

RISK FACTORS RELATING TO JUVENILE ARRESTS IN ROSEVILLE

A Project

Presented to the Faculty of the Division of Social Work

California State University, Sacramento

Submitted in partial satisfaction of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

by

Keri Elias

Elizabeth Wetzel

SPRING
2013

RISK FACTORS RELATING TO JUVENILE ARRESTS IN ROSEVILLE

A Project

by

Keri Elias

Elizabeth Wetzel

Approved by:

_____, Committee Chair
Maria Dinis, Ph.D., MSW

Date

Student: Keri Elias
Elizabeth Wetzel

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this project is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the project.

_____, Graduate Coordinator _____
Dale Russell, Ed.D., LCSW Date

Division of Social Work

Abstract
of
RISK FACTORS RELATING TO JUVENILE ARRESTS IN ROSEVILLE
by
Keri Elias & Elizabeth Wetzel

When trying to understand why juveniles commit crimes, it is important to understand the risk factors that occur most often in juveniles who engage in delinquent behavior. The purpose of this research was to explore the most common risk factors associated with juvenile delinquency in the city of Roseville, California. This quantitative survey research study investigated the perceptions of 62 Roseville Police Department patrol officers. The sampling method was a non-probability purposive sample. The results from the study found that Roseville patrol officers overall did not tend to believe that the seven risk factors indicated were associated with juvenile delinquency. Chi square tests were significant in the association between male and female arrests and their reported mental/emotional issues, male and Caucasian arrests and their self-reporting of current medical conditions, and female arrests and their reporting of parental incarceration. Implications for social work practice and policy are discussed.

_____, Committee Chair
Maria Dinis, Ph.D., MSW

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Collaboration.....	2
Background of the Problem	2
Statement of the Research Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Question	5
Theoretical Framework	5
Definition of Terms	8
Assumptions	11
Justifications.....	11
Delimitations	12
Summary	13
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	14
History of Juvenile Justice	15
Risk Factors of Juvenile Arrests	18

Gaps in the Literature.....	34
Summary	37
3. METHODOLOGY	38
Research Question	38
Research Design.....	38
Variables	40
Study Population.....	40
Sample Population	41
Instrumentation	41
Data Gathering Procedures	43
Data Analysis	44
Protection of Human Subjects	44
Summary.....	45
4. STUDY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	47
Demographics	47
Summary	65
5. DISCUSSION	66
Summary of Study	66
Discussions	68
Limitations	72
Implications for Social Work.....	73

Recommendations.....	75
Conclusion	76
Appendix A. Survey Instrument	79
Appendix B. Human Subjects Approval.....	83
References.....	84

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Demographics of Roseville Officers Perceptions.....	48
2. Female Arrests and Reporting Mental/Emotional Issues.....	50
3. Male Arrests and Reporting Mental/Emotional Issues... ..	51
4. Female Arrests and Parent Incarceration	52
5. Male Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions	54
6. Caucasian Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions	55
7. Female Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions.....	56
8. Female Arrests and Reporting Current or Previous Psychiatric Treatment.....	58
9. Male Arrests and Reporting Current or Previous Psychiatric Treatment	59
10. Male Arrests and Being Under the Influence of Street Drugs	60
11. Female Arrests and Guardian Not Currently Living with Biological Parent....	62
12. Male Arrests and Guardian Not Currently Living with Biological Parent	63
13. Female Arrests and Parents Criminal History	64

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In researching the topic of juvenile delinquency and which risk factors are most commonly seen among juveniles arrested, there is not a shortage of research dedicated to the topic. Juvenile justice is a topic that receives a large amount of attention, as well as high levels of funding. The criminal justice system through the policies and actions taken in addressing juvenile crime, have shown that they believe that much attention needs to be paid to juveniles who commit crimes, if there is hope of lowering the high levels of adult crimes (Wilson, 2009). In order to be successful in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, attention must be paid to the risk factors that are most commonly seen among juveniles arrested. If the common risk factors are understood further, prevention efforts can become more tailored to the population they aim to serve.

What is most important about prevention efforts against juvenile delinquency is in the understanding that the most common risk factors can vary greatly depending on the location of the juveniles. Many researchers examine factors and statistics statewide, or even nation wide when developing programs and policies aimed at juvenile offenders (Mbuba, 2004). The problem that lies with this approach is the factors can change greatly from city to city, even in the same state, and generalizing statistics makes it hard to determine what would be most affective for each location. It is very important for each city to have an understanding of which risk factors are most prevalent in their community while developing policies and programs aimed at combatting juvenile delinquency.

In this chapter, the background of the issue of juvenile delinquency will be discussed. The researchers will then, state the research problem of this study, what the purpose of conducting this research is, as well as provide the major research question being studied. In addition, the theoretical framework used in furthering the understanding of juvenile delinquency will be discussed and definitions will be provided for the major terms used throughout the study. Lastly, assumptions, justifications and delimitations will be discussed, followed by a conclusion summarizing the chapter and laying out what will be discussed in the four chapters that are to follow.

Statement of Collaboration

This project was written through the collaboration of both researchers, Keri Elias and Lisa Wetzel. Lisa was the lead writer for chapters one and three of the project, while Keri was the primary writer on chapter two. Both researchers worked equally on chapters four and five and all the subsequent revisions of the five chapters.

Background of the Problem

A century after the birth of the first court system for adolescents, policies and practices of the juvenile justice system are still being debated on what is the most effective way to handle and prevent juvenile delinquency (Benda & Tollett, 1999). One predominate ideology has focused on a restorative and rehabilitation approach over a punitive approach that is often seen at the adult level. In the last forty years, we have had the Juvenile Justice and Prevention Act (JJCPA), which has allowed for the formation of national, state and local institutes and programs that have access to federal funding for research of juvenile prevention and intervention (Bright & Jonson-Reid, 2010).

Meta-analyses of the effectiveness of correctional intervention over the past three decades has indicated that the efficacy of these interventions reflects a complex interaction of personal characteristics and life experiences (Benda & Tollett, 1999). They also state that policies and practices in juvenile justice systems across the country have begun to reflect punishment philosophies, particularly deterrence through increases in the severity of legal sanctions. With the severity of punishments increasing, the juvenile justice systems then shifted away from the rehabilitative based models that had gathered respect through research to the punishment based approaches (Benda & Tollett, 1999).

There have been findings suggesting interventions initiated by the juvenile court are associated with a nearly three-fold increase in the risk of adult arrest (Bright & Jonson-Reid, 2010). The idea of this becomes alarming, as in light of the push for a rehabilitative model of juvenile justice, the court systems have continued to stray and have strived to treat juvenile offenders more like adults. Bright and Jonson-Reid, (2010) discussed the intentions that the juvenile justice systems interventions has created and believe that it has led to worse outcomes for youth because of ineffective services or an internalizing process such as labeling, which changes the way youth view themselves and influences their future actions.

According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2011), forty-seven of the fifty States and the District of Columbia have substantially changed their juvenile justice laws in recent years. These changes have included more transfers of juveniles to adult courts, more mandatory minimum sentences, and more incarceration; all of which have exacerbated the unlawful conditions found in many facilities where

youth are held. These changes of policies and procedures can lead to an increase of youth recidivism and an increase chance of adult criminal justice system involvement. Although many different sectors of communities get involved in delinquency interventions, few programs create coalitions between various community agencies with the understanding that working together across disciplines can be more effective than working alone (Bright & Jonson-Reid, 2010).

These facts are critical to the core values of the profession of social work, as well as to the clients served. Advocacy for clients is essential as a social worker, and is what makes this profession separate from other similar practices. These authors will attempt to explore the historical practices that have commonly been in place in the field of juvenile justice and the models of community development in an effort to explore the motivation for the practice, as well as the perceived benefits for the clients.

Statement of the Research Problem

This research will study professionals whom are working as sworn police officers of the city of Roseville. It aims to explore the motivating factors behind juvenile delinquency. In addition it will explore the potential lack of knowledge of which risk factors are most prevalent in juveniles that are arrested in the city of Roseville.

Purpose of the Study

Juvenile delinquency is a problem that affects every community nationwide. The most prevalent risk factors that lead to juvenile delinquency, however, can vary greatly depending on the location of the juvenile. The primary purpose of this research is to quantitatively explore the most common risk factors associated with juvenile delinquency

in the city of Roseville, California. The secondary purpose of this research is that it will inform the Roseville Police Department officers which risk factors are most commonly seen in arrested juveniles in the city of Roseville. This research can then lead to training opportunities for the Roseville police officers to further the understanding of these risk factors, as well as it can contribute to the potential development of community-based programs that target to reduce or help overcome these risk factors.

Research Question

This study investigates the following research question: What perceptions do police department officers have on which type of risk factors are more likely to get juveniles arrested in Roseville?

Theoretical Framework

A theory that has been heavily discussed in criminology in regards to explaining delinquency is in Travis Hirschi's work, *Causes of Delinquency* (1969), where he explains his theory of social control. In Hirschi's social control theory of crime and delinquency, he attributes law breaking to the weakness, breakdown, or absence of those social bonds or socialization processes that are presumed to encourage law-abiding conduct (Jensen & Rojek, 1998). The author also describes that social control theory provides an explanation for not only why people commit crimes, but also why they abstain from it. It explains that law-breaking behaviors are a source of instant gratification and conflict resolution and that we need to focus not only on what leads these juveniles to offend, but also on why it is that all individuals do not engage in these behaviors (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts, 1981). The idea is that human beings will

engage in a wide variety of activities and that we form limits based on the process of socialization and social learning that takes place through our development (Jensen & Rojek, 1998).

Travis Hirschi in his work discusses that since delinquency is intrinsic to human nature we must explore the concept of conformity and how we obtain it. He states that conformity is achieved through socialization and it looks at the bonds that individuals have with society and that it is often comprised of four key elements: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. Attachment corresponds to the ties that individuals make with significant others; the family environment is crucial, as parents often act as role models and teach their children acceptable social behaviors. Commitment looks at the development of well-defined goals, and when these are not present and individuals do not feel they have anything to risk by committing delinquent acts, it leads to a possible increase in delinquent behavior. Involvement refers to participation in activities that are valued as leading to social success and the obtainment of positive goals. Belief is the acceptance of a social-value system and how strongly one believes in socially constructed rules. The idea is that the stronger that each of these four elements are, the stronger the social bond will be and that will lead to a lower chance of delinquent behaviors (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts, 1981).

Social control theory puts a lot of emphasis on delinquency occurring when there is failure of primary groups, such as family to help determine the limits and provide reinforcement for non-delinquent behavior. A child's development is influenced greatly by the family environment and also the bonds they have with school, their community

and religion. In a study that addressed parental attachment and delinquency, it was found that the greater attachment to parents, the lower the likelihood of involvement in delinquent behavior (Baron, 2003). Having a sense of attachment to society helps in the development of socialization and in social learning, as it provides accountability and helps in motivating youth to stay on track and out of criminal activities. When any of the four key elements of attachment, commitment, involvement and belief break down, the motivations and goals may become less clear and can then help lead to justifications being made to take place in criminal behavior. Juveniles are at an age that they are under constant peer pressure and without these societal bonds they become a higher risk to take part in delinquent behaviors (Jensen & Rojek, 1998).

An additional theory that helps in contributing an explanation to juvenile delinquency is labeling theory. The idea behind this theory is that once an individual is involved in the criminal justice system and given the label of “criminal” it can alter their social identity. Juveniles in the criminal justice system may find it necessary to change their behavior or take on a new role to live up to their new label (Ascani, 2012). Labeling theory can be very influential on juveniles, as they are at points of constant develop and any stigma felt by being involved in the criminal justice system can have long term social implications (Myers, 2003). The affects that are often encountered by labeled juveniles range from difficulty in school, strain on family relationships, lack of professional networks and inability to make connections with individuals whom are outside the criminal life (Ascani, 2012).

Application of Social Control Theory and Labeling Theory Labeling theory can be applied through several different perspectives. According to Becker (1973), an interactionist approach, describes deviant behavior as a consequence of social controls rather than the quality of the act committed by the individual. Becker also argues that deviance is not necessarily defined by value consensus, but rather by those holding positions of power, such as law enforcement. Durkheim (as cited in Sherman, 1993), argues from a functionalist perspective, that punishment of deviation from a value consensus functions to restore shared values. Thus, functionalists believe that deviance provides to the preservation of society by defining moral values and reinforcing social harmony.

Social control theory helps explain why an individual may engage in nonconforming behavior and labeling theory of deviance focuses on what happens to people after they have been identified as deviants. As agents of control, patrol officers are attempting to regulate those individual and group behaviors that have been identified as deviant in an attempt to gain conformity and reinforce social harmony. Inasmuch, it is important to have an understanding of patrol officers attitudes and beliefs regarding criminal and deviant behaviors.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used throughout this project and are relevant to risk factors that relate to juvenile delinquency.

Juvenile Delinquent is a child or minor under the age of 18 who is accused of breaking the law. The court can approach the juvenile's breaking of the law in several different

ways depending on age, the seriousness of the crime, and criminal records: the child continue to live with parents under court supervision; they can be put on probation in which they can stay in the home, be sent to live with a relative, or in a foster or group home; they can be put on probation and sent to a probation ranch; or the child can be sent to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, division of Juvenile Justice (Judicial Council of California, 2012).

Recidivism is the commission of an offense by an individual who has already been known to commit at least one other offense (OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, 2011).

Recidivism indicates the performance of a correctional program, yet it needs to be noted that in evaluating program performance several measurements can take place: self-reports of re-offending, arrest records, and court records (OJJDP Journal of Juvenile Justice, 2011). The level of measurement determines the recidivism rate, thus the definition of recidivism is not concrete, but rather what data is being measured.

Risk Factors are characteristics and variables that increase the probability that a person will suffer harm (Shader, 2004). In the criminal justice system, researchers often use risk factors to detect the likelihood of reoffending, although many people have several risk factors and never commit criminal acts.

At risk population is a term used to help explain why some people are exposed to harm more than others. Chin (2005), defines populations at risk broadly as the poor, frail, disabled, economically disadvantaged, homeless, ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, victims of abuse or persecution, and persons with social risk factors.

Arrest is the legal capture of a person who has committed a crime (Judicial Council of California, 2012).

Booking procedure is what the police do when they arrest someone. Includes taking fingerprints, photographs, and writing down personal information about the person (Judicial Council of California, 2012).

Substance abuse is a maladaptive pattern of substance use leading to significant impairment, as manifested by recurrent substance use in situations in which it is physically hazardous, results in failure to fulfill major role obligations, substance-related legal problems, and/or continued use despite having persistent or social interpersonal problems caused by the effects of the substance (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

Mental Health refers to a state of well being in which an individual realizes her or his own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and is able to make contributions to her or his community (World Health Organization, 2007). The absence of this can result in a mental disorder.

Developmental disorders are an impairment in normal development of language, motor, cognitive and/or motor skills that are generally recognized before the age of 18 (Segen, 2006).

Single parent households are often defined as a solo mother or father that is responsible for the care of one or more children under the age of eighteen (Bumpass & Raley, 1995). This definition oversimplifies the diversity of “families” though, as many children live

with biological, foster or adoptive parents, often times including grandparents and other extended family members.

Assumptions

The researchers have developed a list of assumptions to be considered in this study. These assumptions are as follows: 1) The city of Roseville police officers will have very similar knowledge levels of what are the risk factors present during juvenile booking following an arrest; 2) Roseville police officers ask all required questions of the juveniles during the booking process; 3) Various risk factors can contribute to juvenile delinquency; 4) Juveniles will report accurate answers to the questions asked by the Roseville police officers during booking.

Justifications

As demonstrated above, juvenile delinquency is a significant issue that affects a large percentage of the population in our society. Juvenile delinquency results in greater risks of continued crime, gaps and difficulties in education, loss of job opportunities, and effects families, communities and society at large. If it is possible to discover new and innovative ways to reduce juvenile delinquency and recidivism, than as social workers, it is our duty and ethical responsibility to help create a path to lower the chances of juvenile delinquency. As many youth are facing multiple challenges in life, it is important to examine the risk that these challenges have in contributing to crime and delinquency. The social work profession involves utilizing multiple levels of interventions, thus it is essential for professionals to coordinate interventions with police, corrections, schools, mental health programs and courts to help decrease the risk of crime and delinquency.

Information from this study will provide social workers the opportunity to improve policies, program interventions and direct services that will ultimately improve the lives of this client population who are vulnerable to harmful risk factors. This study could help the Roseville Police Department in further understanding the juveniles in the community and where they should target their resources. This is beneficial for the profession of social work, as they can work along side the Roseville Police Department in developing program interventions in targeting improvements in juvenile delinquency in the community. Lastly, this study may help raise questions for further study and assist in highlighting the need for policy changes, as well as increase awareness to benefit juveniles across the nation.

Delimitations

This research project does not include qualitative data to further explore possible risk factors that could possibly contribute to juvenile delinquency. Information retrieved is limited to that of the police officers at the Roseville Police Department working during the two days in which the surveys were distributed. As evidence of the literature, there are many risk factors that contribute to juvenile crime and delinquency. The researchers, only including nine risk factors, created the survey questionnaire, thus many other factors that may contribute to juvenile crime and delinquency were not included in the questionnaire. Examples of these risk factors include: socioeconomic status, peer influences, exposure to violence and IQ level.

Summary

In this chapter, there was an introduction to the study that included the background of the problem, the purpose for the study, and the research question. The theoretical frameworks, definition of terms and assumptions were presented as well as justification for the study. Finally, delimitations were included followed by a summary. The following chapter will provide a review of the literature, including the history of the juvenile justice system and sections addressing the various risk factors. Chapter three will describe the methodology for the study. Chapter 4 will examine and analyze the data collected. Lastly, chapter 5 will include a summary and discussion of the major findings as well as provide recommendations and implications for the social work profession.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are 2.4 million juveniles charged with criminal offenses annually. For many of those juveniles, the arrest is not their first run in with law enforcement, as an estimated 55% of juveniles nationwide, and up to 80% in some urban areas, will be rearrested within one year (Wilson, 2009). Juvenile arrests and recidivism rates have garnered a lot of research into the understanding of why juveniles commit crimes in the first place and what are the best ways to try and stop this from happening, or if it already has, from not occurring again (Mbuba, 2004). A lot of current research has started focusing on which risk factors are most closely related to a juvenile engaging in criminal activity. By having an understanding of these risk factors, efforts have started to shift away from a reactive form of handling juveniles involved in the justice system, to instead a proactive effort designed to address the risk factors. By making shifts to proactive efforts, such as trying intervention programs before the first arrest, the hope is that it will have effects on juveniles choosing a different path, instead of getting involved in the criminal justice system (Wilson, 2009).

This review of the literature in this chapter will include an examination of arrest rates and patterns by looking at potential risk factors that can affect a juvenile's involvement in the criminal justice system. The main sections will entail a history of juvenile arrests, the juvenile justice system and models and policies currently being implemented, followed by an analysis of nine risk factors that are potentially related to juvenile arrests. The risk factors included in this review are: substance abuse, mental

health, developmental disabilities, medical conditions, gender, ethnicity, single parent households, parents being involved in the criminal justice system and multiple arrests. Finally, gaps in the literature will also be discussed followed by a brief summary of the chapter.

History of Juvenile Justice

Laws have been in place for juveniles for over four thousand years, dating back to Babylonian codes of law written on stone and clay tablets that referenced children who disobeyed parents. Roman civil law and church dating back two thousand years, distinguished adults from juveniles based on the idea of the “age of responsibility,” that defined infants as those age seven and younger and youth arriving at the age of puberty (Lawrence & Hemmens, 2008). Those who were at the age of puberty were expected to know the difference of right and wrong and were held criminally accountable.

Anglo-Saxon common law in England was influenced by Roman civil law and by the fifteenth century, England had courts in place to provide interventions and assistance for children and women in need. These courts could exercise “the right of parent,” which became the basis for juvenile courts in America (Lawrence & Hemmens, 2008). This rule gave the court authority and decision making power in place of the parent, to give the juveniles guidance and protection.

Early United States History law was heavily influenced by the common law of England, which governed early American Colonies. English common law, following Roman Civil Law, distinguished who could be accountable for their actions based upon whether they were “infants” or “adults” (The America Bar Association, 2011). Infants in

this case, were children who were too young to understand their actions, children up to age seven. Those over the age of fourteen would be tried as an adult and those in between seven and fourteen would be held responsible for crimes based on their knowledge of right and wrong. Overall though, English common law practice preferred for parents to deal with their misbehaved children, if parents were available.

The state preferred the practice of parents dealing with childhood misbehaviors until shortly after the beginning of the opening of state penitentiaries in the early nineteenth century. Until the turn of the century, juveniles were jailed with men, women, adults, and mentally unhealthy people all together. The overcrowding and mixed conditions of the jails concerned reformers and the beginning of the separate housing of juveniles and adults emerged. Hence, the first house of Refuge exclusively for children was opened in 1825 (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 2013).

Houses of Refuge were not only for children who committed crimes, but those who were poor, parentless, or whose families could not or would not keep them. By the mid eighteenth hundreds, training or vocational schools opened in rural areas as a place for troubled or family-less children; this was the start of what is now known as boys ranch's or other juvenile facilities. In 1851, the New York Juvenile Asylum was built for children who were under the age of twelve, that were neglected or impoverished and by 1853 the Children's Aid Society was founded. The Children's Aid Society was founded to come to the aid of children living on the streets and poorhouses by placing them in foster homes or apprenticeships (Sobie, 2003).

By the late eighteenth hundreds, states began to pass bills that enabled children to be turned over to the criminal justice system for disorderly conduct, thus moving away from the idea that parents would handle children whom had not committed criminal acts. The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children was formed in 1875 with the goal of protecting the rights of children by campaigning for legal reforms. This reform led to child neglect statutes, granted states the right to assume custody of children and codified children's laws (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, n.d.), all of which paved the way for the first separate children's court systems, including juvenile court. Though there had been advocacy for separate courts for children since the early eighteenth hundreds, it was not until 1899 that the first juvenile court began in Cook County, Illinois (Tanenhaus, 2005).

Throughout the course of the last century, the parameters of the law when applied to children have varied between the two ideas: first, of children being thought of as inherently good, but vulnerable to immorality; and second, to viewing children as sinful and needing to be restrained (Titus, 2005). The juvenile justice system has also shifts between the ideas that children need to be saved and cared for to that of needing to be accountable for their actions. Titus (2005) explains that the creation of juvenile court attempts to restore this opposition of competing images by creating legal boundaries of when youthful offenders go from innocence to criminals based on the moral and cognitive capacities of juveniles when compared to adults.

Public concern grew in the nineteen fifties and sixties about the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system because of the number of juveniles who were being detained. The

public's perception was that juvenile crime was on the rise and that this was based on the leniency of the justice system. The Supreme Court made a series of changes in the nineteen eighties that led the juvenile justice system to be more like adult criminal courts, such as mandatory sentences and automatic waivers to adult court for some crimes (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, n.d.). Today, we have the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), which was founded in 1974, as a result of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

According to the OJJDP mission statement, they provide leadership, coordination, and resources on a national level, to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and victimization, as well as supports efforts and implementation to effectively create prevention and intervention programs that improves the juvenile justice system so that "it protects public safety, holds offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services tailored to the needs of juveniles and their families" (U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP, n.d.).

Risk Factors of Juvenile Arrests

The following section will include a discussion of common risk factors that are associated with juvenile delinquency. The risk factors that will be included are: 1) substance abuse, 2) mental health, 3) developmental disabilities, 4) medical conditions, 5) gender, 6) race/ethnicity, 7) single-parent households, 8) parent involved in criminal justice system, and 9) multiple arrests.

Substance abuse. Juvenile substance abuse is a known prevalent risk factor when it comes to juvenile arrests. It is estimated that 80% of juveniles in the criminal justice

system have had a history of substance abuse at one time (Mulder, Brand, Bullens, et al., 2010). The uses include things such as, being under the influence of alcohol or drugs while committing their crimes, testing positive for drugs, being arrested for committing an alcohol or drug offense or admitting to substance abuse and addiction problems (*Criminal Neglect*, 2004). The levels of substance abuse in the juvenile justice system are staggering and only show a portion of the problem, as the amount of juveniles that receive any form of substance abuse treatment resulting from their arrests are very low. A study reported that out of a sample of 2.4 million juvenile arrests, substance abuse and addiction involvement was found in 1.9 million of those arrests, with only 68,600 of those juveniles receiving any form of substance abuse treatment (*Criminal Neglect*, 2004).

Substance abuse is prevalent among youth adolescence and teenage offenders, although with the undersupply of treatment options in correctional settings and communities it can become almost impossible for youth to overcome the epidemic of drug use (Muck et al., 2001). The implications of the lack of treatment options only increase the chances of youth offenders becoming more involved in the juvenile justice system; a good example of this implication is shown by a study conducted in 2004. This study showed that 30-40% of the youth surveyed who were using illicit drugs in the past month had also participated in criminal behavior (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2005). Youth offenders are likely to continue their criminal behavior without the intervention of treatment either in the community or while in custody and this will likely lead them to prison as adults.

The drug and alcohol related offenses are only a portion of the effects that substance abuse has on juveniles. Studies have shown that substance abuse can lead to increased violence in juveniles and can attribute to a large portion of the violent crimes committed by juveniles (Mbuba, 2004). Secondly, the more times that a juvenile is arrested, the more likely they will be to use drugs and alcohol and at a much more frequent rate than a first time offender or a person not involved in the criminal justice system (*Criminal Neglect*, 2004). Lastly, substance abuse plays a large factor in how successful a juvenile is in the educational system. Juveniles involved with drugs or alcohol report a low attachment to school, are often truant and are much less likely to graduate, compared to their drug and alcohol free classmates (Mulder, Brand, Bullens, et al., 2010).

There are many factors that contribute to a juvenile using drugs and alcohol and ending up in the juvenile justice system. First, if a juvenile has a parent that is or has a history of abusing drugs or alcohol, the juvenile will be three times more likely to become a user themselves (Mbuba, 2004). Secondly, if a juvenile is raised in an impoverished or dangerous neighborhood, it contributes largely to involvement in delinquent and violent behavior that is most often filled with alcohol and drugs (*Criminal Neglect*, 2004). Lastly, juveniles that lack any form of spiritual grounding are much more likely to use drugs and alcohol. Teens that do not consider religious beliefs important are more than three times as likely to smoke cigarettes and drink alcohol, as well as juveniles will be four times more likely to smoke marijuana, and seven times

likelier to use illicit drugs than juveniles that report religious beliefs to be an important aspect of their lives (*Criminal Neglect, 2004*).

Mental health. The correlation between mental health disorders and juvenile delinquency has led to an increase of research, as the two are intertwined. Research results on mental health prevalence in the juvenile justice system show estimates of 70% of youth coming out of state correctional facilities in need of some formal treatment for various different mental health disorders (Wilson, 2009). These disorders take many forms and have effects on all aspects of the juvenile's life with the effects especially seen at the educational system level. A report completed by the U.S. Department of Justice reported that an estimated 35.6 percent of juvenile offenders have learning disabilities, and an additional 12.6 percent have intellectual disability (Puritz & Sculi, 1998).

The fact that there is a higher prevalence of mental health disorders in juveniles who are committed to a youth correctional facility is problematic and current research on youths treated in U.S. public mental health systems reveal that many youth with mental illness have been or will be involved in the juvenile justice system (Wilson, 2009). A study based on administrative and interview data collected in two communities participating in a national initiative designed to improve mental health services for children and youth, suggested that better mental health services reduces the risk of initial and succeeding juvenile justice involvement by 31 percent (Foster, Qaseem, & Conner, 2004).

One aspect of improved mental health services for children and youth is to develop a better functioning needs assessment. (Altschuler & Brash, 2004), completed a

national study in 1990 of needs assessment instruments used in juvenile justice facilities and found that many states did not administer needs assessments until after a youth was committed. This study also showed that only one third of states used a formal needs assessment instrument, only one half of states assessed emotional and psychological needs, and the quality of the assessment varied dramatically across the country. Another complicating factor for proper mental health treatment is that treatment approaches are often one dimension, meaning they focus just on mental health, chemical dependency, or parental abuse, rather than use an integrated approach (Altschuler & Brash, 2004).

Given the high prevalence of co-occurring disorders in juvenile offenders, treatment that only addresses one problem at a time will be ineffective. Many times, youth are receiving treatment for the first time in placement and the failure to appropriately identify youth offenders with co-occurring disorders often can prevent their involvement in treatment. These failures may lead to high rates of recidivism for juveniles following their release from custody. Ongoing treatment after release is also critical in keeping youth out of placement and increases their chances of success in the community. If treatment addressing multiple disorders was attended to in placement, it must then also continue once the youth is back in the community, especially given that community settings are where triggers, negative influences, and temptations can easily be found (Altschuler & Brash, 2004).

Conservative estimates show that the prevalence of mental disorders among youth involved in the criminal justice system is four times greater than among the general youth population. The disorders that are seen as most prevalent are: conduct disorder,

attention- deficit disorder, and mood and anxiety disorders (Altschuler & Brash, 2004; Cocozza & Skowrya, 2000). Without effective treatment, adolescent youth face the barriers of living with a mental health disorder(s), the symptoms that accompany them, and the possibility of developing new disorders, which all can lead to an increased chance of being involved in the juvenile justice system.

Developmental disabilities. Reports from teachers in juvenile correctional facilities indicated that 32% of the juveniles read at or below a fourth-grade level, 27% at a fifth-to-sixth-grade level, 20% at a seventh-to-eighth-grade level, and 21% at or above a ninth-grade level (Parent-Dale et al., 1994). These statistics indicate that many of the youth who are involved in the criminal justice system are behind their peers in development and struggle with learning disabilities. It can be argued that chronological age and developmental stage is interrupted for many youthful offenders owing to the fact that they lose social and educational interactions that contribute to development. Altschuler & Brash (2004) argue that although there is debate on which “arrested” adolescent development disorders predate entry into the juvenile justice system, as opposed to being a consequence of corrections, agreement exists that young people returning to the community from correctional facilities are often behind developmentally.

Involvement in things, such as school and/or work upon release from a custodial facility is an extremely important factor in the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. One study showed that youth continued to perform poorly after being released from a correctional system when they did not become actively involved in school. Those youth that involved themselves in work and or school immediately after being released from

custody, had a positive effect on the sample's status (Bullis, Yovanoff, & Havel, 2004). The findings from this study suggested that interventions that were focused on education and employment could have a positive effect on formerly incarcerated youth and help in reducing recidivism rates. This study also suggested that if the youth had been actively involved in school or work prior to their involvement with the criminal justice system, those youth might not have committed the crime or engaged in delinquent behavior at all.

The Office of Special Education Programs reported in 2000 that 9% of school age children in the United States have disabilities compared to the estimate of 32% of juveniles who are in the justice system (Quinn, Rutherford, Wolford, Leone, & Nelson, 2001). A disparity such as this indicates that those whom have learning and emotional disabilities are more vulnerable to criminal behavior than their peers. There are two well-discussed hypotheses that exist to help explain this disparity. First, the school failure hypothesis attributes academic failure to the development of a negative self-image (Malmgren, Abbott, & Hawkins, 1999). These youth can then be susceptible to dropping out of school and thus increases their opportunities for criminal behavior. Differential treatment hypothesis states that youth with learning disabilities engage in the same criminal behavior at the same rate as nondisabled youth, but are more likely to be criminalized (Malmgren, et al., 1999).

Medical conditions. Discussions of the health problems youth in the juvenile justice system are dealing with often point to mental health disorders, with little attention being paid to medical conditions. With having access to quality healthcare is a struggle for delinquent youth, medical problems can play a factor in juvenile delinquency

(Committee on Adolescence, 2001). The most common medical problems that delinquent youth faces are: STDS, diabetes, acne, hypertension, tuberculosis, pregnancy-related issues and dental problems (Hammett, 1996). Studies have found that many of the medical conditions, including mental health diagnosis can be attributed to neglect or physical or emotional trauma (Parent-Dale et al., 1994).

Medical problems, such as the ones listed above, have been found in 46% of incarcerated youth, with many of these juveniles never receiving adequate treatment before the arrest (Committee on Adolescence, 2001). Youth incarcerated in the juvenile justice system receive healthcare and these healthcare services, in some cases, have diagnosed significant medicals problems that could affect growth and development if left untreated. Even after the youth are released from incarceration, studies have found a large portion of the care providers for these youth do not ensure that the juvenile will continue to receive proper treatment (Parent-Dale et al., 1994). This tends to be the case for those youth who have been diagnosed as intellectually disabled and who have prevalence in the juvenile justice system of around 7-15% (Committee on Adolescence, 2001). Studies have shown that these offenders suffer from dual-diagnoses, of being mentally ill and intellectually disabled, fall through the cracks in the justice system and do not get the help that they need in ensuring they will no longer be a threat to society upon release (Committee on Adolscence, 2001).

Medical problems can be seen as a risk factor of predicting juvenile arrest due to a few main points. Juveniles dealing with a medical ailment can have a decreased sense of self-confidence and can use criminal acts, such as drugs and alcohol to try and minimize

the ailment that can set them apart. Juveniles that suffer from a medical problem in result from some form of trauma or abuse can use the experiences they lived through as a justification for their risky behaviors (Committee on Adolescence, 2001). Juveniles that develop STD's are associated with multiple partners and start sexual activities at a young age and can often transition into risky behaviors, such as crime. For youth, dealing with a teen pregnancy can lead to struggles on how to support for the child and this can attribute to criminal behaviors (Hammett, 1996). In trying to deal with medical ailments, drugs and alcohol can be common ways to self-medicate and to try and forget about any of the problems in which they have been diagnosed (Committee on Adolscence, 2001).

Gender. The Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) showed that there were over 37.8 million boys and 36.1 million girls arrested in the Unites States between the ages of 0-17 in 2011 (Puzzanchera, Sladky, & Kang, 2012). Since the onset of the juvenile justice system policies, facilities, and programs they have been geared towards males, as the belief has always been that men engage in criminal activity much more often than their female peers. Statistics have seen shown that there is a need for facilities and policies to be updated with the increase of female offenders. In the last two decades, the overall delinquency caseload for females has increased by 92 percent, while males have begun to decrease (Act 4 Juvenile Justice, 2009).

Research results demonstrate several significant differences in male and female populations. First, girls commit far fewer violent crimes compared to their male counterparts. Girls are more likely to be arrested for running away, liquor related offenses, curfew and loitering violations (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005; Snyder

& Sickmund, 2006). Second, girls tend to have a history of physical, sexual and emotional abuse when entering the juvenile justice system, more so than boys (Act 4 Juvenile Justice, 2009). Whether this is the case for males or females, mental health services are needed to address these traumas. Yet often times they are re-traumatized by the way they are treated while in custody. Finally, girls in the juvenile justice system have shown to have a higher risk for reproductive health problems compared to those outside the juvenile justice system (Gallagher, Dobrin, & Douds, 2007). Adolescent girls have different health needs than boys, especially with gynecological and pregnancy related healthcare that need to be addressed, especially once they are in the system.

Many people believe that males commit the majority of crimes that are committed in the United States. By comparing the levels of incarcerated adult males versus levels of incarcerated adult females, those beliefs would hold some truth (Act 4 Juvenile Justice, 2009). However, this is not the case at the juvenile justice level, as the overall statistics presented earlier show that juvenile males and females are arrested at a very close rate to each other. The main difference between the two genders relate to the crimes that are committed. Males tend to commit more of the violent crimes, as well as have higher recidivism rates than females (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Males also commit felonies at a much higher rate than females; and when women are arrested for felonies, a large portion are directly related to their involvement with a male (often acting under their direction) (Act 4 Juvenile Justice, 2009).

Race/Ethnicity. In the adult justice system, it is known that minorities are over represented in correctional facilities and this is also the case at the juvenile justice level. Many studies have published findings that show that minority youth are arrested and detained in custodial settings at a much higher rate than their white counterparts (Austin, Dimas & Steinhart, 1994). Throughout the United States, African American youth are more likely to be arrested than any other youth population. Data has shown that African American youth have been arrested for up to 50% of violent crimes committed by all juveniles, while only making up close to 15% of the entire juvenile youth population (Fite, Wynn & Pardini, 2009). Hispanics in the state of California specifically have become more prominent in the statistics of juvenile arrests and recidivism rates; and those statistics have been used to show the overrepresentation of minorities that was previously linked to mostly only African American youth. Rates of arrests are not the only place where the overrepresentation is seen, as minorities account for over two-thirds of the youth who are placed in custodial facilities (Pope & Snyder 2003).

There have been theories that have sought to explain the over representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system. Many studies have demonstrated that minorities are overrepresented in impoverished areas, where the majority of crime takes place. For example, Piquero (2008) discusses that urban communities provide easier access to services such as, affordable housing and public transportation; and for families of lower socioeconomic status impoverished areas do become the only area where they can afford to live. Being raised in these areas increases the odds for any person to become more involved in criminal activities; and this leads many to believe that is why there is an

overrepresentation of these populations in the juvenile justice system. The juveniles in these areas are being exposed to criminal activities from such young ages and grow up often thinking these behaviors are a way of life and with the feelings that there are no options to escape poverty; thus crime becomes what it takes to survive (Pope & Snyder 2003).

Lastly, police officers in their arrest rate patterns of juveniles have tended to mimic the groups they have found most prevalent in the adult justice system as the groups they feel are most likely to commit crimes. Police officers have the discretion on who to arrest and through forms of police bias, many officers have felt they are being proactive by targeting minority populations at a young age, as that is who they feel will be the serious offenders in adulthood (Fite, Wynn & Pardini, 2009). The highest concentration of police officers also tend to focus their patrol on the impoverished areas of the cities they work, thus the likelihood of arresting minorities becomes much greater. Suburban areas and neighborhoods that predominately are made up of Caucasian families, typically do not generate a large call volume for police departments. The lower call volume leads to departments only responding to those areas in times of need and missing out on other crimes that are committed in these neighborhoods that take place while there are patrolling the documented higher crime areas (Piquero, 2008).

Single Parent Households. Some research indicates that family structure is an extremely powerful factor and greatly affects children's behaviors, attitudes and beliefs. This statement can be especially true for children who grow up living in a single parent household. From 1970 to 2010, the proportion of children who were living in a single-

parent family home more than doubled (OJJDP, 2011) and along with that statistic, the rates of juvenile delinquency also have risen. In 2009, 70 percent of children ages 0–17 lived with two parents, 26 percent with one parent, and 4 percent with no parents (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2010).

Research may indicate that children are at risk for delinquency if they live in a single-parent household, although some researchers argue that this research has limitations. Anderson (2002), argues that most of the research examining delinquency uses either individual-level research or aggregate relationships, and that using these two levels alone is not appropriate. Individual-level research explores the effects of living with one parent on the delinquent behavior of a particular adolescent and aggregate-level research explores how the proportion of single-parent families within some social unit, and by extension all children within that unit, at risk for higher rates of delinquency (Anderson, 2002). Research that uses these two types of research assumes that families exist in isolation and doesn't take into account influences on individual behavior.

Attachment between parental figure and children is also closely looked at when studying juvenile delinquency. Studies have shown that there is a direct link between disorganized parenting and attachment insecurities and problem behavior in children that can lead to adolescent delinquent behavior (Fearon, Bakermans-Kranenburg, Ijzendoorn, Lapsley, & Roisman, 2010; Van Ijzendoorn, Schuengel, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 1999). The two theories that best describe the link between parenting and adolescent delinquency are social control theory and attachment theory. Social control theory stems from the theory that was developed by Hirschi (1969) who conceptualized attachment as

an affective bond in which children internalize conventional norms of society.

Conventional behavior is achieved by having strong parent child attachments and without strong positive family ties, delinquency can occur. Attachment theory (Ainsworth, 1989; & Bowlby, 1973) is an intense distress experienced by infants who had been separated from their parents. If the parent-child attachment relationship is disrupted, long-term negative consequences can be aggressive and delinquent behavior.

Both of these theories discussed above show how poor attachment to a parental figure could be associated with a risk for delinquency in juveniles. Other research indicates that parenting behaviors can be more important than whom the child become more attached to, though few studies focus on parenting styles. Hoeve, Dubas, Eichelsheim, van der Laan, Smeenk and Gerris (2009) found that fewer than 20 percent of studies focused on parenting behaviors of fathers, despite the reality that effects of poor support by fathers can be larger than poor maternal support. To help bridge the gap of parenting and juvenile delinquency, researchers still need studies on which parenting dimensions are related to delinquency, and identify moderators that affect the parenting-delinquency association, such as gender of the child and the parent, delinquency source and type, informant on parenting (parent or child), and short- vs. long-term relationships (Hoeve, et al., 2009).

Parents Involved in Criminal Justice System. The idea that crime runs in the family is one of the oldest conclusions that have been made surrounding the criminal justice system (Murray, Loeber & Pardini, 2012). Criminal parents, whether in the home or incarcerated, have lasting effects on their children. Children learn how to act and

develop largely based on the influences of their parents through modeling and can gain an understanding that crime is okay as crime is one way of survival for these parents. A criminal parent may also struggle at methods of child rearing and are more likely to have their children removed out of the home or have a family member be the primary care giver of their child (Thornberry, 2009).

Emotional and social strain, as well as stigma and labeling, can follow the child of a criminal parent and lead to factors such as isolation, bullying, poor academic performance and defiance, which are all potential indicators of criminal activity (Eddy & Poehlman, 2010). These factors help contribute to the statistics that show that the children of a criminal parent are much more likely to engage in criminal activities, than the children that grew up with a parent that was never involved in the criminal justice system (Murray, Loeber & Pardini, 2012).

All steps of the justice procedures relating to a parent involved in the criminal justice system can cause extreme emotional distress on a child (Murray, Loeber & Pardini, 2012). A parental arrest is often unexpected for the child and tends to occur at night when the child is more likely to be present. The arrest can involve violence and even lead to posttraumatic stress that often goes untreated for the child (Comfort, 2007). For a child, witnessing court proceedings can lead to increased anxiety about the future of their home and relationship with their parent, and they often stress about what the outcome means for their future.

Lastly, having a parent incarcerated effects the child on many levels. Dealing with the absence of a parent is very tough for a child, as well as the visiting of an

incarcerated parent can be traumatizing for youth. Also, incarceration may lead to a temporary or potentially permanent ending of the relationship between parent and child. The new caregiver may make an effort to distance the child from the parent, or the child themselves may want to detach themselves from that parent and that has lasting effects on the child (Murray, 2005). Theories have suggested that severe emotional distress and the inability to escape painful situations can relate directly to problem behavior, thus for a child dealing with these painful memories, it may lead directly to their increased likelihood of engaging in problematic behavior and then themselves entering into the criminal justice system (Murray, Loeber & Pardini, 2012).

Multiple Arrests. Juvenile recidivism rates can vary greatly from state to state and even from city to city with the highest rates found in urban communities and in cities where crime rates are already very high (Huebner, Varano & Bynum, 2007). When a juvenile is arrested and it is not their first offense, roughly 60% will be categorized as a violent or a serious offense (Wilson, 2009). Juveniles who commit violent offenses are more likely to commit additional offenses, both violent and non-violent than those who commit minor and property offenses (Mbuba, 2004). In a study of adolescent rapists and child molesters, it was found that adolescent sex offenders have a significantly higher likelihood of reoffending after release from correctional facilities (Visher & Travis, 2003). Along with sex crimes, drug related charges and weapons charges also see high levels of recidivism for juvenile offenders (Mbuba, 2004).

As discussed previously, studies have shown there are certain crimes that lead to a greater chance of the juvenile recidivating (*Conditions of confinement*, 1994; FBI, 2005;

Wilson, 2009). The findings of these studies also show that crimes relating to drugs and weapons often relate to juveniles that have gang involvement. Juveniles that claim association to a gang have a much higher chance of recidivating than a juvenile with no prior gang involvement (Huebner, Varano & Bynum, 2007). After the first arrest when a juvenile has been validated as a gang member, it becomes harder for the juveniles to get away with their crimes. This is because there is an increased awareness of their gang ties which lead to criminal activity. Law enforcement is also known to keep a closer eye to known gang associates (Huebner, Varano & Bynum, 2007). Many juvenile delinquents view the gang as a sense of family and security that they never received from their own parents or caregivers. Family stability helps ensure that a child is assimilated into mainstream society and understands the societal norms. Without this stability, juveniles commit crimes as they feel they owe the gang everything. In a sense the gang “raised them” and they feel that they must remain loyal to the gang to survive (Mbuba, 2004).

Gaps in the Literature

In completing the literature review of this study, the researchers found many biases present in the literature used. Research conducted on juvenile justice practices make conclusions on what causes juveniles to engage in delinquent behavior. The research analyzed often provided one sided arguments, focusing on negative risk factors and how they increase a juveniles likelihood of offending. The research did not focus on why juveniles that do not have any of the chosen risk factors commit crime. Also, the researchers often tried to draw large-scale conclusions on causation of one variable affecting the other. The problem with these large-scale conclusions is that they do not

account for the differences in each community nor how the common risk factors in one city can be dramatically different than one another.

By analyzing the funding sources for the research used in this study, biases were found. For example, it was found that conclusions from the studies were often based on who was conducting the research. That is, religion-based organizations stressed the positive correlation between spiritual beliefs and a juvenile's likelihood of abstaining from criminal behavior. Also, education focused research groups placed emphasis on how education affects a juvenile's chance of delinquency. While all of these risk factors can contribute to juvenile delinquency, not one is directly causal, as multiple factors are likely to contribute to juvenile delinquency. Also, these findings do not help in explaining why all juveniles do not commit crimes if they are not involved with religion or school. Funding biases can also contribute to the viewpoints made in regards to minorities and sexism. The researchers found that the many of the studies concluded delinquency to be largely from socioeconomic status, with emphasis on the increased likelihood of offending due to being a minority or growing up in a single parent household. Research disproving these claims or trying to understand the cause behind these claims was very hard to locate, as research was aimed to draw conclusions on negative risk factors without much explanation on why it is the cause.

Many studies and reviews focus primarily on assessing the internal validity of sanctions and intervention, yet what remains less clear is the external validity (meaning the generalizability of an identified causal relationship across different populations and settings) (Mears, Cochran, Greenman, Bhati, & Greenwald, 2011). Looking at internal

validity only does not explain the effects among other populations or places that differ from those in the studies. Therefore, to make proactive and effective public policy decisions, representative state and national studies need to be undertaken to clearly identify the magnitude, dimensions, service delivery needs, and outcomes for delinquent youth with disabilities.

Several other gaps in the literature were found as well. First, the discussion of juvenile delinquency is based on research conducted all over the United States, which is beneficial, yet can also come with limitations. Research that is carried out in certain parts of the country can be based on a homogenous group of that population, which can have very different outcomes than in diverse sections of the country. Secondly, there is very little research by carried out by government agencies that focus on the outcomes of juvenile crimes handled by mediation instead of sanctions. The Restorative Justice approach has shown to be very effective in long-term outcomes as well as in reducing recidivism rates, especially when used in juvenile cases (Rodriguez, 2007). Finally, few interventions used also appear to directly correlate with many of the risk factors discussed. Interventions usually involve counseling and mental health services as well as some educational services. There were not enough programs geared towards girls and families, especially those with single parents and juveniles with parents who have been or are incarcerated.

The goal of this study is to fill one or more of the gaps found in the literature. The researchers have not put emphasis on any of the risk factors in particular and are seeking to understand equally how prevalent each risk factor is in the city of Roseville.

By not looking to prove or disprove any particular risk factor but instead giving them all equal weight, it may ensure that the research is not driven to meet any underlying goals or have conflicts of interest as it appears in much of the research presented in this literature review. The researchers understand that the findings from this study will apply only to the city of Roseville and large scale conclusions cannot be drawn from this sample, as the most common risk factors will vary by each city and police department.

Summary

This chapter provided a review of the literature relevant to the purpose of this study. The chapter included current policies and models relating to juvenile justice, as well as a history of what has been used previously in the juvenile justice system. A discussion was included on nine potential risk factors that affect juvenile delinquency and that also will be used as measures in this study. The chapter concluded with a discussion on the gaps in the literature. The following chapter presents the methodology for this study.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology and research design used for this study. A description of the population being examined and the methods of how the population sample was obtained will be discussed. This chapter also includes a description of the data and how the instrument was used for analyzing the data. The conclusion of this chapter will discuss the steps taken to protect human subjects.

Research Question

This study investigates the following research question: What perceptions do police department officers have on which type of risk factors are more likely to get juveniles arrested in Roseville?

Research design

This study utilized an exploratory and descriptive quantitative survey research design. An exploratory design may provide answers to topics not clearly defined (Stebbins, 2001). The researchers were searching for why and how juveniles get arrested; thus an exploratory approach was used because this method is regarded appropriate to develop subsequent research questions and further other studies on this topic (Babbie, 2010). Descriptive designs are a scientific method that allows the researchers to observe and record the subject's behaviors without influencing the findings (Stebbins, 2001).

A closed-ended survey instrument containing 24 questions was developed. A quantitative design is appropriate to describe the population being examined as it

emphasizes the production of generalizable statistical findings when there is a need to verify whether a cause produces an effect in general (Rubin & Babbie, 2011).

Advantages of using a quantitative survey approach is that it allowed the researchers to survey a larger amount of police officers about their interactions with juveniles during arrest procedures while remaining unbiased and neutral on the topic (Marlow & Boone, 2005). Quantitative research was used in this study due largely because of its ability to measure data using statistics and that is how the researchers will be able to describe phenomena from the data analyses (Stebbins, 2001).

One shortcoming of using an exploratory approach is the lack of conclusive answers to the research question (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). Although this method seldom provides conclusive answers to the research question, it can help give understanding to the insight in which later may provide answers. Another limitation of the design is the representativeness of the population being studied may be small in size (Dudley, 2011). Though the representation of the population may be small, the goal is for the data to uncover relevant information that can then lead to further descriptive and or explanatory studies.

Rubin and Babbie (2011) discuss how exploratory studies are essential whenever researchers are breaking new ground and attempting to yield new insight into a topic for research. The researchers have some knowledge from their experience of working in a related field to juvenile delinquency, though they are attempting to become more familiar with the topic of juvenile arrest risk factors. Similarly, the researchers also want to describe some phenomena already in existence within this topic area. Lastly, information

generated from this study may assist to enhance the knowledge of the Roseville police officers in understanding the risk factors that are most prevalent in juvenile arrests.

Variables

In this study, the researchers will explore the following research question: What perceptions do police department officers have on which type of risk factors are more likely to get juveniles arrested in Roseville? The dependent variables for this study were the demographics of juveniles arrested (gender and race/ethnicity). The independent variable was perceptions of the police officers to their perceived risk factors: 1) substance abuse; 2) mental health; 3) developmental disorders; 4) medical conditions; 5) single parent households; 6) parental involvement in the criminal justice system; and 7) multiple arrests.

The above variables were measured by the use of a Likert scale format. The level of measurement used for the independent variables (demographics of juveniles) was nominal. The level of measurement for the dependent variable (perceptions) was ordinal.

Study Population

The study population included all sworn patrol officers of the Roseville Police Department. All sworn patrol officers were invited to participate in this study. The sample population consisted of 62 sworn police officers of Roseville that chose to participate in this study by completing a survey during a mandatory shift briefing. A total of 62 patrol officers were surveyed with law enforcement experience ranging from 2 years to 20 or more years.

Sample Population

A non-probability, purposive sampling design method was used to obtain the sample population. The researchers were studying a subset of a larger population in which the subset of the larger population was easily identified (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). Studying the perceptions of all patrol officers in California could increase the reliability and validity, yet it was not feasible to define and sample all of them. By collecting data from the Roseville Police Department, the researchers were able to collect a sample of data to explore and describe the risk factors prevalent in juvenile arrests.

The Roseville patrol officers were informants, as they were people knowledgeable about the group and were willing to share their knowledge (Stebbins, 2001; Babbie, 2010). They were evaluated based on several criteria: 1) their regular interaction with the juvenile arrestees, 2) the information is specific to their roles in respect to the group, and 3) the knowledge about the group's risks factors.

Instrumentation

The focus of this study was to determine the perceptions police officers have on which risk factors are most prevalent for juveniles who get arrested in Roseville (See appendix A survey instrument). The researchers developed the questionnaire based on the use of the arrest intake questionnaire utilized by the arresting patrol officers. Some of the variables used were directly taken from the arrest information sheet used by the arresting patrol officer, yet the researchers also added variables based on prior knowledge of potential risk factors that may contribute to arrests.

The study participants were asked to complete a written questionnaire designed to measure their perceptions on which risk factors may contribute to juvenile arrests. The questionnaire contained two sections. The first section dealt with demographics most commonly seen during juvenile arrests such as gender and ethnicity. The second section utilized a four-point Likert scale format to determine the extensiveness of risk factors that may influence juvenile arrests.

The survey instrument was not tested for reliability. The study population is however trained to determine and have knowledge of risk factors that are involved in juvenile arrests. Since the survey was self-administered to the study population without the researchers present, it eliminated unreliability and observations by researchers (Rubin & Babbie, 2011). The researchers sought to ensure that the concepts being measured were clearly written and that respondents were likely to be able to answer the questions. Other issues of unreliability was still present because the conditions under which the questionnaires were administered could not be controlled and the data was obtained through participant recall which may or may not be accurate (Marlow, 2011).

The survey was designed specifically for this study to measure perceptions. The instrument had face validity as it was shown to experts in the field and concepts were verified by them (Marlow, 2011). The concepts measured may have had content validity because the researchers performed a pretest with three officers outside of the Roseville patrol division to ensure it measured what it was intended to measure (Marlow, 2011; Rubin & Babbie, 2011). The results from the pretest indicated that the scale used on the pretest did not accurately measure the officer's perceptions. The officer's asked for a

scale using percentage amounts to more clearly define the level of occurrence and provide more precise data. The officer's shared that they believed the questions were constructed in a way that all patrol officers should be able to answer.

Data Gathering Procedures

The researchers met with the sergeant during the preliminary stages to request permission to conduct the study at the department. During that meeting, the researchers explained the reasoning for the research, how the survey would be conducted, human subjects approval process, and explained the voluntary nature of the study for participants. The researchers presented the sergeant with a letter to obtain his/her approval to access the sample population and a copy of the questionnaire for his/her review purposes. After his/her review of study materials and procedures, the sergeant then gave permission by providing a signed consent letter to the researchers to conduct their study at the department.

On December 11, 2012, the researchers gave the sergeant 100 questionnaires and envelopes. The sergeant was then instructed to distribute the questionnaires and envelopes to the staff sergeants in charge of the four daily briefings on both the A and B sides of the shift schedules. This meant that the questionnaires and envelopes would reach all members of the Roseville patrol division on duty. Each officer was given a copy of the questionnaire and instructed that it was their choice to or not to participate in this research study. Since a signature of consent was not required from participants in order to protect their identity, the information sheet provided did indicate that their completion and placing the surveys inside the envelope prior to then giving it to their

sergeant implied their consent to participate in this research study. The participant placed the questionnaire (either completed or incomplete) in an envelope and returned it to their staff sergeant. The staff sergeant collected the surveys that had been placed in the envelope at the end of the briefings and gave the envelope(s) to the sergeant who originally had given the researchers consent to come into the Roseville police headquarters. At the end of the two-day period, the sergeant who had given access to the researchers provided all questionnaires in the envelopes to the researchers.

Data Analysis

Once the researchers received the questionnaires, they entered the information into the SPSS computer database and the variables were statistically analyzed.

Univariate analyses (frequency distribution tests) were performed to describe the distribution of the variables. Bivariate analyses (chi-square tests) were then executed between the independent and dependent variables to examine the relationship between demographics and perceptions. Multivariate analysis (logistic regression) was used to determine which risk factors were more likely to be the perception of patrol officers predicting juvenile arrests.

Protection of Human Subjects

The researchers ensured that the rights to privacy and safety were protected for all human subjects that participated in the study by using a confidential survey format. In the questionnaire, there was no identifying information asked of study participants. The subject's right to privacy and safety was protected through the confidentiality assurance given to the study participants in the form of providing envelopes for them to place their

surveys. They were further instructed not to put their names or any other identifying information about themselves on the survey or on any other materials. The surveys were returned altogether at the end of the two-day period to ensure that the researcher did not determine on what date or time it was administered or even when and if it was completed.

Taking all aspects of this research into consideration, the study was considered “exempt” because the questions asked of patrol officers were of their perceptions on risk factors of juvenile arrests, which had no known risks associated with their participation in this research. Furthermore, the participants were anonymous to the researchers since they did not know which participants chose to participate in this research study. An application to obtain human subjects approval was then submitted to the Division of Social Work Human Subjects Committee; and this project was approved as “Exempt.” In the application procedures, we described that the information was obtained and recorded in such a manner that human subjects could not be identified directly through identifiers and the human subjects responses outside the research did not reasonably place the subjects at risk for criminal or civil liability or was not damaging to their financial standing, employment, or reputation. The researchers instructed participants through written directions that they were not obliged to answer any or all questions and they could opt-out of participation at any time.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to describe how this study was a quantitative exploratory research design. There was a discussion of the population being examined and the methods of how the population sample was obtained. This chapter also explained

the creation of the survey instrument and how the data selection procedure was carried out. A discussion of how human subjects were followed showed that the research was not harmful to participants and the status was exempt. The following chapter will present the data obtained and the results of the analysis of the data.

Chapter 4

STUDY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter examines the results of the survey. The demographics of the Roseville officer's perceptions of those juveniles arrested will be examined as well as the responses of the participants as to their perceptions of potential risk factors that may contribute to juvenile arrest rates. Chi-square tests will be presented on the relationships between variables. This chapter will conclude with a summary.

Demographics

A total of 62 Roseville patrol officers participated in the study. The demographics are not of the participants, but of the juveniles they arrest. The majority of those juveniles reported being arrested more than 50% of the time are males (71%) and Caucasians (77.4%). The vast majority of those arrested under 50% of the time were females (82.3%) and non-Caucasians (83.9%) (Table 1).

What perceptions do police department officers have on which type of risk factors are more likely to get juveniles arrested in Roseville?

This section will explore the perception of Roseville patrol officers on juveniles who are less likely to more likely have risk factors upon arrest. Only those risk factors that were significant to reaching significance will be reported. Perceptions of risk factors based on demographics will be explored.

Table 1

Demographics of Roseville Officers Perceptions (N=62)

	Perceived Arrests Less Than 50%	Perceived Arrests More Than 50%
Gender		
Males	29%	71%
Females	82.3%	17.7%
Ethnicity		
Caucasians	22.6%	77.4%
Non-Caucasians	83.9%	16.1%

Gender and mental/emotional issues. Roseville Police officers who believe that women are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared to males, reported 62.2% of those females were less likely to indicate mental/emotional issues (Table 2). However, officers who believe that women are arrested less than 30% of the time when compared to males reported that nearly four-fifths of them were more likely to indicate mental/emotional issues. There is an association between the number of times females are arrested and the mental/emotional issues they are reporting to the Roseville police officers ($\chi^2=10.013$; $df=1$; $p=.002$).

Roseville police officers who indicated males arrested 60% or more of the time, when compared to females, reported that about four-fifths of those males are reporting mental/emotional issues (Table 3). However, the officers who reported that males are arrested less than 60%, when compared to females, indicated that nearly two-thirds were less likely to report mental/emotional issues. There is an association between the number of times males are arrested by the Roseville Police officers and reporting of parents incarcerated ($\chi^2=11.317$; $df=1$; $p=.001$).

Females and Parent Incarceration. Roseville police officers who believe that females who are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared to males, reported nearly three-fifths of those females were less likely to indicate having parents who are incarcerated (Table 4). However, the officers who reported that females who are arrested less than 30%, when compared to males, over three-quarters of them noted that they were more likely to report parents being incarcerated. There is an association between the number of times females are arrested by the Roseville Police officers and reporting of parents incarcerated ($\chi^2=6.782$; $df=1$; $p=.009$).

Table 2

Female Arrests and Reporting Mental/Emotional Issues

		Reports mental/emotional issues		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Female reported	Count	14	19	33
arrests less than	% within Females	42.4%	57.6%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within	37.8%	79.2%	54.1%
males)	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	23.0%	31.1%	54.1%
Female reported	Count	23	5	28
arrests more than	% within females	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within	62.2%	20.8%	45.9%
males)	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	37.7%	8.2%	45.9%
Total	Count	37	24	61
	% within Females	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%

Table 3

Male Arrests and Reporting Mental/Emotional Issues

		Reports mental/emotional issues		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Male reported	Count	24	5	29
arrests less than	% within Males	82.8%	17.2%	100.0%
60%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within	64.9%	20.8%	47.5%
females)	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	39.3%	8.2%	47.5%
Male reported	Count	13	19	32
arrests more than	% within Males	40.6%	59.4%	100.0%
60%	arrested			
(compared to	% within	35.1%	79.2%	52.5%
females)	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	21.3%	31.1%	52.5%
Total	Count	37	24	61
	% within Males	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Mental/Emotional			
	% of Total	60.7%	39.3%	100.0%

Table 4

Female Arrests and Parent Incarceration

		Parent Incarceration		
		Less likely to	More likely to	
		report	report	Total
Female reported	Count	16	16	32
arrests less than	% within Females	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Parent	41.0%	76.2%	53.3%
males)	Incarceration			
	% of Total	26.7%	26.7%	53.3%
Female reported	Count	23	5	28
arrests more than	% within Females	82.1%	17.9%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Parent	59.0%	23.8%	46.7%
males)	Incarceration			
	% of Total	38.3%	8.3%	46.7%
Total	Count	39	21	60
	% within Females	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Parent	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Incarceration			
	% of Total	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%

Demographics and current medical conditions. Roseville police officers who believe that males are arrested 60% or more of the time, when compared to females, reported 75% of the males are more likely to report having a current medical condition (Table 5). However, the officers who reported that males are arrested less than 60%,

when compared to females, reported that more than half are less likely to have current medical conditions. There is an association between the number of times males are arrested by the Roseville Police officers and reporting of current medical conditions ($\chi^2=4.107$; $df=1$; $p=.043$).

Roseville police officers who believe that Caucasians are arrested more than 65% of the time, when compared to non-Caucasians, reported that nearly three-fifths were less likely to report current medical conditions (Table 6). However, the officers who reported that Caucasians who are arrested less than 65% of the time, when compared to non-Caucasians, reported that over four-fifths were more likely to indicate current medical conditions. There is an association between the number of times Caucasians are arrested by the Roseville Police officers and reporting of current medical conditions ($\chi^2=7.585$; $df=1$; $p=.006$).

Roseville police officers who believe that females are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared to males, reported that half of those females are less likely to report having current medical conditions (Table 7). However, the officers who reported that females are arrested less than 30%, when compared to males, reported that 75% are more likely to indicate a current medical condition. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.060$).

Table 5

Male Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions.

		Reports Current Medical Condition		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Male reported	Count	25	4	29
arrests less than	% within Males	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%
60%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Current	54.3%	25.0%	46.8%
females)	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	40.3%	6.5%	46.8%
Male reported	Count	21	12	33
arrests more than	% within Males	63.6%	36.4%	100.0%
60%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Current	45.7%	75.0%	53.2%
females)	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	33.9%	19.4%	53.2%
Total	Count	46	16	62
	% within Males	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Current	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Table 6

Caucasian Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions.

		Reports Current Medical Condition		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Caucasian reported arrests less than 65% (compared to non-Caucasians)	Count	19	13	32
	% within Caucasian Arrested	59.4%	40.6%	100.0%
	% within Current Medical Condition	41.3%	81.3%	51.6%
	% of Total	30.6%	21.0%	51.6%
Caucasian reported arrests more than 65% (compared to non-Caucasians)	Count	27	3	30
	% within Caucasian arrested	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	% within Current Medical Condition	58.7%	18.8%	48.4%
	% of Total	43.5%	4.8%	48.4%
Total	Count	46	16	62
	% within Caucasian Arrested	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
	% within Current Medical Condition	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Table 7

Female Arrests and Reporting Current Medical Conditions.

		Reports Current Medical Condition		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Female reported	Count	22	12	34
arrests less than	% within Females	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Current	47.8%	75.0%	54.8%
males)	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	35.5%	19.4%	54.8%
Female reported	Count	24	4	28
arrests more than	% within Females	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Current	52.2%	25.0%	45.2%
males)	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	38.7%	6.5%	45.2%
Total	Count	46	16	62
	% within Females	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Current	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Medical Condition			
	% of Total	74.2%	25.8%	100.0%

Gender and current or previous psychiatric treatment. Roseville police officers who believe that females are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared males, indicated that over half of those females are less likely to report receiving

psychiatric treatment (Table 8). However, the officers who reported that females are arrested less than 30%, when compared to males, indicated that nearly three-quarters are more likely to report receiving psychiatric treatment. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.098$).

Roseville police officers who believe that males are arrested 60% or more of the time, when compared females, reported that about three-quarters of those males are more likely to report receiving psychiatric treatment (Table 9). However, the officers who reported that males are arrested less than 60%, when compared to females, reported that half are less likely to report receiving psychiatric treatment. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.073$).

Males and Arrest While Under the Influence of Street Drugs. Roseville police officers who believe that males are arrested 60% or more of the time, when compared females, reported that nearly three-quarters of those males indicated that they were more likely to be under the influence of a street drug (Table 10). However, the officers who reported that males who are arrested less than 60% of the time, when compared to females, more than half of arrestees indicated that they are less likely to be under the influence of a street drug. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.073$).

Table 8

Female Arrests and Reporting Current or Previous Psychiatric Treatment.

		Reports Current or Past Psychiatric Treatment		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Female reported	Count	23	11	34
arrests less than	% within Females	67.6%	32.4%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Psychiatric	48.9%	73.3%	54.8%
males)	Treatment			
	% of Total	37.1%	17.7%	54.8%
Female reported	Count	24	4	28
arrests more than	% within Females	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Psychiatric	51.1%	26.7%	45.2%
males)	Treatment			
	% of Total	38.7%	6.5%	45.2%
Total	Count	47	15	62
	% within Females	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Psychiatric	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Treatment			
	% of Total	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%

Table 9

Male Arrests and Reporting Current or Previous Psychiatric Treatment

		Reports mental/emotional issues		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Male reported	Count	25	4	25
arrests less than	% within Males	86.2%	13.8%	86.2%
60%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Psychiatric	53.2%	26.7%	53.2%
females)	Treatment			
	% of Total	40.3%	6.5%	40.3%
Male reported	Count	22	11	22
arrests more than	% within Males	66.7%	33.3%	66.7%
60%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Psychiatric	46.8%	73.3%	46.8%
females)	Treatment			
	% of Total	35.5%	17.7%	35.5%
Total	Count	47	15	47
	% within Males	75.8%	24.2%	75.8%
	Arrested			
	% within Psychiatric	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Treatment			
	% of Total	75.8%	24.2%	75.8%

Table 10

Male Arrests and Being Under the Influence of Street Drugs

		Under the Influence of Street Drugs		
		Less likely to report	More likely to report	Total
Male reported	Count	25	4	29
arrests less than	% within Males	86.2%	13.8%	100.0%
60%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Under the	53.2%	26.7%	46.8%
females)	Influence of Street			
	Drug			
	% of Total	40.3%	6.5%	46.8%
Male reported	Count	22	11	33
arrests more than	% within Males	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
60%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Under the	46.8%	73.3%	53.2%
females)	Influence of Street			
	Drug			
	% of Total	35.5%	17.7%	53.2%
Total	Count	47	15	62
	% within Males	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Under the	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Influence of Street			
	Drug			
	% of Total	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%

Gender and juvenile not living with biological parent. Roseville police officers who believe that females are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared to males, reported that over half of those females are less likely to indicate living with a guardian that is not their biological parent (Table 11). However, the officers who reported that females are arrested less than 30%, when compared to males, reported that 70% are more likely to report living with a guardian that is not their biological parent. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.099$).

Roseville police officers who believe that males are arrested 60% or more of the time, when compared to females, reported that 70% of those males are more likely to indicate living with a guardian that is not their biological parent (Table 12). However, the officers who reported that males are arrested less than 60%, when compared to females, indicated that over half are less likely to report living with a guardian that is not their biological parent. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.099$).

Females and Parents Criminal History. Roseville police officers who believe that females are arrested 30% or more of the time, when compared to males, indicated that over three-fifths of those females are less likely to report having a parent with a crime history (Table 13). However, the officers who noted that females are arrested less than 30%, when compared to males, reported that over three-fifths are more likely to indicate having a parent with a crime history. The chi-square test was approaching significance ($p=.087$).

Table 11

Female Arrests and Guardian Not Currently Living with Biological Parent.

		Guardian not Biological Parent		Total
		Less likely to	More likely to	
		report	report	
Female reported	Count	19	14	33
arrests less than	% within Females	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Guardian not	47.5%	70.0%	55.0%
males)	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	31.7%	23.3%	55.0%
Female reported	Count	21	6	27
arrests more than	% within Females	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Guardian not	52.5%	30.0%	45.0%
males)	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	35.0%	10.0%	45.0%
Total	Count	40	20	60
	% within Females	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Guardian not	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%

Table 12

Male Arrests and Guardian Not Currently Living with Biological Parent

		Guardian not Biological Parent		
		Less likely to	More likely to	
		report	report	Total
Male reported	Count	21	6	27
arrests less than	% within Males	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
60%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Guardian not	52.5%	30.0%	45.0%
females)	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	35.0%	10.0%	45.0%
Male reported	Count	19	14	33
arrests more than	% within Males	57.6%	42.4%	100.0%
60%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Guardian not	47.5%	70.0%	55.0%
females)	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	31.7%	23.3%	55.0%
Total	Count	40	20	60
	% within Males	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Guardian not	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Bio-Parent			
	% of Total	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%

Table 13

Female Arrests and Parents Criminal History

		Parents Criminal History		
		Less likely to	More likely to	
		report	report	Total
Female reported	Count	7	27	34
arrests less than	% within Females	20.6%	79.4%	100.0%
30%	Arrested			
(compared to	% within Parent Crime	38.9%	62.8%	55.7%
males)	History			
	% of Total	11.5%	44.3%	55.7%
Female reported	Count	11	16	27
arrests more than	% within Females	40.7%	59.3%	100.0%
30%	arrested			
(compared to	% within Parent Crime	61.1%	37.2%	44.3%
males)	History			
	% of Total	18.0%	26.2%	44.3%
Total	Count	18	43	61
	% within Females	29.5%	70.5%	100.0%
	Arrested			
	% within Parent Crime	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	History			
	% of Total	29.5%	70.5%	100.0%

Summary

This chapter looked at the perceived demographics of the juveniles that Roseville officer's arrest. This chapter also explored the officer's perceptions of risk factors that may contribute to juvenile arrests in Roseville. The next chapter will analyze the data gathered and present the conclusions, limitation and implications for social work practice.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the key data that was obtained through this study. The chapter will start by providing a summary of the findings that were presented in chapter four. Next, there will be a discussion on the conclusions that can be drawn from this study and how the findings compared with the literature that was reviewed in chapter two. The chapter will also describe the limitations of the study, as well as provide implications for social work practice and policy. The chapter will conclude with providing suggestions for future research and recommendations on how to affectively use data, such as the findings from this study to better serve juvenile offenders.

Summary of Study

There is not a shortage of studies that aim to further understand the risk factors that are most influential in juvenile delinquency. However, there were no studies dedicated to further understanding the relationship between risk factors and juvenile crime in the city of Roseville, California. After reviewing the conclusions drawn from large-scale studies, the researchers sought to draw conclusions on the data findings for the city of Roseville on the perceptions of police officers to see if their reports matched up with the findings discussed in the literature review of chapter two. The researchers found upon completion of the study, that there were twelve different risk factors that showed to be significant or approaching significance.

The results of the study, through the use of chi-square tests, found that there were five risk factors that police officers reported and showed to be most significant to juvenile crime in Roseville. For both males and females arrested by Roseville police officers, there is an association with their reported mental/emotional issues upon arrest booking intake. The chi-square test found significance in the relationship between males arrested by the Roseville police department and their self-reporting of current medical conditions upon arrest booking intake. Significance was also found in the relationship between Caucasians arrested by Roseville police officers and their self-reporting of current medical conditions during arrest booking intake. Lastly, significance was found between the association of females arrested by Roseville police officers and the reporting of parent(s) incarcerated.

The results of the study found there to be seven risk factors that were approaching significance. In evaluating the risk factor of juveniles receiving current or previous psychiatric treatment, both for males and females, the chi-square test showed it was approaching significance. Police officers reported on the risk factor of females and self-reporting a current medical condition and the chi-square test showed it to be approaching significance. Another variable that was approaching significance for both males and females, as reported by the police officers, was the relationship of the juvenile not living with their biological parent at the time of arrest intake. The association between females arrested and a parent being involved in the criminal justice system showed to be approaching significance. Lastly, the chi-square test was approaching significance

showing that the relationship between males and being under the influence of a street drug at the time of arrest.

The most unexpected findings of the study related to the overall trends of the perceptions of Roseville police officers that tended to show that the higher percent they believed males and females were arrested, the less likely they were to report most indicated risk factors. However, their perceptions differed from those who reported lower percentages of male and female arrests. Officers who reported lower percentages of male and female arrests tended to believe that they were more likely to report the indicated risk factors. Exceptions to the above mentioned are males who report current medical conditions, receiving psychiatric treatment, being under the influence of a street drug, and males who are living with non-biological guardians. That is, these perceptions tend to show that police officers believe that the higher the percent of males arrested are more likely to have these four risk factors.

Discussions

The study was created to further understand the risk factors that relate most closely to why juveniles are arrested in the city of Roseville. In the creation of the study, the researchers looked to further the understanding of nine risk factors and their prevalence among juvenile arrests. These risk factors included: substance abuse, mental health, developmental disabilities, medical conditions, gender, ethnicity, single parent households, parents being involved in the criminal justice system and multiple arrests. A comparison of the data collected compared to the findings of the literature review will follow.

The risk factor of substance abuse is one that garners a lot of attention and research. In the literature review it was found that 80% of juveniles in the criminal justice system have had a history of substance abuse at one time (Mulder, Brand, Bullens, et al., 2010). This risk factor was one that the researchers believed would have a strong significance on both males and females. Out of the questions on the survey relating to substance abuse, there was only one association found. This related to males being arrested while under the influence of street drugs, which was only approaching significance. There was no significance found with females being arrested under the influence of street drugs, as well as no significance found regarding juveniles being arrested for trying to obtain a street drug.

The second risk factor of mental health was another factor that the researchers believed would have significance, as the findings of the literature reviewed showed that in the juvenile justice system it is estimated that 70% of youth coming out of state correctional facilities are in need of some formal treatment for various different mental health disorders (Wilson, 2009). There was an association for both males and females and reporting mental/emotional issues. The third risk factor of developmental disabilities also showed no significance in spite of data showing that 32% of juveniles who are in the justice system have a developmental disability (Quinn, Rutherford, Wolford, Leone, & Nelson, 2001).

The fourth risk factor relating to medical conditions showed significance for males and females, as well as Caucasian youth. The literature review found that up to 46% of incarcerated youth can present with a medical disorder (Committee on

Adolescence, 2001). This risk factor that showed significance did not have much research dedicated to it being a major cause for juvenile delinquency. The fifth risk factor of gender was used more as a demographic characteristic than a risk factor on its own, but from the survey responses it did show that the officers felt that males were arrested at a much higher rate than females. This point is not supported by the literature review, as it was found that the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) showed that there were over 37.8 million boys and 36.1 million girls arrested in the United States under the age of seventeen in 2011 (Puzzanchera, Sladky, & Kang, 2012).

The sixth risk factor relating to the race/ethnicity of the juveniles arrested was inconsistent with the findings of the literature review that had found that minorities are arrested at a much higher rate than Caucasians. The demographics of the city of Roseville show that in 2010, 79.3% of the population was Caucasian (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). From reviewing the demographic population of the city and comparing that to the officer's perceptions that 77.4% of individuals arrested are Caucasian, the data found would support the national trends that Caucasians are arrested at a lower rate than minorities. This two percentage point difference may or may not be statistically significant. The officers believed that minorities were arrested at a rate of 22.6% and that is slightly higher than the minority population of Roseville, which roughly equals 20.7% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). This difference in overrepresentation, however, was not tested for significance. The seventh risk factor relating to single parent households did

not provide conclusive statistics on how it relates to juvenile delinquency as well as this was not shown to be significant in the data findings.

The eighth risk factor of a juvenile having a parent involved in the criminal justice system showed to be significant only for female offenders. Theories have been presented that support the idea that crime runs in the family and that having an incarcerated parent has lasting effects on children; however, the data from this research, as well as the literature review searches, could not confirm these claims. The ninth risk factor relating to multiple arrests showed no significant association on the juvenile's likelihood of committing another crime. Juvenile recidivism rates vary greatly from city to city, but have shown to affect a juvenile's chance of reoffending all the way up to 80% (Wilson, 2009). These findings demonstrate that violent crimes had the highest recidivism rates, thus examining the crimes most often committed by Roseville juveniles could provide a better understanding of why the officers believe a previous arrest would not indicate that they are that much more likely to commit an additional offense.

For many of the risk factors, the officers have to rely on the self-reported information of the juvenile arrested. In many circumstances, it is possible that if the juvenile believes being truthful could increase their punishment or lead to additional consequences, such as admitting to substance abuse, then they may be less likely to be honest with the arresting officer. Also, if a juvenile feels that they may be embarrassed or judged by admitting information, such as a mental health or developmental disorder, they also may not share that information with the officer. Lastly, some of the questions, such as having a parent involved in the criminal justice system may not be readily

available to the officer, especially if last names and address are different; and it may not be a question that all officers ask when conducting a juvenile arrest. All of these factors can play a role on whether the Roseville police officers accurately understand the risk factors that each juvenile presents with at the time of arrest.

Limitations

At the conclusion of the study, the researchers determined that there were some limitations with this study. First, the sample size of this study (N=62) was small and did not include all of the Roseville patrol officers. The researchers at the conclusion of the data collection period found that if more time would have been granted to research participants, a greater number of responses may have been obtained. From errors that were found in the collected surveys, the researchers concluded that a better direction could have been given to ensure surveys were completed correctly. The researchers found that by surveying the police officers about their perceptions on juvenile arrests, the data collected may not match the results that could be collected from the actual arrest intake booking sheets. During intake, there is no way to determine the truthfulness of the juvenile, and thus accurate information may not be able to be obtained if juveniles hide information from the arresting officers. The methodology of utilizing the officer's perceptions might have been better in accessing information if a qualitative rather than quantitative method was used. Lastly, the findings of this study relate directly to the population of Roseville and could not be used to generalize on any other geographical area.

Implications for Social Work

From the findings of the research, there are implications for social work practice and policy. While the findings of this research reflect only the city of Roseville, the study shows that generalized data for large-scale populations may not relate directly to each city. By conducting this research, it shows that in relation to juvenile crime, risk factors can vary greatly based on the location. In the social work profession, it is important to understand the community and populations served, and by having data that accurately portrays the populations, more effective services can be put in place. For the social work profession at the micro, mezzo and macro levels of practice, there are implications that can be drawn.

At the micro level, counselors and other social work personnel would be better equipped to work with clients if they have a better understanding of what risk factors are most prevalent in the city in which they work. While understanding that risk factors change with each juvenile, and by understanding the ones that are seen most often, staff can increase their knowledge and training to better serve the clients and the problems they present. The importance of this understanding are core values of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) that include commitment to service and competence of the populations served (Code of Ethics, 2008). This knowledge also benefits other professions in law enforcement, such as police officers and probation officers, as they can also further their understanding on which risk factors they should be looking for most often and how to handle juveniles that present with the various common risk factors.

At the mezzo level, social work personnel can use the findings to help in prevention work at places such as schools and community events. By understanding the potential risk factors, social workers can tailor their programs to better address the effects these risk factors can have on groups of juveniles, and largely at the school level. In the NASW Code of Ethics, emphasis is placed on the importance of human relationships and at the mezzo level, the community is such a pivotal part to program successes and by strengthening relationships its helps at all levels from individuals to communities (Code of Ethics, 2008). Law enforcement personnel would also benefit from this knowledge at the mezzo level as they work with entire communities on how to best address issues, as well as groups in places such as juvenile hall or continuation schools that include many juvenile offenders.

At the macro level, social workers can use information targeting potential risk factors when developing and implementing city or statewide programs for juvenile offenders. Social work advocates at the legislative level can help in pushing policies and programs that will better serve the client population and can help in obtaining funds for programs to help overcome risk factors. Advocating for social justice is a part of the NASW code of ethnics and at the macro level, social workers can influence social change to ensure services are put in place to aid this population (Code of Ethics, 2008). Law enforcement personnel can also benefit when they are advocating for additional positions, such as school resource officers, as these findings help show where resources need to be allocated to help juvenile offenders.

Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to further the understanding of the risk factors most prevalent in juveniles whom are arrested in the city of Roseville. The following section includes a list of recommendations for future research and how this study could have potentially obtained better results. The list will also include recommendations for social work personnel who are working with juvenile offenders.

- In the survey instrument, the researchers could have collected demographic information of the police officers being surveyed. By doing this, the researchers could have looked for trends based on the police officers age, ethnicity, years on the force and shifts worked.
- The researchers could have allotted a longer collection period for the surveys to ensure that all officers were given the opportunity to complete the survey.
- In future research designs, the researchers could analyze the actual data collected during the arrest intake booking process. The data collected from the actual intake sheets could be used as a comparison to the perceptions of the officers. If there are large differences, it could be used as a training exercise for the Roseville police officers.
- At the end of the survey instrument, the researchers could have included an open ended question to see if there were any additional risk factors that the Roseville police officers found were relevant to juvenile delinquency.

- The researchers could have utilized a qualitative research design that asked the police officers for the top three reasons on why they believe that juveniles are arrested in the city of Roseville.
- Social workers could work closer with law enforcement to better understand the risk factors juveniles engage in delinquent behavior in order to have programs tailored to addressing the needs of this population.
- Further research studies could examine and explore whether police officers understand the risk factors involved and how they can use the information they gather to better help the juveniles they are arresting, with the hope of lowering the number of juveniles recidivating.
- Future research studies could also examine the risk factors that were significant and approaching significance to determine if community programs are effective in working with these issues.

Conclusion

This chapter provided a conclusion on the key findings made from this research design. In this chapter, there was a discussion on the summaries made from the results found in chapter four, as well as a discussion on how those findings compared to literature review of chapter two. Next, the study limitations were introduced followed by the implications for the field of social work. The chapter concluded by providing recommendations for future research on this topic. The findings from this research design help in determining where future research on this topic could be conducted more successfully. Lastly, this research demonstrates that generalizations cannot be made for

each community, as every city can have different risk factors that most affect their rates of juvenile delinquency.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Survey Instrument

Study of Juvenile Arrests

The purpose of this study is to have a better understanding about some of the reasons juveniles get arrested in Roseville. We are interested in your ideas and opinions as a police officer who works in the Roseville Police Department.

Demographics of juveniles arrested. Please fill in a percentage below; the sum of the percentages for each question should equal 100%.

The percentage of males arrested is: _____%

The percentage of females arrested is: _____%

Please list the percentages of occurrence of the ethnicity of the juvenile arrested:

Caucasian _____%

Hispanic _____%

African American _____%

Asian _____%

Other _____%

The following questions are related to questions often asked during an initial intake once a juvenile is arrested. Please check the most appropriate response.

When conducting an arrest of a juvenile, how often would you say the following conditions apply?

Please check if the particular event or condition occurred none, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75% or 76-100% of the time.

1. The juveniles arrested were under the influence of alcohol:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. The juveniles arrested were under the influence of illegal street drugs:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. The juveniles arrested were trying to obtain illegal substances:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. The juveniles arrested were trying to sell an illegal substance:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. The juveniles arrested were placed under the 5150 order:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. The juveniles stated they had or have mental or emotional problems:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. The juveniles stated they are currently or previously received psychiatric treatment:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. The juveniles stated they had been a patient in a mental hospital:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. The juveniles stated they have been treated at a regional center:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10. The juveniles stated that they have been diagnosed with developmental problems:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. The juveniles arrested stated that they were prescribed medication for developmental problems:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. The juveniles arrested stated they are currently attending school:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. The juveniles stated that they have previously had a medical condition:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

14. The juveniles stated they are currently taking medication for a medical condition:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. The juveniles arrested indicated that they lived in a single parent household:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. The juveniles arrested live with a guardian other than a biological parent:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. The juveniles arrested have one or more parent with a previous criminal history:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. The juveniles arrested currently have one or more parent incarcerated:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. More than half of the juveniles are arrested for the first time:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

20. The juveniles were previously arrested one or more times:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

21. More than half the time the juveniles arrested were for a non-violent offense:

None	1-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY

APPENDIX B

Human Subjects Approval



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
DIVISION OF SOCIAL WORK

To: Keri Elias & Elizabeth Wetzel Date: 12/2/2012

From: Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects

RE: YOUR RECENT HUMAN SUBJECTS APPLICATION

We are writing on behalf of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects from the Division of Social Work. Your proposed study, “Risk Factors to Juvenile Arrests in Roseville.”

approved as **EXEMPT** **MINIMAL RISK**

Your human subjects approval number is: 12-13-050. Please use this number in all official correspondence and written materials relative to your study. Your approval expires one year from this date. Approval carries with it that you will inform the Committee promptly should an adverse reaction occur, and that you will make no modification in the protocol without prior approval of the Committee.

The committee wishes you the best in your research.

Professors: Maria Dinis, Jude Antonyappan, Teiahsha Bankhead, Serge Lee, Kisun Nam, Maura O’Keefe, Dale Russell, Francis Yuen

Cc: Dinis

REFERENCES

- Act 4 Juvenile Justice (2009). Fact sheet: Girls and juvenile justice. Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Coalition. Washington DC. Retrieved from http://www.act4jj.org/media/factsheets/factsheet_29.pdf
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44(4), 709–716. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2729745>
- Altschuler, D. M., & Brash, R. (2004). Adolescent and teenage offenders confronting the challenges and opportunities of reentry. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 2(1), 72-87. doi: 10.1177/1541204003260048
- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.). Washington, DC.
- Ascani, N. (2012). Labeling theory and the effects of sanctioning on delinquent peer association: A new approach to sentencing juveniles. *Sociological Perspectives: University of New Hampshire*, 80-84.
- Austin, J., Dimas, J., & Steinhart, D. (1992). Over-representation of minority youth in the California juvenile justice system. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/136854NCJRS.pdf>
- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Baron, S. W. (2003). Self-control, social consequences, and criminal behavior: Street youth and the general theory of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(4), 403. doi: 10.1177/0022427803256071

- Benda, B. B., & Tollett, C. L. (1999). A study of recidivism of serious and persistent offenders among adolescents. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(2), 111-126. doi: 10.1016/s0047-2352(98)00051-8
- Becker, H. (1973). *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.
- Bright, C. L., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2010). Young adult outcomes of juvenile court involved girls. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 36(2), 94-106. doi: 10.1080/01488370903577993
- Bullis, M., Yovanoff, P., & Havel, E. (2004). The importance of getting started right: Further examination of the facility-to-community transition of formerly incarcerated youth. *Journal of Special Education*, 38(2), 80-94. Retrieved from <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/13670924/importance-getting-started-right-further-examination-facility-to-community-transition-formerly-incarcerated-youth>
- Bumpass, L. L., and Raley, R. K. (1995). Redefining single-parent families: Cohabitation and changing family reality. *Demography*, 32(1), 97-109. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2061899>
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (n.d). Juvenile justice history. Retrieved from <http://www.cjcj.org/juvenile/justice/juvenile/justice/history/0>
- Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.socialworkers.org/pubs/code/code.asp>
- Comfort, M. (2007). Punishment beyond the legal offender. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 271–296. doi 10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112829

- Committee on Adolescence (2001). Health care for children and adolescents in the juvenile correctional care system. *Pediatrics*, *107*(4), 799-803. Retrieved from <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/107/4/799.full.pdf+html>
- Criminal neglect: Substance abuse, juvenile justice and the children left behind (2004). The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. Retrieved from www.casacolumbia.org/templates/pressreleases.aspx?articleid=385&zoneid=61
- Dudley, J. R. (2011). *Research methods for social work: Being producers and consumers of research* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Eddy, J. M., & Poehlmann, J. (2010). *Children of incarcerated parents: A handbook for researchers and practitioners*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2005). Uniform Crime Reports for the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr>
- Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (2010). America's children in brief: Key national indicators of well-being. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Fite, P. J., Winn, P., & Pardini, D. A. (2009). Explaining discrepancies in arrest rates between black and white male juveniles. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *77*(5), 916-927. doi:10.1037/a0016626

- Foster, M., Qaseem, T., & Conner, T. (2004). Can better mental health services reduce the risk of juvenile justice system involvement?. *American Journal of Public Health, 94*, 859-865 Retrieved from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1448349>
- Gallagher, C. A., Dobrin, A. & Douds A., S. (2007). A national overview of reproductive health care services for girls in juvenile justice residential facilities. *Women's Health Issues, 17*(4), 217-226. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17602966>
- Hammett, R.W. (1996). HIV/AIDS and STD in juvenile facilities. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.
- Harris, P., Lockwood, B., Mengers, L., & Stoodley, B. (2011). Measuring recidivism in juvenile corrections. *Journal of Juvenile Justice, 1*(1), 1-16. Retrieved from www.journalofjuvjustice.org/JOJJO201.pdf
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Hoeve, M., H., Dubas, J., Eichelsheim, V., van der Laan, P., Smeenk, W. & Gerris, J. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37*(6): 749-775. doi: 10.1007/s10802-009-9310-8
- Huebner, B. M., Varano, S. P., & Bynum, T. S. (2007, May). Gangs, guns and drugs: Recidivism among serious, young offenders. *Criminology and Public Policy, 6*(2), 187-221. Retrieved from http://www.umsl.edu/ccj/pdfs/PPP_Huebner.pdf

- Jensen, G. F. & D. G. Rojek. (1998). *Delinquency and youth crime* (3rd ed.). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Judicial Council of California (2012). Administrative Office of the Courts. Retrieved from <http://www.courts.ca.gov/selfhelp-glossary.htm>
- Lawrence, R. & Hemmens, C. (2008). History and development of juvenile court and justice process. In *Juvenile justice*, (19-116). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Malmgren, K., Abbott, R. D., & Hawkins, J. D. (1999). LD and delinquency: Rethinking the 'link'. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 32(3), 194. Retrieved from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15508239
- Marlow, C. R. (2011). *Research Methods for Generalist Social Work* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Mbuba, J. M. (2004). *Juvenile recidivism: An analysis of race and other socio-demographic predictors within three intervention modalities in the state of Louisiana*. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Mears, D. P., Cochran, J. C., Greenman, S. J., Bhati, A. S., & Greenwald, M. A. (2011). Evidence on the effectiveness of juvenile court sanctions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(6), 509-520. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2011.09.006
- Muck, R., Zempolich, K. A., Titus, J. C., Fishman, M., Godley, M. D., & Schwebel, R. (2001). An overview of the effectiveness of adolescent substance abuse treatment models. *Youth & Society*, 33(2), 143-168. doi: 10.1177/0044118x01033002002

- Mulder, E., Brand, E., Bullens, R., & Van Marle, H. (2010). A classification of risk factors in serious juvenile offenders and the relation between patterns of risk factors and recidivism. *Criminal behavior and mental health*, 20(1), 23-38. doi: 10.1002/cbm.754
- Murray, J. (2005). The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners. In Liebling, A. & Maruna, S. *The effects of imprisonment* (442-492). Retrieved from www.bgsu.edu/downloads/cas/file77089.pdf
- Murray, J., Loeber, R., & Pardini, D. (2012). Parental involvement in the criminal justice and the development of youth theft, marijuana use, depression and poor academic performance. *Criminology*, 50(1), 255-302. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00257.x
- Myers, D. (2003). The recidivism of violent youths in juvenile and adult courts: A consideration of selection bias. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 1(1): 79-101. doi: 10.1177/1541204002238365
- Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention. (2011). *Statistical Briefing Book*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/population/qa01201.asp?qaDate=2010>
- Parent-Dale, G., Lieter, V., Kennedy, S., Livens, L., Wentworth, D. & Wilcox, S. (1994). Conditions of confinement: Juvenile detention & corrections facilities. Research Report: U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Washington, DC. Retrieved from www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/1fontmat.pdf

- Piquero, A. R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Journal of Juvenile Justice*, 18.
- Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2012). Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2011. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>
- Quinn, M. M., Rutherford, R. B., Wolford, B. I., Leone, P. E., & Nelson, C. M. (2001). The prevalence of youth with disabilities in juvenile and adult corrections: Analysis of a national survey. Washington DC: American Institutes for Research, National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/focus-area/human-social-development/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&content_id=1221
- Pope, C.E., & Snyder, H.N. (2003) Race as a factor in juvenile arrests. *OJJDP Bulletin*. Retrieved from http://cjresources.com/CJ_Juvenile_Justice_pdfs/juvenile%20justice%20and%20race%20-%20Pope%20et%20al%202003.pdf
- US Census Bureau (2009). American community survey. Retrieved from http://www.roseville.ca.us/ed/demographics/city_demographics/race_statistics.asp
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2011). *Research Methods for Social Work* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Rodriguez, N. (2007). Restorative justice at work: Examining the impact of restorative justice resolutions on juvenile recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53, 355-379. doi:10.1177/0011128705285983
- Segen, J.C. (2006). *Concise dictionary of modern medicine*. McGraw-Hill Companies.

- Shader, M. (2004). Risk factors for delinquency: An overview. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/frd030127.pdf>
- Sherman, L. W. (1993). Sanction, defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473. doi: 10.1177/0022427893030004006
- Snyder, H. N., and Sickmund, M. (2006). Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/nr2006/>
- Sobie, M., (2003). The family court: A short history. The Historical Society of the Courts of the State of New York. Retrieved from http://www.courts.state.ny.us/history/family_ct/History_Fam_Ct.htm
- Stebbins, R. A. (2001). *Exploratory Research in the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tanenhaus, D. S. (2005). Juvenile courts in *The Electronic Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/682.html>
- The American Bar Association (2011). The history of juvenile justice. ABA Division of Public Education. Retrieved from <http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/migrated/publiced/features/DYJfull.pdf-34k-2011-06-29>

- Thornberry, T. P. (2009). The apple doesn't fall far from the tree (or does it?): Intergenerational patterns of antisocial behavior—The American Society of Criminology 2008 Sutherland Address. *Criminology*, 47(2), 297–325. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00153.x
- Titus, J.J. (2005). Juvenile transfers as ritual sacrifice: Legally constructing the child scapegoat. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 3(2), 116-132. doi: 10.1177/1541204004273313
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Schuengel, C., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (1999). Disorganized attachment in early childhood: meta- analysis of precursors, concomitants, and sequelae. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11, 225–249. Retrieved from http://www.psy.miami.edu/faculty/dmessaging/c_c/rsrscs/rdgs/attach/vanIJ.Disorganization.devPsychopath99.pdf
- Visher, C., & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 89-113. doi 10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.095931
- Wiatrowski, M. D., Griswold, D. B., & Roberts, M. K. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 46(5), 525-541. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/2094936?uid=3739256&uid=2129&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21101997999477>

Wilson, J. (2007). Reducing juvenile recidivism in the United States. *Roosevelt Review*, 49-58. Retrieved from <http://www.rooseveltcampusnetwork.org/policy/reducing-juvenile-recidivism-us>

World Health Organization (2007). Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/features/qa/62/en/index.html>

U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP. (n.d.) OJJDP mission statement. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/about/mission>