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This study was conducted to determine some guideline for developing the total community approach to the prevention of delinquency. An effort was made to reduce the vast amount of literature to a concise, comprehensive overview.

To conduct this research, a review of literature was made with an attempt to analyze the literature to get a clear picture of what should be done in the way of prevention of delinquency.

Some of the important conclusions of this study are as follows:

1. The juvenile delinquency situation does present a problem national in scope and breadth.
2. A majority of the researchers and authors favor the total community approach for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.
3. Statistics on juvenile delinquency are variable depending upon the organization presenting the figures and the method of computation.
4. The causes of delinquency are complex and interrelated, and who will become a delinquent cannot be predicted.
5. Delinquency is best understood in terms of the total motivational-situational-cultural complexes within which it occurs.
6. Social and family disorganization is the most fundamental factor in juvenile delinquency.
7. Our service institutions are not meeting the needs of our youth.
8. Fragmentation of services often keeps people from using them.
9. There is no indication that the individual or the family can be reconstructed by any program that does not take into account the society in which it is shaped.
10. Changes in social conditions must take place at the command of and in response to the community.
11. The community cannot be organized for the benefit of youth and parents unless youth and parents are a fundamental and major part of the organization themselves.
12. The hypothesis that beginning experience will induce a continuous process of community involvement at the grass-roots level was not upheld.
13. To pursue community organization programs successfully, conflict is virtually inevitable.
14. Early detection of predelinquents so that they may receive individual attention at an early age is basic to prevention.
15. The function of the neighborhood council or community council should be community organization, coordination and evaluation rather than direct operation of services.
16. Every community should have a planning and coordinating body which concerns itself with delinquency problems.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Many forces in the community affect the growth, development and ultimate behavior of every child. These forces, for good or evil, are multiple, varied and complex. The task of reducing or removing the adverse factors that may be deeply rooted in the home and the community cannot be accomplished easily by one group alone. Any endeavor to strengthen the social safeguards set up to insure optimum child growth and development or to procure new protective services for youth can succeed only to the extent to which all community members, organizations, and agencies join forces in overall study and planning. The fragmentary nature of the typical community approach to the youth problem is a major reason for the meager success that too often follows such efforts.

Statement of Problem

As an educator with a marked interest, this researcher presents a summary of recent literature for the purpose of determining guidelines relative to the prevention of juvenile delinquency from the total community approach.

General Questions to be Answered

This researcher anticipates that a thorough review of literature will reveal basic guidelines that any community could use in setting up its own community approach to the prevention of delinquency. This researcher also hopes to show that the total community must become involved if significant and continuous results are to be developed.
Purpose of the Study

It is anticipated that a thorough review of the literature will reveal little or no variation in the views with respect to the magnitude and urgency of the juvenile delinquency conditions nationwide. Using the knowledge based on actual experience of other communities will prevent the wasting of time, money, and energy by communities which are beginning to organize their resources to combat the juvenile delinquency problem.

General Procedure

A review of related literature available at Montana State University Library will be used as a basis for obtaining information needed for this survey. The material will be selected from professional journals in the fields of education, counseling, psychology, and sociology; from hardbound publications and professional opinions. The material will then be used as a basis for a subjective analysis by the researcher.

Limitations

A review of the literature is restricted since few scientific research reports have been published. Many of the reports will be subjective and opinionated because they are reports from observations made of these community approaches. Since most of the communities studied were relatively new in development, emphasis will be placed on guidelines for the beginning few years. The study will be reviewed from the large city community programs largely because little research is available on
small town total community approach. Limited evaluation has been provided by most of the communities.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Community action program** - It must involve the community in the development and use of techniques so that victims of poverty, social injustice, broken homes or some other form of exploitation and discrimination are organized to identify their problems; determine the sources and causes, and mobilize their energies, resources, and collective power in seeking and obtaining remedies and the desired changes.

2. **Delinquent** - A youth who expresses an overt form of unlawful practices according to conventional cultural standards.

   The term delinquent is largely determined by court standards and community practice. Legal authorities and other so-called experts disagree over the definition of delinquent behavior. There are serious differences as to where delinquency under law begins and where it should end. Delinquency, as the term is presently used in professional and official literature, may encompass almost any type of so-called "deviant" youthful behavior. In many cases no "crime", in the legal or usual sense, is committed.

3. **Delinquency prevention** - Delinquency prevention is the sum total of all activities that contribute to the adjustment of children and to healthy personalities in children; the attempt to deal with particular environmental conditions that are believed to contribute to delinquency. Delinquency prevention consists of specific preventive services provided to individual children or groups of children.

4. **Primary prevention** - Activities designed to forestall delinquency by early detection, and immediate treatment by cooperative programs in the community.

5. **Secondary prevention** - Activities directed toward youth manifesting behavior that might lead to serious delinquency or toward those already adjudged delinquent.

6. **Subjective analysis** - Term coined in order to more aptly describe the process of abstracting information from a given piece of literature for the purpose of developing a particular topic.
7. Substantive legal code - Demands that reference to carefully defined circumstances and situations in which the individual's overt act and his culpable intentions are jointly considered as evidence of lawbreaking.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The social conditions impinging upon youth are not limited in their effects to this age group alone. Every youth problem is a challenge to the strength and character of the total community. The well-being of children and adolescents is a value in itself, one that needs no additional justification. Nevertheless, from a strictly pragmatic point of view, the positive development of young people represents the development of a resource which the community cannot ignore. If today's youth are defective in mind, spirit, physique, or ability, the community will experience the consequences, both now and in the generations ahead.

But this is a commonplace principle. Much more important is the proposition that the life situations, adjustment, and circumstances of our young people emerge from and reflect, in ever expanding and newly discovered ways, the structural, cultural, economic, and other characteristics of our society. Any attempt to come to grips with the variety of problems and issues confronting youth today must inevitably lead to an examination of the zone in which history and the other sciences of man meet. No youth is an island isolated from his culture, his society, his place in history (Martin and Fitzpatrick, 1968, p. 3).

Reasons for Concern

Because of the conflict in definition of delinquency, statistics are sadly misrepresented. However, statistics in the literature do indicate that a rising number of delinquents are apprehended and brought to court each year, and that the rate of juvenile delinquency is increasing. Delinquency may be interpreted in terms of the failure of socialization. Interrelated causes such as broken homes, poor school records, and unemployment deprive young people of role models and ego ideals on which they can draw to overcome their frustrations and find an accepted
place in society. The implication is that the delinquent must face up to the demands of society rather than society meet the demands of the individual. But how can a person face up to demands if he does not have the motivation and self-confidence? Maybe society should face up to the demands (needs) of the delinquent.

Cloward (1963) states that limitations on the accessibility of cultural goals by legitimate means are the principal sources of pressures toward deviance. In other words, for many people there is no connection between the ends to which they orient themselves and the means at hand for achieving those ends. Cultural goals include upward mobility in terms of socio-economic status coupled with academic skills, and employment opportunities. In essence this general theory (Cloward, 1960) holds that delinquency is a response to frustration in a society which holds up for emulation only middle-class ideals. Marwell (1966) asserts that adolescents are especially powerless, having lost the childhood position of having others do for them and not yet having gained the adult power to do for themselves. He also states that this powerlessness encourages delinquency. Stewart (1967) suggests that delinquents come mainly from disorganized homes or homes that have traumatic occasions. Stewart also suggests that working with parents and youth to develop proper home life is the responsibility of the community.

Alvin D. Zalinger (1961, p. 393), assistant professor of sociology at Boston University, sums up juvenile delinquency and its treatment this way: "Juvenile delinquency must be regarded as a symptom of
both social and individual illness. Therapeutic measures must be based on scientific knowledge and must be aimed at both social and individual reconstruction."

Between the extreme positions that juvenile delinquency is caused by forces within the environment and that it is caused by forces within the individual, there is a third position which describes delinquency as the results of socio-psychological processes. Smith (1967, p. 29) states:

Most knowledgeable people agree that certain personal, social and environmental conditions are positively related to delinquency; however, factors are not causes. It is quite probable that delinquency as a general phenomenon cannot be prevented, but it's equally probable that specific children can be prevented from becoming delinquent.

Other researchers (Martin, Fitzpatrick, and Gould, 1968, pp. 10, 11) review delinquency in interdisciplinary perspectives:

1. Delinquency is best understood in terms of the total motivational-situational-cultural complexes within which it occurs.

2. Social and cultural aspects of human behavior are basic to causation as well as the psychic.

3. Through the bridge provided by the disciplines of social psychology and relevant psychiatry, the social and cultural forces acting upon an individual delinquent must be linked to the particular delinquent act he commits in meeting particular situations within his special milieu.

In view of the many reasons for concern presented, nothing should prevent localities, private industry and commerce, states or regions, universities or other units from developing crime-prevention organizations to serve their special needs. Our present systems place emphasis on events after the crime has taken place and the costly damage has been
done. A focus on crime prevention would have significant effects on poverty, racial problems, community disorganization, and other social concerns at the point where they become most acute. Miles (1968, p. 38) states, "The point of attack on the precriminal life of the offender, the focus on root causes, and the range of cooperation with other community resources distinguish crime prevention from other traditional police, judicial, and correctional action." Miles foresees a profession that is produced through academic preparation and direct attack. Although this will be enormously costly, Miles concludes that only when balanced against the probable savings could there be contemplated a resolution of this important aspect of (1968, p. 40) "... savings in the fabric of our society as well as in the direct costs of crime."

**Why Is Delinquency a Problem for the Whole Community?**

Eva Rosenfeld (1965, p. 379) answers the juvenile delinquency problem this way:

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 and rehabilitative measures. What is needed now is a carefully recorded, analyzed, and evaluated trial-and-error method, using various approaches in various combinations in various conditions, learning all the while - unlearning and learning.

The need for such a "trial-and-error plus evaluation" approach is indicated not only by the uncertainty of our knowledge about prevention and by the difficulty of predicting in advance the effectiveness of any given program of action. This approach is also necessary to debunk the pessimism of those experienced workers who have become paralyzed by routine and have lost the daring for experimentation with new approaches.
In the slow progress from understanding to resolving social problems, action must precede full understanding, for much of the understanding comes from observing first attempts at remedial action fail.

In concluding a study of six community organization programs, Charles Grosser (1969, p. 69) states:

It is possible to base community organization programs on the assumption that major involvement on the part of community residents to improve their own social situation is the requisite for a successful comprehensive program to combat delinquency in disadvantaged and demoralized communities.

The community organization approach (Havighurst, 1963) is based on the assumption that youth-serving institutions of the society can be strengthened sufficiently to help most young people who are vulnerable to delinquency.

American social controls over crime and delinquency (Dentler, 1967, p. 377) are subject to "... deep, disabling internal disorganization. Laws are not effectively or impartially enforced. Laws change more rapidly than the informal standards that give rise to the law, without in turn modifying some of the standards themselves." Dentler continues to promote authentic programs of prevention that require effective techniques for reordering the social structure, at least locally.

Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, who have done much work on the delinquency problem both theoretically and in research, (1930, pp. 335–338) suggest that some preventive work involves factors that lie relatively near the surface. These factors are the focus that social action by community programs must relate and change. Glueck (1930, p. 336)
intelligent community organization, based on a careful survey of community facilities, needs, and liabilities, offers the most promising means of attack upon the problem.

The President's Crime Commission (Delinquent Congress, 1967) recommended a total approach to the control of delinquency by the strengthening of family ties, improvement of slum-area schools, involvement of all community organizations with youth programs for delinquents and potential offenders, and the establishment of Youth Service Bureaus to relieve the strain on juvenile courts.

A report at the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency (1947, pp. 1-3) lists the following seven reasons why delinquency is a community problem:

1. Because it is a composite problem. Human behavior is the result of many types of influences on the individual.

2. Because many organized groups are involved. When a child does get into difficulty or exhibits delinquent tendencies, the way he is handled, the facilities available for his treatment and guidance, and the timing and manner in which all of these facilities go into action on his behalf have a definite bearing on his chances of becoming a stable, useful member of society.

3. Because community services are complex and as it grows, it is not usually uniformly developed but the result of many years of spasmodic and too often stunted growth.

4. Because the community programs will continue to grow. Regardless if the addition is patch-work or if there is some semblance of planned and controlled development with an eye on the total need and the total resources and maximum recognition of priorities.

5. Because it affects all citizens. The needs of every young person in the community must be taken into consideration. In turn the
cost of delinquency in money, property damage, unhappiness, personal insecurity, etc., is borne by every citizen.

6. Because specialized services are necessary. Only through joint community action can these specialties be brought to bear on the whole problem and on the whole child at the most opportune time for best results and with maximum intensity, continuity and follow through.

7. Because the problem is rooted in the basic strains within our culture. Since the problem of delinquency has its roots deep in the conflicts, uncertainties and confusions that characterize America, the most fundamental approach to the problem is in terms of the values, habits and structure of the total community. The attack on delinquency cannot be merely piecemeal, nor limited to formal agencies and institutions; it involves the attitudes and behavior of the entire citizenry.

Leonard (1956), Berkowitz (1967), Boer (1951), Bobo (1956), Novick (1956), Gould (1957), Webb (1957), Winters (1957) and Martin (1967) agree that delinquency prevention is a community problem. It is not the sole responsibility of any one person or agency but the coordinated effort of all. Youth will develop into the man society helps him to be.

Martin (1967) suggests that the prevention of delinquency is not fundamentally a problem of bettering the general welfare of children or rehabilitating individuals nor a matter of coordinating the activities of local service agencies. Martin contends that basically it is a problem of social organization or reorganization and that other approaches have merit only to the degree that they contribute to such reorganization. Grosser (1969) agrees that neither service nor social action can function alone. Grosser (1969, p. 58) states, "Social circumstances must unquestionably be changed so that people are not victimized and at the same time, those victimized by social disorder must be treated."
Martin (1967, p. 351) sums up and defines delinquency prevention in three different ways:

1. Delinquency prevention is the sum total of all activities that contribute to the adjustment of children and to healthy personalities in children.

2. Delinquency prevention is the attempt to deal with particular environmental conditions that are believed to contribute to delinquency.

3. Delinquency prevention consists of specific preventive services provided to individual children or groups of children.

**Summary**

In looking at the picture realistically this researcher suggests that it is quite probable that delinquency as a general phenomenon cannot be prevented, but that it is equally probable children can be prevented from becoming delinquents. A substantive legal code would help clarify the problem which at this point under our existing legal codes promotes the idea that a child becomes a delinquent by decree of the courts. The fundamental proposition is that the prevention of delinquency should include both individual treatment and general or social prevention through community-centered programs. Changes in social conditions must take place at the command of and in response to the community. It is in this way that socially desirable patterns of adjustment will be assured. The total community approach must deal with projects that have potential for wide adaptation and with the social conditions that produce delinquency and antisocial behavior.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

What Have Community Organizations Done?

Introduction

The rationale for the Community Services Act of 1966, according to Perlman and Jones (1966), is that deficiencies of fragmentation and overlap can be overcome. Under this Act many established agencies are experimenting with community-based programs offering a broad spectrum of services. The problem is that each program is evolving independently of the rest, yet all are converging on the same client population. The inevitable result will again be overlap, discontinuity, confusion, and disappointment of the very expectations to which they gave rise. Perlman and Jones (1966, p. 77) propose:

Instead of community mental health centers, community welfare centers, and community public health centers competing side by side for scarce dollars and scarcer personnel, we need comprehensive centers, coordinated programs, and a planning process capable of focusing on the total needs of the individual and the family.

The Community Services Act of 1966 was designed to stimulate progress in this direction. It would do so by providing Federal support to the states for planning and operating comprehensive community service programs and centers, drawing on citizen participation, and enlisting the cooperation of voluntary agencies.
Use of Community Councils

In 1960 the Children's Bureau (Novick, 1960) sent questionnaires to 258 community welfare planning councils that employed a paid executive to find out what communities across the nation were doing with resources available to them. The general activities ranged from studies of community services generally available to youths, the gaps in such services and the quality of such services, to activities concerned with a single service, such as the juvenile court, recreation services, detention services or mental health service.

Gainful employment of youth was viewed by some communities as a deterrent to delinquency. Some councils used the State Employment Office to set up special youth employment and placement services.

Many communities developed an increase of public understanding through the study of local situations and existing services to help delinquents as they alerted the public to local conditions and national trends through radio, TV and newspapers. They held town meetings on delinquency aimed at informing the public and enlisting support for proposals to change local situations and improve services.

Some communities were extending and improving leisure-time programs. This was usually accomplished by providing added subsidy to established agencies such as neighborhood centers. Other community councils supported educational programs and workshops for workers who dealt with youth.
The process of collecting and disseminating information from welfare councils in other communities to aid local agencies and committees in developing their plans to reorganize services or add new ones was also done by community councils. Some community councils were the leaders in establishing intensive coordination of existing services in designated sections of their cities where the delinquency rate was high. For the federally financed local programs (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966) the direction came from groups comprising local government officials, influential community decision makers, representatives of slum neighborhoods, business and labor leaders, and representatives of civic groups, social agencies, and community institutions of all kinds both public and private.

Types of Programs or Projects

Children's Bureau Survey.

According to a survey by the Children's Bureau (Novick, 1960, pp. 7-9) there were eight broad categories of types of programs or projects that communities were using up to 1960:

1. Detached worker services. Social group workers or recreation leaders located groups or individuals who were headed for delinquency or were already known as delinquents. The programs attempted to redirect the aggressive or delinquent behavior by providing legitimate outlets for their behavior with the direction of an adult leader.
2. Area projects. An example was the Chicago Area Project. These projects are based on the idea that delinquency is due partly to the poor quality of the social and physical environment in low-income areas of large cities. They also stressed the fact that slum neighborhoods have lost the sense of mutual responsibility for children's behavior. These projects were attempts to arouse residents to a greater sense of responsibility for the welfare of children.

3. Intensive coordination of services. The team approach with referrals from one agency to another were quicker and less complicated. The best skills of every agency and organization were brought to bear on the problems of the given community.

4. Intensive group work services. This service was provided for the hard-to-serve groups of youth and sometimes parents. Professionally trained group workers skilled in group therapy were used. The emphasis was given to helping group members to help each other.

5. Intensive casework services. Caseworkers had only a small number of clients. These programs were usually an extension of an ongoing program in a public or private agency.

6. Parent education programs. These programs worked with the parents of delinquent youth or of those children who seemed to be heading toward delinquency. Special parent groups were set up and subjects discussed related to child rearing, family life, and community problems that contribute to delinquency. One of the most important aspects of
the program was the support that parents got from each other knowing that other parents were struggling with similar problems.

7. Youth employment programs. These programs tried to help youth, particularly for those who drop out of school to find some meaningful work.

8. Recreation programs. These were extensions of the usual organized recreational activities of the community. It was felt that these programs contributed to the total social climate of a community and possibly served indirectly as a delinquency prevention measure.

Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development sponsored projects and programs.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (OJD) was established in September, 1961 to administer — within the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare — the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. Within the first three years of its operation OJD made grants to sixteen communities to plan and/or carry out comprehensive action programs for projects primarily designed to alter social conditions which breed delinquency and youth crime. Each community program formulated and developed their objectives to the needs of its locality. The only federal requirements were (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966):

1. A simultaneous, multifaceted attack on such delinquency-producing conditions as marginal family income, limited youth employment opportunities, inadequate housing, and school curricula not adapted to meeting the needs of lower-class youth.
2. An emphasis on helping to bring about changes in conditions affecting all target area youth, rather than an exclusive concern with changing the personality of individual delinquents.

The results of Project Innovation (1966) pertaining to delinquency prevention were

1. A system of legal services for the poor, including strengthened defender services and a release-on-recognizance program.

2. Job training and placement centers were developed through the cooperation of local employers and state and local agencies.

3. New educational concepts were developed—special curricula designed to keep youth in school, tutoring services for underachievers, and school readiness programs for youngsters of disadvantaged families.

4. Neighborhood service centers provided a variety of assistance programs for low-income families—ranging from information on credit buying to guidance on legal rights.

5. Probation and parole officials, along with the courts and local police departments, had been involved in experiments to develop new ideas for treating youth offenders in the community setting instead of sending them to institutions.

6. Special group programs—invoking a mixture of educational and social activities were developed to provide services to large groups of unreached youth from low-income families.

These early projects concentrated on the deprived inner-city areas. Since 1964 the Office of Economic Opportunity has taken over the
comprehensive demonstration projects. The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development refocused its efforts from long-range, broad-based programs to short-term projects aimed at serving selected groups of hard-core delinquents and potentially delinquent youth.

The three basic areas of focus (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966) that OJD supported since 1964 were

1. Programs providing for youth to make decisions and affect conditions which are of direct concern to them.

2. Programs designed to modify the functions of institutions which affect youth.

3. Programs providing for community involvement which seek to develop new concepts and community competence for dealing with problems of youth.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development has supported training programs (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966) to fill the shortage of trained personnel and to develop additional community resources to serve youth. The training projects focused in these four areas:

1. Programs designed to stimulate institutions to alter existing patterns to meet changing needs and ideas in the field of youth work.

2. Programs to encourage the creation of new techniques and methods for training personnel to implement new concepts for serving youth.

3. Programs designed to upgrade the competence of personnel working with delinquents.

4. Programs aimed at training new kinds of personnel at the professional and subprofessional levels in the field of youth work.
Mobilization For Youth (MFY).

Mobilization for Youth (Grosser, 1969, pp. 7-16) was the fore¬
runner and in many ways the prototype of the comprehensive juvenile de¬
linquency prevention project. As a part of its total community approach
to the problems of preventing and controlling delinquency, MFY proposed:

... to overcome the apathy and defeatism of the slum dweller
through its community self-help program. To this end, it undertook
to organize the unaffiliated residents of the target area. Its
rationale was that youth could not be successfully integrated into
socially constructive community life unless their adult role models
were themselves a part of the community. Unless the adult residents
of the community saw themselves as having some control over their
environment, youth could not be convinced that antisocial behavior
did not present the only viable way in which to participate in the
community.

When groups had their service-related grievances resolved they
chose to dissolve rather than move on to new tasks. Thus the hypothesis
that MFY proposed, that beginning experience will induce a continuing
process of community involvement, was not upheld.

One of the major accomplishments of the program was that beginning
organizational experience has been provided to persons with absolutely
no organizational background. At least some presenting problems were
solved by the people organizing and finding a way to deal with them.

Syracuse Crusade For Opportunity (Crusade).

The Syracuse Crusade for Opportunity's (Grosser, 1969, p. 18)
major emphasis was on a "community development approach so that action
residents themselves become the chief agents for changing the character
of their neighborhoods." Three neighborhood boards were organized.
Their major weakness, according to Grosser (1969, p. 19), was that they provided services for individuals and did not work on community issues.

Grosser reports that Crusade had succeeded in developing viable community-based organizations in the neighborhood. Grosser (1969, p. 21) outlines the following three reasons why Crusade has succeeded:

1. In areas where organizations already existed, greater unity has been brought about among these organizations through educational and recreational programs benefitting youth.

2. The specificity and visibility of such programs, as well as their noncontroversial nature and potential for broad support, provided the bases for resident coalitions.

3. The local coalitions facilitated the organization of neighborhood boards.

From talking with the board leaders Grosser felt that the neighborhood organizations would continue with their plans and that community interests, ties and identification seemed strong.

United Planning Organization (UPO).

The United Planning Organization, Washington, D.C., included the whole city of Washington, D.C. and six surrounding suburban communities. Grosser (1969, p. 23) reported that UPO's purposes included:

Stimulating self-organization, encouraging disadvantaged people to participate in public decisions which affect their lives, and providing a network of specific services which will expand the opportunities to attack those immediate problems which must be solved before individuals can turn their attention to the welfare of the neighborhood as a whole.

To fulfill these purposes UPO operated nine Neighborhood Development
Project Centers (MDP) each in a defined area. Each center had a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) made up of local neighborhood people. In many cases these committees were both recipients and dispensers of the services.

Although some basic needs were being met there was a limit to what grass-roots participation can accomplish alone. The basic issue with this community organization was that the funding sources wanted to decentralize the organization and UPO wanted to develop programs which would successfully move large city agencies toward meeting the needs of the poor. This effort would require a concentrated and centralized procedure.

Houston Action For Youth (HAY).

Houston Action for Youth (Grosser, 1969, pp. 30-36) began as a research and demonstration project with support first from OJD and later became a community action project under the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Originally it was felt that the project would be of limited duration. However, it was later assumed by HAY that neighborhood organization required the continuous sponsorship of an ongoing agency.

The HAY Project was made up of 100 neighborhood groups who sent representatives to the Inter-Neighborhood Council which was considered the central planning body. HAY encouraged the Councils to use prescribed resources for redress of grievances rather than militant public action. HAY took the position, according to Grosser (1969, p. 34) that "there
is a limit to the extent to which residents can make their own decisions; that there is a point where the power of the people must be curbed, because an agency such as HAY has a responsibility to the total community."

Because of pressure by HAY, the Manpower Development Training Act, the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training, and the United States Department of Labor developed new programs in the neighborhood. Also, the Houston Independent School District Board has altered its policy of refusing federal funds and is now cosponsoring a Headstart program with HAY.

Grosser (1969, p. 36) recorded that the project has produced a climate which discourages delinquent behavior. Although there were no statistics on the incidences of delinquency, project administrators stated, "It is the people who say that it is different now."

The overall picture is not that bright, as Grosser (1969, p. 36) submitted:

Although deviance appears modified in the original youth in the project who have grown up and moved out, new youth growing up in the target area continue to manifest the same problems. Intervention focused on structure would produce changes in these youth entering preadolescence as well as adolescents. A recurrence of deviant developmental patterns would seem to support the view that rehabilitation devices and preventive devices have focused on individuals rather than on structure.

Action For Appalachian Youth (AAY).

Action for Appalachian Youth followed the Charleston Youth Community, Inc. (CYC), which had as its objective the formulating and implementing of a demonstration program for Kanawha County youth. This project was different from other projects in the kind of people and target area
that was reached. The basic concept of AAY, according to Grosser (1969, p. 37), advanced the view that the culture conflict between industrialized, urban society and the rural, hollow folk was the source of the difficulty. It was in the rural areas that delinquency problems occurred. The aim of the project was neighborhood development rather than community organization. Grosser described the geographical neighborhood that they shared a common culture and value system. But he found that except for a couple of churches, no formal organizations and few opportunities for experience in joint action existed.

Each target area had a neighborhood worker whose goal was to help develop a community identity by bringing in additional services, developing organization and leadership. The approach was unique in that the neighborhood worker was non-directive and community centered. It took many months for the workers to be accepted enough for the people of the hollow to tell the worker what their needs were and to make suggestions how to solve them. One of the first achievements was having a road repaired. After two years many hollows had such things as (Grosser, 1969, p. 41) "a functioning community association, a community center with educational and recreational activities, a new playground, road improvements, better school busing or similar gains."

This project has demonstrated that given proper motivation, hollow residents, like other people, can be organized and activated. Of equal significance, according to Grosser, (1969, p. 43) has been "the breaking down of individual and family barriers; the shifting attitudes of the
people in regard to themselves and the outside world." In other words, there is the possibility of developing of a new identity.

**Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited - Associated Community Teams (HARYOU-ACT).**

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited - Associated Community Teams had a target area of three and a half square miles that constitute central Harlem, New York, New York. HARYOU-ACT's stated goals were (Grosser, 1969, p. 45) "... increasing the chances for effective and creative lives for the masses of youth in the Harlem community" and "... developing Harlem into a community of excellence."

The core of HARYOU-ACT programs was the insistence that social action was imperative to the solution of the problems of Harlem's youth. The three units designed to carry out this social action program were Harlem Youth Unlimited (HYU), and Community Action Institute (CAI), and local neighborhood boards.

The HYU while in conflict most of the time with adults, accomplished activities (Grosser, 1969, p. 47) such as providing toilet facilities in a large recreation area, starting voter-registration drives, demonstrating for street lights, pressuring the city to correct housing conditions, raising scholarship funds to help youngsters through college, and registering older adults for medicare. The main problem was trying to involve the "grass-roots" youth under leadership of the more motivated upper-lower and lower-middle class youth.
CAI never really got off the ground. Internal staff problems hindered the program which was sporadic, to say the least. The neighborhood boards also were in conflict from the beginning. Grosser (1969, p. 55) described the problems of the HARYOU-ACT project this way:

It is notable that the entire HARYOU-ACT project has been embroiled in the community planning issues of Central Harlem, a target community which virtually defies solution of its problems. HARYOU-ACT's potential for dealing effectively with these problems has thus far been hampered by local and national issues which have been enacted in its bailiwick. Until the power forces, both local and national, desist from their efforts to use HARYOU-ACT for their own purposes, positive movement of the agency as a whole will be uncertain and its potential unrealized.

Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. (ABCD).

Action for Boston Community Development operated three neighborhood centers: the Roxbury Multi-Service Center, the Shawmut Neighborhood Center of United South End Settlements, and the John F. Kennedy Family Service Center in Charlestown. ABCD's stated goal (Perlman and Jones, 1967, p. 17) was "... not to replace existing agencies but to generate new approaches to Boston's social problems."

These centers were still working to develop a relationship with the communities in which they are located. The approach of ABCD was not to change existing social structure but to provide new solutions to old problems.

Community Progress, Inc.

Community Progress, Inc., New Haven, placed its emphasis on (Perlman and Jones, 1967, p. 19) "... opportunity programs
particularly skill training and job placement in the short run and education as the long-range avenue out of poverty — and has built its operations on a neighborhood base." The approach to reducing delinquency was to provide employment and to assign supporting roles to improved education, recreation and better family and neighborhood conditions.

Although there were seven neighborhoods, CPI wove together the services and staff of community school, employment centers, social service units, and neighborhood organization programs. The outcome was a network of activities, not a center in the sense of a single physical facility.

Provo and Essexfield Projects.

The Provo and Essexfield programs were located in the community. They were based on the assumption that problems that the delinquents are struggling with are those that confront them in their daily lives — families, friends, school, work and leisure time. The focus was on the present. Empey (1967, p. 38) suggested three postulates for intervention:

1. To make the delinquent group the target of change — that is, attempt to change shared standards, points of view, rewards and punishments.

2. To give the delinquent group a stake in what happens to its members by permitting participation with staff in solving problems, exerting controls, and making basic decisions.

3. To open up conventional opportunities to delinquents in the school, the world of work, and other conventional institutions.

These programs were designed so that the delinquent assumed responsibility
for his life and those of the group he is involved with. He was in an active, reformation role rather than a passive one in which he was acted upon.

The Chicago Area Project.

Started in the early 30's by the late Clifford R. Shaw, the Chicago Area Project had developed more than twelve neighborhoods. The neighborhood was the unit of operation. Planning and management were in the hands of the local residents. Local workers were also on the staff. Community resources were to be more fully utilized and coordinated. Credit was given to the local residents.

Community committees were worked with by State personnel to help them attain their objectives and to learn how to attain objectives. Each committee, according to Sorrentino (1959, p. 43), conducted programs which were designed to:

1. provide special facilities for work with groups of delinquent children at the neighborhood level.

2. bring local leaders into youth and community welfare programs, both in the formulation and execution of policy.

3. aid the residents of the area in the development of a better understanding of the problems of children and youth through special adult education projects.

4. assist local institutions and public officials to enlarge and make more effective the services which they render to the community.

5. improve recreational, educational, and other community services to children.
6. foster the physical and social improvements of the neighborhood.

In describing the CAP project, Porterfield (1946, p. 127) commented:

The program is not of one arranging the lives of the underprivileged. What they want is the opportunity to do their own arranging, with better understanding of the way to go about it. We do things with them, not to them. We do not take their children and rear them. We give our assistance as friends and neighbors, not as stoopdowners, through a creative program that will make it possible for them to rear their children themselves and to do as good a job of it as we do ourselves with our own.

In an evaluation of CAP, Witmer and Tufts (Martin, 1967) concluded that residents of low-income areas could organize and have organized themselves into working units for promoting and conducting welfare programs. Witmer and Tufts described the community organizations as being stable and enduring and that they raise funds, administer them well, and adapt the programs to local needs. Witmer and Tufts strongly suggested that the local talent which otherwise was untapped had been discovered and utilized and that local leadership had been mobilized in the interest of child welfare.

Summary

Community intervention of the successful and ongoing programs based their programs on community participation. Members of the community accepted and used the services and opportunities offered them and their children more quickly when they were invited to participate and encouraged to discuss and help in carrying out the program. Community intervention
was more successful when adults in the area were given opportunity and encouraged to develop their dignity and self-image. Since adults served as models of behavior, youth also developed more dignity and a better self-image as their adults changed.

The success of the programs, according to this researcher, depended greatly upon the leadership of the originators of the project. When there was a power struggle and politics were involved, the program became a source of problems instead of a way to help solve problems. When the local people and their problems were kept uppermost in importance, the project went ahead. The projects must be directed with the people, for the people but not to the people.

What Are The Community Organizational Issues?

Creating a Framework For Preventive Action

Before beginning a community project some questions, such as the following by Sieder (1967, pp. 184-186), must be considered:

1. What are other organizations doing or not doing, and what are they planning to do in the future?

2. What kinds of planning structures work best?

3. In today's fluid situation: What is the interconnectedness of different parts of the community? What is the importance of the political process: What are the direct and indirect consequences of economic prosperity or stagnation? What is the role of education in relation to social policies, to income, to employment? What are the competing interests and "sacred cows" and claims of voluntary and public agencies and other types of organization?

4. A sense of what is feasible for an agency and what is not feasible in terms of proposed collaborative efforts must be determined.
It is possible extermination may be the answer for a particular agency and one would not expect their collaboration to this effect.

Research backs the general rationale of modifying youths' experience in their school and street environment so that it will counteract (rather than, as is now the case, reinforce) the early family experience of emotional deprivation, and gives multiple proof that society cares about them and their future. Eva Rosenfeld (1966, pp. 374, 375) stated it more specifically:

1. Expand their reference groups to include ever larger circles of people and, by thus giving them a more broadly-based sense of belonging make it more difficult for them to deny guilt for hostile acts against persons perceived as strangers.

2. Provide constructive channels for the expression of "free-floating energy" and, in general, to satisfy the adolescent need for new experience, exploration, and learning.

3. Offer special help and support to individuals who need it.

Attitudes

Attitudes that hinder a consistent and rational approach to the prevention, control and treatment of juvenile delinquency were three-fold. The first was the attitude that children and youth who engaged in antisocial acts were wrong-doers and should be punished. The second was the belief that juvenile delinquency had a single cause and, therefore, a simple solution. The third was the belief that someone else was responsible for this problem and its solution.

In answer to these attitudes, John McDowell (Zalinger, 1961, p. 338) Dean of Boston University School of Social Work, loudly acclaimed:
Every citizen, parent, youth, teacher, and neighbor shares responsibility for family and community conditions which encourage delinquency. Likewise, everyone can contribute to individual, family, and community changes which will tend to encourage juvenile adequacy and development of healthy individual and family life.

The attitude toward attendance was a problem because of peer pressure both against cooperation and in favor of successful evasion and manipulation. The idea that there is something in the program for them must be felt by the group. The program cannot be sold to the youth.

Fragmentation of Services

Fragmentation of services often kept people from using them. Garell (1969, p. 180) proposed that communities provide centers "... where young people, merely by walking in, could get health supervision, personal counseling, job placement, legal aid, or recreation, according to their needs." Garell felt that many more young people might seek help for their problems before serious complications developed.

An important reason for agency and community activity coordination was that it may enable accurate statistics on reported delinquency to be gathered in various jurisdictions. It was on the basis of such statistics that a community could determine the trend of its delinquency and measure the effectiveness of its preventive efforts. Probably the most important reason was that through agency and community coordination various preventive programs and techniques would be directly available to potential delinquents before their deviancy became well established.
Reaching the Target Population

Participation required a high degree of social, organizational, political and interpersonal skill. Community organization activity demanded of its participants the very qualities that have been absent because of being systematically corroded by generations of poverty and discrimination in most of the projects. Thus in an attempt to eliminate continuous defeat some projects resorted to other than grass-roots level participation. Part of the problem was that services were often offered ahead of the people instead of at a level at which the people were. People who responded were usually the upwardly mobile, stable working class poor rather than the grass-roots level. Novick (1960, p. 11) cited one project that tried to bring gang members from "bad parts of town" to the neighborhood center to participate in regular activities but was stopped by parents of the regular members of the center. Some middle-class people were not willing to share what they felt was their center with persons who may influence their children toward a different value system. The CAP, MFY and HARYOU-ACT met with the problem that a small group of ambitious persons or even certain staff members dominated or exploited the project. The result was apathy on the part of HARYOU-ACT. However in the CAP the democratic processes solved the problem.

Representation

Since the community as a whole is involved in determining the nature and scope of the program everyone from the grass-roots level to
the contributors and politicians should be represented. Too often the
glass-root level and youth have been eliminated. However, Grosser
(1969, p. 64) reported, "To fulfill its dual mandates of social change
and self help, community organization effort must endeavor to place the
poor in direct contact with other segments of the community in regularly
constituted formal and informal policy making groups."

Use of Volunteers

The question each community always has to deal with is how
can the volunteer best contribute to a community program. The Provo
Experiment found that volunteers were indispensable in service on the
advisory council and other support groups. They occasionally provided
a bridge between the program and school and potential programs. They
were also important in seeking funds and facilities. They spoke to
women's and service clubs. They exerted influence on political repre¬
sentatives. However, volunteers often added to the problems by being
absent when expected, by having their feelings quickly injured, and
by sometimes bringing problems that interfered with the work.

Choosing Community Organization Program Strategies

Robert K. Merton (Rosenfeld, 1966, p. 375) warned:

Human behavior in any situation is not a constant but, rather,
is represented by a range of possibilities. This range increases with
any variation in the conditions of the situation. In very complex
situations, determined by many conditions, the range of behavior
resulting from the interplay of all conditions is so immense that
for all practical purposes the probable outcome of social action can¬
not be predicted.
As Merton pointed out we can say what we think should be done but often when we think how it should be done we see a different side of the coin.

Grosser (1969, p. 61) suggested that decisions may be developed from the specific analysis of program types inventorying their strengths and weaknesses in new situations. Decisions may then be based on the extent to which advantages of a given program match the community, target, client and participants. Grosser also recommended that community organization programs demonstrate a conscious selection of alternate organizational strategies.

Service versus Social Action

The basic objectives of all the projects indicated that neither function can be undertaken alone. Social circumstances must definitely be changed so that people are not victimized by social disorder and at the same time, those victimized by social disorder must be treated.

The difficulties of combining the two functions arose from both internal and external considerations. Services felt that social action ignored the present and real problems of the individual. Social action saw services dealing on a one-to-one level with problems that needed to be dealt with on a more general level. The problems of the individual would never change unless social action produced external change in the environment. Externally services were threatened by social action and cooperation was stifled in many instances. HARYOU-ACT and CFO have given priority to services. MFY, UFO and CPI emphasized both services
and social action. Grosser (1969, p. 59) evaluated the problem this way:

Whatever the service and action aspects of the program are present in the same organization, compassion for individuals in distress is usually sufficient unto itself to set aside the action part. Project experience indicates that dual programs either converted to service alone (while continuing to utilize social action metaphors) or separated the functions.

Community Conflict

All projects which underwent and survived crises on the basis of the community organization program appeared to have found a source of support in the independence of the same neighborhood group which provoked the crises initially. Self expression was demonstrated as they supported their project. Grosser (1969, pp. 66, 67) stated that:

To pursue community organization programs successfully, conflict was virtually inevitable since the sine qua non of community organization is the independence of the group being organized. The projects must champion the irrevocable nature of local community organization self-determined activities. They were among the most successful in organizing at the grass-roots, providing real role models for local youth, and engaging in social change.

Community conflict was expressed in another way, as a result of community action, by Cloward (1963, p. 79):

The problem of dealing with delinquents is not simply to reduce pressures toward deviance or to dissuade individual delinquents, by therapeutic means and other activities, to relinquish deviant ways of behaving. If they are to be asked to give up forms of adjustment that they find satisfying, they must be given functional alternatives.

Cloward reported that it has been observed in a number of communities in New York City that when access to violence as a means of securing status was abruptly closed to delinquents, drug use increased
sharply. The point was that by restricting access to one form of de-
viance without providing functional but conforming alternatives, the
risk of simply converting one form of deviance into another was great.

Time and Training

Most of the projects did not conceive the extent of the time and
training that would be involved in setting up a working project. In a
report of ABCD Perlman and Jones (1967, p. 63) insisted that:

The simplest program consists of many procedures and operations,
among them: selection and recruitment of people to be served, se-
lection and training of staff to carry out the program, provision
of physical facilities and equipment, and methods for determining
which of a variety of services is needed and in what order.

As to time, Perlman and Jones suggested that a youth development
program be scheduled over not less than five years. Perhaps even more
time would be needed to achieve the kind of new programming and insti-
tutional change that are now seen as critical to an effective youth
development program.

As implied in many reports on the community projects training was an
invaluable program developmental tool. This was especially true in an
atmosphere where agencies have felt threatened and insecure about the new
challenges they faced. Training activities represented a neutral ground
on which agencies and community staff could cooperate for mutual benefit.

Evaluation

Eva Rosenfeld (1965, p. 379) answered the question of the neces-
sity of evaluation this way:
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 and rehabilitative measures. What is needed now is a carefully recorded, analyzed, and evaluated trial-and-error method, using various approaches in various combinations in various conditions, learning all the while - unlearning and learning.

The need for such a "trial-and-error plus evaluation" approach is indicated by the uncertainty of our knowledge about prevention and by the difficulty of predicting in advance the effectiveness of any given program of action.

However, the process was difficult in that project goals often were not stated in measurable terms, thus outcomes were hard to evaluate. Evaluation also may be confronted with differences of opinion. Should an effective program be one which had a large membership or was it the degree of coordination with other programs, or was it the number of people satisfied with the program, or was it the degree of community leadership or was it the effect of the over-all program of the whole community or was it ...? The problem of evaluation included the problem of measuring the relationships between sets of changes and devising methods to sort out the relative contributions of the different programs to the outcome.

Community Organization Guidelines

Who Shall Initiate Community Coordination?

The initiative for effecting coordination and joint planning should be assumed by governmental or voluntarily supported agencies. The participation of both the tax-supported and voluntary organizations was
important. Each organization should assume appropriate responsibility for continuing leadership and activity. The governing body of the planning organization should be fully representative of all participating bodies.

Experience has shown that every effort should be made to unify state and national planning and coordination with the local planning body keeping the needs of the community in perspective. The size of the community, previous cooperative experience, traditions, personalities, needs of the community, available funds and resources influenced the structure, scope and auspices of such a planning body. The extent of the delinquency problem preceded the composition of a community program.

Community Organization For Planning and Coordination

Introduction.

This researcher assumed that every community should have a planning and coordinating body which concerns itself with delinquency problems. A report at the National Conference on the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency (1946, p. 20) stated four broad categories that still hold true and must be considered by a community planning group:

1. Economic planning - dealing with the development of a sound commercial and industrial structure so that citizens have an opportunity to earn an adequate living.

2. Physical planning - dealing with the use of land and the development of the community in respect to streets, parks, sewers, public buildings, housing, etc.

3. Social planning - dealing with problems of health, welfare, and the constructive use of leisure-time which includes not only all
the regular welfare, recreation, and public health services, but the so-called socialized courts and the health and welfare aspects of the programs of the police, schools, medical, dental, and legal professions, etc.

4. Cultural planning - dealing with the educational, religious, and artistic development of the community.

Look at the Total Picture.

Before a program could be implemented, validated facts should be gathered. A standard form for collection of juvenile delinquency facts should be used. This form should be developed for each community. An example was the standard Confidential Juvenile History Form (Swartz, 1961) which was used by the St. Louis police department. Roland Warren (1955) had also developed a working manual that would be useful in developing a survey of the community. There should be available in each community the basic facts about the children and youth of the community. The facts should include the needs and problems of the youth, the services and opportunities of the youth, and the extent and location of the delinquency problem. Not only should facts of the kinds of agencies giving the services be gathered, but also the facts of the exact services that agencies give.

Promote Public Relations.

Most project staffs suggested that the public should know more about the juvenile delinquency problem. The people had a right to know what the problem was and what could be done about it. Many staff members
felt that if people knew what the problem was and what could be done that people would be more willing to do their part.

**Develop a Balanced Growth and Maximum Quality of Services.**

The demand for the tax and voluntarily contributed dollar that finance many community services always seemed to exceed the supply. That was where the idea of community priorities should hold strength.

Growth of the program should include mergers, elimination and major changes in existing programs. Long and short range goals should be considered. There needed to be balance, not only among the services, but also in the broad functional fields such as education, religion, health, welfare, recreation and the protective services. One approach to balance was to secure the total annual cost of each service and match proportionally the total source of funds leaving an open fund for unforeseen problems.

Before and while monies were distributed the services should have been examined by the organizing community coordinators who had agreement on the minimum standards. There should be continuous discussion and study of the best methods and a joint effort to strengthen weak points.

One of the greatest single factors influencing the quality of service and success of the program was personnel. It was important to emphasize selection, training and evaluation standards and procedures. The personnel should not be chosen according to political affiliation but to the quality of service individuals can produce.
Coordinate and Evaluate Services.

The National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency (1947) concluded that the heart of the problem of community coordination for delinquency control was in the matter of early discovery of behavior problems, proper referral and diagnosis, and integrated treatment. Attempts to coordinate usually met with resistance. Eva Rosenfeld (1959, p. 13) listed five reasons which should be used for an analysis of the resistance at agency cooperation:

1. The approach.
2. The manner of enlisting cooperation.
3. The making of demands that were perceived as incompatible with the main function of the agency.
4. Failure to provide and maintain adequate material and social rewards to sustain and persevere in the program.
5. Failure to provide solid support and auxiliary facilities to front line workers.

Rosenfeld (1959, p. 143) outlined a strategy to implement a program of coordination:

1. Investigate the reservations and objections that agencies which are expected to participate in the project.
2. Investigate the difficulties and problems they can anticipate.
3. Investigate the conditions under which they are willing and able to participate.
4. Ask agencies to participate first on an experimental basis, not a total involvement.
5. An ongoing evaluation of the success or failure of interaction of the personnel and their effectiveness to the community and the total program. If failure, there is the learning value of the failure.
Evaluation was a means for constant improvement rather than a basis for final judgment. The two major aims of evaluation were to assess the total impact of the project and to assess each service in terms of its own immediate objectives. In evaluating the total impact one should assess the changes in the motives, interests, hopes, self-image, attitudes, and self-confidence of a sample of delinquents. There must also be records of rates of symptomatic behavior from the area of such offenses as those against persons and property, incidence of drug use, admission to mental hospitals, to the area of crimes of pent-up energy. The evaluation of immediate services to individuals should cover how the service was carried out and how the service was received by those for whom it was intended.

Coordination dealt with the combination of services and activities so that the basic objective may be accomplished. Each agency or unit required information about the activities and policies of the others. Each agency or unit also needed to know the areas of responsibility so that actions and plans could be appropriately applied. Schwartz (1961, p. 409) stated that:

Adequate coordination requires communication, interpretation, interchange and provision of negotiation, settling differences and agreements relating to policy on procedures. At times, where differences of opinion exist about objectives or methods, and where the differences involve mutually contradictory courses, coordination may demand devices (hearings, policy decisions by those in authority, agreements for test periods, etc.) to assure that some common course is adopted by all concerned.
Community Intervention.

Community intervention must be based on community participation. Members of the community were more likely to accept and use services and opportunities offered them and their children if they were invited to participate and encouraged to discuss and help in carrying out the program. Adults in the area must serve as models of behavior. If youth are to develop more dignity and confident self-image then adults must be given encouragement to develop their dignity and self-image also. Kvaraceus (1961) suggested that only the delinquent can solve the delinquency problem. Youth should serve themselves and the community. If youth are only the objects of the service the problem will continue. Youth must be both the object and the subject of service.

Guideline Questions

The planning group should discuss the following questions. They are considered crucial in coordinative planning and in devising a strategy which will result in the best plan that could be implemented for the particular community involved.

1. Does one organization have the right to act for the community?
2. Will important people acknowledge the right of the organization to plan and take action?
3. Can such people and organizations be brought together in the type of relationship that the proposed organization be assured of their acceptance and cooperation?
4. Who are the important people in relation to the proposed organization?

5. Who are the decision-makers and at what level will they be of help in developing support?

6. Who is the target?

7. Will the target persons be served by the proposed organization?

8. Will the target persons cooperate?

9. Is the plan the most acceptable from the standpoint of scientific and professional standards?

10. Is research available to back the plan?

11. Will the plan be workable with state and federal programs?

12. How can the organization deal at the horizontal level?

13. What kind of inter-agency structure will be able to deal with problems on the horizontal level?

14. How can individual agencies be changed?

15. How can the organization deal at the vertical level including local agencies, the local neighborhood, the city, the region, the state, and the federal level?

16. What functions are most appropriately performed at each level?

Emerging Principles

1. The function of the neighborhood council or community council should be community organization, coordination and evaluation rather than the direct operation of services.
2. Membership should range from grass-roots level to the political and funding sources.

3. Lay citizens and professional workers should work as a team in neighborhood planning but preferably through separate but related councils.

4. The organization strategy should be kept flexible and simple. There should be enough constitutional formality to assure the democratic process.

5. Neighborhood councils should be autonomous. Their interests should be community centered. They should be free to determine their own program, to take action and to share responsibility.

6. In larger cities of more than one neighborhood council, the councils should share and plan together for an over-all community program. This may be done through a central council, a central professional staff, or representatives from each neighborhood council making up a central council. There must be two-way communication between the grass-roots level and city welfare planners or community organizers.

7. The neighborhood councils should be a continuous program with continuous guidance and training by professionals.

8. The long-range and short-range and continuous goal is to improve community conditions. Action in relation to public policies in national, state and local power is important in the whole preventive program.
Analysis

Effective community education comes only through systematic study, planning, organization and implementation involving the cooperation and participation of a major portion of the community. Programs are designed to stimulate institutions, to alter the existing patterns, and to meet the changing needs and ideas in the field of prevention of juvenile delinquency. The personnel to develop these programs are trained continuously. When the grass-roots persons are involved then the program has power to change the environment that is suppressing them. Change is slow and has to be balanced with service to meet the community’s immediate needs.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

This study has been concerned with a survey of literature related to the community approach for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. It was undertaken with the belief that if more is known about how effective preventive programs work more children and youth may be prevented from becoming delinquent. An attempt was made to learn about current theories as to the causes of delinquency, to assess the nature, effectiveness and consequences of community action programs, and to discover basic factors that all communities could use in organizing and developing programs for the local community and thereby increase the chances of observable change in the lives of human beings. The literature was analyzed by the writer in an effort to obtain a clear, concise picture of the overall situation.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the research conducted regarding the total community approach to the prevention of juvenile delinquency the following conclusions can be made:

1. The juvenile delinquency situation does present a problem national in scope and breadth.

2. A majority of the researchers and authors favor the total community approach for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

3. Statistics on juvenile delinquency are variable depending upon the organization presenting the figures and the method of computation.
4. The causes of delinquency are complex and interrelated, and who will become a delinquent cannot be predicted.

5. Delinquency is best understood in terms of the total motivational-situational-cultural complexes within which it occurs.

6. Social and family disorganization is the most fundamental factor in juvenile delinquency.

7. Our service institutions are not meeting the needs of our youth.

8. Fragmentation of services often keeps people from using them.

9. Change of existing service agencies cannot be accomplished through social action but as a result of internal agency factors.

10. The fight against juvenile delinquency includes a fight against poverty.

11. There is no indication that the individual or the family can be reconstructed by any program that does not take into account the society in which it is shaped.

12. Changes in social conditions must take place at the command of and in response to the community.

13. Self-determination and involvement of participants in determining the nature of service or change must exist first.

14. The community cannot be organized for the benefit of youth and parents unless youth and parents are a fundamental and major part of the organization themselves.
15. The hypothesis that beginning experience will induce a continuous process of community involvement at the grass-roots level was not upheld.

16. To pursue community organization programs successfully, conflict is virtually inevitable.

17. Changes in environment might result in new forms of deviance rather than in delinquency prevention and control.

18. Recreation facilities which merely serve to fill in time, without supervision or individual attention, show no potential for delinquency control.

19. Early detection of predelinquents so that they may receive individual attention at an early age is basic to prevention.

20. Over-professionalized and expensive services are not the answer; neither is the opposite extreme of all volunteers.

21. The function of the neighborhood council or community council should be community organization, coordination and evaluation rather than direct operation of services.

22. Membership in community organization should range from the grass-roots level of both adults and youth to the funding sources and political level.

23. Organizational strategies should be based on the extent the advantages match the community, the target, the client and participants.

24. The process of evaluation is difficult but necessary.
25. Every community should have a planning and coordinating body which concerns itself with delinquency problems.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made as a result of this study:

1. There should be a continuous study of local youth problems and local youth-serving agencies.

2. One central agency should be responsible for collecting national statistics concerning juvenile delinquency using a common definition of juvenile delinquent.

3. Follow-up studies should be made to determine the value and effectiveness of community-organized preventive program.

4. Nationwide communities should organize their resources to combat delinquency by providing preventive programs.

5. Community organizations should work at the vertical level including local agencies, the local neighborhood, the city, the region, the state and the federal levels to be the most effective.

6. The target area should be defined before organizational strategies and plans are developed.

7. Community organizers should work with existing groups and not in competition with them.

8. The preventive process should attempt to increase community participation through a collective solution to the problem.
9. The emphasis should be on bringing about changes in conditions adversely affecting youth rather than an exclusive concern with changing the personality of individual delinquents.

10. Community programs must be developed with the people, by the people and for the people if they are to be effective.
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