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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to determine the extent of the effect of the Essex County Diversion Program would have on the enhancement of the self-concept of individuals who went through the program. In addition, the influence of demographic variables and their influence of the enhancement or self-concept was examined. This research utilized an experimental design measuring self-concept before and after involvement in the Essex County Diversion Program, which sought to determine if levels of self-concept had been positively influenced by inclusion in the program.

The data were collected by administering of questionnaires designed to collect demographic variables and by completion of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965). The questionnaires and scale were administered to all subjects who participated in the diversion program between April 1982 and July 1982. The questionnaires and scale were completed by the subjects before entering the diversion program and again upon completion of the program. The analysis of the data provided information to substantiate the hypotheses which sought to establish a link between intervention of the diversion program and the enhancement of self-concept and to determine the relationship between self-
concept enhancement, age, education, parents marital status, contacts with the diversion worker, compensatory task, and perceptions of diversion by the programs' participants.

The research findings indicated that the Essex County Diversion Program did not have a statistically significant effect on the enhancement of self-concept, although self-concept did increase, generally, in all subjects who went through the program. A relationship did become apparent between the demographic variables and self-concept. This relationship—or non-relationship gives support to Pitts' (1965) theory that self-concept is autonomously acquired and not influenced by extraneous variables.

This research attempted to show that the therapeutic intervention of the Essex County Diversion Program would enhance self-concept and, therefore, positively affect behaviour, independently of other extraneous influences.

The major recommendation to emerge from this research would indicate that increased involvement and contact with the Essex County Diversion Program would be beneficial to participants of the program as self-concept appears to be enhanced to a degree that is measurable. As the program seeks to alter behaviour, it would be advantageous to make a concerted effort to enhance self-concept in order to have the desired effect on behaviour. Additionally, the program should seek to incorporate a research component to determine the effectiveness of its intervention. The utilization of
self-concept to measure this effectiveness may validate the philosophy of the program and the theories of behaviour change presented by Pitts (1965) and this research.
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Chapter I

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review was undertaken in an effort to gain an appreciation of where the Essex County Diversion Program stands in relation to diversion practices in general. In this context, therefore, a selective review of the literature was undertaken which focussed principally on some of the issues relevant to the diversion program under study. Among the issues to be discussed are the legal status of pre-trial diversion in Canada and the various rationales advanced for the development and continued use of diversion.

As will be noted, substantial use is made of non-Canadian literature. As Moyer (1986) has noted, there is a lack of Canadian literature on diversion (p. 187). The sometimes extensive use of non-Canadian literature is, therefore, by default rather than by choice. However, when possible, Canadian sources are cited.

At the outset, it is necessary to define the concept under study in order to set parameters on the topic of discussion. However, it was soon discovered that while diversion is a concept which is now relatively widely discussed, debated and practised, it has yet to be defined
in precise, universal terms. In effect, there is no single, widely accepted definition of diversion. Stated otherwise, "No one definition of diversion seems capable of comprehending everything done in its name" (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 1).

Although a general definition is useful as a starting point, an operational definition is required to delimit the purview of the study. Therefore, the following is not intended as a comprehensive definition of all things called "diversion", but rather a refinement of its meaning in relation to the specific program under study.

A suitable starting point from which to begin the refinement of the concept of diversion is a general definition which encompasses as many of the practices referred to as "diversion" as possible. At that point it will be possible to speak of different "types" of diversion, as outlined by the Law Reform Commission (1975). The "type" which best characterizes the subject of the study will then be explored in greater depth.

Klein (1973) defines diversion in the following general terms:

Any process employed by components of the criminal justice system (police, prosecution, courts, corrections) to turn suspect and/or offenders away from the formal system or to a lower level in the system. (p. 376)

The preceding definition identifies the components of the criminal justice system as those having the authority to
divert suspects or offenders. Katkin, Dyman, and Kramer (1976) and "individuals" and "the community in general" to this list, noting that these have a "primary mandate to control and care for young people who commit delinquent acts" (p. 404). A general definition of diversion, therefore, implies that it is a process which can be initiated at the discretion of a diverse number of individuals, officials and institutions.

The general definition also implies that diversion can occur at any point in the criminal justice process. Again Katkin et al. (1976) would add a pre-system stage at which diversion can occur, that being at the point of identification (p. 404).

The initial definition identifies the "divertee" as a suspect or offender. This further highlights the fact that diversion can occur at any point between the identification of a suspect and sentence fulfillment.

The substantive aspect of diversion is referred to as the avoidance of the formal justice process or at least a return to a lower level of the justice process. This thereby implies that diversion can be both "diversion to" or "diversion away from" something. The definition is not very explicit as to what that "something" entails. Jensen and Rojek, (1980) are more explicit, noting that diversion can mean "taking no action at all" or "involving the individual in formal diversion programs" (p. x). Therefore, diversion can presumably be both unstructured or structured.
So far we have identified who can initiate diversion, when it can occur, who can be diverted, and a general idea of what diversion entails. The general definition illustrates that a wide variety of actions or inactions by a number of individuals can all be referred to as diversion. For the purposes of this study however, this wide latitude of meaning is encumbering. At this stage, it is therefore propitious to examine the different "types" of diversion, in order to develop an operational view of the concept.

In an effort to remove the ambiguity surrounding the concept of diversion, the Law Reform Commission (1975) outlined four conceptually different "types" of diversion:

1. Community absorption
2. Screening
3. Pre-trial diversion
4. Alternatives to imprisonment (p. 1)

This division of the concept into four types is functional and also retains the integrity of the general definition previously cited. As will be demonstrated, the four types highlight different individuals and different stages at which diversion can occur.

Community absorption as generally defined by the Law Reform Commission (1975) is either "individuals of interest groups dealing privately with trouble in their areas, outside the police and courts" (p. 1). Illustrative of this type of diversion is the Neighborhood Accountability Project
which is currently operating in the town of Essex, Ontario. This program, through the actions of "neighborhood mediators", seeks to "provide a neighborhood based accountability process as an alternative to the juvenile court process" (Rolfe, Note 1).

The second type of diversion is screening and is characterized by the police referring an incident back to the family or community, or simply dropping a case rather than laying criminal charges (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 1). The most informal form of screening occurs when the police simply decide not to lay charges. A more formal approach to screening which is operational in Essex County is referring the suspect at the pre-charge level to a program which may include a compensatory task, an apology to the victim, restitution, and counselling (Jasper, Note 2). Participation is voluntary and a formal charge is not laid in this screening type of diversion.

A third form of diversion is pre-trial diversion in which "instead of proceeding with charges in the criminal court, a case is referred out of the pre-trial level to be dealt with by settlement or mediation procedures" (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 4). Windsor's version of this type of diversion consists of juveniles voluntarily agreeing to undertake a program consisting of one or more of the following: a compensatory task for the victim or the community, an apology to the victim, monetary restitution, and counselling.
(Lajeunesse, 1982, pp. 13-14). Once juveniles have fulfilled the requirements of their participation, further processing by the juvenile justice system is discontinued.

The fourth type of diversion, alternatives to imprisonment, is applicable to adults only. It is described as "increasing the use of such alternatives as absolute or conditional discharge, restitution, fines, suspended sentence, probation, community service orders, partial detention in a community based residence, or parole release programs". (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 7). The main thrust of such sentencing options is the avoidance of the harshest sanction available, incarceration.

It is evident from the preceding that the four "types" of diversion are all distinct approaches to the concept of diversion. They address themselves to different populations at different stages of the formal justice process. The types are administered differently, by different individuals in the justice system. Yet, despite these differences, the four "types" all adhere to the general definition of diversion discussed earlier.

Given that the Essex County Diversion Program is of the "pre-trial" type, the remainder of this report will focus exclusively on pre-trial diversion.
1.1 **STATUS OF PRE-TRIAL DIVERSION IN CANADA**

Prior to recent legislative revision, the practice of pre-trial diversion was not formally recognized in Canadian law. Prior to the permissive legislation, diversion was "non-legal" in that it was not formally recognized by law, but at the same time, it was not "illegal" in that it did not run contrary to existing legislation. Although *The Juvenile Delinquents Act* (1970) allows for a variety of dispositions following adjudication, "it does not specifically provide a process to enable the use of community and other resources prior to the adjudication" (Solicitor General Canada, 1975, pp. 9-10).

Due to the absence of pertinent legislation, diversion had an uneven development in Canada. A federal government inventory of post-charge, pre-court diversion programs for juveniles in Canada lists only six in this category (Solicitor General Canada, 1979, p. 7). As a result of the absence of pertinent legislation, standardized criteria, goals, and procedures were not developed. There is, therefore, a general lack of uniformity in the present operation of diversion programs in Canada.

The recently passed *Young Offenders Act* (1982) not only recognizes the practice of diversion, but also sets some guidelines for the administration of these programs. The legislation partially fills the void which perhaps delayed the consistent development of diversion in Canada.
Although the federal legislation is permissive, its actual implementation remains a provincial responsibility. The Act (1982) simply allows for the use of "alternative measures":

Alternative measures may be used to deal with a young person alleged to have committed an offence instead of judicial proceedings. (Young Offenders Act, 1982, Sec. 5 (1))

The "screening mechanism" by which the juveniles will be selected for diversion and which will process diversion cases, in the terms of composition and administration, will be left to the discretion of the provinces (Solicitor General Canada, 1975, p. 27).

To conclude, therefore, while the practice of diversion has until the present been unencumbered by legislation, the absence of pertinent guidelines has perhaps delayed a swifter and more uniform development of diversion in Canada.

The new Young Offenders Act (1982) will legalize the operation of diversion, which may provide for more consistent application of the diversion principle. The Act (1982) establishes several criteria for the use of "alternative measures" in Canada which include:

1. A program must be sanctioned by the Attorney General or Lieutenant Governor of a province or persons designated by them.

2. Participation in the program must be voluntary.

3. The young person has a right to legal counsel.
4. The young person must accept responsibility for the
to offence (Young Offenders Act, 1982, Sec. 4).
Additionally, the Act (1982) also states that:

Taking no measures or taking measures other than
judicial proceedings... should be considered for
dealing with young persons who have committed
offences. (Young Offenders Act, 1982, Sec. 3(3))

These and other provisions of the new legislation would
appear to promote the development of measures such as diver-
sion, and provide basic guidelines for the implementation of
such programs in Canada.

1.2 RATIONALE FOR DIVERSION

Proponents of diversion have advocated its application and
expansion on several fronts. An examination of the litera-
ture reveals that diversion is promoted on three separate
levels:

1. Philosophical;
2. Theoretical;
3. Pragmatic;

1.2.1 PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF DIVERSION

It would be quite presumptuous to expect there to be a
distinct "philosophy of diversion", given that its pro-
ponents have yet to settle the matter of an over-all defini-
tion. However, descriptive and analytic literature on
diversion displays several recurring themes or principles
which appear to be characteristic of diversion. These
common themes or principles form the basis of a "philosophy" which is defined as "the fundamental principles of a particular branch of knowledge, [or] an activity" (Halsey, 1979, p. 756). If a single theme were required to describe this "philosophy" of diversion, the theme, "social accountability", would probably describe the philosophical rationale advanced for diversion.

First, diversion programs stress that the offender should be made to feel responsible, at least in part, for his actions (Calhoun, 1976, p. 48). In Canada, the legislation which formally recognizes diversion makes this point quite clear:

While young persons should not in all instances be held accountable in the same manner or suffer the same consequences for their behaviour as adults, young persons who commit offences should nonetheless bear responsibility for their contraventions. (Young Offenders Act, 1982, Sec. 3 (1) a)

The concept of "responsibility" is a significant departure from the spirit of the Juvenile Delinquents Act (1970) and its view of the juvenile offender:

As far as is practicable, every juvenile delinquent shall be treated, not as a criminal, but as a misdirected and misguided child, and one needing aid, encouragement, help and assistance. (Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1970, Sec. 38)

The thrust of the new legislation is to reflect prevailing attitudes and practices (Solicitor General Canada, 1979, p. 1). These attitudes and practices stress the desirability that the offender be held accountable for his actions (Lajeunesse, Note 5). This is, therefore, the first philo-
sophistic principle of diversion: individual responsibility for action.

The second feature of social accountability which is present in diversion practices is a desire to make the community in general more responsible for the treatment and care of young offenders. This idea has its origin in the recognition of the "social roots" of crime (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 23). Carter (1975) refers to this as the "rediscovery of the ancient truth that the community itself significantly impacts on behaviour" (Carter, 1975, p. 373). Given this premise of the social basis of crime, programs which take into account community and social responsibility are seen as desirable.

Carter (1975) believes that the populace is presently predisposed and eager to become involved in what has been until now, the exclusive affairs of government (p. 373). Further, Katkin et al. (1976) believe that not only is society predisposed to an option such as diversion, but that it has been an active participant in diversion on an informal basis for some time:

Diversion begins in the community where delinquent acts occur. It is social institutions in the broader community—families, churches, schools, social welfare agencies, etc.—which have the primary mandate to control and care for young people who commit delinquent acts. It is only when individuals or institutions fail to divert (or decide not to divert) that the formal processes of the juvenile justice system are called into action. (p. 404)
This awareness and willingness on the part of the community to be actively involved is reinforced by the additional belief that dispositions should "take into account not only the offender but the community and the victim as well" (Law Reform Commission, 1975, p. 23). Finally, Eldefonso and Hartinger (1976) point out that the diversion literature implies that an emphasis on diversion also suggests an emphasis on parental responsibility for the behaviour of their children (p. 267). This emphasis on parental responsibility is also mentioned in the Young Offenders Act (1982, Sec. 3 (n)). The second philosophic principle of diversion, therefore, is an emphasis on community responsibility.

A third and final philosophic principle of diversion to be discussed here is a desire to reduce or restrict the amount of official state intervention and control into the lives of citizens. This principle is conveyed in the following excerpt from the Solicitor General's report on the Young Offenders Act (1975):

If intervention in the life of a young person is justified on the basis of the alleged commission of an offence, then the option should be available to deal with a young person without the necessity of resorting to the court process. (p. 10)

Diversion is seen as a viable social alternative to the traditional justice system (Jensen and Rojek, 1980, p. 334).

The rationale for diversion in Canada is that too much socially-problematic behaviour is referred to the courts for solution (Hoyer, 1980, p. xvii). However, the courts can
only provide legal resolutions to these socially defined problems (Moyer, 1980, p.64). Diversion is believed to offer social, rather than legal solutions:

In effect, diversion seeks to offer the offender a set of social controls in lieu of the criminal justice system, our most drastic and overpowering form of social control. The assumption is that many who violate criminal laws are people whose lives will always be difficult and who need continuing support and that supervision and supplemental services may be more promising than the combination of a stigma and a cage. Diversion, with its gentler, less demilitating controls, may offer the best hope of developing in such people a lasting capacity to deal with a complex and difficult society. (Voremben & Voremben in Quinney, 1975, pp. 253-254)

The underlying philosophy of diversion therefore emphasizes three main points:

1. Increasing the offender's responsibility for his actions.
2. Increasing society's responsibility to deal with the problem of crime.
3. Decreasing the State's role for intervening in what are in many cases, social, rather than legal, problems.

1.2.2 THEORETICAL BASIS OF DIVERSION

Proponents of diversion advance a number of theoretical propositions to justify its development and continued use. The advocates of diversion reject a number of assumptions upon which the practices of the traditional juvenile justice system are based, and at the same time, advance an alternate
set of assumptions to justify the use of diversion. Some of these assumptions are made explicit, while others can be subsumed from writings of various practitioners and advocates. The first group of theories to be examined are those which the proponents of diversion reject or protest against.

The first theoretical argument against the existing system of juvenile justice is that it has failed on all fronts:

(1t) is a negative argument against the existing system. The assumption is that the present justice system is sufficiently bad that any alternatives for diverting offenders away from it is better than any that will move the offender further into it. (Nimmer, 1976, p. 52)

These alleged shortcomings are specified by various authors.

Jensen and Rojek (1980) argue that the concept of treatment, upon which the juvenile justice system is based, has failed to prove to be successful (p. 334). Meyer (1980) also makes this point, noting that the juvenile court has failed to provide individualized treatment, or to demonstrate that it is effective in rehabilitating offenders and reducing recidivism (pp. 60-63). Bloomberg (1977) has also remarked that the juvenile court has failed in its official goal of providing individualized treatment, due to the requirements of the everyday routinized processing of clients (p. 275).

Some believe that the court appearance itself is harmful. Kopetz and Bosarge (1973) believe that this harm can stem from the fact that over-crowded court dockets often lead to
"plea bargaining", and the child may thereby come to believe that "he can get away with anything" (p. 81). If such is the case, "the effectiveness of the juvenile court as an agency of rehabilitation is also nullified" (Kobetz and Bosarge, 1973, p. 81).

A final criticism of the formal juvenile justice process is that probation is ineffective due to large caseloads:

As a result, the child gets no help or guidance from the juvenile court and the problems which led to the initial delinquent transgression are left unsolved. (Kobetz and Bosarge, 1973, p. 81)

These arguments against the formal system of justice are, at the same time, arguments in favour of diversion. These were termed "theoretical" arguments in that not everyone concedes the failure of the formal juvenile justice system so readily. Klein (1973) for example, states that there is an "absence of proof that insertion [into the justice process] is an unsuccessful policy" (p. 377).

The preceding arguments pointed to the failures of the traditional juvenile justice system as reasons for considering the diversion option. Proponents of diversion attempt to justify this option by pointing to more formalized theories. The most prevalent theoretical justification for diversion is the adverse effects that are assumed to result from formal judicial proceedings as outlined in "labelling theory".

Bexer, Cole, and Peacock (1980) state that the consensus of the literature is that "labelling theory is the strongest
theoretical force behind the diversion movement" (p. 33).

Given the importance that proponents of diversion place on this theory, a short summation of its major points are presented, as outlined by Thorsell and Kleake (1979):

The labeling theory approach to the analysis of deviance depicts stable patterns of deviant behavior as products or outcomes of the process of being apprehended in a deviant act and publicly branded as a deviant person. The involvement of an individual in this process is viewed as depending much less upon what he does or what he is than upon what others do to him as a consequence of his actions. (p. 654)

Labelling theory postulates that as a result of being apprehended and labelled as a deviant (primary deviation), a consistent pattern or non-conforming behavior (secondary deviation) evolves "out of adaptations and attempted adaptations to the problems created by official reactions to the original deviance" (Lemert, cited in Moyer, 1980, p. 67). This process has also been referred to as the "self-fulfilling prophecy" (Moyer, 1980, p. 65).

 Advocates of diversion believe that formal court processing of juvenile offenders results in labelling as described by this theory. Proponents of diversion believe "becoming enmeshed in the juvenile justice system increases, rather than decreases, the young person's commitment to deviant norms" (Moyer, 1980, p. 2). Diversion, seen as "an alternative less formal than the court process" (Solicitor General Canada, 1978, p. 110), is believed to reduce the effects of labelling "by removing the youth to another or less official program" (Moyer, 1980, p. 79).
Although labelling is the major theoretical force behind diversion, it must be recalled that labelling is a theory which perhaps remains open to question. Some question the theory itself, noting that "there is little empirical evidence which supports the proposition of labelling theory" (Moyer, 1980, p. 1X). Other questions regarding this theory include the possibility that "the process of acquiring a spoiled identity may be gradual, beginning long before the first legal contact" (Moyer, 1980, p. 79).

Other writers have questioned the claim that diversion programs can prevent the incursion of stigma:

Creating new labels by new programs will have little effect on the labeling process or on the secondary deviance labeling is thought to engender. (Bullington et al., 1978, p. 67)

with the expansion of diversion, labelling may occur as easily in diversion programs as in the formal court process:

The 'bad kid' stigma is not necessarily avoided either since the youngsters in diversion programs quickly come to identify themselves as consisting of a fairly homogeneous group: a group of kids who get into trouble a lot, and as a result, have to take part in such programmes. (Cavoukian, 1979, p. 23)

Other than labelling theory, diversion advocates a reintegrative model of treatment. A reintegrative model is one which "is less concerned with specific causes and rather emphasizes the individual meeting their basic needs in order to increase their ability to function in society" (Calhoun, 1976, p. 43). Such a model places more responsibility on the offenders, requiring them to be active participants (Calhoun, 1976, p. 43; Grover, 1976, p. 143).
A reintegrative model, of which diversion is an example, rejects the "sickness" notion of criminality (Calhoun, 1976, p. 48). In this regard, Morris (1970), cited in Benoit (1976) states that:

The evidence to support such a view is lacking and the contributions that psychiatrists have made to the problems of treating offenders have been extremely rare. (Benoit, 1976, p. 48)

Pre-trial diversion programs which make use of such devices as compensatory tasks and restitution would seem to incorporate a number of theoretical postulations. The concept of accepting responsibility for actions was discussed earlier. In addition to this, compensatory tasks and restitution seem to be based on the acceptance of the idea that "social success depends on specific acceptable behaviours" (Young, 1945, p. 6). Compensatory tasks may be viewed as a means to acquire such acceptable behaviours. They may also be employed because proponents of diversion accept the following:

Necessary therapy should be task oriented based on daily activities which provide the necessary coping skills and teach the individual to recognize alternative behaviour choices. (Novotny, 1976, p. 54)

It is also plausible that advocates of diversion are not unaware that gainful employment is considered to be by some the most important factor in helping offenders lead law abiding lives (Spencer, 1980, p. 343). Compensatory tasks can simulate the experience of employment and in some cases provide skills which are marketable.
To summarize, diversion is seen as a response to the perceived failures of the traditional juvenile justice system. Labelling theory is the major theory used to justify an alternate response such as diversion. In practice, diversion is a reintegrative model which does not seek to uncover the causes of juvenile delinquency, but instead uses techniques such as compensatory tasks and restitution to illustrate to offenders socially acceptable and responsible behaviours.

1.2.3 **Pragmatic Basis of Diversion**

Other than the philosophic and theoretical reasons proposed to justify diversion, advocates also point out a number of consequences which would have immediate utility. Two potential consequences of diversion are:

1. A reduction in the number of cases appearing in court, thereby clearing the backlog.
2. A financial saving resulting from fewer court and related expenses.

Sandhu (1977) remarks that while the juvenile court was created as a diversion from the criminal court, "since delinquency covers such a wide spectrum of behaviour, it became imperative to divert a part of this behaviour to non-criminal channels" (p. 245). Kobetz and Bosarge (1973) have noted that much of the court backlog is due to "the huge volume of minor offences" (p. 88). Given this backlog,
diversion is an attractive alternative because the courts simply cannot handle the huge volume of cases (Quinney, 1975, p. 253).

Advocates of diversion claim that such programs can reduce the backlog of minor offences while at the same time "fulfill the objectives of the administration of juvenile justice" (Kobetz and Bosarge, 1973, p. 82).

In reducing the court backlog, the claim is made that this will be accompanied by a reduction in costs, both directly and indirectly. There would be a direct saving in that the time and resources of the court would not be spent on adjudicating the diverted cases (Kobetz and Bosarge, 1973, p. 82). Indirect savings could result from a reduction in referrals to agencies such as probation, aftercare and institutions. The resources saved could be rechanneled to other areas.
Chapter II

DESCRIPTION OF THE ESSEX COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM

The Essex County Diversion Program Inc. is an incorporated body which is responsible for the administration of three separate "diversion" programs. This body administers the Neighborhood Accountability Program (N.A.P.) which operates in Essex, Ontario. N.A.P. is a diversion program of the "community absorption" type. The program receives referrals from the police, and volunteer mediators attempt to reconcile the offender and the victim (Lajeunesse, 1982, p. 18).

A second "diversion" program administered by this body is Project Intervention, a pre-charge program, which is of the "screening" type. The police refer offenders to the program instead of laying a charge. Participation is voluntary, and may include any or all of the following:

1. Compensatory task for the victim or community.
2. Apology to the victim.
3. Restitution.
4. A donation to a charity of the victim's choice.  
   (Gaspar, Note 2).

The third program under the aegis of the Essex County Diversion Program Inc. is a post-charge, pre-trial program. It is this program that is the subject of this study.
The following is an account of the development and administration of the post-charge, pre-trial program (hereafter referred to as the "Diversions Program" or "Program"). After a short account of the program's historical development, a detailed description of the program goals, structure and process is given. The material for this section was gathered from program reports and minutes of the Diversions Committee meetings.

2.1 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

The Essex County Diversions Program is the product of the early efforts of a Windsor Family Court judge and the Chairman of this study who involved the John Howard Society of Windsor, and the local Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Department. Early in 1975, both developed an interest in diversion. A planning group was formed, consisting of representatives from both the public and private sector. The planning group determined the initial program structure, eligibility criteria, and administration. The program became operational as a one-year pilot project, within four months of the initial discussions, on June 13, 1975 (Lajemnesse, 1982, pp. 11-12).

Initially, the Family Court judge "directed" the program, which was staffed by two part-time workers from the John Howard Society and one full-time person from the Ministry of Correctional Services, Juvenile Probation and Aftercare. In
the early part of 1976, a Diversion Committee was formed to "scrutinize and amend the administration, policy, program, procedure, documentation and practice" of the Program, as well as to "hear complaints" regarding the Program (Diver-
sion Committee, Note 3). The Diversion Committee was composed of representatives from business, labour, and vari-
ous professions.

2.2 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

2.2.1 FUNCTIONS OF COMMITTEE

Since its inception, the Diversion Committee has taken on the major role of developing the overall direction of the three programs it directs. The following are the functions of the Committee as established in 1979:

1. To serve as the advisory body responsible for the administration of the Essex County Diversion Program and the Support Services for the Windsor Police Youth Branch. [The "Support Services" program has since been renamed "Project Intervention". In addition, a third program has since been added, the "Neighborhood Accountability Program"].

2. To routinize the programs in order to adequately respond to the needs of the community.

3. To consider amendments, modifications and additions considered necessary for the growth and development of the programs.
4. To establish procedure, documentation and practice
designed to meet the objectives of the program.

5. To engage such staff as deemed necessary and to have
autonomy over the direction of staff and functioning
of the programs.

6. To establish policy for the guidance of staff to
maximize their level of efficiency.

7. To accept and consider input from concerned govern-
ment officials and community agencies.

8. To secure funding necessary for the operation of the
program.

9. To act as an appeal board for the young person and
his/her family should a problem arise requiring arbi-
tration.

10. To meet regularly as called by Chairperson to deal
with business at hand.

11. To make such appointments within the committee as may
be necessary.

12. To replace or to add to the membership of the commit-
tee to maintain a cross-section of the community
served (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 4).

2.2.2 FUNCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

The Program Administrator is responsible for the administra-
tive duties of the three programs under the aegis of the
Essex County Diversion Program Inc. Presently, this posi-
tion is staffed by a Juvenile Probation and Aftercare Officer. While this individual is officially employed by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, he acts as full-time Administrator of the programs. The following are the functions of this position:

1. To provide professional leadership to carry out the aims and objectives of the program.
2. To manage the affairs of the Diversion Committee.
3. To act as a "clearing house" for external input.
4. To prepare and present reports as required by the Committee.
5. To work in co-operation with Chairperson to establish agendas for meetings.
6. To act as a "go-between" for Committee with funding sources.
7. To be responsible for the public image of the programs.
8. To be involved in the hiring procedure of new staff.
9. To act as recording secretary until such time as Committee sees otherwise.
10. To delegate authority duties and responsibilities to program director.
11. To keep staff informed and be informed about the staff.
12. To develop and establish procedures.
13. To be responsible for the staff training and development.

14. To maintain harmonious staff relations, to resolve differences.

15. To present to the Committee unresolvable staff issues.

16. To be present at all Committee meetings.

17. To be a member of the Diversion Committee. [Non-Voting Status]

18. Other duties as assigned by the Committee (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 4).

2.2.3 FUNCTIONS OF PROGRAM DIRECTOR

This intermediate supervisory position entails responsibility for the day-to-day administration of the post-charge pre-trial program. Presently, in the absence of a full-time Program Director, the position is partially assumed by the same individual who acts as Program Administrator. The duties of the Program Director are the following:

1. To develop and establish procedures in conjunction with the Administrator.

2. To maintain appropriate statistical data.

3. To supervise the work performance of staff and to ensure proper handling of cases.

4. To supervise students in accordance with University requirements, act as a liaison person with the University.
5. To scrutinize and monitor all potential incoming cases.
6. To ensure contact is made with potential cases as required by program guidelines.
7. To be responsible for the development of and negotiation with community work resources.
8. Staff training and development in conjunction with Administrator.
9. To be involved in the hiring procedure of new staff.
10. To maintain liaison between program and appropriate persons.
11. To submit monthly attendance sheets and monthly mileage reports to Administrator.
12. To assist in maintaining harmonious staff relations and resolve differences.
13. To present to Administrator unresolvable staff issues.
14. To submit to Administrator topics for agenda for Committee meetings when the need arises.
15. To attend Committee meetings.
16. Other duties as assigned by Administrator (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 4).
2.2.4 **FUNCTIONS OF STAFF MEMBERS**

Staff members (Diversion Workers) are responsible for the processing of diversion cases. Presently, there is one Diversion Worker, who is employed directly by Essex County Diversion Program Inc. The Diversion Worker's duties are the following:

1. Staff (full-time or on loan) will be responsible to the program management for program duties and not their respective agencies.
2. To do intake and process cases as according [sic] to program guidelines.
3. To submit monthly attendance reports and monthly mileage statements to program director.
4. To submit monthly case report to program management.
5. To develop community work resources (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 4).

2.2.5 **FUNCTIONS OF SECRETARY**

The secretary is employed directly by Essex County Diversion Program Inc., and is responsible for clerical duties arising from the operation of all its programs. The duties of this position are the following:

1. To answer telephone and schedule appointments.
2. Responsible for filing and record-keeping.
3. To do typing.
4. To maintain office stationery, forms and supplies.
5. To submit weekly attendance sheet to Administrator.
6. Other duties as assigned (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 4).

2.3 GOALS

The goals of the Essex County Diversion Program, as stated in the 1979 report are the following:

1. To allow the young person to be actively involved in undoing his wrong.
2. To involve the victims of delinquent acts in the resolution of the problem, i.e., confrontation and compensation.
3. To provide an informal means of solving problems involving delinquent acts of young people.
4. To offer assistance to young persons on a voluntary basis without court intervention.
5. To give immediate attention to the problem to protect the community from a young person's continued delinquent behaviour.
6. To engage parents in formulating and carrying out a plan to deal with their young person's behaviour.
7. To elicit the participation of community groups and institutions in response to the young person's behaviour which enhances the young person's self-concept.
8. To instill the concept of responsibility for conduct and to de-emphasize the classical concepts of punishment (Lajeunesse, Note 5).
2.4 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Not all juvenile offenders are eligible to enter the Diversion Program. The original criteria for eligibility to enter the program have been modified over the years. The following criteria are those in effect at the time of writing:

1. The young person who allegedly committed the offence must not previously have appeared in court on a criminal offence.

2. The Crown Attorney must not insist on court process on the offence.

3. The young person and the young person's parents must admit guilt and agree to enter Diversion rather than go to court.

4. The prosecutor's case must not become stale or unprovable through the lapse of time.

5. Alleged offences of murder, rape, armed robbery, serious arson and assault causing bodily harm are not eligible for Diversion.

6. The young person has not been found delinquent within the last two years nor has he participated "unsuccessfully" in the Diversion Program within that period. (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 9; Gaspar, Note 2)
2.5 **PROGRAM PROCESS**

2.5.1 **SELECTION OF DIVERSION CANDIDATES**

The Program Administrator is responsible for selecting candidates for the Diversion Program. He does so by regularly reviewing the court clerk's list of juveniles charged in Essex County. Selection is based on the criteria outlined above (Lajeunesse, 1982, p. 12).

2.5.2 **NOTIFICATION OF YOUNG PERSON**

Once the candidates have been selected, they are notified by letter and are asked to contact the Diversion Secretary to arrange an intake appointment (Appendix A). A brochure explaining the Program is sent along with the initial letter (Appendix B). If a reply is not received within 48 hours of the anticipated receipt of the letter, the Diversion Secretary telephones the young person to arrange the intake interview. If the Diversion Secretary is repeatedly unsuccessful in contacting the young person, or if the young person and his parents refuse to take part in an interview, the case is returned to the court process (Lajeunesse, 1982, pp. 12-13).

2.5.3 **INTAKE INTERVIEW**

At the intake interview, the Diversion Worker explains the alleged occurrence and the charge to the young person and the parents. The options available to the young person, and the
implications of those options are also explained. The Diversion Worker then leaves the room and is replaced by Duty Counsel who "inform the juvenile of the sufficiency of evidence and the advisability of entering into the Diversion Program" (Corrente & Young, Note 12).

Once the family understands the available options and their implications, the Diversion Worker returns to get the family's decision. If the family rejects the Diversion option, the case is referred back to the formal court process. If the family accepts the Diversion option, they are then required to sign a "General Admission of Facts" statement (Appendix C), which indicates that they have spoken to legal counsel and that the youth admits guilt to the charge as stated in the Information. At this time, the family is also required to sign a "Release of Information" statement (Appendix D), authorizing the Diversion Worker to contact various agencies, individuals and institutions regarding the child and family (LaJeunesse, 1982, p. 13).

In those cases when more than one charge is laid and the child is not willing to admit guilt to all of them, or, when the child disputes the facts contained in the Information, the Diversion Worker contacts the police to determine if they are willing to amend the Information. If they choose not to do so, the case is returned to the formal court process. If the police do agree to amend the Information, the diversion process goes on to the next stage (Reynolds, Tyler and Vanderzwaag, 1976, pp. 133-134).
2.5.4 **SOCIAL PROFILE**

At this stage of the process, the Diversion worker is required to assemble a social profile of the child. The worker is guided in this process by a standardized Social Profile format (Appendix E) which was adopted by the Diversion Program, and which is to contain information considered pertinent to the purposes of the Program. The worker meets with the child, family, any other individuals, institutions or agencies that are considered to have relevant information concerning the child's functioning in the home and the community in general. The information contained in the Social Profile is intended to serve diagnostic and planning purposes (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 7).

2.5.5 **VICTIM CONTACT**

In those cases where there is an identifiable victim, the victim is contacted to ascertain the extent of the loss, damage and/or inconvenience caused by the offender. The victim's willingness to participate in the formulation and implementation of a plan for the offender is also solicited. (Lajeunesse, 1982, p. 14)

2.5.6 **THE PLAN**

Based on the information contained in the Social Profile, and through the co-operation of the child, parents, victim and Diversion worker, a diversion plan is formulated. This
time-limited, individualized plan may contain one or more of the following elements:

COMPENSATORY TASK FOR THE VICTIM

In those cases where the offence has a victim, and the victim is willing to participate, a mutually agreeable task for the victim's benefit is arranged. The terms of this task, indicating the number of hours to be worked, the nature of the work, scheduled times and completion date are written into a "Compensatory Task Agreement" (Appendix F) which is signed by the offender and his parents. The number of hours to be worked may not exceed 40, and the offender's involvement in the Program may not exceed nine months from the date on which the contract was signed. Factors which are considered in striking this agreement include police time, personal suffering and inconvenience incurred by the victim, and the child's age and work capacity (Reynolds et al., 1976, pp. 185-186).

COMPENSATORY TASK FOR A COMMUNITY RESOURCE

In those instances where the youth's offence was "victimless", or when the victim chooses not to participate or where the victim is the community at large, a compensatory task for a community resource may be required. The same considerations, conditions and procedures apply in this case as in those which are for the benefit of a victim (Reynolds et al., 1976, pp. 185-186).
VERBAL OR WRITTEN APOLOGY TO THE VICTIM OF THE OFFENCE

A verbal or written apology may be required in those cases where there is an identifiable victim of the offence (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 8).

MONETARY RESTITUTION TO THE VICTIM

In those cases where a victim incurred a loss or damage to property, restitution by the offender may be required. This option may be selected in those cases where the youth has a personal source of income. Depending on the amount of loss incurred by the victim, and the child's financial resources, partial or full restitution may be required. Currently, there is no fixed maximum amount of restitution prescribed by the Diversion Program. (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 9)

REFERRAL TO A SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCY

Where the Social Profile indicates a need for more intensive assessment or intervention for the child or family, referral for counselling may be included as part of the plan. Where such a need is deemed to exist, the Diversion Worker approaches the prospective counselling service to discuss the propriety and feasibility of referral. If the Diversion worker and the referral agency are in agreement, the family is consulted as to its willingness to such a referral, and the nature and extent of the proposed referral. If all
parties are in agreement, the conditions are written into a "Referral Agreement" (Appendix G) which is signed by the child and parents. The duration of the agreement can not exceed nine months from the date on which the contract was signed. The policy of the Diversion Program is that the same resource can not act as both the referral agency and the site of the compensatory task (Essex County Diversion Program, Note 7).

2.5.7 FOLLOW-UP

The worker is responsible for assuring that the agreements made between the child and the Diversion Program are upheld. In the case of the Referral Agreement, feedback is required from the referral agency on the child's progress at 1, 3, 6 and 9 month intervals. There are no specific guidelines to this effect in the case of a Compensatory Task Agreement, but the Diversion Worker is expected to "systematically follow-up on the youths involvement in the selected process" (Reynolds et al., 1976, p. 187).

2.5.8 ADJOURNMENT OF CASES

The charge against the child remains pending until the child fulfills the agreement or participation in the program. When the agreement is fulfilled, and upon recommendation of the Diversion Worker, the charge is adjourned "sine die". A closing letter indicating the child's successful completion
of the Program and recommendation for "sine die" adjournment is sent to the child, the court, the police and the referral agency (Appendix H) (Reynolds, et al., 1976, pp. 187-188).

2.5.9 RETURNING A CASE TO COURT

Since the effect of the Diversion Program is to "temporarily deflect or administratively side-track" the formal court process (Corrent & Young, Note 12), the charge remains pending until the program is successfully completed. This means that the child may be returned to court to deal with the charge at any point during the diversion process. The program literature identifies several conditions under which a child can be returned to the court process:

1. Child refuses to attend initial intake interview.
2. Child refuses to sign General Admission of Facts.
3. Child is generally "out of control".
4. Child refuses to cooperate within Program guidelines.
5. Child does not fulfill the terms of the Compensatory Task Agreement.
6. Child does not fulfill the terms of the Referral Agreement.
7. Child is charged with an offence subsequent to his acceptance in the Diversion Program.

In all instances where the worker believes the youth should be returned to court, the case is to be conferenced with the Program Administrator to obtain his concurrence.
prior to returning the child to court (Essex County Diver-
sion Program, Note 9). If the Program Administrator does
not agree, but the worker still believes the case should be
returned to court, the worker may appeal the Administrator's
decision to the Diversion Committee. The Committee's deci-
sion is then implemented.

When a child is to be returned to court, he is informed
of the reasons why by the Diversion Worker. The child has
the right to appeal this decision to the Diversion Committee
if he believes that he is being treated unjustly. The
Committee has the final decision in such matters.

2.5.10 VERBAL CAUTION
At any time in the diversion process, the worker has the
option of issuing a "Verbal Caution" to the child. A
"Verbal Caution" signifies that in the opinion of the
worker, the child was not in need of further intervention.
It further implies that any diversion plan undertaken by the
child is deemed to be fulfilled upon the issuance of the
"Verbal Caution". In such cases, the worker recommends
immediate "sine die" adjournment to the court, and a letter
indicating this course of action is sent to the child,
court, police, and referral agency (Appendix I). Before a
verbal caution may be issued, the Program Administrator's
concurrence is required. In the absence of such concur-
rence, the Diversion Worker may appeal to the Diversion
Committee for a final decision (Reynolds, et al., 1976, p. 188).

2.6 **PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

The Essex County Diversion Program is currently in its eighth year of operation. During its first six years of operation, a physical count of the files reveals that it has processed 1,105 juveniles.

A research component has not been built into the program as had been intended, which makes the assessment of its effectiveness and impact problematic. The Program has produced a number of "in-house" reports, and has conducted some minor studies of its own. In addition, the Program was the subject of a previous evaluation which resulted in a thesis for the School of Social Work (Reynolds et al., 1976).

However, definitive statements regarding the overall effectiveness and impact of the program based on these studies is precluded, given their piece-meal nature and due to the fact that they cover over-lapping time frames.

2.7 **RESEARCH ON DIVERSION**

2.7.1 **STATUS OF PREVIOUS RESEARCH**

Although diversion has been the topic of much debate for some time now, the amount of research on it has been surprisingly minimal: "One of the most talked about innova-
tions in the field of juvenile justice, diversion is amongst the least researched" (Moyer, 1980, p.190). This statement is particularly indicative of the Canadian situation, and is exemplified by Moyer's (1980) extensive use of American literature, by default rather than by choice (p. 187). This is problematic, as the generalizability of American findings to this country is limited, given the differences in legal systems, in the magnitude of juvenile justice programs, and in the uneven development and prevalence of diversion programs between the two countries (Moyer, 1980, p. 187).

The lack of Canadian research is particularly unfortunate, given current legislation revision which specifically provides for pre-adjudicative measures such as diversion. The recently proclaimed legislation means that there will be a transitional period during which the provinces, who are responsible for administering the provisions of the legislation, will have to adapt their respective judicial machinery. This transitional period will be crucial for diversion research:

Before there are important changes in the Canadian juvenile justice system, there should be research performed to find out where we are at the moment. If baseline data are obtained, it is then possible to compare what happens now with what occurs after the implementation of diversion. (Moyer, 1980, p. 189)

Despite the recent proclamation of the Young Offenders Act (1982), it appears that the various levels of government are not prepared to allocate funds for research into diver-
sion. A case in point is the rejection of a proposed study
to compare the juvenile justice systems of two cities, one
of which has a diversion program, the other which does not
(Note 10). In explaining the reasons why the proposed study
was not granted funding, the Research and Program Evaluation
Section of the Ministry of Community and Social Services
remarked:

We also consulted with the Ministry of the Attorney
General since diversion policy in the province is
jointly determined by the two Ministries. Based on
these varied inputs it has been determined that this
proposal is not a priority for research funding at this
time (Note 11).

Of the research which has been performed on diversion,
client outcome studies have been the most prevalent type.
These take the familiar form of "hypothesized relationships
between program activities and participant effects" (Moyer,
1980, p. 157). Another broad group of studies which have
been performed on diversion are termed "system impact
research" which attempt to determine the impact that diver-
sion has on a number of subsystems such as community, the
juvenile justice system, the social service system, and law
enforcement agencies (Moyer, 1980, p. 156-168). A third
area of study, one not touched upon too much, is process
research which is designed to "describe the activities in
the program in order to 'find out what concrete actions are
being employed to achieve the ends!'" (Moyer, 1980, p. 153).

Taken in aggregate, the results of research on diversion
have been inconclusive. It is not uncommon to find
conflicting reports of success and failure, desirable and undesirable consequences of diversion. It is easy to juxtapose studies which report a reduction of recidivism as a result of diversion, to those which report no such reduction (Moyer, 1980, p. xvi); studies which report a decrease in the number of persons under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to those which report an increase (Aloemergber, 1977, p. 280). In summarizing the research findings Moyer (1980) states "it is simply not known how 'effective' diversion is" (p. 190).

2.7.2 Reasons for Ambiguous Findings

It is disappointing, yet not entirely suprising, that research has failed to yield clear cut answers to the many questions regarding the effectiveness and impact of diversion. It is disappointing because one would hope that important policy and program decisions about diversion would be based on empirical research findings (Moyer, 1980, p. 189). It is not entirely surprising that results have been inconclusive since social service programs which can claim high effectiveness and impact, based on empirical research findings, are not numerous.

Part of the reason for the lack of clear-cut answers about diversion may be the inherent difficulties involved in evaluating a program such as diversion, which is characterized by:
Broad aims, ambiguous criteria for success, a multiplicity of means which are often not well catalogued, and a wide variation in client characteristics and problems which makes it difficult to obtain adequate control groups or baseline measurements without large samples. (Reiken, 1972, p. 89)

Recognizing the difficulties that such a program characteristically presents, some writers have proposed that it may not be that such programs are "failures", but instead, the methods and criteria used to evaluate them tend to assure their depiction as such. This perspective questions the propriety of goal-oriented evaluation which "involves setting a goal, implementing a program, determining subsequent goal attainment, and using the information to modify future activities" (Kiresuk and Lund, 1978, p. 341). Proponents of the opposing perspective, recognizing the pressures to submit to such evaluations, question the over-riding emphasis placed on them:

"Partly because we live in an achievement oriented society, partly because of the demands of funding agencies, and partly as a consequence of intimidation of program personnel by evaluators, a sometimes unwarranted and frequently unrealistic emphasis of program goals develops. (Deutscher, 1976, p.250)

Writers such as Deutscher (1976) believe that an over-emphasis on goal-centred evaluation can lead to a number of pitfalls or "goal traps" (p. 252). A distinction must be made between formal and informal goals. Formal goals have been described as "propaganda...and] statements of what a particular program would be achieving if all functioned..."
ideally" (Kiresuk and Lund, 1977, p. 291). In such goals are used as the basis for evaluation, it would not be surprising to discover that the program has failed to achieve its goals (Deutscher, 1976, p. 252). As discussed earlier, diversion programs are characterized by broad aims and ambiguous criteria for success:

Since many diversion projects attempt to make changes in a variety of areas, few programs have such a narrow focus that personnel can say they have succeeded. (Moyer, 1980, p. 150)

To evaluate a program with reference solely to formal goals is to fall into the first "goal trap" (Deutscher, 1976, p. 252):

Among the many reasons for the negative pall of evaluation results is that studies have accepted bloated promises and political rhetoric as authentic program goals. (Weiss, 1973, p. 44, in Deutscher, 1976, p. 252)

In an effort to avoid the first 'goal trap' evaluators may inadvertently become ensnared in another. The researcher may attempt to refine the broad aims of the program into specific, measurable goals. In this attempt, program descriptions are read, program personnel are interviewed, and operations are observed. If the goals are still not readily apparent, those responsible for the program are forced to specify the program goals more clearly:

The end result of this process is that, more often than not, the program is evaluated in terms of marginal goals which are unlikely to be achieved (if for no other reason, because no one is very serious about them) and are likely to be denied their legitimacy when the evaluator finally reports that the program does not seem to make any difference. (Deutscher, 1976, p. 253)
In this same respect, Moyer (1980) has commented that operationalizing the multiple goals of diversion has proven to be a problem in research (p. 152).

A possible explanation for the conflicting research findings on diversion may therefore be an emphasis on measuring formal or spurious goals. Additionally, studies on diversion have tended to measure outcomes in the absence of clear descriptions of what actually happens in diversion programs (Moyer, 1980, p. 153-154).

Evaluators usually accept the description of the program given by practitioners as sufficient. They rarely attempt to specify the theoretical premises on which it is based, define the principles that guide its practice, or even monitor its operation so that there is confidence that the program as officially described actually took place... It is possible that evaluation is attributing the observed effects (or no effects) to a phantom program, or to one of such marginal caliber that it hardly provides a fair test of the program concept. (Weiss, 1972, p.321)

With reference to diversion, there has been a noticeable lack of descriptive material on the diversion process (Moyer, 1980, p. 153).

One of the few studies which did examine the diversion process was conducted by Cressey and McDermott (1976). This study provided a narrative description of the policies and practices of three diversion programs. Although the study is somewhat unique in its examination of both policy and practice, it is devoid of any quantitative data as to the proportion of cases handled in different ways. The study did reveal, however, that due to the nebulous nature of the
diversion concept, it was not uncommon to find "the stated goals of diversion policy or program at variance with the actual mode of implementing those goals" (Cressey and McDer- mott, 1973, p. 57). This finding lends support to the claim made by Weiss (1972) that research on programs which do not incorporate an examination of the actual, as opposed to advertised, process, could lead to spurious or meaningless findings (Weiss, 1972, p. 321).

This study is an attempt to define the Essex County Diversion Program in terms of specific, measurable goals. Criteria recognized as essential in therapy and behaviour-change will be used to measure specific changes in the diversion population. This is viewed as being a significantly different approach to what has been done in research where nebulous or ideal goals have been evaluated.
Chapter III

SELF-CONCEPT: LITERATURE REVIEW

There is mounting evidence that "the delinquent can be differentiated from the non-delinquent on the basis of self-concept" (Fitts and Hamer, 1969, p. 2). The implication this statement has is to suggest that specific behaviours can be associated with negative or deviant self-concepts and can be used as a predictor of an individual's level of self-concept. Additionally, it can be theorized that positive behavior and a positive self-concept are correlated.

Self-concept examined in isolation is virtually meaningless; it must be seen in relation to the behaviour of which it is hypothesized to be a determinant. One of the assumptions of this research is that a positive self-concept is an indicator of socially responsible behaviour. It is hypothesized that individuals who possess a high positive regard for themselves will more likely be responsible members of society.

This literature review shall attempt to document the concept of self. More likely the end result will be to accentuate the varied definitions of self-concept which exist about self-theory. The self-concepts which many authors, theorists and researchers discuss are similar in
many aspects to one another. A concept of the self which may at the outset give the impression of being easily definable assumes complicated proportions with continued investigation. Self-theory's concept of the self has been called different things by different researchers. Examples of this are: self-regard (Wylie, 1961), self-esteem (Brandon, 1969), self-identity (Wagner, 1975), self-attitudes (Kaplin, 1975), and self-consistency (Samuels, 1975). In this research references to other researchers, the utilization of their findings, and terminologies they use will be considered interchangeable. While not identical these terms and theories have enough similarities to be referred to under the one general heading of self-concept. Throughout this research "self-concept" will be considered to be interchangeable with any of the many terms or phrases which refer to self-theory. This paper shall use the term self-concept singly throughout in reference to self-theory.

Self-concept appears initially to be a simple concept which should therefore be readily definable. As noted previously, different researchers have their own specific definitions, each having its own peculiarities. This chapter will illustrate the difficulties which exist and impede a concise and generally acceptable definition of self-concept.

Self-concept, as William Pitts (1972, p. 5) uses the term and applies the concept, shall serve as reference for this
paper and provide a criterion for understanding the relationship between self-concept and delinquency. Fitts maintains that the "internal frame of reference provides data about people which help to understand and predict behaviour" (1972, p. 8). Fitts emphasizes the importance of self-concept with particular reference to rehabilitation, "special attention should be devoted to the individual client's self-concept throughout the entire rehabilitation program" (1972, p. 9). Continuing, he states that research increasingly implies that "some kind of self-concept rehabilitation may be needed before vocational or other phases of rehabilitation should be attempted" (1972, p. 9). Growing evidence indicates that those individual clients possessing highly negative or deviant self-concepts are less likely to continue and obtain satisfactory results in therapy and rehabilitation (Fitts and Hamner, 1969).

To show that a relationship exists between delinquency and self-concept a study in which profiles of normal non-delinquent high school and junior high school students was undertaken by Fitts and Hamner (1969). They discovered that many deviant features exist in both these populations. The level of self-concept for adolescents in general is understandably lower than that of the normal adult population (Fitts, 1965, p. 19). What is significant though are the profiles of delinquent children which show greater deviance than those of their non-delinquent peers. Self-concept or
non-delinquents appears to be generally higher than the self-concept of delinquents but lower than the normal adult population (Fitts et al., 1969).

The self-concept of non-delinquents shows some deviation from that of the rest of society, but on the whole they tend to have a more positive view of themselves. Thompson (1972) explains the lower self-concept of non-delinquents by stressing that young people are more uncertain about their self-concepts as they strive to establish who they are within the new roles they acquire at this stage of their lives. The uncertainty reaches a peak during the high school years. As new roles and behaviour are either acquired or discarded, self-esteem increases with age (Thompson p. 27).

This review will explore the varying definitions of self-concept and examine several of its antecedents. Several theories discussing how self-concept is acquired will be looked at and their relation to the Essex County Diversion Program shall be analyzed.

This literature review will be used to give credence to this research whose aim is to determine whether the Essex County Diversion Program will effect positively the self-concept of those individuals who complete the program during the course of this study.
3.1 DEFINITIONS OF SELF-CONCEPT

Although there are several definitions of self-concept, this research will use Pitts and Harmer's (1969) view of self-concept, for terms of reference.

Pitts and Harmer's view is that self-concept is a determinant of behaviour and provides an internal frame of reference by which individuals interact with the world. Self-concept according to them is "a central or core set of data which enables us to understand and predict many aspects of behaviour" (1969, p.1). This is to say that our view of ourselves has a mediating effect on our interpretation of our experiences and perceptions. Our "internal harmony" (Festinger, 1957 in Samuels, 1975), or frame of reference, is maintained which allows us to be consistent in our self-concept. This aspect will be further examined in the section dealing with Self-Consistency Theory.

A different view of self-concept was presented by Pelkey (1974):

Self-concept is the sum total of the view an individual has of himself. Self-concept is a unique set of perceptions, ideas and attitudes which an individual has about himself (p.2).

M. E. Wagner (1975), defines self-concept as:

The image we all have of ourselves. It is a mental picture of our self-identity. Self-identity is the 'I am' feeling of being a person (p. 20).

Carl Rogers hypothesizes that individuals strive for self-actualization via the acquisition of 'positive regard'
which is a prerequisite of self-regard in his interpretation of self-concept.

Every person has an inborn tendency toward self-actualization which includes a sense of autonomy, independence and self-determination; experience is valued as positive or negative in reference to the actualization tendency; the individual tends to approach positively valued experiences and to avoid negatively valued experiences (Rogers in Rotter and Hochreichen 1975, p.69-71).

Rogers and his theory of self-actualization will be more fully explored in the subsequent section dealing with Self-esteem Theory.

Alfred Adler has a differing view as to the acquisition or self-concept in that he sees individuals as striving from birth to compensate for their perceived low self-esteem.

A person attempts to compensate for inferiority by striving for superiority (Adler in Rotter & Hochreichen 1975, p. 51).

Social psychologists tend to view self-concept as being derived from the individual's perceptions of experiences and feelings towards others and others' perceptions and treatment of the individual.

William James theorized that: "there must be not one, but many social selves, and that the 'social we' grows out of the recognition that we receive from others" (James in Samuels 1975, p. 47).

Charles Horton Cooley in 1902 expressed a similar view in his 'looking glass self'. Cooley maintained that "the self is a reflection of what individuals think others' judgments are of them" (Samuels 1975, p.47).
Sullivan in 1953 considered "the self-concept as being central to human personality, individuals cannot exist apart from their relations with other people (Samuels 1975, p. 49)."

A more recent author, R. Sprigle, concurs with the social psychological determinants of self-concept. Sprigle states, "A child's healthy self-concept depends heavily on her others-concept because that determines the child's own behaviour towards others with its resulting positive or negative consequences" (1980, p. 23).

Other social psychological views of self-concept will be examined in the section dealing with Reference Group Theory.

An important point to be remembered and considered is that the one constant thing about self-concept is that it is always changing. Most theorists hold that the "self-concept of most individuals is fluid and constantly changing in minor ways, yet quite stable and consistent as a total entity" (Fitts et al., 1969, p. 27).

B.C. Wylie (1961) sums the differing foci of this section most lucidly.

Theorizing about the young child focuses on the emergence of self as a separate person and development of gender identity; theorizing about adolescents centers around development of a stable sense of identity; theorizing about middle age emphasizes the sense of autonomy and power, as well as change in self-perceived body competence; and the sense of being old has particularly drawn the attention of those dealing with self-concepts of elderly persons (p. 9).
In regard to this research and rehabilitation programs in general "the evidence indicates that individuals with highly negative and deviant self-concepts are high risks for continuation and satisfactory performance in many activities. In many cases some kind of 'self-concept habilitation' may be needed before vocational or other phases of rehabilitation should be attempted" (Fitts, 1972, No.7, p.9).

The self-concept must be dealt with before or in the very least concurrently with other rehabilitation efforts. Self-concept as an indicator of behaviour can be interpreted as being a measurement of the effectiveness of treatment or rehabilitation strategies.

In application to this research and the intervention strategies of the Essex County Diversion Program the measurement of self-concept at the conclusion of the program will reflect the program's effectiveness on future behaviour its participants.

3.1.1 ANTECEDENTS OF SELF-CONCEPT

There are several criteria which may be considered prerequisites or essential elements or self-concept. This subsection will attempt to identify some of them as there seem to be specific criteria underlying the different theories of self-concept.
Wagner (1975) believes that self-concept is dependent upon three feelings: belongingness, worthiness and competency.

Belongingness is the awareness an individual has of being wanted, accepted and being cared for by others. It is the sense one feels when one is accepted for what one is and enjoyed as a person in his or her own right. It is the "we feeling" according to Wagner (1975, p. 32).

Worthiness is derived from others' positive attitudes towards the individual. The individual acquires feelings of being good, right or counting in someone else's eyes. Individuals who feel worthiness by believing they are right, do right (Wagner, 1975, p. 32).

Feeling competent depends on an a person's attitudes concerning his or her adequacy, courage and hopefulness. Competency for each individual is affected positively by success and negatively by failure (Wagner, 1975, p. 33).

Wagner examines each of these feelings in relation to one another, realizing that they each have an effect and interact with the others.

Belongingness is fundamental. Worthiness somewhat depends on belongingness, for one must feel accepted by others to value their conforming attitudes concerning how good a person he is. Competence depends partially upon belongingness and upon worthiness. We need to feel accepted by others in order to value their approval or profit by their helpful criticism. We also must approve of ourselves to have the incentive to keep trying after we have failed (Wagner, 1975, p. 37).
The relationship these feelings of belongingness, competency, and worthiness have to the juvenile offender and the possible benefits the diversion program may produce warrants further examination. If the juveniles do not feel accepted by society, the likelihood that they will value the same socially positive attitudes is diminished greatly. Old attitudes, which are possibly anti-social, will continue to be those with which the juvenile offender identifies.

Wagner (1975) sees the rejection of the individual or the perceived rejection of the individual as loss of self-identity (p. 42). Hostility, frustration or humiliation are the possible responses persons may have if they feel rejected. Hostile reactions are accordingly vented against the perceived source of the rejection, in many cases society itself. Vandalism, for example, may be attributable to rejection if credence is given to these hypotheses.

Coopersmith (in Samuels, 1977) cited "concerned, respectful acceptance of significant others as vital in the establishment of positive self-esteem. Self-esteem and subsequent positive behaviour which is socially acceptable will come from the identification and acceptance with positive others". These significant others may be provided by involvement in the diversion program.

Felker (1974), as does Wagner, sees the same three components being necessary to the development of self-esteem. He defines the terms in this manner:
1. Belonging is the sense that an individual is part of a group and is accepted and valued by the other members of that group (p.25).

2. Competency is determined by self and other's evaluation using the basis of how efficiently the person accomplishes purposeful behaviour (p.27).

3. The worthiness an individual feels is determined by the estimation of others and reflected back to the individual to internalize. An individual's worth to others is "often expressed in what others do for and to that individual" (p.29).

The sense of belonging and identification individual juveniles may have with a deviant sub-group and their reluctance to give up the subgroup's values and attitudes may be partially explained by the feelings of acceptance the juvenile has toward that group. The juvenile may feel incompetent in relation to the rest of society but may be considered a worthwhile member of that deviant sub-group and may therefore obtain needed positive self-esteem from it. Conversely, if juveniles do not identify with a deviant subgroup but rather with society's values their sense of competency, worthiness and belongingness may suffer terribly in comparison to the predominant values to which they aspire.

Persons with an inadequate self-concept spend much attention, time and energy trying to establish a secure premise of self-identity in each situation instead of being able to function because they already have such a premise. Some people are so
completely preoccupied with feelings of being a nobody in a world of people who seem to them more or less stable somebodies that they can scarcely apply themselves to any certain task (Wagner, 1975, p.13).

The implication is clear that when delinquent juveniles can not "measure up" by their own perceptions to society's standards, a sense of failure and ever increasing futility will likely develop.

Rosenburg, (in Samuels, 1977), suggested that the importance researchers have placed on an individual's reference groups may be not as important as we have been generally led to believe. Members of a particular socio-economic group, for example, may refuse to accept society's evaluation of their group. Rosenburg supports this by stating that members of a low prestige group will often rank their own group as higher than others rank it. People within low prestige groups will often compare themselves with others in their own group over whom they have superiority. Persons are more likely to confine their associations to their own group so that feelings of prestige are based on those associations within the group. Additionally, the values to which society may subscribe may not be those that a "lower socio-economic class" individual holds or aspires to. In order to have a low self-concept or to develop feelings of inadequacy the criteria for judgement or measurement must be deemed important or relevent by the individual who is doing the comparing.
Child rearing practices have been hypothesized to be key factors in the development of self-concept. Samuels (1975) states that the parent-child relationship is significant in developing the "core" self-concept of the child. Healthy or unhealthy parent-child relationships are reflected in children's attitudes towards themselves and are developed from birth.

Coopersmith (1967) maintains that self-esteem is determined by three factors which are related to parenting: total acceptance of the children by their parents, clearly defined and enforced limits and the respect and latitude for individual action that exists within the defined limits (p. 236).

As parents are in the vast majority of cases the most prominent and influential persons in a developing child's life, they logically affect the child to the greatest extent.

Children can only develop perceptions about themselves in terms of their experience and the treatment they have received from those responsible for their development (Combs and Snygg in Samuel 1977, p. 52).

As important as child rearing practices are, it is beyond the scope of this research adequately to study this variable and on the effect it has on the acquisition of self-concept.

Another such variable which is unable to be adequately studied or accounted for is age, as this research study did not have the means to control for the variable. Age as a
variable affecting definitions of self-concept has been mentioned previously and it has been implied that differing perceptions of self-concept exist at various life stages. This study dealt with adolescents between the ages of twelve and sixteen. Adolescence is perhaps the most difficult time of a person's life. Roles are not as clearly defined as they are for children or adults. At this stage of life a new and varied multiplicity of roles exists. Peer acceptance at this life phase is paramount to the adolescent's self-concept to the point of surpassing parental expectations in many instances. Establishing and maintaining a healthy positive self-concept at this life stage is an increasingly complicated task.

Adolescence should be viewed as an opportunity for achieving a realistic, stable, socially acceptable and personally satisfying self-concept—providing conditions in which they can discover and develop their capacities; by offering opportunities for them to be creative, socially successful, responsible and competent within the limits of their capacity... (Stranjo, 1957, p. 128).

This is analogous to one of the objectives of the diversion program which is to provide opportunities for the young offender to experience some social and practical success within the context of an individual's abilities. Much effort is made to ensure that the young offender entering into the diversion program and the task undertaken will be completed satisfactorily.

Sex is another variable which is important to the acquisition of self-concept. Some differences do exist among the
sexes and the acquisition of self-concept. The differences which exist are generally explained by contrasts in such factors as socialization, role expectations, and maturation rates. As this study did not involve any female delinquent offenders a further explanation of this variable will not be necessary.

Another variable which is usually specific to studies concerning juvenile delinquency is that of recidivism. This is often the only criterion used to evaluate the effectiveness of correctional programs. This variable is not a consideration in this study as the Essex County Diversion Program does not usually allow the inclusion of repeat offenders in the program.

Considering only the rate of recidivism is limiting and negates other positive changes which may occur in the life situation or self-concept of the offender. It is not realistic to expect programs or therapy to undo in a matter of weeks or months negative self-concepts or behaviour patterns. Conversely, this study hopes to determine whether a positive relationship exists between change in the self-concept of the delinquent and involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program. A change of self-concept does not necessarily have to be great to illustrate that the diversion program has had some positive effect influencing the young offender's self-concept.
M. Branden (1969) takes the analysis of these antecedents one step further as he sees the two basic conditions for self-esteem as the will to understand and cognitive self-assertiveness.

Branden's will to understand is similar to Rogers' self-actualization drive in that it is also an innate drive the individual possesses at birth. Young infants will attempt to understand their environment instinctively and interact with it. As a person ages the "will to understand" expands and they attempt to understand behaviours and policies of every day life which were previously beyond them. If policy and behaviour of significant others are erratic or confusing to individuals, they may become resigned to the fact that they may never understand what is expected of them and what is acceptable. If individuals are unable to internalize limits, due to inconsistent feedback and cues, their behaviour develops, needing the immediate cues of others for future and subsequent behaviour. If they have failed to internalize limits or note consistency from others by which they can judge their self-concept or behaviour, the individual may seek limits and approval in every new situation. Self-concept will depend entirely on the acceptance of others for cues to behaviours as each situation or person is presented.

So long as a child continues to struggle, so long as he does not give up the will to understand, he is psychologically safe, no matter what his anguish or bewilderment: he keeps his mind and desire for efficacy intact. When he surrenders
the expectation of achieving efficacy, he surrenders the possibility of achieving full self-esteem (Branden, 1969, p. 109).

Branden's second criterion of self-esteem is that of cognitive self-assertiveness. He does not imply the necessity to repress the emotions, but rather to recognize that the mind controls the emotions and that the emotions are not tools of cognition or of judgement. Emotions must be viewed for what they are, "effects, consequences of value judgments" (Bandura, 1969, p. 111). Emotions may often influence individuals to behave, act or think in a manner which is directly opposite or contrary to their best interests or cognitive processes. Branden (1969) believes that it is imperative that decisions should be made by the "independent exercise of your own mind" (p. 116). The responsibility for and evaluation of the decision may then be decided objectively with the self-esteem of the individual left intact.

A healthy self-esteem gives a man an insurmountable weapon in dealing with errors since his own value and the efficacy of his mind are not in doubt. Conversely, one of the most disastrous consequences of an impaired deficient self-esteem is that it tends to hamper and undercut the efficiency of a man's thinking processes (Bandura, 1969, p. 129).

Acceptance of one's mind and mental faculties and understanding the role of the emotions in the decision-making process will help an individual to tap in objectively evaluating behaviour and acquiring an appropriate self-concept.

Samuels (1977, p. 36) concurs with these findings and recognizes the relationship which exists between the mind
and the self-concept as he states, "there is no question that the self-concept affects the emotional, physical, social and cognitive life of the individual".

The diversity of theories that relate to the development of a concept of self will be discussed in the subsequent subsections. The few theories presented are not to be considered comprehensive of all theories of self nor are they by any means a thorough examination of each theory. The intent of this section is to provide the reader with an overview of the development of a self-concept.

3.2 THEORIES OF SELF

3.2.1 SELF-ESTEEM THEORY

Basically, Self-Esteem Theory postulates that the individual organism has a need for positive self-esteem. This need for self-esteem is "satisfied by the approval they receive from others and is frustrated by their disapproval" (Samuels, 1975, p. 64). Self-Esteem Theory assumes that individuals actively seek out experiences or situations which will increase, maintain or confirm their feelings of competency, worthiness or belonging.

Self-Esteem Theory has similarities to Rogers' concept of 'self-actualization' which postulates that the organism appears to seek ways to maintain or enhance self. To Rogers the striving for self-actualization is an innate drive, one which individuals attempt to achieve or maintain throughout their life (Rogers in Rotter and Hochreich, 1975, p. 69).
The acquiring of self-actualization for self-esteem may be inhibited by certain circumstances, groups or significant others and the individual may wish to avoid those experiences or feelings which produce negative self-esteem or do not provide positive self-esteem.

The individual tends to approach positively valued experiences and to avoid negatively valued experiences (Rogers in Rotter et al., 1975, p. 69).

This may be significant if we examine the motivation the juvenile delinquent may possess for assuming the deviant values and behaviours of a group or subculture. That group may provide the delinquent with positive reinforcement which enhances self-concept. Diversion is an attempt to provide the delinquent with an alternative source of positive regard.

Alfred Adler's view of human psychology may be interpreted also in much the same way as Carl Rogers' self-actualization principle. According to Adler human beings learn to feel inadequate through experiences early in their development. People not wishing to feel inadequate strive to feel superior (Adler in Rotter and Hochreich, 1975, p. 51). Accordingly, a person sets up a life plan to overcome or compensate for imagined or real inferiorities (Adler in Samuels, 1975, p. 48).

Adler (in Rotter and Hochreich, 1975) hypothesized that destructive behaviour is a means for individuals to attain some attention and recognition which they may have thought
they were not getting. Unable to achieve superiority through socially acceptable means, individuals who feel frustrated and angry may lash out. Negative attention is preferable to no attention.

Kaplin (1975) gives further credence to the self-esteem theory with his research in which he reports:

The self-esteem motive is defined as the need of the person to maximize the experience of positive self-attitudes or self-feelings and to minimize the experience of negative self-attitudes or self-feelings (p. 10).

This is significant in regard to the diversion experience as it is a positive experience which maximizes positive feelings of success and accomplishment.

To support this hypothesis further Kaplin's research found that:

1. Individuals when asked to describe themselves tend to do so in positive terms avoiding negative descriptions of themselves.
2. People possessing low self-concept in self-threatening circumstances respond with behaviours that tend to be self-defensive or serve self-enhancing functions.
3. People with low self-esteem are more apt to manifest subjective distress, which while not imagery has internal origins rather than external.
4. People who have positive self-attitudes are more likely to maintain them over time and experience
while people with negative self-attitudes tend to change their attitudes more so over time in a more positive direction (1975). Dissatisfaction is reflected in the fact that many people would like to be better or different from what they perceive themselves to be. For example, a lawyer may work hard to become a judge or a politician, a teacher may desire to be a principal, or a blue collar worker may wish to be a foreman. Many people seek to better themselves for various and innumerable reasons. James (in Rosenberg, 1965) stated "...ideally we would like to be all great things. Realistically, however we must pick and choose" (p. 244).

Theoretically, diversion may provide a positive experience for an individual, one which may have never been experienced before. This may provide a new socially acceptable role for persons to measure theirself against and aspire to.

3.2.2 SELF-CONSISTENCY THEORY

Self-Consistency Theory hypothesizes that:

Individuals' receptivity of information from other people is strongly affected by their tendency to create and maintain a consistent state of evaluation (Samuels, 1975, p. 61).

Self-Consistency Theory, is illustrative of why negative or deviant self-concepts and behaviours are so difficult to change.
Pestinger (1957) explained the resistance to change as a defense mechanism the individual employs to reduce anxiety:

The human organism tries to establish internal harmony, consistency or congruity among his opinions, attitudes, knowledge and values. Individuals may misperceive evaluations, which are inconsistent to already existing feelings and perceptions in order to prevent themselves from becoming psychologically uncomfortable (p. 260).

B. J. Kroeger (1971) lends support to this premise in an article concerning value change and its relation to rehabilitation.

Once we have formulated personal values it is usual that we endorse those changes which are in keeping with or support our views, while we oppose or negate those changes which are contrary or non-supportive of our views (p. 123).

The psychological theory of cognitive dissonance is similar in that it implies information which does not fit into the mind or mental set of an individual is less likely to be acceptable to the individual, (Campbell, 1961, p. 116).

Sullivan, (in Strang, 1957), states that self-concept is determined by the way an individual organizes experiences which avoid or diminish anxiety.

Combs and Snygg (1959) believe that individual change in self-concept is difficult because the self ignores experiences which are inconsistent and more readily accepts those which confirm concepts of the self we already possess. This has implications for the treatment process of the diversion program which this research is examining. Juveniles may not
gain positive benefits from involvement with the diversion program if this theory is correct. They may perceive their new experience as being inconsistent with their perceptions of their self-concepts and therefore ignore the newer more positive benefits which may be gained from involvement in the diversion program. Self-concept may therefore not be enhanced and positive behaviour change is less likely.

Self-Consistency Theory maintains that self-concept operates as an inner mechanism maintaining self-consistency, determining the interpretation of experiences and providing expectancies for the individual. Every experience and perception we have, either positive or negative, distorts or taints new experiences and perceptions. Objectivity in evaluation of experience is a difficult achievement according to this theory.

So intently does a man feel the need of a positive view of himself that he may evade, repress, distort his judgements, disintegrate his mind in order to avoid coming face to face with facts that would affect his self-appraisal adversely (Branden, 1971, p. 104).

People will continue to believe and interpret new experiences in light of established feelings, values and knowledge which confirm their self-concept. An example which may illustrate the point is an individual who possesses a low self-concept and views himself as deviant. This person will interpret each new experience to be, no matter how positive or self-enhancing it may appear to an objective observer, as confirming of the negative perceptions held of
oneself. This hypothesis is related to that of the selffulfilling prophecy (Campbell, 1981, p. 116), which is relevant to much social science research and theories of personality.

3.2.3 Reference Group Theory of Self

As a social psychological theory of the development of self-concept, reference group theory has similarities to other theories of sociology, such as the theory of differential association, to name one. This section shall examine some theories in regard to juvenile delinquency.

Discouraging the association between delinquents, has been one of the objectives of diversion; instead the programs are designed to involve the youthful offender with alternative positive role-models and experiences. Differential association theory implies that individuals will identify their values with the values of those individuals with whom they socialize.

Reference group theory maintains that the self-concept is forged by external pressures exerted upon an individual. It must be remembered that "self-concept also is an ingredient in an individual's experience" (Rosenburg, 1965, p. 6). Self-concept is not developed in isolation from other factors influencing the individual. Social factors are constantly interacting with a person's self-values and effecting self-perception.
No one evaluates in the abstract; evaluation is always with reference to certain criteria. Every society or group has its standards of excellence and it is within the framework of these particular standards that self-evaluation occurs (Rosenburg, 1965, p. 14).

How certain individuals identify with and become part of a deviant subgroup is of particular interest to this study and will be discussed, as well as means and methods which may influence individuals to become part of another social group, one which is more socially acceptable.

It has been stated above, in the section dealing with antecedents of self-concept, that if a person fails to receive the perceived appropriate reinforcement of their self-concept they will cease to attempt to acquire those reinforcements via those normally acceptable means. But the confirmation of self must come from somewhere and individuals will actively search out the group or significant others who will confirm in the person's mind who they perceive they are.

An individual will tend to develop negative self-attitudes if he has, in balance, a history of perceiving and interpreting the behaviour of highly valued others toward him as expressing negative attitudes toward him in general (Kaplin, 1975, p. 37).

Kaplin (1975) continues, stating that his empirical findings suggest strongly that negatively perceived experiences in any group that are associated with adverse consequences for the person's self-attitudes will result in the rejection or avoidance of that group and result in a search for or acquire an attraction to a substitute group.
The importance this has for diversion is that of the identification which a young offender develops for the deviant subgroup which is used for reference purposes. Failure to acquire or succeed in the greater society invites identification with a less demanding acceptance group. Diversion has been developed to address this problem and to provide an avenue for the young offender to enter into the mainstream of society by accomplishing or succeeding at the diversion experience. The diversion experience must come to be seen by the program’s participants as a positively valued experience which provides other more socially acceptable references for behaviour.

Considering the preceding, it can be extrapolated that juvenile delinquents associating with one another may be the direct result of their perceived rejection by society and their acceptance by a deviant subgroup. Once juveniles associate with one another they become more susceptible to peer pressure, as the group members feel they have found a place to belong and will therefore strive to continue to do so. Older juveniles are particularly prone to peer pressure (Wood, 1972), and are more likely to commit serious offences with companions. Milior Baron’s (1956) research discovered that 60% to 90% of offences committed by juveniles can be attributable to groups either directly or indirectly.

Coopersmith (1967) explains a group’s definable limits which holds an attractiveness to an individual. He states,
"imposition of limits serves to define the expectations of others, the norms of the group, and the point at which deviation from them is likely to evoke positive reaction" (p. 238).

Limits which are not achievable in one group may be viewed as unattainable and incomprehensible and therefore may be rejected in favour of another group's criteria for membership.

Merton (1967) suggested that the greater the prestige a non-membership group confers on an individual, as compared to their own membership group, the more likely it will be that the individual will use the non-membership group as their frame of reference.

Samuels (1977) summed up the general feeling when he stated that "people who judge themselves by the standards of a higher status group will be less satisfied with their own status and more prior to negative self-esteem" (p. 57).

Kaplin (1975) expressed similar thought when he stated that when individuals adopt the values and goals of society they may in effect be adopting goals and values which may be either too high or unattainable. This would make the adoption of these new patterns unlikely as they could be perceived by the person as damaging or threatening to their self-esteem. This in turn leaves the route for self-enhancement to be achieved via the performance of deviant roles.
The relationship between the rejection of normative values and deviant behaviours is noteworthy if it is remembered that the individual's response to perceived rejection may be either attack, avoidance or substitution. The subsequent actions as a result of these feelings have been noted in the literature on juvenile delinquency and mental health.

Hall (1966 in Kaplin 1975) discovered in his research the positive identification which delinquent group members have within their group. He discovered that those delinquents, who define themselves as delinquents, had been through the court process and in addition possessed a high delinquent orientation and had a higher level of self-concept than expected. The marginal delinquent on the other hand, who has not as yet identified with the sub-culture, would be expected to manifest lower self-evaluation in relation to the totally committed delinquent. This is the optimum time for diversion intervention to take place as the young offender may not totally identify with a deviant subgroup and more flexible in accepting other values and experiences.

3.3 SELF-CONCEPT AND DELINQUENCY

There are certain assumptions that must be made before suggesting that a significant relationship exists between self-concept and delinquency. One such assumption of this research is that there is an association between a positive
self-concept and socially acceptable behaviour. Conversely, it must also be assumed that socially acceptable behaviour is an indication of positive self-concept. The specific hypothesis relevant to this research state that involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program will enhance the juvenile delinquent's self-concept. There has been much literature and research dealing with the effectiveness of traditional correctional programs but owing to the newness of formalized alternative community correctional strategies, such as diversion programs, little empirical evidence has been obtained regarding their effectiveness. This study hopes to add to knowledge which presently exists.

Kaplin's theory of deviant behaviour (1975, p. 6), gives validity to the previously made assumptions. He states:

1. Negative self-attitudes significantly increase the probability that deviant behaviour patterns be adopted.

2. Deviant behaviour patterns function to change self-attitudes in a more favourable direction.

Furthermore Pitts and Hamner's findings (1969, p. 1) maintain that "there is mounting evidence that the delinquent can be differentiated from the non-delinquent on the basis of self concept", thus bearing out Kaplin's (1975) assumptions.

Considering the direction Kaplin (1975) and Pitts and Hamner (1969) appear to suggest in their research, this
study focused on the self-concept of the juvenile delinquent with the aim of discovering that juvenile offenders possess a lower self-concept than the non-delinquent population. This is recognizing that the population of the Essex County Diversion Program are typically first offenders and theoretically not enmeshed in the juvenile sub-culture.

Traditional therapies and counselling methods have had varying effect on the rate of recidivism, which has been the generally used yardstick for determining the success of correctional programs. Traditional programs have focused on vocational training, job placement or additional education rather than dealing with self-esteem, attitudes and criminality (Goldburg and Johnson, 1980, p. 328), which are some of the considerations the diversion program attempts to deal with.

Diversion attempts to manipulate the situation of the juvenile offender to practice and experience socially positive experiences and acceptable behaviours (Lajeunesse 1979, p. 6). The program recognizes also that the offenders must acquire the values of society in order to feel that they have acquired a stake in society. A sense of belonging greatly increases positive feelings in an individual as well as enhancing self-concept.

Heydt (1957) concurs with the above as he has maintained that, for therapy to be effective, the individual must first be reintegrated into normal community life with some struc-
turing if necessary. Comparisons can be made between Coopersmith's (1967) limit settings and Heydt's (1957) structuring as establishing guides for acquiring self-concept. Diversion programs provide these limits for the juvenile offender while at the same time recognizing that they are not hardened criminals and taking care to ensure that individual self-concept is left as intact as possible.

Fitts and Ranner (1969) give specific guidelines to follow for treating the juvenile offender which may have had some influence on the development of the alternative strategies for corrections. They believed that to be effective the correctional environment must:

1. Convey to the offender's that they are still a person of worth and value despite previous behaviour.

2. Help the delinquent to avoid negative behaviour, but more importantly to find new behaviour that will be more rewarding.

3. Provide ample opportunity for rewards for the exhibition of new positive behaviours (Fitts et. al., 1969, p. 2).

These recommendations were suggested once a realization was made that much of the delinquent's anti-social behaviour is a direct expression of the negative views he holds of himself and it is increasingly apparent that no real or permanent changes in the behaviour of the young offender will be accomplished unless he is also helped to change.
Schmidberg (1957) wrote that one of her goals in correctional therapy was to influence the behaviour of the individual in such a way as to change the value identification of the offender. Schmidburg believed that the individual who identified with the norms and values of society would be less likely to do anything of a negative nature against that society. If individuals identify with a group or culture it would be detrimental to their own sense of self if they attacked those values the group or culture espoused.

Coopersmith (1967) put it in terms more applicable to the theories of self and its antecedents. To enhance self-concept Coopersmith (1967) maintained that "it is important to determine the basis or bases a given individual employs in judging his worth as this may be a crucial step in ascertaining the source of a person's difficulties" (p. 262). It should be recalled that not every person values or evaluates himself using the same criteria. Therapeutic intervention may be misguided if effort is not made to determine accurately the area or areas of distress. Coopersmith (1967) believed also that conditions necessary for the acquisition of self-esteem required a considerably more structured, demanding and specific type of therapy than traditional therapeutic rehabilitation methods (p. 263). An important consideration is that self-concept takes years to acquire and once acquired remains relatively fixed and difficult to affect. A highly manipulative and structured therapeutic
setting will help to accelerate the therapeutic process. Another recommendation of Coopersmith (1967) is that individuals may benefit markedly by modelling their behaviour after an effective, competent person (p. 263). A good role model, whether real or experienced vicariously, may go far in providing a positive example for a person. There is a risk however, if an individual sets the standards of the role model either too high or too low.

3.4 SUMMARY
This chapter has attempted to illustrate the inherent difficulties in defining self-concept. In addition to the divergent definitions of self-concept there are several diverse theories alluding to the development of self-concept. Theories of personality are other relevant considerations; however, their examination was beyond the scope of this literature review.

This chapter has attempted to give an understanding of the term self-concept and its broad application in the literature. One of the inherent difficulties in the literature is the various but somehow similar definitions authors use in describing the criteria defining self-concept. The examination of the antecedents of self-concept illustrated some of the basic principles underlying the definitions of self-concept and provided an understanding of how it is acquired.
Chapter IV
RESEARCH DESIGN

4.1 PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the Essex County Diversion Program would affect the self-concept of those individuals who went through the program.

It has been suggested by Fitts (1969) that rehabilitation programs, out of necessity for success, focus on more than the traditional factors of employment, education, and punishment. A concurrent approach should be attempted which includes efforts to enhance self-concept.

A commonality which appears in populations of young offenders, which have been studied, is that invariably they possess deviant self-concept levels (Fitts and Hamner, 1972). Most studies of rehabilitation programs have limited themselves to the measurement of success by a single criterion: the rate of recidivism. This study is an attempt to validate Fitts and Hamner's (1972) assertions that rehabilitative success is dependent on the enhancement of self-concept.

Given the lack of program evaluation which exists, regarding the Essex County Diversion Program, this research attempts to determine if the rehabilitation efforts of the program are effective or in need of modification.
One of the original reasons for this research was to provide the diversion program with an evaluation of specific aspects of its services. Evaluation of community correction programs are scarce and it was agreed by those concerned that an evaluation would be appropriate as the Essex County Program has been operating for approximately six years since the last formal evaluation which occurred shortly after the inception of the program. The findings of this study, as well as those entailed in Breton (1982) and Morneau (1984), could conceivably initiate changes in the diversion program which would alter its goals and objectives and subsequently increase the effectiveness of the program. This study, along with Breton (1982) and Morneau (1984), may presumably provide some empirical data with which to improve the program.

4.2 HYPOTHESES

This research attempted to gather and analyse data relevant to the following hypotheses:

1. Involvement with and completion of the Essex County Diversion Program will result in a positive change in the self-concepts of the participating juvenile offenders.

2. There is a statistically significant relationship between enhanced levels of self-concept and the number of hours required by the compensatory task,
number of contacts with the diversion worker, and
number of contacts with the placement agency.

The first hypothesis attempts to examine a cause-effect
relationship between self-concept and the diversion program,
while the second hypothesis examines the association between
the demographic variables and the levels of self-concept of
diversion clientele.

4.3 DESIGN CLASSIFICATION

This study according to the classification system developed
by Tripodi, Felli and Meyer (1969, p. 38), is classified as
a quantitative-descriptive study, sub-type hypotheses testing.

4.4 ASSUMPTIONS

For the sake of this research the following assumptions
will be accepted, as they have support in the literature.

1. Self-concept and behaviour are inter-related. In the
context of this research an individual's deviant
behaviour is an indicator of low self-concept, and
inversely, a low self-concept will be indicative of
socially undesirable behaviour.

2. An understanding of an internal frame of reference
helps to predict behaviour (Fitts, 1972, p.9). Poss-
essing some knowledge of an individual's perception
of themselves will help to understand some of the
origins of his or her behaviour.
3. Understanding self-concept may represent more basic and vital information than symptomology when considering an individual's motivation and treatment. (Fitts, 1972, No. 4, p. 113).

4. Self-concept is a central and critical variable in human behaviour (Fitts, 1972, p. 1).

5. It was assumed, and determined as accurately as possible, that procedures and personnel were constant throughout the Essex County Diversion Program.

6. It was assumed that the effect the diversion variable had on the subjects could be isolated and identified regardless of the other internal or external variables.

4.5 OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

The following operational definitions were used in the design of this study.

**Essex County Diversion Program** - a community oriented correctional program designed to redirect juveniles from the court system.

**Diversion Program Staff** - at the time of this study the staff of the diversion program consisted of the following: The Administrator/Program Director, the Diversion worker and the secretary.

**Self-Concept** - as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, of which thirteen (13) dimensions of a possible thirty-two (32) were used in this study.
Juvenile Delinquent Behaviour - as determined by the courts and police to be in contravention of the Criminal Code of Canada, the Juvenile Delinquents Act, or Municipal Bylaws.

4.6 POPULATION

This research sampled those juvenile offenders entering the Essex County Diversion Program between the months of April 1982 and July 1982. The population consisted of fourteen self-admitted male juvenile offenders who were under sixteen years of age. Data collection commenced in April of 1982, with the instruments being administered by the Diversion Worker, and was completed in July of 1982 by the writer. Each subject, a first-time offender, according to the criteria of the program, had been given the choice of proceeding to court on the charge(s), or entering the diversion program and signing a statement of facts: admitting guilt. Six juveniles, who entered the program during the time of this study, chose not to participate in this research.

Pitts and Hamer's (1969) research provides norms for both delinquent and non-delinquent populations and these norms will be used for comparison purposes.

That other diversion projects which are operating in Canada have either minor or major procedural differences precludes this study from being generalizable to those
diversion programs. The small sample size, statistically speaking, may prove a limitation as it reflected only a portion of the juveniles who proceed through the diversion program.

It is noteworthy that the low number of subjects within the time of this study was not indicative of the number of juvenile offenders who are usually referred to the Essex County Diversion Program through the course of a year.

4.7 COMPARISON OF POPULATION SAMPLES

The three programs used for comparison purposes to this study will be discussed briefly to allow some understanding of the various treatment techniques used in therapy with young offenders. This section will illustrate the differences which exist in the treatment programs used in this study and provide some clarification why one program may be more effective than another.

Glenn Joplin's study (Fitts and Hamner, 1969, p.23) involved a pre-post test comparison of twenty-eight (28) male subjects at the Highfields Center in New Jersey. Emphasis at the Highfields' program stresses personal adjustment rather than vocational or academic training. Treatment scores are given in Table 10.

The second comparison sample is Hamner's (Fitts and Hamner, 1969, p. 7), in which pre-test and post-tests of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were used on a group of 58
subjects, 28 in the experimental group, 30 in the control group. The subjects were all inmates of the Tennessee Intensive Treatment Rehabilitation Center. Hamner used an intensive program of group techniques, operant conditioning, peers as reinforcers, videotape, drug therapy and planned tarill seeking experiences (Fitts and Hamner, 1969, p. 45). This treatment was in addition to the regular therapy carried out in the institution. The subjects were tested previous to their undergoing therapy and again—immediately after their two week intensive treatment. The results are seen in Table 10.

The final comparison group considered by this study is the Fitts' group. These data are presented in the Tennessee Self-Concept Manual (Fitts, 1965, p. 14). This sample was taken of 626 people from various parts of the country; age ranged from 12 to 68; there was an equal representation of men and women, and black and white subjects; representatives from all socio-economic levels were considered; all educational levels were represented from sixth grade to doctoral degrees. These data are represented in Table 10.

4.8 METHODOLOGY

The following instruments were used in this study.

1. A questionnaire designed to collect demographic information on subjects and their families. Variables consisted of age, sex, education, parents varia
tal status, financial status of family. (See Appendix J)

2. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Pitts, 1965) is a multi-variable self report instrument which measures different aspects of an individual's self-concept. (See Appendix K).

3. A self report questionnaire to ascertain specific information from the subjects dealing with their perceptions of the diversion program and their individual experiences within it. (See Appendix L).

The first questionnaire and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were administered to the subjects once they met the admissions criteria of the diversion program. The subjects were informed that their participation in the research was voluntary and were then requested, by the Diversion Worker, to answer the questionnaires. The parents of the subjects were permitted to assist in the completion of the demographic questionnaire if they wished or if the subject did not possess the required information. Once this questionnaire was completed, the subjects were instructed by the Diversion Worker to answer the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. This scale was to be answered by the subjects unaided. Subjects were permitted to ask for clarification of words or phrases if these were not clear to them.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale can be easily completed by anyone who has a grade six reading level and it does not
require any special comprehension ability (Pitts, 1965, p. 1). The scale was administered by the writer to two groups of problem adolescents in the public school system to pre-test and become familiar with the instrument. The children ranged in ages from twelve to fifteen years and did not have any difficulty in completing the scale. The administration of the scale was not a difficult task and required little preparation or fore-knowledge.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was also chosen due to the standardization of the scoring procedures which would reduce the likelihood of bias or error. The scale has also been used and tested extensively which has provided standardized statistics for normal and other populations (Pitts 1965, p. 14).

Subjects were assured that their responses would be kept confidential and that they would not be identified in anyway in the research or to the diversion program. To exemplify this, the completed questionnaires were sealed in legal size envelopes by the subjects and delivered, unopened, to the researcher. Initial testing was conducted either in the subject's home or in the diversion offices in the provincial court building in Windsor.

The time required to complete the Information Questionnaire and the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was approximately thirty minutes.
The post-test of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was administered by the writer at the home of the subject as was the Diversion Questionnaire.

The subjects were aware of the purpose of the research as it was explained to them initially by the Diversion Worker and again during the post test by the writer. The Information Release Consent Form, which was attached to the questionnaires, also explained the purpose of this study. (See Appendix M). This form was completed by the subjects upon their initial testing. The Information Release Consent form was included in this research study to deal with the possibility of subjects' or subjects' parents taking exception to some of the questions in this research.

4.8.1 **The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale**

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was selected for use with this study because the scale has been used extensively by its author William Potts as well as others, such as Thompson (1972), Joplin (in Potts et al., 1969), to measure the self-concept of deviant and delinquent populations.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale measures thirty-two (32), separate and different aspects of self-concept (Potts, 1965). Recently the test's originators have developed two additional measures already existing within the present scale to measure and interpret self-concept. It was determined, however, that only certain subscales would be appro-
appropriate and necessary for this research. The subscales which were used are as follows, (Pitts, 1965, p. 2-3):

1. **Self-Criticism Score (SC):** This scale is composed of mildly derogatory statements which most people admit to being applicable to themselves. High scores generally indicate a normal healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism. Extremely high scores indicate a deficit in defences and the individual may be pathologically undeveloped. Low scores indicate defensiveness and that the Positive Scores (P), are probably artificially elevated.

2. **The Total Positive Score (P):** This is the most important subscale on the Tennesse Self-Concept Scale as it indicates the overall level of self-esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they have value and worth and they have confidence in themselves and act accordingly. Persons with low scores are doubtful of their own worth, view themselves as being undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed and unhappy with little faith and confidence in themselves.

3. **The Now One P Score—Identity:** The individual describes his basic identity with this score answering items which reflect "what I am".

4. **The Now Two P Score—Self-Satisfaction:** This score reflects how the individual describes the self ac
perceives in the Row One P and Row Three P Scores. This score measures the level of self-satisfaction or self-acceptance.

5. **The Row Three P Score Behaviour**: This score measures the individual's perception of his or her own behaviour or functioning.

6. **Column A Score— Physical Self**: With this scale, the individual expresses his or her view of their body, state of health, physical appearance, skills and sexuality.

7. **Column B Score— Moral-Ethical Self**: This score describes the person from a moral/ethical frame of reference which includes a sense of moral worth, a relationship to God, feelings of being a good or bad person and satisfaction with religion or the lack of it.

8. **Column C Score— Personal Self**: This score reflects the individual's sense of personal worth. Feelings of adequacy as a person and personality are evaluated here apart from the body or others.

9. **Column D Score— Family Self**: This score reflects the person's feeling of adequacy, worth and value as a family member. This scale is also a reflection of an individual's perception of self in reference to his or her closest and immediate circle or associates.
10. **Column E Score- Social Self:** The individual's sense of adequacy and worth in social interactions with other people is scored by this scale.

11. **The Variability Scores- (Total Y):** These scores indicate consistency from one area of self-perception to another. High scores imply the person tends to see himself in a compartmental way and view parts of himself separately from the remainder of self. Low "variability" scores below the first percentile may indicate rigidity in self-perception. Well integrated people, as measured by Fits & Hamner (1965, p. 14), tend to score just below the mean.

12. **The True-False Ratio (T/F):** This score is an affirmation of self and an elimination of what is not the self. High T/F scores indicate the individual is achieving self-definition by focusing on what they are and are unable to define self in terms of what they are not. Low T/F scores mean the exact opposite.

4.8.2 **GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

The General Information Questionnaire was intended to measure demographically the population to account for and control those other variables measured in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which may affect self-concept. It was thought that relationships between the demographic data and self-concept levels could be found.
This instrument was a self-report questionnaire which was given to the subject during the initial interview for the diversion program. The subject's family were informed that they could help the subjects with this questionnaire.

This questionnaire was utilized as a convenient means of assessing the present familial circumstances and their possible effects on the young offender. Ideally a follow-up study involving personal interviews, to determine changes in family dynamics and personal situations, would have been most beneficial in evaluating which variables had the most effect during the young offender's tenure in the program.

This questionnaire was pre-tested on the same two groups of children as were mentioned previously. Some of the original items were modified or deleted as a result of the pre-test to make the questionnaire more logical and understandable.

4.8.3 The Diversion Questionnaire

The Diversion Questionnaire was developed to determine the perceptions of young offenders concerning personal perceptions of the program, their diversion worker and their overall impressions of their experiences. The two previously mentioned questionnaires did not allow for any subjective feedback about the program and it was thought that some additional information could be obtained from this third questionnaire. Questions were intentionally left open so
that the participants might expand upon their answers to provide more information regarding their perceptions of the diversion experience. Ample space was provided for answers in the event of lengthier responses.

This questionnaire, as were the two previous ones, was a self-report questionnaire. It was pre-tested on the same group of subjects used to test the other two questionnaires.

4.9 STATISTICAL PROCEDURES

A variety of statistical procedures were used in analyzing the data for this study. A computer was employed utilizing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS Institute Inc., 1978). The General Information and Diversion Questionnaire were treated as interval data and appropriate statistics such as percentages and averages were utilized to describe the data.

The subscales of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were treated as interval data. T-tests were used to determine if significant differences in means occurred between the pre- and post-test data and with the other studies cited in the subsequent chapter. Pearson product-moment correlation procedures were used to demonstrate correlations between variables of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

A series of T-tests were performed to determine if a relationship existed between the subjects of this research and those in Joplin, Hammer and Pitts' research (Pitts, 1972). A critical value was established for each sample and
was compared to this study's research findings. A prime value was computed and compared to the critical value previously established. If the prime value was greater than the critical value, a significant difference was deemed to exist. Negative prime values were interpreted as positive values, as this was a one directional test. This exercise was performed to illustrate the similarities which exist between this study's sample and other data gathered from different samples of juvenile offenders.

Discussion will be brief in the comparisons of the juvenile offender samples, but a more detailed examination will be undertaken of the Pitts' data and this study's sample.

4.9.1 CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

Extraneous variables must be considered when measuring for variations in self-concept. Whether the influence of extraneous variables can be controlled in the experimental or therapeutic situation, is cause for discussion.

It would be illogical to believe that involvement in the diversion program was the sole independent variable affecting self-concept levels. Taking into consideration the maximum number of hours, forty, which could be assigned to an individual it would be presumptuous to assume that the diversion program could be the singular force effecting change in self-concept.
This factor is referred to as 'contemporary history' by Isaac and Michael (1972 in Smith, 1976 p. 65). Contemporary history acknowledges the experiences the study population may have outside the experimental situation and how these experiences may affect the scores of the study population. These experiences are beyond the scope of this research to document accurately or assess properly.
Chapter V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of the findings is presented under three headings. Each section consists of a presentation of the research findings and their relationship to the previously mentioned hypotheses.

The first section shall present data regarding the population sample and deal with the analysis of this data using percentages and averages.

The second section will examine and compare this study's population to other populations tested using the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale to show the relevance of this research's data to other research of a similar nature.

The third section will present data relating to the two hypotheses which will attempt to measure differences between pre- and post-program test scores.

Self-concept has been theorized by differing authors to be the result of age, sex, I.Q., race, socio-economic status, birth order, marital status or other variables.

Fitts (1972, p. 13) cites several studies in which samples were carefully matched in regard to demographic variables and the results have not proved conclusively that these demographic variables contribute to variations in
self-concept. Pitts does concede that the demographic variable which has the greatest effect is age. However, most delinquent studies, including this one, deal with individuals who represent only a narrow age range. Pitts (1972) concludes that "age is not a significant factor in the differences between delinquents and non-delinquent nor accounts for the within group differences among delinquents" (p. 13). In fact, the general findings of Pitts (1972) and other studies indicate that demographic variables do not account for self-concept differences.

It is advantageous, however, if these variables are understood and identified as they are important in describing the study sample. In a subsequent section correlations between the demographic variables and self-concept will be discussed which will either give support to or refute Pitts' (1972) assertions.

5.1 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF POPULATION

5.1.1 AGE

The population consisted of fourteen male subjects ranging in age from twelve years of age to sixteen. The mean age was 14.14.

As seen from the table, the largest category consisted of fifteen year olds (35.72%), next were the fourteen year olds (28.57%). The next largest category was the thirteen year olds who consisted of 21.43% of the population sampled.
TABLE 1

Age of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x=14.14
sd.=1.99

5.1.2 EDUCATION

The educational level each subject had attained at the time of testing is shown in Table 2

TABLE 2

Educational Level of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one subject failed to report his grade level
Finding significance or association between grade and involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program is difficult. This is due to the diversity and unique curriculum available to each student. A student's age is no longer an accurate reflection of his achieved grade level as it was traditionally. The opportunities for students to advance, or not, through the school system, at their own pace, makes it unlikely that a statistical correlation will be found.

5.1.3 CHARGES

The charges which preceded the involvement of the young person with the Essex County Diversion Program are recorded in Table 3. The table is divided into three categories: one is theft over or theft under $200, category two is break, enter and theft over or theft under $200, and category three is other miscellaneous charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft (over/under)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break &amp; Enter and Theft (over/under)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*three subjects failed to report
As the table of the charges indicates, the predominate offences committed by the study sample were property offences. This is consistent with the diversion philosophy and practice in screening of individuals. Only those individuals who were not a clear or present threat to society or other persons, were considered as candidates for the diversion program (Moyer, 1980).

5.1.4 **Marital Status of Parents**

The status of the parents was divided into two categories. Parents were either considered married or not married. The single category consisted of all divorced, separated, widowed or single parents. The married category included common-law relationships. Table 4 describes the marital status of the young offender's parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 4, eleven of the fourteen subjects lived with both their parents. This was not
expected as, ordinarily, many children experiencing the type of difficulties which this study's subjects were, would be thought to live in single parent households. Single parent households might experience more daily stresses and problems than would normally be the case of two parent households (Schaerfer and Millman, 1977, p. 226). The research did not account for nor measure the incidents of separation, divorce, or widowhood which may have preceded their current status or living arrangements.

5.1.5 **COMPENSATORY TASK: HOURS ASSIGNED**

The hours of community service each subject was required to perform varied according to the seriousness of the offence and the circumstances surrounding the illegal act. The hours assigned varied between 10 and 38 with the maximum possible being 40 hours. The mean number of hours was 25.21. The data are presented in Table 5.

### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Assigned</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.1-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 14 100.00

$x=25.21$

$s_d=3.17$
Many of the tasks assigned were of a menial or janitorial nature. Subjects were often required to do this type of work for churches, homes for the aged and other non-profit organizations. The majority of the subjects in the Essex County Diversion Program completed their assigned hours successfully and were subsequently discharged from the program.

5.1.6 CONTACTS WITH PLACEMENT AGENCY

The placement agency is where the subject was assigned to perform the community work. All tasks performed were menial in nature and consisted of either maintenance or janitorial work. The frequency of contacts may not be representative as some confusion may have existed in the mind of the young offender when responding to the questionnaire. The questionnaire did not specify what kind of contacts were to be included when answering this question. Telephone conversations may be included in the totals. The inclusion of these data was still considered relevant as it was believed any contact the young offender had with the placement agency was significant. Table 6 lists the findings.

The missing values were due to the failure of the subjects to report or their inability to recall the number of contacts they had with their respective placement agencies.
### TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts with Placement Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x = 6.45$

$s d = 5.34$

$median = 4$

*three subjects failed to report

The majority of subjects had less than five contacts with their respective placement agency. It is a safe assumption to speculate that the frequency of contacts with the placement agency and its personnel was not great and, therefore, would unlikely be very influential on the subjects.

### 5.1.7 CONTACTS WITH DIVERSION WORKER

Similar to the previous section the number of contacts the young offender recorded may also include telephone conversations as well as personal interviews. Table 7 presents the findings.

As it does not seem likely that the diversion workers could effectively perform their function by having only one personal contact with the young offender, it is therefore
TABLE 7

Contacts with Diversion Worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x=1.79
sd.=.7

assumed that communication between the diversion worker and young offender was performed by a third party, in some cases either the referral agency or diversion secretary acted as a middle man. It is noteworthy that a personal or telephone contact is not necessary to conclude the involvement of the young person in the diversion program. A letter was customarily sent to the young offender stating that the conditions of the diversion order have been met.

This practice has changed since this research has been completed. Individuals who now complete the diversion program are brought before the court to have their charge dispensed with. This normally involves a statement by the diversion worker indicating that the client has successfully completed the assigned number of hours, upon which the judge orders the charges to be withdrawn.
5.1.8 The Diversion Experience

Table 8 illustrates the impressions the young offenders had of their diversion experience at the conclusion of their compensatory task. The question put to the subjects asked if the diversion experience was worthwhile and if they would have liked to do some other task than the one that was required of them.

**TABLE 8**

Subject's Impressions of Diversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Found Worthwhile</th>
<th>Do Something Different</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That so many of the subjects found their compensatory task worthwhile and did not wish to do something different implies that the screening process and matching of individuals to tasks by the diversion worker is most satisfactory according to the program's participants. To influence positively the young offender by the diversion experience it is important that they feel that the work they are assigned to do is worthwhile.

Another possible explanation for the high level of satisfaction reported by the subjects is that they may have felt
they were let off easily by performing the task which was required of them. Perhaps consideration was given by the subjects to future involvements in the diversion program which may account for their reluctance to propose different compensatory tasks which they may find unfamiliar and more difficult.

5.1.9 **NEW CHARGES**

Table 9 illustrates the number of new charges which were incurred by the young offender while involved with the diversion program. Additional information regarding the nature of the charges was not collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charged</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That there were only two new charges may be accounted for by the screening process of the Essex County Diversion Program. Individuals who chose to participate are judged by the diversion worker to be more likely to complete the compensatory task and be good candidates for the program.
That so few of the subjects incurred new charges may not be an accurate indicator of the influence of the Essex County Diversion Program. These findings, rather, may represent the screening process of the diversion program and may more accurately reflect the motivation in the individuals to stay out of further conflict with the law.

5.2 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

5.2.1 EDUCATION

There would be difficulty in establishing if an association between the subjects' grade level and their involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program existed. This is due to the diverse and unique curriculum available for each student. A student's age was not necessarily an accurate reflection of the grade level attained as once it was. Another problem becomes apparent when one considers that students can also fail grades. The opportunity for students to advance through the school system at their own pace makes it unlikely that a statistical correlation will be found.

5.2.2 MARITAL STATUS

Initially it was thought that a differing level of self-concept might exist between individuals who were living in single parent homes and individuals who were living with both parents. It was believed that individuals with single parents would possess a lower self-concept than children of
two parent families. It was thought that those individuals in single parent families may perceive themselves as being less worthy or different from others. Feelings of guilt and self-admonishment have been associated with parental disharmony (Schaeffer and Millman, 1977, p. 226). It was thought that these feelings may be evidenced by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The data in this study did not show statistical significance and the hypothesis was rejected.

5.2.3 CONTACTS WITH PLACEMENT AGENCY

This statistic resulted in presenting a skewed picture of the sample as a result of the extreme values reported. The median of 4 is thought to be a more accurate representation of the number of contacts with the placement agency, which is based upon verbal confirmation with the diversion worker. The mean of 6.45 is not very accurate in light of the extreme number of contacts reported. The mean number of contacts when the extreme values are not considered is 3.8, which more closely approximates the median.

The number of contacts the young offender had with the placement agency was thought to be relevant to this research. The more contacts that occurred the higher the probability that the young offender would identify with the new positive role models they would be exposed to. This is supported by the theory of differential association which was discussed in the previous chapter.
5.2.4 IMPRESSIONS OF DIVERSION

Table 8 shows that the majority of young offenders found the diversion experience worthwhile (92.8%) and thought the task they performed in their respective community agencies acceptable (85.7%). This is, according to the literature, expected. Though most community service tasks involved menial, laborious or volunteer work, the subjects stated they achieved some feeling of success and competency. Once exposed to these feelings, the young offender will more likely seek out the "alternative life-style" they may have experienced in performing their community service (Mathews, 1979, p. 319).

That such a high percentage of the program's participants found their community work agreeable and did not wish a change, is a positive reflection on the program and the placements available in it. Since most felt the placements worthwhile and beneficial, this may indicate that increased exposure or increased hours of community work could produce more effective results than those presently attained by the program in relation to client satisfaction.

Alternatively, the subjects may have thought the tasks either easy or not very demanding. They may have given a very distorted or elevated impression of the diversion program for this reason.
5.2.5 NEW CHARGES

The vast majority of subjects (85.7%) completed the diversion program without incident. As is more often than not the case, the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs is measured by the rate of recidivism or additional charges. This study can not directly address the recidivism rate of individuals who have completed the program. Table 9 shows the successful completion rate of the subjects, while in the program, without additional legal involvement. This rate of 85.4% is noteworthy and may be a truer reflection of the diversion program's effectiveness.

That so many of the subjects finished their community work uneventfully is either a reflection of the individual's response to the program or of the screening process, or both. A high success rate is easily achieved if subjects are chosen on the basis of being the most likely to succeed.

Other explanations for the high success rate are possible, i.e., the program's minimal expectations of its participants or an inability of the program or legal system to detect further infractions of the law.

It may be preferable in the future to take a chance on those individuals who are a higher risk as they may derive as great or greater benefit from the Essex County Diversion Program. While this may negatively effect the "success rate" of the program, the advantages to the more entrenched juvenile delinquents may have further reaching effects.
5.2.6 CONTACTS WITH DIVERSION WORKER

As can be seen in Table Seven the average number of contacts between the diversion worker and the young offender was not high (1.79). It should be remembered that the data obtained in this research were provided by the subjects and not the diversion worker. However, if the data are an accurate reflection of the number of contacts then, on the whole, there does not appear to be any great effort to engage the young offender in a counselling relationship other than to provide a positive community service placement.

One of the hypotheses of this study is that increased contacts with the Essex County Diversion Program will enhance self-concept. However, if contact is as infrequent as the data suggest then the positive proposed change in self-concept is unlikely to occur, that is, if any consideration is given to psychological theory which strongly recommends personal counselling as beneficial to change.

5.3 DATA COMPARISON OF DEVIANT POPULATIONS

The intent of this section is to compare the findings of this research with those of other similar research. The aim is to see if certain constants exist in the "delinquent" populations and whether test results of one sample are generalizable to those of another.

The data for comparison purposes are presented in Table 10.
### TABLE 10

Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barger (n=14)</th>
<th>Joplin (n=28)</th>
<th>Hamner (n=38)</th>
<th>Fitts (n=626)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.S.C.S. subscores</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>319.2</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True/</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral/</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>114.5</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>109.4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-criticism</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean scores are presented with standard deviations to allow for a more thorough comparison and understanding of the data of these four studies. A closer examination of the data will demonstrate that similarities exist among delinquent populations. Also apparent are the differences between the delinquent groups and the Fitts scores, which represent the normal population.

5.3.1 JOPLIN'S STUDY

Scores in which significant differences in the means between this study's data and Joplin's data (Fitts, 1969, p. 50) are: "post-positive" scores, pre- and post- "T/F" scores, post- "physical" scores, post- "moral/ethical" scores and post- "identity" scores.

In all but one score the statistical differences in the mean scores occurred in the post score comparison. From this finding an assumption may be made that Joplin studied a program which was therapeutically more effective than the Essex County Diversion Program. Joplin's subjects ranged higher in the post-test scores or overall self-concept than did the subjects in this research.

The Hillfields study which is examined in Joplin's research is a highly intensiried, institutionalized, relatively long term program (Fitts 1969, p. 23). A detailed explanation of the program will not occur here but major emphasis of the Hillfield program is on group approaches
where the boys have considerable responsibility in setting and enforcing limits and behavioural standards.

As seen in Table 11 the pre- "T/F" scores of both sample groups indicates deviancy, in Joplin's study less so. There exists a significant difference in the means between the two groups' scores. The fact that this study's sample scored higher on this scale is an area which requires more research adequately to explain the differences. Joplin's subjects were incarcerated individuals, and as such should theoretically demonstrate greater deviant scores than those individuals in this study. This is according to Pitts (1972), who deduces that individuals involved more deeply in the criminal justice system will have a more deviant self-concept than the rest of society.

There are only six subscores of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which varied significantly between these two groups of juvenile offenders. The most interesting statistic in Joplin's study is the dramatic increase in the overall positive score of the Highfield's subjects. Further examination of Joplin's data indicates that there were positive gains in all the categories of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which were used for comparison in this study. In this study there were positive changes in nine of the thirteen categories examined.
### TABLE 11

A Comparison of Mean Scores of Barger and Joplin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barger (x)</th>
<th>Joplin (x)</th>
<th>T-Critical</th>
<th>T-Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Posit.</td>
<td>319.2</td>
<td>341.7</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Posit.</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre T/F</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T/F</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Var.</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Var.</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Phys.</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Phys.</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Moral</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Moral</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-2.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Person.</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Person.</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Family</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Family</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Social</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Social</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Identity</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Identity</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-2.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Self-Sat.</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Self-Sat.</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Behav.</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Behav.</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre S/C</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S/C</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

p<.05
d.f.=40
5.3.2 HAMNER'S STUDY

Table 12 shows that there were only four significantly different correlations between Hamner's research sample and this research's sample in the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale's scores. This is similar to Joplin's findings, which support Pitts' theory, which states that there exists little difference between the self-concepts of different deviant groups.

The scores which had significant differences in the two populations were: pre- and post-"variability", post-"identity", and pre- and post-"self-satisfaction".

Hamner's sample scored higher on the pre and post "variability" scales indicating that a greater degree of inconsistency existed in his sample than this study's research. Hamner's subjects being more involved in the deviant sub-culture have compartmentalized certain areas resulting in poor integration of the self. The mean score for Hamner's subjects was 63.00 and 59.00 respectively, while the norm is 49.00. As can be seen Hamner's subjects scored much higher.

The third significant area of difference is the post-"identity" score. Hamner's subjects possessed a higher mean than this research's subjects. The pre-test scores were not significantly different but the therapeutic intervention undertaken by Hamner has obviously had a positive enough effect on the post-"identity" scores of the subjects.
### TABLE 12

A Comparison of Mean Scores of Barger and Hammer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barger (x)</th>
<th>Hamner (x)</th>
<th>T-Critical</th>
<th>T-Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Posit.</td>
<td>319.2</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Posit.</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre T/F.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T/F.</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Variabl.</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-4.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postability</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-2.7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Phys.</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Phys.</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Moral</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Moral</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Person.</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Person.</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Family</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Family</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Social</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Social</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Ident.</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Ident.</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Self Sat.</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Self Sat.</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Behav.</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Behav.</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre S/C</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S/C</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant
p<.05
d.f.=70
to bring about a statistically significant improvement. Hamner's subjects possessed higher pre- and post-"identity" scores than this study's sample, 121.00 and 123.00 respectively, compared with 114.64 and 114.43 respectively.

The fourth and fifth differences between sample means occurs in the pre- and post-"self-satisfaction" subscore. Hamner's subjects scored low enough on this sub-scale to be significantly different from this study's sample. This subscale measures an individual's acceptance of one's self, the low score exhibited by Hamner's sample likely reflects the negative feelings and turmoil the individuals have or themselves.

Hamner's subjects scored 92 and 95 respectively, on the pre- and post-tests while this study's subjects scored 104 and 109 respectively. The normative score is 103.

5.3.3 FITTS GROUP

The fact that 11 of the 24 subscale scores differed significantly in the comparison of means between this study's data and the norms established by Pitts (1965, p. 10) was expected. Overall levels of self-concept are lower in adolescent groups, while delinquents have a greater deviation in their scores as well as having lower scores (Pitts, 1969). Scores can be seen in Table 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barger(x)</th>
<th>Fitts(x)</th>
<th>T-Critical</th>
<th>T-Prime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Posit.</td>
<td>319.2</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Posit.</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre T/F</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>5.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T/F</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Var.</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Var.</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Phys.</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Phys.</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Moral</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-8.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Moral</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-4.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Personal</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Personal</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Family</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-3.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Family</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Social</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-3.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Social</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Identity</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-4.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Identity</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-3.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Self Sat.</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Self Sat.</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Behaviour</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-5.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Behaviour</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-4.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre S/C</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S/C</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant
p<.05
d.f.=638
More beneficial comparisons can be made if pre- and post-scores of this research are examined in relation to the normative score which is the same for each pre- and post-comparison. For example the "positive" pre-score is significantly different in comparison to the normative "positive" mean score, 319.21 and 346.00 respectively. A comparison of the post-"positive" score and the normative score indicates the significant difference in means has disappeared, 324.57 and 346.00 respectively. This may be significant in that involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program may have had a positive effect on the self-concept of the young offenders who participated in the program.

Similarly, for the pre- and post-"T/P" scores a significant difference exists between both pre and post scores. However, this statistical significance is reduced upon the completion of the Essex County Diversion Program with the post-"T/P" score more closely approaching the norm. The scores are 1.71 and 1.58 respectively while the normative score is 1.03.

The same can be said for the pre- and post-"moral/ethical" scores. Significant differences continue to exist after the completion of the Essex County Diversion Program but the difference reflected is less with the post-score. The scores are 58.14 and 59.43 respectively which the normative score is 70.00.
The same can be said again for pre- and post-"identity" score. The pre-score is 114.64, the post-score is 114.43 and the normative score for comparison is 127.00.

Finally, in the same vein, pre- and post-"behaviour" scores remain significantly different but there is less variance in the post-"behaviour" score than with the pre-"behaviour" score. The scores are pre 100.57, post 100.79 and the normative score is 115.00.

Significant changes occurred in the means of the pre- and post-"family" and normative scores. The significant difference in the means disappears in the post-"family" score so that the normative "family" mean score and the post-test score are not statistically divergent enough to warrant attention. Improvement is therefore believed to have taken place in the individual's relationship to the primary social group which includes family and close friends (Pitts, 1969, p. 3). The respective scores are 63.43 (pre) and 66.57 (post) with the normative score being 71.

Echoing very similar results are the pre- and post-"social" scores. Statistically significant change has occurred in the post-score to negate any significant difference in the means between this research study's sample and the norms. The figures are 63.50 (pre), 65.07 (post), and the normative score is 68.00.

This score reflects a positive change in the individual's "self as perceived by others" (Pitts, 1965, p. 3). This
score reflects the subject's view of self in regard to other people in general. This may be accountable to the Essex County Diversion Program, one of the goals of which is to provide new experiences and more positively orientated role models for the young offender. Exposure to different people outside of the young offender's own peer group may have enhanced the young person's self-concept in this area.

Five subscores neither pre- nor post- differed significantly from the norms; these are the "physical", "personal", "self-satisfaction", "variability", and "self-criticism".

5.4 **PRE/POST COMPARISON OF MEANS**

In this section a comparison of means generated by this research shall be undertaken. A one-tailed t-test was used to determine if there were any significant differences in the means of the pre and post test subscores for the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. A critical value was determined ($t=1.771$) and used to establish significance ($p=.05$, $df=13$). If a t-score was found to be greater than the critical value then it could be hypothesized that there was a significant difference in the means and a change in self-concept had occurred. Negative t-score values were interpreted as positive values as this was a one directional test for association.

Table 14 gives the results of the comparison of means for the subscales.
There were only two subscores which changed enough to be significant: the "family" and "self-criticism" scores.

To say that the Essex County Diversion Program was the only single intervening variable and did not have a major effect on change in self-concept scores would be simplistic and erroneous. The fact that significant change did not occur in ten of the twelve subscales of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale does not mean that the diversion experience is negligible in relation to enhancing self-concept. Noticeable change did occur in five of the twelve subscores.

Considering what little was required of the program's participants it is remarkable that any change in levels of
self-concept occurred at all. Taking into account the few contacts with the diversion worker and placement agency, that there was no other therapeutic intervention and the small number of hours performed, it may be hoped that with a more concerted effort or concentrated program diversion may have a significant impact on the self-concept of the program's participants.

Objectively speaking, diversion has obviously contributed to some value change or clarification in the individuals to have registered some statistically significant data. A change in values is an accomplishment if consideration is given to the information presented in the last chapter, which states value change is resisted (Kroekeker, 1971, p. 123).

5.5 CORRELATION OF SELF-CONCEPT AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The negation of demographic variables as a determinant of self-concept may be verified by the findings of this research and as supported by the literature which maintains the non-effect of demographic variables on self-concept. If no association is found between the demographic variables and self-concept then further credence may be implied as to the relationship of the Essex County Diversion Program and its effect on self-concept.

The Senter Scale (Senter, 1969, p. 433) was used to determine the level of correlation among variables.
TABLE 15

Senter Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.9-.1</td>
<td>very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7-.89</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4-.69</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2-.39</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-.19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rather than report all of the different correlational values between the items, a table is used to illustrate (Table 16). In each category, a letter representing the strength of association between the two variables, as measured by the Senter Scale (Senter, 1969), shall be noted to enable a quick reference for the reader.

Table 16 does not have a single high or very high statistical correlation between items designed to test the self-concept on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale and the demographic variables which were used for comparison. This is to be expected as this study's sample was very small and it was therefore more difficult to find a correlation. As there were no significant correlations, inference can be made which supports Pitts (1972) assertion that demographic variables have only a negligible effect on self-concept.

There are, however, several moderate correlations which may be worth further examination as some of the findings may indicate the effect the Essex County Diversion Program has on self-concept.
TABLE 16

Correlations of Self-Concept and Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.S.C.S. Age</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Hrs Done</th>
<th>New Charge</th>
<th>Worker Contact</th>
<th>Agency Contact</th>
<th>Line Div.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Pos -.4m</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.2n</td>
<td>-.2n</td>
<td>-.4m</td>
<td>-.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Pos -.41</td>
<td>.6a</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre T/F -.21</td>
<td>-.1n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T/F -.41</td>
<td>-.2n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.1n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Var -.31</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.4m</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.2n</td>
<td>.2n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Var -.4m</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.0</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Phy -.2n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Phy -.2n</td>
<td>.6m</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.2n</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Mor -.6m</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.4m</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>-.6m</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Mor -.21</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Per -.0m</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Per -.4m</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>-.4m</td>
<td>-.4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Fam -.4m</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Fam -.41</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.4m</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Soc -.41</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Soc -.5m</td>
<td>.6m</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Iden -.31</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Iden -.21</td>
<td>.4m</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre SSat -.5m</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post SSat -.5m</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.1n</td>
<td>.5m</td>
<td>-.1n</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Beh -.31</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.2n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Beh -.21</td>
<td>.6m</td>
<td>-.1n</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.6m</td>
<td>-.6m</td>
<td>-.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre S/C -.31</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S/C -.1n</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.1n</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.5.1 **POSITIVE SCORE CORRELATIONS**

The most noteworthy correlation is that of the pre and post "positive" score and the number of contacts with the diversion worker. The data in Table 16 indicate that there was what could be considered a significant increase in the strength of association between the pre- and post-test results, -.19 and .45 respectively. This could have major implications for the Essex County Diversion Program as it could be suggested that increased contacts with the diversion worker could have a positive effect on the self-concept of the program's participants.

5.5.2 **VARIABILITY CORRELATIONS**

Remembering that "variability" scores represent an individual's inconsistency or variability from one area of self-perception to another will help in interpreting these correlations (Fitts, 1965, p. 2).

As Table 10 illustrates "variability" and "age" correlated low on the pre-test (-.26) but a negative moderate correlation occurred during the post-test (-.42). This may indicate that the age of an individual has an effect on the affirmation of self-concept, the older the people are, the less variability will be evident in their perceptions of self. Involvement in the diversion program may have been influential on the improved adhesiveness of the subjects' personalities and therefore on the enhancement of self-con-
cept. Additional empirical evidence or a more detailed analysis of a larger sample would be necessary to answer some of the questions which are posed.

Additionally, inconsistency in self-concept is high in comparison when pre- and post-test levels of "variability" and "number of hours in diversion" are examined, .42 and .30 respectively. While .42, is not a high correlation, the change which occurred in the pre- and post-test scores is dramatic, indicating that perhaps the exposure to the diversion program did contribute to a less variable self-concept in the individual participants. Further research would be needed in this area to show whether there is a relationship between number of diversion hours and consistency in self-concept (variability), i.e., a larger population sample or a longitudinal study of the subjects to see if variability decreases over time.

5.5.3 MORAL/ETHICAL SELF CORRELATIONS

The "moral/ethical" score in general provides a representation of feelings of being "good" or "bad" (Fitts, 1965, p. 3).

A significant change occurred in pre- and post-"moral/ethical" scores when correlated with "age". The scores are -.6 and -.2 respectively (see Table 16). While these scores are not statistically significant, they do imply that a correlation may exist between these variables.
This would appear to support the supposition that age is a constantly changing variable which has a measurable effect on the self-concept of the subjects. In this case, it can be extrapolated that morals and ethics seem to be at least partially influenced as time passes and the subjects have grown older. It should be noted that a great deal of time did not pass for the subjects who were in the Essex County Diversion Program, the most time for a single subject being six months. The program itself could be the cause of the change in the moral/ethical scores and their increased correlation between the pre and post testing of the subjects.

A similar claim may be made if the correlation between pre and post "moral/ethical" scores and the "number of hours in diversion" are compared. The scores are -.4 and .03 respectively. The post-score is not statistically significant but the change occurring in the pre- and post-scores could have practice implications for the diversion worker. These changes suggest that individuals have a much less negative perception of themselves upon completion of the Essex County Diversion Program than before entering the program. In other words, they see themselves as being less "bad".
5.5.4 FAMILY SELF CORRELATIONS

The "family" subscale on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale reflects the individual's feelings of worth and value as a family member (Pitts, 1965, p. 3).

Two correlations worth noting are "contacts with diversion worker" and "did you like diversion?"

The correlations are not high when "family self" and "number of contacts with diversion worker" are examined but once again it is the change which occurred in the pre and post test scores, from .09 to .43 which is significant (see Table 16). The individual's perception of his or her position in the family structure is much improved at the post test writing and this may be attributed to the number of contacts they had with the diversion worker. The change may also be accountable due to the fact that the diversion worker or the diversion program helped to clarify the individual's position in the family in regards to expectations and responsibilities. There are no correlations which are statistically significant but a relationship does appear to exist.

The "family-self" scores and the correlations between the variable "did you like diversion?" suggest similar conclusions. The scores were not highly correlated in themselves but rather it is the change in the pre- and post-scores that are worth noting (the scores being .20 and .52 respectively).
5.5.5 Social Self Correlations

"Social-self" scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale reflect the individual's feelings of self in relation to others. This category is more general than the "family-self" (Fitts, 1965, p. 3).

High correlations were not found but the change in the correlational scores between the pre- and post-test scores and the "age" variable are noteworthy: the scores were .35 and .48 respectively (see Table 16). To suggest that an increase in age is the sole reason for this change, is questionable, as the time frame involved between the pre and post test was only a matter of months. It could be hypothesized that exposure to the Essex County Diversion Program had some effect on the increased correlation. Further research is needed to determine if age is a significant variable in the formation of self-concept.

5.5.6 Self-Satisfaction Correlations

The "self-satisfaction" score reflects in general how the individual feels about the "self" he believes himself to be and how self-acceptance is demonstrated (Fitts, 1965, p. 2).

A significant change in the correlations occurred with the pre and post "self-satisfaction" scores and "number of contacts with the diversion worker"; the scores were .14 and .5 respectively (see Table 16). This change suggests that the individual's sense of self-acceptance was influenced
by contacts with positive significant others, in this case the diversion worker or with the placement agencies. This supports the hypothesis that involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program enhances self-concept. Further implications for the Essex County Diversion Program are that further extensive research might be undertaken in this area as the data imply that the self-concept can be influenced positively by contacts with the diversion worker.

5.5.7 BEHAVIOUR CORRELATIONS

The "behaviour" score is a reflection of how the individual acts, and measures the individual's perception of his own behaviour (Fitts, 1965, p. 3).

Correlational changes which were noteworthy occurred between "behaviour," and "new charges," "number of contacts with diversion worker," and "number of contacts with the placement agency".

The correlational increase between "behaviour" and a "new charge" is .19 for the pre-test and .38 for the post-test (see Table 1b). This may be explainable by the fact that the individual subjects are much more aware of their behaviour, having completed the Essex County Diversion Program.

Significant change in correlations also occurred in the pre- and post-test "behaviour" scores and "number of contacts with the diversion worker". The scores were .01 and .45 respectively. The belief is that behaviour can be
positively influenced by the intervention of significant others. This may have implications for the diversion program. If the number of contacts between the diversion worker, placement agency, and the young offender could be increased, this might effect and influence the self-concept and subsequent behaviour of the persons in diversion.

Similar findings were the result of a comparison of pre- and post-"behaviour" scores and "number of contacts with placement agency".

5.5.8 SELF-CRITICISM CORRELATIONS

This score is a reflection of an individual's ability for self-criticism (Fitts, 1965, p. 2).

A difference of correlational pre and post test scores occurred when "the number of hours assigned" were compared to "self-criticism", the scores being -.13 and .5 respectively (see Table 16). This may be interpreted to mean that the individual subjects were much more able objectively to examine their behaviour once they had completed the diversion program. This interpretation of the findings suggests that an increase in self-concept allows an individual to better examine behaviour than previous to entering the Essex County Diversion Program. This area requires additional research to establish whether a cause-effect relationship exists and verify the assumptions which have been made.
5.5.9 **Marital Status Correlations**

Several correlational differences occurred with the "marital status" variable in the pre- and post-test scores of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale which are worth noting (See Table 16). Almost every subscore of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale has significantly changed between the pre- and post-testing in relation to "marital status". This area needs further research and exploration to account for the correlations which were found.

As the marital status of the subjects' parents did not change during the time of this research, it is unlikely that the increase in the correlations between the pre- and post-tests can be explained by a change in marital status. Overall, a small increase in self-concept did occur and perhaps this was best reflected in the correlations which occurred between the self-concept items and "marital status".

5.5.10 **Summary of Data Analysis**

To compare this study's data with Hamner's, Joplin's and Pitts' (norms) a series of t-tests were carried out to determine if there was any statistical significance in the means of each sample. Prime values were calculated for "t" and compared to the critical values of "t" as determined by the analysis. Critical values of "t", greater than prime values of "t", suggested significance. That so many of this research's scores were significantly different from the
normative scores supports Pitts' assumption that juvenile delinquents score lower overall on self-concept than non-delinquents (Pitts, 1972, p. 13).

To establish whether significant differences in the means occurred between the pretest and posttest scores a t-test was used and a critical value was determined to establish significance. This was done for each subscale of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. The results obtained from this part of the study indicated that there were no significant differences in means except for two of the 13 subscales, which were "family" and "self-criticism". The results of this analysis suggest that self-concept improvement is not associated with involvement in the Essex County Diversion Program.

The findings lead directly to the rejection of the major hypothesis, which is that involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program will positively affect the self-concept of those individuals who complete the program.

Lastly, the Spearman Rho Correlation Co-efficient procedure was used to establish whether an association existed between the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, its subscales, and the demographic variables. This statistic was utilized to test the minor hypothesis. The results of this analysis did not find the variables to be significantly correlated. Not a single high or very high correlation occurred with these variables. These results suggest that for this population
improvement in self-concept is not associated with the number of hours in the diversion program, the number of contacts with the diversion worker, the number of contacts with the referral agency, age, or new additional charges against the subjects. However, while no high associations were found, several moderate associations were noted and discussed.

5.6 CONCLUSION

The results of this study appear to indicate that there was not a significant increase in self-concept change in individuals if only the "positive" score is examined. The hypothesis that the Essex County Diversion Program has a positive effect on self-concept must be rejected and the null hypothesis accepted. This finding was reached once examination of the statistics were made and a comparison of this study's data with Joplin's (Fitts, 1972) and Hamner's (Fitts, 1972) data was undertaken.

The analysis of the data does not support the major or minor hypothesis, but does suggest that there is a positive directionality happening when examination is made of the pre and post test scores. The post-test scores were higher overall and imply that the Essex County Diversion Program was effective in enhancing self-concept. Further research, which will more thoroughly examine this cause-effect relationship, is necessary to determine whether the Essex County Diversion Program can enhance self-concept and behaviour.
Chapter VI
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to determine whether the Essex County Diversion Program had a positive effect on the self-concept of the juvenile offenders who chose to participate in the program. The population of this study consisted of all the individuals entering the Essex County Diversion Program between April 1982 and July 1982, who participated in this research. There were fourteen volunteers who agreed to be part of this research.

The rationale for this research was the presumption that behaviour change, not only in rehabilitation programs, but in all therapeutic programs, must be accompanied by a positive change in self-concept. This view is validated by the literature which suggests that change in self-concept results in changed behaviour.

This research was influenced extensively by William Pitts' theory of individual behaviour change which hypothesized that individual behaviour was related to levels of self-concept and that one was a predictor of the other.

While this research does not support conclusively Pitts' theories, this in no way implies that either the theories or this research should be discounted. As has been stated
several times previously, further research is necessary to provide other data which will support or refute this research's hypotheses and Pitts' theories. Change in self-concept was apparent in this study and additional research will undoubtedly prove statistical significance.

If the hypotheses had been confirmed the results of this study would have lent support to the theoretical effectiveness of the type of intervention the Essex County Diversion Program performs.

The sample population was described according to several demographic variables and by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Demographic variables included "age", "marital status of parents", "number of hours performed in diversion", "number of contacts with the diversion worker", "number of contacts with the referral agency", "school level attained", "like or dislike of diversion experience".

The demographic variables were important in describing the population's characteristics as well as elements of the diversion program. An examination of the correlations of the demographic and self-concept variables was completed to lend support to William Pitts' theory that self-concept is autonomously acquired and not influenced by extraneous variables. The data obtained from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale were also analyzed and compared to other juvenile offender treatment programs to illustrate that similarities
exist in deviant juvenile populations and that self-concept results are generalizable from one population to another. High correlations were evident when data were compared between this research and other treatment programs. In addition, the pre- and post-test scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale for this sample were compared to determine if statistically significant differences occurred in the time between the pre and post test scores and completion of the Essex County Diversion Program. This was the significant statistic used to test the major hypothesis.

6.1 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS
The population consisted of 14 subjects, all males, ranging in ages from twelve to sixteen years, all were attending school and all volunteered to participate in the diversion program. Over 78 per cent (78.57%) of the subjects came from two parent families while the remainder came from either divorced, single or separated families.

The results obtained suggest that the change in self-concept was not statistically significant with the subjects involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program.

There were three measures of the Tennessee Self-Concept scale which did show a significant statistical improvement between the pre- and post-scores. Further study to verify and explain the relationship which was found to exist is necessary. That three self-concept subscores improved
enough to be considered statistically significant implies that the Essex County Diversion Program may indeed have an effect on behaviour and could therefore influence or enhance other subscales of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

When compared with other self-concept studies in juvenile rehabilitation, this research demonstrated that many similarities existed in the delinquent populations, and that the findings were comparable.

The results this study obtained in regard to the second hypothesis, which examined factors within the diversion program and self-concept, did not statistically support the hypothesis. There were some moderate correlations which implied that associations between the variables may become more apparent with additional research.

As there were many moderate correlations among the variables implies that perhaps a larger population would have produced more statistically significant correlations between the variables which were considered.

As moderate correlations are obvious, it is possible to suggest that an increased or more intensive involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program may produce higher statistical correlations. It would then follow that self-concept would be enhanced and behaviour might then become more socially acceptable.
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

It would be unfair and extremely short-sighted to interpret only the significant statistics of this study. Several positive changes in the self-concept subscores did occur, though the changes were not statistically significant. While the total "positive" score did not prove to be statistically significant, other changes occurred in the self-concept of the subjects, which suggests that at least further investigation of these changes is required to account for them.

The correlations between the internal variables of the Essex County Diversion Program and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale subscores were noteworthy in that moderate associations did occur between several variables. Further research is needed in these areas to determine if additional programming by the Essex County Diversion Program aimed at specifically influencing these variables could effect a change in self-concept which could be considered statistically significant. For example, would devoting more time in the way of worker contacts positively influence those individuals in the program?

Fitts (1972, p. 12) has suggested that self-concept change manifests itself gradually and overtime, and is not immediately measurable or noticeable in the individual's personality and behaviour. A further recommendation of this study is that an extensive follow-up study be undertaken which
will follow graduates of the Essex County Diversion Program for an extended period of time to measure the correlations between the diversion variables and their self-concept levels at different time intervals.

Additional studies comparing various treatment programs for juvenile delinquents should be undertaken to ascertain which therapeutic approach is most effective in producing a change in self-concept, the Essex County Diversion Program being one such alternative.

6.2.1 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ESSEX COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM

In light of the findings of this research, several recommendations are presented which may increase the effectiveness of the Essex County Diversion Program.

1. An increase in the correlations was obvious between the pre- and post-test scores indicating that perhaps contact with the diversion worker was beneficial in enhancing the self-concept of the subjects.

2. Increase the number of contacts the juvenile offender has with the placement agency. As there exists a moderate correlation between this variable and self-concept, perhaps increasing the frequency of contacts with the placement agency may effect positively this correlation and in turn this may influence levels of self-concept.
3. Based upon the young offenders specific needs, vary the placement agencies and tasks to give the juvenile offender many different experiences with other persons and situations. Although subjects did not report any dissatisfaction with their placements, the literature suggests that individual therapeutic gains may be greater if compensatory tasks are considered worthwhile and challenging to the people performing them. A moderate correlation between the variables of self-concept and placement was reported and it is possible that this correlation may be increased if other compensatory tasks and placements are utilized.

4. Build in a follow-up component to the service to determine if subsequent referral or intervention is necessary. This is necessary to determine the effectiveness of the program on self-concept change. Pitts theorizes that change in self-concept takes time to manifest itself after intervention has occurred (Pitts, 1969, p. 4). This recommendation is also based upon the desire to continue the focus of this research and to determine if self-concept change, which has been influenced by the Essex County Diversion Program, is long lasting and effective.

These recommendations are based on the assumption that self-concept has been positively enhanced by involvement with the Essex County Diversion Program, although the data
are not statistically significant. While the change in self-concept has not been shown to be statistically significant, the implication does present itself that the program does have some affect on self-concept.
Appendix A

INITIAL LETTER
Dear

An incident involving has been referred to this Court by

It is essential that we meet with your child and you and your husband in order to conclude this matter in the best interests of your family. We invite you to phone the Juvenile and Family Court within 48 hours, at 254-9405 to arrange a friendly, confidential conference.

A lawyer will be present to advise you at this conference unless you wish to retain your own counsel.

We trust that your co-operation in this matter will be voluntary and will not necessitate the involvement of the Juvenile Court process.

Yours truly

Helen Sarkis
Secretary
Essex County Diversion Program Inc.

hs
Appendix B

PROGRAM BROCHURE
DIVERSION

As a young person participating in this program:

What are my rights?

What are my responsibilities?

January 12, 1977
RIGHnts AND RESPONSIBILITIES:

Diversion is an agreement that is reached only after you understand the program and have received advice from a lawyer who is there to look after your best interests. Before you can proceed with Diversion, you must acknowledge your responsibility for the offence and agree that the facts as provided by the police are correct. If there is any question about your involvement, the matter must go to court where a judge can listen to all sides and make a fair decision. You have the right to go to court and be heard.

In the Diversion Program, each person — you, your parents, the Diversion Worker, the Victim, the Counsellor — has a share in making plans for the compensatory work and/or counselling. These plans should be completed within two to three weeks and it is the Diversion Worker’s responsibility to make sure this happens.

The Diversion Program is not always the best way. At times, even when someone has decided to go through Diversion, the Diversion Worker may see reasons for plans not working. For instance, your situation at home may require more assistance than the program can offer to you. Two weeks after your first interview, the Diversion Worker has the right to return the charge to court. The Diversion Worker does not
make this decision alone but will discuss it with another member of the Diversion team. If you or your parents think the decision of the team is unfair, you can bring the matter to the Diversion Committee.

If you proceed into the program and there are no further changes in the plans, they are written into "contracts" which will be signed by yourself, your parents and the Diversion Worker.

By signing the contracts, you are saying that you agree with the work and/or counselling and will follow the plans until they are completed. No one in the program can be asked to work more than a total of 40 hours. The contracts are different for each person, but none will last longer than 9 months from the date that you sign them.

Your co-operation in following the plan is important. It becomes your responsibility to do the work and see the counsellor. You may find that there are difficulties, but you can talk these over with the Diversion Worker. However, if you do not do the work or do not see the counsellor, without good reason, then you are not co-operating and are not fulfilling your shared responsibility.

The Diversion Worker will discuss your situation with another member of the Diversion team. If members of the Diversion team decide that the original charge must be dealt with in court, the charge will be sent on to Court and you must appear before the Judge.

When this happens, if you and your parents disagree with the Diversion Team's decision to return the
Once the program has been successfully completed, the charge laid by the police will be adjourned "sine die" by the Judge. This means, that as far as the Court is concerned, the matter is finished and nothing else is expected of you in regard to the offence. This also means that you are a responsible young person who did something to undo any harm that your actions caused to others.

Because you didn't go to court, you were not found guilty of anything and do not have a record. However, a file that says you were charged with an offence on a certain date, stays at the court.

All information such as contracts, referral reports, and school contacts are kept in a separate file outside of court files.

As with any activity, we have the right to participate, but we are also governed by rules that guide our actions. You will find this to be true in sports, in families, as well as Diversion.

In order to meet with the Diversion Committee, call the Diversion secretary at 254-4471.
Appendix C

GENERAL ADMISSION OF FACTS
ESSEX COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT FOR ESSEX COUNTY
250 WINDSOR AVENUE
WINDSOR, ONTARIO
N9A 6R5

RE: Name of Child:
Address:

We have been advised of our legal rights by a lawyer and have a general understanding of this program.

Notwithstanding the right to insist on a trial to prove the facts alleged against our child, he readily admits to those facts and we both agree to meet with the Diversion Worker and cooperate to whatever extent necessary.

__________________________  _________________________
Date                           Parent

__________________________  _________________________
Parent

__________________________

Appendix D

RELEASE OF INFORMATION
ESSEX COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM INC.
4th floor, 250 Windsor Ave.
P.O. 1508
Windsor, Ontario
N9A 6V9

RELEASE OF INFORMATION

This is your authority to release to a Diversion worker of the Juvenile Court of Essex County any or all information that you have in your possession relating to ____________________________
name of child

I further authorize the Diversion Worker to convey to Social and/or Education Authorities information which may be used for the benefit of the child.

__________________________  _____________________________
Witness                Parent or Guardian

__________________________
Date

This information will be treated as confidential by the Essex County Diversion Program Inc. and used solely for the benefit of the child.
Appendix E

SOCIAL PROFILE
DIVERSION PROGRAM

Social Profile

CHILD:
ADDRESS:
TELEPHONE:
DATE OF BIRTH:
SCHOOL:
GRADE:

Presenting Offense

Persons Living in Child's Home:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FATHER:
MOTHER:
SIBLINGS:

OTHERS:

Significant Others Living Outside Home:
Difficulties of Child:
Profile Information Sources

1)  
2)  
3)  
4)  

At Home:

1) Your child's behaviour is generally good  YES NO  

2) Does your child have a curfew?  YES NO  
   If so - Time ____________  
   Is he/she responsible to keep it?  YES NO SOMETIMES  

3) Has your child ever run away from home?  YES NO  
   Reason ____________________  
   Has he/she threatened to?  YES NO  

4) Does your child have assigned chores?  YES NO  
   Is he/she responsible?  YES NO SOMETIMES  

5) Does your child accept your instruction and discipline?  YES NO SOMETIMES  

6) Does your child inform you of his/her whereabouts when he/she goes out?  YES NO SOMETIMES  

7) Does your child receive an allowance?  YES NO  
   If so how much? ____________________  

8) Does your child bring friends home?  YES NO  

9) Is your child under your control at home?  YES NO  
   If no why? ____________________
At School:

1) Does your child like school?  
   YES  NO

2) Do you believe your child has any difficulties at school?  
   YES  NO
   If so - Why? ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

3) Is your child's attendance 
   GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR

4) Your child's grades are 
   GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR

5) Does your child get along with the school staff?  
   YES  NO

School Report

4. Grades:

2. Attendance:

3. Behaviour:

4. Relationship to Teachers:

5. Relationship to Peers:

In the Community:

1) Previous police contacts  
   YES  NO
   Timing & Nature ____________________________}
2) Do neighbours complain about your child's behavior? YES NO
   If yes - why? ______________________________

3) Do you approve of your child's friends? YES NO
   If no - why? ______________________________

4) Does your child use drugs or alcohol? YES NO
   If yes - How frequently? ______________________

5) Why did your child get into trouble with the law?
   FUN FLUKE PEER PRESSURE ANGER BOREDOM SELFGAIN UNCERTAIN

Family Relationships:

Between Parents:
1) How long have you and child's other parent been:
   MARRIED SEPARATED DIVORCED LIVING TOGETHER SINGLE WIDOWED

2) How would you describe your marriage relationship?
   Father ______________________________
   Mother ______________________________
   (answer when applicable)
3) Have there been any periods of stress or separation? YES NO
If yes - Explain

4) Who sets rules and limits for children?
   FATHER  MOTHER  BOTH  OTHER

5) Who enforces rules and limits for children?
   FATHER  MOTHER  BOTH  OTHER

6) Do parents agree on rules and limits? YES NO
   (answer when applicable)

7) Do you like being (a) parent(s)? YES NO SOMETIMES

8) Is your method of discipline effective? YES NO SOMETIMES
   METHOD: ________________________________

9) Is this child your natural child? YES NO

10) Has this child ever been out of your care for a period longer than 3 months? YES NO
    If yes - In whose care was he/she? ________________________________
Between Father and Child:

1) How do you and your child get along?
   VERY GOOD  GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR  TERRIBLE

2) How do you and your father get along?
   VERY GOOD  GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR  TERRIBLE

3) Are there many areas of conflict between father and child?  YES  NO
   If yes - Explain
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

4) Does child confide in father?  YES  NO  SOMETIMES

5) Do child and father participate in activities together?  YES  NO  SOMETIMES
   If so - What?
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________

Between Mother and Child:

1) How do you and your child get along?
   VERY GOOD  GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR  TERRIBLE

2) How do you and your mother get along?
   VERY GOOD  GOOD  AVERAGE  POOR  TERRIBLE.

3) Are there many areas of conflict between mother and child?  YES  NO
   If yes - Explain
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
   ________________________________
4) Does child confide in mother? YES NO SOMETIMES

5) Do child and mother participate in activities together? YES NO SOMETIMES
   If so - What?

Between Child and Siblings:

1) Does child usually get along with brothers and/or sisters? YES NO

2) Are children's arguments considered to be normal? YES NO

3) Are there any extraordinary conflicts based on jealousy or resentment? YES NO

4) Have any of child's siblings been in trouble with the law? YES NO
   If yes - Explain

Other Important Information:

1) Has your child or family previously been involved with a helping person/and/or agency? YES NO
   If yes - Who?
   When?

2) What are your child's strengths?

3) What are your child's weaknesses? ________________

__________________________

__________________________

4) Do you think your child will be in trouble with the police again? YES NO UNCERTAIN

5) Do you feel that you need the help of an outside service agency to assist your child? YES NO

Identified Needs and Service Recommendations:

1) Compensatory work contract
   a) Number of hours ______________
   b) Placement ______________
   c) Other ______________

2) Referral - Suggested to family by worker
   AGENCY ____________________________

       Accepted by family
       Rejected by family

3) No referral necessary ______________
   Comments (if necessary)
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________
Additional Information:


Submitted by: ______________________
Date: ____________________
Appendix F

COMPENSATORY TASK AGREEMENT
ESSEX COUNTY DIVERSION PROGRAM
Juvenile and Family Court for Essex County
250 Windsor Avenue
Windsor, Ontario
N9A 6R5

PRE-COURT SETTLEMENT - STATEMENT OF INTENTIONS

RE: Name of Child:
Address:
Occurrence:

I, __________________________ without prejudice, for the purpose of settlement, acknowledge my responsibility under this program to make restitution for any damages or inconvenience I may have caused.

To discharge this obligation, I agree to do the following things:

Date to be completed:

_________________________Witnesses:_________________________
Child

_________________________Parent

_________________________Date

_________________________Parent

_________________________Diversion Worker

c.c. Police Department
Appendix G

REFERRAL AGREEMENT
CONSENT TO REFERRAL

RE: Name of child:
Address:

1. We consent to the referral of ________________
   to the following specified agencies for help.
   a) ________________
   b) ________________
   c) ________________
   d) ________________

2. We commit ourselves to remain cooperative and involved
   with the above mentioned agencies for a period of up
   to nine months.

3. We also consent to the release of any information about
   our family among various agencies that may become involved
   in this matter.

_________________________  ____________________________
Date                      Child

Witness: Diversion Worker  ____________________________
Parent

__________________________  ____________________________
Parent

__________________________  ____________________________
Parent
Appendix H

CLOSING LETTER- COMPLETE
Chief of Police

Attention:

Dear Sir:

RE:

ADDRESS:

D.O.B.:

This is to inform you that the above named, who was charged in Juvenile Court by your department and entered into the Diversion Program, has successfully completed the Program.

His/her involvement with the Diversion Program has therefore terminated, the file has been closed, and the charge adjourned Sine Die.

Thanking you for your continued interest and cooperation in this Program, I remain,

Yours truly

[Signature]

Diversion Worker
Appendix I

CLOSING LETTER—VERBAL CAUTION
Chief of Police

Attention:

Dear Sir:

RE:

ADRESSES:

D.O.B.:

In response to an information sworn by you against the above named, this child and his/her parents were seen by a Diversion Worker of the Juvenile Court. After an assessment of this child's and his/her family's needs, it was determined that the appropriate response to the occurrence was to caution the child and send him/her home.

No further intervention or court process appears to be needed at this time.

Should you have any further contact with this young person, kindly inform the writer. Your assistance will help us to evaluate the effectiveness of the Diversion Program.

Yours truly

Diversion Worker
Appendix J

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Date: 

PART I

SECTION F: Personal Information.

Complete all items. Circle either "Yes" or "No", or fill in the blank space provided.

Name: ..........................................................

Address: ..........................................................

Age: 

Sex: Male Female (circle one)

Religion: Protestant Roman Catholic Other (specify) ............

What country was your mother born in? .........................

What country was your father born in? ........................

Do you attend religious services? "Yes" "No" Sometimes (circle one)

Do you speak another language at home? "Yes" "No"

Do you have brothers, sisters or step-sisters, step-brothers? "Yes" "No"

If yes, give their ages and sex: ..... ..... ..... ...

[Use the back, if you need more space]

Do you have your own room? "Yes" "No"

What kind of things do you do in your spare time? ..................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

.................................................................

[Use the back of the paper if you need more space.]
PART 1

Section 2: Parental Information
Complete all items. Circle either "yes" or "no" or fill in the blank spaces provided. Your parents may help you with this section.

Do you live with your parents? Yes No

If your answer is "no," whom do you live with?..............

Do you see your parents? Yes No Sometimes

Answer this section if you live with your mother.

Marital Status: (circle one of the choices below)
Married, Common-law, Single, Widowed, Divorced, Separated.

Previous number of marriages or common-law relationships:............

Does your mother work? Yes No

What does your mother do if she is working?......................

How much, approximately, does your mother earn a year?........

Does your mother collect family "benefits"? Yes No

Does your mother live at home with you? Yes No

How often do you see your mother if she does not live with you?........

Answer this section if you live with your father.

Marital Status: (circle one of the choices below)
Married, Common-law, Single, Widowed, Divorced, Separated.

Previous number of marriages or common-law relationships:............

Does your father work? Yes No

What does your father do if he is working?......................

Does your father collect unemployment insurance "benefits," or any other type of benefits?................. Yes No

How much, approximately, does your father earn a year?............

Does your father live at home with you? Yes No

Is your father your natural father? Yes No

How often do you see your father if he does not live with you?........

Do the persons you live with own their home? Yes No

Do the persons you live with rent their home? Yes No

Do the persons you live with rent an apartment? Yes No

How many rooms do you have in the house or apartment?..............

(do not count the bathroom as a room)
PART 1

SECTION 3: Past Involvement with the Court

Complete all items. Circle either yes or no, or answer in the space provided. If you cannot remember answer as best you can.

How many times have you been warned by the police? ......................
How many times have you been charged with an offence? .................
How many times have you been in court? ..................................
How many offences have you been charged with or convicted? ..........
List them and what happened below. Most recent first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge &amp; Date</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever visited a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist?
Yes  No

If Yes, what for, and how long: ........................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................

Have your parents ever visited a social worker, psychologist or psychiatrist?
Yes  No

If Yes, what for and how long: ........................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
...................................................................................
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INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet, fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill these boxes in later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a circle around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an X mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked time started and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked time finished.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a circle around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Completely false</th>
<th>Mostly false and partly true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

© William H. Fitts, 1964
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I have a healthy body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am an attractive person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I consider myself a sloppy person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I am a decent sort of person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I am an honest person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I am a bad person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I am a cheerful person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I am a calm and easy going person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I am a nobody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I have a family that would always help me in any kind of trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I am a member of a happy family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>My friends have no confidence in me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>I am a friendly person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I am popular with men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>I am not interested in what other people do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>I do not always tell the truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>I get angry sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:**

- Completely false
- Mostly false
- Partly false and partly true
- Mostly true
- Completely true
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I like to look nice and neat all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am full of aches and pains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I am a sick person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am a religious person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I am a moral failure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am a morally weak person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I have a lot of self-control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am a hateful person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I am losing my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am an important person to my friends and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I am not loved by my family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I feel that my family doesn’t trust me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>I am popular with women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>I am mad at the whole world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>I am hard to be friendly with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: Completely false | Mostly false | Partly false and partly true | Mostly true | Completely true
---|---|---|---|---|---
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
7. I am neither too fat nor too thin ........................................ 7
9. I like my looks just the way they are .................................... 9
11. I would like to change some parts of my body ...................... 11
25. I am satisfied with my moral behavior ............................... 25
27. I am satisfied with my relationship to God .......................... 27
29. I ought to go to church more ........................................... 29
43. I am satisfied to be just what I am .................................... 43
45. I am just as nice as I should be ....................................... 45
47. I despise myself ................................................................... 47
61. I am satisfied with my family relationships ....................... 61
63. I understand my family as well as I should ......................... 63
65. I should trust my family more ........................................... 65
79. I am as sociable as I want to be ....................................... 79
81. I try to please others, but I don’t overdo it ......................... 81
83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint ...................... 83
95. I do not like everyone I know ........................................... 95
97. Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke ............................. 97

Responses: Completely false  Mostly false  Partly false and partly true  Mostly true  Completely true
1 2 3 4 5
8. I am neither too tall nor too short.

10. I don't feel as well as I should.

12. I should have more sex appeal.

26. I am as religious as I want to be.

28. I wish I could be more trustworthy.

30. I shouldn't tell so many lies.

44. I am as smart as I want to be.

46. I am not the person I would like to be.

48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do.

62. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living).

64. I am too sensitive to things my family say.

66. I should love my family more.

80. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people.

82. I should be more polite to others.

84. I ought to get along better with other people.

96. I gossip a little at times.

98. At times I feel like swearing.

Responses - Completely false  Mostly false  Partly false and partly true  Mostly true  Completely true

1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I take good care of myself physically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I try to be careful about my appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I often act like I am &quot;all thumbs&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am true to my religion in my everyday life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I sometimes do very bad things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I can always take care of myself in any situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I take the blame for things without getting mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I do things without thinking about them first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I try to play fair with my friends and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I take a real interest in my family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents are not living.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I try to understand the other fellow's point of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>I get along well with other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>I do not forgive others easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>I would rather win than lose in a game</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses - 
1. Completely false  
2. Mostly false  
3. Partly false and partly true  
4. Mostly true  
5. Completely true
14. I feel good most of the time

16. I do poorly in sports and games

18. I am a poor sleeper

32. I do what is right most of the time

34. I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead

36. I have trouble doing the things that are right

50. I solve my problems quite easily

52. I change my mind a lot

54. I try to run away from my problems

68. I do my share of work at home

70. I quarrel with my family

72. I do not act like my family thinks I should

86. I see good points in all the people I meet

88. I do not feel at ease with other people

90. I find it hard to talk with strangers

100. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Completely false</th>
<th>Mostly false</th>
<th>Partly false and partly true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

DIVERSION QUESTIONNAIRE
SECTION 4: Diversification Information

This section is to be answered once you have completed the Diversification Program. Complete all items to the best of your ability. Answer either yes or no or use the space provided. You may use the back of the page if you need more room.

1. How long were you in the diversification program? ...

2. How many hours of work did you have to perform? ...

3. How often did you report to the agency you were assigned to? ...

4. How often did you see your diversification worker? ...

5. Did you like your diversification worker? Yes No

6. Your reasons for question #5: ...

7. Was diversification better than being on probation? Yes No

8. Your reasons for question #7: ...

9. Did you think the diversification experience worthwhile? Yes No

10. Your reasons for question #9: ...

11. Would you go back and work for the agency you were placed with, if you had a choice? Yes No

12. If you had a choice, would you have wanted to do something else than what you did in diversification? Yes No

Your reasons for answering question #12: ...
Appendix H

INFORMATION RELEASE CONSENT FORM
INFORMATION RELEASE CONSENT FORM

Date: __________________

I hereby agree to allow my son or daughter to participate in a research study on the effect of the Windsor-Essex Juvenile Diversion Project and individual self-concept.

Participation will be limited to answering this questionnaire and attitudinal test.

I understand that the information contained in this questionnaire and test will be treated as confidential to be used for research purposes only. The information will be destroyed once the study is complete. My son's or daughter's name will not be identified in any matter whatsoever with the information. No one other than the researcher shall have access to the information contained in this study.

__________________________  __________________________
parent or guardian               participant,
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