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CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

The Development of the Juvenile Court

The juvenile court as we know it today had its origins in the English Common Law. One branch of English law from which the juvenile court developed was chancery law which was mainly concerned with the property of children. Later, the law was given further interpretation whereby the court became interested in the welfare of children.

The court based its authority on two very sound legal principles which still carry great weight. They are the doctrines of parens patriae and in loco parentis. Parens patriae is shown when a Chancery Court Chancellor, acting for the Crown could place a child under its authority by declaring the child a ward of the court. The king in this case was seen as the father of his country and of course, as the, "... ultimate father and protector of all his subjects."^{1}

The Crown when acting in the interest of a child is acting in loco parentis, or in place of a parent (as a

---

parent would act). Today both of these legal principles are used to form the foundation of the juvenile court.

It should also be emphasized that the common law of England (which later became a basis for much of the law of the United States) held that a child under the age of seven years was incapable of committing a crime and hence not responsible for his actions. Children from seven to fourteen were thought not to be capable of committing a crime, either, but this could be challenged in a court.\(^2\) Children over the age of fourteen years were treated as adults. Whether this was due to early maturation and short life expectancy at that time, is not germane to our discussion. What is important is the fact that a child over the age of fourteen could be considered an adult and this has helped to develop the concept of concurrent jurisdiction regarding juvenile matters. Concurrent jurisdiction simply means that the juvenile court may not always have original jurisdiction in cases pertaining to juveniles.

Arizona's law, fortunately, makes it quite clear that the juvenile court has original jurisdiction in all juvenile matters. This philosophy will be given more amplification later in the introduction.

Today's juvenile court did not result only from English common law; other factors emerged in the eighteenth

\(^2\) Ibid.
and nineteenth centuries which aided its development. First, as was noted children came to be separated from adults in the court processes. Second, many influences from various fields added to an awareness that juveniles needed to be considered separately for any type of treatment program. The humanitarian reformers of the nineteenth century, the introduction of child labor laws, the industrial revolution itself, resulted in a general concern for social problems. It also saw the acceptance of the concept that the state should assume responsibility for those in need of its protection.³

Another influence responsible for the development of our modern juvenile court, is that of probation. Probation as we know it today has been called, "... a hybrid institution."⁴ This is because many have felt that it developed not only from English common law, but that it received a great impetus in the American courts.

Most of us are quite familiar with the story of John Augustus, America's first probation officer, but its social import renders its re-statement here a necessity. John Augustus was a Boston bootmaker and philanthropist who happened to be a member of an abstinence group. This group devoted its efforts in the promotion and advocacy of total

³. Ibid., p. 311.

abstinence from alcoholic beverages. In August of 1841, these endeavors led Augustus to a court in Boston to bail out a person who might have corresponded to a modern skid-row alcoholic. Augustus posted bail, took the hapless individual home, cleaned him up, gave him a change of clothes and at the end of three weeks returned him to court. The judge was so surprised and pleased that the chap was fined one cent plus court costs.  

So began John Augustus' eighteen year period of devotion to the efforts aimed at improving the lot of individuals who appeared in the Boston police courts. Also, it appears that John Augustus was the first to use the word probation, in describing his work with these cases.

It would be unwise for Americans to claim all the credit for the development of probation as a casework tool for dealing with offenders. It is, as was mentioned, a hybrid institution, meaning that its roots are firmly held by the soil of English common law.

Perhaps the earliest antecedants of probation can be found in English common law. These early precursors while not directly responsible for probation as we know it today had one thing in common and that was their attempt

---

to take the sting out of the harsh penalties of the king's laws.

It has been argued that the moral temper of the times was harsh, and that it was believed that man's lot in life was to be punished for his transgressions; nevertheless, the early humanitarian attempts at alleviation of severe punishment cannot be discounted. The thinking of the classical criminologists, such as Cesare Beccaria and others, no doubt left their impressions on the temper of the times.\(^7\) The members of the Classical School of Criminology argued that human nature expressed itself in hedonistically oriented behavior, i.e., a person acted in terms of how much pleasure or pain a certain act was calculated to bring to him. The more painful the consequences of antisocial acts became, the more control could be exerted by society.\(^8\)

The earliest forerunner of probation was benefit of clergy. This device was used first by members of the clergy, and was developed to enable people charged with misbehavior, to be tried in the courts of the church. This thirteenth century legal device later came to include anyone who could read, and the ability to read was defined as


\(^8\) Ibid., p. 260.
reading and memorizing a simple bible verse. The Ecclesiastical Courts of that time were generally more lenient and a bit of judicial manipulation saved many from severe sentences.

Another early legal device which aided the development of probation was the judicial reprieve. It was used by early English judges when they believed that a criminal conviction was unwarranted. It was further designed to allow the defendant to appeal his case to the crown in hopes of obtaining a pardon. Tappan has indicated that the first progenitor of probation, most certainly was the judicial reprieve.

We find another early source of probation in England with the judicial procedure called recognizance. Recognizance originally was a stipulation by the accused, who was not yet convicted, that he would behave himself and stay out of further trouble. Usually, in granting recognizance, some type of bail or bond was required and if the suspect did not keep the faith and violated the conditions of the bond, he could be returned to court to face further action. This sanction is also seen as a method of "preventative justice" and a means of avoiding harsh

10. Ibid.
penalties. It can be understood then, that in its early use, recognizance was a form of suspended sentence. The bond or posting bail was used with it and was seen in use especially among first offenders, and what would correspond to those convicted of misdemeanors. This form of action later became known as "binding over for good behavior." 

Much later recognizance came to mean a conditional release on a promise to appear before a court without the posting of a bail or bond. Today we see its use in the Inferior Courts of the City of Tucson and Pima County.

In this writer's contact with some young offenders aged 18 years and over, the phrase "r.o.r." was found to be in general use. This refers to "released on recognizance," and is in use on selected cases appearing before these courts.

Bond became an entrenched legal action and its widespread use was furthered by the passage of the English Criminal Law Consolidation Act of 1861, and the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879.

The use of bond was increased in the early colonies of America and it became noted for an alternative to harsh

11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
penalties then common to the criminal legal codes of the
day. Tappan states:

The conditional release of offenders under sponsorship of sureties was a true predecessor of probation. Indeed, it is dubious whether in a good many jurisdictions today more is accomplished by formal probation than was achieved long ago by suspending the imposition of sentence through the use of recognizance.\footnote{14}

Another form of suspended sentence which found general use in early Massachusetts was known as the filing of indictments. In these cases, following a conviction, the court had the authority to literally file away an indictment and in effect suspending sentencing of the individual. Two conditions had to be met in order for this process to take place: (1) the court had to decide that justice could be served by this method, and (2) the court had to have the consent of both the prosecutor and the defendant.\footnote{15}

Viewed in the context of the discussion, probation is seen as a court process. In one sense this is true. The various forms of suspended sentence, developed in the framework of English common law, have certainly added their mark on probation as we know it today. But, yet, modern probation is much more than a form of suspended sentence. Indeed, it can be successfully argued that probation is a

\footnote{14}{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 541.}
\footnote{15}{\textit{Ibid.}}
sentence in and of itself. In another sense, however, probation is not just a court process, but also a correctional process.

Probation, then, is a legal sanction or court sentence, in that a court may sentence an individual to prison for a length of time but may refuse to impose this sentence by placing this individual on probation. Probation is seen as a correctional process because it seeks to change an individual's behavior and help him to become a responsible, law-abiding citizen; and it seeks to do this while the person is functioning in the community.

Tappan has indicated that probation consists (usually) of the following elements:

1. conviction of a crime
2. the selection of cases for this disposition
3. the suspension of sentence for a specified period of time and the avoidance of imprisonment
4. the imposition of conditions as a limitation on the freedom of the offender, and as a basis of possible revocation
5. the control and treatment of the individual in the community.

It is to be noted that these conditions vary from community to community and from the various court structures from which they arise.

The process of probation is carried out by probation officers. The officers work for and are responsible to the court and to the judge who is its titular head.

---

16. Ibid., p. 539.
Administratively speaking, the organization of the probation officers is called a probation department or office. The probation department is the action arm of the court. It is here that the functions of probation supervision are carried out. Although a part of the court, the probation department is really a separate entity. It is the probation department which accomplishes the routine day-to-day assignments which the judge has ordered.

Most probation departments are administered by a chief probation officer and an assistant. They are responsible for hiring the middle management level supervisors and other probation officers. In juvenile courts having jurisdiction over detention homes, a supervisor of detention facilities is an integral part of the department. Other management personnel might include a training supervisor, personnel supervisor, receiving supervisor, business manager, and supervisor of probation officers.

The success of the department is enhanced or degraded by the quality of the personnel who do the work of the department. Many a department, suffering from cramped quarters, and even low salaries, has been able to function to a high degree because of the quality of its staff.

It is the probation officer, also called field probation officer or deputy probation officer, who by his relationship to the client or probationer, on a one to one
basis, is able to help the client effect change in his behavior. This "miracle" (and sometimes it seems miraculous), this change, is the justification of the sentence of probation by the judge. How does a judge arrive at a decision to place an individual on probation?

After the defendant in a criminal court proceeding has been found guilty, or has entered a guilty plea, the probation officer is directed by the judge to prepare a report which will enable the judge to arrive at a decision regarding the sentencing of the defendant. In some juvenile court jurisdictions the report may be compiled before the individual's appearance in court. In others, the report comes after the individual has been adjudicated for an offense. This latter development is being seen more frequently since the United States Supreme Court's decision "In the Matter of Gault." The implications of this decision upon the Pima County Juvenile Court will be discussed at the conclusion of this diary.

The report is made from information obtained in various interviews with the client. In compiling the report the probation officer is intending to gather enough information to make a diagnosis of the problem that is now facing the client. The probation officer is trying to answer the question: What factors have caused this individual to commit criminal and/or illegal acts? Points to be considered in this report are: early developmental
history, factual data about his family, school information such as attendance and grades, prior criminal record, medical history, employment history, etc. This report helps the judge and the probation officer make an evaluation of the situation. The final part of the report concerns itself with a recommendation to be made to the judge stating the reasons why the client should or should not be placed on probation. It should be noted that in some states the conviction resulting from the commission of certain crimes, automatically precludes the granting of probation by the court.

The report is usually presented to the judge prior to the time of sentencing. The judge is free to make use of the recommendation or to follow his own thinking. It should be fully understood that the probation officer does not "play God" or "play judge"; that is, in the final analysis the judge is the one who sentences and it is his decision whether or not to grant probation.17

Probation was logically carried into the structure of the juvenile court and today is considered an integral part of it. Although probation, being both a court process and a correctional process, in itself did not cause the development of the juvenile court. The court developed

17. R. A. Mulligan, lecture notes Public Administration 346a. Also stated by Judge Jack G. Marks presiding Judge of Pima County Juvenile Court Center.
from several diverse factors. On the one hand, the court received an impetus from English Chancery Courts. On the other hand, humanitarian reforms evidenced especially during the nineteenth century saw children being singled out to receive special attention.\footnote{18}

The honor of the development of the first juvenile court belongs to the state of Illinois. The legislature of that state passed an Act in 1899, providing for the establishment of a juvenile court. The first juvenile court was held in the Circuit Court of Cook County. This procedure was used throughout the state, and soon after the juvenile court began in Illinois, other states followed suit.\footnote{19}

Delinquency in the state of Illinois was given a broad definition. It stated that a delinquent child was simply one who violated any state, village, or city law. As we shall later see, the law of the state of Arizona is quite similar. In addition the Illinois statute eliminated many of the features found in the criminal courts, such as: the use of indictments, the arresting of children by warrant, informal judicial proceedings, separate courtrooms and even separate records.\footnote{20} The philosophy behind the new

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{18} Bloch and Flynn, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 310.
\item \footnote{19} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 311.
\item \footnote{20} \textit{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}
law was that the treatment of children should be similar to what a parent would do. Again the reader can see the interplay of the two doctrines of *parens patriae* and *in loco parentis*. The court acting as a "wise parent" was presumed to have an adequate knowledge of the problems of children in order to make proper decisions. The broad discretionary powers of the Illinois juvenile court law had their effect on the development of juvenile court laws across the United States. It has been said that the reformers active in the development of the first juvenile court had as their goals, the removing of children from contact with adults, especially in jails, and the protection and extension of the powers of the state to not only delinquent, but to neglected and dependent children as well.  

Although the philosophy of the juvenile court certainly pervaded the country (a juvenile court in all states by 1945), no cohesive element was seen as a unifying factor. The fact is that the juvenile court is all too often a part of another court jurisdiction. In many instances, it does not even have a full time judge. Usually its judge is a representative of the larger jurisdiction, and comes to sit on the bench of the juvenile court.


court only when needed. In a sense then, the juvenile court becomes somewhat like an orphan child whom no one really wants. Concomitantly, the fact that the juvenile court usually does not have a full time judge also means that the juvenile court lacks a trained judge. There are no specialized schools where a judge may go to learn and acquire the skills needed to become a judge in the juvenile court. In truth, a modern judge can barely keep abreast of the developments in criminal and civil law, let alone juvenile court law.

What is needed is a specialized court in a specialized jurisdiction designed to handle the problems of juveniles only. Furthermore, this court needs a full time, eight to five, five days a week judge, who has the specialized training, not just in law, but especially in the behavioral sciences, to deal with the problems of juveniles; juveniles neglected, delinquent, and dependent. Furthermore, this judge should be either elected to this specialized office or he should be appointed as has been proposed by some legal groups.

The functions of the court are so important and essential to modern society, that its needs require nothing but specialized training, devotion, and attention of the wise, understanding judge. The writer feels that these views are far from utopian and in many states could be met by only minor statutory changes.
The image of the juvenile court can be only aided by a system designed with these tentative standards in mind. It cannot be stated too often that the Gault Decision, whatever its merits or demerits, does not really alter the all-pervading philosophy of *parens patriae* and *in loco parentis*. The juvenile court is a helping court and in order that it maintain the autonomy it so richly deserves, it is essential that its main concern be that of helping children with their problems. Any movement that would deviate from this standard, can only be considered inimical to the entire juvenile court process. The juvenile court was developed and designed with the express notion of being separate and apart from the adult court jurisdictions in order to render aid to children who had problems; hence, the inclusion of neglected and dependent children in its framework. Those who would fetter the court in its relationships with children had better examine their own motivations with much thought and care. If the changes that are so ardently sought only bring the juvenile court that much closer to the adult jurisdictions, what is to be gained?

The writer has sat in countless juvenile court proceedings and has witnessed many legal manipulations by sharp-witted attorneys. If the appearance of a lawyer in the juvenile court proceeding is to guarantee the juvenile involved that the lawyer will get a petition dismissed on
a legal technicality, then a great disservice has been done and the philosophy of the court has been prostituted.

It seems essential to this writer, that the informal nature of the juvenile court proceeding be maintained, in order to establish an atmosphere conducive to the development of a relationship between the court, the child and the parents which will enable the helping process of a rehabilitation program to take place.

Although the court hearing can be said to have two functions, determination of jurisdiction, has the child committed the delinquent act, and discussion of the problem or disposition, the major portion of the hearing is rightfully concerned with the dispositional phase of the problem. Since the court's function is to offer help to the juvenile and his problems, it can be seen that the hearing would concern itself with a discussion of the problem of why the juvenile has appeared in court, and what can be done to help him to become a better citizen. Insofar as the hearing deviates from this, the court is losing its "helping quality," the hearing is wasted, and the court's time could be better used elsewhere.

There are those who will immediately say, "What about the rights of the child?" "What you are advocating is a railroading of justice!" Nothing could be further from the truth. Thanks to the Gault Decision, the writer feels sure that no juvenile's rights will be or are going
to be lost in the court process. No judge is in a hurry to rush to an adjudication where a child feels he is not in violation of the law. It can be argued that if a juvenile wants all his civil rights the only way to obtain them would be to transfer the case to an adult jurisdiction. In an adult jurisdiction, the individual would be guaranteed all of his rights. He would be entitled to a jury trial, which would be as impartial a proceeding as our modern society can have. He would also be entitled to all of the publicity that goes with the adult court.

Gerald Francis Gault was a juvenile who lived in Gila County, Arizona. He had previously been placed on probation by the Gila County Juvenile Court. He had violated the terms of his probation by allegedly making obscene telephone calls. For this offense he was committed to the Arizona State Industrial School at Ft. Grant, Arizona.

His parents appealed the Superior Court order on a writ of habeas corpus. They contended through their attorney that their son's civil rights had been violated and that Gerald's constitutional rights had been denied to him in six major areas. They are:

1. Notice of Charges
2. Right to Counsel
3. Right to Confrontation and Cross Examination
4. Privilege against Self-Incrimination
5. Right to a Transcript of the Proceedings
6. Right to Appellate Review

The Arizona State Supreme Court upheld the findings of the lower court. A further appeal was made and, in 1967, the U. S. Supreme Court brought forth its historic Gault decision. In it the Court held that the juvenile court hearing must measure up to the standards of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution's 14th amendment. It also stated that adequate notice be given in all respects as would be given in either a civil or criminal proceeding. Elaborating further, the court indicated that parents might retain counsel and they were entitled to have counsel appointed if they could not afford one. Also, the child could remain silent if he so chose. The court must also have clear and convincing evidence if there is no valid confession. It should be noted that confessions per se are still valid in juvenile court procedures. The court did not rule upon transcripts, the failure of the juvenile judge to indicate the reasons for his judgments, and the problem of appellate review.

The lone dissenter in the Gault decision was Mr. Justice Potter Stewart, who indicated that he would dismiss this appeal, because to cause a lengthy number of requirements on a juvenile hearing is "to invite a long step

backward into the Nineteenth Century. In retrospect, it is the opinion of this writer that Gerald Gault was the victim of small-town, informal, rural justice. It is doubtful whether a Gault decision could have arisen from large urban counties, such as Pima or Maricopa. If all of the constitutional safeguards had been maintained would Gerald still have been committed? A reading of the Arizona Supreme Court's decision indicates that perhaps Judge McGhee would have not changed his decision in any event.

It needs to be mentioned at this point that the Pima County Juvenile court, under the leadership of Judge Jack G. Marks, was "expecting" the Gault decision and had already modified the court's process in anticipation of the decision. Petitions had to be modified and the judge would not consider a recommendation for commitment unless the child (note, child, not parents) had legal counsel present. In certain instances this right has been waived, but then it is done only in open court, after the judge has fully explained the situation to the juvenile involved.

Again this last statement provokes another question, "Can a child intelligently waive his right to counsel?" This could be argued for hours, suffice it to say that below certain ages he cannot.

24. Ibid., p. 6.
A further change made necessary by the Gault decision was the development of the bifurcated hearing. As was stated previously, a standard hearing consists of an adjudication and a dispositional phase. The Pima County Juvenile Court divided the hearing into its two elements and ended up with a two-phased hearing. The first part consists only of the adjudicatory stage, where the court makes a determination based on evidence and testimony of whether or not there has been a violation of the law. If there has been and the youngster is adjudicated under the Court's authority, then a probation officer is assigned to the case to make an investigation of the juvenile and his family, write a report and submit it to the judge or to his representative, a referee, at the dispositional hearing held a month or so later. The interim period is to be used to give the probation officer time to do an adequate evaluation of the youngster.

The bifurcated hearing may or may not be original with Pima County. It has dissipated the criticism that a juvenile court pre-hearing report was prejudicial in that it was submitted prior to adjudication, and was used instead of evidence to argue for the court's adjudication of a youngster.
Probation in Arizona

Arizona can boast of having a juvenile court before it even became a state. The passage of the juvenile court bill by the territorial legislature in 1907 was a landmark in the history of the state of Arizona. It has been noted that the public was not very much aware of the fact and the passage did not even make the newspapers. The early law did not even bother to use the word juvenile in its wording but this did not bother the local officials. As was mentioned earlier, the wording of the Arizona law was patterned after that of Illinois.

The first juvenile court bill, contained many of the concepts that still today form the nucleus of the procedural and functional framework of the juvenile court in Arizona.

For example, the early law provided that the district courts in the territorial counties, forerunners of the county superior courts, had original jurisdiction in cases involving neglected, dependent, and delinquent children. This part of the law is essentially similar to today's statute, with the main difference being in the age of the definition of what constituted children. The early law used sixteen years as the age delimiting the court's

jurisdiction while our modern, revised statute indicates that the juvenile court is empowered to deal with children under the age of eighteen years.\textsuperscript{26}

The early statutes further set the manner and temper of the court hearing by indicating that the judge could either hold the juvenile hearing in regular court or in his chambers. The thinking behind this particular statute seemed to be in maintaining the hearing separate from criminal cases.\textsuperscript{27} It should be noted that the early law provided for the concept of concurrent jurisdiction. Basically, it allowed the district courts to retain their powers to indict and bring to trial a child charged with a crime. The juvenile court in Arizona today, has identical authority. It can, in its discretion, refuse to treat a child within its jurisdiction and thus transfer the matter to the adult jurisdiction.

Since the enactment of the first juvenile code in territorial days, the State Legislature has seen fit to revise and update the statutes from time to time. The earliest mention of probation is in the original territorial code, which provided for probation services before, during, and after a juvenile proceeding. Unfortunately, no


\textsuperscript{27} Morrison, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 26.
payment provisions were noted. The court was expected to appoint the necessary workers to do the job at hand. Not until the Twenty-Fifth Legislature passed an amendment, was it possible for the voluntary help situation to be changed. At that time it became the responsibility of the county board of supervisors to provide pay. This situation remains the same today, with pay for probation staff coming from the general fund of the county, with the state and the county dividing equally the salary of the judge.

An important provision added in 1917 concerned the confidentiality of the juvenile proceeding. The law indicated that the juvenile court docket be kept separate and apart from the rest of the superior court proceedings and records. Thus, the effect was to impart a secret and exclusive nature to the entire juvenile court process. This provision was repealed by the State Legislature in 1957. Today the effect of a juvenile court adjudication is not considered privileged information. It is true that many counties receive the support and cooperation of the local news media and the names of juveniles are not publicized. The exceptions to be noted here, are in notorious cases, where heinous acts have been committed by juveniles. In situations such as these, it would be almost impossible to control publicity in the various news media. Indeed, it can be successfully argued that perhaps more publicity should be given to juvenile court proceedings. In our
democratic society, the accused is entitled to a "speedy and public trial" and justice is served best when the hearing is an open one.

The writer has also had contact with those who even advocate more "openness" and publicity in the dispositional phase of a court hearing. Mr. Sol Rubin, counsel for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, has indicated to this writer and others that the pre-sentence investigation and dispositional report should not be treated as a confidential document, to the extent of allowing the subject of the report to see its contents. It was the feeling of Mr. Rubin that no information could be so dangerous to the subject awaiting sentencing that it would cause harm to that person.

As Arizona grew from a territory to a state, the juvenile code was modified through various revisions, the last of which occurred in 1957. Presently the code is in need of further revisions due to the effects of the Gault Decision, which have rendered certain portions of the code unconstitutional. A copy of the present code as it pertains to the juvenile court will be included in the diary.

The Juvenile Court and Probation in Pima County

At 1:30 P.M. November 26, 1907, the Juvenile Court of Pima County came into existence when as its first order of business, Mr. Henry Meyer was appointed as its first probation officer. The order makes no mention of salary for Mr. Meyer, but the judge of that district court made certain that the probation officer was to serve "the pleasure of the Court."

In its early years Pima County had little need for detention services, and children who committed serious violations were kept in the county jail, while the less serious offenders were housed with the probation officer. It was not until 1909 that the law allowed the Board of Supervisors to pay the probation officer on a per diem basis for the children detained in his home. Later changes made it necessary for the sheriff to rent quarters to keep juveniles separate and apart from adult offenders. In 1913 a new law was passed requiring the establishment of a county detention home. Pima County's first detention home was operated by Mr. and Mrs. Patrick Higgins. In the years from 1920 through 1929, Mr. Pat Higgins was the juvenile probation officer of the county. This first detention home had a capacity of twelve. Mrs. Higgins operated a

detention facility for Pima County until 1947, at which time the entire juvenile court was moved to the court house. At that time children were again housed in separate quarters in the county jail, a direct violation of the requirements of state law.30

From this writer's conversations with various workers at the Juvenile Probation Department, it was learned why Mrs. Higgins had such a great success in the caring for detained children. Mrs. Higgins was of German ancestry, and was reported to be an excellent cook. To say that she developed control through her cooking is not overstating the case. Many of the children with whom she came in contact had literally never been fed so well.31

In September 1956, the Pima County Juvenile Probation Department and Juvenile Court moved to a new facility located between the present Freeway and the Santa Cruz River. The facility was named "Mother Higgins" as a tribute to the lady who had for many years worked with juveniles. In 1963 the name of the building was changed to the "Pima County Juvenile Building." The original name stayed and was still in general usage by the juvenile population of the county at the time of this internship.


31. Interviews with Mrs. Helen Wollard and Mrs. Christine deCook, former employees of the Pima County Juvenile Court Center.
This building had approximately 8,700 square feet of floor space, and when first occupied provided more than adequate space for its staff. In it was included a detention home with space for twenty-six boys and twelve girls, a probation department, and a juvenile court. Although the design of this building was in most respects good, future expansions for staff and larger detention populations were evidently not given much consideration.

The facility was opened at a time when Tucson and its environs were undergoing the tremendous growth in population which continued until the early 1960's. By 1963 the staff was beginning to outgrow this building, and by 1965 a branch office was opened on Tucson's east side to provide more office space and interview rooms for probation officers. This arrangement continued until December 1967, when a new Juvenile Court Center was opened for business on East Ajo Way near South Campbell Avenue. The "old" building cost $266,000. The new facility cost $467,000 and comprises 31,000 square feet of floor space. It was designed to meet Tucson's expected growth until the year 2000.32

The new Juvenile Court Center instituted changes in detention procedures which bear mentioning. In the former juvenile detention home, children were housed two to a

32. Pima County Juvenile Court Center, op. cit., p. 4.
room. The new facility uses a dormitory arrangement called a "Living Unit" where detention personnel are present twenty-four hours a day with the youngsters. If the youngster creates a disturbance he can be removed from the group and isolated. The detention program has been improved to allow for more activities while a child is being detained. A full time resource teacher is now attached to the detention home to enable youngsters to receive remedial help as well as to coordinate home-work programs.

A Receiving Unit with its own offices is now a central part of the over-all program. It is the responsibility of the receiving unit and its officers to screen all referrals to the department and to make preliminary dispositions of cases. At receiving, the family and the youngster first make contact with the probation department and it is here that a decision is made whether or not to detain a youngster. Notice that the decision is not made by the police agency. For although a police agency may make an arrest, take the juvenile into custody, and bring him to the Juvenile Court Center, the receiving officer may decide to release him to his parents. The criteria used are: (1) Will the youngster run away if released? (2) Will he commit another delinquent act? and (3) Is he a danger to himself or to the community?
The new building also provides for two court rooms with their own separate lobby, for now the court is holding some sixty juvenile court hearings per week. Each court room is connected to a private judge's chambers, so that the judge and court referees can accomplish office work when they have time available.

With the opening of the new Juvenile Court Center, the entire staff is now able to function in a much less crowded atmosphere and this new spaciousness has obviously made the work of the probation staff easier to perform. This writer has noted on many occasions, that even the clientele have remarked on the building and its open "airy" qualities.
CHAPTER II

DIARY OF WORK EXPERIENCE

The introduction of the diary begins with the Juvenile Court of territorial days and finishes with the developments brought about by the recent Gault decision.

The actual work experience, however, is in the spring of 1964, before many of the changes actually had taken place.

On the 17th of February, 1964, I appeared at the Pima County Juvenile Building for an interview with Mr. Joel Valdez, the training officer for the probation department. He explained my duties, responsibilities and informed me that I would be attending training classes. It was made clear to me by Mr. Valdez that the specialized training that was to be given to me, an intern, was the same that was to be given to the new probation officer trainees. It was further indicated by Mr. Valdez that few departments offered such specialized training. I was asked to report in a week. Due to the fact that I was also working as a graduate assistant at the university, my work schedule was to include a 400 hour internship program with twenty, twenty-hour weeks of experience.
Monday, February 24, 1964

Today the internship program began; and I am to attend training sessions with three new officers, two men and a woman. The training session began with an intensive study of the juvenile code of the state of Arizona. The code is contained in the Arizona Revised Statutes as amended in 1956. The code, for the most part, is self explanatory; but certain areas were given special emphasis by our training supervisor. We learned that in order for a probation officer to be effective in his job, he must know the limits of his authority.

A copy of the entire juvenile code will be found in the appendix of this diary. In addition to dealing with delinquent children, the Court also has original and exclusive jurisdiction over dependent and neglected children, but in the Pima County Juvenile Court, these functions are carried out by a specialized worker, Mrs. Davison.

Upon reviewing the code in its entirety, questions were solicited. It seemed to this intern that certain areas of the code were rather broadly defined. In section 8-201 the word "incorrigible" is not really defined. I wondered if this might not cause some problems when a juvenile appeared in court and the judge had to make a decision as to whether or not the child was in fact, "incorrigible." Mr. Valdez answered that a state of
incorrigibility existed when a parent was no longer able to control his child. The law requires that a parent be responsible for his child and hence the parent must have the youngster under supervision or control.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent reviewing the code and various departmental procedures.

Tuesday, February 25, 1964

Today Mr. Valdez arranged for the "class" to observe court hearings. The regular judge of the Juvenile Court, Judge Alice Truman, is to preside today, and will be hearing neglect cases and cases where the probation officer has recommended a commitment to an institution.

The first case of the afternoon involved three juveniles alleged to be neglected. A representative from the welfare department was present at the hearing to give testimony. This hearing must have had more than the usual importance and interest, in addition to the Judge and court personnel, the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, the Assistant Chief Juvenile Probation Officer, and various other workers in the department were present. From the investigation of the welfare department, the Court learned that the mother of the three juveniles had a long standing police arrest record. The welfare worker gave testimony, described a very questionable home situation due to the fact that the mother had been arrested recently for
prostitution and lewd acts. Previous to this court hearing, two of the children, both girls, were adjudicated delinquent minors placed on probation and placed in a foster home. One of the girls, Mary, had run away from the foster home and had made such poor progress while on probation that her probation officer was recommending to the Court that she be committed to the Good Shepherd School for Girls. After much deliberation Judge Truman entered a commitment order on Mary. Mary's sister Gloria was a mentally retarded child, but due to the fact of the neglectful home situation, arrangements were made for her placement at the Valley of the Sun School for retarded children located in Phoenix. Manny, the youngest of the juveniles involved, was adjudicated a neglected child and his care and custody was given to the welfare department. I was informed by Mr. Valdez that it was the responsibility of the welfare department to place this youngster in an approved foster home. The family left the courtroom in tears.

The next case involved a youngster referred to the court for violating the terms of his probation because of incorrigible behavior in the home. The judge asked the boy to explain what his problem was and why he should be continued on probation. The youngster did not communicate well to the court, and so his probation officer gave testimony from a seated position, and explained what had
happened and what the family and the probation officer were trying to do to alleviate the problem. The judge continued the boy's probation but warned him that the next time he appeared in court he might have to go to Fort Grant, the state's industrial school.

After a twenty minute recess, more cases were heard by Judge Truman. The first case to be heard after recess concerned Joan, a 15 year old Anglo girl referred for immoral conduct. From statements given by her probation officer it became apparent that Joan's misconduct was not a single encounter, but a pattern that had been developed since the girl was twelve years old. Joan was committed to the Good Shepherd School.

The last case of the afternoon was rather surprising. Arthur, an eleven and a half year old boy, had been on probation for about eight months. His probation officer Mr. Auburn (senior probation officer in the department), described a youngster who not only would not accept the controls of his parents but those of anyone else either. The probation officer related that Arthur had been apprehended at the Greyhound Bus Depot on February 16, at 4:00 A.M. As the testimony continued this student realized that this boy was completely out of anyone's control. Mr. Auburn recommended that Arthur be committed to Fort Grant and be placed in the junior cottage for boys under the age of twelve. The judge followed his recommendation. This
was the final case of the day, and the training class was allowed to leave early.

Wednesday, February 26, 1964

This afternoon's training session was spent in reviewing and learning the departmental procedures in handling the cases of juveniles. The newly hired probation officers did have an advantage over me in that they were and are being trained on an eight hour training program, while I come in to work in the afternoon from one o'clock until five o'clock.

This afternoon we discussed the Intake Department and its functions. All new cases referred to the department by the various police agencies are screened by the Intake Supervisor. Mr. Kohl then assigns the cases to various intake officers who have the responsibility to evaluate it and either "adjust" them, or bring the cases to court. An "adjustment" means that the department will take no official action. Usually the parent and child are counseled to determine the youngster's attitude and to see if there are any serious problems. If the Intake Officer decides that the case must come to court, petitions are filed by the chief probation officer, and a pre-hearing report is prepared by the intake officer assigned to the case. At the time of the court hearing a determination of adjudication and a disposition of the case will be made.
The court makes use of probation in the majority of its dispositions.

After this discussion the training class reviewed forms necessary to their work. A copy of all forms used in the department will be found in the appendix of this diary.

Thursday, February 27, 1964

This afternoon's training class was spent in further work in learning and familiarizing ourselves with the many procedures that seem to go with the job of being a probation officer. Attention was given to the procedures used in a hearing involving severance of parental rights. Since the action of the court is final in such a matter, extreme caution is given to all aspects of the case. Parents, witnesses, police officers, welfare workers, all are subpoenaed to the hearing. Usually in such cases, there already has been an adjudication of neglect or dependency. If the parents cannot be reached by a direct personal service of a subpoena, then other efforts involving mail and advertisements are made.

The Order to Show Cause Hearing was also given great amplification. Since Arizona law requires that parents help to pay for the support of their children while they are in state institutions (ARS-8-231, b), many of the juvenile court hearings are devoted to determining if and to what extent the parents are able to support their
children who have been committed to institutions provided by the state.

The remainder of the afternoon was consumed by observing court hearings. The first case involved a severance of parental rights. In this case the parents did not show up for the hearing. It was learned that the mother was placing her child, born out of wedlock, for adoption. In this instance the court terminated the parent's rights.

The next case we observed concerned itself with the annual review of a neglect case. In a neglect or dependency case regular reviews are a matter of procedure. At the termination of the hearing, the judge ordered that two of the children who had been placed in the custody of the welfare department, be returned to the parents.

Case two involved a sixteen year old Mexican-American boy who was living in a foster home. The social worker from the welfare department recommended that the youngster's care and custody continue with the welfare department, with the boy to continue to live with his foster parents. It was so ordered.

The third case was an order to show cause hearing. The father Mr. J. was ordered to show cause why he should not be held in contempt of court for not paying support for his son who was living at Fort Grant. The records showed that the father was $180.00 in arrears. Besides being
subpoenaed to the hearing, Mr. J. was also ordered to bring his financial statements such as payroll stubs, and income tax returns. The father was able to show that he was suffering from some financial hardships at this time, but that he had intentions of paying his debts. The judge reduced his monthly payment from twenty-five dollars to fifteen dollars, but explained to the father that he would have to pay the arrears.

The remaining cases of the afternoon were those concerned with children who had violated their probation in one way or another.

The final case of this afternoon was of particular interest, because it involved a remand to the adult jurisdiction. The youngster, Larry S., was already on probation to the Pima County Juvenile Court. His probation officer pointed out to the court that this youngster had been on probation in another state and had been treated as an adult in that jurisdiction. The officer further testified that Larry was not responding to supervision. Judge Truman ordered that this youngster be remanded to the adult court for the present offense, auto theft. At the conclusion of the hearing the judge permitted the training class to ask questions. This intern wondered how the decision to remand the case to the adult court was made. Judge Truman indicated that several factors entered into her decision. First, was the age of the juvenile; in this
case the boy was seventeen and a half years old. Judge Truman stated that the court simply does not have the resources to handle boys and girls who are approaching their eighteenth birthdays. Second, was the fact that the youngster was having problems in another jurisdiction, to the extent that he was on probation and had been remanded. Third, the fact that other probation officers had tried to work with this youngster also entered the picture. Fourth, the offense itself was considered. In this case auto theft was a serious violation of the law.

Friday, February 28, 1964

This afternoon our training supervisor suggested that we observe more court hearings. His reasoning was that by observing court hearings, we would see all types of cases and situations which can occur in the Juvenile Court.

Today's cases were in the most part new cases. By that is meant that these children had never been before the court. We were informed by Mr. Valdez that some of these youngsters had never been referred to the Juvenile Court, while for others it was their third or fourth time to be referred to the agency.

The first two hearings concerned probation violations, in which the court admonished the children, and gave advice to the parents. Both youngsters were continued on probation.
The third case saw a thirteen year old girl appear before the court for her involvement in acts of sexual delinquency. The mother stated to the court that she was keeping a very close watch over her daughter's activities. This intern received the distinct impression that the mother was trying to cover up her lack of supervision of this youngster. The girl made few statements to the court. She was adjudicated a delinquent minor and placed on official probation. At the conclusion of the hearing a female probation officer was assigned to this case. The new probation officer introduced herself and told the family that she would like to talk to all of them. Mr. Valdez had indicated the post-hearing interview was most important, because it was here that the worker could develop rapport and interpret to the family the meaning of a probation program.

The next hearing of the afternoon involved acts of malicious mischief and burglary committed by a fifteen year old boy. After questioning the boy about his involvement, and indicating that the Juvenile Court would take jurisdiction in the matter, Judge Truman asked the father what disciplinary action the parents had taken. The father replied that he had restricted the boy to the home. Judge Truman felt that this was an entirely too lenient approach. The Judge asked the boy to leave the courtroom in order that she might talk to his parents. Judge Truman then
counseled the parents about their approach with their child. She indicated that they might be losing control of him. She recommended that they adopt a much more strict approach toward him. At this point the intake officer Mr. Huerta stated that he felt that this was the heart of the problem. He indicated that in his opinion, the parents were entirely too lax. The Court indicated that it sometimes must take the role of a parent if a parent is not capable of so doing. At this time the youngster was called back to the hearing, placed on official probation and assigned a probation officer. In addition strict conditions of probation were imposed: That he have definite curfew hours, and that he not associate with the other boys involved in the offense. The final stipulation was that the child be responsible for his fair share of the restitution.

It was learned that the Juvenile Court will make restitution orders in order to help youngsters to develop more responsibility and to help somewhat to pay for the cost of damages to property. The probation officer sees to it that the youngster pays the restitution, but is under strict order not to collect or to have anything to do with the collection of restitution monies. Despite the fact that state law allows this to be one of the duties of a probation officer, this intern agrees whole-heartedly with
the department's policy. Collecting money is not part of
the role of a probation officer.

The next case was related to the preceding one.
Two brothers Joe and Tom, also committed acts of malicious
mischief and burglary with the previous appearing youngster.
These boys too, were adjudicated delinquent minor children
and placed on probation.

The remaining cases of the day were termed "review,"
or informal hearings. Usually the probation officer
appeared alone before the judge. The probation officer
would explain that one of the children in his caseload had
violated his probation in a minor manner. Perhaps the
youngster had violated the terms of his curfew, or maybe
had been referred again to the court. In any event the
officer would ask the judge to "adjust" the matter. It can
be understood then that the cases which do come to the
attention of the court are usually considered to be of a
serious nature.

Monday, March 2, 1964

Today I attended the regular Monday afternoon staff
meeting. The entire courtroom is filled to capacity. It
seems like most of the staff is here to attend this meeting.
Dr. Lewis Hertz of The University of Arizona is to explain
to us the meaning and purposes of psychological evaluations,
which are used by probation officers in their dealings with children.

Dr. Hertz explained that in conducting a psychological evaluation, he is able to quickly get a picture of the personality of the person by the use of subtle and obvious techniques.

He indicated that he starts the exam by asking the subject to draw a picture of a person. Following this, he asks the person to make up a story about the person he has drawn. Dr. Hertz stated that he was always looking for clues to other areas in the subject's own life.

Next in the series of the test battery, comes the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. From this test an accurate measurement of the child's intelligence can be gained. Following this comes the Rohrschach and the Bender test. Since both of the latter are projective tests whereby the person projects his personality into the test figures, the answers from each are not regarded as conclusive.

In his final evaluation and written report submitted to the Probation Department, Dr. Hertz tries to analyze the case to determine what type of program is needed, prognosis of the case on regular supervision from a probation officer, whether or not the youngster needs to be institutionalized, and if so what type of institutional program is best suited for him.
Following Dr. Hertz's discussion, our training supervisor had us examine some of the files of juvenile cases. The Juvenile Court uses a double file design, consisting of an inside and outside file. The outside file contains the youngster's records of court appearances, records of adjudication, brief family data, and police reports. The inside file contains correspondence, school and psychological reports, pre-hearing and violation of probation reports, and any other information that is considered confidential, such as the reports submitted by the probation officer.

This type of file arrangement was developed in response to the change in the Juvenile Code by the State Legislature of 1957. Prior to that time the records of the Juvenile Court were kept in a separate docket, and were for all purposes, confidential. With the repeal of Title 8 section 237, the Juvenile Court's records are considered part of those of the Superior Court. Technically then, an adjudication of delinquency is a matter of public record.

At this time the pre-hearing report was discussed. The format of the report is as follows:

**Identification Data:**

NAME: 

RACE:  

AGE: (should include birthdate)  

RELIGION:  

SEX:  

SCHOOL: (and grade)  

ADDRESS:  

OFFENSE:
REASON FOR REFERRAL: Usually a brief statement of the offense is described. The writer refers to the attached referral report from a police agency. For example: "Please refer to Tucson Police Department Reports #792,807 and #792,808. These reports give the details of two separate acts of burglary."

CHILD'S STATEMENT: Here, either a verbatim or summarized statement taken from the child is included. In many cases the investigating officer includes statements intended to give the reader some clues as to the child's attitude and truthfulness about the offense. Some officers ask the children to write their thoughts and feelings about the offense, thus giving further knowledge to the investigator.

PREVIOUS COURT OR INSTITUTIONAL RECORD: A list of the juvenile's previous referrals to the Probation Department, including traffic referrals is listed. If the child has been under probation supervision, or has been committed to an institution, these dispositions are also included.

OTHERS INVOLVED: If the offense was carried out with other juveniles, then their names are included. It is also necessary when possible to give the disposition of these cases. For example: "John Smith--pending hearing." Or, "Mary Jones--case adjusted."

RESTITUTION: If there have been any damages, the intake officer may want to formulate a plan whereby the children involved will share in the re-payment of expense. If the
monetary loss is so great that it would be unrealistic to expect the juvenile to repay the entire amount, then the intake officer may recommend to the court that the child be responsible for his fair share, usually an amount determined by the court, intake officer, or by the on-going probation officer if there is to be one.

**FAMILY HISTORY:** The family history of a pre-hearing report is in many ways similar to family history data compiled by other social agencies. It is usually chronological in order and is designed to give the judge and staff an idea of the socio-economic station in the family. It is also used to give the probation officer help in evaluating the family and the problems, if any, they are having. If the intake officer has made a home visit prior to the court hearing, then a brief summary of the home conditions is included. From a single home visit the observant probation officer can obtain insight into the family structure itself. For example, problems of parent-child communication may be readily observed.

**CHILD'S HISTORY:** The child's history is perhaps the most crucial part of the pre-hearing report. A good report gives a well-rounded picture of the youngster, starting from birth. The early developmental years are noted. Childhood diseases, and any unusual problems the parents have had are noted. The child's present status is discussed. His activities are delved into, his friends may be
mentioned. His goals and expectations for the future are noted. In short, the report tries to give a newly assigned probation officer, who prior to the hearing has never met the child and his parents, a good mental picture of the child. Some intake officers like to include a physical description of the youngster in case the report is sent to an agency or court outside of the community.

SCHOOL REPORT: The Pima County Juvenile Probation Department uses a special form that is sent to the school where the child attends. In it are included testing information, and notes from the school authorities about the child's behavior in the school setting.

DETENTION REPORT: If a child has remained in detention for any length of time, his behavior is noted by the detention officers. In many cases these reports stress the child's attitude, and indicate how accepting the youngster is to continuous supervision.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION: The final statements by the intake officer are to give a recapitulation of the entire case without being too repetitious. The concluding statements contain the plan of probation. "It is recommended to the Court that John Smith be adjudicated a delinquent minor child and placed on official probation under the standard terms. It is further recommended that he pay restitution to the complainant in the amount of fifty dollars."
The intake officer signs the report which is then read and approved by his supervisor. In the later stages of this internship there will be included several pre-hearing reports which will be written by this intern. This news was surprising, but according to my training officer, I am expected to investigate several cases for the court.

**Tuesday, March 3, 1964**

In this afternoon's training session, policies and procedures that probation officers must follow were discussed in some detail. Basically, Mr. Valdez emphasized that a good probation officer is well organized; he has to be because the size of his caseload means that all of his spare time will be utilized.

The new workers were admonished to never stand in the way of a police investigation. We were told that the police do police work and we do probation work and we should never confuse our roles.

The probation officer is expected to keep his notes in his field book. Each contact made is to be noted and the notes are to be accurate and neat. In other words, the field book is to be something more than a crutch for the officer. If a probation officer leaves the department his book will be a great help to the worker who assumes his caseload.
Hints on testifying in court were mentioned. Briefly, a probation officer should never make a statement in court that he cannot back up in fact. The department works with a family as a unit. The officer should note the other siblings in the family too. Mother and father should be contacted as often as the child. In many cases it is necessary to back up the parent, even to the extent of making some parental decisions. The court exists in part, to support parents in their role.

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Today the training class studied the Intake and Supervision division of the Probation Department. It was learned that Tucson is divided into four geographic areas. Each area has an assigned male intake officer who handles boys' cases, while two female intake officers handle two areas each for the girls' cases. The supervisor of the Intake Division is Mr. John Kohl, who will be explaining procedures and policies to us.

We learned that the Intake Supervisor arrives at the office at 7:30 A.M. to review the various police reports and physical arrests which have arrived since the previous night. After the cases have been assigned, it is the responsibility of each intake officer to make a preliminary review of the case. The department does have the policy that if an offense committed by a juvenile could be
classified as a felony, if he were an adult, or if the youngster is involved in joy-riding (no intention of permanently depriving the owner of his car), then the matter must come to the attention of the court.

In discussing intake with us, Mr. Kohl indicated that it is a different type of work. The work is with any child and it is of a short duration. In this respect it may be a disadvantage. The liabilities include: pressure from parents to make a "good" recommendation to the court, and pressure resulting from the worker's own heavy case-load. Intake has its responsibilities also, and they are: to work for the best interest of the child, and the responsibility to make a decision and not to procrastinate. In intake the worker sees the child at his worst. Parents may be either overly punitive in orientation, or they may be over-protective. Intake offers a great deal of variety in that each day brings new cases and new challenges and the culmination of old ones.

When questioned about interview techniques Mr. Kohl stated that an intake officer has to be able to develop rapport quickly because his time is limited. It is also necessary to be able to insulate oneself to some degree from the emotions of his clients and their parents. He further stated that he did not mean that an officer should be insensitive to other's emotions. A worker should be able to develop patience and tolerance in dealing with
children and their problems. He should be able to resist pressure from parents when his recommendation will conflict with their wishes for the child. Most important, he added, a worker should know his limitations and not be afraid to ask for help.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent observing court hearings.

**Thursday, March 5, 1964**

Today I was introduced to the detention staff, and for the next two days I will be observing procedures in the detention home. The detention home is supervised by Mr. John McFarland, and it is his responsibility to see to it that any juvenile who is arrested by the police department and is detained by the court be cared for properly.

If a juvenile is arrested by a police officer, the youngster is brought to the detention home. During the daytime hours, a probation or intake officer is contacted, who then must decide whether or not to detain a youngster pending final disposition by the court. If the youngster is apprehended at night, a telephone call is made to an on-duty probation officer. Telephone duty is handled on a rotation basis, seven days a week, holidays included. Each probation officer can count on being "on call" during the evening and night hours at least once a month.
If the youngster is to be detained, then the detention staff takes over. His personal belongings such as watch, wallet and purse are taken from him. He is searched and also asked to remove his shoes and socks. The child is then given a shower and issued a uniform. At this time an interpretation lecture is given to explain the rules of detention. Following this he is placed in a room by himself if possible. Due to the fact of larger detention home populations, space in the detention facility is at a premium. The first twenty-four hours are spent in "isolation." This preliminary isolation is designed to give the youngster time to think about his delinquent act. It also serves the purpose of allowing the detention staff to observe the youngster for any unusual kinds of behavior.

After the first twenty-four hours have elapsed and, if the youngster is still to remain in detention, he is integrated into the detention program. From this time until his release, he will partake of the regular detention activities. These activities include reading and homework studies, use of a small library, outdoor recreation activity, and various work programs in the detention home.

The detention home is divided into two areas, consisting of a boys and girls area. The boys live in one wing of the detention home and the girls in the other. Although no talking is allowed between boys and girls, the children do eat together, sitting on opposite sides of the
dining area. This worker observed that during meals one of the youngsters would usually volunteer to offer a blessing before eating. Children regularly volunteer for work details in the detention home, and such work is awarded for good behavior.

Midway between the boys and girls dormitory wings is a large desk area used by the detention staff to visually control and supervise the children. In addition, a male and female detention officer stays with the children, on an eight hour shift.

Each room of the detention home includes a commode, wash-basin, drinking fountain, and a heavy metal frame built-in bunk bed. The room also contains a window covered by a heavy mesh wire screen called a "psychiatric screen." I was informed by the detention supervisor that very few juveniles have broken out of the detention facility.

The space available allows for twenty-six boys and twelve girls. There have been times when the detention home has exceeded its capacity, and then the children are placed three or more to a room by having them sleep on mattresses on the floor.

This afternoon saw the admittance of three juveniles to the detention home. Of the three, two were boys and both were on probation at this time. This intern was informed that it was a departmental policy to detain all
youngsters on regular probation supervision. The third case, a girl, was referred for running away from home.

Because I was in a position to observe each step of the admittance procedure, I was allowed to ask a few questions. The first boy Tommy L., was arrested for being involved in several acts of automobile theft. Upon questioning by the probation officer, the boy readily admitted his involvement in the delinquent activities. This student was able to have a few minutes alone with Tommy who related the following story: A few weeks ago at a large metropolitan high school, Tommy, on the dare of a friend, took a car from the high school parking lot and proceeded to drive it around during the afternoon hours. As the school was on double session, his being out of class caused no great alarm. After his drive he returned the car to the school without being apprehended. This act seemed so easy that he decided to repeat it after a few days. During the interim period he had managed to take a total of eight cars in this fashion. He had been apprehended by a student who happened to see Tommy driving his car. This student, it was learned from the police report however, had failed to report this theft to the dean or the police for several days, and in the meantime Tommy had taken more automobiles.

It should be emphasized that the acts were carried out alone. Tommy stated, when asked if he thought about
what might happen to him, that he really gave no thought at all about the possible consequences of his behavior. This intern talked briefly with Tommy's probation officer who came to see Tommy. He indicated that there was a strong possibility that the youngster would be committed to Fort Grant.

The next boy to be admitted was Jesus F. Jesus stated that he and some friends went into a Circle K Food Store with intentions of taking some candy. Jesus told this intern that he knew his probation officer would be quite angry at him for shoplifting. The youngster appeared remorseful for his actions.

The final youngster to be admitted during the afternoon was Gail P., a 14 year old Caucasian girl, who was attending a local junior high school in Tucson. As this intern was interviewing the two previous cases he was not able to talk to Gail during the afternoon.

Friday, March 6, 1964

This afternoon was spent in the detention home observing and talking to juveniles admitted and released. The probation violator who had been referred yesterday for shoplifting, Jesus F., was released this morning by his probation officer. I had an opportunity to talk with his probation officer, who informed me that he would ask Judge
Truman to adjust the referral since the boy was doing well in other areas of his life.

This afternoon saw only two children admitted to the detention home, again a rather quiet day. The first youngster to be admitted was a ten year old Negro boy who lives in Tucson's worst slums. Danny B. was referred by the Tucson Police Department for shoplifting from a market in his neighborhood. Danny stated to the admitting officer and to Mr. Kohl that he was taking candy from this particular store and had been doing so for some weeks. He stated that he knew this to be wrong but other children in the neighborhood had been doing the same thing. This was this youngster's second referral to the department for this type of offense. The decision was to detain the youngster and, in an aside, Mr. Kohl told this intern that he believed there would be a good possibility of Danny coming to the attention of the court.

After Danny B. was admitted to the detention home and placed in an empty room in isolation, I had an opportunity to talk to Gail P., the fourteen year old girl who had come to the detention home yesterday for running away from home. At this time the girls who were in detention numbered eight, a sizable number as the detention home has space available for twelve girls. The girls were outside in the recreation yard playing tether ball. Several of the girls were sitting on the side lines observing, apparently
not wanting to participate. Gail was among this group, and I asked if I might talk with her, explaining who I was. She agreed and we sat nearby at a picnic table used for eating purposes in the spring.

Upon asking a few rather general questions, Gail's story seemed to come tumbling out, as if she was waiting for someone to ask her to tell her troubles. Gail had decided to leave home after a heated argument with her mother regarding the use of cosmetics at home and in the school. She indicated that the school authorities had notified her mother regarding this problem. Gail felt that she was old enough to use cosmetics and felt that basically her parents were not allowing her to grow up. The argument ended when her mother told Gail to go to her room and remain there the rest of the day. Gail further stated that she was to be placed "on restriction" and not be allowed to leave the house except to attend school.

When asked if she was happy at home, the youngster stated that she was and really wanted to return home. I asked her if she had as much freedom in the detention home as she had at home; and Gail told me that even when she was on restriction she felt that at least she was free. She stated that she hoped her probation officer would allow her to return to her family so that she could be with them over the weekend. I indicated to her not to get her hopes up
too much regarding a release. The recreation period was ending and the girls had to return to their rooms.

The next case to come into the detention setting was Pete R., a seventeen year old Italian-American youngster referred for immoral conduct with his girl friend. At this time his girl friend was in the process of being referred by the police department, but I did not find this out until later.

While Pete was being processed into the detention home, I had an opportunity to talk with the detention officer of the afternoon shift. He explained to me that it was his duty to stay with the boys in the detention setting at all times. Realizing that there would probably be exceptions to even this rule I asked about this. I learned that if a youngster is on a work detail he is sometimes supervised by the maintenance man of the department. It goes without saying that on this type of work detail, only youngsters who have shown they can be trusted are allowed to volunteer.

The dinner hour at the detention home is at 11:30 A.M., and the evening meal is at 4:30 P.M. The noon meal is the main meal of the day and usually includes a very complete selection of food. The evening meal is light, sometimes consisting of soup and sandwiches. This student noted that of all the children interviewed when he was in the detention home, none really complained about the
food, either in quality or amount. I remember one Mexican-American youngster who did state that he was unfamiliar with the food. It was my understanding that Mexican-type dishes are not served in the detention home.

The remainder of the afternoon was rather uneventful, with no new cases coming into the detention home.

Monday, March 9, 1964

This afternoon I observed field probation officer Mr. Omar Rios. My duties would include following Mr. Rios on his daily routine of assignments. Mr. Rios has an active caseload of fifty cases, and was quite proud of the fact that during the month of February, he had only two referrals or probation violators. He stated that one of his boys was arrested by the police for consuming liquor, and another youngster for shoplifting.

This afternoon we visited two junior high schools, Safford and Utterback. In the course of this visit we saw about half a dozen of "my boys," as Mr. Rios refers to his clients.

During the interviews which were held in the principal's office, this intern was able to observe and note Mr. Rios' interviewing techniques. I observed that Mr. Rios was always courteous to his clients and treated them with respect. He tried to make them feel that he was interested in them and their problems. Furthermore, he
encouraged them to take part in the conversation by asking, for example, "Well John, what do you think we should do about this?" In this manner I felt Mr. Rios was injecting an element of self-determination into the interview.

This type of interviewing technique was not used in all situations, for as Mr. Rios told me some boys need a more authoritarian structure in the casework situation. The boy in question may need a firmness that may be lacking in his home or family environment. The idea of self-determination as relating to a juvenile is important if the youngster is to live in our society as an adult. He must in a real sense hold his own reins and stand up for himself. He must be able to make his own decisions and, for some youngsters who have led lives which could be described as overprotected, decision-making is not something which is inherited.

After the interviews in the school setting were completed Mr. Rios drove to the home of a boy whom he had not seen for several weeks. Mr. Rios seemed very proud of the progress of this youngster, who had originally been placed on probation for running away from home. As we drive to the home of Joe V., he stated the facts of the case. The youngster appeared to come from a family of many problems and at first Mr. Rios felt that Joe would have a difficult time while under probation supervision. As of this date the boy had been under court authority for six
months. Despite some initial setbacks, Joe was doing quite well. When we arrived at the home, we found Joe and his mother. Joe was out of school this day because of illness. He showed Mr. Rios his report card before his probation officer had a chance to ask him for it. The grades were all quite good, being "1's" and "2's," and, as I was to learn later, showed a much different scholastic picture than the youngster was producing six months previously. Mr. Rios did not forget to introduce me and I noted that he seemed to be very well accepted by the family. After a short visit the interview was terminated and we left to return to the office.

**Tuesday, March 10, 1964**

This afternoon I was placed in the detention setting for more observation. I was able to see a more complete picture of the daily routine in the detention home. I was able to observe the boys recreation program. Today the detention officer took the boys outside for group exercise, following which the boys in detention (ten) were allowed to play volleyball. The youngsters were quite enthusiastic about playing with each other, with the exception of the boy who had been referred on March 6, 1964 for immoral conduct. Pete R. seemed not to take much interest in the activities at hand. After receiving permission to speak with him, I asked Pete a few questions
about why he was in the detention home. He stated that he felt he had serious problems which were concerned mainly with himself and his girl friend. It seems they had been "going steady," for about one year, and were quite serious about each other. He finally indicated that the relationship had become intimate and that the girl's parents had discovered them in a compromising situation. He told this intern that the parents had threatened to sign a complaint against him charging him with rape, because his girl friend was sixteen years old. I asked him if his girl friend was pregnant, and he answered that as far as he knew she was not, but that they had made plans to get married if her family would give their approval.

This intern could see that Pete was a youngster with a strong emotional attachment to his girl friend. It was learned that the department takes the view in cases such as this, that the boy is not guilty of statutory rape or any kind of rape because no force was used. It is felt that both parties in the relationship bear equal responsibility for their acts. The court wants to make sure that these youngsters are aware of the consequences of their behavior. I learned through another worker that because Pete is a senior in high school and is expected to graduate, there would be a possibility that he might be allowed to marry the girl. It was further learned that both the boy
and girl would be appearing in court for their immoral conduct.

As I was preparing to leave for the afternoon, I noticed that Pete was in the process of being released to his mother.

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

This training session was spent in actual observation of field probation work. Today I was placed with Mr. Tony Guzman. Mr. Guzman, of Mexican-American descent, speaks fluent Spanish and hence his caseload is located in that part of Tucson where there are many families of that origin. Our activities were spent in making some initial home visits on cases where the boys had just recently been placed on probation. Following a court hearing it is considered good procedure for the officer to make contact with the parents and the boy so that they can become better acquainted with him.

The major portion of Mr. Guzman's caseload seemed to reflect families with very low socio-economic status. Some of the homes were what I would consider slum housing, meaning that they were extremely sub-standard. Mr. Guzman would usually speak Spanish to these families, but I was able to get the gist of what was being said; and afterwards would question him rather closely to make sure. I felt
that the families probably felt more at ease because they felt that I did not speak their language.

Generally, Mr. Guzman would ask a few questions about the boy and how he was doing since the hearing. He would also try to show the people involved that he was there to help. Mr. Guzman also spent considerable time in interpreting the order of probation to the parents and youngster. Mr. Guzman indicated that the court usually sends the order of probation to the family and child about a week after the court hearing. As this order is written in English, many families have no idea of what it means. I was also surprised to find out that some of the parents on Mr. Guzman's caseload were not citizens of the United States, although in one case the parents had lived in Tucson for many years.

After returning to the office to check if he had any telephone calls, Mr. Guzman stated that he was leaving for home and I did likewise.

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. Valdez my training supervisor asked me to accompany Mr. Jim Henry, a new probation officer in the department. Mr. Henry has completed his internship and is in the process of finishing his diary so that he can obtain his degree of Master of Public Administration.
Mr. Henry was working on two cases simultaneously as he has two boys in detention. The boys were involved in the stealing of five automobiles. He first interviewed the mother of Leo, one of the two involved. Next he spoke with Leo who admitted his part and was quite tearful and afraid of the consequences of his behavior. Leo has been on probation for three months. At the time of his referral, Leo had not been making good progress in school. His grades were low and his class rank was 286 in a class of 288. This was surprising because Leo has above average intelligence. Leo's home environment is not good, probably adding more difficulties to the boy's already unsettled life. He is in the middle of a mother-father conflict according to his probation officer. Mr. Henry feels that Leo should be removed from his unstable home environment and placed in a more stable living situation. This idea was given further strength by Leo's own mother who wants Leo to attend the Brophy College Preparatory School in Phoenix.

From an interview with the Dean of Boys at Salpointe High School, Mr. Henry learned that because of Leo's poor scholastic showing, Brophy Preparatory would not accept him. The financial structure of the family would not allow Leo to attend a private boarding school. Mr. Henry is faced with an impasse, for it now appears that the only plan open to the court is a recommendation of commitment to
the State Industrial School. This student asked Mr. Henry about the possibilities of living with either of the parents and was told that both parents could not offer proper supervision for this youngster: the mother because of her drinking problem and her failure to come to grips with it, and the father because of his serious health problem which required him to have constant medical attention. After our return from the conference with the Dean at Salpointe, the afternoon was completed. Mr. Henry explained to me that he would undertake the necessary steps to ready the youngster for a court hearing and explain to him its possible consequences.

Friday, March 13, 1964

Today Mr. Valdez made plans for me to visit the state industrial school at Fort Grant. I made arrangements to come to the office at 8:00 A.M. I observed court hearings for the first part of the morning. Two juveniles were committed by the court, and it is a policy of the department that following a child's commitment to an institution of the state, to make immediate arrangements for his placement at the designated institution.

Mr. Ken Cooper, field probation officer, and myself made ourselves ready to deliver two boys to Fort Grant. We drove in a county vehicle equipped with a two-way radio so that we could maintain contact with the Sheriff. I sat in
the front seat and faced the boys in the back of the station wagon. Mr. Cooper and I talked with the youngsters during most of the trip. It takes about two hours to drive the 130 miles or so to the Fort.

Fort Grant is situated at the foot of the Graham Mountains, and is about thirty-five miles from Wilcox and about thirty miles from Safford. From the distance Fort Grant gives the appearance of a small city, and the two boys failed to realize that this was to be their new home. Only when we turned off the main highway, did they comprehend that this was the Fort. The physical plant is large with many dormitories situated around the campus. Mr. Cooper drove directly to the dining hall so that the boys and ourselves could have a bite to eat. It was lunch time and it seemed as if everyone living there was at the dining hall. The hall itself is large and appeared to this intern as a large institutional dining hall.

During lunch I met Mr. Leo Krasow, who is a counselor at the industrial school. I did not have much opportunity to speak with him at length, but did learn that on this date the daily attendance at the Fort is 470.

Fort Grant Industrial School operates on a budget of about one million dollars per year. Its budget design is that of the line item type which makes for many problems when funds need to be shifted from one area to another.
Apparently the concept of program budgeting has yet to make itself felt on the state level.

The food at the "Fort," judging by what we ate, is adequate and we had more than enough to eat. There were fresh homemade rolls on the table, as well as several meat dishes. Mr. Cooper told me that most of the boys sent to the Industrial School gain weight while they are there.

According to Mr. Krasow a large percentage of the boys at the Fort neither read nor write. As a counselor, he indicated that he gives as much encouragement as possible to the boys to enroll in school. He further indicated in response to a question, that the main reason the State Industrial School is not accredited is due to an inadequate library. Mr. Krasow indicated that he does not have enough time to really be effective in working with boys. He stated that his counseling load exceeded those of most school counselors.

After lunch we escorted the boys to the administration building so that they could be processed. With each boy was delivered a commitment order, a pre-hearing report, a report written by the former probation officer justifying his reason for commitment, a physical examination report, including a blood test and x-ray examination, and any other reports that would be helpful to the staff at the institution. Mr. Cooper told each boy, upon leaving, that,
"... this could be the best opportunity you've ever had. Good Luck!" I felt that he meant it too.

As we were leaving, Mr. Cooper drove through the campus so that I could see it and appreciate what the state of Arizona offers boys who have problems. The buildings are mostly new and impressive to look at. It can be seen, however, that conditions are overcrowded. The Fort Grant trip convinced me more than ever that this state needs several intermediate juvenile institutions. Fort Grant is too large to be a very effective institution for dealing with today's troubled youth. A recent study conducted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency rated it at no more than 250 total enrollment. It was a long trip back to Tucson.

Monday, March 16, 1964

Today I continued my observation of field probation work, by again being asked to observe Mr. Rios. This afternoon's assignment seemed quite similar to that of the last session I had observed, in that we made visits to the school. Today we visited Wakefield Junior High and Utterback Junior High. Both of these schools seem to have a disproportionate number of students who come from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

It was at Utterback School that I saw how difficult it is to be a probation officer. One of Mr. Rios' boys
Eddy J., had just turned sixteen years old, certainly a day of rejoicing for most boys. Prior to his sixteenth birthday Eddy had been placed on probation and was doing very well according to Mr. Rios. He was an excellent athlete and, according to his probation officer and the school officials, could play any sport well.

Eddy was having some scholastic problems, as can be seen since he was only in the eighth grade. The officials at Utterback, especially the assistant principal Mr. Moore, felt that it was imperative that Eddy remain in school. Now that Eddy is sixteen, however, he will no longer be permitted to play in any varsity competition. This will be a blow to Eddy. The school and the probation officer fear the worst: that Eddy will revert to his old ways and eventually drop out of school. Mr. Rios gave as much encouragement to Eddy as he could and indicated to Mr. Moore that he should be called if Eddy begins to have problems at school. Mr. Rios felt that if Eddy could make it until the end of the semester in June, he could count the case a success.

Tuesday, March 17, 1964

After observing field probation work for some length of time, it was felt that I was ready to observe the intake department. This afternoon I was placed with Mr. Gordon Pageau. Mr. Pageau is one of four male intake
officers who handle the male referrals to the department. There are two female intake officers who handle the girls' problems.

Mr. Pageau was already at work with Robert B., a thirteen and a half year old Anglo-American youth referred for having sexual relations with a female student at a junior high school in the city. The intake officer is interested in getting the facts straight in order to insure that the juvenile will not be falsely accused or hurried into Juvenile Court without reason. Robert has been previously referred to the department for running away from home, loitering, and receiving stolen property. These first three referrals were adjusted by the department, meaning that no petitions were filed, and no official action was taken.

During the past twenty months, no male authority figure has been living in the home and this, according to Mr. Pageau, is part of the problem. To compound this situation, the boy's mother is a very passive individual and has not given the boy the supervision that a boy his age needs. From the three previous referrals there is a strong implication of poor supervision. She also has given him little or no sex education, although Mr. Pageau feels he probably does not need much. Rather, the youngster has not even been taught any attitudes about sex and boy-girl relationships.
While dictating the pre-hearing report, Mr. Pageau found that the girl's mother had taken her to a doctor for a medical examination, the results of which showed that although there was sex play, the doctor felt there had been no penetration. It was told by Mr. Pageau that from a legal standpoint, in Arizona there has to be penetration to constitute a rape. This fact, however, will not have too much bearing on this particular case, as Mr. Pageau intends to ask the court for an adjudication and recommend that Robert be placed on official probation.

After an intensive interview with Robert who was at that time in the Detention Home, it was decided that he could be released to his mother's custody pending his court hearing.

Wednesday, March 18, 1964

This afternoon I was allowed to observe Mrs. Helen Wollard, a female intake officer. At this time Mrs. Wollard was very busy with the case of Mary P., a fifteen year old girl who is alleged to have been raped repeatedly by many boys. The medical report confirmed the fact of intercourse. The police report was read thoroughly by Mrs. Wollard. As Mary was in detention, and Mrs. Wollard had another appointment, she met with her scheduled appointment first.
Patricia L. appeared in the office for her runaway from home. The case was an obvious problem of poor parental control due to a lack of communication on the part of both the parents and the girl. Patricia was very non-committal, and Mrs. Wollard had to "dig" any statements from her. I thought perhaps that I was the cause of this problem and so I excused myself and had a coffee break. At the conclusion of the interview Mrs. Wollard indicated that the girl had maintained her attitude throughout the entire interview. According to Mrs. Wollard, Patricia's problems were so great that it was felt that court action is necessary. Mrs. Wollard had her doubts as to whether or not the girl would respond to probation supervision.

At the conclusion of the afternoon Mrs. Wollard spoke briefly to Mary P., the youngster whose police report we had read earlier in the afternoon.

Thursday, March 19, 1964

Today I continued my observation of the investigation of the multiple rape case which was still being conducted by Mrs. Wollard. A detective from the Tucson Police Department had come to interview the girl, to see if she could identify any of the boys who had attacked her. Mrs. Wollard stayed with the girl during this interview. The detective used pictures from the high school year book for this purpose. Later he asked if he could take Mary to
his office for visual identification of some of the boys and this request was granted.

This case promises to be a difficult one, as the girl may have been intoxicated during the evening. Furthermore, she does not remember very well all the events that took place during the evening in question.

During one particular interview with Mary, I was struck by the girl's obvious sincerity, when she stated that she did not want any of the boys involved to get into trouble. This, as it turned out, was a very telling statement.

Mary is a short pudgy girl, which gives her an almost dumpy appearance. One wonders how such a youngster with this type of physical appearance could have been the object of a multiple rape. Mrs. Wollard tried to help Mary understand that the Juvenile Court does not want such acts as this to happen to other girls as well as Mary herself.

Later in the day some of the boys involved were brought to the detention home by the police department. From their statements it was learned that Mary had the reputation of being a girl of "easy virtue," meaning that she would have intercourse with just about anybody. A group of boys at a school dance decided to take advantage of her and, after a few beers, ganged up on her and took her to an isolated desert area and raped her. According to the boys, Mary put up only a token resistance. Mary
herself had indicated that she tried to stop the boys from this type of activity, but was unable.

Midway through the afternoon Mrs. Wollard spoke to a mother who had come to ask the court for help with her daughter. These cases are usually referred to as "walk-ins," because the people involved usually do not take the time to schedule an appointment.

Mrs. S. had come to the department to ask that her seven year old daughter be placed for adoption, because she was very disturbed. After an initial interview Mrs. Wollard scheduled another with Mrs. S. so that she could bring her daughter in for a conference. Immediately after the termination of the interview, Mrs. Wollard asked that this case be transferred to the neglect-dependency worker Mrs. Davison, as she suspected a neglect situation. This intern had to agree that it was most unusual for the parent of a seven year old to ask the court to place her for adoption.

Friday, March 20, 1964

Today I am again with Mrs. Wollard. I found that Mrs. S., who wanted to place her daughter elsewhere has done so. It was learned through the Tucson Child Guidance Clinic that the mother was a prostitute who was rejecting her illegitimate daughter and, in fact, had mistreated her. The mother has also attempted suicide on at least seven
different occasions and has been a patient at the state hospital. The Child Guidance Clinic made a tentative diagnosis that the mother was a socio-pathic personality. The people at the Arizona Children's Home say the child is doing very well.

Following this news Mrs. Wollard completed the form required to request a psychological evaluation for Mary P. The reason for this type of planning for this youngster is that Mrs. Wollard feels she is not getting all the information she needs in order to complete a pre-hearing report. At the completion of the psychological evaluation, the court's clinical psychologist, Dr. Hertz will give an evaluation both verbal and written to the department, and will give an evaluation to the parents.

The next item on the day's agenda was a court hearing involving incorrigibility on the part of the girl Diana A. This case had been investigated several weeks previously and now the family was making its appearance in the Juvenile Court. Mrs. Wollard, being the intake officer, explained to the family and court the situation regarding Diane. The judge tried to help the family realize that if they did not change their ways, their daughter was headed for more serious problems. Diane was placed on probation.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent in several conferences with Mary P., the subject and victim of the multiple rape case. At one point Mr. Cooper interviewed
Mary, as one of the youngsters on his caseload is involved. From the observation of the interview, it seemed obvious to me that their stories were far apart. It seems amazing to me that Mary could remember any of the details of that evening, for I feel sure that she is exhibiting signs of retrospective falsification. How could a youngster of this age who had been raped at least a dozen times remember with any degree of accuracy the painful details of that night?

**Monday, March 23, 1964**

This afternoon I observed the work of Mr. Gordon Pageau, an intake officer. The first case of the afternoon saw a twelve year old boy accused of child molesting. The victim is a girl six years of age. Charles S. comes from a broken home, where the parents are living apart. The S. family is already known to this department, with other family members having been on probation. At the time of the interview the full police report had not been received, so Mr. Pageau did not want to get too involved with the case at this point. A conference was held with the boy and later with his father.

The rest of the afternoon was taken up by handling numerous cases where it was felt that no court action or services of the department were needed.

The final case of the afternoon was concerned with shoplifting. John S., a seventeen year old boy and a
senior in high school was the driver of a car which was used to carry his friend Jim B. (whose case was handled by Mr. Kohl), away from the scene of the delinquent act. John claimed he did not know until later that Jim had taken the cigarettes. After counseling with John as to the possible consequences of this sort of activity, Mr. Pageau spoke with John's father. The intent of Mr. Pageau's questions was to determine if there were other areas of John's life which showed problems. The probation department seemed to want to make sure that John's family was doing an adequate job of supervision, and carrying out family responsibilities in an adequate manner. John's father stated that he believed that John was unaware of his friend's activities. In this manner he was supporting his son. According to the statement of Mr. S., there seemed to be no outstanding problems in the family structure. The final result of the interview was that Mr. S. was told that the court would take no formal action concerning the matter.

Tuesday, March 24, 1964

Today I observed probation officer Frederick Auburn conduct field investigation. Mr. Auburn is considered by many in this department as the outstanding probation officer. According to Mr. Valdez, the reason for this high standing is Mr. Auburn's excellent organizational ability. It was stated to me that Mr. Auburn makes
excellent use of his time in the field and in the office. He has also been pointed out by several other probation officers as the best in the department. All new probation officers spend a portion of time studying Mr. Auburn's methods.

On our first visit this afternoon we visited a foster family in the department. This family receives funds from the county for the care of youngsters placed in their temporary custody. This particular family had three youngsters all siblings, placed with them. The three have run away repeatedly. Mr. Auburn informed me that these children had been placed in several other foster homes, all to no avail. He talked with the foster parents, told them the circumstances and mentioned that perhaps institutionalization was a final solution.

We visited several other families during the afternoon, and saw three of Mr. Auburn's charges. He seems to be the only probation officer in the department who can get away with calling his clients "darling" and "sweetheart." This seems to be because of his fatherly appearance and due also to the fact that most of the boys that I observed seemed to be under the age of twelve years. Mr. Auburn mentioned to me that the department usually gives him cases of emotionally disturbed youngsters and, that due to his many years as director of a children's home in the east, he
worked well with these types of cases. I told Mr. Auburn that I looked forward to being with him again.

Wednesday, March 25, 1964

Today I observed Mr. George Rosenberg a court referee, conduct referee hearings. As this is allowed by statute, I was interested in finding out how much variation there would be between a referee and a judge.

Mr. Rosenberg would explain his function in the hearing, always indicating to the family and child that if they were not satisfied with his recommendation, they had forty-eight hours in which to think it over. In the event that the family or child was not satisfied they could notify the probation officer and a new hearing would be scheduled with the judge.

During the hearing Mr. Rosenberg asked many questions, of both the parents and the youngster. Sometimes he would ask the parents to leave the room and question the child, and sometimes he would do the opposite. Mainly, his questions seemed to draw the youngster out, and get him talking in the court hearing itself. Finally, Mr. Rosenberg would offer comments and suggestions in a stern manner. He would try to help the youngster to look at and evaluate his behavior. I felt that at the conclusion of the hearing the child really felt that he had been before a
court of law and that the child had a fair understanding of what had happened.

Thursday, March 26, 1964

Today I returned to the detention home for more observation. I got better acquainted with Mr. Kemph, a detention officer. After the noon dinner there usually is some type of group discussion held in the small alcove of the detention home called the library. Generally it is Mr. Kemph's idea to get the youngsters talking about their delinquent activities and what factors got them in trouble in the first place.

I noticed that he tried to dispell any false beliefs or rationalizations that a youngster might have about his offense. "You are here for a reason; and you didn't get here for shining shoes!"

Taking part in this afternoon's discussion were eleven boys. Mr. Kemph works only with boys. In response to the question, "What did you do?," several youngsters would answer in the following manner: "They said I did . . .," or "They told me that I took . . . ." Mr. Kemph would interrupt and almost coerce the youngster to state in his own words what had happened. This was done by verbal confrontation. Although Mr. Kemph has an imposing size, his purpose was to help the youngster to see the reality of his delinquent act. This direct approach in a
group setting was new to me and I was so interested that I stayed the entire afternoon observing Mr. Kemph's activities.

He stated that he was an ex-Marine and believed that certain of the Marine Corps' teachings had value in the detention setting. During exercise he would demand that the youngsters be at attention, and remain quiet. If a youngster was slouching in line, "Stand tall," would ring out. It was Mr. Kemph's belief that many boys in the detention setting basically hated themselves and their attitudes showed this self-debasement. In his own way he would try to help them see and believe that each boy had something unique to offer; it was then the problem of the probation officer to find a suitable placement for this youngster.

He further believed quite strongly in the concept of children having respect for adults, especially parents. He would tell the boys that each of them would have only one set of parents, no more. No matter how bad they were they were still parents and someday they would be gone. I felt that this type of reasoning was good, because I had observed that in other cases of family conflicts, that when the children grow up to adulthood, they usually have to "make their peace" with mom and dad.
It was noticed during this afternoon five boys and two girls were checked into the detention home, indicating an unusually heavy number of referrals.

Friday, March 27, 1964

Friday was also spent observing detention practices, and this afternoon saw the continuation of a large number of children in the detention home. I was told by Mr. McFarland that every attempt would be made to care for the children brought to the detention home, but that since the building had opened in 1956, there had been an almost continuous increase in the daily population.

Mr. McFarland indicated that a good detention program was necessary, but that except for meal time a child had to be available for consultation with his probation officer. It can be seen then, that a child has to be available for interviewing with the probation officer from eight until five. The library has to be shared with the boys and girls and scheduling is arranged so that each group has an equal time to use it.

It was decided that in order for me to get an idea of a weekend's activities in the detention home I would also observe next Monday afternoon.

Monday, March 30, 1964

Monday showed the effects of a long, busy weekend. I was informed that the detention home had received many
referrals over the weekend, and that the morning hours were
spent sorting cases. I learned that the population of the
detention home would drop considerably during the course of
the day.

If a child had been on probation, only his proba-
tion officer and/or his supervisor could release the
youngster. This meant that if a probationer had been
referred for a curfew violation on Friday night, he might
not be released until Monday. This practice is followed
for two reasons: First, because the youngster is on proba-
tion the court feels he should remember that his freedom
has been curtailed to a degree and he should be more careful
and watchful of his actions. Second, this procedure allows
the probation officer to be fully aware of the actions of
children assigned to him. If a child had been told by the
probation officer to be in at dark and the child is referred
for some type of activity at midnight, then the officer may
not want to have him released. In other words, this might
be the "last straw."

The afternoon ended with the detention population
at about twenty-five, still a sizable number.

Tuesday, March 31, 1964

This afternoon I observed a different area of the
work in the department. I found that in addition to being
training supervisor, Mr. Valdez had the responsibility of
keeping track of the statistics of the department and the preparation of the annual report. It seems that these tasks would consume most of his energies but I found Mr. Valdez had the time to do all of his jobs with ease.

The initial part of the afternoon was spent in helping Mr. Valdez prepare some data for the 1963 annual report. The concept of electronic data processing is still in the talking stage at this point. I have noticed that each probation officer and intake officer is required to keep an accurate month by month account of his workload and that the mathematical figuring has caused some difficulties.

After these tasks were completed, Mr. Valdez had to substitute for the traffic referee, Mr. Roy Meyer. This gave my supervisor a chance to explain the workings of this area of the department to me.

The Juvenile Court believes that since it has legal, original jurisdiction in matters of delinquency, and a delinquent act is a violation of a state law by a person under the age of eighteen, it then has jurisdiction in areas where children who drive motor vehicles violate state motor vehicle laws. This takes in a broad area as I was soon to learn.

The traffic referee is a duly appointed representative of the court and operates in much the same manner as a regular court referee with the exception that he is a full time, paid member of the staff.
If a child receives a citation from a local police agency for a violation of the motor vehicle laws, he is required to come to the Juvenile Probation Department with a parent to discuss the citation with the traffic referee. The referee then hears the matter and asks the child if the facts of the situation according to the citation are correct. If the child feels that they are the referee then makes a recommendation to the judge, with the child and his parent having the same forty-eight hour waiting period as would be had by a youngster appearing before a court referee on a behavior referral.

As can be seen, the probation department divides its referrals into the area of traffic and behavior and it is conceivable that children would get referrals of both kinds.

Mr. Valdez asked me to watch closely for the attitude of the parent during the hearing. This intern noted with some surprise that some parents were quite put out at having to accompany their child to Juvenile Court; others were angry at the police department for giving a ticket to their son or daughter, while others seemed to be cooperative and were interested in seeing their child become a better driver. Mr. Valdez made sure the parent understood what the court was trying to accomplish and that ultimately a parent was fully responsible for his son's actions behind the wheel of an automobile. The purpose of
making the parent accompany the child was to make sure he knew of his child's activities. Some parents had already taken action concerning their child's citation before their appearance in Juvenile Court. One parent stated, "Do what you think is best, but I've already taken his license away and he won't get it back for a month."

Since there is no statutory design for fines and the like, the court acts only in ways that would effect the youngster's driving privileges in some manner. Usually the court acts in two ways, by either restricting a child's driving privileges or suspending them entirely for a period of time. The length of time of suspension is usually left to the discretion of the traffic referee, with a suspension being for a shorter period of time than a restriction for the same offense. To recapitulate, the intent of the court is to make the child and parent aware of the problem. If a youngster has to drive, such as to and from work, then his license can be restricted to work driving only, but this restriction would be for a longer period of time than would be a period of no driving at all.

Since the court requires that a parent accompany a child when he appears for a citation, many of the afternoon's cases did not arrive until the last hours of business, with the result that I did not leave the office until 5:30 P.M.
Today I again observed the traffic referee, with Mr. Valdez substituting for Mr. Meyer. Although many cases were observed, I feel that more procedural functions should be mentioned to enable the reader to have a clear understanding of the traffic referee.

Besides handling children who receive citations for driving motor vehicles, the court also receives referrals on youngsters who have violated the laws concerning bicycles and motor scooters, and even walking. When handling these types of offenses, the court tries to achieve the same objective, that of trying to develop safe drivers and children who will see the necessity of obeying the law. It reaches its objective, however, in a slightly different manner, for the court cannot very well suspend or restrict a driver's license on a child who does not have one in the first place. Usually the traffic referee tries to help the youngster realize the seriousness of the offense. Then he makes sure that the parent understands the nature of the offense. Finally he asks the cooperation of the parent by asking him to assign extra work around the home to help the child realize that he has violated a law.

This type of action by the court is strictly informal and depends on the cooperation of the parent, but it is hoped by the court that parents will understand what the
court is trying to do and give the court their full cooperation.

Thursday, April 2, 1964

First on this afternoon's agenda was to accompany Mr. Cyrus Preston, a new probation officer. We were returning a youngster to his home who had come to the office to speak with Mr. Huerta, an intake officer, about a problem.

After completing this task, I helped my training supervisor Mr. Valdez who is still substituting for the traffic referee. One of the first tasks of the day for the traffic referee is the posting of the previous day's referrals on a statistics record. It was interesting to note that this activity is accomplished by the use of tally marks on a large ledger sheet. At the end of the month the traffic referee then totals his tally marks for all categories and submits the sheet to the statistician, Mr. Valdez.

Friday, April 3, 1964

Today's training session saw another episode of observation of traffic referrals due to the absence of Mr. Meyer. I was allowed to ask a few questions during the hearing, provided the statement of the child or his parent was not entirely clear. Mr. Valdez asked me to observe closely the interviewing techniques, so that if I should
ever be a probation officer, I would have knowledge in this area. It was learned that normally, if Mr. Meyer is absent, a field probation officer is usually assigned his duties. The department feels quite strongly that, in many cases, driving is an extension of the personality and that some teen-agers use a motor vehicle to act out their aggressions and frustrations.

Monday, April 6, 1964

Before I could continue my observation of the probation department it was necessary for me to familiarize myself with the file room of the department. As the name implies, all the files concerning families with whom the department has had contact are kept in one central area. A case file is divided into two parts, the inside and outside folders. The inside folders contain the reports of the probation officer and the outside folder contains the records of adjudication and a brief family history called a face sheet.

Arizona state law requires that the records of the Juvenile Court must be destroyed when a child reaches his eighteenth birthday, or upon the completion of his period of probation, or two years following his release from an institution unless he committed another offense. This is according to Arizona Revised Statutes, 8-238. I found that every month file clerks go through the file and remove
those files which meet the criteria stated. Following their removal, the files are examined by Mr. Valdez or Mr. Kohl and marked for destruction.

This afternoon was spent under supervision of Mr. Valdez, in reviewing such cases. I noted that it seemed a waste of much effort to let these files be destroyed because the probation officer had put a great deal of work into some of the cases.

**Tuesday, April 7, 1964**

This afternoon was uneventful, with my reviewing cases for Mr. Valdez. I was able to read a few cases. I was told that I should read many pre-hearing reports from as many different writers as possible, thereby developing a good understanding of its various elements.

**Wednesday, April 8, 1964**

Today I observed field work with Mr. Jim Henry. Our first visit of the afternoon consisted of a visit to Tucson High School. Mr. Roda, the Dean of Boys, was obliging and allowed Mr. Henry to use his office to interview several boys.

The first youngster to be interviewed was Bob M. Bob was having "girl troubles," in that his girl's father did not approve of him. It turned out that she too was on probation and Mr. Henry had some contact with her probation officer, Miss Chavez. Mr. Henry advised the youngster that
if the relationship with the girl was going to cause problems with her parents, he might have to end it.

Several other youngsters were seen briefly and then we left to make a contact at the home of John F., who lived on the north side of town. John's mother and father were divorced, and John was living with his mother. According to Mr. Henry, the mother is a very weak individual who does not provide adequate controls for her son. The father is inadequate due to a very severe drinking problem. John is not in school but working and, despite his unhappy home situation, had not been referred to the department since being placed on probation about nine months ago. John seemed to be doing all right and he related well to Mr. Henry's questions. After the interview, as we were returning to the office, Mr. Henry remarked that this boy did not always relate so well, in fact, on other occasions would hardly say anything. Mr. Henry stated that this boy had serious emotional problems.

Thursday, April 9, 1964

This afternoon I traveled with Mr. Ken Cooper and Miss Joy Geller, a student in Mrs. Fuller's class, while the department transported five boys to Fort Grant. The boys ranged in age from twelve to sixteen. Several of these boys had been associated with the Sunnyside rape case which has received much publicity. The trip was uneventful.
Friday, April 10, 1964

This day's assignment included some field work with Miss Mary Stewart, a new probation officer in the department. I felt that Miss Stewart had a good rapport and used a good approach with the girls she interviewed. At our first visit to the home of Jane R., the probation officer asked the girl to explain her side of the story. Jane had been reported as a runaway by her parents when it seemed she had left home without permission and without telling her parents where she was going.

Next, we visited Rincon High School to talk with the Dean of Girls about the possibility of returning a student to school who had been ditching. It was believed by the dean, that the girl in question had "used up her chances" by ditching too much over too long a period of time.

From Rincon we traveled to Palo Verde High to see Mrs. Cox, the Dean of Girls. While visiting with Mrs. Cox, we did manage to see several girls. After leaving Palo Verde High, we journeyed across the street to the Diamond Pin Bowling Alley, which is a "meet" or hang out for teenagers. As teenagers are barred from entering the alley itself, a room at one end of the alley was utilized for a meeting room. The room was bare except for a few chairs and a juke box. I was informed by Miss Stewart that the adult hired by the bowling alley to supervise the "club,"
was an ex-convict and well known to the local police
department. I felt that it would have been much easier
for the bowling alley management to allow young people to
use the full facilities of the alley. With the exception
of the bar, there did not appear to be anything which would
endanger the health, welfare or morals of any teen-ager.

Monday, April 13, 1964

I was informed by Mr. Valdez that I was to begin to
work in the intake division of the probation department.
First came a review of intake procedures with the notifica-
tion that eventually I would be tested on the knowledge I
would be expected to possess. Briefly, Mr. Valdez reviewed
the law and certain specific intake procedures. It is the
intake officer who must decide whether or not a child shall
have to appear at a juvenile court hearing. The intake
officer also may decide to dismiss or adjust the referral
after talking with the child and his parent. The child may
have committed the offense in question, and may have
admitted doing so, but because of the nature of the offense,
or because it is the first referral to the department, the
boy or girl and his or her parent may be counseled and sent
home.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent by helping
Mr. Valdez prepare the statistics for the calendar year of
1963.
Tuesday, April 14, 1964

This afternoon, due to my training supervisor being busy with other matters, I was placed with Mr. Tony Guzman, a field probation officer. Several visits were made at John Spring Junior High School and following that we made some home contacts.

The first home visit was made at the home of Wilbur G. At the time of our arrival we found Wilbur's sister visiting her probation officer, Miss Chavez. Because of the inconvenience of having so many people on the premises we did not stay long and Mr. Guzman made arrangements to return another time to talk with Wilbur.

The next home visited was that of Oscar C. Oscar was having difficulties in the home and this had been the reason for his being placed on probation. Oscar's father is a very passive individual, believing that his duties as a father ended with his bringing home his paycheck. As a result, the boys in this family lacked a strong male figure with whom they could identify. Mr. Guzman's biggest problem in this case has been to make the father understand that he has responsibilities other than monetary ones.

The final visit of the afternoon was made at the home of Cesar B., a Mexican citizen. Cesar's family has just moved to the U. S. and most of the family speaks no English. Cesar did not know the traffic laws of the state but this did not stop him from driving. He was apprehended
by the police. It was decided that, although this was a youngster who was violating the traffic laws, because of the many problems in the area of language it would be best to have a Spanish-speaking probation officer in contact with Cesar as well as his family. Cesar's parents were not at home but Mr. Guzman carried on a lively conversation with him, mostly in Spanish. I noted that he and Mr. Guzman were able to communicate very well and that Cesar even looked like he was happy to see Mr. Guzman. I felt that the judge had made a wise choice in placing Cesar on probation, for it can be understood that a youngster such as this must feel somewhat alienated in a strange country even living in an area where there are Spanish-speaking people.

Wednesday, April 15, 1964

A trip to the Good Shepherd School was planned for today. I traveled with Miss Carol Fassnacht a probation officer and two student interns from Mrs. Fuller's class, Miss Joy Geller and Miss Gail Johns. We delivered two girls to the school, but the more interesting aspect about the trip was the fact that we also stopped at the Arizona Children's Colony in Coolidge to deliver a girl who had been committed there by the court. Despite advance planning on the part of the Juvenile Court, the officials were reluctant to accept her. I was worried for a while and
thought we might possibly have to take the girl back to Tucson with us. The girl did not want to go to the Children's Colony, realizing that it was an institution for retarded youngsters.

The remainder of the trip was rather anti-climatic after our experience at the Children's Colony. The girls whom we were to deliver at the Home of the Good Shepherd did not put up any resistance and seemed reconciled to their new home. There was no one available to take me on a tour of the facility, but from what I observed, I decided that if the program matched the physical plant, it must be a fine institution.

Thursday, April 16, 1964

This morning I made arrangements to be present at the morning intake meeting. Present were Mr. John Kohl supervisor, Mr. Alex Valdez, Mr. Gordon Pageau, and Mrs. Helen Wollard. The intake officers meet every morning to discuss the previous day's referrals. Case assignments are made at this time. Various case problems are discussed, and occasionally a specific case will be discussed or "staffed" by the entire group of intake officers.

Following the meeting I stayed with Mr. Gordon Pageau. He interviewed and recommended that a case be adjusted on a referral involving a fourteen year old boy.
accused of stealing from his classmates. After a coffee break we were ready for the next appointment.

This case involved a junior high school aged child involved in a long standing pattern of bicycle thefts. Mr. Pageau made an appointment so that he could talk to a parent and obtain a social history of the family. From this information he will construct a pre-hearing report to submit to the judge or referee. I observed the interview and jotted a few notes concerning the types of questions asked by the intake officer.

The mother Mrs. G., was asked many questions about her family and several questions were asked about her mother and father, as well as the husband's mother and father. I gathered that these questions were designed to elicit information about the social class of the family. Mr. Pageau then asked about Danny, the child in question. How does he behave? Does he talk back? How is the discipline managed? Does your husband swear at the boy? Does he physically chastise him? The general response of Mrs. G. was that the family was tight-knit with no unusual problems.

She described her son as a typical American youngster who loved sports, but was not particularly enthusiastic about school. Upon further questioning about the thefts, it was learned that Danny did at one time have a bike, but this was stolen some time ago. It appeared
that his parents were somewhat over-indulgent in giving in
to many of his wishes. A plan was developed by Mr. Pageau
whereby Danny would have to work for his privileges. Mr.
Pageau suggested that at a later date perhaps the youngster
could handle a newspaper route. After the interview Mr.
Pageau indicated to me that he was interested in helping
this child have some positive experiences with earning
money and in general being responsible. As Danny was in
school during the interview, arrangements were made to
bring the boy to the office for a conference.

At the end of the morning I had an opportunity to
observe a hearing conducted by Judge Truman involving a
girl formerly a resident of the Good Shepherd School. The
youngster Pat K., has had two out-of-wedlock children and
at the time of the hearing was pregnant for a third time.
Mr. Kieffer, her parole agent, told the court that it
would be useless to send the girl back to the school as
they could not handle her. The school does not provide
pre-natal care and does not have a program geared for hard­
core delinquent youngsters. I could see that the court was
stymied as far as a decision was concerned. Reluctantly,
the judge released the girl back to the community.

Friday, April 17, 1964

I observed court hearings for the first part of the
afternoon and during the late afternoon interviewed two
cases which according to Mr. Kohl could be "adjusted."
Both incidents concerned themselves with boys who were
toilet-papering each other's homes. Everything would have
been all right except that one parent called the police.
It was learned that there were eight boys involved in this
 escapade. The probation department sees this as "mischief"
where no malicious intent was involved.

The mother of the second boy I spoke with treated
the entire matter as a big joke, as she was taking moving
pictures of the incident.

I adopted the approach that although there was no
harm done the group behavior pattern could have very easily
gotten out of hand with the boys going on to more serious
types of vandalism. I also mentioned that when a "TP" job
such as this is watered down with a sprinkler or by a rain
shower, it then becomes almost impossible to remove.

Monday, April 20, 1964

After Mr. John Kohl had assigned several cases to
me, I spent the initial part of the afternoon trying to
make telephone contact with the people involved. Some of
the families were not home, while others had no telephone.
Mr. Kohl indicated that when the delinquent act was under­
going police investigation and the officer decided not to
take the child into custody but rather make a referral on
paper, the family or parent involved was advised to make
contact with the probation department regarding an appoint-
ment for their child.

The cases which I am to handle and dispose of are those consisting of minor offenses and first referrals of which it is felt can be "adjusted" by the department.

It was indicated to me by my supervisor that it would be all right to have the youngster miss school for an appointment, however, I felt that under normal circum-
stances this was not a wise idea. I therefore tried to schedule my appointments during the late afternoon hours.

Upon reading the police reports, I noticed that they often contained hearsay, and second-hand information. This makes it doubly important for us to interview the child and his parent. A plan suggested to me was for the interview to commence with talking to the child alone and not in the presence of his parents. Following this interview, I then could talk to the parent. If the home situation appeared to be normal and the parents seemed to be taking proper steps to correct the situation, then I could interview the child and the parent together, and inform them of the course of action the department would be taking.

Midway through the afternoon I accompanied Mr. Valdez as he delivered some files to a court referee. This procedure is followed so that the referee has time to read the file and obtain a thorough picture of the case before it comes to court.
At 4:00 P.M. I interviewed my first case of the day. A twelve year old boy had thrown a rock and broken a window in a telephone booth. He stated he did not intend to hit the window because he was not aiming at it. At the time of the impact there were some girls using the booth. He was asked if the girls had been hurt and what would happen if they had. The lad's response was that it would be bad. After speaking with the parent, I felt that the boy's statement was essentially correct and that the family seemed to have taken an appropriate action. This case was adjusted.

The final case concerned another of the boys of the group that was toilet-papering homes. The boy appeared to be aware of the circumstances and I handled this case in the same manner as I had the others.

Tuesday, April 21, 1964

I continued my program of interviewing and counseling those cases where Mr. Kohl felt no official action by the court was necessary. The first hour was concerned with making appointments for the cases which had been assigned to me.

At 2:30 P.M. I began my first interview of the day with the case of Chuck S., a youngster referred for violating the liquor laws. According to the police report, Chuck had been at a party where liquor had been served.
Chuck denied doing any drinking, however. His attitude appeared to be good in that he indicated that if he were to be at any future parties where there was drinking he would walk out. I told him that this was good advice and I hoped he would heed it. After speaking briefly with his mother, the wife of a Tucson attorney, I felt that the parents had acted in a responsible manner. The mother indicated that she objected to her son being contacted at school by a police detective, feeling that such notoriety in the school-setting was unjustified. I explained to her that the Juvenile Court and Probation Department of Pima County was not connected to the Tucson Police Department and she could, if she wanted, direct her complaint to the local police department. I tried to explain that police detectives worked daytime hours as did many other people in the community. The mother had stated earlier that she had taken corrective action which amounted to restricting the boy for the next two weeks. I indicated to the parents that the department would be taking no official action.

My next case concerned a boy who was reported as a runaway by his parents. Upon talking to Bill and his mother it was learned that Bill had taken the family car on a date and had failed to return home at the proper time. The youngster had returned home about 3:00 A.M. in the morning and, not wanting his parents to discover his tardiness, had spent the night in the car parked in the back
yard of his home. I attempted to help Bill realize the immaturity of his action, asking him if it was better to endure the police investigation or his parents anger and worry. There did not appear any elements of incorrigibility or waywardness in this case, as Bill and his mother seemed to relate well to each other during the interview. It was also noted that this was the first referral for this sixteen year old boy. This case was adjusted.

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

I continued my assignment of handling those cases which were considered to be adjustable. The first case of the afternoon saw a fifteen year old white male referred for throwing oranges at the home of the complainant. The boy gave his excuse the fact that the complainant's daughter had a bad reputation. I first tried to help the youngster see that this was primarily an excuse for his misconduct and that his behavior pattern was largely a rationalization. Although the court would consider this type of act one of mischief, with no real malicious intent involved, the boy could have done real damage to the home. I encouraged the youngster to find more socially acceptable ways of letting off steam. The parents seemed to have good controls and also understood the seriousness of the behavior. I recommended that no action be taken by the department. It is interesting to note that this interview took about
thirty-five minutes, which is about average for cases such as these.

The next child to come for an appointment was also involved in the orange-throwing incident. Steve, a friend of the first boy, had a better attitude than his friend. He stated to me that he knew what he did was senseless and stupid and had realized this from the time the first orange was "heaved." This situation was handled in essentially the same manner as the first.

The third case of the afternoon saw Joey K., a ten year old referred for runaway. Upon a perusal of the police report, I learned that Joey and a friend had left the school grounds at noon to go on a bike trip. The boys had become lost and had left their bikes at Swan Road near Grant Road and had started hitch-hiking home. The boys did not return until late in the evening. In the meantime their parents had filed runaway reports with the police department. After speaking with Joey, I could see that this was really a situation of youthful immaturity, for the boy had a strong sense of guilt over what had happened. Joey's mother did not understand why she and her son had to come to the probation department. I explained to her that all police investigations of matters involving juveniles had to be referred to the juvenile court and its "action arm" the probation department. I further interpreted to her that our aim was to help the parents in any
way we could. I indicated to her that the department would take no official action concerning the matter.

The fourth boy to be interviewed was Scott T., a member of the orange-throwing group. This case presented no extraordinary problems and the youngster's attitude was as good as could be expected. My approach was the same as used in the previous cases, and I encouraged Scott to find better uses for his spare time.

Thursday, April 23, 1964

In order to facilitate an appointment for a client I arranged my hours so that I worked in the morning. James N. and his father came to the office before 9:00 A.M., their scheduled appointment time. James, a twelve year old Anglo boy, had run away from his home. His mother had threatened to whip him because he told a lie to her. James was quite talkative and it was not difficult to establish rapport with him. As it turned out, the youngster had become so frightened that he had secreted himself in an empty house not far from his own home. When the family had retired for the evening and had turned out the lights, James had returned home. In this case I tried to help James see that running away was a poor way to solve his problems. From conversation with the father and James together, I could sense a strong relationship and felt that no serious
problem existed in the family itself. This case was adjusted.

My final case for the morning concerned Dave O., a high school senior who was referred for being at a party where liquor was served. Dave was a good looking, well-built boy, and a member of the school's football team. In addition, he had been working on a part time job for the past two years. His future plans included college, perhaps the University of Arizona. I tried to impress upon Dave the serious implications of this kind of behavior. He could have become drunk and lost control of himself. I told him directly that if he found himself at another drinking party, it was his obligation to leave immediately. The lad said he would take my advice and indicated that he had never considered the consequences of this type of activity. The family was encouraged to discuss drinking with their children. I indicated to the mother that Dave, now seventeen, would soon be beyond the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and if he were to continue drinking, he faced the possibility of being arrested and charged with a misdemeanor. The fact of a criminal conviction seemed to impress upon the family the seriousness of the situation. This was Dave's first referral to the juvenile court and I felt that it would probably be his last. Case adjusted.
Friday, April 24, 1964

Today I was not at the office because of illness; fortunately, I had no appointments scheduled.

Monday, April 27, 1964

The initial part of the afternoon was spent reviewing the weekend's referrals, especially those that have been assigned to me. A few telephone calls were made to arrange appointments for the week.

The day's first case was that of a youngster who attended a party where liquor had been served. Gary, a six foot four inch senior, plays on his school's basketball team. His attitude appeared to be good in that he realized the seriousness of his conduct. There appeared to be a large amount of group pressure and tacit parental approval concerning these drinking parties. The police report and the child's statement both affirmed that Gary had not done any drinking. The parents seemed quite concerned about the whole matter and stated that, if they had had knowledge about the party, they would not have allowed their son to attend. Furthermore, they had restricted Gary for the next two months. I indicated to the parents that our job was not to tell them what to do, but to make sure that Gary and his parents understood the situation and that some action was taken. This case was adjusted.
The next case concerned an attempted petty theft. Ronnie C., and his friend Jim C., on probation to Mr. Beattie, had tried to take a coke out of the Midas Muffler Shop's coke machine. Ronnie's attitude was poor in that he blamed his friend for his problem and he tended to reject parental authority. This was his first referral and he indicated in his statement that he had "learned his lesson." At the conclusion of the interview I felt that his attitude had improved to a degree. He agreed with me that his mother's way of handling it was all right (she had restricted him). The mother seemed to have the situation under control, although it should be noted that there was no father in the picture.

**Tuesday, April 28, 1964**

Only one case was handled today, that being a referral over an incident which had taken place over a year ago. Bob S., was brought to the office by his mother. The charge was extortion. Bob was involved with another youngster when approximately one year ago the "victim" had called a teacher a name behind the teacher's back. Bob and his friend decided that it was about time to collect the "debt" and had gone to the victim's home. According to the police report, they refused to leave the premises and began using profanity. In interviewing Bob, I attempted to help him realize the seriousness of the offense and also its
stupidity. Bob was very apprehensive about his appearance at the probation office, and stated that he didn't really mean any harm by it as they had only "asked" for ten cents. I immediately interjected the statement, "You mean you threatened this boy, . . ." I had noticed that oftentimes children tried to rationalize their involvement in these acts. I furthermore defined the word extortion for Bob, as he was only in the sixth grade. The mother stated to me that she did not see why Bob waited so long to attempt to get the money. At the conclusion of the interview I could see that Bob was plainly scared and on the verge of tears. This was a surprise to me as the interview had progressed smoothly and the tone of my voice had been subdued. The recommendation was that our department would take no official action.

The remainder of the afternoon was spent in assisting Mr. Valdez with compiling the statistical records of the department, in preparation for the annual report which is due to be released near the end of the school semester.

Wednesday, April 24, 1964

Today a case was assigned to me which was more complicated and more unusual than the ones I had been previously interviewing. Dewey R., a fifteen year old youngster in detention, was brought to the detention home
last night for grabbing a woman on the buttocks. The incident occurred in a coin operated laundry. When I talked with the boy, I found him very nervous and apprehensive. I tried to reassure Dewey that I was not going to hurt him and that I wanted to listen to his story. Dewey related that he was walking out of the laundry when he brushed against the complainant. She asked him what was going on. He answered that this was initiation into the club. She slapped him. He later was apprehended by the police. Dewey denied having grabbed the complainant, claiming only to have brushed against her accidentally. I told Dewey that his statement was not going to convince many people as to its truthfulness. He admitted that this was true. He stuck to his story, however, and maintained that all he did was to accidentally touch the complainant. Dewey has a very low opinion of himself, stating several times during the interview that he needed a psychiatrist. He talked a lot about his troubles.

I spoke with the mother and encouraged her to have Dewey examined by the staff of another agency, perhaps the Child Guidance Clinic. The mother, a cold and hard-appearing woman, said she would think it over. She seemed to resent having to come to the detention home to obtain the release of her son. Since this was the first referral for this child and, since it was felt that other agencies
could more effectively handle the boy's problem, the case was adjusted.

My second and final case of the afternoon saw the friend of Joey, the child who left the school without permission, referred. Danny R., a nine year old boy stated essentially the same story as had Joey. I asked Danny what action the school had taken because the boys had left the school grounds without permission. Danny replied that the principal had made him stay after school. Since this matter seemed more a problem for the school and parents to solve, I adjusted the case.

Thursday, April 30, 1964

No cases were handled today, with the afternoon being taken up with making telephone calls, to schedule appointments for tomorrow and next week.

Friday, May 1, 1964

Today my first case was scheduled at 9:00 A.M. The appointment had been arranged yesterday. Keven I. had been accused of riding his bike through another woman's property. According to the statement of the child, he was accused of riding his bike through her yard before and had been warned. The youngster denied this, explaining that until a few days ago he did not have a bike. He did admit to knocking over a low adobe wall, which he said he and his friends would help to replace. I told Keven that he had no
business riding around or near the home of the complainant. Since the parents had good control of the boy and, since this was a very minor matter, the case was adjusted.

The second case of the day proved to have more complications. John P. was referred for putting ground rubber into the gasoline tank of a car belonging to a former boss at a car wash. John emphatically denied having anything to do with the matter. I pointed out to the youngster that the complainant claimed to have seen John commit this act. This did not change John's statement. I felt that perhaps John might not be telling the truth. I examined the boy's file and noted that he had attended the Howenstein School, an institution for special education students. John in all probability had a below average intellectual capacity. From the standpoint of evidence, the police report did not give much other than hearsay evidence and, if the court were to force the issue, I doubted whether or not an adjudication or placement on probation would help the situation. I spoke with John's mother, and noted that she sided with her son on the issue at hand. I indicated to her that the department was interested in seeing that children not get into further trouble and, concerning this referral, we would let the matter drop at this point.

The final case of the afternoon involved a runaway. Bob R., a bright appearing sixteen year old boy, had gotten into a fight with his mother. When she tried to physically
chastise him, he prevented her by holding her arms. This had only exacerbated the situation and, in desperation, the boy had left his home. I let Bob know that I thought he was too old for physical punishment but that he had the responsibility to obey his parent's requests. Bob indicated that he was happy at home and he did not fight very often with either his mother or father.

I spoke briefly with the father, who stated essentially the same thing. I told him that we would rather the parents handled this problem if at all possible. In observing Bob and his father, I could see that things were going along in a satisfactory manner and I adjusted the case.

Monday, May 4, 1964

Monday the fourth of May still finds this intern doing intake work, and handling cases which can be adjusted. My training supervisor informed me that I have done more intake work than any other previous intern.

The first case to be handled, concerned a youngster who was found on the premises of a building that was being demolished. He was referred for his own protection. Raul F. readily admitted being there, as he said he was waiting for some friends. He indicated that he was not going to play around that area any longer. I affirmed the boy's statement by telling him that I agreed
because he could be either injured or even killed. After making sure that the parents were aware of the circumstances, and would more carefully supervise the child, I recommended that the matter be adjusted.

The next youngster I spoke with was Ralph P., the friend of Keven I., the bike rider. Ralph's story was almost identical with that of Keven. I felt that the best approach to the matter was to make sure that Ralph had helped Keven rebuild the wall and that from now on the boys would avoid the complainant. I asked Ralph's mother to make sure her son would do his part in the rebuilding project. Case adjusted.

Tuesday, May 5, 1964

I began the afternoon by reading the cases which had been assigned to me since yesterday. One case in particular interested me more than the usual routine ones. It concerns a boy David D., who was involved in starting fires. Since the boy had admitted to fire department investigators that he had started more than one fire, my concern increased. Mr. Joel Valdez suggested I contact the Tucson Child Guidance Clinic for further information. I did, and they said they had no information concerning this boy. I next contacted the school, and they told me that he was having some difficulties, but not in the
classroom. I made an appointment to talk to the principal tomorrow.

At 3:30 P.M. I saw Tommy H., another of the individuals involved in putting ground rubber into the gasoline tank of a car belonging to the complainant. Tommy readily admitted to doing this act, indicating as his reason that the complainant had made things difficult for them at the auto wash. The boys had been fired as a group and they were trying to get even.

I interpreted to the youngster that no matter how bad things were that they could not get even. Two wrongs don't make a right. I pointed out that the complainant could sue all the boys for damages to his automobile. Tommy indicated he would stay out of trouble because he did not want to come to the probation department again. His attitude was questionable, as he seemed to be doing the right thing for the wrong reason. I spoke to his mother and sister and told them that they were responsible for the damages to the complainant's vehicle. The mother stated that Tommy would always mind her and had never been in any kind of trouble. As this was a first referral, the matter was adjusted.

Wednesday, May 6, 1964

The first interview of the afternoon involved a brother and sister Jack and Rose E., ages ten and twelve
respectively. Jack and Rose were involved in the taking of keys from a hardware store. Jack claimed that he had no intention of taking the key, in fact he was going to pay for it when he was arrested. This family presents some unusual problems to the worker. First, they classify themselves as gypsies. The boy and girl are not in school and when they do attend Jack is placed in the second grade. Rose stated that she was placed in the third grade. The mother admitted that the family travels all the time and thus the children are never in one area long enough to attend school.

In counseling with the two youngsters I tried to help them understand that even if they had no intentions of taking the key, their outward behavior gave that impression to the store detective. After stating the situation in several different ways, I believe the children had some idea of what I was talking about. The mother had a very limited vocabulary and I could see that these children were going to be carbon copies of the parents. The only way for the court to act in this situation would be to adjust the matter, and this was done.

The next interview was with a juvenile who had been involved in the ground rubber incident at the car wash. This sixteen year old Negro boy admitted his involvement and had a good attitude. He appeared to have above average intelligence and had considered attending college upon
graduation from high school. This case too, was adjusted.

The remaining case of the afternoon involved two boys referred for shoplifting a pair of swimming trunks from a store. Don C. could not understand why he was referred because his friend Cruz F. had done the stealing. Upon questioning, it was learned that Don learned about the theft when the boys were in the car after leaving the store. I stated to the youngster: "That makes you an accessory after the fact." My purpose was to help him realize what comprised his legal responsibilities; and to enable him to understand that by not acting when he had knowledge, even in a group situation, he was as guilty as his friend. I had a difficult time in making myself understood, so I rephrased myself three different ways. I still don't think I got the point across.

I then discussed the boy's background. Don informed me that at the end of the semester he planned to drop out of school and join the Marines. He stated that he considered himself "a cut above the average" and I told him that if he were a cut above the average he would not be in trouble. His attitude was questionable.

In speaking with the mother, I learned that Don was having home problems with his father and school problems with ditching. The youngster saw the Armed Forces as a way to solve his problems. Despite these negative factors, I
felt that the youngster might be able to adjust himself to his problems. I felt that he saw the armed forces as a way to get away from home and assert his independence. After speaking briefly again with the boy, I adjusted the matter.

Thursday, May 7, 1964

My first case of the day concerned a youngster who had been referred for starting a fire in a shed that belonged to his grandparents. Prior to interviewing this youngster I had called the parochial school where the child attends and spoken with Sister Leo, the principal. David D., age ten years, was doing poorly in school, although testing has shown that this youngster's intelligence placed him in the bright average category. It seems that the youngster was creating classroom disturbances and had to be removed from the class on several occasions.

Dave was an average-appearing ten year old boy. Contrary to what his principal had said, he did not give the appearance of being emotionally disturbed, at least in the interview situation. I learned that there was no father in the home, although Dave lived with his mother in the home of his grandparents.

When I spoke with his mother, I realized that she may have had very good insight into the youngster's problems. She indicated that there were too many authority figures in the home telling the boy what to do. His
grandparents were not understanding and, although they would not discipline the boy physically, they would show him little patience and would yell at him on many occasions. The mother told me that she was planning to move to Chicago. I indicated to her that it might be a good idea to change the youngster's environment; furthermore, it might be a good idea for David to have some positive experiences with male authority figures. I suggested that in lieu of getting a new father for the boy, that she should seek the aid of the Big Brothers organization. Mrs. D. agreed to this plan and the case was adjusted. The remainder of the afternoon was spent in helping Mr. Valdez compiling statistics and filling out some paper-work of the various cases I had been handling.

Friday, May 8, 1964

Today I assisted Mr. Valdez in reviewing cases for destruction. As I had done before, I followed several rules in determining whether or not a case would be destroyed. First, if a boy or girl had turned eighteen in April of 1964, and they were not on probation or parole, or had not been released from the state Industrial School, or the Home of the Good Shepherd (no institutional commitment), then the file was marked for destruction. All cases of traffic referrals were marked for destruction providing they had reached their eighteenth birthday in April. Thus,
in this manner over one hundred cases were marked for destruction.

Monday, May 11, 1964

I had four new cases assigned to me during the weekend. Three of the parents called the department and I arranged appointments with them. I was able to schedule one of them for this afternoon.

At 3:00 P.M. Ricky C. appeared at the office. Ricky a nine year old Anglo boy was referred for shoplifting from a downtown variety store. He was apprehended on the premises by store personnel. I asked Ricky if he knew that this was wrong. He answered, "sort of." I questioned him about the act, and it appeared to me that he was answering my questions, but he was very withdrawn. It was difficult for me to engage him in conversation. I did feel that he was being truthful but he spoke mostly in a monotone. I began to think he was a little slow intellectually, because for a nine year old he appeared a little dull. He did not know his home address or his home phone number. He did not know where his school was located. He stated that he was in the "lower fourth grade," in school. I asked him if he was doing all right in school and he answered that he was having troubles in mathematics and reading. I spoke with him at some length concerning his delinquent act. Finally the youngster said he did not want
to do it again. He also indicated that he would try to save his money to buy the item that was taken, a pair of spurs, worth $1.80.

I spoke with the parents and explained to them our function. I told them that owing to his age and that this was a first referral we would prefer that the parents handle the problem. I told the parents of our conversation, and that I would recommend an adjustment for this matter.

Tuesday, May 12, 1964

I began the afternoon with the case of Charles T., a rather large 185 pound, thirteen year old boy, who had been apprehended on the roof of a local elementary school. Charles stated that he was going to spend the night on the roof of the school. I said that I doubted whether the policeman who apprehended him would believe his story. When the boys involved were apprehended, they had part of a carton of eggs and a box of matches in their possession. Charles admitted to throwing eggs at several children while he was on the roof of the school. The youngster had not told his mother where he was going. Due to the type of offense, and the age of the child, I felt an adjustment was in order and so, after speaking with the mother, I did just that.
An hour later I spoke with Charles F., the friend and accomplice of Charles T. This lad's story was essentially the same and the case was handled in the same manner.

The third case of the afternoon was a runaway. William C. had run away from home because his parents had restricted the use of his motor scooter. His mother had told me over the phone that the boy had an extremely poor attitude and that he was quite rebellious toward his parents. She stated further that Bill was running around with a boy who was formerly at Fort Grant and that she considered this boy to be a poor influence on her son.

I spoke with the lad who was a freshman at Sunny-side High School. On his own initiative he took up the hobby of electronics and he also was learning how to play the guitar. I felt sure that these two factors would be helpful to him in the future. I next talked with the boy about his home and indicated to him that he would have to make a greater effort there. I had learned from his mother that the father was disabled and the family was subsisting on a small pension.

I questioned Bill about his relationship with Richard S., the boy who was a former resident at Fort Grant. Bill told me that Richard was O.K., as he (Richard) was staying out of trouble, for he knew the consequences if he did not. Bill told me that his mother had let him have his scooter providing he did not associate with the boy
any more. Bill said that he did not really associate too much with Richard anyway so that he did not think that decision a difficult one.

I spoke with the mother for about fifteen minutes. Although she indicated that she was having some problems with the youngster, I believed that they were not of a serious enough nature to warrant court action. Matter adjusted.

Wednesday, May 13, 1964

Only one case was interviewed today, that of David H., a nine year old apprehended for shoplifting at a local five and ten cents store. David was taking some postage stamps which he intended to use in his stamp collection. I questioned him extensively about this and the youngster admitted to his act. I asked him what the policeman had told him and what his parents had done. He told me that the policeman had talked to him and that his parents had talked to him. I asked him if he knew what he did was wrong and he said that he did now.

When I talked with David's father I found that Mr. H. was not going to allow David to go to the store by himself for a while. The family situation seemed to be all right and I noted that David and his father seemed to have a good relationship. I explained to the father that
we would prefer to have the family take care of this matter and that we would be taking no action in this case.

**Thursday, May 14, 1964**

Today I continued to handle cases which it was felt could be adjusted by Mr. Kohl, the supervisor of the intake officers. Jesus T. was the first youngster to be interviewed during the afternoon. He was a twelve year old child who was referred for shooting his B-B gun in a city park. He gave the appearance of being brighter than the average youngsters and answered my questions without hesitation. I asked him if he knew what the law said about shooting B-B guns within the city limits and he indicated that he was unaware of the law. Actually, there is a city ordinance prohibiting the use of B-B guns within the city limits. I tried to communicate to the youngster that the law was designed to protect people in the city from getting hurt, and that the law was there to help everybody. I told him that he could shoot his gun outside the city limits, preferably in a desert area.

When I spoke with his mother, I discovered that she was unaware of her son's activities. She said that both she and her husband had spoken to Jesus about this and that from now on they would take a more positive approach to their son's use of a B-B gun. The parents' approach to
handling this situation seemed to be very good and thus I adjusted the case.

I next telephoned the receptionist and told her to send the next case to the interview room. I asked to see Mike K., but instead of Mike appearing, I was confronted with his mother. She informed me that she was Mrs. K., and when I asked her where Mike was, she informed me that I had not told her that he was to appear at the probation department. I told her that I believed that I had informed her of the fact, but she insisted that I had not. I apologized, saying that I may have forgotten to mention this. I questioned her about what action she had taken regarding her son's law violation. Mike was caught in the act by the store authorities shop lifting. Her answer was: "Must I tell you?" I said that I would appreciate it if she would. She appeared very reticent, however, and did not want to tell me very much. I could see that I was meeting much resistance here and did my best to relieve her anxieties. As I discovered later, I did not succeed too well at this endeavor. In filling out the intake form, Mrs. K. refused to give me the names of Mike's brothers and sisters. I made an appointment to talk to Mike at his home during the afternoon.

When I arrived at the K. residence I found Mike home alone. He did not want to talk to me. I questioned him about his act and was able to learn little more than
was contained in the police report and which his mother had related. Soon after my arrival, Mrs. K. returned and again I asked questions about the family. Again Mrs. K. refused to answer them but did indicate that there were three children altogether.

In my opinion this woman exhibited an extremely poor attitude regarding the entire situation. She seemed fearful that Mike's activities would give her family a bad name. I tried to reassure her again that none of this information would be or could be used against Mike, pointing out that our records would be destroyed when Mike was eighteen, provided Mike stayed out of trouble. I felt sure that my statements did nothing to change her attitude. Mike appeared to be a shy, quiet boy in his home, almost to the extent of being brow-beaten or stifled by a superior force. As I had accomplished my purpose in interviewing the boy, I terminated the interview and recommended that the case be adjusted.

Friday, May 15, 1964

Today I interviewed Kirk B., the first case assigned to me that will not be resolved in the way that the previous ones had. Kirk was referred to the probation department for his involvement in an act of burglary. I was directed to investigate and write a pre-hearing report about Kirk and his family to submit to the court. Today I interviewed
Kirk and his mother and father. Kirk is involved with another boy in the breaking and entering of a home and stealing liquor, coins, and other items.

When I first questioned Kirk, I found him to be a pleasant, courteous thirteen year old boy. He addressed me as sir, and I felt that he was not doing this to make an impression. The burglary was the third offense for Kirk in which theft of some sort was involved. I questioned Kirk extensively about his delinquent act and he readily admitted that he was involved in this and stated in great detail how he and Davis S. carried out the burglary. It appeared that David S. was the instigator of this burglary according to Kirk.

I then spoke to the mother and father, asking them questions about their son and about the family itself. I next made arrangements to visit the family at home. During the interview I asked Kirk to make a written statement about the offense. Following the interview with his parents, I talked to the lad and at this time discussed the statement with Kirk. My purpose was twofold: first, to see if the youngster could express himself on paper, and second, to obtain a statement in the child's own words concerning the offense. Basically, I wanted to make sure that I had obtained an accurate statement of the offense and that no items that were taken were omitted. Following this
discussion, I told Kirk that I would be visiting him at his home.

Monday, May 18, 1964

Monday I received a new case to interview, however, it was discovered that I knew the child in question and therefore I asked that this case be handled by another probation officer. Mr. Kohl then reassigned the case. The remainder of the afternoon was spent in preparing my first pre-hearing report.

Tuesday, May 19, 1964

Today, I was assigned the case of David S., the companion of Kirk B., and David too, was referred for burglary. I made an appointment for Mr. and Mrs. S. to come to the office with David. The rest of the afternoon was spent in reviewing my notes on the case of Kirk B., in preparation for writing my report.

Wednesday, May 20, 1964

I had arranged that David S. and his family would come to the office today. When they arrived I spoke first with David. I found him to be a shy, retiring youngster, who had some difficulty in talking about the offense. I asked him if this was the first time he had done something like this and he indicated that it was. I asked David to
write his statement of the offense and then spoke with his parents.

I detected some hostility from the parents about the offense. Mainly, this was directed towards our department. The family tended to blame Tucson in general for their son's misconduct. The father seemed to feel that if he could move to Alaska, he would solve the problems he was having with his son. The family was surprised when I told them that the matter would have to come to the attention of the court. I pointed out to them that if the boys were eighteen they would face a prison term. I interpreted to them the philosophy of the juvenile court and indicated to them that to our way of thinking a problem existed and that we wanted to help them if possible. After I completed my interviewing I indicated to the family that I would arrange a time for the court hearing, and that they would be subpoenaed to it. The last part of the afternoon was spent in arranging my notes from the interviews.

Thursday, May 21, 1964

I had several new cases assigned to me today, and I decided to arrange appointments for them as soon as possible. My first case of the afternoon concerned a fourteen year old boy who was referred for knocking over garbage cans. Mike F. was involved along with several other juveniles in this delinquent act. Mike admitted to
me that he had knocked over about four empty cans, but that he had decided to stop because he thought that the other boys were becoming too wild. I told him that I thought he had done a sensible thing, for he was too old for this type of activity to continue.

In speaking to his mother, I learned that another juvenile in the group had been knocking over her garbage cans for some time, but that she did not mind too much. I told Mike's mother that I thought Mike had a good attitude about his offense and that we would not be seeing him at the probation department again. Case adjusted.

Friday, May 22, 1964

Today, because I had no appointments scheduled, I asked Mr. Kohl if I could observe him conduct interviews. My purpose was to compare my interview techniques with those of a seasoned professional. As Mr. Kohl had several children in detention it was agreed that this would be a good idea.

The first boy interviewed was Jim E., referred for a burglary. Jim was in detention and when first seen by Mr. Kohl was reading a book about pirates. He was asked if he would like to live that kind of life. The youngster was very nervous and could not answer the question. The youngster was taken from the detention home to an interview room and his pattern of nervousness was even more evident.
He was always doing something with his hands and, when not fidgeting, he would be preening himself by smoothing his hair or picking at his skin. During the interview Mr. Kohl was called from the room and the youngster immediately began reading the book he had brought with him from the detention home. I took this type of behavior to be escapism as it appeared to me that the youngster was withdrawing from the situation he was facing.

After a time Mr. Kohl returned and the interview was completed. The child was returned to the detention home and Mr. Kohl indicated to me that this case would come to the attention of the court.

The next boy to be interviewed was also in detention. Mark B., a student at Amphitheater High School was involved in an altercation after a baseball game in which he broke another boy's arm by hitting him with a baseball bat. He was asked by Mr. Kohl if he had a temper, to which the boy answered that he did. He then asked Mark who would pay the medical costs of repairing the other boy's broken arm. Mark did not feel that he should have to pay as he believed that the other boy started the fight. By this time Mark was almost in tears. Mark was then asked if he wanted to kill someone; and the interview took on a more serious quality. I could see that the intake officer was trying to help the youngster realize just where this type of behavior was leading.
Mr. Kohl then told the boy why he should not fight. The report from the police indicated that prior to any blows being struck there was a lot of swearing. Mr. Kohl indicated to Mark that his swearing was an excuse to make the situation more tense. Mark was told that he would have to learn how to control his temper and to learn self control. The discussion centered around ways to solve problems other than swearing, or fighting. At the termination of the interview the youngster still felt justified in his fight and believed that he would and should not be required to pay for the medical costs.

An appointment had been scheduled with Mark's father for that same morning and so I asked to attend that interview also. Mr. B. felt that his son was provoked into the fight. When asked about his feelings about his son being involved in a fight, the father answered that it was all right but that he thought that his son should not have used a baseball bat as a weapon. He stated that he taught his son never to run from a fight. Due to the seriousness of the offense, the matter will come to the attention of the court. The "charge" is aggravated assault. If Mark were eighteen he would be charged with a felony. The father felt that because his son was provoked into fighting he should not have to pay the medical costs.

In discussing this case with Mr. Kohl I learned that the intake officer had already made some astute
observations about Mark. It was felt by Mr. Kohl that Mark's attitude is one of violence—in his reaction to the problem. Furthermore, he used swearing as a means to get himself involved in a fight. To justify his thinking, Mr. Kohl cited the attitude of the father; an attitude of almost encouraging the youngster. Mr. Kohl doubted that the youngster would make a good adjustment to probation unless there was a change in his attitude.

Monday, May 25, 1964

My assignment this afternoon was to dictate the pre-hearing report of Kirk B., which is found in Appendix E. Several drafts were made before one was submitted that was approved.

Tuesday, May 26, 1964

More cases were assigned to me today. I was able to arrange appointments for the duration of the afternoon. The first boy I interviewed was Frank P., a small Negro youth referred for fighting. The police report told me little about the situation, and in fact was one of the few reports which I considered to be inadequate. After discussing the matter with Frank and his mother, I adjusted the case.

The second referral of the afternoon was of more serious nature in my estimation. Robert S., a ten year old had been referred for taking bicycles from the school where
he attends. The youngster admitted his part, but could
give no adequate explanation for his conduct. He did
mention that his own bike had been taken several months
ago, and that he had been without one since. I asked him
if he knew what he did was wrong and he indicated that he
did. I then tried to help him realize that two wrongs
don't make a right. Since this was his first referral and
due to the fact that his mother had taken disciplinary
action, this case was adjusted.

The final youngster to be interviewed during the
afternoon was Brian L., a sixteen year old who has been
knocking over garbage cans. The boy did not appear overly
concerned about his conduct. He admitted doing this, but
rationalized his involvement by saying that all boys did
this. I immediately countered that all boys did not do
this, in fact, most boys did not do this. I pointed out to
him that he was causing much trouble with the neighbors, as
well as damaging other people's property. The father
appeared concerned and said that he had punished the boy by
making him stay in for the next few weeks. The youngster
still seemed unconcerned and as they left the office I
could not help feeling that with an attitude such as the
one he displayed, he would probably be seen again soon by
the department.
Thursday, May 28, 1964

The major portion of the afternoon was utilized by the compiling of the pre-hearing report of David S., who was involved in the burglary of a house with his friend Kirk B. Both of these boys will be coming to court soon, and Mr. Kohl suggested that I write these reports as soon as possible so that if any changes needed to be made they could without any difficulty. The report is found in Appendix E.

Friday, May 29, 1964

My first appointment of the afternoon concerned Don L., a fifteen year old boy who was referred with other boys for smoking. The police report and Don indicated that he had not been smoking. After making sure that Don understood the law of the State of Arizona regarding a juvenile and smoking, I spoke with Mrs. L., stating I would recommend that no action be taken.

The second case of the afternoon saw a young boy of ten referred for kicking over garbage cans. In counseling with Mike J., I tried to help him realize what a nuisance he was in his neighborhood. Mike admitted to me that he knocked over several cans but decided that this type of behavior caused too much trouble and that he was not going to do it again. Case adjusted after speaking with his mother.
Saturday, May 30, 1964

This morning I went to the home of Dewey R. Dewey had been referred to this department several weeks ago. He had run away this time. Dewey said that he had had an argument with his mother and this resulted in his running away. I spoke at length with his mother and then I took Dewey for a ride after obtaining his mother's permission. Dewey appeared to be concerned about his behavior. I found that he had been ditching school. He had already talked to the principal about this matter. Dewey indicated that he plans to go to summer school to make up for lost work. I discussed with the boy and his mother the possibility of a court hearing. Dewey did not like this idea at all. He told me that he very much wanted to be on his own. I told him that if he wanted this he would have to act more as an adult would act. He would have to learn to take orders, etc. I discussed this matter with my supervisor, Mr. John Kohl. It was his feeling that the boy was not clearly delinquent and that bringing the boy to court would not be the best way to solve Dewey's problems.

Monday, June 1, 1964

This month begins my final period at the Juvenile Court. My supervisor Mr. Valdez has told me that I have completed more than the necessary four hundred hours of internship training. I will be finishing a few remaining
cases and will probably attend the court hearings of the two youngsters who were involved in an act of burglary.

I was also able to interview an eleven year old Mexican-American youngster who was involved in an act of bicycle theft. Peter R. told me that his friend Rene had brought a bike to his home. The boys took turns riding it. Peter indicated that Rene had told him that the bicycle was stolen. By the time of referral the bike had been returned. I had a difficult time in helping the lad see that he was partially to blame for this act. I restated his problem in several different ways, before I was satisfied that he understood the point I was trying to make.

After speaking with his father I recommended that the matter be adjusted. I noted that Peter had a speech impediment and that he stuttered. He also stuttered when he spoke his native language, Spanish. I felt that he might be a little retarded.

The remainder of the day was spent reviewing the pre-hearing reports that I had written. It was not necessary for me to continue at the department, with the exception of the need for my attendance at the two court hearings. This will be accomplished next week.

Wednesday, June 10, 1964

Today I returned to the department to attend two court hearings. The hearings were presided over by Mr.
George Rosenberg. The first hearing was that of David S. After explaining to the family what his job was, and their right to appeal, the referee began questioning David. David answered in a forthright manner and did not appear to be evasive. I noted that he was dressed in a white shirt and tie. Throughout the hearing, the referee tried to impress upon the boy the serious nature of his behavior. He told the boy that now that he was almost sixteen, he was going to have to start acting like an adult.

In addition, Mr. Rosenberg discussed David's school record, and gave encouragement for the boy to improve. At the end of the hearing the recommendation was made that David be placed on probation and that Mr. Stuart Robbins be assigned as his probation officer.

The second hearing was that of Kirk B., and this case was handled in much the same manner as the first. I noted that Kirk was not as well dressed as David, but he appeared neat. Mr. Robbins was also assigned as Kirk's probation officer.

The hearings were very informal but I felt that the dignity of the court was maintained. Mr. Rosenberg has a deep resonant voice which he used with obvious and telling effect.

After the hearings were completed, and Mr. Robbins had talked to each boy and his parents, he took time out to discuss the merits of the cases with me. It was his
opinion that David will make an excellent adjustment under probationary supervision. He believed that Kirk will be harder to work with as he indicated that Mrs. B. is too over-protective.

Thus, with the final interview at the juvenile court and probation department, my formal internship ended. In one sense it did not really end, however, for I was able to start work as a probation officer approximately six months later.
CHAPTER III

EVALUATION

The writer approaches the problem of an evaluation of his internship program with some trepidation. The problem cannot be compared to that of an intake or receiving officer evaluating a case involving delinquency. At least the investigating officer can maintain objectivity by simply staying within the realm of his role. He is not personally involved in the act of delinquency, and thus, can be very objective. The writer is now faced with a different problem in that he was the intern and now also finds himself employed at the same agency where the internship was conducted.

Any type of evaluation implies, to some degree, criticism. The writer's intent is not to criticize in the sense of a censure, but rather offer suggestions so that the internship program can be improved, to offer a truly distinctive program of training in the field of corrections. What the writer is striving for, then, is an ideal situation; the comments made can be considered as future goals which could be included in such a program.

The entire staff at the Pima County Juvenile Court Center was very courteous to me and everyone was quite
willing to answer any and all of my questions. From the chief probation officer to the cook, I was given full cooperation. The amount of learning was certainly enhanced by this cooperation.

When I began my internship program, the problem that became apparent to me was the extremely cramped quarters of the Pima County Juvenile Building. Small offices, which were first intended for the use of one officer, usually held four or five probation officers. The court lobby was also cramped and afforded the only public entrance to the court room. The other entrance passed directly through the office of the chief probation officer. After the conclusion of an emotion-laden hearing, tearful processions of juveniles and their parents would pass directly through the public lobby to an office for an interview.

Fortunately, these unhappy conditions are in the past with the construction of the new Juvenile Court Center. Each probation officer now has a desk to call his own and he need not worry about being asked to move in order that another officer may conduct an interview or use his telephone. Interviewing is conducted in a special area of the building and apart from the offices of the field probation officers.

When I first started my internship I was allowed to arrange a work schedule which consisted of a twenty hour
work week. I was also part of a training class of new probation officers. The probation officers, however, worked an eight hour shift, whereas I was working a four hour shift. In retrospect, I feel that the internship program should be a ten week, eight hour a day program, rather than a twenty week, four hour a day one. I felt that just as the work day was starting, it would seemingly be time to leave. Since the agency operates on an eight hour day, I felt that I missed out on some important business and opportunities for observation of specialized problems. I feel quite strongly that the intern will get the greatest amount of benefit from a full time rather than a part time program.

The internship program is basic to the development and training of probation officers and is analogous to student-teacher programs in existence in all public school systems. A program such as an internship which is designed to give on-the-job experience to an individual who has never before had experience with correctional work, should demand a top priority from the supervising agency. This means that a full time supervisor of the department should be assigned the duties of internship director. It should be the job of this director to supervise closely the activities of the student intern. He should be observed in all phases of the training program. Daily meetings for evaluation are necessary to provide feedback to the trainee
so that he can understand his shortcomings and make efforts to improve them. Actual interviewing of clientele should be under the immediate and direct supervision of the internship director or his subordinate.

I could not find fault with my supervisor Mr. Joel Valdez or Mr. John Kohl but I believe that in the initial stages of handling cases for the Intake Department, closer supervision would have helped me to be more aware of problems that I was experiencing. Mr. Valdez did observe a few of my interviews but I believe he should have done more actual observation. I have been allowed to help in the training of a new field probation officer, in my capacity as field probation officer, and I can state from experience in both directions, trainee and supervisor, that closer supervision pays off when the tyro probation officer is allowed to assume a caseload. The new officer is more assured of himself and feels more at ease with his caseload. He is less likely to make administrative errors which might place his job in jeopardy. He is more pleased with himself because his training has given him self-confidence. Close supervision leads to a positive training experience and this in turn leads to well qualified workers who are happy with their jobs and will want to remain in the field of corrections.

The major portion of my internship program was spent in the Intake Department. I spent a great amount of
time interviewing the less serious cases which had come to
the attention of the court. Most of these could be handled
administratively, that is, after some counseling the matter
was adjusted with no official action being taken. I also
was able to investigate several cases of a more serious
nature, which required the attention of the court. While
this experience was extremely valuable to me, I would have
liked to be able to assume a caseload of children on proba-
tion. I was informed that because I was not getting paid,
the department could assume no financial responsibility if
anything were to happen to me. Again, to use the analogy
of the student-teacher, it should be noted that while
receiving no pay, student teachers are allowed to assume
entire responsibility for teaching classes as part of their
training experience. The National Education Association
provides liability insurance in such instances. Further-
more, the supervising teacher often receives financial
remuneration from the university where the student teacher
is enrolled. In addition, the supervising teacher may
receive a student teacher waiver, which would allow him to
enroll at the university of the student-teacher for a total
of six units of graduate course work, for only five dollars.
This amounts to a ninety dollar value, not counting any
payment which is received by the supervisor. What I am
advocating is that the probation department or correctional
agency participating in the internship program, should
receive benefits comparable to those received by a school involved in a student teacher program. Such a program designed for a correctional agency would benefit both the agency involved and the internship trainee. Each would be gaining something.

I feel that it is necessary for the internship program to include actual casework experience. An insurance program could be developed to include field work experience for the student intern. The program should be designed to give equal emphasis to both the intake area and the field probation area. Today, the Pima County Juvenile Court Center uses slightly different titles for the various departments. The Receiving Department is central to the entire program for it is here that first contact is made and vital first impressions are developed in parents and children. This area should not be slighted. Detention, too, demands "equal time." For the professional worker, however, the major portion of the internship should be conducted in what is now known as the Court Investigation Unit and in the department of field probation.

A program which I feel might be very feasible is as follows. The student intern is brought to the Court Investigation Unit after a period of observation in the Receiving Unit. At this time he could be given a relatively uncomplicated case for investigation. He could complete his investigation, write his report, and attend the court
hearing. If the child were to be placed on probation, the student intern would then become the acting probation officer of that case. This process could be repeated until he has a caseload of five or ten. The internship director could be a supervisor at this point, or, even a senior probation officer, or court investigator. With the close supervision that would be given in these cases, no harm would be done when the student trainee completed his internship, as the supervising probation officer could place these cases in his caseload. The children involved would be aware of the supervisor and would not see him as a stranger.

This plan could be initiated with little administrative change on the part of the supervising agency. Its value would be great, in that it would allow the student intern to have an actual work experience with the supervision of children on probation before becoming a full-fledged probation officer. I have observed, too often, that individuals coming from different fields of endeavor, to the field of corrections leave after a period of time. A student of corrections having such a first hand experience, would have an opportunity to see for himself if it was to his liking. Furthermore, this could be accomplished at a greatly reduced cost to the agency involved, as well as to the student himself.
After being with the department for three and one-half years, and seeing many changes in the Juvenile Court one of the great lessons I have learned is the necessity of being flexible. It seems as if one of the characteristics of human nature is to resist change and one of the obstacles which I had to overcome was an unwillingness to accept change in the department. What is meant, is administrative change. When I first began as an intern, the department consisted of three areas; detention, intake, and probation, with probation being supervised by intake.

Later, came the introduction of the Receiving Unit, and the Court Investigation Unit, each with its respective supervisor. With the advent of the Gault decision, the Court Investigation Unit was collapsed into the realm of the field probation officer. The bifurcated hearing system was inaugurated as a response to the Gault decision. It was later found, however, that about ninety per cent, or better, of the cases appearing before the court were not contested, meaning that the youngsters were admitting to the allegations of delinquency before the adjudicatory hearing. The administration felt that a great amount of the court's time was being wasted and an alternative was sought.

The solution was for the adjudicatory and the dispositional hearings which were formerly considered a two stage process, now to become one hearing if the charge was
not to be contested. In addition, a court appointed referee could hear the matter, thus relieving the judge so that he could hear cases which were contested. If the case were to be contested, then the state had to prove the allegation of delinquency, according to the terms of the Gault decision. Furthermore, under the rules of evidence, the state had to support its allegations with clear and convincing evidence instead of the preponderance of evidence which was used in pre-Gault days. What the court was doing in effect, was using a stipulation of delinquency in the single phase hearing. The hearing still maintained a formal quality, by having petitions issued, making sure that the allegations were read in open court, and accepting wavers of attorney from children over the age of fourteen.

It then became the duty of the court investigator to make investigation and recommendations to the court concerning these uncontested cases. If an attorney was requested by a youngster who could not afford one, then use of the services of the legal aid society were obtained. If, following such a hearing a child were to be placed under the court's authority, he still had legal safeguards in that the referee had made only a recommendation. The child and his family could review the decision for a full forty-eight hours before it would become an order of the court.
If a youngster contested the charge of delinquency, then the case would be handled under the former method of a bifurcated hearing. The state would have to prove the allegation of delinquency and would do so by prosecuting the case with a county attorney assigned full time to the Juvenile Court Center. The child would have his counsel also, with either a representative from the legal aid society or family-retained attorney representing the interests of the child. The hearing would amount to an adversary proceeding. If he were found to be delinquent, a probation officer would be assigned to evaluate the case and present a report to the court at the dispositional phase of the hearing.

As can be seen the changes at the Center have been many. They have made the author learn not to be resistant to change if it is in the best interest of the child, the parent, and the court.

The final area of the evaluation of the entire program which needs to be mentioned is that of community resources. When I first began my internship at the Juvenile Court, I noted that the major disposition of cases coming to court was that of probation. It was observed that if a youngster did not adjust to probation supervision, the probation officer did not have very many resources in the community to which he could refer the child. The result was the use of institutions of the State, which at that
time included Fort Grant and the Good Shepherd School for Girls.

Today the situation has changed somewhat for the better. The State of Arizona now has three institutions for the rehabilitation of children. The third addition is the Arizona Youth Center which has been in operation for approximately one year. This has helped the probation officer in his work with problem cases. In addition, with the development of the Job Corps, many youngsters classified as high school drop-outs now have another avenue open to them to increase their education and job training. It is to be lamented that, as of this writing, the state still does not have its own institution for girls. Hopefully, things are moving in this area and perhaps within the year this problem, too, may see some improvement.

As of this year the State of Arizona took steps to bring its various correctional institutions under better administrative control. With the passage of the State Department of Corrections Act, the state prison for men, the women's prison, Fort Grant, the Arizona Youth Center, adult parole, and juvenile parole, came under a unified control. Previous to its passage Fort Grant had been controlled by a Board of Directors of State Institutions for Juveniles, with the state prison coming under no formal control. With policy now being set at higher levels of administration, a more cohesive organization is developing
and better relations with the agencies on the county level will most certainly result.

The changes in the organization of the Juvenile Court Center, almost certainly have come about in a response to the Gault decision which has been discussed previously. Now that most of us in the field of corrections understand its intent more fully, what about the future? Where will Gault lead us? It is the opinion of the writer that the main purpose of the Gault decision was and is to insure equal treatment for children in the children's courts. That is, a child is to have the same rights afforded to him in a juvenile proceeding as an adult would have in an adult court proceeding. Already Gault is felt beyond the court room and is seen at the investigative end of the judicial process. The various police departments of the community regularly and routinely advise juveniles of their legal rights before questioning them in an investigation.

In discussion with law students from the University of Arizona who were taking a course in juvenile court procedures, some rather surprising opinions were found to be in vogue. Many of these students who will be tomorrow's attorneys felt that the Gault decision, whatever its benefits as far as the juvenile was concerned, effectively jeopardized and disintegrated the relationship that the probation officer had with his client. One even suggested that before I interview any of my clients, I should warn
the youngster of his rights. Furthermore, it was felt that Gault reduced the probation officer to a watchdog, as he could no longer effectively engage in counseling for fear that the probation officer would discover something in conversations with the client that he would have to bring to the attention of the court.

I felt that this type of reasoning should be and was fallacious for the law students seemed to be confusing the various roles in the entire correctional process. I do not believe that a probation officer is a police officer. I do not believe that a worker can effectively operate utilizing both functions. The job of the probation officer is that of a counselor. He is not sent to spy on the client. That is the job of the police officer and, hopefully, never the twain will meet. At the beginning of the probation officer-client relationship, a few "ground rules" should be established that will be observed by the probation officer in his relationship to his client, the probationer. First, the officer should indicate what areas of counseling and conversation may not be kept confidential. This would include knowledge of major delinquency. Second, in dealing with a juvenile, the officer should make sure that his young client understands that he might have to report problems to his client's parents if he feels that it is in the best interest of his client to do so. Furthermore, he must make it quite clear that he, as an officer of the
court; is duty bound to make reports and that he must uphold the laws of the state. Not to do these things, is not to clarify and define the limits of the relationship and, in effect, is not being fair to the juvenile or adult client in the counseling relationship.

The effect of the Gault decision was to make this officer more aware of these subtleties in the relationship of counselor and client. Gault, for all of the adverse comments, thoughts, and beliefs held by many in the field of corrections, was an inevitable and necessary "happening" in the juvenile court. Its effect, in my estimation, only adds to the strength of the court and what it is trying to accomplish.

In summary, it was an exciting experience for me to work as an intern at the Pima County Juvenile Court Center, first, because I gained a great deal of practical experience and, second, because I was able to obtain work at the same agency. Today the court and this probation officer can look back on a four year period of rapid, exciting, and meaningful change. The future seems even brighter and I for one welcome what it may bring.
IDENTIFICATION DATA:
Name:  B., Kirk A.  
Race:  Anglo
Age:  13, July 11, 1950  
Religion:  Protestant
Sex:  Male  
School:  Vail Jr. High
Address:  1227 E. Pierce  
Offense:  Burglary

REASON FOR REFERRAL:
Please see attached Tucson Police Department report #405377, Juvenile B. The subject is alleged to have entered a residence with David S. and stolen several bottles of liquor, a coin collection, and a clock. The boys entered the house, while the complainant was on vacation, by forcing a screen on a bathroom window.

CHILD'S STATEMENT:
Kirk states that David S. called him and told him that there was a house which they could enter and, "... take whatever we wanted." Kirk states that he told David he considered this to be too risky and that he believed that they might get caught. David informed him that he had already cut the screen door and that it would be easy to
gain entrance to the house. Kirk then told this intern:
"I consented to do it."

Kirk and David then tried to enter the home by a back door, however, they failed in this attempt, so they tried to enter by forcing the bathroom window. Here they succeeded and made a room to room search. Kirk indicated that David took a clock, a pair of binoculars, and a coin collection. These items were placed in a pillow case and taken outside the house and hidden in the back yard of David's house which adjoins that of the complainant.

In another room the boys found a liquor supply and took five bottles of liquor and hid them in the same location. The boys then left the scene because they thought they heard a noise in the house.

Sometime later the police questioned Mr. S. about the theft from the complainant's house in his neighborhood. He was unaware at that time of his son's and Kirk's delinquent acts. Upon questioning David about these thefts, David admitted to his father that he and Kirk were the ones responsible. Mr. S. then called Mr. B. and the police were contacted. The boys and the fathers talked the matter over with the police and the complainant. Kirk states that now all of the items that were taken have been returned to the complainant.
PREVIOUS REFERRALS:

8-12-60  Theft of U.S. Mail  adjusted
8-23-62  Breaking and Entering  adjusted

OTHERS INVOLVED:

David S.  pending hearing

RESTITUTION:

Mr. B. and Mr. S. state that restitution has been paid for the damages and that the two boys will split the costs between them.

FAMILY HISTORY:

The father William B., and the mother Susan R. B. were married in Tucson before World War II. From this union there have been seven children. They are: Max, now 21; Harry, 18; Susan, 16; Kirk, now 13; Scott, 10; Mary, 5; and Kerry, 1-1/2. Of these children, Max and Harry are both married and live away from the home but here in Tucson.

The family resides in a middle class neighborhood on Tucson's east side. The home is small and needs some repair. The family owns a rather old automobile of a 1947 or 1948 vintage. The interior of the home is sparsely furnished, but appeared to be clean. It was evident to this intern that the family is suffering economic hardships. When this intern spoke with the family at their
home several of the younger children were present and was impressed that both parents share in the rearing of the children. The family was friendly and answered questions with little hesitation.

The father William B., now forty-one, was born in Mississippi. He graduated from high school in Detroit, Michigan, and since 1940 has lived in Tucson. Mr. B. served four years in the armed forces, seeing action in the South Pacific. At present he is unemployed, but when he is employed he works as a turret lathe operator at Hughes Aircraft Company, with a take home pay of $110 per week. The father has been out of work since the first of the year and stated that things have been difficult at home. He has tried to find jobs but has met with little success. On one occasion he even went to Phoenix to work there for a while. Mrs. B. states that this was not satisfactory as her husband had to rent an apartment in Phoenix and his pay rate was less than it was in Tucson. Mr. B. also plays the guitar and has a small group of musicians with whom he works. This group plays at different night clubs in Tucson but the work is only sporadic and not on a full time basis.

When this worker asked Mr. B. about Kirk, it was learned that the boy's father was surprised about his son's behavior. Mr. B. stated that he has always had a good relationship with Kirk and that Kirk has always talked things out with him. Mr. B. stated he thought that Kirk
was aware of his rather strong feelings about stealing. The father then related how he and his older son Harry had been involved in a hunting incident. When Mr. B. and Harry were hunting, someone took their car. These persons were caught in the act by Mr. B. and Harry. Mr. B. and Harry fired their rifles at these individuals killing one of them. The son Harry was placed on probation and this department had supervision of this boy.

The father states that Kirk may be "a little hard-headed," but that he has shown much initiative. On his own, Kirk started a paper route. His father says that he never has had to awaken Kirk early in the morning for him to fold his papers. He believes Kirk to be a good worker.

The mother Susan R. B., now 39, was born in Tucson, Arizona, and graduated from Tucson High School. She is quite proud of the fact that she is a grandmother. Mrs. B. states that Kirk has had above average health. She says that Kirk does not "chase around," and that he usually is home in bed by eight or nine in the evening. She says that Kirk does not have an easy-going disposition but that he does not present any problems other than the usual teen-age ones.

She realizes Kirk's guilt in this situation but she did emphasize the fact that David S. is almost two years older than Kirk. The mother explained that she was shocked at this happening because she feels that Kirk is a moral
boy. When this worker pointed out to her Kirk's two other offenses, both involving theft, she stated that Kirk's first offense happened when he was ten, and that the second occurred when he was twelve, and that the latter offense was with a large group of boys.

Several times during my interview with Mrs. B., conducted at this department, she mentioned that the family was having difficulty with finances, with Mr. B. out of work, etc. She told this intern that she is receiving job retraining, as a cashier and grocery clerk. She hopes to find a job here in Tucson at a local super market.

CHILD'S HISTORY:

Kirk B. was born on the eleventh day of July, 1950 at Tucson, Arizona. His mother says that he has had no health problems. She did state that about a year and a half ago Kirk broke his jaw in a bicycle accident. His jaw was wired and this necessitated his staying on a liquid diet for some time. Despite this inconvenience he managed to play little league ball and even made an all star little league team here in the community.

Kirk is now almost fourteen years of age and he gives the appearance of being a polite, courteous boy.

Besides baseball, he stated that he likes to hunt. His father stated that the two of them hunt every year and that Kirk first went hunting when he was twelve.
Kirk is in the eighth grade at Vail Junior High School, and the school indicates that he has average grades and good attendance. This intern had a conference with his counselor and it was learned that although Kirk has caused no behavior problems, he is considered to be "an operator," a person who knows what is "going on," at school.

It is evident from talking with Kirk that he has built up some delinquent attitudes, especially regarding other people's property. This worker asked him if he would steal from any of the people on his paper route and he said that he would not because he respected these people. When asked again why he stole from the complainant's home, he had no answer.

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION:**

This is Kirk B.'s third referral to this department; each referral was concerned with theft of one kind or another.

This worker feels that there are some positive factors in the case. First: Kirk is a boy who comes from a strong, cohesive family environment. This worker was impressed by both parents. Second: Kirk is an individual who has demonstrated much initiative. The negative factors seen are the severe economic hardships under which the family now lives, and Kirk's attitudes about other people's
property. While generally this worker considers his attitude to be good at this time, it could stand further improvement.

It is therefore respectively recommended by this worker to the Honorable Court that Kirk B. be adjudicated a delinquent minor child and be placed on probation indefinitely under the standard terms; and that Mr. Stuart B. Robbins be appointed as his probation officer.

Respectfully submitted.

William G. Stead
Student Intern
IDENTIFICATION DATA:

Name: S., David L.  Race: Anglo
Age: 15, June 12, 1948  Religion: Protestant
Sex: Male  School: Rincon
Address: 5440 E. Poe St.  Offense: Burglary

REASON FOR REFERRAL:

Please refer to Tucson Police Department report #405377, Juvenile A. On or about the eleventh of May, 1964, David S., and Kirk B., did break into and steal from the house of the complainant. They took a pair of binoculars, a coin collection, a clock, and several bottles of liquor.

CHILD'S STATEMENT:

David states that he called Kirk B. on the telephone and told him that he knew of a house where they could break into and take what they wanted. David states that Kirk "came right over" and the two boys attempted to break into the home of the complainant. Here they experienced some difficulty, but eventually they pried the bathroom window open and gained entrance to the house. The boys went from room to room. They first took a clock, a coin collection, and a pair of binoculars. These items were taken outside of the house in a pillow case and hidden near a tree in the back yard of David's home which adjoins that of the complainant. The boys returned to the victim's home
and took five bottles of liquor. David indicated that they tried to steal only small items, because he believed that they would get caught if they took larger ones.

The boys were not discovered until David's father questioned his son about the burglary of the complainant's home. David admitted to his father that he and Kirk B. were the ones responsible for these delinquent acts. The police which had been contacted previously, were re-contacted, and the boys were referred to this department. David could give no reason for his behavior.

**PREVIOUS REFERRALS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-22-62</td>
<td>Tresspassing</td>
<td>adjusted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHERS INVOLVED:**

Kirk B. pending hearing

**RESTITUTION:**

All of the items taken have been returned by Mr. S., and the damages to the complainant's home have been repaired. David and Kirk will split the costs between themselves. David will work for his father and Kirk will pay with earnings from his paper route.

**FAMILY HISTORY:**

Frank Adolphus S., and Wilma Durham S., were married in Deming, New Mexico, in 1947. From this union there have been four children: David 15, Michael 14,
Darold 11, and Frances 10. The parents met here in Tucson. Mr. S. is self-employed and works as a painting contractor.

Mr. S., now 44, was born in Des Moines, Iowa. He did not graduate from high school. According to Mrs. S., Mr. S. was an orphan and joined the Navy when he was 17. He served during World War II. During the interview with Mr. S., he indicated that he was interested in business conditions in Alaska. This week he is making a trip to Alaska to investigate job opportunities. Mr. S. stated that he believed that Alaska could offer David a better environment. Mr. S. also stated that he felt that the City of Tucson did not offer teen-age boys enough recreational facilities.

The mother Wilma Durham S., now 38, was born in Enid, Oklahoma. The mother is a high school graduate, and during the War worked as a clerk for the United States Civil Service. Mrs. S. stated to this worker that the family is just, "coasting along," financially. She stated that the family is not saving any money, and has been living thus, since coming to Tucson. Prior to coming to Tucson in 1960, the family has resided in many areas of the country. It was learned that Mr. S. would like to leave the painting business and this was why he was interested in relocating in Alaska.
CHILD'S HISTORY:

David S., now fifteen years of age, is a rather small boy for his age. He stated to this worker that he considered himself to have average health. He was born on June 12, 1948, and is the oldest of the S. children. He is in the ninth grade at Rincon High School. He says he is an average student. When this worker received a school report from the Rincon High School authorities, it was found that David was placed in the slow learner group and until recently was in special education. This worker spoke with David's counselor, Mr. Smith, who informed this worker that David is now able to produce work in the average group. David's grades are low, but according to Mr. Smith, are the best that can be expected from the boy. He stated that David has made an excellent adjustment in the average group. He believes David has a reading block and that this is the cause of his not doing well in his academic subjects. David is doing satisfactory work or better in Physical Education and manual arts classes. The lad's conduct at school has been satisfactory. The counselor indicated to this worker that he believes David not to be a delinquent boy as he is not causing any trouble at school.

David stated to this worker that he likes most sports and plays basketball and baseball; and likes to watch football but says he is too small to play. He stated that, "I am crazy over sports cars." He watched the
Indianapolis race, and likes to go to the Tucson Speedway. The lad has a great deal of knowledge about automobile racing and racing drivers. He indicated to this worker that he wants to be a sports car driver when he matures. This worker then asked what his mother thought of this, and David answered that his mother did not like this idea too much.

David states that he does not know why he committed his delinquent act. He told this worker that he does not intend to continue in this type of activity. Mr. S. told this worker that he has talked extensively with David concerning this and David was honest with him in admitting his involvement.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION:

David S. is a small fifteen year old boy. He has been referred to this department once before, concerning trespassing. According to the school report David tests in the range of IQ about eighty. David, however, does not give the appearance of being dull. His counselor at school states that David has a good attitude in the school setting.

It is the opinion of this worker that David needs the protection and help of the juvenile court. This worker feels that David would make an excellent adjustment if placed on probation.
This worker therefore, recommends to the Honorable Court, that David S. be adjudicated a delinquent minor child, and be placed on official probation under the standard terms with the following added conditions:

1. That he no longer associate with Kirk B.
2. That Mr. Stuart B. Robbins be assigned as the probation officer in this case.

Respectfully submitted.

William G. Stead
Student Intern
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