FROM THE PRESIDENT

Inger Sagatun-Edwards

First, let me introduce myself. I am very pleased to be serving as the President of the Western Society of Criminology (WSC) for 1996-97, especially since the Board in its wisdom voted to hold the conference in Hawaii next year. I grew up on the frigid shores of Norway, and any mention of Hawaii still brings visions of paradise to my mind. I am currently a Professor and Chair of the Administration of Justice Department at San Jose State University. My main teaching and research interests are in the areas of juvenile justice, child abuse, and family violence. Over the last five years, I have been conducting research on risk factors for parental abductions and the legal response to such abductions, as well as ongoing projects concerning drug exposed infants and their families in the juvenile court dependency system. I have been a member of WSC for about ten years, and have served on the board for about seven years. I have always found WSC to be a particularly friendly and welcoming association. For younger persons, it is a wonderful opportunity to establish new connections, and for the not so young, it is a great way to maintain old ties and develop new professional associations. It is precisely the small size of our organization that makes such personal contacts possible. In addition, I like the fact that academics, researchers and criminal justice practitioners are equally welcome in WSC, and that our meetings consistently focus on the most pressing criminal justice issues of our time.

Our last annual meeting in the beautiful wine country of Sonoma County, California again demonstrates the open friendliness of the organization combined with a thought-provoking analysis of a wide range of justice issues. Past President Candace Cross-Drew of the California Youth Authority and Program Chair Pat Jackson of Sonoma State University put together an excellent program. The theme of the conference was Reassessing Crime, Realizing Justice: Collaborating for a New Agenda. The keynote address was given by Barry Krisberg, President of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, who convincingly argued that today the most effective way (if not the only way left) to prevent crime is through intervention at the local community level. Our past efforts at the larger political level, arguing for a prevention approach rather than a ‘lock-em up’ strategy, have not met with much success as evidenced by the ‘three strikes’ legislation. However, Krisberg and others are hopeful that the comprehensive community approach to crime prevention as outlined in the latest call for proposals from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention will prove fruitful.

In a plenary session, Peter Greenwood and Scott Menard both discussed the topic, Reassessing the Predicted Crimestorm. They addressed the problem of sensationalist media coverage based on blown up anecdotes and faulty statistics, and the dilemma of getting the media and politicians to react to carefully presented, complex data rather than oversimplified, ‘firebrand’, alarmist conclusions. They stressed the need for all of us to continually share our research findings with high level practitioners, policy makers and journalists. We also need to work towards better methods of data collection, especially with respect to self-reports of delinquent behavior and gang membership, and to choose our age cohorts more carefully.

Our awardees this year formed a most distinguished panel. Edwin Lemert received the Paul Tappan award, which is given for outstanding contributions to the field of criminology. It was very rewarding for all of us, but particularly our younger student members to see this famous scholar from their textbook pages ‘in person.’ The Joseph D. Lohman Award went to Chris Curtis for her contributions as Past President of the WSC, as well as for serving twice as program chair. The June Morrison-Tom Gitchoff Founders Award was given to Mimi Halper Silbert for her work in the Delancy Street Foundation. Mark Wiederanders, formerly of CYA and now with the Department of Mental Health, received the President’s Award which is given by the WSC president for positive influence on his/her career and on the field of criminol-
All spoke on the conference theme. Arnold Rosenfield from the Sonoma County Superior Court, UC Berkeley; Dan Monez, Police Chief of Napa; and Judge technology. Finally, WSC Fellows this year were Paul Brantingham and Julius Defaro, University of Washington; Matthew Leone, University of Nevada, Reno; Paul Brantingham, Simon Frasier University, Canada; Barbara Bloom, Sonoma State University; Martha-Elin Blomquist, California State University-Bakersfield; and Pat Jackson, Sonoma State University. Serving as Counselors at Large are Patrick Kincaid, Texas Christian University; Susan T. Meier, California State University, Sacramento; and Jean Scott, Chief of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention at the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. The student counselors are Marilyn Brown from the University of Hawaii, Manoa, and Rosin Deegan, Sonoma State University. Linda Humble continues to serve as the secretary/treasurer and Miki Vohryzek-Bolden as the Editor of The Western Criminologist. Candace Cross-Drew, the immediate past president, has taken on the job as Program Chair for the 1997 conference with Meda Chesney-Lind (also a past president), as co-chair. Our outgoing board members Cynthia Burke, Darlanne Hoctor and Robert Hurley all deserve our thanks for all their work for the society.

As already mentioned, the 1997 conference will be in Hawaii at the beautiful four-star, ocean front Hawaii Prince Hotel in Waikiki, Honolulu. The theme for the conference is Crime, Justice and Cultural Diversity: From the Wild West to the Pacific Rim. We hope that you all plan to come, and that you will spend some time at the meeting, as well as at the beach! We already have an exciting preliminary program planned which includes several prominent local community leaders and criminal justice practitioners. We particularly want to invite and include academics, researchers and practitioners who may not previously have had a chance to attend this conference; people from the Hawaiian Islands, from the South Pacific, Japan, Taiwan, China, Australia and New Zealand. If you know of colleagues in any of these locations, please invite them to come. As Freda Adler so eloquently argued in her ASC presidential address, we need to turn our attention to international comparative approaches to criminology. We have much to learn from our members from the Pacific Rim, especially with respect to attention to diversity in our criminal justice systems. According to Adler, "...when it comes to social control, the varied experiences of differing cultures are likely to lead to perfection far more easily than xenophobic regard for the experiences of a single culture..."Today, within the global village and information age, new paradigms beckon us and are forcing us to think differently (see Adler, 34 Criminology (1), 1995:1-11,4).

In addition to all westerners from the "Wild West to the Pacific Rim," we are of course also especially inviting our frozen colleagues from colder regions elsewhere in the country to enjoy a professional meeting in a more exotic climate. Judging from the speed by which our flyers were snapped up at the recent ACJS conference in Las Vegas, there is a great deal of interest and excitement about this conference, so get your room reservations in early.

Finally, to heed the call from both of our two most recent conferences, it is more important than ever that we bring our analyses and research into public discussion. At last year’s conference, we discussed the irrationality of the ’three strikes’ legislation. Today, we have ample evidence of how this legislation has brought near chaos to both criminal and civil courts, and that more people are being incarcerated of a ‘third strike’ minor drug offense than violent crime. In commenting on a recently released preliminary California Justice Department crime report which showed that crime in California is down (see San Jose Mercury News, March 13, 1996: 3B), Attorney General Dan Lungren attributed this decline to the success of the ‘three strikes’ legislation, in spite of the fact that crime was also generally down in states without such legislation! We clearly need to communicate better alternative explanations. And you have a chance to do so on our newly established WSC Web Site: http://www.sonoma.edu/cja/. We look forward to hearing from you either in ‘cyber-space,’ by phone or by mail, and to seeing you in Hawaii.

JUVENILE INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION: A POLICY APPROACH
Rebecca D. Petersen, Graduate Associate and Ph.D. Candidate, Arizona State University, School of Justice Studies

Ms. Petersen’s paper was given the first place June Morrison Student Award at the 1996 Western Society of Criminology Conference in Rohnert Park, California.

Policy design and policy analysis are performed mainly by professional experts in a variety of policy fields. Their approach often is grounded in scientific analysis borne out of positivism. Positivism suggests that phenomena are observable, explainable and measurable in quantitative terms. As such, reality consists of a world of objectively defined facts which can be scientifically measured (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1993). Thus, the advice of experts is assumed to be “objective” and “accurate.”
Moreover, policy analysis practiced by experts using this "scientific approach" is based on instrumental rationality. Dunn (1981, p.273) suggests that this type of technical rationality is a "characteristic of reasoned choices that involve the comparison of alternatives according to their capacity to promote effective solutions for problems." Furthermore, in relation to criminal and juvenile justice issues, technical approaches often involve ranking intervention, treatment and/or punishment alternatives and determining which alternative is most effective. This approach is common in the policy science field.

Laswell (1951, p.15) states that the purpose of the policy sciences are to provide knowledge "needed to improve the practice of democracy." According to Fisher, the 1951 policy science approach of Laswell was "to be grounded in a fundamental moral objective: the protection and furtherance of democracy in America and the world" (1993, p.165). Based on this presupposition, does the use of expert knowledge improve, encourage or discourage democracy and ultimately, citizenship?

Experts, that is intellectuals, academicians, members of advisory structures, civil servants and/or private consultants, play a major role in designing, forming and analyzing policy, including juvenile justice policy. As such, youth, parents, and citizens are often left out of the policy process. This leads to the support of the status quo and a narrow focus on controlling members of society rather than empowering them, unlike the purpose of the policy sciences as described by Laswell. The policy sciences appear to impede rather than encourage democracy since the actual process of democracy is not being adequately practiced. One such example is the Arizona juvenile intensive probation supervision program.

**JUVENILE INTENSIVE PROBATION SUPERVISION**

Juvenile intensive probation supervision (JIPS) has become an increasingly popular policy for youth. JIPS emerged in the mid to late 1980s as an alternative to incarceration under the "get tough" movement, not the "get treatment" approach as did the community corrections movement in the 1970s. The community corrections movement was primarily built on the medical model of corrections with the purpose of "treating" offenders and thus, rehabilitating them in the community. This ideology has changed considerably and community corrections programs are now usually referred to as intermediate punishments or alternatives to incarceration and are built upon a more retributive philosophy.

This "get tough" approach was primarily a response to the overcrowding problem in the nation's prisons and jails. According to Burkhart (1987, p.75), Americans were facing a "social dilemma caused by the desire to obtain maximum offender control through imprisonment and a reluctance to support the high public costs associated with prison construction and the maintenance of a large inmate population." As such, intensive supervision programs provided an opportunity to "get tough" without adding to the overall cost of corrections (Byrne, 1990), and was viewed as doing "tough time" in the community without jeopardizing public safety.

For example, in many states youth on JIPS are contacted by their probation officer several times per week. They are to attend many counseling sessions, perform community service, work and/or go to school. They are to stay at home at all times unless they are working, attending school or fulfilling a service requirement. These conditions are much more stringent and intensive than standard probation in which there are few visits with limited control provisions.

JIPS reflects a "get tough" approach to delinquency and under this philosophy, it mirrors the classical approach in dealing with offenders, i.e., punishment and retribution. However, the original purpose of the juvenile justice system was to treat and rehabilitate youth, not to punish them (Short, 1990). Prior to the establishment of the first juvenile court in 1899, children were treated like adults and were subjected to the same rules and regulations as adults (Empsey, 1991). The juvenile court began with a rehabilitative philosophy which was greatly influenced by the medical model of delinquency (Champion, 1992). According to the medical model, delinquency was considered a physical illness which was susceptible to treatment in which individual conditions could be changed through treatment services, not punishment. This philosophy was inherently different than other tactics in dealing with "problem" youth. In a sense, the juvenile court was a "rescue" operation to act in the best interests of the youth (Rothman, 1979), through individualized treatment services with the goal of rehabilitation.

However, there has been some disagreement about the motives and intent of the juvenile court system. An alternative view is that problems and delinquency were generated by large-scale urban growth of Western European immigrants and that poor children posed a threat to the moral fabric of American society (Siegel & Senna, 1994). As such, Platt (1977) suggests that the juvenile justice system was just another mechanism of controlling youth, especially lower-class immigrant youth. Bortner (1988) states that the juvenile justice system was created to resocialize youth to conform to society and according to Platt (1977), it was an extension of state control and oppression formed by those with power and privilege.

In spite of the conflicting views of the philosophy of the juvenile court, it can be concluded that the ideal view of the juvenile justice system was to provide treatment in hopes that at least some youth would become rehabilitated and would benefit from the treatment services. Punishment and retribution were to play no part in the juvenile justice system. However, today's policies and programs for youth often reflect the punitive nature of the system. The rising concern about serious delinquencies of youth and the desire to hold youth more accountable.
for their actions has increased the punitiveness of the juvenile justice system. Policies and legislation reflect this philosophy which is divergent from the original concept of the juvenile court (Davis, 1980).

For example, most JIPS programs in practice contain a strong punishment component. JIPS contains high levels of offender control and posits a "punishment" approach through home arrest and frequent control mechanisms of surveillance and frequent face-to-face contacts. According to Lurigio & Petersilia (1992, p.9), "the increased monitoring and surveillance in intensive probation supervision programs are designed to boost offenders' perceptions of the effectiveness of the system in detecting and punishing their criminal behavior." Hence, intensive probation may be designed for the mere purpose of punishment in the guise of some limited treatment services. But what should be noted is that every JIPS program is different and may have different goals. Unsettling tension exists amongst the experts between the two polarized elements of the purpose and practice of JIPS; that is, treatment and rehabilitation v. control and punishment. Harland & Rosen (1987) define this dilemma as the "control versus cure" debate.

However, if the ideal purpose of the juvenile court is to treat children, then why do the punishment provisions even exist? Furthermore, the important question is who exactly designs and develops these programs? Moreover, many policies, such as the Arizona JIPS policy, emphasize the quantitative element in impact evaluations while ignoring qualitative approaches that one would not necessarily detect. For example, if these youths had better self-esteem, had improved their relationships, took more control over their life, and/or obtained a job, an impact evaluation may not uncover these findings since in traditional outcome evaluations, one of the most common measures are recidivism and cost effectiveness. But when taking a child-centered approach, what does all of this mean for the juveniles?

Most JIPS programs target on changing an individual once s/he has been in the system. However, are these individuals ever involved in the policy process? Those who design and develop JIPS programs are usually those at the top, such as experts, legislators and public officials who think they know what is best for youth. What appears to be missing in the formation and delivery of juvenile policies is the involvement of the people most affected by programming for youth; that is, the youth, parents, teachers and the community-at-large. A technical expert making many public policy decisions often forgets or does not understand the problems of youth and his/her special needs. Policies made by professionals often ignore the human element. Policies such as JIPS may offer some treatment potential, but it may be yet another way of controlling oppressed individuals, such as youth, while ensuring the position of those in power. Only a few are involved in the process of policy making. As such, democracy "by the people" appears to be overshadowed and actual involvement by ordinary citizens in the process of engaging in policy making is misconstrued.

### EXPERT POLICIES

JIPS policy is, in part, a result of public demands that we need to "do something" about delinquency. Hackler (1985, p.181) states that:

> Since we must act, it is normal to ask the 'experts' to research the problem, analyze the causes, generate reasonable proposals, launch programs based on these proposals, evaluate these programs and rationally select the programs that will 'cure' delinquency. Many believe that this scientific approach will lead to the 'solution' of the problem.

Moreover, policy making and analysis develops from a process dominated by politics in which knowledge of experts plays an increasingly significant role. Technical policy analysis convinces agencies and the general public that the expert or professional knows what is best (Edelman, 1977). The government recognizes that expert knowledge is the preferred method of legitimizing social classifications. By giving authority to the experts, political leaders can escape responsibility and politics.

Stone (1993) agrees and uses the terms "clinical reasoning" or "clinical authority" of experts. She believes that clinical reasoning of experts removes power from ordinary citizens and places it in the hands of experts and professional researchers. As such, clinical reasoning through quantitative measurement then is to yield "objective" information. The objectivity begins with the examination of the target population, in this case, juvenile delinquents.

For example, clinical authority is often utilized to arbitrate claims of "truth" in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Rape trauma syndrome, the battered women's syndrome and the child abuse accommodation syndrome are all illustrations of how clinical authority is used in criminal and juvenile justice. To illustrate, the rape trauma syndrome unarguably has empowered women by giving them more credence and legitimacy in the courtroom. However, the substitution of "clinical" knowledge by the experts in place of experiential knowledge by the victims may have denigrated women as legitimate witnesses. According to Stone (1993, p.58), "the substitution of clinical observations for women's own claims still denies them credibility in the courts. Clinical experts--not women themselves--are constituted as the bearers of truth." The claim then becomes constructed and legitimized by the experts.

In essence, clinical authority may enhance the power of less privileged people on the surface, but the clinical professionals, not ordinary people or victims, gain influence over the public's understanding of a social problem. The professional experts have the power to construct such envisionary transformations and claims.
Stone also maintains that clinical authority "expects to find the source of trouble in the individual, and it promises to locate and define problems by measuring something inside the boundaries of the person" (p.47). In other words, clinical authority identifies an individual as a "delinquent," and measures his/her risks to decide a proper correctional approach. Moreover, it is the technical ability of the experts and professionals to reveal what is unknown that gives them their claim to control citizen classification on behalf of society (Ibid). It replaces subjective knowledge of the client with objective knowledge of the expert. However, what appears to be ironic is that the public-at-large does not appear to be nearly as punitive as public officials who are making the policy (see Schwartz, Guo & Kerbs (1993), Steinhart (1990) and Cullen et al. (1983).

Nevertheless, it is the politician and other public officials who make the policies directed at the youth. They are the ones who have the power to create punishment-oriented policies to demonstrate that they are "getting tough" on crime. If policies were developed and formed by people within communities, they might be quite different and would instead, reflect the public's ideas; hence, the community would be not only involved in the process but empowered through such involvement and decision-making. Thus, the policies would come from and by the people to whom the policy is directed.

EXPERT OBJECTIVITY

Experts identify some feature of an individual, i.e., the juvenile, that has measurable characteristics. For example, in order to be recommended for JIPS, the juvenile has to meet several conditions. Prior delinquent history, severity of the offense, emotional/mental stability, substance abuse and school performance all play a part in whether or not a juvenile is recommended for JIPS. Frequently, a risk-factor and/or needs assessment is conducted to determine if the juvenile is appropriate for intensive probation. Risk/needs assessments are empirically derived statistical predictions to measure the "dangerousness" of an individual, to assess the probability of recidivism and/or objectively measure the needs of such offenders with possible rehabilitation in mind.

Risk-needs assessments are used to choose among sentencing alternatives, such as JIPS. They are objective checklists that involve a number of categorical characteristics of the juvenile. According to the risk-needs assessments, one youth may pose more of a threat to recidivate and hence, may produce high levels of surveillance. Conversely, another youth on JIPS may indicate a greater need for substance abuse counseling or education and hence, may have more treatment requirements.

Since the early 1980s, quantitative assessment instruments have increased in popularity due to the belief that they are valid and accurate, and it is believed to limit the amount of discretion of decision makers in criminal and juvenile justice. For example, risk/needs assessments are purportedly used to lessen the amount of disparity and discretion of some of the key decision makers; that is, intake workers, juvenile probation officers, and judges. Individual-level case processing studies have demonstrated how "extralegal" or "social" factors such as race, age, gender and social class of the offender greatly influence court decision making (Hagan, 1974; Hagan & Bummiller, 1983; Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1988), as well as "extralegal" factors of key decision makers themselves (Reese, Curtis & Whitworth, 1988). Reese et al. (1988) concluded that decisions made on behalf of the youth may reflect the systematic disparity of juvenile justice personnel, specifically that of juvenile probation officers.

Added to these "extralegal" factors, "legal" factors such as type and seriousness of offense and prior criminal history also influence decision making in the juvenile justice system. These elements are often the factors on which risk/needs assessments instruments are formed. In addition, the structural context of the juvenile court itself (Sampson & Laub, 1993) may offer some reasons as to disparities in juvenile justice processing, including the differing ideologies of each juvenile court in the United States. Furthermore, the context and setting in which interactions between youth and juvenile justice officials are made also may affect decision making. Demeanor, language, speech, non-verbal communications and self-presentation of an offender all may account for varying amounts of discretion, both at the individual and systems-wide level.

Even though risk/needs assessments may be used to limit the amount of discretion, the underlying purpose is to, for example, predict future law-violating behavior and/or future needs in which offenders are assigned into "categories" to determine the proper level of supervision. Armstrong (1991, p.23) suggests that "the use of more formal and more quantitative assessment techniques will ensure a growing ability to target those youths who require more structured intervention and/or services and source provisions." Armstrong continues by saying that "if a major underlying principle of intensive supervision programs is the selection of that population of clients who will benefit the most from their involvement, a central objective must be the use of procedures providing the most objective and accurate predictions of both future conduct (risk) and the nature/extent of present problems and deficits (needs)" (p.20). In essence, quantitative measurements, such as risk-needs assessments, are popular tools used for the prediction of "accurate" intervention, treatment and/or punishment modalities. However, some studies contend that they may not be as "accurate" as generally believed (Ashford & LeCroy, 1988; Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990; Andrews & Kiessling, 1988).

Considerable debate continues on the "accuracy" of measurement devices. However, what occurs through this "objectification" is that offenders are subsequently "lumped" into categories based on their score. The higher
the score, the more "punishment" and/or intervention. Thus, it takes the individuality out of juvenile justice and assigns them a number by which their future in the system is determined. However, risk assessments may not really measure anything at all. It can be said that these type of devices are yet another source of clinical authority in which a level of risk or need becomes legitimized by a statistical design created by experts.

Some suggest that these predictive scores may limit the amount of discretion by decision-makers, but conversely, the youth’s future may, in part, be determined by how s/he “fits” into a measurement scale. As such, youths are treated as objects of intervention through such scales while the human element is forgotten. Furthermore, these scales purport to be scientific and are developed by experts who claim that they can give accurate predictions. However, in reality this is far from the case. Moreover, risk assessment instruments legitimize the practice of those in power while maintaining the status quo and controlling the predicted behavior of offenders.

### EVALUATIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS

Yet another aspect of expert knowledge in juvenile justice is evaluations to study the effectiveness of governmental programs for youth. Virtually all criminal justice and juvenile justice programs have an evaluation component built into the design. Most evaluations of intensive probation programs have looked at effectiveness questions (Armstrong, 1991; Barton & Butts, 1990; Barton & Butts, 1991; Feinberg, 1991; Latessa, 1987; Petersilia & Turner, 1990), without analyzing the actual policy itself. These impact evaluations often focus on technical violations, rates of recidivism or cost effectiveness. Some outcome evaluations determine the impact of more treatment-oriented goals or address the impact of the program on the system itself, i.e., net-widening. As such, evaluations conducted by “experts” may involve different approaches and the experts themselves may not always agree on which variables to measure.

However, criminal justice and juvenile justice evaluations almost always identify rates of recidivism to determine how effective the program is or if it is “working.” If the program is not working, then the experts are to find out why. These evaluations conducted by experts often measure quantitatively the outcomes of the conditions and its relative effectiveness. Countless evaluations of intensive probation programs have been conducted by experts to determine these effectiveness dimensions which are based on objectively defined criteria (see Armstrong, 1991; Baird, 1991; Byrne, 1989; Clear & Hardyman, 1990; Fagan & Reinarman, 1991; Feinberg, 1991; Latessa, 1987; Petersilia, 1990; Petersilia, 1989; Petersilia & Turner, 1990; Turner, Petersilia, & Deschenes, 1992). Furthermore, most studies have documented that JIPS is not cost effective and does not reduce recidivism. In other words, research has identified what happens to offenders after they have been in the program. But what about the actual JIPS policy that creates the conditions? Who is part of creating the policy, the policy process and of screening “appropriate” offenders? These types of issues are not adequately addressed since it is assumed that the technical experts are knowledgeable and hence, make the “correct” decisions and know what is best for society.

### SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONS

One result of expert policy is that it ignores the human side of individuals. For example, juveniles considered delinquent are socially constructed as being deviant and as being “monsters.” As such, “claimsmakers” construct problems and then promote a particular definition or perspective about them (Palumbo, 1994). Social problems, such as delinquency, “exist only because claimsmakers construct them and make the public and policy makers aware of their existence” (Ibid, p.v). For example, by the mid 1980s the characterization of alternatives to incarceration was changed from community corrections to “intermediate sanctions.” Researchers began to refer to them as “intermediate punishments,” saying that they were essential to achieve “just deserts” and to give judges more sentencing options than just probation or prison (McCarthy, 1987; Morris & Tonry, 1990; von Hirsch, 1992). “This new characterization of alternatives to incarceration emphasizes intermediate punishments and control over offenders rather than rehabilitation and community responsibility” (Palumbo & Petersen, 1994, p.161, original emphasis), as did the community corrections movement of the 1970s.

It is also suspect as to whether or not these types of sanctions are really alternatives to incarceration at all, since many offenders have not necessarily been targeted correctly; that is, if sanctions such as intensive probation did not exist, would they have received standard probation? This also raises the question of the net-widening effect of intermediate sanctions such as JIPS, in which this effect may not always have positive outcomes. The “toughness” of risk control may be a waste for those who constitute little risk. Furthermore, rehabilitation may not necessarily be the goal of JIPS and in essence, is another mechanism of control. Little potential for rehabilitation exists in many intermediate punishments but they have been seen by the public as offering some potential for rehabilitation of young offenders.

Moreover, social problems, such as juvenile delinquency, are not objectively defined as suggested by proponents of positivism. Rather, they are socially constructed by “claimsmakers” who usually have a stake in their claim. This type of constructionist approach looks beyond the assumptions of neutrality and objectivity of social problems. For example, in regard to the construction of elderly abuse, Baumann (1989, p.65) writes that “claimsmakers seek to persuade readers to accept their conclusions about the necessity for intervention and the appropriateness of the proposed intervention schemes.” Furthermore, experts play an increasingly important role in the construction of social problems. Powerless or marginalized people do not have the power to make such claims
of social problems and as such, the claims making of professionals often limit their ability to effectively participate in policies that influence their lives.

**CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRACY**

Stone (1993, p.65) suggests that clinical authority “elevates a particular type of expert knowledge and denigrates or even ignores the knowledge, perceptions, and interpretation of ordinary citizens in their relations with other individuals and with social institutions.” This then results in profoundly antidemocratic values (Dryzek, 1990; Stone, 1993), with citizens being prevented from self expression. The use of experts identifies individual problems and policies directed at individual behavior and thus, ignores the structural problems that exist in our society.

Expert knowledge reinforces the status quo, and usually fails to question social structures as causes of problems. Moreover, Lindbloom & Woodhouse (1993, p.135) state that “professional policy analysis tends to end up supporting the existing social order and its prevailing distribution of privileges and deprivations.” Experts assume that the existing system or policy is workable rather than challenging the irrationalities or coercive elements of, for example, the juvenile justice system. They do not appear to challenge the status quo.

Furthermore, public policy analysis conducted by experts has tended to focus on effectiveness and scientific quantitative analysis rather than to question citizenship and democracy (Dryzek, 1990; Smith & Ingram, 1993) or structural inequalities. Moreover, Dryzek (1990, p.112) notes that policy analysis within an expert culture is “another force of impoverishment of the life world and the obstruction of discursive democracy.” It has neglected to look at the full effects; that is, the effects of public policy on citizenship, participation or democratic values. Groups receiving policy may feel neglected in the policy process which leads to alienation and low participation. Disadvantaged groups’ voices, such as youth on JIPS, will rarely be heard.

“Delinquent” youth are considered a deviant population with a message sent to them that they are “bad” people who pose a nuisance to others and who will subsequently be punished for their actions. Ingram & Schneider (1993, p.91) suggest that these types of people are “angry and oppressed people who have no faith in government’s fairness or effectiveness. They see themselves as alone and as individual players who have no chance of ‘winning’ in a game that they view as essentially corrupt.” As such, justice and democracy may have little or no meaning to them.

Lindbloom & Woodhouse (1993) suggest that to improve the professional contributions to policy making, we need to reduce professional impairment; have experts become more open to challenge and to practice skepticism. Moreover, they state that “rather than aiming analysis solely at political elites, recognize that improved thinking by ordinary people may be humanities best hope” (p.138). In other words, maybe a professional could elicit the responses from groups to whom the policy is most effected, which could empower disadvantaged groups. Furthermore, I do not believe we should abandon the use of experts per se, but that their expertise could be used differently. Experts could assist and facilitate bottom-up empowerment. It is the actual process of decision making that is crucial for democracy.

Youth at all levels need to be empowered and should have opportunities to represent themselves. With regard to juvenile delinquency, how then would public policy be developed by the youth? First, we should ask youth their views of delinquency and the best ways to deal with “troublesome” kids. Youth in schools would be the main target of such decision-making. However, many youth do not necessarily attend school. Therefore, job corps, youth in correctional facilities and youth in-the-streets also need to be involved so, they too, would be involved in decision-making.

Youth would be asked their view and the best ways to deal with all types of adolescent issues. Their “voices” would not only be heard, but then acted-upon and as such, policies would represent their vested interests and not just the professionals who have the power. Furthermore, parents, teachers and members of the community would also take part in decision-making. Policies would then represent the interests of those most effected by future decisions and would represent the interests of the community collectively, not solely a technical expert who may not even know or adequately understand the community conditions or culture. From this would spur a grass-roots movement. This type of representation would help instill the ideas of democracy and citizenship in those people who never really had much voice before. However, this might be very difficult to do in such an individualistic society such as ours that is not in practice, based on communitarianism.

The restoration of community-based societal improvements will transpire and be “successful” only if all voices are heard and all are involved in decisions that affect their lives. It is fairly accepted that traditional punishment in its truest form of retribution does not work and as public opinion polls have demonstrated, the public has not yet given up on rehabilitation for its youth. Currently, only one part of the crime problem is being addressed and that is retribution, taking action after a offense has been committed. However, we need to attack the problems of crime and delinquency in a much more proactive policy approach, bringing together and encouraging as many voices as possible with the goal of each having an equal participatory voice. Support of the public, not solely the experts, is what needs to be greatly expanded in order for our society to improve.

**CONCLUSION**

In short, policy analysis based on instrumental rationality by professional experts can be antithetical to democracy. Policy design and analysis with expert advice tends
to support the status quo, which in turn reflects the values of the powerful. Ordinary citizens, such as those on JIPS, are not involved in the policy process and they are the ones to whom policy is directed toward. The end result is detrimental for youth and ultimately to society in that people without power often become more alienated from democracy and from further “buying into” society. Moreover, to help change this current practice, policy analysis needs to first look to society and social structures instead of identifying the individual as the center of the problem. Moreover, critical theory suggests that people need to become empowered, enlightened, and emancipated through policy rather than feeling alienated, neglected or ignored. Participating in the policy process is of utmost importance for individuals as well as society’s democratic values; people must feel as if they are part of society and hence, of democracy.

A participatory democracy would receive strong resistance from the government (Dryzek, 1990) since it may challenge the status quo and experts may not necessarily be used. Traditional policy-making would be “dismantled” and “ordinary” citizens would be highly involved. Dryzek suggests that this type of action would be like a removal of policy analysis from the state to the public. According to Kaufman-Osborne (1985), the goal of policy inquiry is to generate a community capable of taking political action on a particular social problem rather than an expert. This could be accomplished by involving citizens in the policy process.

Presently, policy design and analysis is conducted by experts who rely heavily upon objectively defined criteria in the selection of those eligible for a policy. They often support quantitative measurements and observable phenomena (i.e., delinquency). Policies such as JIPS are often aimed at correcting an individual problem rather than identifying problems with structures of society. Furthermore, traditional policy-making does not challenge the status quo. As a result, policies do not encourage participation of the recipients or that of the wider community. In essence, the experts are removing power from the already powerless citizens and youth and are placing it in the hands of a few who are viewed as knowing what is best for everyone.

The ultimate goal of creating policy is that people need to be adequately represented and empowered. We need to “empower those experiencing personal troubles with greater individual autonomy and greater say in the establishment of public issues” (Katovich & Reese, 1993, p.392). In other words, youth, parents and communities need to be able to be empowered to participate in activities that affect their lives. We need to instill the concepts of community and citizenship in public policy.

A “community-centered” and bottom-up approach to decision making and policy making would represent a true participatory democracy. Problems and solutions would be examined from those within the community which would reflect a genuine participatory policy approach that Laswell might have envisioned.

In order for policies to encourage citizenship and democracy, clients of a policy and the community-at-large need to become empowered and thus, a part of the policy process. The policy process needs to be expanded to include all to whom the policy effects, whether this be directly or indirectly. Youth, parents and community residents’ voices need to be heard and acted upon for policies to become more democratic. Authentic democratic participation is key to ameliorating the conditions of society.

Editors note: Due to space limitations, the reference list has been deleted. Please contact the author at the School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University (Box 870403, Tempe, Arizona, 85287-0403) if you would like to obtain a copy of the references.
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Recipients of the Western Society of Criminology Fellow Awards 1995-96

Paul T. Brantingham, David Matza, Dan Monez, and Arnold Rosenfield

Recipients of the Western Society of Criminology Awards 1995-96

The Paul Tappan Award — For Outstanding Contributions to the Field of Criminology

Edwin M. Lemert

The Joseph D. Lohman Award — For Outstanding Service to the Western Society of Criminology

Christine Curtis

The June Morrison-Tom Gitchoff Founders Award — For Significant Improvement of the Quality of Justice

Mimi Halper Silbert

President’s Award — For Contributions to the Field of Criminology and Positive Influence on the Current President’s Career

Mark Wiederanders

FYI

The 1995 Fall Semi-Annual Meeting of the Association for Criminal Justice Research (California) is to be held on October 23 and 24 at the Bahia in San Diego. Themes are community planning options/alternatives and privatization. Contact Welton Jones, Program Chair, (310) 492.1022 or Dale K. Sechrest, (909) 880.5566.