of her time and her resources to some disadvantaged people serving program which is located many life styles away from her suburban tri-level home with its two car way of life. This style of voluntarism has been documented by Platt (1969) relative to the juvenile court and child welfare movements in this country which took place around the beginning of the present century. Armed with their version of compassion for the to-be-served youths and coupled with their understanding of the problems of these youths, these bountiful volunteers gave of themselves enthusiastically and apparently with some regularity in the development of agencies for their favorite charities.

The nature of voluntarism being what it is in this country, there exists no meaningful statistics that could grasp the breadth of the organized volunteer effort in America, past or present. Yet, while the saga of "Lady Bountiful" is repeated hundreds of thousands of times a year, many of the social problems which generated these volunteer services and programs continue to increase. To those near the scenes of organized volunteer action, it is apparent that the programs of human services which public and private monies have generated are not yet equal to the task of reducing the human problems towards which these service programs address themselves.

Within the last three or four years, some basic philosophical changes have been occurring inside and outside of the volunteer effort. Perhaps traceable to the general cultural process of deemphasizing influence via social status, the "Lady Bountiful" volunteer has slipped both in her desirability and in her effectiveness (Nathan, 1970). In fact, it is rather fashionable today to poke fun at the ole girl. In subtle and not so subtle ways, many people in the organized volunteer effort desire to create appropriate distance between their volunteer efforts and this slightly-to-highly tarnished image of our avocation (or vocation as it is for volunteer administrators).

* Presented at the First Southeast Regional Meeting of Association of Volunteer Bureaus of America, November 17-19, 1971, Birmingham, Alabama.

Acknowledging the current demise for this image of and orientation to the organized volunteer effort (without judging that demise as positive or negative), a new image for this effort is clearly on the horizon and seemingly ready to take its place as a central feature among our phrases of self-identification (Nathan, 1970). This new phrase which may provide voluntarism with a new image is the phrase "the volunteer as an advocate." Probably immediately traceable to the populist movements of our recent past (the Civil Rights Movement of the 1950's and the 1960's, the War on Poverty of the mid 1960's and the Vietnam War protests of the mid and late 1960's), this phrase may occasion a new day and a new role in "professional" human services for the volunteer. Inherent in this philosophy of voluntarism is a shift away from emphasis on performance considerations (for example, how many volunteer hours did your Bureau generate this month?) Increasingly, more attention is being focused on service impact considerations (for example, have your volunteer service efforts produced perceptible, fairly permanent improvement for the people toward whom your service is (was) directed?), and on issues of needs unmet by existing service programs (for example, why do so many juvenile courts continue to judge youths delinquent without providing these youths with minimum legal services?). There has been too little concern with actual results and too many unasked questions by volunteers that may have precipitated the increased interest toward activism within the organized volunteer effort — activism directed at the agencies themselves.

But it is this speaker's general impression that such activism in organized volunteer efforts hasn't permeated very deeply into Volunteer Bureaus. With a Missourian orientation (that is, "Show me") to this general issue, a questionnaire was constructed and sent to the thirty-three Volunteer Bureaus in the Southeast Region (Volunteer Bureau Directory, 1971).¹ Prior to reporting the results of the returned questionnaires, (73% of the questionnaires were completed),² it would seem appropriate to briefly describe the phrase "volunteer as an advocate" which this paper suggests is developing into a new action philosophy of voluntarism.

The source for defining the concept "advocacy" in this paper is Senator Ribicoff's pending bill on child advocacy, (Congressional Record, 1971). From that context the following definition of advocacy is developed. Accompanying that definition is a statement of advocacy objectives. The term "advocacy" refers to the process of representing the interests and unmet needs of people unable to help themselves or unable to secure help for themselves. Of the major source of interests present in most settings where organized voluntarism occurs — agency interests, professional personnel interests, the person-in-need interests — the last set of interests are treated as primary by the volunteer ad-

vocate. While the rhetoric of voluntarism has always emphasized the importance of the people being served, much (a more accurate word might be most) volunteer effort seems to have been organized mainly around the primacy of agency and professional self-interests. Again drawing from the Ribicoff bill on child advocacy, the role of the volunteer as an advocate is seen as having two general objectives. First, the volunteer "will be the link between the person in need and the program that fills that need, (Congressional Record, 1971)." For example, a mother in the ghetto might come to an agency where a person is doing volunteer work. The mother's daughter may have a vision problem for which the agency refers the mother and her child to an appropriate service agency. The volunteer advocate might go with the mother and child to the referred agency or check subsequently with the mother (not the agency) to see that the needed services were provided as well as follow up later to see how the mother and child are progressing. Through this objective the volunteer functions both to provide continuity of service to the mother and child and to provide a spokesman (or broadcaster) if obstacles arise between the needed services of an agency and the people needing such services. In short, the advocate volunteer is most committed to people needing services and not to the agencies or agency personnel providing services. The volunteer advocate, in the primary interests of persons needing service, will confront or challenge agency policy and/or professional etiquette if either or both seem to be in conflict with the interests of the people needing service. It is this recognition that: (1) the interests of the people in need are paramount and (2) the willingness to question the standard operating procedures of professionally-run agencies that are the special characteristics of volunteer advocacy.

The second objective of a volunteer advocate is to serve as an overseer (perhaps uninvited) of human service programs within the community. Quoting Sen. Ribicoff, "Since the volunteer is an independent agent solely concerned with the welfare of his clients, he will be best able to assess the needs of community people, to evaluate the adequacy of the community's performance and to (help) set the goals and priorities. He will spot inefficiencies and inadequacies in the present system and press for their solution" (Congressional Record, 1971). It might be pointed out that to the extent to which the attention of the volunteer advocate is devoted to agency service objectives, likely to be missed by the advocate is the extent of similar but unserved needs of people who are not in contact with existing service agencies. It is this commitment to unmet human needs which broadens the concern of the volunteer advocate from just meeting agency service objectives to meeting the entire class of needs to be serviced by that agency.

With this rather long description of advocacy, it is now appropriate to turn to a description and analysis of the questionnaire data. The work-

ing hypotheses which guided the development of this questionnaire were two in nature. The first hypothesis concerns the breadth of services provided by Volunteer Bureaus in the Southeast. That is, do the services provided by the Volunteer Bureau extend existing services in a community or merely supply free woman power to ongoing services? The second hypothesis involves the extent to which Volunteer Bureaus are an autonomous service force within their respective communities. That is, do Volunteer Bureaus bring their own standards (which hopefully are higher) of quality control to human service settings, or do they attempt to fit into current practices? The first four tables provide information on the first working hypothesis. As table 1 indicates all or

TABLE 1
Services Provided By Volunteer Bureaus

	Yes	No
Volunteer Recruitment	24	0
Volunteer Selection	22	2
Volunteer Training	8	16
Volunteer Placement	22	2
Volunteer Supervision	2	22
Volunteer Evaluation	12	12

virtually all Bureaus provide volunteer recruitment, selection and placement services. About half of the Bureaus provide the services of training, supervision or evaluation of volunteers. Table 2 reflects the

TABLE 2
Bureaus With A Philosophy of Voluntarism

Yes	No
21	3

extent to which each Bureau apparently has articulated a specific philosophy of voluntarism. A needed analysis of these specific philosophies suggests a very lucrative area for a follow-up research project. Tables 3 and 4 provide information on the relationship of Bureaus to

TABLE 3
Volunteers Recruiter or Placed in Extra-Agency Settings

	Yes	No	No Answer
Recruited	11	12	1
Placed	11	12	1

agencies utilizing Bureau volunteers. Bureaus are split almost evenly

TABLE 4
Evaluation By Bureaus of Volunteer Settings

	Yes	No	No Answer
Agency's Purpose for Volunteers	17	7	0
Agency's Opportunity for Volunteers	22	1	1
Agency's Volunteer Supervision	15	9	0
Agency's Service Where Volunteer is Working	12	12	0

concerning the extent to which they work totally within the community's agencies as opposed to extending the role of voluntarism beyond the existing network of agencies. Such a tendency seems very relevant when coupled with the degree of evaluation practiced by Bureaus relative to the use of volunteers by different agencies. As Table 4 indicates, only about half of the Bureaus engage in direct evaluation of an agency's service wherein volunteers are used. But the vast majority of Bureaus are evaluating the purposes of, opportunities for and supervision of volunteers within specific agency settings. The information in this particular table seems particularly relevant to the information to be discussed subsequently in Table 9.

Tables 5 through 12 pertain to the second working hypothesis for this study. Table 5 reflects the extent to which Volunteer Bureaus utilize their own quality control standards for their services as opposed to

TABLE 5
Bureaus With Standards For Their Own Services

	Yes	No	Service Not Provided
Volunteer Recruitment	23	1	0
Volunteer Selection	20	3	1
Volunteer Training	10	6	8
Volunteer Placement	21	2	1
Volunteer Evaluation	16	2	6
Agency Evaluation	15	2	7

relying only on the standards or needs of community agencies. Table 6 is an indication of where Bureaus think volunteers should place

TABLE 6
Strongest Loyalty of Volunteers*

Volunteer Bureau	1
Supervisor In Volunteer Setting	3
Agency's Program	9
Volunteer's Personal Goals	0
People Being Helped	13
Loyalty Isn't Relevant Issue	2

* Some Questionnaires contained more than one response.

their strongest loyalty. While a volunteer whose first loyalty is toward the people being helped is the essence of the philosophy of advocacy, a significant number of Bureaus believe that the volunteer's first loyalty is toward the agency program in which the volunteer is working. The potential conflict for the volunteer between the interests of people needing services and the agency's unique interests is seen as a real issue from the data in Table 6. The potential conflict is heightened when the different Bureaus' conceptions of what is "advocacy voluntarism" are considered (See Apendix A). Many of these conceptions reflect primary interests other than those of the people in need of service. Tables 7 and 8 deal with the general issue of the role that

TABLE 7
Should Volunteers Evaluate
Quality of Social Agency's Services?

Yes	No	No Answer
17	5	2

the organized volunteer effort should play in evaluating professional

TABLE 8
Should Bureaus Evaluate Agency
Programs For Volunteers?

Yes	No	No Answer
17	5	2

human services. Bureaus by a margin of approximately two to one believe that both individual volunteers and the Bureau itself should actively evaluate agency programs that use volunteers. Table 9 serves as an index of the extent to which agency evaluation by Volunteer

TABLE 9
Bureaus Not Placing Volunteers
Because of Inadequate Agency Program

Yes	No
8	16

Bureaus has been translated into action (though admittedly, the table reflects only negative action). Eight of the 22 Bureaus who place volunteers have refused to place them with agencies because of inadequacies in these agency's programs. Tables 10-12 offer more data concerning program evaluation and voluntarism. Table 10 shows the number of Bureaus who ask the clients of agencies where Bureau

TABLE 10
Bureaus Asking People Served
To Evaluate Volunteers

	Yes	No	Sometimes
People Being Helped	14	8	2

volunteers are serving to evaluate the volunteers. About two-thirds of the Bureaus responding include this type of quality control in their volunteer services. Table 11 reflects the number of Bureaus asking

TABLE 11
Bureaus Asking Clients About
Adequacy Of Agency's Services

Yes	No
11	13

clients of Agencies where Bureau volunteers are serving to evaluate the Agencies' program. Less than half of the Bureaus responding function in this way relative to agencies where volunteers are placed. Table 12 indicates the number of Bureaus asking agencies where

TABLE 12
Bureaus Asking Agencies
To Evaluate Volunteers

Yes	No	Sometimes	No Response
22	0	1	1

volunteers are placed to evaluate the volunteers. Virtually every Bureau responding asks agencies to evaluate volunteers who work in their programs.

Discussion

Regarding the first working hypothesis — the breadth of Volunteer Bureau services — a typical Bureau in the Southeast can be described. Such a Bureau is basically concerned with volunteer recruitment, selection, and placement. It may or may not concern itself with the direct evaluation of its volunteers (as opposed to agency evaluation of its volunteers). More likely than not, it is not involved in training or supervising its volunteers. The typical Volunteer Bureau operates under a specific philosophy of voluntarism. It is as likely to work completely within agency service systems — relative to the recruitment or placement of volunteers — as it is to have extended services beyond the services of existing social agencies. The typical Bureau has evaluated the purpose of, the opportunities for, and the supervision of volunteers by agencies using Bureau volunteers. Lastly, the typical Bureau may or may not have evaluated an agency's program in which its volunteers will be placed. This last mentioned form of evaluation can serve as one lever by which Volunteer Bureaus can exert positive influence to upgrade the quality of an agency's services or to make public the continued service inadequacies of that agency's program.

The picture just described of a typical Volunteer Bureau in the Southeast is not a strong picture when viewed from the perspective of volunteer advocacy as detailed in this paper. Weak in evaluating existing agency services and virtually uninvolved in the training or supervision of volunteers, the typical Bureau would seem to be doing very little to extend or assess the volunteer-using human service agencies in its community. It might be more accurately described as reacting to agency needs rather than to people needs (to the extent that these two sets of needs are not synonymous).

With regards to the second working hypothesis — the autonomy and concern with quality of services — the typical Bureau can be described. It has its own standards of quality for the recruitment, selection, placement and evaluation of volunteers. The data reported herein contained no information concerning how formalized or how accountable Bureaus are to their own standards of quality control for human services. The typical Bureau does not have its own standards for training or for evaluating agencies. The typical Bureau believes that a volunteer owes her (or his) loyalty either to the people being served or to the agency where the volunteer is working. It is the belief of this typical Bureau that volunteers should evaluate the services of an agency, but the typical Bureau has yet to refuse to place volunteers in programs found to be inadequate (Or this typical Bureau has yet to find an agency with an inadequate program.) The typical Bureau asks the people serviced to evaluate both the volunteers and the service agency's program. Finally, the typical Bureau asks the agencies to evaluate volunteers.

This tentative description of the typical Volunteer Bureau in the Southeast clearly has the rudiments for implementing a philosophy of volunteer advocacy. Yet this same typical Bureau would seem to be some distance from a program operating on advocacy principles, as opposed to operating on "Lady Bountiful" principles. On the other hand the typical Bureau will settle within current community service standards — both breadth and quality — to the extent that Bureaus react to agency program needs rather than act to meet people's unserved and unidentified needs. Perhaps the greatest "de-advocacy" trend potentially influencing Southeast Region Bureaus may be their tendency to co-opt the philosophy of advocacy into current non-advocacy or barely advocate Volunteer Bureau programs. Granted the desirability of volunteer advocacy, each Bureau should analyze carefully this philosophy relative to the *changes and expansion* in program required to implement this 1970's version of voluntarism.

REFERENCES

Nathan, Cynthia, "The Volunteer of the Seventies." *Volunteer Administration*. Vol. 4, No. 1, 1970, p.g.

Ibid. pp. 3-9

Directory of Volunteer Bureaus. (Preliminary Draft) United Way of America: New York, 1971.

Platt, Anthony M. *The Child Savers*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969.

Congressional Record. Vol. 117, No. 45 (S. 1414 - Child Advocacy Program).

APPENDIX A

Meaning of the Phrase "Volunteer as an Advocate" to Volunteer Bureaus in the Southeast

It distinguishes volunteers whose services to a cause or agency program are not limited to a particular task, but embrace the supportive role of a positive channel to and from the community.

To serve with an eye towards making things better, speaking up, if necessary.

One who believes in helping.

That the volunteer is an advocate of volunteerism. A well-placed volunteer will spread the word of the advantages and awards of being a volunteer to others.

A person who is actively involved in community service and enthusiastically talks about it to others.

A Volunteer directly helping someone with their problems.
Volunteers are public relations ambassadors.

One who is an example of "help to others" in a positive and meaningful way.

This means that individual participation demonstrates or lends support to community needs.

This indicates one offering to speak on behalf of another or support another.

A volunteer may be the voice of the community and may help agencies expand their thinking and service.

It means that the volunteer is so committed to the purpose of the agency as to be the spokesman for the agency in the community. I see the phrase coming to mean that volunteers marshal the resources available to work at solutions to community problems not necessarily through agencies.

Advocate means "plead a cause." The volunteer's satisfaction in a placement usually results in his speaking in behalf of the program and the client served.

It could mean an advocate of helpfulness to others of community involvement, or of self-fulfillment, probably a little of each.

The volunteer must believe strongly in the usefulness of his work and witness to that with others.

Feel that the volunteer by being a volunteer is stepping forward to say "let's help" and lead the way to broader and better service.

Seems to be this year's relevant (along with) input. I suppose it means the power of the volunteer to serve as a spokesman for an agency or program. But it seems to be used more in group form to express the voice of a minority with a grievance.

Encourages and promotes intervention for individuals in need of such intervention.

Nothing.

Voluntary action center.

In a rewarding position, volunteer becomes an arm of the program, interpreting it from a unique viewpoint to citizens and (to) aid recipients. For recruitment of more volunteers.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Southeast Region referred to is the regional organization of the Association of Volunteer Bureaus of America. The states comprising that region are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.
2. Those communities choosing not to participate include: Mobile, Alabama; Texarkana, Arkansas; Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Miami, Florida; Louisville, Kentucky; Owensboro, Kentucky; Greensboro, North Carolina; Columbia, South Carolina; Richmond, Virginia.

The writer would like to thank Mrs. John Ahearn for her comments relative to the design of the questionnaire used in this study.

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND COLLEGE STUDENT PARA-PROFESSIONALS: A NEW APPROACH FOR OUR JUVENILE COURTS

THOMAS M. KELLEY

Director of Student Volunteer Services
Wayne County Juvenile Court; Detroit, Michigan

and

DANIEL B. KENNEDY

Coordinator, Criminal Justice Center
Maccomb County Community College, Mt. Clemens, Michigan

ABSTRACT

The ineffectiveness or total absence of evaluation of time-worn programs of delinquency rehabilitation in our juvenile courts have led the authors to conclude that efforts of prevention must receive greater emphasis if the juvenile crime rate is to be significantly reduced. However, the results over the past few decades of the majority of adequately evaluated experiments in delinquency prevention have been extremely disappointing in reducing juvenile crime. Even if the severe "treatment underexposure" inherent in many prevention programs is corrected and positive results eventually ensue, the costs of expanding these professionally staffed programs to the larger community would be enormous. The authors therefore contend that what must be found is an approach to delinquency prevention which would have the potential for providing the maximum number of adolescents with adequate and continuing counseling and attention at a minimal expense to the community. The authors suggest that one approach to the problem that would seem to fulfill these conditions would be the utilization of trained student para-professionals from our universities and community colleges. Such a program, currently in progress at the Wayne County Juvenile Court in Detroit, Michigan is discussed briefly.

Juvenile delinquency is a major area of concern in the U.S. today. Statistical evidence indicates that the incidence of delinquency is consistently increasing and that increasing proportions of American youth are engaging in more serious forms of delinquency such as larceny and auto theft. According to the U.S. Children's Bureau, which collects current statistics on a national basis, there has been a real increase in juvenile delinquency in recent years, an increase which is out of proportion to the rise in the child population. Almost one million (988,500) juvenile delinquency cases, excluding traffic offenses were handled by Juvenile Courts in the U.S. in 1969. These cases in-

volving some 853,000 children, represent 2.7% of all children in the country between the ages of ten and seventeen. The 1969 rate represented an increase of 10% over the 1968 rate as compared to an increase of only 2% in the ten-seventeen age group. Except for 1959 and 1961, such disproportionate increases have been the rule since the end of World War II (Freedman, 1966). A more specific breakdown of the problem was expressed by Senator Birch Bayh (1971) in his recent address to the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges:

"During the 1960's violent crime by children under 18 increased by one hundred and forty eight percent. Property crimes, such as burglary, larceny and auto theft increased by 85%. Persons under 25 now account for more than 59% of the crimes of violence and for 81% of the property crimes each year. The recidivism rate for juveniles is nearly 75%, even higher than the rate for adult criminals. Last year alone the cost of juvenile crime was more than four billion dollars. (P. 57)."

Every year, our Federal, state, and local governments spend millions of dollars on programs aimed at the rehabilitation of delinquent youths. A large portion of this money is used by our Juvenile Courts for the purpose of continuing time-worn placement, treatment, and probation methods of seemingly questionable value. Virtually no conclusive evidence can be found in the literature regarding the effectiveness of these Court sponsored programs in reducing juvenile crime. Even today, very few research plans are in progress at Juvenile Courts.

Attempting to explain the tremendous lack of research in this area, Cressy (1966) suggested that persons administering programs in our Courts often have vested interests in maintaining only vague procedures for measuring the effectiveness of their programs or discouraging research efforts completely. Evaluative research which would show a treatment to be ineffective would seriously threaten the administering agency or personnel. For this reason the personnel or agencies involved are likely to maintain that criminality or delinquency is reduced by whatever they are doing. Furthermore, according to Cressy, it is often the case that few personnel administering delinquency rehabilitation programs have had either the research training or the time necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of their work.

Considering the few evaluative studies of Court sponsored programs that have been carried out, the overall results have in general been either inconclusive or negative indicating that those who have received a given treatment from a given professional group improve no more than those who have not been given that same treatment. For example,

one follow-up study of delinquents returned from the Boys Training School in Lansing, Michigan in 1947 indicated that approximately 80% got into further trouble (Wild, 1961).

A classic study in this area was carried out by Dunham (1955) at the Wayne County Clinic for Child Study in Detroit. This clinic had as one of its express purposes the arresting of further development of delinquent behavior by means of psychotherapeutic treatment of the adolescent. Dunham hypothesized that psychotherapeutic treatment of juvenile delinquents in varying degrees in the clinical setting would not serve to prevent them from becoming adult offenders. The results were in support of this hypothesis indicating no significant differences in the percentages of arrest of those receiving psychiatric treatment compared with those not receiving such treatment.

In the specific areas of probation and parole effectiveness, the studies that have been done have led many researchers to conclude that there is little demonstrable relationship between the officer's work and the offender's subsequent criminal behavior (Street, Vinter, and Perrow, 1966; Glaser, 1964; McEachern, 1968). These findings, however, should not necessarily be taken as a rejection of institutions and agencies given over to the care and correction of delinquents. According to Martin (1961):

"Far from abandoning this line of approach we must act imaginatively regarding the invention of 'new ones.' Furthermore, we must, as we have seldom paused to do so in the past, rigorously test and verify the effectiveness of the various approaches aimed at the rehabilitation of individual delinquents (P. 22)."

Another seemingly logical implication of the fact that present methods of delinquency rehabilitation have not been notably successful in reducing juvenile crime rates, is that the policy of prevention must receive greater emphasis if the crime rate is to be reduced significantly.

Over the past few decades, however, there have been relatively few programs instituted in the area of delinquency prevention. Of the programs that have evolved only a small percentage have been subjected to substantive evaluation. There are a number of reasons for the dismal amount of effort in this area. First of all, definitions of "prevention" tends to vary from program to program. To some, delinquency prevention is practically synonymous with the promotion of the healthy personality development of all children. Proponents of this viewpoint would seek to prevent or reduce delinquency by improving all aspects of American life that bear closely on the personality development of children and all services that are provided in the child-

ren's behalf. To other students and planners of programs, delinquency prevention means reaching potential delinquents before they get into trouble. The big problem here is developing adequate instruments for the efficient screening and early identification of children and youth who may be exposed or who are vulnerable to delinquency.¹ Of the techniques that have been developed for this purpose only a few have been subjected to the rigorous before-and-after tests of validation (E. G. Glueck Prediction Table, Bristol Social Adjustment and Prediction Instrument, K. D. Proneness Scales and Check List). When this has been done, the results have indicated only marginal success and low predictive power. As yet, no simple practical and valid test for delinquency prediction can be found on the test market (Kvaraceus, 1966). Finally, a third conception of prevention (incorporating a much narrower definition of delinquency) stresses reducing recidivism and lessening the likelihood of serious offenses.

Second of all, there has been little agreement among sociologists as to the underlying causes of delinquent behavior. Wattenberg (1969) states the problem quite accurately in his book "A Phenomenon Searching For A Cause." Sutherland's Differential Association Theory, The Sub-Cultural Status-Deprivation Theory of Cohen, and The Opportunity Structure Theory of Cloward and Ohlin, all lead to Different Conclusions About Delinquency Prevention (Lunden, 1968).

Differential Association Theory, for example, is based on the assumption that criminal behavior is learned in interaction with persons in a process of communication. A person becomes delinquent because he learns an excess of definitions favorable to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violations of the law. Thus the delinquent learns a system of values supporting criminal behavior. Generally speaking, Differential Association Theory stresses the idea that delinquency is a consequence of the failure of social control. Programs of prevention stemming from this theoretical network would tend to have the goal of strengthening social sanctions against crime, or to effect in some manner the conditions whereby the individual is effectively governed by social control processes.

The Status-Deprivation approach to delinquency is derived from the basic assumption of the uneven distribution of status. According to this theory, the middle class measuring rod prevents status being conferred on certain persons, who in order to defend themselves from resulting loss of self-esteem, band collectively forming a so-called "Contraculture" to disaffirm the validity of the middle-class judge-

¹. It is noteworthy that teacher nominations appear to offer the most reliable potential for detection of future norm violators (Kvaraceus, 1966; P. 219).

ment. Prevention programs based on this theory attempt to penetrate delinquent "gangs" with the purpose of changing attitudes and re-directing energies.

Opportunity Structure Theory takes more objectivist and structural position assuming that it is those boys who want only higher incomes (not status mobility) who respond to the limitations of opportunity by directing hostility against the social order rather than against themselves. The theory is based on the "unjust" distribution of opportunity among the social classes. Prevention programs stemming from Opportunity Structure Theory would ideally attempt to equalize opportunity among the social classes. On a more limited basis such programs would aim at providing jobs or job training for delinquent youths.

Finally, concerning theories of delinquency, it should be noted that they are generally vague and thus difficult to put to empirical testing. In the words of Bordua (1966):

"The most fundamental problem of proof posed by the . . . theories is that they are simply not stated in propositional form. The statements in the theories vary from assumptions of fact to semipropositional statements of relationships between variables and to complex normative interpretations. Thus, the theories are open to varied interpretations, and it is rarely clear what tests — if any are indeed possible — would be crucial for the theories (P. 95)."

Thus, depending on held definitions of prevention and theories of delinquency, the objectives of delinquency prevention programs will vary considerably. Furthermore, this state of affairs makes the evaluation of these programs' effectiveness quite difficult as well as prevents the direct comparison of the results achieved by different programs.

The stark realization then is that no universals have been discovered and there are virtually no generalizations that can be made about delinquent boys, except that they have committed an act that is regarded as illegal. At the present time no one can show in advance that crime will be significantly reduced if a particular program of prevention is adopted. Until such prediction is possible, it would appear that programs of prevention must operate on the trial and error principal. However, according to Lunden (1962) there is nothing wrong with this approach:

". . . . it should be restated that there may be a number of theories of crime causation but there is no theory of crime prevention. The issues do not lie in the realm of theory but in the field of strategy. There is an ob-

jective to be attained — the prevention of lessening of crime — and all possible resources must be marshalled to gain that objective. At present the strength of the opposition or the forces of crime may not be fully known, but it does now appear that to date the present systems of corrections have not 'gotten off the ground' and have certainly not gained a beachhead in the attack. The time has come for less theory and more strategy in the struggle against the rebels in society (P. 228)."

The general public is opposed to crime to be sure. But it is also opposed to high taxes and individual financial sacrifice and apparently would prefer to make emotional gestures in regard to crime rather than risk capital on unproven delinquency prevention programs (Giallombardo, 1966). In the words of Rosenfield (1956):

"Further research into the origins of juvenile delinquency and of related symptoms of social and personal malfunctioning among our youth is not likely to produce much knowledge relevant to preventive measures. What is needed now is a carefully recorded, analyzed, and evaluated trial and error methods, using various approaches in various combinations in various conditions, learning all the while — unlearning and learning (P. 42-43)."

With the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offences Control Act in 1961, along with strong support from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and from some of the major foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation, many of the largest urban centers in the country are beginning to plan and to institute "total approach" programs aimed at delinquency prevention (Lohman and Carrey, 1966). These programs, however, are too new to be evaluated at the present time. The few delinquency programs that have been effectively evaluated have been disappointing to say the least. These programs can be classified into three general types of approaches: (1) Programs and measures aimed at improving the environmental situation, (2) Programs oriented toward the delinquent as an individual apart from the local community, and the wider social process and, (3) Programs oriented toward the delinquent as a member of national and formally organized groups which are primarily involved in leisure-time activities (Lohman and Carey, 1966).

Before presenting descriptions of some of the major programs and their accomplishments, it must be mentioned that the numerous causes of delinquency tend to narrow the effectiveness of any one particular program. In the words of Witmer and Tufts (1954):

"The causes of delinquency are numerous both in tota and within the individual case. This makes it unlikely that any program will achieve spectacular results. Most programs are singlefocused, they aim at the elimination or

amelioration of some condition that the backers regard as especially important in delinquency causation. Since, however, these conditions do not operate in isolation — either in the community or within the individual child and family — it is not to be expected that any single approach to delinquency prevention will be strikingly successful (P. 8)."

Each program mentioned below aims to effect a change in one or more factors thought to make for delinquency — environmental, interpersonal, intrapsychic, etc. Evaluations must take into account whether, and to what extent, this desired change has been brought about. If the change has not been achieved, it is obviously impossible to determine whether the program could prevent delinquency.

It should also be pointed out in this context that the chief test of many delinquency prevention programs is what happens to delinquency rates. This is a poor test for two reasons. On the one hand, delinquency rates are an undependable index of the amount of delinquent conduct in a community. They go up or down with changes in law and with changes in community attitudes toward children's conduct, etc., as well as with changes in the actual amount of delinquent behavior. On the other hand, insofar as the rates are dependable, they register the joint effects of many factors in addition to those with which a particular delinquency prevention program is concerned. Control over these factors is difficult to achieve.

The classic Cambridge-Somerville (Mass.) Youth Study (Power and Witmer, 1957), in effect between 1937 and 1945, was based on the hypothesis that many delinquent and pre-delinquent boys would develop into youths of upright character if they were provided with the continued friendship and wise counsel of adults who were deeply interested in them and who could secure them access to whatever community services they needed. The boys involved in the program ranged from mentally retarded and neurologically impaired to confirmed delinquents. Six hundred and fifty boys were divided into a treatment group of 325 who were given a wide range of treatments and intensive counseling and a control group of 325 who remained in the area with no supervision other than that given the average youth. After seven years a final assessment of the program was made in which the two groups were compared in terms of the number of boys who were committed to institutions for delinquent acts or who were arrested. The findings indicated no significant differences between treatment and control groups.

In an offshoot of the Cambridge-Somerville Study, McCord, McCord and Thurber (1960), did a follow-up study of 19 boys, who as part of the treatment provided through the Cambridge-Somerville Program were placed in foster homes. These nineteen were matched with nine-

teen other boys who formed the control group. The study hypothesized that the foster home boys would have a lower rate of adult deviance than would the matched controls. This expectation however, was not fulfilled as a significantly higher proportion of those who had been placed in foster homes had criminal records in adulthood. The authors suggest that foster home placement may actually be harmful during adolescence.

While the Cambridge-Somerville Study utilized the individual approach with boys, the Youth Consultation Service (Meyer, Borgotta and Jones, 1965) utilized a three-year intervention program with potentially delinquent girls from New York City Vocational High School. In this experiment, some 400 potentially delinquent girls were identified. Two hundred of these girls, chosen at random, were designated as a control group; the remaining 200 were referred to the Treatment Service which provided traditional, individual, social casework as well as group therapy. The combined efforts of teachers, social workers, psychologists, and sociologists were used to provide treatment in the experimental group. The girls were followed through their high school careers and evaluated namely in terms of their social and academic adjustment while in school. Criteria included the incidence of poor conduct, truancy, suspension, expulsion, and out-of-wedlock pregnancies. School grades and personality measures were also used in the evaluation. The results, however, indicated no significant differences between the treatment and control groups on any of the criteria utilized. The combined services were not effective in abating delinquent patterns.

Providing employment has been thought by many social agencies to be a potential means of delinquency control. The opportunities for Youth Program (Hackler, 1965) launched in Seattle in 1964, attempted to modify the self-concepts of approximately ninety boys living in low-income areas by utilizing a work program in combination with teaching machines and other experimental variables. The program was based on the theory that by providing appropriate behavioral models and modifying interaction patterns for experimental subjects, positive changes in self-concept would result and ultimately be reflected in the boys behavior. A control was used in the research design. The overall results, however, showed that the program had little, if any, impact and suggested that extreme caution should be taken by other programs using employment as a means of delinquency control. Such programs may be futile "unless they can also bring about changes in the larger social system surrounding boys in low income areas (P. 155)."

Another approach to the delinquency prevention problem is Child Guidance which is based on psychiatric theory and involves both the

home and family groups. Using this approach, the New York City Youth Board (Craig and Furst, 1952) offered case work services to twenty-nine experimental subjects who had medium to very high probabilities of becoming delinquent as predicted by the Glueck Social Prediction Scale. A control group (N-29) was provided and matched on neighborhood, prediction score, ethnic group, age, and I.Q. score. All subjects were first grade boys in a high delinquency area. The treatment consisted of Child Guidance Therapy over a period of five years provided by psychiatrists, psychologists and psychiatric social workers. In comparing the delinquency outcomes of the experimental and control groups no significant differences were found in the number of serious delinquents in each group. The researchers concluded that their survey offered no encouragement for the hope that Child Guidance Therapy offered a means of materially reducing the incidence of serious delinquency in a population of boys selected by the Glueck Social Prediction Table as probable delinquents.

The conclusion above from the New York City Youth Board Study is in accord with results of the Maximum Benefits Project (Tait, Hodges, and Hodges, 1962) carried out along similar lines. This project provided casework service to 111 subjects and their parents over an average period of eleven months. Again the results revealed the program to be ineffective in preventing delinquent behavior.

Using a "total community approach" the Midcity Project (Miller, 1962) was a delinquency control program in a lower-class district of Boston between 1954 and 1957. Using trained professionals, all with degrees in social work, the project was based on the assumption that delinquent behavior of urban lower-class adolescents, whatever their personality characteristics, is facilitated by certain structural features of the community. The project executed action programs directed at three of the societal units deemed to be most important in the genesis and perpetuation of delinquent behavior; the community, the family, and the gang. Between 1954 and 1957 some 400 boys between the ages of twelve and twenty-one were involved in the project. Local citizens groups were encouraged to discourage juvenile gang activities in their neighborhood. Increased cooperation among various agencies were effected. Churches, schools, police departments, and probation departments carried out an intensive and coordinated campaign against delinquent behavior in a selected district. A number of families in the area with long records of dependency were given an intensive dose of psychiatric casework. The results showed that "all major measures of violative behavior, disapproved actions, illegal actions, during contact Court appearances, before-during-after Court appearances, and project-control group appearances again provide consistent support for a finding of negligible impact (P. 190)." Again it could be noted, that each of the studies described above adhered to strict research protocol for evaluating their service effective-

ness. Thus the control procedures which characterized the above experiments would seem to invest the negative findings with directly challenging the claims made for delinquency prevention experiments. Berleman (1969), however, after closely examining the studies described above in terms of concept and execution of treatment utilized states:

"On the other hand, to accept the negative findings with gloomy finality may be equally fallacious, for to do so assumes that the experiments were flawless in concept and execution. This has not been the case. For example, the crucial question of the extent to which the experimental subjects were exposed to service cannot be satisfactorily answered (P. 473)."

Assuming that a fair amount of attention is necessary before a helping relationship can develop, Berleman went on to report the poor documentation of the amount of experimental service given subjects in the delinquency prevention experiments. According to Berleman, four of the studies listed above (Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, New York City Youth Board, Midcity Project, and Youth Consultation Service) although claiming adequate treatment exposure, failed to report either average monthly contacts with subjects or average monthly contacts on behalf of subjects. Where treatment exposure was reported or could be roughly estimated, the range was from .4 contacts per month for the Maximum Benefits Project to 2.3 contacts for the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study. Again it should be emphasized that the 2.3 average contact for Cambridge-Somerville represented the sum of contacts both with and on behalf of an adolescent. Berleman concludes that such a range of contacts with or on behalf of the subject does not satisfy any definition of adequate service:

"Hence, it can be argued that the overall negative results occurred not so much because the service itself was faulty but because the subjects were so woefully under exposed to the service agents that the forms of service were never actually tested (P. 347)."

A reevaluation of the data of the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study by the McCords (1959) lends support to Berleman's conclusion. In this re-appraisal the McCords evaluated the experimental treatment for thirty-four subjects who were seen at least once a week and another eighty-four seen at least once every two weeks for a period of at least six months. The McCords concluded that "treatment was most effective for those children seen most frequently and at least effective for those seen once every two weeks (P. 31)." Further support for the "deficient attention hypothesis" comes from a pretest phase of the Seattle Atlantic Street Center's delinquency prevention experiment. In this phase two service agents were able to average slightly more

than twelve contacts per month with or on behalf of thirteen subjects over a five month period. The result was a considerable reduction of delinquent behavior of these subjects below that of their control counterparts (Berleman, 1966).

Thus, for whatever the reason (high caseloads, treatment saturation, poor criteria, etc.), the paid professional staffs of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, probation officers, etc., utilized in the studies reviewed above were not able to give each child and his strengths, problems, and needs the necessary time and attention. Furthermore, even if future research, correcting for severe "treatment underexposure," produces positive results for the professionally staffed programs involved, the costs of extending and expanding such programs to encompass the larger community would be enormous. It is also noted, that all prevention programs appear to be one-shot affairs. It is unusual to find a replicated experiment. This would seem unfortunate when one considers that there exists such a wide variety of delinquents and variation of causative factors.

In our Juvenile Courts the manpower shortage is particularly acute in the vitally important area of individualized service to potentially delinquent youngsters and their families. Juvenile Courts throughout the country are fast becoming aware of the impossibility of providing, to all those youngsters in need of it, adequate one-to-one attention and assistance through regular court employed personnel — whether they be trained mental health professionals or sub-professionals serving in the role of caseworkers. There simply are not and will likely never be enough of these individuals to provide the kinds of personalized adult involvement, support, and supervision which these youngsters desire and need.

From the Federal Government on down, increased attention has thus been given to alternative solutions to help supplement and augment the work of professionals in the area of delinquency prevention. Considering the state of affairs indicated above it would appear that what must be found is an approach to delinquency prevention which incorporates the potential for providing a maximum number of adolescents with adequate and sustained attention at a reasonable cost to the community. Furthermore such an approach must lend itself to easy replication under various conditions and within the wide spectrum of delinquent types to note any differential effect. One approach to delinquency prevention which might incorporate the potential to fulfill the requirements above and which would be specially applicable to our juvenile courts would be the utilization of the potentially tremendous yet largely untapped reserves of volunteer and non-professional manpower that exists in communities throughout this country. Although it is obvious that the para-professional cannot take over the

functions of the trained professional, volunteers can provide services that the paid staff cannot provide. According to Goddard (1967):

"The volunteer can meet the immediate needs of the 'whole child' thereby bringing about growth and greater independence, and can often open opportunities to assist him in school work and school activities. Having responsibility for only one youngster or a few, he can give more time than the professional can to the relationship and to developing and obtaining needed resources. Professionals with full time responsibility for a number of children could not begin to spend the time or acquire the range of talents necessary to meet the spectrum of needs presented by many children. A group of carefully selected, well trained, and effectively used volunteers, under professional supervision, can (P. 126)."

Thus the volunteer (in comparison with the professional) with his "caseload of one" can spend the time with the juvenile necessary for a better acquaintance and the chance for a helping relationship to develop. Furthermore, most professionals are from the middle class or strongly identify with it, while most of their clients are from the lower socioeconomic strata. Some volunteers, however, have actually experienced the same situations as their clients and have first-hand familiarity with their folkways, values and language. Also, children sometimes feel that professionals help because they are paid and not because they want to. They know that volunteers are not paid and therefore must really want to help. Finally, what is extremely important, the volunteer is not identified as a Court official, lessening the danger of reinforcing the delinquent self-concept and still meeting the needs of the child. According to Lohman and Carey (1966):

"The crux of delinquency prevention is to approach such deviations and abhorractions without dramatizing youngsters as evil, and hence to cut short or even avoid their public definition and self-identification as delinquents. It is this public naming of the delinquent, and the resulting conception of himself as delinquent, which is at the heart of the prevention problem (P. 393-394)."

The extent to which volunteers are utilized by our Juvenile Courts at the present time is not widely known by the general public, partly because the movement began only in 1960. Today over 10,000 court volunteers, in about 125 courts, are providing a huge variety of services. There are more than 150 distinct court volunteer jobs in twenty different major job categories. The National Register of Volunteer Jobs in Court Settings (1967, Chapter 12) describes the 150 jobs which volunteers have performed in court settings. Some of the various areas in which volunteers can be used in Juvenile Court settings are: Advisory council members, Arts and crafts, Recreation, Employment, Foster parents, Neighborhood work, Office work, Public relations, Record keeping, Religious guidance, etc.

Although the volunteer movement is accelerating at a rapid rate, most Juvenile Courts have been hesitant, unimaginative, and even suspicious about utilizing volunteers, especially on a one-to-one counseling basis. There appear to be a number of reasons behind this, many of them based upon largely irrational or misinformed conceptions about the difficulties and risks inherent in volunteer programs such as these:

1. The recruitment and supervision of such volunteers is too costly and troublesome.
2. There are not enough potentially interested persons to make such a program work.
3. Volunteers are likely to get into the way of the court's normal functioning, creating more problems than they solve.
4. Volunteers, due to their "Naivete" are likely to be ineffective, even harmful in their relationships with youngsters.
5. Volunteers might provide a more effective and economical substitute for the services of professionals or sub-professionals.

As a consequence of these fears or expectations, many Juvenile Courts who have sought out the assistance of volunteers have done so only in the most limited circumscribed ways. Thus, most court connected volunteer programs are not really "programs" at all, but consist instead of the limited use of already existing volunteer groups such as church groups, big brothers, etc. While they are eager to cooperate and render a definite service, organizations have to spread their services so thinly in so many directions that they cannot possibly provide volunteers in these numbers or at the rate they are needed. Thus, in order to counteract these problems and prevent further solidification of these fears and expectations what would seem to be needed is a pool of potential volunteers who:

1. Are available in sufficient numbers to meet a significant portion of the need.
2. Can be easily recruited.
3. Can be efficiently trained and supervised at minimal expense to the court.
4. Have had previous experience working with adolescents or are somewhat knowledgeable about the social and psychological problems associated with adolescence.

One potential group of volunteers who would appear on the whole to satisfy these requirements are the student para-professionals from our universities and community colleges. As Kirby (1966) has noted:

"Many kinds of juvenile and adult correction agencies are close to colleges and universities. Each has something to offer the other. The correctional agency can offer a field experience far more meaningful to students of human behavior than anything derived from the printed page and can also offer to faculty a tremendously stimulating opportunity to observe and participate in real problems. On the other hand, the colleges and universities can supply agencies with alert, inquisitive students, full of ideas and questions from the "outside" and are also the most likely source for the personnel which correction agencies so badly need (P. 253)."

College students have many unique characteristics which make them especially desirable to work with delinquent and pre-delinquent adolescents. Greenblatt and Kantor (1962) suggested that college students are more successful than "volunteers of a more senior station in life," because they manifest less resistance to and more motivation for face-to-face contact with such children." Also, student volunteers appear to have a sense of personal conviction in their work that the staff of other volunteer workers cannot duplicate. The reasons for this high level of motivation are numerous. First of all, college students find great satisfaction in working on a worthwhile cause. Further, they are revolutionists engaged in a struggle against juvenile delinquency, the toll of which can be seen in the various youth homes and state facilities. Finally, an element of altruistic novelty, characterized the students observed by Umbarger et al. (1962).

Because they cannot rely on professional training or the professional facade, college students are forced to use a naive, common sense approach to their encounter. College students tend to be free from theoretical constrictions and are therefore less inhibited in experimenting with new approaches. As a result of this naivete, an ignorance of theory, students may find themselves engaging in successful and unique approaches that would be considered inappropriate or too ill-logical by professionals. The fresh approach of college students may result therefore in new learning experiences for professionals as well. Furthermore, college student volunteers have a greater flexibility in terms of appropriate activities and behaviors than do caseworkers or probation officers. According to Groover (1971) whereas a college student may take his charge to the zoo or be invited to a party by the ward, a professional probation officer, by virtue of his role prescription, would probably not engage in these activities.

A further advantage of using college students as companion counselors may be that there is less stigma involved for the adolescent. Whereas

a parent may be concerned about the stigma attached to having his child placed on probation, he may be less inhibited about his child seeing a college student.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1966) has noted that students represent a large and relatively unkept source of volunteer manpower for institutions housing juvenile delinquents. It is suggested that college students may more easily break the psychological barriers that often separate juvenile delinquents from adult workers since alienated young people usually trust in any young person more than they trust in adults. In the probation program in Boulder, Colorado, college students are presently serving as tutors, interviewers, and discussion leaders for the delinquents.

Gorlich (1967) further postulated that the functions of student volunteers in institutions for delinquents are threefold. First, they prove to the delinquent that someone on the outside really cares about them. Also, college students provide the young person with a role model. Finally, the students can later help spread the word about institutional needs.

It should also be pointed out that the university or community college student as a volunteer (in comparison with volunteers from the community at large) comes into the Court setting with many built-in motivational and practical advantages. First of all, the student volunteers would be receiving ongoing training from their respective educational institutions. Also the students would be receiving course credit and grades for their services, a source of reward perhaps more powerful than personal gratification alone. Finally, the age gap between most student volunteers and their clients would be small enough to enhance the possibility of their establishing effective models for imitation and identification by their adolescents.

Since the evidence reveals quite clearly that the effects of the juvenile court judicial process in preventing delinquency and rehabilitating confirmed delinquents is questionable to say the least, it would seem that the pre-adjudication stages involving a juvenile offender might be a more worthwhile area for utilizing the services of student volunteers. In its report, the Challenge of Crime in a free society, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice treated the intake proceeding fully. The Commission recommended that as many cases as possible be adjusted outside of the judicial process. The report stated:

"The primacy of the rehabilitative goal in dealing with juveniles, the limited effectiveness of the formal processes of the juvenile justice system, the labeling inherent in adjudicating children delinquent, the inability of the formal system to reach the influences — family, school, labor

market, recreational opportunities — that shape the life of a youngster, the limited disposition options available to the juvenile judge, the limitations of personnel and diagnostic and treatment facilities, the lack of community support — all of these factors give pre-judicial dispositions an especially important role with respect to juveniles (Ralston, 1971; P. 161)."

Thus it would certainly appear that the university and community college student para-professionals, having some background in the social sciences, could be an effective tool in the area of delinquency prevention. For what he lacks in professional training, the student volunteer can provide the adolescent with much more of the attention that was so obviously lacking or unreported in the prevention studies reviewed herein. In addition it would seem that student volunteers can in many cases fulfill many needs of certain adolescents that professionals, because of their very role as "professional," cannot. Furthermore, it would seem quite logical in terms of a philosophy of prevention to utilize the services of student volunteers in connection with juvenile court intake departments during the pre-adjudication stages. This would help chances of "catching" offenders in comparatively early stages of development.

At the present time no studies can be found in the literature which have evaluated the assumptions above in relation to the utilization of student volunteers in a program of delinquency prevention. Although university and college student volunteers may be a potential solution to those problems indicated earlier, it would be impractical to utilize such volunteer programs without evaluating their effectiveness. If attempts are not made at such evaluation, programs that are as ineffective or questionable as the time worn casework programs already in use at juvenile court may be continued.

At the present time, only a handful of programs utilizing volunteers on a one-to-one counseling basis with adolescence in a juvenile court setting have been evaluated. The Royal Oak, Michigan's NIMH grant, compared 94 young adult offenders in their largely volunteer-assisted probation program, with a group of 82 similar offenders in a controlled court, which did not use volunteers. Both groups were tested at the beginning of probation and again 18 months later. A nationally standardized-test measured hostility, belligerence, and anti-social attitudes. In the volunteer-program group, 73% of the probationers showed improvement in social attitudes after 18 months, but only 18% of the non-volunteer group showed much improvement. In that non-volunteer group of probationers, 82% either showed no change in social attitudes, or actually regressed. A final report of this project is expected out soon (HEW, Preliminary Research Study Report, 1967).

A Denver County court preliminary study deals with volunteer impact on young offenders (like Royal Oak), but in a large metropolitan area, (where they always used to say volunteers would never work). A group of 13 probationers-with-volunteers was compared with a group of 13 probationers-without-volunteers. Both groups were tested at the beginning of probation and again one year later, on a sociometric self-evaluation form covering such characteristics as (do you see yourself as) reliable vs. unreliable, foolish vs. wise, varying vs. cautious, hard to get along with vs. easy to get along with, etc. The volunteer group of probationers improved on a 12 out of 13 of these self-evaluated characteristics: the non-volunteer group improved on only 3 out of 13 and they got worse on 10 out of 13 (Trujillo, 1968).

Much more information of this type is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn. Furthermore, it should be noted that the studies above did not use student volunteers and that the efforts of the volunteers used were directed to adolescents already placed on probation. An investigation specifically designed to determine the impact of college student volunteers working with preadjudicated adolescents is presently in progress at the Wayne County Juvenile Court in Detroit, Michigan. In this study, some 50 male college students from Wayne County Community College and Wayne State University will be working on a one-to-one counseling basis with male adolescents referred from the Juvenile Court's Intake Department. The students will work with these youths over an entire academic year (approximately 8 to 9 months), each student spending a minimum of three hours per week with his assigned adolescent. For their involvement, these students will receive from 10 to 12 credit hours toward their undergraduate degrees from their respective educational institutions. Supervision entails weekly class training and discussion sessions over the entire duration of treatment.

At determination of treatment, a number of criteria will be collected (recidivism, school related behavior, and personality and attitude measures) to determine the impact of the student volunteer counseling program. An adequate control group will be used in the evaluation phase. Results of this study will be completed in the summer of 1972. Meanwhile, it is strongly recommended that other juvenile courts across the country (especially those in large metropolitan areas located near to inner city colleges and universities) seriously consider the idea of initiating programs with nearby educational institutions for the involvement of students in similar prevention experiments.

REFERENCES

1. Adamson, Lamay and Dunham, H. Warren. Clinical Treatment of Male Delinquents: A Case Study in Effort and Result. *American Sociological Review*, June, 1956, 312-320.

2. Berleman, William C. and Steinburn, Thomas W. The Value and Validity of Delinquency Prevention Experiments. *Crime and Delinquency*, 1966, 12, 471-479.
3. Craig, Maude M. and Furst, Phillip W. What Happens After Treatment? A Study of Potentially Delinquent Boys. *Social Service Review*, June, 1965, 165-171.
4. Cressy, Donald R. The Nature and Effectiveness of Correctional Techniques. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Autumn, 1958, 754-771.
5. Freedman, Marcia K. Background of Delinquency. In Social Deviancy Among Youth. *The Sixty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. William W. Wattenberg (Ed.), Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
6. Giallombardo, Rose (Ed.). *Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1966.
7. Glaser, D. *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*.
8. Goddard, Jewel. Volunteer Services In a Juvenile Court. *Crime and Delinquency*, 1967, 13, 337-343.
9. Gorlich, E. H. Volunteers in Institutions For Delinquents. *Children*, 1967, 14, 147-150.
10. Gruver, Gene Gary. College Students as Therapeutic Agents. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1971, 76, 111-127.
11. Hackler, James C. Boys, Blisters, and Behavior: The Impact of a Work Program in an Urban Central Area. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, July, 1966, 155-164.
12. Kantor, D. Inducing Preferences For Mental Health Careers. *National Association of Social Workers*, 1959, 75.
13. Kirby, Bernard C. An Experiment in Student Interning in Correction, *Crime and Delinquency*, 1966, 12, 250-253.
14. Kvaraceus, William C. Programs of Early Identification and Prevention of Delinquency. In Social Deviancy Among Youth. *The Sixty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. William M. Wattenberg (Ed.), Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

15. Lohman, Joseph D. and Garey, James T. Rehabilitation Programs For Deviant Youth. In *Social Deviancy Among Youth. The Sixty Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. William W. Wattenberg (Ed.), Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
16. Lunden, Walter A. Three Theories of Crime Prevention. In *Prevention of Delinquency: Problems and Programs*, John R. Stratton and Robert M. Terry (Eds.), New York: Macmillan, 1968.
17. Martin, John M. Three Approaches to Delinquency Prevention: A Critique. *Crime and Delinquency*, 1961, 7, 16-24.
18. McCord, Joan, McCord, William, and Thurber, Emily. The Effects of Foster-Home Placement in the Prevention of Adult Anti-Social Behavior. In *Prevention of Delinquency: Problems and Programs*. John R. Stratton and Robert M. Terry (Eds.), New York: McMillan, 1968.
19. McCord, William, McCord, Joan, and Zola, Irving Kenneth. *Origins of Crime: A New Evaluation of the Cambridge Somerville Youth Study*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
20. McEachern, A. W. The Juvenile Probation System, Simulation for Research and Decision-Making. *American Behavioral Scientist*, January and February, 1968.
21. Meyer, Henry J., Borgatta, Edgar F., and Wyatt, C. Jones. *Girls At Vocational High: An Experiment in Social Work Interaction*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.
22. Miller, Walter B. The Impact of a "Total Community" Delinquency Control Project, *Social Problems*, Fall 1962, 168-191.
23. O'Neill, Eugene. Analysis of the Seattle Atlantic Street Center Program: A Social Experiment Evaluating the Impact of Social Worker Service. Seattle: *Seattle Atlantic Street Center Mimeo*, 1965.
24. Powers, Edwin and Witmer, Helen. *An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: The Cambridge Somerville Youth Study*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.
25. Ralston, William H. Jr. Intake! Informal Disposition or Adversary Proceeding? *Crime and Delinquency*, 1971, 17, 160-165.

26. Rosenfeld, Eva. Social Research and Social Action in the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency. In *Prevention of Delinquency: Problems and Programs*. John R. Stratton and Robert M. Terry (Eds.), New York: McMillan, 1968.
27. Shannon, Lyle W. The Problem of Competence To Help. *Federal Probation*, 1961, 25, 32-39.
28. Silver, Albert W. Retooling for Delinquency Prevention and Rehabilitation in Juvenile Courts. *Federal Probation*, 1966, 30, 29-32.
29. Street, D., Vinter, R.D., and Perrow, C. *Organization for Treatment*.
30. Tait, C. Downing Jr., Hodges, M. C., and Hodges, Emily F. Jr. *Delinquents, Their Families and the Community*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1962.
31. Umbarger, C. C., Dalsimer, J. S., Morrison, A. P., & Breggin, P. R. *College Students in A Mental Hospital*. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1962.
32. Wilde, H. A Follow-Up Study of Boys Conveyed By the Wayne County Juvenile Court to the Boys' Vocational School, Lansing, Michigan in 1947. (Unpublished masters thesis). Detroit: Wayne State University, 1961.
33. Witmer, Helen L., and Tufts, Edith. The Effectiveness of Delinquency Prevention Programs. *Children's Bureau Publication Number 350*. Washington: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1954.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

1. HEW, Preliminary Research Study Report, National Institutes of Mental Health and Royal Oak Municipal Court, November, 1967.
2. Trujillo, Robert. The Use of Volunteer Probation Counsellors for Misdemeanants. (Unpublished study) Denver County Court, 1968.



"TRAINING DESIGN FOR VOLUNTEERS IN JUVENILE COURT SERVICES"

EDWARD A. BODANSKE

Coordinator of Volunteers in Juvenile Court Services

Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, Maryland

This article is intended to serve as a practitioner's model of a training program for volunteers working with juvenile delinquents. It is hoped that persons or organizations interested in forming or improving a volunteers program of this type will be able to draw upon this model to fit their own local needs. The program described below is currently in operation in suburban Washington, D.C. and some 150 volunteers have participated in this form of training.

Goals of Training

Volunteers are called upon to communicate with and relate to delinquents, who are persons probably very much unlike the average volunteer. Scheier (1968) noted that "volunteering today is overwhelmingly an upper-middle-class phenomenon, as is suggested by the average volunteer's income, education, and occupational status."¹ It is commonly held that delinquency knows no class lines, but that in an urban community it is frequently a function of the disadvantaged classes. It is easy to see how communication between volunteers and delinquent clients can be a problem, one that training programs should try to deal with.

A Louis Harris & Associates survey in 1969 concluded that "the volunteer will have to learn to listen to the offender he will be serving."² The study further suggested that training should give a volunteer a chance to "examine his experience and test his perceptions."³ Jorgenson (1970) stated that "training programs must impart knowledge, deal with attitudes, and develop skills."⁴ Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1971) feel that "most potential volunteers need help in clarifying their future roles or in understanding other people's roles."⁵

The basic thrust of this design is that volunteers need experience in the skills of communication in a helping relationship. The design provides communication training that is more introductory than complete. It is primarily a design for training young adults to work with delinquents, but may be modified to fit other volunteer or client populations. It tries to maximize trainee participation in the learning process with an

action-oriented approach and an emphasis on application. It is presented here as both macro and micro design, in that a total program is described, but with emphasis on individual pre-service training sessions.

The Probation System

The Maryland suburbs of the District of Columbia are divided into two large and populous counties, Montgomery and Prince George's. Juvenile delinquency is a serious problem in the area, as evidenced by court statistics. For calendar 1971 there were 5800 juvenile delinquency complaints in Prince George's and 5600 in Montgomery. Typical delinquent offenses include breaking and entering, unauthorized use of a motor vehicle, or the non-delinquent offense of being beyond the normal control of parents. First offender delinquents or ungovernable children are usually placed on probation by the juvenile court.

Probation for juveniles in Maryland is a period of time during which an offender under the age of 18 is exposed to rehabilitative treatment by a probation worker. Probation is customarily ordered by the court to be for an indefinite length of time and the child is counseled rather than punished. Most probationers stay under the jurisdiction of the court at least six months and termination of probation is made only after the child has indicated a willingness and an ability to function normally in the home and community.

Juvenile offenders in Maryland are supervised while on probation by the professional staff of the Department of Juvenile Services. Each probation worker is assigned 30-40 cases to supervise and is responsible for planning and implementing a rehabilitative treatment plan for each case. Such treatment is based on individual needs and may include psychological testing, counseling, restrictions, career planning, remedial skills instruction, etc. The emphasis is on child development and family support and the probation worker is seen as a change agent. The probation worker serves as counselor and coordinator, as well as authoritarian, to each case in varying degrees.

Function of Volunteers in the Probation System

Volunteers are seen as a support service for probation workers and have the full backing of the court and the department. Volunteers normally function as counselors or tutors for one or two clients, who also receive normal probation services. Certain volunteers may assume nearly professional responsibility for a case and work as an intern probation worker. Some volunteers specialize in certain areas, such as drug abuse or job placement, while others serve as recreation aides at the local juvenile detention facility.

Most of the volunteers currently at work in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties are college students from the University of Maryland, College Park or other area schools. The use of student volunteers has wide acceptance, as pointed out by Arffa (1971).⁶ In addition to the student volunteers, there are a number of private citizens involved in the program, many of whom are federal employees or educators. Over 95% of the volunteers are white and the mean age is around 21 years old. The age range is 18 to 65.

Intern or assistant probation workers are senior criminology majors at the University of Maryland, enrolled in field placement or practicum. The course allows students interested in probation as a career to receive practical experience in the field. After training, the interns are assigned to three probation or aftercare cases to supervise for one or two semesters. Some interns work in the intake section and handle informal 45-day supervisions. Cases for interns to supervise are selected by workers and their supervisors and professional workers maintain close contact with the interns. Therefore, since interns function practically as probation workers, they require training that approximates the professional levels.

The larger portion of volunteers are not interns, but may well be college students nonetheless. Non-intern volunteers primarily work in conjunction with routine probation services in the counseling, tutorial, or more specialized capacities. In the bi-county areas there are about 40 interns per year, and in excess of 100 regular volunteers.

Probation staff considers the volunteers program as a way of providing needed services or as another resource in the community. A probation worker observes in his or her caseload a need that the worker cannot fulfill for a particular client. The worker consults with the coordinator who classifies the need in terms of volunteer jobs. The coordinator periodically recruits and trains a group of volunteers to fill the needs of staff. The coordinator then matches the volunteers to the needs after again consulting with staff. The individual worker calls the volunteer and discusses the case history and treatment plan. The worker and volunteer jointly decide on each other's role in the treatment and the volunteer sets to work.

Training the Intern Probation Worker

The coordinator conducts preservice orientation and training for interns in three evening sessions early in each semester. The first session is a group discussion of individual perceptions of the roles of actors in the probation system. Communication or the lack of it with other human service agencies, the police, judiciary, etc. is brought out for the group to consider. The concept of treatment as the function of

a probation worker is presented and debated. Departmental objectives and goals are summarized in a handout⁷ and translated into operational definitions by group synthesis. Communication exercises are used as needed to facilitate the group's work on the issues. The interns themselves as a group are responsible for making the session work, as well as getting to know each other, while the coordinator/trainer is responsible for facilitating the learning process.

The second session is more structured and begins with a sketch of a client. The group is encouraged to act out their stereotypes of police, blacks, addicts, freaks, parents, judges, etc. in an attempt to explode some mythology and to point out individual differences. Handouts on court procedure, including a chart tracing a delinquent through the legal system, are distributed. Role playing is introduced as a learning technique and the group is free to negotiate its relevance and use. If participants agree, a role-play of an intake hearing is fish-bowled by the coordinator and a volunteer trainee. The roles to be portrayed are flexible, but a frequently used starting point is to have the volunteer put himself in the role of a first offender at an intake hearing for shoplifting. The trainer plays the intake consultant and for about three minutes the other participants observe the behavior of the two actors. At the conclusion of the role play, participants are invited to ask questions of the actors in and out of role, to get a better understanding of how they felt and what words or actions affected them.

The group next proceeds to dyadic role play among themselves in similar scenes: a hearing, a meeting with parents, a conference with the arresting officer, a meeting with school authorities, etc. Each dyad is asked to share its experiences and happenings with the large group and processing of the data is carried on informally. Comparisons of the group scenes with those in actual field situations are drawn and participants are made aware of the distortions and false impressions that might arise.

In session three a case study is presented for the group to work on. Copies of the case history are distributed at the end of session two and participants are asked to consider questions of treatment. The group shares their individual responses to the study questions as a way of getting into a discussion of how a probation worker affects treatment. The group notes inputs from actors in the case history and decides what events have true causal relationships to improvements in the client's behavior. Role playing is used if the group gets stuck. The session ends with a lecturette on report writing, general supervision techniques and accountability.

After the last session, interns contact the probation workers they will be assigned to and plan to meet their clients. Within two weeks the

group reconvenes to share experiences and problems. Specific and general topics for discussion in later group meetings might include how to handle a hostile client, problems with schools, when to terminate a case, or the like. The group is also required to attend a communications skills lab and a cross-cultural or racial awareness lab, facilitated by professional consultants. On-going dialogue between staff using interns and the coordinator is maintained and the course instructor and the coordinator lead the biweekly group meetings.

Training Regular Volunteers

Training for regular volunteers is conducted monthly as needed in a day-long Saturday session. Interested persons are recruited and registered for the next volunteers orientation and training session by the coordinator or volunteer assistants. As participants arrive at the session, they are given handouts on communication, the department's history, objectives and goals, lines of problem-solving within the program, and general information and phone numbers of key personnel. They are also asked to fill out a two-page application form and are assigned to one of five groups. Each small group (10-20) is facilitated by a volunteer trainer or the coordinator. Trainers are usually experienced volunteers who have themselves been involved in training for trainers. Training of trainers is discussed by Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt (1971).⁸ As participants find their small groups they are encouraged to introduce themselves and check out with their neighbors some motivations for being here. The session officially begins with introductory remarks as trainers join their groups. Each trainer presents a case study he or she has actually been involved in and the group analyzes it. Questions of input, like what techniques are working with that child, what are the parents doing well, how does the child demonstrate his unfulfilled needs, etc. are considered. The trainers move the group to a discussion of the role of volunteers in probation treatment and have the group examine the effectiveness or advisability of a volunteer entering the case being studied. After an hour the small groups share their impressions in the large group. Since each group's case was unique, the total group gets an exposure to several types of clients and several styles of probation work.

After lunch the coordinator charges the group to break into trios and introduces the listening exercise. The triads are asked to designate each member as a speaker, listener or referee. The referee is to select one topic from a list of value statements about voluntarism. The statements are actually local or national criticisms of volunteers. Typical topics are: "A volunteers program which uses whites to work with blacks is a form of institutional racism;" or "volunteers often make kids dependent on them to fulfill their own needs;" or "Volunteers get more out of their work personally than their clients do."

The speaker is asked to communicate his feelings on the subject in two minutes to the listener. The listener must summarize what was said in one minute without adding his personal feelings. No one may take notes and the referee is allowed 15 seconds to critique the effectiveness of the communication process. When the round is completed the participants change roles until each member has taken all three parts, each on a different topic.

Time for each triad to process its own activities is allocated and a brief talk is given by the coordinator on application of learning in the exercise to real-life probation situations. The next exercise is to have the several triads observe the trainers in a role play of a court hearing. The scene is that of a young offender, his parents, the judge and a probation worker, planning for the youth's probationary period. Triads act out certain scenes of probation after the observation and discussion. Examples of scenes used are: the first meeting of a volunteer and client; the volunteer accidentally interrupting a family argument; a jail scene after the volunteer had done quite a bit of work with the client; a revocation of probation hearing in court, etc. Each scene needs to be clearly introduced by trainer staff and should be kept short. At this point trainees are asked to return to their original groups for an evaluation and question session. Volunteers leave the session with the understanding that the coordinator will refer their names and applications to staff needing volunteer services. On-going training by way of discussion groups is offered for the volunteers and interested volunteers sign up for specific areas they feel weak in. Such topics might be court procedure, juvenile law, community resources, crisis intervention, drug information, etc. Lectures or films on these topics are scheduled as needed and the volunteers are invited to attend.

Conclusion

Subjective feedback on the results of this training has been obtained from the volunteers themselves. By and large they indicate approval of the techniques used and the material presented, and call for more of the same. A small number of volunteers have been disillusioned by the training and withdrew from the program before being assigned. Their response was that they felt very uncomfortable talking with persons like the ones portrayed in the role plays and were afraid they could not be of any help to certain of those people. These volunteers were contacted about performing other kinds of volunteer service and several assented. The large majority of the volunteers stated that they had begun to think in terms of communication as a system and felt they were more conscious of their personal counseling approaches now than before training. Many agreed that they had noticed several of their own myths about delinquents and courts being exploded and felt this was enlightening.

Exercises such as role play or listening topics are not a training end in themselves. They must be considered tools to help trainees expand their participation and awareness. A combination of traditional didactic techniques and the more experiential approach provides for trainee internalization of concepts and responsibilities. The application of learning must be the chief objective of the design if the volunteer's training is to be a positive factor in the quality of his service to clients and agencies.

FOOTNOTES:

1. I. H. Scheier and L. P. Goter, *Using Volunteers in Court Settings*, (Washington, D.C., U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., 1968), p. 24.
2. "Volunteers Look at Corrections," *Report of a Survey by Louis Harris and Associates*, (Washington, D.C., Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, 1969, p. 27.
3. IBID, p. 27.
4. J. D. Jorgenson, *Volunteers! and the Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders Conference Report*, (Detroit, 1970), p. 35.
5. Eva Schindler-Rainman and Ronald Lippitt, *The Volunteer Community*, (Washington, D.C., Center for a Voluntary Society, 1971), p. 75.
6. Marvin S. Arffa, "Student Volunteers Make a Difference," *Volunteer Administration*, vol. V, no. 3, Sept. 30, 1971.
7. McTeague, Elizabeth, ed., "Maryland's Approach to Juvenile Problems," *Maryland's Health*, vol. 1, no. 2, March-April 1971.
8. Schindler-Rainman and Lippitt, OP. CIT., pp. 84-100.



SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

Name

Street

City State Zip Code

Subscription rates:

\$ 6.00 — 1 year ☐

\$11.00 — 2 years ☐

\$16.00 — 3 years ☐

Subscription years are concurrent with calendar years
Make Checks payable to "VOLUNTEER ADMINISTRATION"

and send to: Dr. Marvin S. Arffa, Editor
P.O. Box 242
Wakefield, Mass. 01880