## FILE COPY DO NOT REMOVE

#442-77



ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE, SENSITIVITY TO CLIENTS, AND VULNERABILITY: THE VILLAIN AS AMBIGUOUS HERO

Michael Sosin



## Organizational Maintenance, Sensitivity to Clients, and Vulnerability: The Villain as Ambiguous Hero

Michael Sosin

### September 1977

This research was supported in part by funds granted to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. My thanks to my research assistant, Merle Edwards-Orr, for his help and comments.

#### ABSTRACT

This paper reexamines the concept of organizational maintenance and argues that the common assumption of an inverse relation between maintenance and the sensitivity of organizations to client needs is not valid. A logical analysis suggests that maintenance should lead to a greater sensitivity to environmental forces that control important resources; if these forces are in the direction of supporting sensitivity to clients, organizations with a maintenance orientation will be more sensitive. The idea that maintenance (defined and operationalized as an orientation toward maintaining comfortable working conditions) relates to attempts to develop ties with environmental forces, and further, that there is a positive relation between maintenance and client sensitivity that is mandated by law is demonstrated using a national sample of juvenile courts. This relation is especially strong when the juvenile courts are vulnerable to legal pressure. Moreover, maintenance has varying relations to other reactions to clients, depending upon the relation between the court and the environment. It is concluded that a maintenance orientation is often consistent with sensitivity to clients and might even be used to increase sensitivity.

Organizational Maintenance, Sensitivity to Clients, and Vulnerability: The Villain as Ambiguous Hero

Although the concept of organizational maintenance is generally vaguely defined and poorly measured, much importance is attached to it. Maintenance has become one of the few unambiguous villains in the organizational literature. Piven and Cloward (1971) claims that the desire of public welfare organizations to maintain a powerful status in society leads to arbitrary reductions in caseloads, accompanied by attempts to control the behavior of recipients. Blumberg (1967) and Feeley (1973) believe that the desire for maintenance in courts reduces the courts' commitment to the long, tedious trials inherent in the due process model of justice. Jacoby (1973) and Coleman (1974) believe that maintenance reduces the extent to which the coming organizational society takes the needs of citizens into account. On a broad conceptual level, the overall hypothesis is that there is a strong inverse relation between organizational maintenance and sensitivity to client needs.

This paper questions the assumed relation between maintenance and responsiveness to clients. It is argued that some of the complaints concerning maintenance stem from ambiguities in its conceptualization. More central, data from a national survey of juvenile courts help demonstrate that organizational maintenance is not necessarily inimical to needs of individuals. In many situations the opposite is true; maintenance makes organizations more amenable to controls that are in the best interests of individuals when outside forces demand it. Another theme of the research is that it is possible to move from maintenance as an overall concept to an operationalization of the notion. Maintenance may be turned into a variable that takes on definite values and has large correlations with other factors. Therefore, further inquiry into the importance of maintenance is invited.

### 1. THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONEL MAINTENANCE

A quick review of the maintenance notion reveals that it has been conceptualized in many different ways, some of which have been defined only indirectly. For present purposes, it is possible to divide the use of the concept into three schools: maintenance as survival, as organizational growth, and as maintaining pleasant working conditions. Each actually predicts somewhat different relations and has different possibilities for empirical analysis. Therefore it is necessary to assess the three views of maintenance in order to correctly specify the research.

### Organizational Maintenance as Survival

The first appearance of the idea that eventually led to notions of maintenance is found in the works of the institutionalist school of organizational analysis. Using a functional frame of reference, institutionalists argue that organizations must make compromises with the environment in order to survive. Selznick (1949) documents that survival needs altered the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This organization found it necessary to take the demands of land grant

colleges and other local powers into account in order to survive; as a result, fewer projects aimed at poorer farmers or blacks were developed. Similarly, Scott (1967), building on Merton's ideas (1957), claims that the survival needs of an agency for the blind led to an emphasis on production goals as opposed to the rehabilitation of blind workers and their reintegration into society.

The institutionalists are unambiguous in equating the maintenance of an organization with bending toward changes necessary to insure survival. While this concept is clear, it is not useful for empirical analysis. First, the claim that it is necessary for organizations to react to the environment in order to survive implies that variation in the environment, and not in organizational maintenance, is the explanatory variable. For example, Selznick seems to link the transformation of the TVA to community interests, while he simply assumes that maintenance is a constant. The analysis suggests that organizations have difficulty in becoming accepted in the society due to environmental powers, but says very little concerning how the variable of maintenance can lead to alternate outcomes with respect to individual needs: To institutionalists, maintenance is the functionalist constant that motivates (along with other specified values) nearly all organizations, not a variable that can be measured and directly correlated to other factors.

Just as important, the institutionalist view of maintenance does not lead to unambiguous predictions concerning the relation between survival and meeting client needs. On one hand, some institutionalists have documented that survival orientations leave room for many choices. Sills (1957), for example, notes that the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) refused to meet many demands of

its environment, yet it continued to survive. On the other hand, survival may often lead to compromises with the environment that increase the sensitivity of organizations to clients. Clark (1956) implies this when he notes that adult education gradually came to mirror the immediate demands of clients for recreational courses. In fact, the entire notion of a market rests on the assumption that market forces make organizations respond more to clients in order to survive. Obviously, these ambiguities in prediction and measurement make maintenance as survival a poor guide for empirical analysis.

### Organizational Maintenance as Organizational Growth

The bridge between institutionalists views of maintenance and modern conceptualizations is presented by Etzioni (1960) in his classic article concerning the evaluation of organizational performance. Etzioni states that studies such as those by Selznick (1949), Scott (1967), and Sills (1957) demonstrate that when organizations are evaluated they seldom reach their original goals. The reason for this lack of goal attainment is that organizations spend most of their time on organizational maintenance, not on reaching goals. Like all other social groups, organizations must meet the needs of their members for security, satisfactory interpersonal relations, etc. These tasks preceed and take more time than goal attainment; goal achievement comes after these maintenance needs are met.

Building on Etzioni, some researchers developed the concept of maintenance as organizational growth. Specifically, Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) believe that maintenance as growth is the only goal organizations have. Organizations are constantly interested in improving their bargaining position with the environment and will change other aims and structures in whatever manner is necessary in order to do so.

Of course, Yuchtman and Seashore overemphasize their case. As the institutionalists note and as Perrow (1970) makes clear, many organizations engage in behavior that does not involve maximizing bargaining position. In fact, if all organizations had such an aim, maintenance again would become a constant that is always present and thus cannot be operationalized to explain anything. If organizational growth is seen as one variable, however, it does lead to some interesting hypotheses concerning when organizations will be more or less responsive to individual needs. It seems likely that when environmental groups who have the power to enable an organization to grow demand behavior that does not favor certain classes of individuals, organizations with an orientation to growth will tend to overlook these client interests. However, when environmental conditions suggest that client interests must be met to insure growth, the opposite effect will occur. This notion of maintenance suggests a complicated and interesting link between organizations and the larger society.

Despite its possibilities, the notion of maintenance and growth will not be used in the present paper. One problem is that the variable of growth may have little relevance for large classes of organizations. Juvenile courts, the organizations upon which this paper is based, comprise one such class. Observation of courts makes it apparent that only an extremely small portion of these organizations show much interest in growth. Usually court budgets and staffs are set by custom and continuing local agreements, so that juvenile courts have little motivation to attempt to grow. The limited possibilities of growth make analysis of the outcome of maintenance as growth difficult to carry out.

Organizational Maintenance as Comfortable Working Conditions

A third set of works also begins with the Etzioni (1960) article, but takes it in another direction. Many authors stress Etzioni's notion of the importance of internal working conditions to organizations. It is often hypothesized that the orientation toward comfortable working conditions leads to behaviors that may be inimical to client welfare. Thus (as has been mentioned) Blumberg (1967) and Feeley (1973) claim that the orientation to maintain comfortable working conditions results in less due process in adult courts. Probation officers, judges, and attorneys desire to maintain good relations with each other, and eschew due process because it results in conflicts between individuals. A similar concept is often used to explain resistance to change. Theorists (e.g., Warwick, 1975) note that the desire workers have for maintaining comfortable working conditions is a barrier to implementing changes that might be in the interest of clients.

While at first glance the conceptualization of maintenance as comfortable working conditions may appear to reduce the importance of the concept, this conceptualization actually has important positive properties. One such property is that the concept can be measured with relative ease. Organizational leaders may be questioned about the extent to which they stress providing comfortable working conditions, and responses can be turned into something like a continuous variable.

At the same time, this view of maintenance has close ties to some key sociological interests. For example, Michels (1915) argued that the embourgoisement of leaders of workers' political organizations is related

to the desire of leaders for comfort, which results in profound changes in the functioning of organizations. This is what this paper is arguing against--that the internal property reduces sensitivity to those who consume the services of organizations. This argument has evolved into a study of the extent to which organizations are natural systems (Gouldner, 1959) that operate to meet the needs of members for supports: The extent to which an organization is a natural system is said to reduce the orientation of the unit toward reaching outside goals or toward sensitivity to client needs.

Maintenance as comfortable working conditions thus retains the essential element of maintenance as a whole, an implied relation between the needs of the organization as opposed to those of the broader society in general or clients in particular. While this should be sufficient to demonstrate the importance of the concept, it is also likely that this view of maintenance correlates with the other notions. Thus an organization must survive if it is to maintain comfortable working conditions, and growth is one possible manner of maintaining such conditions.

Further, the relationship between maintenance in this third sense and other organizational variables are both interesting and similar to the relationship one might expect in light of the other two conceptualizations. Under different circumstances, the relationship between client needs and maintenance should differ dramatically. For example, literature concerning leadership style (Wofford, 1971) and professionalization (Litwak, 1961) note that maintenance of comfortable working conditions correlates to higher goal performance. Thus, in some circumstances worker autonomy and comfort apparently lead to a commitment to better

services, and perhaps to meeting client needs more fully. On the other hand, maintaining worker comfort may lead to reducing responsiveness. Change often involves discomfort, and some organizations may be reluctant to meet new client demands due to an investment in continuing comfortable working relationships.

In more general and more relevant terms, the conceptualization of maintenance as internal comfort leads to a series of ideas concerning the role of environmental conditions and the relationship of an organization to its environment in determining responsiveness of organizations to individuals. Maintaining internal conditions must demand certain types of arrangements with the environment. Compromising with demands of powerful groups and reducing conflict with the environment seems to be a logical manner of maintaining comfortable conditions; flaunting authorities can lead to external pressure to change or to threats to domain or budget that will upset the internal balance. Moreover, different types of organizations may be more or less amenable to such pressures. For example, an organization with a settled budget and few environmental needs may be less amenable to external pressures (Eisenstadt, 1959).

In fact, depending on the environmental demands and the vulnerability of the organization to the environment, one can expect maintenance to lead to quite different organizational responsiveness to clients. If the environment that controls working conditions for a jail demands punitive measures toward inmates, and if the organization is oriented toward pleasant working conditions, one can expect the organization to intensify its punitiveness (Ohlin, 1960). On the other hand, if relevant environmental groups demand compliance to due process guarantees favoring

clients, maintenance will lead to a more favorable view of clients.

Maintenance as internal working conditions leads to the notion that maintenance may be a hero as well as a villain with respect to responsiveness to clients.

The preceeding paragraphs should demonstrate two points. First, maintenance as comfortable working conditions is a clear and important conceptualization that may be studied empirically, and will inform the remainder of this work. Second, a logical analysis calls into question the typical ideas concerning an inverse relation between maintenance and sensitivity to clients. Thus, while institutionalists seem to imply that maintenance has such effects, the argument usually hinges on environmental constraints, not internal orientations. Maintenance defined in the other two senses seems to imply more or less sensitivity to clients depending upon other variables, although few researchers have studied this issue. Here, I focus on only one view of maintenance, and specify some of the relations between maintenance, the nature of the environment, and sensitivity to clients.

### 2. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

This study looks at the effect of maintenance, defined as comfortable working conditions, the manner in which organizations relate to clients. One aim is to demonstrate that this conceptualization of maintenance is an advance in the field because it is both useful and operational; the concept has both some internal integrity and definite relations to

many measures of responsiveness. At the same time, the study will specify some of the complex relations between maintenance and responsiveness to clients. The underlying premise is that maintenance often has effects measurable only within an interactional framework. The orientation of the community toward organizational aims and the extent to which the organization is buffered from the community mediates between maintenance and responsiveness to clients. In fact, once these relations are specified, surprisingly large correlations between maintenance and measures of treatment of clients develop. Further, these relations demonstrate that under many conditions maintenance leads to a much greater commitment to behaviors that are favorable to clients.<sup>1</sup>

Mostly for the sake of convenience, it is best to consider the specific propositions of this relearch in the form of two general hypotheses. In this section the hypotheses will be presented and defended. The exact operationalizations within juvenile courts and results of the analysis will comprise the next two sections.

Hypothesis I

Organizational maintenance, defined as maintaining comfortable working conditions, depends upon maintaining successful relations with the environment.

This hypothesis is an important component of the research. It points out that maintenance involves the community as well as the organization. If an organization is oriented to maintaining comfortable working arrangements, at least some energy must be spent in insuring that the community demands are met. If demands are not met, the resources

necessary for organizational maintenance will not exist. In other words, the internal maintenance aim must be related to attempts to meet environmental demands.

As will be noted below, this hypothesis also demonstrates the integrity of the maintenance concept itself. A factor analysis will be used to note the relations between comfortable working conditions and meeting external demands. The factor analysis also points out that maintenance as a concept has some integrity that can be observed from the resulting factor loadings.

### Hypothesis II

Organizational maintenance is related to sensitivity to clients in interactional terms. Maintenance will lead to meeting demands for varying reactions to clients that are presented by environmental forces especially when the organization is vulnerable to these pressures. Furthermore, (1) in organizations stressing maintenance, there will be a stronger inclination to obey laws favoring responsiveness to clients; and (2) organizations that must respond to immediate short-range environmental demands will witness strong relations between maintenance and immediately obvious client centered demands, organizations facing periodic accountability will stress client orientations leading to long range success, organizations that are not directly accountable will demonstrate no relation between maintenance and receptivity to clients.

These specified relations restate the general premise that maintenance dictates a response to the environment, but that specific conditions dictate what that response will be. Because maintenance depends upon meeting community demands, one will expect organizations with a maintenance orientation to respond more fully to community pressure. One specific pressure is that of law. It is hypothesized that, as opposed to common beliefs, maintenance will lead to more compliance to guarantees for client responsiveness when they are mandated by law. The reason

for this is that disobeying laws may result in pressure from outside forces, which might result in a reduction in the possibility of maintaining comfortable working conditions. Therefore, organizations in which maintenance is stressed prefer to obey laws rather than to risk external pressure.

The second portion of hypothesis II is most important because it will result in rather impressive correlations. This hypothesis rests on a notion of how organizations are buffered (Thompson, 1967). Naturally, some organizations need to worry less about the community than do others. These organizations are well buffered. Our hypothesis is that well buffered organizations will not need to respond to the community or to laws in order to reach maintenance goals. It is primarily in organizations that are accountable that maintenance will be important. In these organizations a failure to meet external demands will result in pressures that can upset the quest for comfortable working conditions. However, different organizations find themselves amenable to different types of pressure. Some (the exact definitions will be noted below) are forced to respond to immediate pressures in order to insure internal comfort, and thus in these instances one would expect a relation between maintenance and strategies leading to minimizing immediate pressures. Periodically accountable organizations will adopt strategies aimed at maximizing working conditions by stressing attitudes to clients that will lead to less long-range disagreement.

It must be stressed that hypothesis II runs directly counter to prevalent notions concerning maintenance. It states that maintenance

will result in an increase in responsiveness when pressure exists for an organization to react in this manner. As opposed to earlier studies, our notion is based on the idea that for most organizations maintenance requires sensitivity to the environment. Only in quite well buffered organizations will this not be the case: In these organizations maintenance is hypothesized to have <u>no</u> relation to due process, rather than a negative one.

### 3. DATA AND OPERATIONALIZATION

The hypotheses present above will be assessed in this paper using 1973 data from a national sample of juvenile courts (National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections 1976). The sample is a random representation of courts in counties with a population of over 50,000 people, supplemented by a small handful of courts in the largest counties. The largest courts were added to insure an adequate representation of urban areas. Questionnaires were went out to the judge, detention supervisor, and to probation officers (and others) in 600 courts in 400 counties.

Responses include 277 judges, 171 detention workers, and 501 probation officers. On the basis of the original sample, the response rate is about 40%. However, through telephone calls and other means it was noted that a large percentage of the courts originally sampled did not exist. Using conservative estimates gleaned from some systematic telephoning to 16 states, the actual response rate is over 60% for judges and probation officers, and about 70% for detention supervisors. Using available census figures, it was found that the courts that responded

are not that different from those that did not, except that respondents tended to be from slightly larger and more urban areas (National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections 1976).

### Operationalizing Maintenance

The questions relating to the existence of a maintenance orientation involve a number of statements relating to goals asked of all three types of respondents. They were asked to rate on a six point scale how important a list of goals actually were, and how important the individuals thought they should be. The division between the two concepts was made in order to avoid the problems of a confusion of desires and goals, as suggested by Gross (1968). In the analysis that follows, only the "is" goals are analyzed. The instructions and the first item were as follows.

Different courts and probation agencies place emphasis on different <u>objectives</u> or <u>aims</u>. The following is a list of possible objectives or aims that might be stressed in juvenile courts or agencies like this one.

A. These objectives or aims are related to clients. For each item, please check the responses corresponding to how important the item <u>actually</u> is in this court or agency, <u>and then also</u> check how important you yourself think it <u>should be</u>.

To provide adequate social services to juvenile officers:

|        |        | Of hardly<br>any im-<br>portance | tle im- | ate im- | impor- | Of abso-<br>lutely top<br>importance |
|--------|--------|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------------------------|
| is now | ()     |                                  | ()      | ()      |        | ()                                   |
| should | be [ ] | []                               | []      | []      | []     | []]                                  |

The goal items include three representations of the maintenance orientation. These are the goals of keeping staff morale high, increasing financial support for the court, and providing effective channels of communication between the staff and the administration. These items clearly operationalize three distinct notions of an orientation to pleasant working conditions. In addition, some items represent orientations to the community. These items include protecting the community from dangerous youth, upholding the moral standards of the community, promoting better services to youth in the community, and developing ties with social agencies in the community.

Both orthogonal and oblique rotations were used in order to discover if the maintenance orientation actually exists (that is, if proposed items actually factor together) and if it relates to the community items. As will be noted below, results were affirmative in both cases. Accordingly, a maintenance score based on the orthogonal rotation was used as the measure of organizational maintenance in tests of the second hypothesis.

### Responsiveness to Law

Client responsiveness as mandated by law is operationalized by an additive scale comprised of 14 yes or no items concerning compliance to Supreme Court due process guarantees. These items (see Table 1) were mandated by the Supreme Court in the recent Kent (1966), Gault (1967) and Winship (1970) decisions. A complete description of the items is found elsewhere (National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections 1976), and is irrelevant in the present context.

## Table 1

# Court Compliance with Mandated Due Process (N = 277 judges)

|   | % of<br>Courts |
|---|----------------|
| Counsel seldom appointed when not requested                               | 14             |
| Counsel often calls witness from social report                            | 20             |
| Only counsel can waive right to self-incrimination or no waiver permitted | 20             |
| Judge has no access to social file at adjudication                        | 52             |
| Counsel always cross-examines witnesses                                   | 54             |
| Nature of charges in both factual and statutory language                  | 70             |
| Counsel always has access to social file                                  | 72             |
| Appointment of counsel at waiver hearing                                  | 77             |
| Right to counsel at waiver hearing  | 86             |
| Counsel may call witness from social report                               | 86             |
| Always use state's rules of evidence in adjudication                      | 87             |
| Must hold hearing before waiver   | 90             |
| Always use criterion of proof beyond a reasonable doubt                   | 95             |
| Always have written notice of charges                                     | 96             |
| Appoint counsel at adjudication   | 96             |
| Right to counsel at adjudication  | 97             |
| Total   | 70%            |

For the current paper two general points concerning Supreme Court decisions are important. First, these decisions imply a new orientation to clients in juvenile courts. Traditionally, juvenile courts have been very informal operations. When a juvenile came to court he was seldom represented by an attorney, and he did not face a formal trial. The judge, with the help of social reports prepared by probation officers, was expected to make a disposition that was in the best interest of the juvenile. Much more emphasis was placed on what a juvenile needs than on whether he is actually innocent or guilty. The Supreme Court decisions greatly alter the situation. They insist that guilt or innocence (that is, adjudication) must be determined first, and only in the disposition phase of a case, once guilt has been proven, can elements such as the needs of the juvenile be brought into play. A juvenile court that obeys both the letter and the spirit of the law will not let the needs of a juvenile or any long-range consequences interfere in the determination of guilt or innocence.

Second, clearly within the culture defined by the Supreme Court, obeying the law does involve sensitivity to clients. Compliance includes' notice of the charges, the right to counsel, the right to remain silent, and the right to a hearing in general. These measures are aimed at insuring the most important response to clients, that the decisions made depend on a set of rules, rather than an arbitrary procedure.

It should be noted that the scale assumes that each guarantee must be carried out at all times in a given court if the Supreme Court decision is

to be obeyed. Accordingly, scales are developed making use of the "always" or "never" component of the scales. The variables are all found in the judge's questionnaire.

### Interaction Effects

The second part of hypothesis II demands that courts are divided by the extent to which they are open to immediate pressure, long-range pressure, or very little pressure. The manner in which the judge attains office was selected for this measure. An elected judge is under immediate pressure. Such a judge is part of the local political structure, and must respond to immediate political pressures in order to insure reelection. Appointed judges, most of whom either desire further advances or must be re-appointed, are under long-term pressure. Advancement or re-appointment depends upon long-term high quality service as perceived by the one who appoints. Appointed judges also must develop long-term ties to the community in order to maintain their favorable position. Judges who are first appointed and then elected (the Missouri plan) are most nearly completely buffered. Once appointed they normally run only against their record, not against other candidates. In most instances there is only a small amount of accountability in such a situation, unless the judge makes some quite obvious, controversial decisions.

The reliance on the manner in which the judge attains office is used to represent the vulnerability of juvenile courts as a whole, largely due to the special nature of these organizations. Judges are powerful leaders, and their demands are quite important in organizational performance.

While the use of the manner in which a judge obtains office as a measure of the vulnerability of the organization may seem questionable, it is appropriate within the context of juvenile courts because juvenile court judges greatly determine the character of the courts in which they serve. Judges are powerful organizational leaders who can, and usually do, dictate the general operating procedures used in juvenile courts. At the same time, the descriptions of the three different methods of obtaining office are consistent with ongoing research concerning the juvenile court. Previous work documents show that the three different manners of obtaining office do result in different types of vulnerability. Elected judges respond more often to direct short-term pressures of interest groups; appointed judges develop long-term ties with outside groups with which they have a continuing relationship; while appointed then elected judges do not react to outside community groups in any measurable degree (Sosin 1977). Further, based on a one to five scale concerning how certain financial support is, elected judges report the least certainty, appointed judges report somewhat more certainty, while appointed then elected judges report the most certainty. The results are statistically significant and offer some support for the current notions concerning the importance of the way in which a judge obtains office.

### Client Receptivity and Buffering

Within each type of buffered organization it is hypothesized that the relationship between maintenance and various measures of sensitivity

to clients will vary. The measures, outlined below, are found in the judge's questionnaire, while the maintenance score used is a factor score also stemming from this questionnaire.

Judges were asked to rate on a seven point scale how important various factors were in the adjudication decisions they made. Relevant factors for the present purpose include the importance placed on the needs of the juvenile, the danger a juvenile presents to the community, and the protection of the juvenile's rights. Because recent pressures for due process reforms should effect the three types of courts differentially, it is to be expected that the relation between the maintenance orientation and the importance given to the three factors will vary.

A strong emphasis on the needs of juveniles at the adjudication decision is opposed to the standards of law implied in recent Supreme Court decisions. At the current time it is mandated that the adjudication decision be based on the facts concerning the crime. An interest in the needs of the juvenile takes the focus away from the act. It thus may result in unfavorable adjudication decisions when the judge believes that a juvenile needs help, even if no crime has been committed. On the other hand, the use of the criteria of needs at adjudication is quite consistent with the traditional notion of the juvenile court. Traditionally, a judge is expected to make decisions concerning juveniles on the basis of needs, and not evidence (Platt 1969); indeed, direct community pressure often supports this position.

Elected judges and appointed judges should demonstrate opposite correlations with the criteria of the needs of the juvenile adjudication.

Elected judges, it has been pointed out, are most amenable to immediate pressures: Thus they will be expected to obey the law and avoid appeals. It is to their advantage to use the criteria of needs less in order to insure maintenance. On the other hand, as has been mentioned, appointed judges are more likely to adopt a long-range strategy. The use of the criteria of needs at adjudication, leading to decisions which demonstrate a good deal of concern for the quality of the decision, is more likely to lead to approval. Unlike the supreme courts, appointing politicians stress performance and not rights. Thus maintenance should lead to a larger emphasis on needs at adjudication, if the hypothesis is correct.

The utilization of the criteria concerning protecting the rights of the juvenile at adjudication should show the opposite pattern. Protecting rights is mandated by law, and elected judges should obey laws more thoroughly. Thus the maintenance orientation will relate positively to protecting rights at adjudication. On the other hand, appointed judges are more concerned with long-range consequences. Maintenance in this case should show no relation to the use of the criteria.

The utilization of the danger criteria should match the results for the needs criteria. Elected judges base their decisions solely on the evidence. Thus the use of how dangerous a juvenile is should be irrelevant at adjudication. Only once the charge is proven should danger matter, at the disposition stage. Thus elected judges with concerns for their own maintenance will stress danger less often; otherwise, they may face more pressure for not obeying the law. Appointed judges, interested in developing long-term ties with their community, will react in opposite form. In this case using a danger criteria responds to the long-term interests

of the community for its own protection. Thus a judge interested in maintaining comfortable working conditions will stress danger at adjudication in order to receive community support.

In all cases above, it is hypothesized that there is no relation between maintenance and the dependent variables for appointed then elected judges. Such judges are not at all dependent on community support for remaining in service. Their power is such that they do not need to stress any particular pattern in order to maintain favorable working conditions, and thus will not react to outside pressures in order to insure maintenance.

Two other relations are also expected. First, elected judges should experience the largest relation between the existence of a maintenance orientation and compliance to due process guarantees, appointed judges should show a smaller relation, and elected then appointed judges should show no relation at all. Again, the assumption is that as one moves across categories the vulnerability to immediate legal pressure is reduced. Elected judges are under the most pressure to obey laws in order to insure comfortable conditions; maintenance should correlate highly with compliance for organizations with elected judges.

Finally, a classic component of maintenance as working conditions is the notion that there is a tendency for maintenance to lead to taking an easier road to carry out a task. If clients cause trouble for the organization, they will be dealt with more harshly. We expect this relation to hold, but only under certain circumstances. Because appointed then elected judges are so well buffered, it is hypothesized that they do not need to consider behaviors of children in order to maintain their position. In this group

there will be no relationship between maintenance and harsh treatment for troublemakers. Elected judges will also show no relation for another reason: Harsh treatment could lead to political outrage and thus to a loss of votes in the next election. Only appointed judges will demonstrate a positive relation between maintenance and harsh treatment for troublemakers, as appointed judges can be most affected by a long-term trend toward being too "lenient." It should be clear to the reader that our perspective, stressing interactions with the environment, in this instance predicts opposite relations from those normally assumed in theories of maintenance.

The above relation will be operationalized by the relation between the maintenance score and the judge's report on a five point scale on how often individuals who violate parole are subject to a revocation of probation (that is, are subject to institutionalization). This measure is quite reasonable; it points out precisely how troublemakers are dealt with by the court.

One underlying assumption of the analysis is that compliance to due process mandates, stressing rights but not danger and needs at adjudication, and committing juveniles less often for violating rules of probation represent sensitivity to client needs. Of course, agreement with these assumptions depends upon values. The values represented in this paper are based on the current notions that juvenile courts would be better off if they complied to due process more fully, refrained from unnecessary detail into juveniles lives at adjudication, and minimized the penetration of youth into the justice system. Even if the reader disagrees with these

notions, the general point of the paper is not compromised. It will be demonstrated that maintenance bears distinct relations to behaviors toward clients depending on the environment and the vulnerability of the organization; the obvious general point is that responsiveness to clients under <u>any</u> definition will be encouraged by maintenance and some specific combination of environmental constraints and vulnerability.

### 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

### The Maintenance Concept

Hypothesis I demands a factor analysis of the goal items in each of the three questionnaires. The factor analysis must demonstrate that the proposed maintenance items are all found in one factor, and that items related to community support are also involved. Table 2 illustrates those factor loadings above .40 as developed from an orthogonal rotation of the goal items in each questionnaire.

Factor I, organizational maintenance, is the only relevant factor for the current analysis. The results indicate that for each of the questionnaires the three predicted maintenance items factor together. This confirms that the maintenance concept does have some internal integrity.

In two of the three cases community items are also found in factor I. The judge factor includes protection of the community, while providing services in the community loads at .39, just shy of falling in the factor. Detention supervisors place providing services in the community and

## Table 2

| Goal Factors, by Court Posi | . <b>tion</b> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
|-----------------------------|---------------|

. c.

|  | Judge<br>(N=244) | Probation<br>(N=464) | Detention<br>(N=144) |
|--|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Factor I. Court Maintenance  |                  |                      |                      |
| Keep staff morale high   | .81              | .86                  | .76                  |
| Provide communication channels   | .79              | .80                  | .71                  |
| Increase financial support   | .53              | .56                  | .61                  |
| Protect the community  | .42              |                      | هن هم بين            |
| Provide services in community  | (.39)            | میں جد ہے            | .61                  |
| Develop ties with social agencies  |                  |                      | .53                  |
| Factor II. Community Protection  |                  |                      |                      |
| Uphold moral standards of community  | .60              | .64                  | .62                  |
| Develop respect for law  | • 55             | .53                  | .47                  |
| Protect the community  | • 52             | .59                  | .65                  |
| See that juveniles are appropriately   |                  |                      |                      |
| punished   | .46              |                      | .42                  |
| Change a juvenile's attitudes, values  |                  | .40                  |                      |
|  | •                |                      |                      |
| Factor III. Youth Concern  |                  |                      |                      |
| Develop ties with social agencies  | .77              | .60                  | .46                  |
| Protect rights of juveniles  | .66              |                      |                      |
| Provide social services to juveniles   | .56              | .48                  | .72                  |
| Promote better services in community   | .55              | .73                  | .42                  |
| Change a juvenile's attitudes, values  | .43              |                      | .56                  |
| Process cases quickly  | .43              |                      | .40                  |
| Develop a respect for law  | .41              |                      |                      |
| Note: Items not factoring:<br>Nudge Questionnaire - To restrict in               | torwontio        | to bohowior          | that                 |
| Judge Questionnaire - To restrict in<br>are crimes for                           |                  | a to penavior        |                      |
| Probation Questionnaire - To protect the<br>- To see that ju<br>- To process cas | veniles a        | re punished          | fenders              |
| etention Questionnaire - To restrict in<br>are crimes for                        |                  | n to behaviors       | s that               |

- To protect the rights of juvenile offenders

developing ties with social agencies in the factor. Probation officers include none of the community items.

These differences and the overall pattern support the notion of a relation between internal maintenance and community support. Both the judge and the detention supervisor are heads of organizational units, and both are probably involved in dealing with community concerns in order to maintain internal conditions. Thus both place items relating to the community in the maintenance factor. The difference between the exact items may stem from the fact that detention, viewed almost universally as a punishment, faces few additional demands to protect the community, but many demands to become more treatment oriented. The judge, on the other hand, faces the brunt of the demands for community protection. Probation officers, who are essentially buffered by the judge, are simply unaware of some of the relations developed with the community.

It might be argued that some of the relations are constrained by the demanded orthogonality of the factor analysis. Therefore, for the judge questionnaire an oblique rotation was also carried out. The organizational maintenance factor is presented in Table 3. The results again confirm the predicted relation. The three maintenance items factor together, and in this case two community related items (promoting services, protecting the community) are also involved. The only additional item is a small negative loading of the goal of restricting court intervention to acts that would be crimes for adults. This relation, while not predicted, does make sense; organizations that desire

| Maintenance | Goal | Factors   | on | the | Judge | Questionnaire, |
|-------------|------|-----------|----|-----|-------|----------------|
|             |      | inue Rota |    |     |       | •              |

Table 3

| Item                              | Loading |
|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Factor I. Court Maintenance       |         |
| Increase financial support        | 1.03    |
| Keep staff morale high            | .95     |
| Provide communication channels    | .91     |
| Protect the community             | •55     |
| Provide services in the community | .42     |
| Restrict court intervention       | 40      |

comfortable working conditions do not favor a goal that would reduce the control the court has over juveniles.

While some differences in the various factor analyses develop, overall the results confirm the first hypothesis. Maintenance does have some internal integrity, and it is related to environmental demands. The notion that maintenance is dependent upon an organization's relation to the environment is supported.

### Maintenance, Vulnerability, and the Environment

Table 4 reports the correlations that test the two components of the second hypothesis. The overall relations between the dependent variables and maintenance (based on a factor score from the judge's orthogonal rotation) are presented. Further, the correlations divided by the measure of buffering (the status of the judge) are presented for mandated due process, factors in hearings, and revocations of probation.

On the whole, the results strongly support the hypotheses. There is a positive correlation between organizational maintenance and compliance with due process guarantees. As predicted, a desire to maintain oneself leads to more, not less, of an interest in obeying the law. And because the law in this case favors client rights, the organization with a high maintenance score demonstrates more concern for the rights of individuals. This relation, further, is not spurious. Attempts to control for attitudes, population size, urbanization, and structural characteristics do not. reduce the correlation; in fact, with controls it increases in strength to a small degree. Our hypothesis, which goes against most existing literature, is confirmed.

## Table 4

Correlations Between Maintenance and Sensitivity to Clients, Judge Questionnaire

| Maintenance<br>and:          | Overal1 | Elected<br>Judge | Appointed<br>Judge | Elected then<br>Appointed Judge |
|------------------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mandated                     | .18*    | .49*             | .24**              | 11                              |
| Due Process                  | (227)   | (68)             | (90)               | (68)                            |
| Hearing Criteria;            | .07     | 41*              | .25**              | .15                             |
| Use of needs at adjudication | (159)   | (47)             | (67)               | (42)                            |
| Jse of Rights of             | .06     | .42*             | 09                 | .04                             |
| Adjudication                 | (197)   | (58)             | (78)               | (58)                            |
| Jse of Danger at             | .12     | 14               | .23***             | .16                             |
| Adjudication                 | (158)   | (47)             | (67)               | (41)                            |
| Probation Revocation         | .13***  | 10               | . 36*              | 05                              |
| for Rule Violation           | (226)   | (65)             | (90)               | (67)                            |

\*p < .01 \*\*p < .05 \*\*\*p < .10 Perhaps it is even more interesting to look at the correlations within categories. As predicted, due process guarantees that are part of the law relate extremely strongly to maintenance when judges are elected, less so when they are appointed, and not at all when they are elected after being appointed. In the case of elected judges the correlation is a quite high .49. This is strong support for the notion that organizations show an interaction between environmental demands and buffering, with organizations responsive to immediate pressure showing a greater propensity to obey the law..

The result for elected judges, especially, is so large that some may believe it is somehow spurious. One argument is that maintenance and mandated due process are related due to a common relation to a third variable. Another is that for some reason maintenance and due process, whether guaranteed or not, may be related, so that the explanation concerning the environment is incorrect. However, additional analysis results in a rejection of both hypotheses. An attempt to reduce the correlation between maintenance and due process by using a large number of controls (population characteristics, legitimacy of the Supreme Court, judge's values, and court structure) did not reduce the relation. Thus spuriousness seems less likely. Second, the relation between due process and maintenance is specific for items mandated by law. Thus Table 5 shows a second index, that of due process guarantees the court did not recommend. This index is strongly related to mandated due process (r=.41) largely for practical reasons. For example, even though the court does not mandate an attorney at disposition, it mandates one at adjudication. Because the

| rab. | le | 5 |
|------|----|---|
|------|----|---|

## Court Compliance with Nonmandated Due Process (N = 277 judges)

|   | % of<br>Courts |
|---|----------------|
| Parents always have access to social file         | 27             |
| Court orders never modified without hearing       | 35             |
| Judge reviews probation cases routinely           | 45             |
| Probation cannot admit to detention               | 49             |
| Bail sometimes used                               | 53             |
| Have transcripts                                  | 57             |
| Intake cannot admit to detention                  | 61             |
| Appoint counsel at intake                         | 64             |
| learings always held re change in disposition     | 64             |
| light to counsel at intake                        | 69             |
| Appoint counsel at disposition                    | 73             |
| Probation reports always open to challenge        | 75             |
| Police cannot admit to detention                  | 80             |
| Right to counsel at detention                     | 86             |
| appoint counsel at probation violation hearing    | 86             |
| Detention staff cannot admit to detention         | 86             |
| learings held when probationers commited to state | 90             |
| robation revocation hearings always held          | 90             |
| Right to counsel at probation violation hearing   | 93             |
| Right to counsel at disposition hearing           | 97             |
| Service agencies cannot admit to detention        | 99             |

two stages usually occur at once, having an attorney at one stage relates strongly to having an attorney at the next. Accordingly, there is a strong simple relation between nonmandated due process and maintenance (r=.30). However, when one controls for the contribution of mandated due process to the relation, the partial correlation coefficient becomes statistically insignificant (r=.03). This occurence strongly supports the specificity of the relation between mandated due process and maintenance as one due to law.

While complete support for the hypothesis is not found, the relations between maintenance and factors at hearings also show strong support in general for the proposed model. First, there are no statistically significant relations between maintenance and the dependent variables for judges who are appointed then elected. As predicted, without environmental constraints the relation between maintenance and internal processes is quite limited. Many reversals and significant relations occur in the other two cases. Appointed judges demonstrate more concern for juvenile needs at adjudication, and danger at adjudication. This is quite consistent with the long-range goals of appointed judges, as predicted. Elected judges show some quite large reversals. Much less attention is paid to needs at adjudication when maintenance increases, and more attention is paid to rights at adjudication. While it is not statistically significant, danger is used as a criteria less often when maintenance is high for this group. In sum, all relations are in the direction predicted, although not all are statistically significant. Four of the six relations are statistically significant, while five were hypothesized to exist. Clearly maintenance

does relate to how clients are treated in a manner that depends upon the relation between an organization and its environment. Not all relations predicted appear, but the differentials are quite dramatic; the average differential between elected and appointed judges is .45.

Further, the relation between maintenance and how often probation revocation follows rule violation is as expected. The relation is significant and positive only for appointed judges. Again, it is important to stress that this relation is the opposite of what previous theories would predict. Our notion of maintenance suggests that such adverse client action would occur only under specific conditions, and this is the case.

### 5. CONCLUSION

The results of both the factor analyses and the correlations strongly support the general notions with which this report began. Organizational maintenance can be operationalized if it is defined as an orientation toward obtaining comfortable working conditions for the staff. Further, maintenance in this sense is strongly related to behaviors toward clients, but only in interaction with the environment. Depending upon whether an issue is treated by law or not, what the status of the judge is, and how community groups might interfere with the court, relations between maintenance and internal operations vary widely. Correlations within specified categories reach rather large figures.

Further, in many cases maintenance may be seen more as a hero than a villain. When judges are elected and maintenance is high, juvenile courts

seem to be quite sensitive to client needs under the assumed definitions. Such organizations protect due process guarantees more often; they do not use extraneous criteria at adjudication, nor do they commit juveniles quickly for minor offenses. In other cases--especially when judges are appointed--maintenance leads to more ambigious results in which compliance to law is combined with activities that may actually reduce client well being, such as commitments for breaking rules, or procedures stressing the needs of juveniles at adjudication.

From a macrosociological view, the results tend to call into question the notion that an organizational society must be unresponsive to individuals. Indeed, when organizations are accountable in specified manners, pressure from the environment can lead to sensitivity to clients. A large amount of further research is necessary to specify the conditions, but the results of the current work begin to demonstrate that public policy may be able to make use of the desire of organizations to maintain themselves in order to control organizations. An application of pressures and a structuring of the relation of organizations to their environments can result in altering the manner in which large organizations react to clients.

### REFERENCES

Blumberg, Abraham S. 1967. <u>Criminal justice</u>. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Clark, Burton R. 1956. Organizational adoption and precarious values. American Sociological Review 21:327-336.

Coleman, James S. 1974. Power and the structure. New York: Norton. Eisenstadt, S.N. 1959. Bureaucracy, bureaucratization, and

debureaucratization. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> 3:309-332. Etzioni, Amitai. 1960. Two approaches to organizational analysis: a

critique and a suggestion. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> 5: 258-278.

Feeley, Malcolm. 1973. Two models of the criminal justice system: an organizational perspective. <u>Law and Society Review</u> 7:407-426. Gault v. United States. 1976. 387 U.S. 1.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1959. Organizational analysis. In <u>Sociology today</u>, eds. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., pp. 405-406. New York: Basic Books.

Gross, Edward. 1968. Universities as organizations: a research approach.

American Sociological Review 33:518-544.

Jacoby, Henry. 1973. <u>The bureaucratization of the world</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kent v. United States. 1966. 383 U.S. 541.

Litwak, Eugene. 1961. Models of bureaucracy which permit conflict.

American Journal of Sociology, 67:177-184.

Merton, Robert. 1957. <u>Social theory and social structure</u>. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Michels, Robert. 1915. <u>Political parties: a sociological study of the</u> oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy. New York:

Tr. Eden and Cedar Paul.

- National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections. 1976. Brought to justice? Juveniles, the courts, and the law. Ann Arbor: Center for Continuing Legal Education.
- Ohlin, Lloyd E. 1960. Conflicting interests in correctional objectives. In <u>Theoretical studies in the social organization of the prison</u>, ed., Richard Cloward, pp. 111-129. New York: Social Science Research Counsil.
- Perrow, Charles. 1970. Organizational analysis: a sociological view. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.
- Piven, Francis F., and Cloward, Richard. 1971. <u>Regulating the poor</u>. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Platt, Anthony. 1969. The <u>Child savers: the invention of delinquency</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scott, Richard. 1967. The factory as a social service organization.

Social Problems 15:110-175.

- Selznick, Phillip. 1949. <u>TV and the grass roots</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sills, David. 1957. <u>The volunteers: means and ends in a national</u> organization. New York: The Free Press.

Sosin, Michael. 1977. Controlling organizations through law: due process mandates and diversion grants in juvenile courts. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan.

Thompson, James D. 1967. Organizations in action. New York: McGraw Hill.

Warwick, Donald P. 1975. <u>A theory of public bureaucracy</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Winship v. United States. 1970. 397 U.S. 358.

Woffred, F.C. 1971. Managerial behavior, situational factors, and productivity or morale. <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> 16:10-18. Yuchtman, Ephraim, and Seashore, Stanley E. 1967. A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. <u>American Sociological</u> Review 32:891-903.