

FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

BY

OLIVIA CROSBY

A thesis submitted

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Forensic Psychology

California Baptist University

School of Behavioral Sciences

2017

DEDICATION

To my family in New York, New Jersey, and Baltimore, I want to thank everyone who has been by my side since I decided to pursue my Master's Degree in 2014. I thank everyone for always encouraging me to never give up and motivating me to finish this degree strong. I'm honored to have a supporting family. To my immediate family, thanks for being my backbone when I needed to vent or wanted to just give up. All praise to my father Carlos, even though you live in Kingston, Jamaica, you have been there for me every time I needed a shoulder to cry on or some encouraging words. To my little sister Atiya, thanks for being the reason I strive to be the best I can so you can follow in the same footsteps. To my family from John Jay Cheerleading, thanks for giving me those long speeches and pushing me to the limit. Also thanks for always reminding me how much my grad school journey has inspired each one of you to pursue a Master's degree.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank my Chair, Troy Hinrichs, for helping me pick my final topic and for the final edits. I want to thank my reader, Dr. Ana Gamez, for helping me put my thesis together from start to finish. I also want to thank her for all the wonderful feedback and edits she helped me with. Without Dr. Ana Gamez, I probably would have still been trying to pass through IRB with my first thesis. Dr. Ana Gamez's helpful hand has kept me on track with my thesis and I commend her for that. Also, I want to acknowledge my other two teachers throughout previous semesters, Dr. Larsen and Dr. Aguilar.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Factors That Contribute to Juvenile Delinquency

by

Olivia Crosby

School of Behavioral Sciences

Troy Hinrichs, Professor

Thesis Committee Chairperson

2017

There are a variety of factors contributing to the delinquency of juveniles. This study examined Los Angeles Risk and Resiliency Checkup (LARCC) to determine the frequency and percentage of protective and risk factors regarding delinquency, education, family, peers, and substance use and the individual. This study included 40 LARCC records from juveniles on probation at Los Angeles Probation South Central Gang Unit. Risk factors that contributed to juvenile delinquency ranged from absentee parents, significant crime in the neighborhood, gang affiliation, and drug and alcohol use. Protective factors that helped juveniles resist delinquent behavior ranged from a supportive community, positive interaction with teachers, family support, pro-social peer relations, and able to manage stress well. Results indicated no significant correlation between the number of prior arrests and the risk level for male offenders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION.....	vi
Chapter	
1. The Problem Statement.....	[10]
a. Introduction.....	
b. Problem Statement.....	
c. Purpose of Study.....	
d. Research Questions/Objectives.....	
e. Delimitations.....	
f. Assumptions.....	
g. Definition of Key Terms.....	
2. Review of the Literature.....	[14]
a. Introduction.....	[14]
b. Factors that Contribute to Juvenile Delinquency.....	[15]
1. Poverty.....	[15]
2. Family.....	[17]

Chapter	Page
3. School	[22]
4. Neighborhood	[24]
5. Substance Use	[27]
6. Gang Affiliation	[29]
7. Resilience	[31]
3. Method.....	[34]
Participants.....	[34]
Design	[34]
Instruments	[34]
Procedure.....	[35]
Data Analysis.....	[35]
4. Results.....	[36]
Results.....	[36]
Summary.....	[36]
5. Discussion.....	[38]
Introduction.....	[38]
Conclusions.....	[38]
Limitations.....	[39]
Future Research.....	[39]
References.....	[40]
Appendices.....	[53]
A. [TABLE 1]	[54]

B. [TABLE 2]	[55]
C. [TABLE 3]	[56]
D. [TABLE 4]	[57]
E. [TABLE 5]	[58]
F. [TABLE 6]	[59]

THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

Juvenile delinquency is a persistent and pervasive social problem in America. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), youth under age 18 accounted for 14% of all arrests in 2009. Nationwide each year, police make 2.2 million juvenile arrests; 1.7 million cases are referred to juvenile courts; an estimated 400,000 youth cycle through juvenile detention centers, and nearly 100,000 youth are confined in juvenile facilities on any given night (Snyder & Sickmund, 2008).

Much research has been conducted in order to find what the protective and risk factors for delinquency are. It is commonly understood that pathways to delinquency and crime are determined by multiple factors in children's social ecologies, which are typically interrelated in complex ways (Lipsey & Derzon, 1999; Loeber & Farrington, 1998). Psychologists, sociologists, and criminologists worldwide debate on the different possible causes for this type of violence from young people. Criminologists believe juvenile delinquency encompasses all public wrongs committed by young people between the ages of 12 and 20 (World Youth Report of UN, 2003). On the other hand, sociologists view this concept more broadly by believing that it covers a multitude of different violations of legal and social norms, from minor offenses to serious crime, committed by juveniles (World Youth Report of UN, 2003). Sociologists associate the youth behavior with the home, family, neighborhood, peers, and many other variables that together or separately influence the formation of young people's social environment (World Youth Report of UN, 2003).

Numerous risk and protective factors have been identified as indicators or predictors of juvenile delinquency and those factors represent dysfunction at several levels (Shumaker, 1997), including the structure of the offender's family or the neighborhood the offender grew up in, or

even the school the offenders attended. The majority of the juveniles who suffered from these risk and protective factors ended up experiencing the juvenile justice system. This included being arrested, spending the night in juvenile hall, or being put on juvenile probation.

According to Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, probation serves as a sanction for juveniles adjudicated in court, and in many cases as a way of diverting status offenders or first-time juvenile offenders from the court system. Some communities may even use probation as a way of informally monitoring at-risk youth and preventing their progression into more serious problem behaviors (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention).

The main goal of this study was to examine the risk and protective factors of juvenile delinquency. The archival records known as the LARRC Risk of a total of 40 juvenile offenders from Los Angeles County Probation South Central Gang Unit were obtained in order to determine the frequency and percentage for protective and risk factors regarding delinquency, education, family, peers, substance use, and the individual. A Pearson r correlation was used to examine the relationship between the number of prior arrests and risk levels of male offenders. It was hypothesized that the number of prior arrests would determine the risk level for male offenders.

Purpose of the Study

The study was conducted to determine the frequency and percentage for protective and risk factors regarding delinquency, education, family, peers, substance use, and the individual risk using the LARCC. The LARCC contained a total of seven demographic questions including age, grade level, gender, ethnicity, primary language, age at first arrest, and number of prior arrests. The relationship between these variables, number of prior arrests, and risk level of male offenders was tested using Pearson's r .

Research Questions/Objectives

What is the frequency and percentage for protective and risk factors regarding delinquency education, family, peer, substance use, and the individual? Also do the number of prior arrests determine the risk level for male offenders?

Delimitations

There are several limitations in this study. First, the sample size of the archival data was small. Second, the data was descriptive and did not allow for inferential analyses to be conducted. Future research should examine the relationship between prior arrests and risk level for male offenders. However, this study lent support to the importance of having protective factors, as well as the impact that risk factors may have on the development of delinquent behavior. Further research should explore the role of family and gang affiliation to examine its relationship with juvenile arrest and incarceration at a juvenile hall. Further research should also examine the role of resiliency in delinquency and Probation Department's role in assisting juveniles with getting off probation.

Assumptions

This research was conducted on the premise that the frequency and percentage for risk factors regarding delinquency, Education, family, peer, substance use and the individual would be higher whereas the frequency and percentages of protective factors would be lower. Also, the risk factors for peer and substance use may be higher due to gang affiliation and high drug use amongst juveniles. As far as gender, the females would have medium risk levels versus the males who would have higher risk levels. Lastly, it is hypothesized that the Pearson r correlation results would be significant.

Definition of Key Terms

Juvenile delinquency: A person who is under age (usually below 18), who is found to have committed a crime in states which have declared by law that a minor lacks responsibility and thus may not be sentenced as an adult (Legal dictionary, 2017).

Individual level factors: One factor that influences an outcome. It may not be the direct cause but it has some bearing on who an individual is and what the individual does (Dictionary, 2017).

Risk factors: Something that increases the risk; conditions or variables with a lower likelihood of positive outcomes and a higher likelihood of negative or socially undesirable outcomes (Dictionary, 2017).

Protective factors: Conditions or variables associated with the likelihood of positive outcomes that lessen the likelihood of negative consequences from exposure to risk (Dictionary, 2017).

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In 2010, it was estimated that juvenile delinquency accounted for approximately 24% of total crimes committed in the United States (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). Approximately 2.5 million juveniles are arrested yearly, of which around 100,000 are for violent crimes. Juvenile involvement in violent crimes has remained roughly constant for the past two decades. Juvenile delinquency has a multiplicity of factors. Nationwide each year, police make 2.2 million juvenile arrests; 1.7 million cases are referred to juvenile courts. An estimated 400,000 youth cycle through juvenile detention centers, and nearly 100,000 youth are confined in juvenile facilities on any given night (Snyder & Sickmund, 1995).

No single risk factor can predict who is likely (or unlikely) to engage in delinquent behavior (Mmari, Blum, & Teufel-Shone 2010). The more risk factors present in a youth's life, the greater the probability of the youth committing delinquent acts (Green, Gesten, Greenwald, & Salcedo, 2008; Reingle, Jennings, & Maldonado-Molina 2012; Wasserman et al., 2003). Similarly, prolonged exposure to risk factors may increase the likelihood of adverse outcomes, and age of exposure to risk factors amplifies this relationship (Green et al., 2008; Hoeve et al., 2012). The difference between at-risk youth and high-risk youth is that at-risk youth can include any young person who is exposed to a risk factor whereas high-risk youth are exposed to multiple risk factors (Le Vries et al., 2014; Odgers et al., 2007).

There are two types of risk factors: static and dynamic. Static risk factors are those historical characteristics of juveniles that cannot be changed through treatment or programming, such as a history of violent behavior and parental criminality. Dynamic risk factors are

characteristics that can change over time because of treatment or the normal development process (Vincent, Guy, & Grisso, 2012). This study will examine different risk factors contributing to juvenile delinquency such as poverty, family, school, neighborhood, substance use, gang affiliation, and/or level of resiliency. Risk factors are correlates that are shown to predict delinquency (Kraemer et al., 1997). The five domains that risk factors are typically organized into are individual, peer, family, school, and community. Each of these five domains relate to the six different factors contributing to juvenile delinquency. Individual risk factors encompass factors associated with a child's behavior: biological disposition, psychological disposition, attitudes, values, and knowledge skills. The peers factor is based on norms, activities, and attachment. The family factor encompasses risk factors associated with function, management, bonding, abuse, and violence. The school factor focuses on binding, climate, policy, and performance. And the last domain, community, focuses on bonding norms, resources, poverty level, and crime.

Factors that Contribute to Juvenile Delinquency

Poverty

Poverty is one of the major contributing factors toward children under 18 being convicted. Poverty, along with other structural factors such as unemployment, racism and discrimination, lack of cohesion, and the flight of the middle class, is presumed to be causal factors of youth crime, particularly in urban areas (Nellis, 2005). In these areas, youth may also be more likely to witness a street crime, legitimizing it to some extent in their minds (Sampson & Wilson, 1995). Socioeconomic status is one of the most well-documented correlates of juvenile delinquency (Rekker et al., 2015). According to Rekker et al. (2015), youths from low-socioeconomic status (SES) families are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior than

youths from high-SES families. Rekker et al. mention in their study that youth growing up in poverty might lack the legitimate means to achieve desired social and economic goals. Low-SES youth may have much to gain and little to lose from offending. Jarjoura, Triplett, and Brinker's (2002) study linked poverty to delinquency and crime along with such factors as persistent unemployment, marital disruption, female-headed households, and teenage pregnancy.

Sickmund and Punnazecha (2016) stated that youth who grow up in families or communities with limited resources were at a higher risk of offending than those who were raised under more privileged circumstances. Those who were very poor or chronically poor seemed to be at an increased risk of serious delinquency. The timing of exposure to poverty was of particular importance. A meta-analysis by Hawkins, Catalano, and Miller (1992) found that family socio-economic status at ages six to 14 was a stronger predictor of a grave and violent delinquency than at ages 15 to 25. Agnew, Brezina, Wright, and Cullen (2002) found that self-reported delinquency was highest among individuals who experienced several economic problems.

In 2010, 15% of all persons in the U.S. lived at or below the poverty threshold. This proportion was far greater for individuals under age 18 (22%) than for those ages 18–64 (14%) or those above age 64 (9%) (Sickmund et al., 2014). The youngest children were the most likely to live in poverty: 21% of juveniles ages 5–17 lived in households with resources below established poverty thresholds, 26% of children under five years old did (Sickmund et al., 2014). Jarjoura et al. (2002) (as cited in Sanchez Jankowski, 1995) believed that many people living in poverty saw crime as the only opportunity for achieving a higher level of socioeconomic status. Also, some people living in poverty turned to crime as a means of surviving, and at a minimum, to maintain their current economic status. Additionally, they felt that adolescents resorted to

delinquency to enhance their financial ability to have fun. Lastly, the individual was often prepared to take whatever means were necessary to protect his or her respect and honor. Barnert et al. (2015) expressed the idea that neighborhood poverty was the most important determinant for predicting juvenile offending because, in poor neighborhoods, negative influences were more rampant.

Sampson and Laub (1994) found that family processes mediated approximately two-thirds of the effect of poverty and other structural background factors on delinquency. Namely, poverty appeared to inhibit the capacity of families to achieve informal social control, which in turn increased the likelihood of adolescent delinquency.

Family

Families are one of the strongest socializing forces in life. They teach children to control unacceptable behavior, to delay gratification, and to respect the rights of others. Conversely, families can teach children aggressive, antisocial, and violent behaviors (Wright & Wright, 1994). Researchers have examined the impact that family systems have on adolescent development (Steinberg, 2007). Family support can be an important protective factor against delinquent behavior. In some cases, however, an uncertain family environment can quickly become a risk factor that can increase proclivity towards delinquency (Harmening & Gamez, 2016). Family relationships have a significant impact on children's development. Lamb (2012) identified the relationships between children and parents/significant others and between parents/significant others as the most important social influences; attachment theory provides a theoretical explanation for this significance (e.g., Bowlby, 1953). Good relationships between parents and children are associated with active child behavioral outcomes in high-risk environments (e.g., Cummings et al., 2000).

Supportive family relationships moderate the association between exposure to violence, poverty, and everyday stressors, and, for African-American children, internalizing behavior which produces low but not high levels of risk (Li, Nussbaum, & Maryse, 2007). This pattern was termed “overwhelming-risk” by Li et al. (p. 30) after Luthar, Cicchetti, and Becker's (2000) “protective-reactive” (p. 547) classification of moderation effects because protective influences were overwhelmed by risk factors. This concept is important insofar as it relativizes overly optimistic views on resilience in cases where numerous stressors accumulate and do not leave much “space” for protective influences (Lösel & Bender, 2003).

For families with few risk factors, close mother–child relationships could enhance the emotional security of the children and have a positive impact on behavior. While not individually protective, the accumulation of benefits from support and shared responsibility could have a positive influence on the family environment, the availability of resources, parenting, and children's emotional security (e.g., Cummings et al., 2000; Lamb, 2012). The Sampson and Laub (1994) meta-analysis found that aspects of family functioning involving direct parent-child contacts were the most powerful predictors of delinquency and other juvenile conduct problems.

Researchers have also examined the role of parenting in the development of juvenile delinquency (Cashwell, 2014; Higgins, 2009; Meldrum, 2016). Meldrum et al., (2016) found that low parental self-control was correlated with various aspects of family environments and juvenile delinquency. Also, they found that association between low parental self-control and juveniles' delinquency was mediated by family circumstances. This is because parents with low self-control are less accomplished at fostering warm, nurturing family environments and properly supervising and disciplining adolescent behavior and are more likely to contribute to adolescent

delinquency. Higgins (2009) study provided evidence that parental criminal behavior was correlated with ineffective parenting and adolescent delinquency.

Family characteristics such as poor parenting skills, family size, home discord, child maltreatment, and antisocial parents are risk factors linked to juvenile delinquency (Derzon & Lipsey, 2000; Wasserman & Seracii, 2001). Cashwell et al. (2014) believe that a family influences an adolescent's interpersonal behaviors with the adolescent wanting to replicate family patterns in peer relationships.

However, in another study, Hen-Len Chung (2006) found that parenting practices were not directly related to offending. There was a definite marginal link between social cohesion and peer deviance, suggesting that neighborhood connectedness could be a factor, as that research related to youths spending time with more deviant friends being a contributing factor.

A number of specific family factors have been identified as being associated with delinquent behavior. Nye (1961) found that the connection between broken homes and delinquency was more evident for status offenses than for more serious offenses. There has been an examination of the fact that juvenile delinquents appear to come disproportionately from single parent homes (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). Schroeder et al. (2010) found that adolescents in broken homes tended to be more delinquent than youth in intact homes. The process of family dissolution was not associated with concurrent increases in offending, however.

Research findings on family size revealed that children from larger families generally engaged in more delinquency than did children from smaller families. Some evidence exists that delinquent siblings learned delinquency from other family members (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). Other studies have reported that poor quality of home life, measured by marital

adjustment and harmony within the home, affected the rate of delinquent behaviors among children more than whether or not the family was intact. Nye (1961) found the happiness of the marriage to be the key to whether or not children became involved in delinquent behaviors (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). Similarly, several studies have found a significant relationship between rejection by parents and delinquent behavior (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014).

Inadequate supervision and discipline in the home can be associated with delinquent behavior (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). The consistency of discipline within the family seems to be important in deterring delinquent behavior (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). Lack of mother's supervision, father's and mothers' erratic/harsh discipline, parental rejection, and lack of parental attachment appear to be the most important predictors of serious and persistent of delinquency (Glueck & Glueck)

Larzelere and Patterson (1990) found that socioeconomic status, parental monitoring, and parental supervision accounted for 46% of the variance in delinquent behavior. Patterson (1982, 1986) found that children raised in a coercive environment generalized this coercive interpersonal style to relationships with peers. Simons et al. (1994) reported that the presence of a coercive interpersonal style had a direct effect on the probability of involvement in delinquency, regardless of the type of peer associations. Also, aggression toward peers has been found to be a significant predictor of delinquency (Kupersmidt & Coie, 1990).

Henry et al. (2001) found that adolescents who experienced low emotional support and inconsistent discipline from their parents, compared with youths from families characterized by warm interpersonal relationships and consistent discipline, reported having more deviant friends (two years later). Earlier studies of parental involvement investigated how dysfunctional

parenting styles had an adverse effect rather than a positive effect on parental involvement with delinquents.

Farrington and colleagues (2009) found that parental convictions were significantly related to second generation male convictions and that the parenting-related processes of harsh discipline and inadequate parental supervision accounted for a portion of this association.

Thornberry et al. (2003) investigated the intergeneration continuity of antisocial behavior by drawing on data collected as part of the Rochester Youth Development Study, finding that parental antisocial behavior had a significant influence on later child antisocial behavior, and that parenting-related processes also mediated part of this relationship. Likewise, the Simons et al. (2007) study found an association between low parental self-control and officially recorded juvenile delinquency. Research also linked parental criminal behavior to adolescent delinquency via the family environment (e.g., Farrington et al., 2009; Thornberry et al., 2003).

According to a study by Barnett et al. (2015), many youths felt neglected by parents perceived as absent because the parents worked late hours, were single parents, were addicted to drugs, or were incarcerated. Also, Barnett et al. found that financial difficulties at home might promote criminal behavior, either because youth wanted items that their families could not afford or because they wanted to help their parents with finances. Jackson and Knepper (2013) found no difference between children who had working mothers and those children whose mothers didn't work. Jackson & Knepper (2013) concluded that the primary important factor was not whether the mothers worked but how they spent time with their children.

Youth ages 10 to 17 who had engaged in delinquent behavior in the past year reported higher rates of exposure to violence than their peers who reported little or no delinquent behavior

(OBJJD, 2015). Youth who have been exposed to violence were at a higher risk of engaging in criminal behavior as adolescents (OBJJD, 2015).

School

Barnert et al. (2015) expressed that participants described an ideal school as a safe place that teaches practical skills for achieving success in life. Most, however, reported that their schools felt unsafe because of gang activity and bullying, leading many youths in their communities to protect themselves by joining gangs, carrying weapons, or avoiding school (Barnert et al., 2015).

Kandel et al. (1988) found that high-risk individuals often did not become involved in antisocial behavior because of the positive reinforcement that education provided. Maguin and Loeber's (2008) meta-analysis of studies of academic performance and delinquency found that children with lower academic performance committed more delinquent acts, committed more serious delinquent acts, and had a longer offending history than those with higher academic performance. Felson and Staff (2006) used the National Education Longitudinal study and concluded that academic performance and delinquency had a spurious relationship.

According to Carson and Butcher (1992), these high-risk individuals may be engaging in an antisocial behavior because they are not focusing their time and energy on more socially acceptable behavior such as their academic performance. Similarly, in the Barnert et al. (2015) study, several participants stated that poor school performance sets youths on a critical pathway because they feel frustrated, resulting in a bad attendance or dropping out.

Peer pressure was another issue the participants discussed (Barnert et al., 2015). They cited peer pressure as a negative aspect of the school environment, stating that efforts to fit in often lead to delinquency. Lastly, although they recognized that teachers could play a prominent

role in promoting positive behaviors, most felt that teachers gave up on them too easily (Barnert et al., 2015).

School failure is directly related to delinquency. Those adolescents who fail in school seek out peers who also are not succeeding in school (Bartollas &Schmalleger 2014). School failure brings disapproval from family and teachers. School failure can also create psychological problems with youth, and these negative feelings toward self are the real cause of the delinquent acts (Bartollas &Schmalleger, 2014). School failure and delinquency also share a common cause, such as poverty, drugs, family disruption, or gangs (Bartollas & Schmalleger, 2014). Lastly, the school has a role in school failure. The school can contribute to student alienation; dividing students into groups according to achievement level and ability has been a contributing cause to school failure (Bartollas &Schmalleger, 2014).

In America today, millions of young people are alone and unsupervised in the hours after school, before parents return home from work. This situation places children and teens at grave risk for juvenile crime, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, and other problems. Statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau found that 15 million kids have nothing to do once they are released from school (Aschkenazi, Bryant, Chuo, Duggins, & Letman, 2012) Studies by the FBI found that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 2 p.m. to 8 p.m. (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2000). The after-school period from 2:00-8:00 p.m. is the time that teenagers are most likely to commit crimes, be victims of crime, get in an automobile accident, engage in sex, smoke, drink, or use drugs. (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2000). About in one in five of all violent crimes with juvenile victims occurs between three in the afternoon and seven at night on a school day. Language development is also linked to delinquency. Herrenkohl and colleagues (2001) note that children with low academic performance, low commitment to school, and low

educational aspirations during elementary and middle school grades are at higher riskier for youth delinquency than are other children.

Neighborhood

Participants in a study conducted by Barnert et al. (2015) described their ideal neighborhood as peaceful and quiet, with abundant nature and parks, and where community members were friendly and attentive to one another. However, they described their communities as “ugly,” a “ghetto,” with “lots of gangs, shootings, and murder going around.” They explained that neighborhoods strongly promoted crime. When not at home or in school, however, youths spent most of their time there (Barnert et al., 2015). One youth expressed that, If the home was bad and school was bad, that youths would end up on the streets, and inevitably, in jail (Barnert et al., 2015).

Ingoldsby et al. (2006) demonstrated that deviant peer relationships within the child’s neighborhood exacerbated the trajectory (additive effect) of early-starting antisocial child behavior for children who had experienced early parent-child conflict and neighborhood disadvantage (neighborhood poverty and neighborhood problems such as unemployment and abandoned homes). The assumed mechanism for this relationship was that negative neighborhood peer relationships may have provided the context in which neighborhood norms and values affected child behaviors (Ingoldsby & Shaw, 2002; Ingoldsby et al., 2006)

Duncan and Hirschfield (2001) confirmed that neighborhoods characterized by structural disadvantage evidenced high rates of juvenile crime and youth violence and that these associations were largely explained by social processes that took place within communities. Neighborhood structural and social characteristics have also been linked to processes in the family and peer groups (Tolan et al., 2003). Tolan et al. found that weak neighborhood structural

and social characteristics were indirectly related to gang membership through their effects on parenting practices (low monitoring, harsh discipline, and low parental involvement) and that gang affiliation mediated the influence of ineffective parenting behavior on individual violence. Hen-Len Chung (2006) found that community factors accounted for only a small portion of the overall variance in juvenile offending. Other studies have found that youth in high-poverty neighborhoods were more likely to be involved in property offenses (Kingston, Huizinga, & Elliott, 2009) Disorganized communities tended to exacerbate the frequency of violent acts (Burman 2003). A McCord et al. (2001) study found a powerful connection between residing in an adverse environment and participating in criminal acts. Tiet, Huizinga, and Byrnes' (2009) results showed that youths were deemed high-risk by virtue of living in neighborhoods that had the highest crime rates among socially disorganized neighborhoods.

Multiple twin studies have found that genetic influences on delinquency and related behaviors (e.g., drinking) were magnified among teenagers with deviant peers (Boardman et al., 2008; Button et al., 2007, 2009; Fowler et al., 2007; Guo, Elder, Cai, & Hamilton, 2009; Harden et al., 2008; Hicks, South, Dirago, Iacono, & McGue, 2009) According to Mann et al. (2015), teenagers whose friends engaged in delinquent behaviors were more likely than teenagers without such friends to engage in delinquency themselves.

Research shows that adolescents may select friends partly by delinquency itself or by correlated behaviors and traits (Mann et al., 2015). As children start associating with deviant peers, they are also likely to adopt more tolerant views of delinquent behavior (Pardini, Loeber, & Stouthamer- Loeber, 2005). According to Ferguson & Meehan (2011), children are exposed to delinquent behavior when they reside in problematic neighborhoods or experience negative life events, and delinquent peer associations may further model, reinforce, and provide

opportunities for a child to engage in such delinquent behaviors. Thus, peer delinquency is expected to exacerbate the influence of both neighborhood problems and negative life events on child delinquency (Ferguson & Meehan, 2011). Delinquent peer affiliations are one of the strongest proximal predictors of child delinquency (Ferguson & Meehan, 2011). Rankin and Quane (2002) also found that neighborhood characteristics were related to peer deviance.

Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn's (2004) study was based on social organization theory. The study stated that the majority of crimes committed by teenagers occurred in groups and that youths' association with deviant peers may be the best predictor of participation in future, potentially more serious forms, of antisocial activity. A Thornberry et al. (2003) study found perceived delinquent peer association was a robust predictor of gang affiliation; however, it was not effective in predicting the duration of gang membership. Gatti et al. (2005) also found that association with deviant peers was a significant predictor in gang membership.

Lachman, Roman, and Cahill (2013) expressed that peer groups could offer youth friendship and emotional and social support, as well as an escape from other aspects of their lives. Also, some youth may seek out prosocial peers as a way to avoid negative influences in their homes, while others may associate with antisocial peers despite a positive home environment (Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 2000) Lachman, Roman, and Cahill (2013) stated the influence of delinquent peers on individual delinquent activity remained one of the strongest and most consistent findings in the youth offending literature. Research has also shown that certain components of peer groups, such as the amount of time youth spend together, was relevant to understanding how youth form peer groups and the group's relationship to individuals' delinquent behavior (Greene & Banerjee, 2008).

According to Larsen (2015), peer pressure is a factor that contributes to juvenile delinquency. Juveniles have an irresistible pressure to conform to the group's norms. In contrast, most junior high and high school students resist negative peer pressure (Larsen, 2015) Peer pressure is most effective when standards are not clear-cut. Subjective standards such as taste in music and clothing are examples. This is also true for smoking, drinking, and drug usage. Lipsey and Derzon (1998) noted that for youth ages 12-14, a key predictor variable for delinquency is the presence of antisocial peers. According to McCord (2001) and colleagues “factors such as peer delinquent behavior, peer approval of delinquent behavior, attachment or allegiance to peers, time spent with peers, and peer pressure for deviance have all been associated with adolescent antisocial behavior” . Involvement with delinquent peers is a risk factor for higher levels of antisocial behavior; however, when the prior antisocial behaviors are controlled, involvement with delinquent peers no longer significantly predicts antisocial behavior.

Substance Use

Youthful offenders demonstrate elevated rates of substance abuse in comparison to non-offending youth (Tripodi & Bender, 2011) According to Neff and Waite (2007), substance abuse often increased recidivism and reflected a deeper involvement in the juvenile justice system. Tripodi (2011) stated that drug and alcohol use also increased the likelihood that a youthful offender would have prolonged interaction with the juvenile justice system. In addition, substance abuse produced antisocial behavior in youth (Young, 2007). Severe substance abuse was associated with increased rates of offending and more serious offenses. Furthermore, the younger the child was at the onset of substance use usually reflected greater probabilities for severe and chronic offending (Tripodi, 2011).

A 2011 report by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) drew attention to the fact that research has consistently found that substance abuse among adolescents was linked to serious juvenile offending. This finding was supported by research from OJJDP *Pathways to Desistance* study. This study is still currently going, in which the researchers follow 1354 serious juvenile offenders, male and female, ages 14 to 18, for seven years after their adjunction as delinquents. This study intends to explore factors that lead youths who commit serious offenses to continue offending or to desist from offending. Some factors seen within this study are individual maturation, drug involvement, life changes, and involvement with the criminal justice system. This study also is finding that the presence of a drug or alcohol disorder and the level of substance use are both shown to be strongly and independently related to the level of self-reported offending and the number of arrests.

Substance use amongst adolescents has dropped dramatically since the late 1970s. However, marijuana use among teens rose in 2011 for the fourth straight year. (Schmallenger & Bartollas, 2011) Drug use has significantly increased among high-risk youths and is becoming commonly linked to juvenile law breaking (Schmalleger & Bartollas, 2011). According to the National Survey on drug Use and health, an estimated 22.6 million Americans ages 12 or older were current illicit drug users.

Substance-abusing children in the juvenile justice system usually exhibit a multitude of psychosocial and clinical problems (Henggeler,1997). These various problems can make youthful offenders a challenging subset to treat (Henggeler,1997). Many of these children come from economically disadvantaged homes (Henggeler,1997). Moreover, it is common for these children to struggle with co-occurring psychiatric disorders (Tripodi,2011). Though treating

youthful offenders for substance abuse can be challenging, the return on society's investment is worth the effort.

Gang Affiliation

Dong and Khorn's (2015) study found that studies in a growing number of cities revealed that "gangs are loosely organized groups that are constantly changing consolidating, reorganizing, and splintering". On the other hand, Esbensen et al. (2001) found that members of gangs that were somewhat organized (with initiation rites, established leaders, and symbols or colors) self-reported higher rates of delinquency and involvement in more serious delinquent acts than other youths. Papachristos' (2009) study found that Youth gangs persisted in part because they fulfilled certain needs of their members, including the desire for status, sense of belonging, perceived protection, or respect. Derogation by one of their members resulted in "collective honor," which demanded immediate, aggressive, and violent responses.

Gangs are conflict groups, and their members make sure to fight to protect what is theirs. Fighting is status oriented involving members of the same gang more so than status oriented to competing gangs (Bellair & McNulty, 2009). Gang affiliation can be considered to define someone's status within a group of peers or community (Bellair & McNulty, 2009). A gang member's social support system consists and relies on support from other gang members (Bellair & McNulty, 2009). Byrnes et al. (2011) mentioned that gangs were based on strong social networks and trust that provided resources to members; they imposed shared norms, but these resources were related to unhealthy behaviors. Tolan et al. (2003) found that gang membership fully mediated the link between parenting practices and levels of individual violence, and given the nature of the present sample, it was likely that they captured more serious forms of delinquency than have other studies using community adolescents.

Dong and Khron's 2016 study found that evidence suggested that gangs functioned in crime-facilitating contexts. Also, Dong and Khron's study found that the link between gang membership and offending held across time, geographic and national boundaries, sex or race/ethnicity division, definitions of gangs and gang membership, and different measurements of offending. Warr (2002) found that perceived delinquent peer association was one of the strongest predictors of criminal offending, especially in adolescent years. Decker et al. (2013) also found that perceived peer association served as a noted risk factor for gang participation and associated increased levels of deviant behaviors next to other risk factors.

A study by Thornberry et al. (2003) compiled gang members' responses regarding their motivation for joining a gang in Rochester, NY. More than half of these gang youths specified friends/family members in the gang as the primary reason they joined. Klein and Maxon (2006) summarized the differences between gang and nongang youths in the reasons they selected for joining their primary peer group in San Diego and Long Beach, CA, USA. Friend being a member was one of the reasons more commonly identified by gang boys. Although many of these groups were involved in occasional delinquent behavior, they lacked a commitment to a criminal orientation. They formed temporarily over a special issue then were disbanded and never seen again. "These adolescent groups lack the size, formal organization, and permanence of youth gangs and their delinquency is typically not as frequent, serious, or violent" (Howell 2012, p. 62).

McDaniel (2012) found that gang affiliation facilitated an increase in antisocial behaviors (e.g., excessive substance abuse, more severe criminal behavior) through peer pressure. Youth gangs persist in part because they fulfill certain needs of their members, including the desire for status, sense of belonging, perceived protection, or respect (Papachristos, 2009). Children who

join gangs do so for various reasons but primarily because the gang functions as substitute family (Jackson & Knepper, 2013) They receive the security protection and love that they may not be able to attain in their biological families (Jackson & Knepper, 2013). Gang members treat the gang as they would treat their genetic families (Jackson & Knepper, 2013). Shockingly, Zahn et al. (2008a) found that Gang membership was associated with more violent behavior among females.

Klein and Maxson (2006) discussed that the most enduring finding from the study was that gang affiliated youth committed more crimes, especially violent drug and weapon-related offenses, and were more delinquent than youth who never been involved in gangs. Esbensen et al. (2001) found that gang members reported increasing involvement in illegal activity as definitions became more restrictive. Curry, Decker, and Egley's (2002) study found that youth who reported being loosely associated with gangs or who had friends in gangs had lower offending rates than gang members, and at higher rates than youth with no gang affiliation.

Gang membership is considered to be a major cause of deviant behavior, with normative structures and group processes seen as significant facilitators of delinquency (Krohn & Thornberry, 2008) The Rochester Youth Development Study found that rates of violent delinquency increased substantially when the youth joined gangs and decreased when they left the gang (Thornberry et al., 1993).

Resilience

Despite the other factors, a factor that can be undermined is the level of personal resilience. Resiliency is the ability to recover strength and spirit under adversity in both internal (self) and external (family, school, community, and peer relations) domains for a positive outcome. National Center for Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice Research on resilience

is continually growing, and a focus on economic policies or individual factors may be most useful in some areas of resilience research (Seccombe, 2001). Ungar, Teram, and Picketts (2001) recognized the need for a community focus about resilience to delinquent behavior and crime. Currently, the concept of resilience is seen as a “personal” characteristic but more as a social construct (i.e., characteristics and mechanisms but which resistance to adversity are achieved) (Ungar, 2004). Smith and Carlson (1997) characterized resilience in three different ways. It has been equated with coping, and defined as an effort to restore or maintain internal or external equilibrium under significant threat by means of human activities including thought and action.

Resilience has also been viewed as the recovery in the face of trauma such as abuse or injury. Finally, resilience has been defined as the presence of protective factors or processes that moderate the relationship between stress and risk on the one hand, and copying or competence on the other. Individual factors related to resilience in the face of stress and risk include the child’s temperament or disposition. Resilient children are adept at seeking out and gaining the support of the adults.

Mota and Matos (2005) found that the quality of relationship with significant figures was positively associated with resilience and may play an important role in preventing deviant behavior. However, the quality of relationship to significant figures was negatively associated with deviant behavior. Drapeau, Saint-Jacques, Lépine, Bégin, and Bernard (2007) recognized that the quality of the bonds of youth in the institutional environment was significant in the growth of resilient youth; namely through the development of feelings of self-efficacy and the adoption of adaptive lives. Through the analysis of case studies, Dalbem and Dell’Aglia (2008) noted that the institution could be a place of new significant affective relationships and therefore helped the development of the resilience process among youth. As resilience is a developmental

construction intimately related to attachment (Bowlby, 1969), mediation was expected. So part of the variance in the dimension of the quality of relationship to significant figures that explained the avoidance of deviant behaviors seemed to be explained by the intervention of resilience.

Tiet, Huizinga, and Byrnes (2009) examined longitudinal data of 877 youths from the Denver Youth survey to identify predictors of resilience, longitudinal interrelations among predictors, and bi-directional relationships between resilience and life context factors. Resilience was longitudinally predicted by bonding to family and teachers, involvement in extracurricular activities, lower levels of parental discord, fewer adverse life events, and being less involved with delinquent peers (Tiet et al., 2009). A positive feedback loop was found, in which resilience predicted further resilience. Youths who had higher levels of functioning despite the detrimental effects of high-risk neighborhoods were considered resilient, as indicated by higher levels of adjustment (higher levels of academic achievement, self-esteem, and psychosocial functioning) and lower levels of antisocial behavior (lower levels of gang involvement, delinquent behavior, and substance use (Tiet et al., 2009)

Chapter 3

METHOD

Participants

This study used the archival records of a total of 40 juvenile offenders that had been under the supervision of a County Probation Department in Southern California. All of the offenders had been assigned to the Probation Departments' gang unit. A total of 93% were male ($n = 37$), and 8% were female ($n = 3$). Participants ranged between 14 to 19 years of age ($M = 17$, $SD = 1.18$). The grade levels for this sample ranged from 7th grade through college. A total of 3% ($n = 1$) were in the 7th grade, 5% ($n = 2$) were in the 8th grade, 23% ($n = 9$) were in the 9th grade, 28% ($n = 11$) were in the 10th grade, 23% ($n = 9$) were in the 11th grade, 15% ($n = 6$) were in the 12th grade, and 5% ($n = 2$) were a freshman in college. The ethnicity breakdown was as follows: A total of 43% ($n = 17$) were Hispanic, and 58% ($n = 23$) were African American. The primary language breakdown was as follows: A total of 93% ($n = 37$) of juveniles had English as a primary language, and only 8% ($n = 3$) had Spanish as a primary language. The age at first arrest ranged from 10 to 17 years of age ($M = 14$, $SD = 1.75$). The number of prior arrests ranged from 0-15 times ($M = 5$, $SD = 3.71$).

Design

A correlational research design was used in this study.

Instruments

The study was conducted to determine the frequency and percentage for protective and risk factors regarding delinquency, education, family, peer, substance use and the individual.

This study used the LARRC. The LARRC contained a total of seven demographic questions including age, grade level, gender, ethnicity, primary language, age at first arrest and number of prior arrest.

Procedure

A total of forty LARRC records were obtained and analyzed. The data was entered into IBM SPSS statistical program. The information from the LARRC survey was used to determine the frequency and percentage for each of the protective and risk factors of delinquency, education, family, peer, substance use and the individual, and to examine the relationship between prior arrests and offender risk level.

Data Analysis

IBMS SPSS statistical program was used to analyze the data. A Pearson r correlation was used to examine the relationship between the number of prior arrests and risk levels for male offenders.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

Table 1 (Appendix A) shows frequency and percentages of delinquency for both protective and risk factors. Only 20% reported having support/reinforcement in the community. Only 22.5% reported prosocial adult relations. A higher percentage reported a lack of participation in faith within the community, whereas a lower percentage reported somewhat participation in faith within the community. Only 5% reported having no prior arrest, while 90% reported having a prior arrest. A total of 70% reported having a delinquency orientation, and only 15% reported somewhat or no delinquency orientation.

Table 2 (Appendix B) shows the frequency and percentage of education for both protective and risk factors. Only 20% reported having school engagement/bonds, whereas 48% reported a lack of school engagement/bonds. A total of 68% reported no attachments with academic achievers. A total of 55% reported having poor academic achievement, whereas only 20% reported having a positive academic achievement. A total of 53% reported having disruptive classroom/school behavior and 23% reported not having disruptive classroom/school behavior.

Table 3 (Appendix C) shows the frequency and percentage of family for both protective and risk factors. Only 35% reported having communications with family. Only 13% reported being involved in family activities, while 58% reported a lack of involvement in family activities. A total of 40% reported poor relationships with parents, and 50% reported having a chaotic family.

Table 4 (Appendix D) shows the frequency and percentage of peer for both protective and risk factors. Only 15% reported having prosocial peer relations. Also 50% reported having no values dignity/rights of others. A total of 90% reported having gang affiliations/associations. Also 90% reported having delinquent friends.

Table 5 (Appendix E) shows the frequency and percentages of substance use for both protective and risk factors. Only 27.5% reported their parents somewhat model healthy moderation. Only 10% reported effectively managing peer pressure. A total of 55% reported difficulty managing stress. A total of 40% reported a pattern of alcohol abuse and 32% reported no to a pattern of alcohol abuse. A total of 48% reported using mood altering substances other than alcohol. A higher percentage reported yes to early onset of substance abuse over the age of 13, whereas a lower percentage reported somewhat an onset of substance abuse over the age of 13.

Table 6 (Appendix F) shows the frequency and percentages for individual for both protective and risk factors. Only 48% reported having no values of honesty and integrity. Only 10% reported having self-control. A total of 50% reported limited to no prosocial interests including employment. Only 15% reported no supportive delinquency, whereas, 53% reported having supportive delinquency. A total of 58% reported having anger management issues.

A Pearson r correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between the number of prior arrests and risk level for male offenders. A positive linear trend between risk level and prior arrests was hypothesized. The results were not significant.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

This study was descriptive and examined the frequency by which protective and risk factors of juvenile delinquency such as education, family, peer associations, substance use, and factors contributing to the individual occurred. The findings highlight the importance of understanding the impact and ramifications of the role that risk factors have on the development of juvenile delinquency. For example, in this study, poverty, family, neighborhood, and peers, including gang affiliation, were risk factors among some of the juvenile records reviewed. These findings were broadly consistent with prior research (Jarjoura et al., 2002; Rekker et al., 2015; Sickmund & Punnazecha, 2016). Rekker et al. (2015) for example, found that youths from low-socioeconomic status (SES) families were more likely to engage in delinquent behavior than youths from high-SES families. Also, youth growing up in poverty might lack the legitimate means to achieve desired social and economic goals. The results of this study showed that 45% of participants had no supportive reinforcement in the community, which resulted from either growing up in poverty or parents being a factor to the juvenile's life. According to Jarjoura et al. many people living in poverty view crime as the only opportunity for achieving a higher level of socioeconomic status.

Conclusions

These findings were consistent with the results of this study. Results of this study indicated that 90% of the juveniles had prior arrests. Eighty-percent of juveniles had significant crime in their neighborhoods. However, these findings run counter to the expressed view that neighborhood poverty was the most important determinant for predicting juvenile offending because, in poor neighborhoods, negative influences were more rampant (Barnett et al., 2015).

Although these findings were generally compatible with the results of this study, there was one researcher who had a different conclusion. In his study, Hen-Len Chung (2006) found that community factors accounted for only a small portion of the overall variance in juvenile offending.

Limitations

There were several limitations in this study. First, the sample size of the archival data was small. Second, the data was descriptive and did not allow for inferential analyses to be conducted. Future research should examine the relationship between prior arrests and risk level for male offenders. However, this study lent support to the importance of having protective factors, and the impact that risk factors may have on the development of delinquent behavior.

Future Research

Further research should explore the role of family and gang affiliation to examine its relationship with juvenile arrest and incarceration at a juvenile hall. Further research should also examine the role of resiliency in delinquency and the Probation Department's role in assisting juvenile's with getting off probation.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R., Brezina, T., Wright, J. P., & Cullen, F. T. (2002). Strain, personality traits, and delinquency: Extending general strain theory. *Criminology*, *40*, 43–72.
- Aschkenazi, J., Bryant, J., Chuo, S., Duggins, A., & Letman, S. T. Reducing Juvenile Delinquency. *Journal of Global Intelligence & Policy* *5.6*, 22-26.
- Barnert, E. S., Perry, R., Azzi, V. F., Shetgiri, R., Ryan, G., Dudovitz, R., . . . Chung, P. J. (2015). Incarcerated youths’ perspectives on protective factors and risk factors for juvenile offending: A qualitative analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, *105*(7), 1365-1371.
- Bartollas, C., & Schmallegger, F. (2014). *Juvenile delinquency*. Boston: Prentice Hall.
- Bellair, P.E., & McNully, T.L. (2009). Gang membership, drug selling, and violence in neighborhood context. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, *26*(4), 644-669.
- Benard, B. (1996). Resilience research: A foundation for youth development. *New Designs for Youth Development*, *12*(3), 4-10.
- Bilchik, S. (1999). Juvenile justice: A century of change [Electronic Version]. National Report Series, *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Blokland A.A.J., & Nieuwebeerta P. The effects of life circumstances on longitudinal trajectories Of offending. *Criminology*, *43*, 1203–1240.
- Boardman, J.D., Saint Onge, J.M., Haberstick, B.C., Timberlake, D.S., & Hewitt, J.K. (2008). Do schools moderate the genetic determinants of smoking? *Behavioral Genetics*, *38*(3), 234-246.
- Borowski, A. (2003). Danger of strong causal reasoning. In juvenile justice policy and practice.

- Australian Social Work*, 56(4), 340-351.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*. New York: Basic Books.
- Burman, M. (2003). Challenging conceptions of violence: A view from the girls. *Sociology Review*, 13(4), 2–6.
- Button, T. M., Corley, R. P., Rhee, S. H., Hewitt, J. K., Young, S. E., & Stallings, M. C. (2007). Delinquent peer affiliation and conduct problems: A twin study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 116, 554–564.
- Byrnes, H. F., Chen, M. J., Miller B. A., & Maguin, E. (2007). The relative importance of mothers' and youths' neighborhood perceptions for youth alcohol use and delinquency. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, ;36, 649–659.
- Carson, R., & Butcher, J. (1992). *Abnormal psychology and modern life*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N. P., Hancox, R., & Harrington, H. (2007). Prediction of differential adult health burden by conduct problem subtypes in males. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 64, 1–9.
- Odgers, C. L., Milne, B., Caspi, A., Crump, R., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T. E. (2007). Predicting prognosis for the conduct-problem boy: Can family history help? *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 46, 1240–1249.
- Cornell, D. G., Peterson, C. S., & Richards, H. (1999). Anger as a predictor of aggression among incarcerated adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(1), 108-115.
- Corcoran, K. M., Farb, N., Anderson, A., Segal, Z.V., & Kring, A. M. (2010). D. M. Sloan (Ed), *Emotion regulation and psychopathology: A transdiagnostic approach to etiology and treatment* (pp. 339-355). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

- Curry, G. D., Decker, S. H., & Egley, A., Jr. (2002). Gang involvement and delinquency in a middle school population. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*(2), 275-292.
- Dalbem, J. X., & Dell'Aglio, D. (2008). Attachment in institutionalized adolescents: Resilience processes in development of new affective bonds. *Psico*, *39*, 33–40.
- Delisi, M., Vaughn, M. G., Gentile, D. A., Anderson, C. A., & Shook, J. J. (2013). Violent video games, delinquency, and youth violence. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *11*(2), 132-142.
- Derzon, J. H., & Lipsey, M. W. 2000. *The correspondence of family features with a problem, aggressive, criminal and violent behavior*. Unpublished manuscript. Nashville, TN: Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University.
- Dong, B., Gibson, C. L., & Krohn, D. M. (2015). Gang membership in a developmental and life-course perspective. In S. H. Decker & D. C. Pyrooz (Eds.), *The handbook of gangs* (pp. 78–97). London: Wiley.
- Drapeau, S., Saint-Jacques, M. C., Lépine, R., Bégin, G., & Bernard, M. (2007). Processes that contribute to resilience among youth in foster care. *Journal of Adolescence*, *30*(6), 977–999.
- Duncan, G. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1999). Assessing the effects of context in studies of child and youth development. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*, 29–41.
- Esbensen, F.-A., Winfree, L. T., He, N., & Taylor, T. J. (2001). Youth gangs and definitional issues: When is a gang a gang, and why does it matter? *Crime & Delinquency*, *47*, 113-130.
- Farrington, D. P., Coid, J. W., Murray, J. (2009). Family factors in the intergenerational

- transmission of offending. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 19, 109-124.
- Felson, R. B., & Staff, J. (2006). Explaining the academic performance-delinquency relationship. *Criminology*, 44, 299–320.
- Ferguson, C. J., & Meehan, D. C. (2011). With friends like these...: Peer delinquency influences across age cohorts on smoking, alcohol, and illegal substance use. *European Psychiatry*, 26, 6-12
- Ford, J., Chapman, J., Mack, M., & Pearson, G. (2006). Pathways from traumatic child victimization to delinquency: Implications for juvenile permanency court proceedings and decisions. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, Winter, 13-26.
- Fowler, T., Shelton, K., Lifford, K., Rice, F., McBride, A., Nikolov, I., . . . van den Bree, M. B. (2007). Genetic and environmental influences on the relationship between peer alcohol use and own alcohol use in adolescents. *Addiction*, 102, 894 –903.
- Garbarino, J. (1995) Raising children in a socially toxic environment. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Green, A. E., Gesten, E. L., Greenwald, M. A., & Salcedo, O. (2008). Predicting delinquency in adolescence and young adulthood: A longitudinal analysis of early risk factors. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 6(4), 323–42.
- Greene, K., & Banerjee, S. C. (2008). Adolescents' responses to peer smoking offers: The role of sensation seeking and self-esteem. *Journal of Health Communication: International Perspectives*, 13, 267–286.
- Harmening, W. M., & Gamez, A. M. (2016). *Forensic psychology*. Boston: Pearson.

- Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Implications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*, 64–105.
- Henggeler, S. W. (1997b). The development of effective drug abuse services for youth. In J. A. Egertson, D. M. Fox, & A. I. Leshner (Eds.), *Treating drug abusers effectively* (pp. 253-279). New York: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hennessey, K. D., Ford, J. D., Mahoney, K., Ko, S.J., & Siegfried, C. B. (2001). *Trauma among girls in the juvenile justice system*. Los Angeles, CA: National Child Traumatic Stress Network, Juvenile Justice Working Group; 2004.
- Henry, D. B., Tolan, P. H., & Gorman-Smith, D. (2001). Longitudinal family and peer group effects on violence and nonviolent delinquency. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *30*, 172–186.
- Herrenkohl, T.L., Hawkins, J.D., Chung, I., Hill, K.G., & Battin-Pearson, S. 2001. School and community risk factors and interventions. In *Child delinquents: Development, intervention, and service needs*, edited by R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 211–246.
- Higgins, G. E. (2009). Parental criminality and low self-control: An examination of delinquency. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *22*, 141-152.
- Hoeve, M., Stams, G., van der Put, C., Dubas, J. S., van der Laan, P., H, & Gerris, J. (2012). A meta-analysis of attachment to parents and delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *40*(5), 771–85.

- Howell, J. C., & Decker, S. H. (1999). *The youth gangs, drugs, and violence connection: Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Youth Gang Series*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Howell, J. C., Moore, J. P., & Egley, A. Jr. (2001). The changing boundaries of youth gangs. In C. R. Huff (Ed.), *Gangs in America III* (pp. 3-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Howell, J. C. (2006a). The impact of gangs on communities. *NYGC Bulletin No. 2*. Tallahassee, FL: National Youth Gang Center.
- Ingoldsby, E. M., & Shaw, D. S. (2002). Neighborhood contextual factors and early-starting antisocial pathways. *Clinical and Family Psychological Review, 5*, 21-55.
- Ingoldsby, E. M., Shaw, D. S., Winslow, E., Schonberg, M., & Criss, M. M. (2006). Neighborhood disadvantage, parent-child conflict, neighborhood peer relationships, and early antisocial behavior problem trajectories. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*, 303-319.
- Kingston B, Huizinga D, Elliott DS. (2009). A test of social disorganization theory in high-risk urban neighborhoods. *Youth and Society, 41*(1), 53–79.
- Klein, M. W., & Maxson, C. L. (2006). *Street gang patterns and policies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kraemer, H.C., Kazdin, A. E., Offord, D. R., Kessler, R.C., Jensen, P. S., & Kupfer, D. J. (1997). Coming to terms with the terms of risk. *Arch Gen Psychiatry, 54*, 337–43

- Kupersmidt, J. B., & Coie, J. D. (1990). Preadolescent peer status, aggression, and school adjustment as predictors of externalizing problems in adolescence. *Child Development, 61*, 1350-1362
- Jackson, M. S., & Knepper, P. (2003). *Delinquency and justice: A cultural perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jarjoura, G. R., Triplett, R. A., & Brinker, G. P. (2002) Growing up poor: Examining the link Between persistent childhood poverty and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 18*(2), 159–187.
- Lachman, P., Roman, C. G., & Cahill, M. (2012). Assessing youth motivations for joining a peer group as factors for delinquent and gang behavior. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 11*(3), 212-229.
- Larzelere, R., & Patterson, G. R. (1990). Parental management: Mediator of the effect of socioeconomic status on early delinquency. *Criminology, 28*, 301-323.
- Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2004). Diversity in developmental trajectories across adolescence neighborhood influences. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* (pp. 451-486). New York: John Wiley & Son.
- Li S. T., Nussbaum K. M., & Richards H. R. (2007). Risk and protective factors for urban African-American youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*–35.
- Lipsey, M.W., & Derzon, J.H. (1998). Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood: A synthesis of longitudinal research. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions* (pp. 86–105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (Eds.) (1998). *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lösel F., & Bender D. (2003). Protective factors and resilience. In D. P. Farrington & J. W. Coid (Eds.), *Early prevention of adult anti-social behavior* (pp. 130–204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lösel, F., & Bender, D. (2006). Risk factors for serious juvenile violence. In A. Hagell & R. Jeyarah Dent (Eds.), *Children who commit acts of serious interpersonal violence: Messages for practice* (pp. 42–72). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000) The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology*, *12*, 857-885.
- Maas, C., Herrenkohl, T. I., & Sousa, C. (2008). Review of research on child maltreatment and violence in youth. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*. *9*, 56–67.
- Mann, F. D., Kretsch, N., Tackett, J. L., Harden, K. P., & Tucker-Drob, E. M. (2015). Person environment interactions on adolescent delinquency: Sensation seeking, peer deviance and parental monitoring. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *76*, 129–134.
- McCord, J., Widom, C.S., & Crowell, N.A. (Eds.). (2001). *Juvenile crime, juvenile justice. Panel on juvenile crime: Prevention, treatment, and control*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- McDaniel, D. D. (2012). Risk and protective factors associated with gang affiliation among high-risk youth: A public health approach. *Injury Prevention*.
- Melde, C., & Esbensen, F. A. (2011). Gang membership as a turning point in the life course. *Criminology*, *49*, 513-552.
- Melde, C., & Esbensen, F. A. (2012). Gangs and violence: Disentangling the impact of gang

- membership on the level and nature of offending. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*.
- Meldrum, R. C., Young, J. T. N., & Weerman, F. M. (2012). Changes in self-control during adolescence: Investigating the influence of the adolescent peer network. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*, 452-462.
- Mmari, K. N., Blum, R. M., & Teufel-Shone, N. (2010). What increases risk and protection for delinquent behaviors among American Indian youth? Findings from three tribal communities. *Youth & Society, 41*(3), 383-413.
- Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2001). Childhood predictors, differentiate life-course persistent and adolescence- limited antisocial pathways among males and females. *Development and Psychopathology, 13*, 355-375.
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behaviour*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mota, C. P., & Matos, P. M. (2005). *Relationship to significant figures questionnaire*. (Unpublished Manuscript). Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação da Universidade do Porto.
- Nellis, A. M. (2005). Seven steps to develop and evaluate strategies to reduce disproportionate minority contact. National Criminal Justice Reference Service. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=209585>
- Nye, F. I. (1958). *Family relationships and Delinquent behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Papachristos, A. V. (2009). Murder by structure: Dominance relations and the social structure of gang homicide. *American Journal of Sociology, 115*(1): 74 – 128.

- Pardini, D. A., Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (2005). Developmental shifts in parent and peer influences on boys' beliefs about delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 15*, 299–323.
- Rankin, B. H., & Quane, J. M. (2002). Social contexts and urban adolescent outcomes: The interrelated effects of neighborhoods, families, and peers on African-American youth. *Social Problems, 49*(1), 79–100.
- Reingle, J. M., Jennings, W. G., & Maldonado-Molina, M. M. (2012). Risk and protective factors for trajectories of violent delinquency among a nationally representative sample of early adolescents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 10*(3), 261–77.
- Rekker, R., Pardini, D., Keijsers, L., Branje, S., Loeber, R., & Meeus, W. (2015). Moving in and out of poverty: The Within-individual association between socioeconomic status and juvenile delinquency. *Plos One, 10*(11).
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1994). Urban poverty and the family context of delinquency: A new look at structure and process in a classic study. *Child Development, 65*(2), 523.
- Sampson, R. J., & Wilson, W. J. (1995). Toward a theory of race, crime, and urban inequality. In J. Hagan & R.D. Peterson (Eds.), *Crime and inequality* (pp. 37–54). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schroeder, R., Osgood, A., & Oghia, M. (2010). Family transitions and juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry, 579*-606.
- Secombe, K. (2002). Beating the odds versus Changing the odds: Poverty, resilience, and family policy. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(2), 384-394.

- Seguin, J. R., Pihl, R. O., Harden, P. W., Tremblay, R. E., & Boulrice, B. (1995). Cognitive and neuropsychological characteristics of psychically aggressive boys. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 104*(4), 614–624.
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, T., Kang, W., and Puzanchera, C. (2013). *Easy access to the census of juveniles in residential placement.*
- Silverthorn, P., & Frick, P. J. (1999). Developmental pathways to antisocial behavior: The delayed-onset pathway in girls. *Development and Psychopathology, 11*, 101–126.
- Simons, R. L., Wu, C., Conger, R. D., & Lorenz, F. O. (1994). Two routes to delinquency: Differences between early and late starters in the impact of parenting and deviant peers. *Criminology, 32*, 247-276.
- Smith, C., & Carlson, B.E. (1997). Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth. *Social Services Review, 231-256.*
- Snyder, H., & Sickmund, M. 1995. *Juvenile offenders and victims: A National Report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Strasburger, V. C., & Donnerstein, E. (2013). The new media of violent video games: Yet same old media problems? *Clinical Pediatrics, 53*(8), 721-725.
- Tiet, Q. Q., Huizinga, D., & Byrnes, H. F. (2009). Predictors of resilience among inner city youths. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 19*(3), 360-378.
- Thornberry, T.P., Krohn, M.D., Lizotte, A.J., & Chard-Wierschem, D. 1993. The role of juvenile gangs in facilitating delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 30*, 55–87.

- Thornberry, T. P., Freeman-Gallant, A., & Lovegrove, P. J. (2009). Intergenerational linkages in antisocial behavior. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 19*(2), 80-93.
- Tolan, P. H., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. (2003). The developmental ecology of urban males' youth violence. *Developmental Psychology, 39*, 274-291.
- Tripodi, S. J., & Bender, K. (2011). Substance abuse treatment for juvenile offenders: A review of quasi-experimental and experimental research. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*(3), 246-252.
- Tzoumakis, S., Lussier, P., & Corrado, R. (2012). Female juvenile delinquency, motherhood, and The intergenerational transmission of aggression and antisocial behavior. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*, 211-237.
- Ungar, M., Teram, E., & Picketts, J. (2001). Young offenders and their communities: Reframing the institution as an extension of the community. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health (Revue canadienne de santé mentale communautaire), 20*(2), 29-43.
- Ungar, M. 2004. Nurturing hidden resilience in troubled youth. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Vincent, G. M., Guy, L. S., & Grisso, T. Risk assessment in juvenile justice: A guidebook for implementation (2012). *Systems and Psychosocial Advances Research Center Publications and Presentations, 573*.
- Vries, S. L., Hoeve, M., Assink, M., Stams, G. J., & Asscher, J. J. (2014). Practitioner review: Effective ingredients of prevention programs for youth at risk of persistent juvenile delinquency - recommendations for clinical practice. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 56*(2), 108-121.

- Vujanovic, A., Bonn-Miller, M., Bernstein, A., McKee, L., & Zvolensky M. (2010). Incremental validity of mindfulness skills in relation to emotional dysregulation among a young adult community sample. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, 39(3), 203-213.
- Warr, M. (2002). *Companions in crime: The social aspects of criminal conduct*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wasserman, G. A., Keenan, K., Tremblay, R. E., Coie, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Loeber, R., & Petechuk, D. (2003). Risk and protective factors of child delinquency. *Child Delinquency Bulletin Series*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Zahn, M. A., Agnew, R., Fishbein, D., Miller, S., Winn, D.M., Dakoff, G., ... Chesney-Lind, M. (2010). *Causes and correlates of girls' delinquency*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. NCJ 226358.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Table 1

Delinquency Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Supportive/Reinforcement in Community	8	20	14	35	18	45
Prosocial Adult Relations	9	22.5	15	37.5	16	40
Extensive Structures Activities	9	22.5	11	27.5	20	50
Participates in Faith Community	0	0	15	37.5	26	62.5
Involved in Community Organization	3	7.5	8	20	29	72.5
<i>Risk Factors</i>						
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Prior Arrests	36	90	2	5	2	5
Significant Crime in Neighborhood	32	80	6	15	2	5
Offenses Committed While Under Influence	19	47.5	12	30	9	22.5
Assaultive or Fighting Behavior	27	67.5	6	15	7	17.5
Delinquency Orientation	28	70	6	15	6	15

Appendix B

Table 2

Education Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
School Engagement/Bonds	8	20	15	37.5	17	42.5
Attachments w/Academic Achievers	6	15	7	17.5	27	67.5
Positive interaction with Teachers	7	17.5	18	45	15	37.5
Educational Aspirations	9	22.5	18	45	13	32.5
Caring/Supportive School Climate	9	22.5	20	50	11	27.5

<i>Risk Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Poor Academic Achievement	22	55	10	25	8	20
Pattern of Truancy Past Semester	20	50	11	27.5	9	22.5
Pattern of Suspension/Expelled	19	47.5	9	22.5	12	30
Disruptive Classroom/School Behavior	20	50	11	27.5	9	22.5
Presently not in an Educational Programs						

Appendix C

Table 3

Family Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Communications with Family	17	42.5	17	42.5	9	22.5
Constructive Use of Time at Home	10	25	10	25	25	62.5
Extensive Structures Activities	12	30	12	30	23	57.5
Family Activities	20	30	20	50	7	17.5
Unconditional Regard from a Parent	14	35	14	35	7	27.5

<i>Risk Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Poor Relation Parents	16	40	16	40	8	20
Parental Supervision Deficiencies	25	62.5	10	25	5	12.5
Chaotic Family	20	50	11	27.5	9	22.5
Parental Criminality/Substance Abuse	12	30	8	20	20	30
Runaway	18	45	8	20	14	35

Appendix D

Table 4

Peer Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Prosocial Peer Relations	6	15	14	35	20	50
Has at least 1 Person to confide in (P OR N)	18	45	15	37.5	7	17.5
Values Dignity/ Rights of Others	4	10	16	40	20	50
Ability to make Prosocial Friends	8	20	18	45	14	35
Ability to Communicate Disagreements	6	15	17	42.5	14	35

<i>Risk Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Socially Isolated	12	30	13	32.5	15	37.5
Has Very few Prosocial Acquaintances	26	65	10	25	4	10
Has Gang Affiliation/Associations	36	90	3	7.5	1	2.5
Has Delinquent Friends	36	90	2	5	2	5
No Meaningful Relations w/any Adults	11	27.5	18	45	11	27.5

Appendix E

Table 5

Substance Use Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Parents Model Healthy Moderation	15	37.5	12	30	13	32.5
Effectively Manages Peer Pressure	4	10	11	27.5	25	62.5
Youths Free of Distressing Habits	6	12.5	12	30	23	57.5
Youth Manages Stress Well	3	7.5	15	37.5	22	55
Positive Self	5	12.5	21	52.5	14	35

<i>Risk Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Pattern of Alcohol Abuse	11	27.5	16	40	13	32.5
Used Mood altering Substance other than Alcohol	19	47.5	18	45	3	7.5
Used Substances Frequently	15	37.5	14	35	11	27.5
Substance Use interferes w/Daily Function	20	50	11	27.5	9	22.5
Early Onset Substance Abuse (<13)	23	57.5	23	57.5	10	25

Appendix F

Table 6

Individual Protective & Risk Percentages of Juveniles on Probation

<i>Protective Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Values Honesty/Integrity	5	12.5	16	40	19	47.5
Self Control	4	10	16	40	20	50
Self Efficacy in Prosocial Relationships	12.5	10	24	60	11	27.5
Problem	5	12.5	21	52.5	14	35
Plans, Organize and Completes Tasks	4	10	17	42.5	19	47.5

<i>Risk Factors</i>	Categories					
	Yes		Somewhat		No	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
No Prosocial Interests (Included Employment)	13	32.5	20	50	7	17.5
Supportive Delinquency	21	52.5	13	32.5	6	15
Anger Management Issues	23	57.5	13	32.5	4	10
Sensation Seeking	23	57.5	12	30	5	12.5
Manipulative/Deceitful	19	47.5	16	40	5	12.5
