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Juvenile delinquency in the nation’s cities, suburbs, and rural communities has been considered a longstanding problem with severe implications for not only youth offenders but their families and communities as well. The source of juvenile delinquency has been attributed to a number of factors including the breakdown of the family, antisocial behavior as a result of the child’s environment, and rapid urbanization of America’s cities. No matter the source, the problem of juvenile delinquency has been addressed by a variety of stakeholders including law enforcement agencies, community organizations, and school systems with the purpose of diminishing the problem. The current climate of juvenile justice reform is shifting toward prevention and intervention, rather than complete suppression by way of detainment. According to the theoretical framework applied to this study, a consideration for understanding forms of deviance relates to social controls and the presumption that conformity is not intrinsically accepted, but is the result of internal and external motivations or factors.
This research was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Youth Against Violence (YAV) program, which focused its efforts on reducing juvenile delinquency in the community and assisting youth to meet bond conditions in order to reenroll in traditional public schools. Participants were referred to the YAV program by court order, school referral, or parent/self referral for participation in an 8-week intervention and prevention program to help rehabilitate offenders for the purpose of successful re-entry into the community and completion of their education in public schools.

To determine program effectiveness, this study utilized several independent variables including parental involvement, participant demographics, gang membership/affiliation, program curriculum, frequency of contact with law enforcement, family history with law enforcement, and extended family support. These variables were selected to measure participants’ perception of YAV program effectiveness. This mixed method analysis utilized participant surveys, focus groups with former participants, parents of former participants, and interviews with YAV personnel.

The research concludes by identifying the significant relationships between the dependent and independent variables revealed in descriptive and correlative statistics. The research also discusses the emergent themes related to program effectiveness that were identified in qualitative analysis. Finally, the research provides recommendations for program practice, juvenile justice policy, and future rehabilitative and reentry research based on the research findings to assist practitioners with the development of prevention and intervention programs that can effectively deter youth from engaging in delinquency.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Local school boards across the nation are becoming increasingly interested in rehabilitating students who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system. There are a number of factors contributing to this trend in policy, which focuses on how to successfully reenroll previously detained students. According to researchers Granello and Hanna (2003), high school dropouts cost taxpayers between $1.7 million and $2.3 million over their lifetimes, thus it is in the public’s best interest to provide the appropriate services students need to succeed at an early age. From the perspective of law enforcement, successfully rehabilitating youth offenders and reenrolling the offender into a school system tend to decrease the rate of recidivism and prolonged delinquency (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010). According to JustChildren (2006), “It is crucial that students are involved in an appropriate educational program while in the correctional center, and upon release. The incidence of recidivism becomes greater when enrollment is not available soon after release” (p. 1).

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE), state DOE’s, and local school boards are interested in strategies and programs for reenrolling youth offenders to assist in the effort of turning around failing schools, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing postsecondary enrollment and completion. Overall, the negative implications of unsuccessfully rehabilitating youth offenders is far reaching, thus requires the attention
of schools, law enforcement agencies, social service organizations, community organizations, and community leaders. Attention to rehabilitative and reenrollment strategies must be translated into formal action taken by key stakeholders, which results in stronger schools and communities for all students.

According to the Institute for Educational Leadership’s *Guidepost for Success*, in order to assist and rehabilitate youth offenders into the school system and society, collaboration must exist between key groups. These groups include the juvenile justice system, education, workforce development, and other community institutions, as well as youth and families (Gagnon & Richards, 2008). Through collaboration, these groups can successfully transition youth at-risk of delinquency into adulthood and economic sufficiency (Gagnon & Richard, 2008).

In order to best serve youth offenders and guide reenrollment efforts, one must first understand the characteristics of youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system. The National Collaboration on Workforce and Disability for Youth (NCWD) purports that youth with emotional disturbances and learning disabilities are over-represented in the nation’s juvenile justice systems. The U.S. Department of Education (2005) reports that youth diagnosed as emotionally disturbed represent 47.7% of students within secured facilities, while youth diagnosed with learning disabilities represent 38.6% of students within the juvenile justice system. These youth typically have poor academic outcomes within secondary schools and also have more frequent disciplinary action taken against them within secondary schools. In regard to academics, 58% of students with emotional disturbances perform below grade level in reading and 93% below grade level in math (Greenbaum, Dedrick, Friedman, Kutash, Brown,
Lardieri et al., 1996). Similarly, youth with emotional disturbances are suspended or expelled, four times the rate of students with other disabilities or without disabilities all together, and are 13.3 times more likely to be arrested, than youth without disabilities (Doren, Bullis, & Benz, 2005).

Additional risk factors for youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system are as follows:

1. **Low socioeconomic status.** In many cases, youth with emotional disturbances or learning disabilities drop out of high school, which results in long-term financial difficulty. Youth who drop out of school are 72% more likely to be unemployed and earn 27% less than high school graduates (U.S. Department of Labor, 2003).

2. **High levels of antisocial behavior.** Adolescents with emotional disturbances are lower functioning on measures of social skills, including areas of self-control, assertion, and cooperation (Gagnon & Richards, 2008; Wagner, Kutush, Duchnowski, Epstein, & Sumi, 2005).

3. **Lack of parental role models and support.** Parental support and involvement are critical to a youth’s development and socialization, thus when the family structure is weakened due to family transition, financial stress, lack of education, or condoned violence within or outside the home, youth offenders are more likely to seek role models and support systems within other networks. These networks for youth offenders are often time found within gangs or other juvenile delinquent groups.
4. **High commitment to and interaction with delinquent peers.** Howell (2010) states, “Aggressive and antisocial youth begin to affiliate with one another in childhood, and this pattern of aggressive friendships continues through adolescence” (p. 7).

An additional risk factor of juvenile delinquency discussed within the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs Department’s (OJJPD) Juvenile Justice Bulletin relates to the youths community of residence. In areas that experience high crime rates and low economic opportunity, youth are more likely to engage in delinquency. This is because as youth get older, family influences decrease, while community influences increase. More significantly, low levels of neighborhood attachment, greater level of criminal activity, and access to firearms and drugs can push or pull youth toward law breaking and away from educational attainment and achievement (Howell, 2010).

There are various models that been used by schools and local law enforcement agencies which focus on prevention, intervention, and suppression to address the problems associated with juvenile delinquency. In the state of Georgia, however, the literature pertaining to successful school rehabilitation of youth offenders who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system is limited. A review of the literature reveals the existence of programs, which focus on overall rehabilitation (decreased delinquency and recidivism), but does not offer a plethora of information regarding programs, which focus on successful reentry into institutions of education at the secondary and postsecondary levels. The intent of this investigation is to examine a community-based program administered by a local law enforcement agency, which seeks to decrease
juvenile delinquency and assist participants in meeting the multiple conditions of their bond agreements including reenrollment into secondary schools.

**Statement of the Problem**

The negative implications of unsuccessful reentry of youth offenders into secondary schools are far-reaching and harmful to both the individual and society at-large. This is because as the youth offender progresses toward adulthood (in legal terms), the life chances for the individual are greatly influenced by educational outcomes. When the value of education becomes secondary or tertiary to competing values (particularly juvenile delinquency), educational outcomes including persistence and completion are likely to diminish. Contact with the juvenile justice system, compounded by unsuccessful secondary school reentry, raises the probability of a challenging adulthood, particularly for youth living within urban communities and at-risk of succumbing to various social ills to include:

1. **Higher rates of unemployment.** According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2013), the unemployment rate for individuals with less than a high school diploma is 11.1% compared to an unemployment rate of 7.4% for individuals with a high school diploma and an unemployment rate of 3.8% for individuals with a bachelor’s degree or higher. Table 1 provides a detailed account of the unemployment status of the civilian population 25 years and over by educational attainment.
Table 1

*Unemployment Status of the Civilian Population 25 Years and Over by Educational Attainment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Not seasonally adjusted</th>
<th>Seasonally adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a high school diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>11,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>10,242</td>
<td>9,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduates, no college¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>37,119</td>
<td>36,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>34,239</td>
<td>33,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian labor force</td>
<td>36,899</td>
<td>37,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>34,157</td>
<td>34,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-population ratio</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes individuals who have completed high school, certificate, or diploma from an institution of higher education.
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Not seasonally adjusted</th>
<th>Seasonally adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bachelor's degree and higher**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Civilian labor force</th>
<th>Participation rate</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Employment-population Ratio</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,191</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>46,408</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,663</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>47,888</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,392</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>47,623</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,291</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>46,411</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,991</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>47,172</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>1,819</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,436</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>47,555</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,236</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>47,371</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,492</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>47,563</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,473</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>47,581</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes persons with a high school diploma or equivalent.
2 Includes persons with bachelor’s, master’s, professional, and doctoral degrees.

NOTE: Updated population controls are introduced annually with the release of January data.

Table 1 illustrates a correlation between educational attainment and employment with employability being highest among individuals with a bachelor’s degree or higher for ages 25 and over.

2. **Increased likelihood of receiving public assistance.** Public assistance may include Temporary Assistance of Needy Families (TANF), food stamps, and Medicaid. A study prepared by the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University made the following assertion: “The average high school dropout will cost taxpayers over $292,000 in lower tax revenue, higher
cash and in-kind transfer costs, and imposed incarceration costs relative to the average high school graduate” (Sum, Khatiwada, & McLaughlin, 2009, p. 14).

3. **Higher rates of delinquency and adult criminality.** The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports the overrepresentation of high school dropouts within the U.S. penal system (Tyler & Lofstrom, 2009). High school dropouts account for 68% of the nation’s prison population. When stratified by race, African-American and Latino inmates have higher proportions of high school dropouts in prison (69% and 78%, respectively) compared to the proportion of white inmates who have dropped out of high school and are incarcerated (62%).

4. **Increased likelihood of perpetuating the cycle of school failure with their children.** The educational experiences for children whose parents did not complete high school often prove difficult, especially for minority children in urban communities. According to Tyler and Lofstrom (2009), adults who dropout of high school “may also be less effective at parenting” (p. 88). Less effective parenting may be observed in disciplinary practices and involvement in the child’s education beginning in primary school.

5. **Lower earnings.** According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the average annual income of a dropout is $20,241 compared to $30,627 of a typical high school graduate and $56,665 for an individual with at least a bachelor’s degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009).

Research by the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs Department (2011) has revealed that many youth offenders drop out of school and face the aforementioned
predicaments due to involvement in delinquency and gang membership/affiliation as adolescents. The problem of juvenile delinquency in schools and the community has remained a challenging issue for various constituents including parents, adolescents, law enforcement, political leaders, and educational leaders. For many constituents, avoiding or not acknowledging the fact that adolescents are joining gangs seems to be a major stumbling block. Some hold the false assumption that juvenile delinquency is the result of weakened parental discipline and structure or increased testosterone in young men that will likely fade once youth reach adulthood. While in some instances this may be the case, it is a dangerous notion taken for granted all too often. The danger in this line of thinking was evidenced in the 2010 murder of Bobby Tillman who was attacked by four teenaged boys during a house party in the suburbs of Atlanta, Georgia. The four teenagers charged with murder beat and stomped Tillman so badly that his own broken bones pierced his heart. To date, one suspect (Emanuel Boykin) has pled guilty to the charges and sentenced to life in prison, one suspect is awaiting the trial to begin in June 2012, and the trial of the two remaining suspects has yet to be determined. Whether these teenagers who attacked Tillman could be characterized as bonafide gang members is debatable; however, the teenagers can be categorized as bullies whose behavior extended beyond the result of increased testosterone. In many instances, bullying and other delinquent behaviors precedes gang affiliation and membership regardless of formal recognition as gang.

In contrast, there are communities and schools that do acknowledge the presence of gangs; however, the challenge rests in figuring out how to deter and prevent juvenile delinquency. Oftentimes, individuals know that there is a problem within the community
or school that should be addressed, but are unsure as to how to go about doing so. In many instances, addressing juvenile delinquency and gang activity is left up to local law enforcement agencies. Schools often deal with increased gang activity by increasing the presence of law enforcement within the school building and community. The methods employed by law enforcement are typically confined to strategies of suppression whereby law enforcement works to diminish gang activity by targeting areas with high incidences of gang activity (increased patrolling), gathering intelligence (community policing), and arresting gang members when a crime has been committed (formal sanctioning). While law enforcement agencies by many accounts appears to be the logical choice for dealing with juvenile delinquency and more specifically youth gangs, the effectiveness of these bodies are questionable in that formal sanctions, including arrest, may have unintended consequences that perpetuate the problem of gangs and juvenile delinquency.

According to Kaufman (2010), there are conflicting views on the effects of formal sanctions on youth offenders. Those supporting formal sanctions delivered by law enforcement agencies contend that arresting an individual is a form of deterrence that will prevent further delinquency because the individual will come to understand that their nonconforming behavior does not fit into the social norms held by the larger society. Furthermore, John Braithwaite’s theory of shaming and crime defines shaming as social disapproval, which has the “intention or effect of invoking remorse in the person being shamed and/or condemnation by others who become aware of the shaming” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 146). Braithwaite contends that shaming stigmatizes the offender and excludes that individual from normal social interactions. However, critics contend that law enforcement itself may act as a crimenogenic force in the delinquency of offenders,
youth included. Sociologist George H. Mead (1934) contends that an individual’s identity exists within the context of a society, and is shaped through social interaction. According to Mead, the meanings that are assigned to social events are constructed within the relationship of senders and receivers of messages. Furthermore, unique meaning lead to different interpretations of events, and through this process a sense of self is constructed. This idea of the sense of self as a social construction is further illuminated in the work of Frank Tannenbaum. Tannenbaum (1938) contends that state intervention “dramatized evil” when it pulls the juvenile into the criminal justice system. In this circumstance (dramatization of evil), when a youth is singled out as a delinquent and punished through formal sanctions, “the arrest suddenly precipitates a series of institutions, attitudes, and experience which other children do not share” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 128). As a result of the aberration, a prolonged criminality may be inevitable due to the offender’s adjustment to the label he or she has been given, thus the impact of formal sanctions (delivered by law enforcement) is negative.

The problem for many schools and law enforcement agencies is that there are too few organizations equipped with the necessary resources, namely strategic intervention/suppression models to replicate, qualified personnel, and funding, to assist youth who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system successfully reenter public schools. Furthermore, the various organizations responsible for the various aspects of the youth offender’s rehabilitation often work independently from one another. Law enforcement agencies (juvenile justice court systems and police forces) tend to legal matters such as sanctioning and bond conditions, while schools focus on less formal disciplinary processes (detention, suspension, or expulsion) to focus on the areas of
attendance, retention, and completion. Social service organizations dealing with youth offenders pay particular attention to such factors as mental health and substance abuse while the youth’s family unit (in all its varieties) is tasked with the responsibility of maintaining the physical, emotional, and financial safety and well-being of the youth. Each of these constituents plays a critical role in meeting the needs of youth offenders; however, each constituent must work as a collective unit willing to collaborate and meet the needs of the whole child if reentry into schools is to be successful.

There is a significant need for reentry programs to intervene on the behalf of youth who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system, and while this need may seem to be a logical approach to addressing the problem of delinquency and school dropout, the task remains challenging. Much of the challenge comes from the sheer fact that most programs do not follow a particular model\(^1\) that has shown noteworthy results. Intervention programs seeking to assist youth who have experienced the juvenile justice system exist in many forms and have the potential to be successful in theory; however,\(^1\)

---

\(\text{Well-intended juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs abound across the nation, yet a limited number of these programs evidence effectiveness in terms of reducing juvenile delinquency and successful reentry into secondary schools due to poor implementation. The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado Boulder identifies, recommends, and scientifically evaluates youth programs for practitioners to utilize or model subsequent programs after in order to reduce juvenile delinquency and promote positive youth development.}\)
poor collaboration and implementation by key stakeholders stunt the effectiveness of many reentry programs.

For the purpose of this study, the dependent variable was program effectiveness of the Youth Against Violence intervention program. The independent variables included extended family involvement, school attendance and truancy, staff and facilitator implementation of training, family history with law enforcement, mentoring relationships, gang membership and/or affiliation, frequency of contact with law enforcement, type of participant (repeat offender vs. first-time offender or non-offender, youth offender demographics (age, gender, race,)), parental involvement, and program curriculum. These variables were selected because the researcher believed each variable would provide significant findings for the intended outcomes of the program and prove or disprove program effectiveness.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of an intervention program facilitated by a law enforcement agency in an Atlanta suburb. The law enforcement agency works with youth offenders through a program entitled “Youth Against Violence” (YAV). The participants of YAV have either been court ordered as a result of the conditions set within the bond agreement, referred by the local school district as a result of student disciplinary problem(s), or sent by parents who have observed wayward behavior from the adolescent to complete an 8-week rehabilitation program. For approximately 60% of the participants, the juvenile justice courts have ordered successful completion of the program in order for the student to return to the home school
within 8 weeks as opposed to remaining in an alternative school setting for at least one academic school year.

The Youth Against Violence Program was selected as the focus of this study because the program is managed by a local police department that works with key stakeholder groups including the juvenile courts, the local school district, social service organizations, and community organizations which are described in detail in the following chapters. Through this study, the researcher intended to investigate the practices of the YAV program as it relates to curriculum, staff/volunteer training and implementation of training, participant subsequent contact with law enforcement, and participant educational outcomes (to include attendance, achievement, and completion) as a result of the intervention program. Examining the intervention program administered by the law enforcement agency provided insight as to the effectiveness of a local reentry program’s ability to diminish the problem of juvenile delinquency and determine if participants were able to successfully reenter a school system after contact with law enforcement. The researcher asserts that the findings of this study challenges widely held assumptions, but also illuminates appropriate strategies, which may be utilized by schools, communities, and law enforcement agencies through collaborative efforts.

**Research Questions**

**RQ1:** Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and extended family involvement?

**RQ2:** Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and school attendance and truancy?
RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement?

RQ4: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and mentoring relationships?

RQ5: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and gang membership and/or affiliation?

RQ6: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the frequency of contact with law enforcement?

RQ7: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and participant status (i.e. court referred, school referred, parent referred, first-time offender, repeat offender, or nonoffender)?

RQ8: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and youth offender demographics (age, gender, and race)?

RQ9: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and parental involvement?

RQ10: What is the relationship between YAV program effectiveness and program curriculum?

RQ11: How does the implementation of staff and facilitator training(s) impact the effectiveness of the YAV intervention program?

RQ12: What are the implications of the youth offender’s family history with law enforcement in terms of the success (reduction of recidivism and program effectiveness) of YAV intervention strategies?
RQ13: How does participation in the YAV intervention program lead to an increased understanding of juvenile law and adherence to various social control agencies as it relates to YAV program curriculum?

**Significance of the Study**

School systems have the responsibility to educate all students despite extenuating circumstances that threaten to prevent this goal from being achieved. Juvenile delinquency is one circumstance that makes education difficult, yet it is no justification for not facing the challenge head on. This unique challenge may be addressed in a number of ways, but research has revealed that the problem of juvenile delinquency is best addressed through collaboration between schools, law enforcement, parents, and community organizations. When youth offenders have experienced the juvenile justice system and are provided with court conditions that rest largely on educational requirements, there is a need for programs focused on ensuring that students are able to reenter the community and public school system successfully.

The Youth Against Violence Program administered by a metro-Atlanta police department has the ability to influence pedagogy, curriculum, and instruction in a meaningful capacity without undermining the purpose and outcomes of education. In order for this to become a real resolution for decreasing juvenile delinquency and successfully reentering youth offenders, it is important to examine a local intervention program that assists in rehabilitating court ordered or school referred participants. The researcher contends that this study will cause school leaders and law enforcement agencies to reexamine their practices for deterring juvenile delinquency and approaches
to helping youth who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Additionally, the researcher assessed the effectiveness of intervention program and was able to determine if programs like YAV are successful in achieving its mission to, Deprogram youth that have a destructive and rebellious mentality, by educating and warning them of the dangers and consequences that come from truancy, drug usage, fighting, peer pressure and gang involvement and teaching them the benefits and rewards of being productive citizens in society. (Powell, 2006, para. 1)

Finally, this analysis provides recommendations for educational policy makers, community-based prevention programs, and law enforcement agencies seeking to reduce juvenile delinquency and successfully reenroll youth offenders into educational systems. The expectation was that this study would reveal the best practices for collaboration between schools, law enforcement agencies, and community organizations that reduce delinquency and effectively help students reenter the public school setting and successively prevent high school dropout.

**Summary**

This chapter has provided an overview of the intent of this research study and the factors that contribute to the necessity for such research. Youth offenders often find transitioning back into the public school setting difficult due to a variety of factors including learning or emotional disabilities, antisocial behaviors, lack of parental role models and support, high commitment to and interaction with delinquent peers, and the community in which one lives after contact with the juvenile justice system. For
educators and law enforcement agencies, successfully rehabilitating these students and decreasing recidivism has proven to be a daunting task likewise, due to a lack of resources, qualified personnel collaborating with multiple agencies, and a lack of youth offender intervention models that have been scientifically proven to produce significant and positive reentry outcomes. Unsuccessful reentry into public schools after interaction with law enforcement yields a multitude of latent dysfunctions including school dropout, higher rates of unemployment, lower earnings, dependence on public assistance, increased probability of adult criminality, and most significantly for education, the propensity of perpetuating a cycle of school failure in future generations of school-aged children.

This chapter identified the article of analysis to be studied and provided a brief description of the program. The researcher’s intent was to examine the effectiveness of strategies developed by Youth Against Violence (YAV) Program, implemented and facilitated by a metro-Atlanta police Department. In conducting this case study, which examines the effectiveness of a juvenile delinquency programs educational leaders, law enforcement agencies, and community organizations are provided with a foundation of research that may direct strategies, practices, and curriculum for future implementation and facilitation of programs.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents research findings related to juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention in conjunction with the findings associated with reentry programming for youth offenders transitioning back into public schools and communities. The review of literature will begin with describing the historical and social context that shaped juvenile justice policy in the United States, providing a brief overview of how the federal government became involved in the juvenile justice system and the formation of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Prevention. Additionally, this chapter will discuss the use of effective prevention and intervention models used to successfully reenter juvenile offenders into public schools. Much of the research specifies the necessary components for structuring programs including the need for school-based preparatory experiences, career preparation and work-based experiences, youth development and leadership, connecting activities, family involvement and support, speedy placement, appropriate placement of the youth offender, and mentoring relationships. This chapter concludes with the presentation of intervention and suppression programs that have shown significant gains in reducing recidivism and effectively reentering youth offenders into public schools across the nation.
Historical Context of Juvenile Delinquency Policy: From Progressive to Punitive Policy to an Attempt at Equilibrium

Early legislation (1932-1938) addressed juvenile crime from a jurisdictional standpoint rather than from the standpoint of addressing the problem of delinquency. This was the case largely due to the fact that the federal government delegated the responsibility of juvenile crime to state and local law enforcement agencies. At this turn, there was no significant interest at the federal level to deal in juvenile delinquency. However, the legislation of the 1950s took on a drastically different approach, focusing efforts on strategically developing policy and programs to address delinquency through prevention and rehabilitation.

Special attention to juvenile delinquency became prevalent during the 1950’s as a result of increased youth violence (Barnosky, 2006). Not only was the issue of delinquency a priority for law enforcement agencies, but also during this time in history, both the executive and legislative branches began to make appeals to the American public to devise an approach for reducing juvenile delinquency. The accepted approach centered around prevention and rehabilitation programs as opposed to the “sterner penalties and gun control measures” (Barnosky, 2006, p. 315) that would become popular during the 1980s and 1990s. To understand the shift from progressive policies to punitive policies for addressing the problem of delinquency, it is important to consider the various factors that influenced the direction of juvenile justice policy.

During the 1950s, many Americans were of the opinion that juvenile crime was in fact a national problem (Gilbert, 1986). Juvenile crime was widely considered a national problem...
problem by the American public due to the violent nature of crimes committed by youth, but also because it was not limited to urban communities. More and more, violent youth crime was expanding to rural areas and the suburbs. According to Barnosky (2006),

A senate study showed a 7% increase in the suburbs and a 15% increase in rural locales in 1959. This ‘trend to the suburbs’ in juvenile crime is a clear indication that the increase is largely among the children of so-called white collar classes. (p. 321)

Communication mediums including Newweek Magazine and the New York Times provided multiple accounts of the problem urban and rural cities were facing related to juvenile delinquency. Within these publications, writers documented the sophistication of youth criminals compared to their less advanced and less violent counterparts of previous generations. The youth offenders of the 1950s were more likely to kill, according to a 1957 Newweek article titled “Why the Young Kill: Prowling the Juvenile Jungles of the Big Cities.” Additionally, the weapons of choice were knives, guns, tire irons, broken bottles, dynamite and acid (Barnosky, 2006). School violence was also given particular attention by media outlets. There were multiple publications that told of stabbings, bombings, shootings, and threats against both students and teachers by youth offenders.

Popular culture was also cited as a growing concern for Americans believing youth crime was a problem. Popular culture predominantly included comic books, television, and movies. Critics blamed comic books for its depiction of violence and horror believed to provide children with examples of fantasy and blueprints for violence
Television was a convenient target because of its popularity during this period. Similar to what is presented on television today, the images depicted on television during the 1950s were thought to have a strong influence on youth. Critics argued that television provided a guide to youth on how to engage in rule breaking and criminal activity. Particularly with gun violence, critics argued that television was a great influencer for teaching youth how to deal with problems (Barnosky, 2006).

While the media was a major source for presenting the problems related to juvenile delinquency to the masses, it was also responsible for framing the American public’s way of viewing and understanding the problem of delinquency from multiple perspectives. Some journalists and writers attempted to explain the phenomenon by providing structural explanations for the increase in delinquency opposed to the individual explanations of youth delinquency. Basically, the problem was not with the youth offender, but instead could be better understood by assessing the structural composition of American institutions and value systems: particularly the economic system. On the contrary, other writers concluded that Americans had gone soft on their children, even quoting biblical scripture “spare the rod and spoil the child” to account for how Americans had gotten off course (lack of discipline in the home) in dealing with youth.

Progressives, according to Barnosky (2006), challenged the assertion that popular culture was responsible for the increase in juvenile delinquency. Additionally, progressives continued to advocate for preventive and rehabilitative approaches rather than punitive policy. While there were various approaches presented to Congress in the
mid-1950s, the policy approach taken by Congress reflected progressive values. According to Barnosky, policies related to the censorship of various communication mediums and punitive actions were widely ignored as legitimate approaches to dealing with delinquency. The two federal agencies claiming jurisdiction over juvenile delinquency were the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and the Department of Justice. Within the HEW, there were two agencies that played a significant role in advancing preventative and rehabilitative service: the Children’s Bureau and the National Institutes of Mental Health (NIMH). The Children’s Bureau utilized publications and conferences to advance progressive policy, which reflected the sentiments of then director Dr. Martha Eliot assertion that “delinquency is an index of the effectiveness of services to children in general. When the incidence of delinquency arises, it is evident that our services to children are failing to keep pace with the time” (Barnosky, 2006, p. 330). In 1952, the Children’s Bureau established a temporary project known as the Special Delinquency Project, which focused its efforts in assisting organizations (particularly the various bodies of law enforcement) provide better quality treatment services for youth offenders. The National Institutes of Mental Health major difference from the Children’s Bureau was its ability to provide financial support for projects and research (Barnosky, 2006). Research initially funded by NIMH was confined to psychological studies of juvenile delinquency; however, research studies were redirected toward understanding environmental factors, which aligned with the progressive movement.
As a result of the Children’s Bureau and NIMH’s work, progressive legislation was passed under President Dwight D. Eisenhower. There were three major senate bills responsible for shaping juvenile justice practices in the United States: S. 894, which led to the drafting S. 278. Senate bills 894 and 278 were combined to form S. 4267, which “adopted the grants-in-aid approach of the others, but increased the amount of funding from $3 million to $11 million” (Barnosky, 2006, p. 340). Under the legislation, states were provided grants for programs focusing on prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Grantees were both public and private organizations including the American Association of Social Workers, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges (Barnosky, 2006). In 1961, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act was passed, which gave the federal government a substantial amount of control in the direction of juvenile delinquency policy. At the time, for progressives this was a victory since legislators continued to advance the work of the Children’s Bureau and NIHM. Given this, one may question how juvenile justice policy shifted to the punitive approach. The answer is complex, but can be understood in the bureaucratic complexity of the federal system and an examination crime rates according to racial composition. The latter of these will be explained first.

As federal involvement increased, the progressive policies fell out of favor when conservative policy makers advanced an alternative approach to youth delinquency. First, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency was formed within the Department of HEW. The Children’s Bureau was unable to play a significant role that it once had, but instead,
responsibility was delegated to a number of agencies including (but not limited to) the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Authority, the Department of Agriculture Commerce, and the Labor Department (Barnosky, 2006). As a result of the vast number of agencies involved with implementing juvenile justice policies, coordination among them was poor and lead to legislative battle over which agency would be responsible for implementation and enforcement of the law. Advocates for HEW suggested the agency could better service juvenile delinquents with treatment that prevented or rehabilitated offenders. In contrast, Department of Justice supporters believed the agency to be better suited because it promoted law and order through social control. The battle was ultimately won by the Department of Justice, which later formed the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Even with the OJJDP’s victory, funding was a major obstacle despite the initial $125 million appropriation because President Gerald Ford slashed that appropriation by $100 million (Barnosky, 2006). During the Carter administration, funding for the OJJDP was increased to over $100 million; however, as new administrators overtook the White House over the years, funding continued to decrease. Further compounding funding limitations, the Reagan administration thought it best to neutralize the power, authority, and influence of the OJJDP. This was accomplished by appointing individuals with more conservative values and ideals to head the organization. As a result, the organization moved away from progressive (or liberal) values, to policy that aligned with Reagan’s ideology, which emphasized the need to get tough on juveniles through arrest and harsh sentencing. Reagan’s war on drugs was a major influence in the shift from prevention to punitive
criminal justice, having long-term implication for the direction of juvenile justice after
his tenure as president.

The second factor contributing to the shift from progressive policy to punitive
policy relates to race. In assessing the prison populations along racial composition, the
large majority of individuals incarcerated during the 1980s and 1990s were minorities,
particularly blacks and Latinos. This trend in incarceration caused policy makers, most
notably during the Reagan administration, to ignore the work of progressive supporters
pointing to structural problems and the need for prevention and rehabilitation policies.
The widely accepted contention was that the problem existed within the individual
(namely minorities) rather than any environmental risk or factor, which may contribute to
the propensity toward delinquency. “In making the link between changes in crime policy
and race, scholars argue that as adult and juvenile crime became more closely associated
with blacks, punitive policies became more popular” (Barnosky, 2006, p. 316).

In the 21st century, juvenile justice systems are witnessing another shift in
juvenile justice policy. While juvenile justice policy is largely still punitive, advocacy
for prevention and intervention has resurfaced and caused the OJJDP and state agencies
to reconsider the approach to decreasing juvenile delinquency. This is the case for two
critical reasons. First, the cost of incarceration for youth offenders far outweighs the cost
of preventive/intervention strategies, and second, the negative implications experienced
by youth offenders confined to secured facilities are more often harmful than helpful to
the individual and society as a whole (Greenwood, 2008). Over the past decade,
prevention and intervention models have become increasingly popular for law
enforcement agencies, other practitioners, and educators. The new trend within research is the evaluation of program effectiveness and the implementation of evidenced-based models yielding significant gains in the reentry of youth offenders into the community and schools.

**Implementation and Evaluation of Evidence-Based Effective Delinquency Programs (Dependent Variable)**

The adoption of evidence-based practices is a relatively new phenomenon, despite its salient logic and rationale. Juvenile delinquency programs have had a long history of implementing programs that were well intended and popular, but grossly ineffective. Many of these programs gained popularity through the media and legislative support. Prior to the acceptance of literature disputing the effectiveness of popular juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs, programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), boot camps, custodial juvenile correctional facilitates, and Scared Straight programs were widely accepted as the best approach to decreasing juvenile delinquency and rehabilitating youth offenders. These programs often had no effect on the behavior or rehabilitation of youth offenders, and in the case of boot camps, custodial juvenile correctional facilities, and programs modeled after scared straight, the rate of recidivism for participants increased (Rosenbaum, 2007; Lipsey, 2009; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Finckenauer, 2000; Blackburn, Mullings, Marquart, & Trulson, 2007). An examination of Scared Straight programming will better illustrate the practice and popularity of adopting ineffective juvenile delinquency prevention policy.
Scared Straight began in the 1970s in the state of New Jersey for the purpose of scaring delinquent or at-risk youth engaging in adult criminality. The basic method was to present the horrific experiences of inmates incarcerated within the penal system. These experiences were presented by hardened criminals, who detail their experiences with rape, murder, and gangs. In some cases, much of the information concerning the inmates’ stories was grossly exaggerated (Finckenauer, 1982).

In 1979, a Public Broadcasting Station (PBS) television documentary was released depicting a 94% success rate (despite the absence of a control group), thus gained national attention (Finckenauer, 1982). This attention included the U.S. House Subcommittee on Human Resources and resulted in a number of states adopting the Scared Straight model for delinquency prevention and intervention. Consequently, an independent 1992 study of the Scared Straight programs was conducted and did not reveal any significant relationship between Scared Straight participants and subsequent behavior compared to the behavior of youth who did not go through the program (Finckenauer, 1982). In fact, participants of Scared Straight were reported to be more likely to recidivate (Finckenauer, 1982). As a result, practitioners began to question the effectiveness of Scared Straight and similarly modeled programs to determine if these programs in fact deterred juvenile delinquency and prevent adult criminality. Studies conducted by various researchers revealed that Scared Straight was largely ineffective, yet managed to remain popular notwithstanding the evidence (Finckenauer & Gavin, 1999).
In 1999, yet another PBS television documentary was produced which reflected similar results of success as the 1970 television documentary (Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Buehler, 2003). An independent study conducted by Petrosino and colleagues revealed that Scared Straight “increased crime between 1% and 28% when compared to a no–treatment control group” (Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Buehler, 2003, p. 44). As a result of this study, the researchers questioned why intervention programs modeled after Scared Straight have a criminogenic effect on youth offenders. This is a question and affirmation posed by other social scientists including sociologist Edwin Lemert. According to Lemert (1951), state intervention (particularly incarceration of the juvenile) has adverse affects on the juvenile offender, as it reinforces the deviant label, allows offenders to interact with other criminals to advance their criminal skill set, and occupy the master status of delinquency.

As previously stated, the research on prevention and intervention has expanded over the past decade and juvenile delinquency programs are witnessing a shift in strategies to address the problem. The research on evidence-based practices suggests three approaches to using the research on effective programs to implement programs that bear significant results in reducing recidivism. These approaches include direct evaluation, implementation of programs certified by an authoritative source, and implementation of programs that have undergone meta-analysis, yielding average or better than average results than the research (Lipsey, Howell, Kelly, Chapman, & Carver, 2010).
Direct evaluation requires the use of an experimental and control group to assess the effectiveness of the intervention as it relates to the selected outcomes. Direct evaluation also provides practitioners with the opportunity to observe implementation problems and correct those problem areas appropriately. In order for direct evaluation to significantly impact and guide program implementation, “impact evaluation requires resources, technical expertise, and favorable conditions with regard to the ability to create a control group and collect the desired process and outcome measures” (Lipsey et al., 2010, p. 17).

The second approach of implementing model programs certified by an authoritative source requires practitioners to review models that are similar in scope and expected outcomes. Successful implementation requires models to be implemented identically (fidelity of implementation) as to produce the expected results. This may be accomplished through strict adherence to program protocols. The difficulty of this approach is that it may be costly for local programs to implement brand-name models. Additionally “local providers may also find it difficult to modify or abandon their established practices to adopt a model program ‘by the book,’ and they often resist or make their own adaptations to the program with the associated compromises to fidelity” (Lipsey et al., 2010, p. 19). To minimize the challenges, models should be piloted initially and evaluated prior to lateral expansion.

The final approach to using evidence-based practices, the use of meta-analysis research, is most critical to identifying and implementing effective juvenile delinquency prevention/intervention models. According to Borenstein (2009) and Lipsey and Wilson
(2010), meta-analysis is “the technique for extracting and analyzing information about intervention effects and the characteristics of the interventions producing those effects from a body of qualifying research” (p. 20). Meta-analysis can assist providers with identifying the characteristics of effective programs, to include brand-name model programs and local/home-grown model programs that have proven to be effective.

**Structuring Reentry Program Models to Reduce Juvenile Delinquency and Successfully Transition Youth Offenders into Schools**

Reentry into the community and educational structures for noninstitutionalized (i.e. youth who have been suspended, expelled, or dropped out of school, but not detained in a secured facility) and institutionalized youth (i.e. youth who have had short and long-term stents within secured facilities) is often a difficult transition. Particularly in regard to successful reentry into the educational system, youth offenders need academic and behavioral support uniquely tailored to supporting the student’s needs and reducing risks. In the Practice Guide published by the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk, the authors argue that this specific population of students (youth offenders within the juvenile justice and child welfare systems) need supplemental support. Supplemental support is necessary for the success of this population due to the hardships they face including “changes in placement, family mobility, disabling conditions, economic disadvantages, and involvement in the justice system” (Gonsoulin, Darwin, & Read, 2012, p. 1). Unfortunately for youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, coordination between the justice system and school systems, particularly related
to enrollment, class placement, or restrictive education placement is poor (Leone & Weinberg, 2010). In many cases, youth offenders face barriers when trying to reenroll into school, which may or may not be as a result of the youth’s incarceration. Some schools may not want to accept the student into the school, fearing subsequent delinquency or risking the safety of other students. Contrarily, the youth offender may find difficulty enrolling in a school that will allow him/her because a previously attended school of record maintains the youth on its roster (Gonsoulin et al., 2012). Given these barriers, Gonsoulin suggests that planning for placement should begin early as not to delay placement. To delay the youth’s placement increases the probability of failed reentry as the youth has greater opportunity to either engage in delinquency or lose interest in academics. A smooth transition plan will include the youth and key stakeholders representing various organizations or groups.

Successful reentry also requires the collection and use of data to identify and develop learning plans. The use of technology is critical to gathering and sharing data that provides insight on the youth offender’s academic and behavioral needs. While it is necessary to the development of educational plans for youth transitioning back into schools, practitioners within various agencies must be mindful of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) restrictions; however, information within student records can be shared without violating confidentiality (Gonsoulin et al., 2012). The Guide recommends identifying an individual or team responsible for obtaining and passing information to appropriate bodies to decrease the delay in receiving records once the student is placed in an educational setting. Again, technology may be employed for
increased access by all necessary agencies. Once the data has been collected and adequately assessed, educators should develop plans based on the student’s academic and behavioral needs.

Given that inconsistencies between the educational frameworks of juvenile confinement institutions and public schools, many delinquent youth transitioning back into school systems experience academic gaps. Academic gaps may be identified through pre/posttests to establish a baseline of where students are and where they need to be academically. The assessment must be appropriate for the student’s age, skill level and background (Gonsoulin et al., 2012). Once the gaps are identified, educators (particularly those responsible for delivering instruction) should prepare instruction that not only addresses the students’ weaknesses, but provide instruction that highlights strengths. Problem areas ought to be broken down into manageable units as not to overwhelm or discourage the student (Gonsoulin et al., 2012).

Personalizing the school environment is compulsory to engaging the youth offender in school and ensuring successful reentry. Educators should focus on the academic needs and performance of students reentering while simultaneously showing interest in the student’s social development. Reis, Colbert, and Herbert (cited in Gonsoulin et al., 2012) contend that “at-risk students need teachers who value them as individuals with unique abilities, interests, strengths, and support their personal achievements” (p. 10). Finally, allowing students to actively participate in the decision-making process of their educational plan fosters an environment for greater commitment
to the educational goals on the part of the student and possibly on the part of their
caregivers. This assertion will be discussed in further detail below.

A final component of successful reentry for youth offenders is the avoidance of
punitive approaches by educators. Many juvenile delinquents returning to public schools
experience feelings of “not fitting in” to the educational setting. As a result, delinquency
may be difficult to avoid because the youth has yet to develop socially responsible
behavior. Given this challenge, educators must devise methods for correcting behaviors
that are not perceived as threats to the student psyche or physical well-being. Ignoring
minor disruptions or “giving students purpose and responsibility for behaviors and
maintain a clear structure for expectations and feedback to them” (Gonsoulin et al., 2012,
p. 12) helps build trust between student and adult.

Gagnon and Richards’s (2008) research on transitioning youth involved in the
juvenile corrections system reveals five core commonalities, across various settings, to
guide organization and community leaders and develop programs and services. First is
the need for **school-based preparatory experiences**. Youth who are confined to
secured-care facilities must have access to highly qualified personnel. These youth
offenders should be able to pursue education and maintain some degree of consistency
regarding education, thus it is incumbent upon the law enforcement agencies and
appropriate school district to develop a standardized curriculum for youth in confined
facilities. This curriculum should be aligned with instruction that is delivered within the
public school setting and should also be aligned with state standards and assessments
(Gagnon & Richards, 2008). Additionally, the personnel responsible for delivering
instruction must be able to effectively deliver instruction to students, with and without learning disabilities or emotional disturbances. Furthermore, Gagnon and Richards assert that the “Carnegie units earned wile the youth is confined within the secured facility should be transferable to public schools” (p. 15). This will diminish the time detained students have to commit to credit recovery plans upon reentry into the home school. For youth who have contact with the juvenile justice system, but are not restricted by secured facilities, collaboration and the planning of educational goals (primarily graduation) must also exist to ensure that the youth offender’s education, social, and emotional needs are met (Gagnon & Richards, 2008).

Second, youth offenders need access to career preparation and work-based experiences. For youth to develop career goals and make informed decisions about career paths, the youth must be exposed to various career opportunities. This exposure may be found within vocational programming offered through the school, secured facility, or community organizations. As students identify their career interests and obtain the appropriate skills, their potential for employability increases and the youth are better equipped to reenter the community and school. Gagnon and Richards (2008) suggest that career preparation and work-based experiences be provided after school, during school, onsite, or offsite, where applicable. The experiences provided for youth should be aligned with community needs. Furthermore, the work-based experience must show learning on the part of the youth that may be measured through formal assessment (Gagnon & Richards, 2008). Finally, the career preparation and work experience training should assist the youth offender with addressing the following:
1. How to respond to employers about previous involvement with juvenile justice system;
2. How to get juvenile records sealed and expunged; and
3. How to get such items as a social security card, financial assistance (e.g., health care, housing assistance, food assistance, etc.). (p. 16)

**Youth development and leadership** is the third component of successful models of reentry programs discussed by Gagnon and Richards (2008). In order for youth offenders to make better decision about future behaviors, the research suggests that offenders be provided with education related to risk-taking behaviors and associated consequences. Oftentimes, youth engage in criminal and risky acts, because they do not know or understand the implications of a given action or the severity of punishment. Providing education on risk-taking behaviors, such as gang membership, drug abuse, sexual activity, and law violations, may assist youth with controlling their impulses and being vulnerable to peer pressure (Gagnon & Richards, 2008). In addition, peer and adult mentoring may be utilized to prepare youth with leadership competencies. Identifying the most appropriate mentor for a youth offender is the key to making a real impact, as adolescents are more apt to respond positively to their peers. According to Gagnon and Richards, “Older youth who have transitioned form the juvenile justice system and made positive changes may be particularly positive role models for youth. Adult role models may also promote positive youth development” (p. 16). Lastly, youth development and leadership should be guided by broad and individualized transition plans, which provide services for developing “self-determination skills, competitive job placement, flexible
educational opportunities, social skills instruction, and immediate service coordination of wrap-around services” (Gagnon & Richards, 2008, p. 17).

The research study’s fourth observation is that successful programs and models are able to provide connecting activities through collaboration. The collaboration among various agencies (education, law enforcement, mental health, and families) must be consistent, communicate frequently, and clearly define the roles of each party. Rather than duplicating services and overlooking others, the agencies may work together while the youth is confined and upon release in an effort to ensure that recidivism occurs less frequently. In addition, Gagnon and Richards (2008) suggest the development of an exit plan that outlines the reenrollment process. This plan is to be developed by all concerned adults.

The final characteristic of programs, which have been successful in youth offender transition and school reentry, relates to family involvement and support. While parental influence lessens as children grow older and are influenced by external factors, when youth come into contact with the juvenile justice system, parental involvement and support is pivotal. The parent should be involved while the youth is confined or monitored and upon release, so that the parent may effectively advocate for their child. Similarly, familial involvement during youth confinement and upon exit is an important factor for reducing recidivism rates (Dague & Tolin, 1996; Quinn & Van Dyke, 2004).

A report published by JustChildren, Legal Aid Justice Center and submitted to the Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education, presented strategies implemented by
various state agencies seeking to reenroll students. The commonality between each states’ practice was the formal collaboration that existed between the court system and the educational system. Juvenile offenders within West Virginia’s Office of Juvenile Justice (OJJ) are required by law to have an educational plan prepared at least 45 days prior to release. This plan is developed by the OJJ and reviewed by the student’s parent, defense attorney, prosecutor, parole officer, local school principal, and mental health caseworker for comments (JustChildren, 2006). This form of collaboration ensures that all stakeholders know and understand their role in the student’s reentry process and supports the student’s educational and social needs.

Similarly, the JustChildren’s report highlights the practices of other states, including New York, Maine, and Kentucky. The local school superintendent in Maine establishes a reintegration team for students who will be reentering the district upon release from a juvenile facility. Unlike in West Virginia, the reintegration team does not consist of representatives within law enforcement agencies, but instead is comprised of the school principal, a parent, the student’s classroom teacher(s), and a guidance counselor (JustChildren, 2006). Even though law enforcement is not represented in the reintegration team, collaboration occurs in the form of notification of student leaving the OJJ system and coming to the school district. Both Kentucky and New York have similar structures in place for transitioning youth offenders from the juvenile justice system to the school district. The collaboration between the school district and law enforcement agency occurs before reentry/during confinement (in the form of dual enrollment, transition interviews, etc.) and upon release (JustChildren, 2006).
The research conducted by JustChildren identifies four characteristics of best practices for reenrolling students into schools. The recommendations are as follows.

1. **Inter-agency and Community Cooperation: Clear roles and responsibilities.** Identify clearly the roles and responsibilities of various agency personnel including specific timelines for the development of a reenrollment plan and the transfer of record, and insure that there is transparency and accountability built into the process so that these responsibilities are met. (JustChildren, 2006, p. 3)

   This practice will allow various organizations to avoid a duplication of services or ineffectively meet the needs of the youth offender. Through sharing information related to the services provided while the student is detained, the school system will be better prepared to offer appropriate additional services.

2. **Youth and Family Involvement.** Include in the reenrollment process the people who have the most at stake—the young person and appropriate family members or guardians. Insure that they have copies of the plan and the contact information for people who are responsible for helping the student reenroll (JustChildren, 2006, p. 3).

   Involving both the youth and parent appears to be a logical inclusion in the reentry process; however, the failure of many rehabilitative efforts is the result of not including the student and the parent. Instead, various agencies plan in isolation for a number of reasons, including the bureaucratic process of formal organizations, unavailability of parents, or simply due to an individual’s contention that the student or
parent does not have the capability of contributing to the plan, thus should be excluded. As stated, this recommendation appears logical, but is often taken for granted and not practically applied when developing reentry plans for youth offenders. Additionally, the report offers recommendations for overcoming barriers that exclude youth and parents in the reentry process. These recommendations may assist schools, law enforcement agencies and community organizations increase parental involvement as parents interface with the courts and school. The strategies are as follows.

A. Schedule meetings and hearings to accommodate working parents;
B. Inform parents of the importance of the process and decisions being made;
C. Reduce probation officer caseloads;
D. Allow volunteers to work with parents, such as CASA’s (Court Appointed Special Advocates);
E. Clarify who is responsible for involving the parent;
F. Increase the access to information between various agencies; and
G. Increase funding for community programs that work with families to provide information about the families to the courts for individualized resolution of cases. (JustChildren, 2006, p. 15)

3. **Speedy Placement.** Insure that young people can reenroll quickly—the same day or within a very short time—after their release. (JustChildren, 2006, p. 3).

The timing of placement into a school is critical for successful reentry in that speedy placement illustrates to the student that the educational plans developed by the law enforcement agency, school, or community organization are expected to be carried
out immediately. In essence, it sends the message that the plan and expectations are real rather than a form or protocol or condition of release only on paper. In addition, placing the student within a structured environment [school] minimizes the opportunity for continued delinquency in the community because the student is supervised within the school.

4. Appropriate placement. Insure that the student is returning to an appropriate education placement in the least restrictive environment. Continuity is vital and frustration must be reduced to a minimum. There should be individualized consideration of each student's placement based on the presumption that a young person has been rehabilitated, not automatic placement in alternative programs for students with discipline problems. (JustChildren, 2006, p. 3)

This recommendation speaks to the frequent practice of educational systems placement of students with criminal histories into alternative schools. As JustChildren suggests, this practice may be more detrimental to the student’s future behavior or delinquency in the school system. If it is assumed that the student has been rehabilitated through the justice system, placing the student within an alternative school, may be perceived as additional punishment by both the student and parents as the alternative school setting provides little to no social engagement opportunities through extracurricular programming. Furthermore, “critics of alternative schools voice concerns about the effectiveness of alternative schools, citing low graduation rates, noncompetitive standardized test scores, and the students ability to perform well in college after having
graduated from an alternative school” (Cable, Plucker, & Spradlin, 2009, p. 2). Overall, the placement of youth offenders into alternative schools should not be automatic, but assessed on a case-by-case basis. For some students, this setting is absolutely necessary, but for others, the alternative school structure is too restrictive and counterproductive to school reentry.

**Intervention and Mentoring Relationships**

The purpose of mentoring can best be understood in terms of its intended outcomes, particularly for the mentee. Mentoring relationships are often established for the express purpose of personal or professional development. Within the confines of the juvenile justice system, mentoring is recognized as an effective technique to reach youth who are at-risk of juvenile delinquency or who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system due to criminal activity. The goal then is twofold: personal development related to self-esteem, behavior, and academics, but also an effort to reduce the likelihood of recidivism (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2003). Because mentoring within the juvenile justice system is largely focused on reducing subsequent delinquency, mentoring programs are structured differently from traditional community-based mentoring programs (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008). To support this effort, the OJJDP has provided more than $500 million to mentoring programs (Office of Justice Programs: Fact Sheet, 2011).

The research on mentoring and its impact on juvenile delinquency is limited; however, available studies yield mixed data. In fact, more is known about the relationship between mentoring and risk factors than on the relationship and effect of
mentoring on delinquency (Roberts, Liabo, Lucas, DuBois, & Sheldon, 2004). Some studies have shown significant reductions in areas like aggressive behavior and delinquency; however, the research design of many studies is flawed according to critics. The problem with the research design is the absence of a comparison or control group (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008). Without comparing juveniles exposed to mentoring treatment with juvenile offenders not exposed, the validity of a significant relationship between the two variables is questionable. In contrast, other studies have revealed significant relationships between mentoring and reduction in delinquency. An evaluation of the Aftercare for Indiana Through Mentoring [AIM] program (an aftercare reentry program which includes a variety of wraparound services and establishes mentoring relationships for youth offenders) showed success in reducing recidivism and reincarceration. AIM researchers conducted a longitudinal study comparing three distinct populations of youth offenders. The interventions for each offender ranged from life skills training-only, life skills training and mentoring, to no service at all for youth on probation over the course of four years. At the conclusion of the study, the finding revealed the positive implications of mentoring for youth offenders receiving treatment. The population which received both mentoring and life skills training experienced the lowest incidence of reincarceration at 43%, while the population that received life skills-only training experienced a 50% reincarceration rate compared to the control group that received neither service experienced a 62% reincarceration rate (AIM, 2004). The findings of this research suggests that mentoring relations can have positive implications for the youth offender related to subsequent contact with the juvenile justice system.
In a study conducted by Bouffard and Bergseth (2008), the researchers used an experimental and control group to determine the impact of mentoring relationships facilitated by paid employees in a rural setting. This study was unique in that the personnel (transitional coordinators [TC]) were not only responsible for programmatic requirements including case management and the preparation of transitional plans, but these individuals were also responsible for coordinating and attending social activities with the court involved youth. The activities supported by the mentor (TC) included shopping, cultural activities, college tours, and sporting events (Bouffard & Berseth, 2008). Relationships and the coordination of activities between the mentor (TC) and mentee (youth offender) were established prior to the release of the offender through personal visits and telephone calls. The services of the reentry program were delivered over the course of six months and then evaluated to determine the impact of the intervention.

First, the study revealed significantly higher rates of contact with probation officers and mentors (TC) for youth offenders within the reentry program (1.05 contacts per week) compared to youth not served (probation only) by the reentry program (.27 contacts per week). As a result of the increased contact, the study suggested that there was a correlation between contact and other measurable outcomes including drug use and recidivism.

The second significant finding related to drug use, indicated that the experimental group (youth within the reentry program) was subjected to urinalysis more frequently (3.13 average number of tests) compared to the control group (1.53 average number of
tests). Given the higher frequency of testing and the larger proportion of subjects tested within the experimental and control group (74.1% and 30.6%, respectively), the urinalysis test showed higher incidences of drug use within the control group at 62.17% compared to 34.27% within the experimental group (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008). The third outcome that showed significant effects of mentoring and delinquency was related to subsequent contact with law enforcement. Within the sample of both populations, 37% of youth within the reentry program had subsequent contact with law enforcement after six months compared to approximately 49% of the control group having subsequent contact (Bouffard & Bergseth, 2008).

Overall, this study asserts that mentoring relationships contribute to the effectiveness of juvenile offender reentry programs. While the findings of this study and similarly structured mentoring relationships illustrate the positive impact of mentoring on juvenile delinquency and reducing recidivism, a review of the literature reveals the need for further study. However, to maximize the impact of mentoring relationships structured within reentry programs it is important for practitioners imbed the following practices: “(a) reasonably intensive screening of mentors, (b) matching based on shared interest of the mentor and mentee, (c) more than six hours of training for mentors, and (d) ongoing training and support after matches have been made” (TeamChild, 2011, p. 2).

Promising Collaborations between Law Enforcement Agencies, Workforce Development Agencies, and Community Organizations

As the research suggests, collaboration among varying agencies has proven most effective in transitioning youth out of the justice system and back into their respective
schools and communities. While evaluation of program effectiveness is limited, a number of intervention programs have been deemed effective and provide models for practitioners to follow. The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) denotes that in order for an intervention plan or program to be successful, it must be “positive in orientation and comprehensive in their scope” (OJJDP, 2000, p. 13). The programs discussed within this section show evidence of these characteristics.

The Court Employment Project (CEP) funded in 1967 in New York City, is a 6-month program that offers alternative programming for youth who have come into contact with the justice system. This program offers services in the following areas: (a) Orientation classes on legal rights and responsibilities, health, education, and substance use; (b) Individualized case management and service planning; (c) GED and pre-GED instruction and testing; (d) Assistance with public school enrollment and engagement including school visits; (e) Next Steps college prep class, college visits, and application assistance; (f) Substance abuse education and referrals; (g) Mental health screening and counseling; (h) Employment readiness training; (i) Subsidized internships and job placement assistance; (j) Recreational fitness activities; and (k) Art classes and art therapy activities (Court Employment Project, 2013).

Youth offenders are referred to the Court Employment Project (CEP) upon contact with the New York juvenile justice system; however, offenders are not automatically admitted into the program. Instead, CEP court staff assesses the youth’s criminal history, interview potential participants, and meet with the youth’s attorney to
determine eligibility. If the youth offender is accepted into the program, his/her educational and clinical needs are assessed in order for staff to develop and individualized plan for transition into schools or the workforce. During the 6-month intervention, CEP provides status updates to the courts according to participant release conditions. If the program is completed successfully, documentation is provided to the courts that assist the youth in offender in avoiding jail time and/or sealing the juvenile record. Participants are also provided with aftercare services once graduating form the CEP program. CEP staff refer student to a variety of community-based organizations that may provide education, recreational, health, and counseling services. According to the CEP website, 60% of participants successfully complete the program, 90% are provided with aftercare services (connected to schools, job training, counseling, etc.), and 85% of graduates have no further criminal conviction within 2 years (Court Employment Project, 2013).

A collaborative effort managed by the Oregon Department of Education, Oregon Youth Authority, Oregon Office of Vocational Services, and the University of Oregon offers an effective transition program for youth offenders. Project Parole SUPPORT has defined two primary goals: (a) decrease rates of recidivism and (b) increase school and/or workforce engagement among participants (Gagnon & Richards, 2008). Key personnel include a designated transition specialist, the youth’s parole officer, a vocational resource counselor, and community education staff. These individuals work together to develop a transition plan that is aligned with the youth’s parole plan and also based upon the assessment of the youth’s “strengths, needs, interests, and life goals”
(Gagnon & Richard, 2008, p. 25). Services provided are based upon five components specific to effectively serving youth with emotional and behavioral disorders. The components include (a) Competitive job placement; (b) Social skill instruction; (c) Flexible education opportunities; (d) Immediate service coordination of wrap-around services; and (e) Enhanced self-determination skills (Gagnon & Richards, 2008). Project Parole SUPPORT reports success in achieving one of its primary goals: reducing recidivism. An external report showed 85% of the program’s participant did not repeat offenses at the 12-month marker (Gagnon & Richards, 2008).

**Summary**

The review of literature provided within this chapter reflects the research that has been conducted on juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention strategies as well as reentry practices. The research indicates collaboration between law enforcement agencies and educational bodies is an absolute necessity for successful reentry into schools and the community. Both structures cannot afford to work in isolation simply because the results are detrimental to the individual and society in both the short and long term. This chapter provided an in-depth examination of the history of juvenile justice policy (from prevention and rehabilitation to punitive policy to an intermingling of the two approaches) in the United States. As the literature states, approaches to juvenile justice policy are significantly influenced by the race and culture of the dominant class, often resulting in dire consequences for minority youth offenders. These consequences affect an assortment of institutions including education. As a result, researchers within juvenile justice, education, and the social sciences have taken a keen look at school and
community prevention and intervention programming that will diminish the negative implications of juvenile delinquency. The review of literature contained within this chapter focused on the structure of juvenile delinquency programs that effectively reduce subsequent delinquency and assist the youth in successful school reentry.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

For this study, the theoretical framework rested upon sociological and criminological theories of control. Control theories were selected as the framework for analyzing the effectiveness of the Youth Against Violence intervention program due to its focus on conformity rather than deviance. Control theory takes the position that an explanation of why individuals become deviant is not the critical question for understanding deviance. Instead, the theory focuses on both internal and external factors that influence an individual’s choice to conform. The variables included within this study were largely confined to the key agents influencing conformity including the family and school. These two institutions are the major sources of control as children and adolescents are socialized, thus require a theoretical framework that can be practically applied in a study of program effectiveness on youth who have come into contact with law enforcement agencies.

In this chapter, the researcher presents the origins of control theory from a historical perspective, then move to subsequent theories that have evolved under the auspices of control theory including F. Ivan Nye’s (1958) modes of social control, Walter Reckless’ (1967) containment theory, Travis Hirschi’s (1969) social bond and delinquency theory, and Hirschi and Michael Gottfredson’s (1995) self-control theory. Included within this discussion of the theoretical framework, the implications of control
theory is also presented to provide an explanation of control theories popularity and application to programs that focus on prevention and intervention programs related to juvenile delinquency. Finally, this chapter will discuss the relationship among the variables and the theoretical framework and limitations of the study.

**Origins of Control Theory**

Control theories became popular during the 1960s because it seemed to explain the loss of control and conformity in American society. At the time, conventional institutions were said to be crumbling, thus it made sense to think that crime was the natural order of a failed society. Unlike theories preceding control theory including American anthropologist Robert K. Merton’s strain theory (1938) and American sociologist Edwin Sutherland’s (1939) differential association, control theory is not a theory of deviance, but instead a theory of conformity. Conformity in itself is often taken for granted according to control theorists because of the assumption that conformity is considered the norm and natural order of a civilized, modern society. Control theorists assert that if this were in fact an inherent norm (conformity), crime, deviance, and delinquency would not occur; however, because crime, deviance, and delinquency are present in any society the theory postulates that controlling factors mitigate the frequency and occurrence of crime yielding conformity most often observed in society. The main theoretical premise of control theory is that “when controls are present, crime does not occur; when controls are absent, crime is possible and often does occur” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 80). Further, if there are controls in place yet crime still ensues, one may conclude that those controls are ineffective and failing both individuals and society.
Punitive policy in handling delinquency in some cases may be deemed ineffective because recidivism remains high while deterrence remains low. In this instance, one may question the purpose of juvenile justice policy that is ineffective in achieving the intended outcome(s).

The origins of control theory can be traced to the work of sociologist Emile Durkheim. Durkheim (1964) studied the implications of the Industrial Revolutions and the collapse of solidarity among individuals: bonds between individuals became broken which resulted in anomie (normlessness), forcing individuals to become more self serving in a new complex society. Within every individual, according to Durkheim exists a blending of two aspects of the self that must reconcile in order to maintain social solidarity and diminish crime and delinquency. One aspect of the self is the “civilized member of the community” who looks to society to determine what is socially acceptable and what is not. The process of socialization is the vehicle for which individuals come to understand the norms. In contrast, the other aspect of the self is egotistical, exhibiting “no natural limits” and succumbing to the impulses or whims that offer gratification of and for the self only. These two aspects of the self are constantly negotiating the terms of conformity and deviance. When the individual is able to commit to socially acceptable norms and behaviors, the egotistical aspect of the self lies dormant. For adults, the process of socializations teaches individuals how to reconcile the two, but the path toward conformity as an adolescent is more difficult for some. Given this, it may be assumed that juvenile delinquents have not reached the cognitive capacity to control the impulses even when social controls are in place to govern behavior. Those controls (i.e.
personal self control, discipline by parents and other authority figures including law enforcement agencies or school disciplinary figures) are futile.

Albert Reiss’s (1951) article “Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Control” primarily focused on two types of control. The first, personal control is defined as “an individual’s ability to refrain from behavior that conflicts with norms and rules of society to meet needs” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 85). An example of personal control for a youth who has experienced the juvenile justice system might include refraining from drug use or attending school per the requirements of his or her bond condition rather than being truant. The second type of control, social, is defined as “the ability of social groups or institutions to make norms or rules effective” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 85). The practice of schools and employers to adopt a code of conduct that can effectively deter unfavorable behavior is an example of social control. Given both types of control according to Reiss (1951) conformity results only when individuals either accept (internalize) the norms of society or submit in adherence of the existing social controls (i.e. legitimate authority). It should be noted that Reiss’s primary concern was not to understand why delinquency occurred, but rather to develop an instrument that would predict delinquency (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). Conformity and control according to Reiss could only be achieved through the child’s primary groups, which include the family, school, and community. Furthermore, failure of the primary group(s) to provide social norms that the child internalizes and submits to results in delinquency and recidivism.

F. Ivan Nye (1958), also a control theorist, utilized four modes of social control to explain why criminal behavior is not more common. From his perspective, because the
results of crime are easier and quicker to obtain, there must exist some reason why 
individuals choose not to become delinquent. His theory focuses on the family as the 
most important agent of social control capable of “generating direct control, internalized 
control, indirect control, and control through alternative means of need satisfaction” 
(Lilly, Cullen, Ball, 2007, p. 87). Direct control is that which is imposed by external 
forces including parents, law enforcement agents, having the ability to enforce 
punishment for norm violations. The individual manages internalized control in the 
absence of direct control. Indirect control can be understood in terms of the “extent of 
affection and identification integrating the individual with authority figures in general 
and with parents in particular” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 86). Finally, control may 
be generated when a social system allows for a variety of legitimate means to an end. 
Each mode of control, according to Nye (1958), works independently, but reinforces one 
another to result in conformity and reduce delinquency.

**Control: Containment Theory**

According to Lilly, Cullen, and Ball (2007), “Internalization is the process by 
which social norms are taken so deeply into the self as to become a fundamental part of 
the personality structure” (p. 103). The question then becomes, how do or by what 
process do norms become so deeply imbedded into an individual’s consciousness or 
moral character that socially accepted norms translates into conforming behaviors. As 
control theory postulates, the theory itself is concerned with why most individuals 
conform to social norms, expectations, and rules of social engagement and interaction 
rather than submit to norm violations (deviance). According to control theorist, Walter
Reckless (1967), understanding the reasons individuals conform or become deviant requires the explanation of differential responses (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). Differential responses refers to self factors that would explain why some individuals succumbed to social pressures leading to crime and delinquency, whereas others remain relatively law-abiding in the same circumstances (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007).

To identify the differential responses, Reckless’ (1961) research focused on youth living in disorganized areas who did not become delinquent. Reckless’ containment theory addresses why conformity is widely accepted by the masses, particularly by individuals overwhelmingly affected by negative social ills having the capability to push or pull an individual toward delinquency. He defined pushes as environmental conditions that pressure an individual toward delinquency. These environmental factors include poverty, deprivation, or blocked opportunities (Akers & Sellers, 2004). The second environmental condition, which induces delinquency, is referred to as pulls. Pulls are described as illegitimate opportunities that might pull an individual toward misbehavior (i.e. gangs or other delinquent subgroups) (Akers & Sellers, 2004). Given the environmental factors (pushes and pulls), delinquency can only be thwarted when counteracted by inner and outer containment. According to containment theory, “outer containment as a form of social control includes parental and school supervision and discipline, strong group cohesion, and a consistent moral front. Inner containment consists primarily of strong consciousness or a ‘good self-concept,’” (Akers & Seller, 2004, p. 114).

As Reckless (1967) refined containment theory, he identified three factors which influenced outer containment: “(a) reasonable limits, (b) meaningful roles and activities,
and (c) several complimentary variables such as reinforcement by groups and significant supportive relationships, acceptance, [and] the creation of a sense of belonging and identity” (Reckless, 1967, pp. 470-471). Essentially, outer containment is external to the individual and reflects various agents of social control having the capacity to impede individual impulses to engage in delinquency. Accordingly, outer containment requires varied degrees of social pressure experienced by the individual.

Inner containment by contrast emphasizes an individual’s ability to regulate behaviors in order to satisfy social norms, regardless of changes in the environment. The factors influencing inner containment include self-concept, goal orientation, frustration tolerance, and norm retention (Reckless, 1967). Individuals with a positive self-concept (heavily influenced by parents) are less likely to engage in delinquency according to the theory because personal perception of the self aligns with abidance of the law. Even in the presence of pushes and pulls toward delinquency, the positive self-concept overcomes the environmental condition, thus the reason many youth within disorganized communities yield to social norms. Goal orientation according to Reckless is so critical to inner containment because positive aspirations serve as a tool for guiding behavior in order to meet personal gals at some point in the future. The individual must conclude that the goal and opportunity to achieve the goal is available, realistic, and attainable. Frustration tolerance refers to an individual’s degree of control over frustrations (both externally or internally generated). Those who exhibit high frustration tolerance are better equipped to cope with the frustrations of contemporary society and exert self-control (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). The final component of inner containment, norm retention is important for a less than obvious reason if one critically analyzes the term
beyond face value. For control theorists including Reckless (1967), the critical analysis of norm retention requires particular attention to the way in which norms become eroded. Rather than focusing on an individual’s “adherence to, commitment to, acceptance of, identification with, legitimation of [and] defense of values, norms…”, the focus is turned to the way in which individuals “alienate, emancipate, and withdraw from norms and values” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 91).

**Travis Hirschi: Social Bonds and Delinquency Theory**

In developing the social bond theory, American criminologist Travis Hirschi (1983) focused his work on differentiating offenders from nonoffenders. His intent was then to challenge the theories of other social scientists, particularly Sutherland’s (1939) differential association and Merton’s strain theory. Hirschi (1983) asserted that there was no need to explain motivations for committing crime (as differential association and strain theory did), but instead, there was a need to identify the nature of the social controls that regulate when crime occurs: “social bonds.” While Hirschi sought to challenge the social disorganization theories of the Chicago School, it must be noted that he did not necessarily disagree with the theories. In fact, Hirschi admits that due to social disorganization’s unpopularity at the time, he purposely avoided it explaining social bond theory.

To explain social bond theory, Hirschi (1983) made the assertion that control is sustained by individual’s continuing relationship with conventional order (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). The relationship with conventional order is consistently maintained through the process of internalization previously discussed in this chapter. According to
Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory, delinquency occurs when social norms are not internalized and the individual’s bond to society is weak or completely broken. To understand how this process occurs, Hirschi stressed four control variables that influence social control: (a) attachment, (b) commitment, (c) involvement, and (d) belief. In explaining attachment, Hirschi argues that the more attached individuals (particularly youth) are to their parents, peers, and school, the less likely they are to engage in delinquency. “Attachment to parents is measured by supervision, discipline, and good communication while attachment to school is measured by grades, test scores, self-perception or scholastic ability” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 119). This is due to the individual’s degree of admiration of significant others and his or her desire to meet the expectations of significant others. In contrast, when individuals have low attachment or weak affectional ties to significant others (particularly parents), the individual is more inclined to violate social norms. Hirschi (1969) also argued that youth who have high attachments to delinquent peers or parents who are delinquent, are still less likely to become delinquent because of the strong bonds to those peers and parents. This argument drastically differs from Sutherland’s differential association, which states that youth who are delinquent create a subculture that encourages and fosters an environment of delinquency because the individual is so attached to the delinquent peers and the behaviors associated, required, and expected with group membership.

When explaining commitment, Hirschi (1969) refers to the individual’s commitment to this or her self-interests and the need to protect those interests.

---

2In Hirschi’s subsequent work, this notion was later found to be untrue.
Individuals conform to conventional norms for the purpose of ensuring that investments produce intended outcomes that the individual can enjoy over the long haul. A violation of a norm could result in the loss of some tangible object (i.e. job, loved one, money), thus people are inclined to prevent such a loss through norm retention or commitment as Hirschi described.

Involvement, according to Hirschi (1969), refers to a multitude of activities or responsibilities (legitimate) that an individual engages in which prevents participation in delinquent acts. Basically, a person does not have the time or opportunity to do anything that violates conventional social norms, thus conformity results. For youth, involvement that prevents time for delinquency might include after school academic programming (study hall or tutorials), extracurricular activities at school or in the community, familial responsibilities delegated by parents, or even employment. This variable of social control by social bonds is questionable because Hirschi’s findings did not support the hypothesis that involvement in conventional activities resulted in conformity (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007).

The final variable of social control by social bonding, according to Hirschi, belief, refers to the extent to which an individual believes that “values and norms, especially the belief that laws and society’s rules in general are morally correct and should be the obeyed” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 119). An individual’s belief in conventional norms is highly dependent on constant social reinforcement (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007). This is to say, individuals come to believe in conventional norms as a result of personal attachment to conventional systems and institutions (parents, school, etc.) previously discussed in this analysis.
Social bond theory contends that the weaker the bonds, the higher the probability of juvenile delinquency. Many studies have applied Hirschi’s theoretical framework of social control by social bond and have revealed data that do not support the variables to the extent hypothesized by Hirschi (Akers & Sellers, 2004). In regard to attachment, Hirschi himself found that youth who are highly attached to delinquent peers are more likely to become delinquent also. A study by Jensen and Brownfield (1983) disproved the notion that high attachment to parents reduced the tendency to engage in delinquency whether the parent exhibited positive or negative behaviors. Overall, evidence supporting the bond variables and impact on delinquency is varied, but appears to “range from moderate to low” (Akers & Sellers, 2004, p. 122; Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 106).

**From Social Bond Theory to Self-Control Theory**

Self-control theory was developed in 1990 by Hirschi and colleague Michael Gottfredson in an attempt to move away from Hirschi’s social bond theory. Self-control according to the theory is exercised restraint that allows people to resist crime and other short-term gratification. Hirschi and Gottfredson (1995) assert that the path toward or away from crime starts at an early age, similar to social bond theory. The major difference between the two theories however, is that social bond theory is largely dependent upon social relationships and the quality of those relationships to society, while self-control theory is completely internal (and bares resemblance to Reckless inner containment). According to the theory, an individual’s ability to control the self is largely influenced by the quality of parenting. Neglectful parenting, particularly as it
relates to supervision, may result in a youth’s attraction to crime and delinquency. This is surmised because the youth’s socialization (again, largely influenced by parents) is incomplete or ineffective. Deviant acts go unpunished or unaddressed which signals to the youth that such behavior is acceptable. As a result, the youth tends to exhibit low self-control in various aspects of life to include the acceptance of social norms, values, and beliefs.

An assessment of self-control theory yields that empirical tests support the theory of low self-control being related to delinquency. However, the theory has received criticism due to its assumptions concerning self-control. The first criticism of self-control theory is that it does not explain how individuals with low self-control as adolescents do not become deviant as adults. Low self-control in adolescence is not indicative of absolute adult criminality. Second, “self-control is not strongly related to analogous behaviors such as smoking” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 109). While engagement or nonengagement in analogous behaviors such as drinking in excess or gambling requires a degree of self control, the theory is more focused on self-control as it relates to criminal behavior. The final criticism of the theory is in the argument that parenting is not the chief source of low-self control. Critics argue that self-control is learned through the process of socialization, which is influenced by a variety of socialization agents including schools, peers, the media, and organized sports. Take schools for instance. If a school environment is unhealthy and the culture provides an atmosphere of disorganization, the presence of control is unlikely and teaches youth nothing positive in terms of self-control.
Implications of Control Theories

According to control theorists, if the problem of crime is attributed to the weakening of social bonds and institutions (family and school) or self-control, those bonds and institutions only need to be strengthened to deter crime. Regulation of individuals through policies of deterrence that rely on the fear of getting caught and punishment have not been significantly effective in eliminating crime because these policies offer no help in procuring self-control or social bonds. Control theories are supportive of programs that would strengthen the family and assist in instilling favorable self-concept, impulse control, and frustration tolerance. Control theories also provide considerable support for school programs developed to build school-aged children’s bond to school. In strengthening the bond between children and school, the risk of academic failure and delinquency is increased. Finally, control theories contend the need for policies that reflect a positive payoff to adolescents and adults who avoid delinquency and instead conform to conventional social norms. Programs that focus on prevention and intervention for youth offenders can assist in efforts to increase internal self-control and attachment to social norms, yielding positive outcomes in delinquency and school reentry.

Definition of Dependent Variable

Program effectiveness of Youth Against Violence—the extent to which the intended outcomes of school reentry and reduction of recidivism (juvenile delinquency to include offenses ranging from truancy to murder) are achieved upon completion of the 8-week intervention. Measures of effectiveness for school reentry include (a) return to
home school or traditional school, (b) return to an alternative school, and/or (c) complete dropout of secondary school.

**Definition of Independent Variables**

**Extended family involvement**—the extent to which family members including grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, step relatives, new spouses, and partners of parents promote and support the social, emotional, academic, and physical well-being of the youth during participation of the YAV intervention.

**School attendance and truancy**—regular school attendance in accordance with Georgia state laws for youth between the ages of 6 and 16. **Truancy**—the habitual violation of school attendance policy to include completely skipping the entire day or portions of the school day unrelated to excused absences.

**Staff and facilitator implementation of training**—the extent to which staff and facilitators incorporate strategies for reducing delinquency and reenrolling students into schools during the intervention programming.

**Family history with law enforcement**—the extent to which the YAV participant’s family member and significant others have had both negative and positive contact with law enforcement to include arrest incarceration, probation, parole, employment, or victimization.

**Mentoring relationships**—the extent to which mentoring influences program effectiveness and participant success outcomes to include reentry, reduction in recidivism, and positive social skills development; also includes the frequency of contact between mentor and mentee.
**Gang membership and/or affiliation**—the extent to which program participants and program staff members identify participants as gang members and how the label affects program goals and outcomes. A gang, according to Georgia law (Street Gang and Terrorism Prevention Act [OCGA 16-15-1]) is defined as any organization, association, or group of three persons associated in fact, whether formal or informal, which engages in criminal activity. These individuals may be associated together by name, hand signs, logos, tattoos, common colors, common clothing, or any other common characteristic.

**Frequency of contact**—refers to the number of times a youth has had negative or positive contact with law enforcement prior to, during, and after completion of the intervention program.

**Type of participant**—refers to the classification of the program participant within the intervention program to include first-time youth offender, repeat youth offender, non-youth offender, court ordered participant, school referred participant, or parent/family member referred.

**Participant demographics**—the extent to which race, age, gender, parental marital status, and socioeconomic status of program participants impact program effectiveness related to school reentry and reduction in recidivism.

**Parental involvement**—the extent to which youth offenders parents promote and support the social, emotional, academic, and physical well-being of the youth. Also refers to parental participation in program related activities (workshops, court appearances, etc.).
**Program curriculum**—refers to the materials and content within materials utilized during the 8-week intervention program to include workbooks and handouts which focus on a variety of developmental topics to include but not limited to gangs, drugs and alcohol use, conflict resolution, ethics and values, decision-making, violent crimes, and self-esteem.

Table 2 shows the alignment of the variables to items in the data source.

**Table 2**

*Alignment of the Variables to Items in the Data Source*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 1</td>
<td>B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 2</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 3</td>
<td>D1, D2, D3, D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attendance/Truancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 4</td>
<td>E1, E2, E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8</td>
<td>4, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Contact with Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 5</td>
<td>F1, F2, F3, F4, F5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 6</td>
<td>G1, G2, G3, G4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gang membership/Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 7</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of Contact with Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ 8</td>
<td>A1, A2, A4, A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant demographics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Independent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Variable(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 9</td>
<td>H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8, H9</td>
<td>Parental involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 10</td>
<td>I1, I2, I3, I4</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 11</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 12</td>
<td>4, 6, 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>6, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>Parental Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Family History with Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 14</td>
<td>4, 5, 7, 12, 13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful school reentry and the reduction of juvenile delinquency is essential for both the individual and society as noted in the introduction of this study. As an intervention program, the Youth Against Violence program’s effectiveness can only be measured in terms of its achievement of intended outcomes. In order for the program to be characterized as effective according to the characteristics of effective programs presented in the review of literature, there are specific strategies and activities for implementation that must be utilized. The core concepts of parental/extended familial involvement and support, attachment and commitment to school and academic achievement are critical to program success and effectiveness because these factors are believed to significantly influence a youth offender’s decision to conform to social norms. For the purpose of this study, the critical social norms in need of adherence are
comprised of regular school attendance upon meeting conditions for school reentry and the abidance of laws and rules governing behavior in school and society.

The independent variables for this study were selected to determine whether or not a significant relationship exists between them and the dependent variable and to understand how and why these factors affect program effectiveness. The selected variables for this research include (a) extended family involvement, (b) school attendance and truancy, (c) staff and facilitator implementation of training, (d) family history with law enforcement, (e) mentoring relationships, (f) gang membership and/or affiliation, (g) frequency of contact, (h) type of participant, (i) participant demographics, (j) parental involvement, and (k) program curriculum. Each of these variables have the capacity to influence the effectiveness of YAV programming because they relate to tenets of control theory’s social bond theory, self control theory, and containment theory. During the participation of the 8-week intervention, the support of parents and extended family is critical because this group acts as a source of accountability, ensuring the successful completion of the program in order to achieve school reentry and reduce recidivism. When youth offenders experience a supportive parental unit even after contact with law enforcement agencies, the researcher contends that program effectiveness is enhanced and more attainable. Additionally, the mentoring relationships provided for youth offenders afford subsequent support toward achieving programmatic goals and the goals developed by the youth offender as a result of successful completion. Mentoring relationships according to the review of literature have a significant impact on a youth offender’s decision making, thus YAV mentors who illustrate a commitment to the youth offender’s school achievement and adherence to laws and rules can positively influence
behavior. In contrast, the youth offender’s status or affiliation with gangs also plays an instrumental role in achieving the outcomes of the YAV program. The culture of gangs does not typically support conforming behaviors such as school attendance and completion or acceptance of laws and rules, thus the research sought to determine the relationship between the dependent variable and gang membership or affiliation. School attendance limits the opportunity for juvenile offenders to engage in delinquency and increases the probability of persistence and school completion. As it relates to staff and facilitator implementation of training and program curriculum, these variables are input factors that influence program effectiveness. The frequency of training, content included within the training setting, implementation of such training during the 8-week intervention, and curriculum developed by program staff must demonstrate best practices if the intended goals are to be achieved. Furthermore, for the youth offender, each of these variables exhibit a degree of control influencing behavior, thus the youth offender must incorporate the skills presented and/or taught during the program.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study identified three limitations. First, the Youth Against Violence program is an 8-week intervention program administering the program with new participants every 10 weeks. This was a limitation due to the researcher’s access to sample population once the study began. The determination of effectiveness then was limited to approximately 4 weeks after the start of the 8-week cycles beginning December 28, 2013. In an effort to collect the data in a reasonable time frame, the sample included participants attending the YAV intervention between December 28, 2013 and February 15, 2014 to determine
school reentry. To assess the effectiveness of the intervention on reducing recidivism, the research was limited to 4 weeks after completion of the program.

The second limitation of the study relates to the availability of the parent and extended family population to be sampled. In most cases, parents or extended family of participants dropped their child(ren) off during the session and returned for pickup at the end of each session. The few that stayed for the entirety of each session represent a statistically biased group as opposed to the desired random selection of parents. However, the researcher made every attempt to sample a diverse parent and extended family population to capture the most accurate representation of parental/extended family involvement and perception.

A final limitation of this study is that the program reviewed for analysis focused its strategies on prevention, intervention, and rehabilitation of youth offenders. When this research began, the researcher believed that the program utilized a formal curriculum that focused on school reentry; however, after observation it was concluded that the YAV program was not structured as a reentry program. While many participants were court ordered to complete the program in order to return to a traditional public school or meet the conditions of a probation/bond agreement, the YAV program does not systematically track or measure program effectiveness in terms of school reentry. Given this limitation, this analysis could not evaluate program effectiveness in regard to school reentry.

**Summary**

School reentry and reducing recidivism have been the goal of many juvenile delinquency programs. The way in which programs address the problem of juvenile
delinquency vary from shock treatment and incarceration to rehabilitation of youth offenders. The YAV program was one program that utilized a rehabilitative approach to reducing juvenile delinquency and successful school reentry. As control theories posit, in order to thwart juvenile delinquency, intervention programs that focus on increasing internal self-control and attachment and commitment to parents, schools, and socially accepted norm are most appropriate.

This chapter presented the theoretical framework to be utilized in examining the dependent and independent variables. Additionally, each of the selected variables was operationally defined in order to guide the study and measure program effectiveness. The intent of this study was to determine program effectiveness and identify the best strategies necessary for successful school reentry and reducing recidivism. Through this case study, school administrators, law enforcement agencies, parents, and other community stakeholders will be able to determine the factors which significantly influence school reentry and reducing recidivism for youth offenders in order to structure and facilitate future programming for prevention and intervention.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed the mixed methods approach to research to include tenets of the exploratory and explanatory research design coupled with both qualitative and quantitative research methodology. The mixed methods approach was selected due to its ability to provide more insight on program effectiveness than either of the approaches could provide independently (Creswell, 2009). The approaches are discussed within this chapter, followed by the description of the setting, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, statistical applications, a description of data analysis methods, and chapter summary.

Research Design

Exploratory Research Design

To become better acquainted with the Youth Against Violence program, and more specifically the effectiveness of the model to achieve its intended goals, the exploratory research design was used. Exploratory research design is most often used when the researcher becomes curious about a phenomenon or event. While programming for juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention is not a new phenomenon or event, what is unique about the YAV program is that it is the only juvenile delinquency initiative funded and facilitated by a law enforcement agency in the state of Georgia for nondetained youth offenders. The participants of the program have exhibited some form
of norm or law violation either in schools or in the community, which has resulted in admittance into the program. More specifically, youth offenders who enroll in the 8-week intervention program are either court referred as a part of their bond condition, referred by a local school district upon suspension or expulsion, or referred by parents upon observance of errant behavior. Applying the exploratory research design seemed to be well suited for assessing the effectiveness of local juvenile delinquency intervention program.

There were a number of advantages for using the exploratory research design. For the purpose of this analysis, the most obvious advantages will be discussed. As previously stated, this type of research sheds light on things relatively un-researched. Secondly, the exploratory research design tests the feasibility of undertaking more extensive research (Babbie, 2007). It tells the researcher if the time, effort, resources, etc. invested in the study is worth the information gained. Finally, this design approach helped the researcher develop methods to be employed in subsequent research. It is expected that the exploratory research of the YAV intervention program will lead to subsequent research on program effectiveness and program evaluation.

While the exploratory research design has a number of advantages for the researcher, there are also disadvantages that must be noted. The first and most obvious disadvantage is the lack of any clear direction to follow because no previous model exists. The researcher is basically tunneling through information that may be relatively hard to find or nonexistent because the model has not previously been evaluated or studied in regard to producing positive or negative intended and expected outcomes. Because of this disadvantage, the researcher may run into the problem of reliability
and validity. Reliability refers to that quality of measurement method that suggests that the same data would have been collected each time in repeated observation of the same phenomenon (Babbie, 2007; Borgatta & Borgatta, 1992). Validity is a term describing a measurement that accurately reflects the concept it is intended to measure (Babbie, 2007; Borgatta & Borgatta, 1992). Considering both reliability and validity in the exploratory research design, the data collected may not be reflective of the larger population.

**Explanatory Research Design**

A second approach utilized in this study was the explanatory research design. This research design is most commonly used because it answers the how and why a phenomenon exists, and more significantly, explanatory research addresses the dynamics between the independent variable (cause) and the dependent variable (effect). The purpose of this case study was to ultimately analyze the relationship between program effectiveness and the various independent variables presented in Chapter III of this analysis.

It must be noted that while the explanatory design is most commonly used, there exist negative consequences to such an approach. First, the cause and effect may be confusing or misleading. That is to say, the researcher is faced with the possibility of believing that action “b” resulted in action “a” rather action “a” resulted in action “b.” It is this misstep in qualitative field research that requires the researcher to be clear headed and consistent in defining key terms during the conceptualization and operationalization
phase of the research design. Finally, there also exists the possibility that final conclusions and explanations may be partial or incomplete.

While there are negative implications of the explanatory research design, overall, the design provides insight that goes beyond the description of events and participants. Considering the examination of the theoretical framework (control theories) and program effectiveness, the explanatory research design seeks to uncover the relationship between variables the variables which either do or do not have a significant impact on the intended outcomes of YAV programming.

**Description of the Setting**

To conduct this study, the primary setting for research was at the site where the 8-week intervention program was facilitated. Program participants and staff convened on a weekly basis, primarily on Saturdays between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., and occasionally on Thursday evenings during the cycle at the police department’s Public Safety Complex. The participants of the YAV intervention program came through the program via court, school referral, or parent/guardian referral.

The population for which the sample was taken, is located in a suburb of Atlanta, with a population of 133,971 as of 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2009). The student population within the county consisted of approximately 25,000 students in elementary, middle, and high school. A majority of the participants of the YAV program attended schools within this district. For students who were expelled from the home-base school and were enrolled in the 8-week program in order to return to the home-base school
typically attended the Ombudsmen High School program also functioning within the county school district.

**Sampling Procedures**

For collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, the selection process of participants was nonrandom, that was conveniently selected. When the 8-week cycle began, all program participants (approximately 40-50) were selected for survey completion. This was done due to slight fluctuations that were observed from week to week. In attempt to avoid overgeneralizations or researcher bias, the researcher worked with program staff to identify a balanced participant sample for collecting the qualitative data. A YAV administrator identified four former participants who were available to participate in the focus group. These former participants were over the age of 18 and included 2 males and 2 females. The staff focus group included 7 respondents, 4 males and 3 females. Focus group interviews were conducted face-to-face at the police department’s Public Safety Complex. The respondents of the survey instrument were between the ages of 12-22. As anticipated, a large majority of the participants were in grades 7-12, attending schools within the suburban school district. The participants’ contact with law enforcement ranged from non-offender to first-time offender to repeat offender. This information is provided in specific detail in Chapter V of this analysis. The gender and race of the participants are also described in detail in the following chapter. Table 3 shows the alignment of independent variables to data instruments.
Table 3

Alignment of Independent Variables to Data Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Instrument for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extended Family Involvement</td>
<td>1. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School Attendance and Truancy</td>
<td>2. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff &amp; Facilitator Implementation of Training</td>
<td>3. Staff Interview/Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family History w/Law Enforcement</td>
<td>4. Student Survey; Parent Focus Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mentoring Relationships</td>
<td>5. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gang Membership and/or Affiliation</td>
<td>6. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequency of Contact</td>
<td>7. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Type of Participant</td>
<td>8. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Parental Involvement</td>
<td>10. Student Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Data Analysis Methods (Qualitative Research)**

One method of data collection used in the research YAV program effectiveness was qualitative field research. Qualitative field research holds valuable strength in that it is very effective for examining social processes over time and allows the researcher to be flexible. Additionally, there is always room for modification during the data collection phase. Another advantage of qualitative field research is that it is relatively inexpensive. Unlike other methods of research including mail surveys or questionnaires, the money spent in this research was minimal.
There are a number of field research paradigms including naturalism, grounded theory, case studies, and the extended case method from which a researcher can choose. This analysis utilized the intrinsic case study method “in which the focus is on the case itself (e.g. evaluating a program, or studying a student having difficulty) because the case presents an unusual or unique situation” (Creswell, 2007, p. 74).

The researcher utilized interviews with one YAV facilitator (lawyer) and a YAV senior level administrator (deputy chief). The interviews were conducted face-to-face as this was the best way for the researcher to control the line of questioning and allowed respondents to provide historical information relative to YAV program effectiveness (Creswell, 2009). The interviews were recorded and transcribed by the researcher for the purpose of identifying emergent themes and connecting those themes to the independent variables where applicable. Additionally, the researcher conducted a focus group with four YAV participants and seven YAV staff to collect data on perceptions. The focus group responses were also recorded and transcribed by the researcher. Finally, document analysis was utilized to provide insight on YAV curriculum used during the 8-week intervention program. The documents that were analyzed included the YAV student workbook, which included program content and newspaper articles published by various local media outlets on the YAV program.

**Statistical Application (Quantitative Research)**

This study also used the quantitative research design to provide numerical descriptions of trends, attitudes, and opinions influencing YAV program effectiveness. A survey was administered to 41 YAV participants. The data collected from the survey
instrument was cross-sectional (collected at one point in time). The purpose of using the quantitative data was to demonstrate any correlation between the dependent variable and independent variables. To determine if significant relationships existed between the variables, the researcher used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The researcher developed code categories for organizing the intended outcomes for YAV participation (e.g. 1 = return to home-base school; 2 = return to alternative school; 3 = appearance of school dropout).

**Summary**

This chapter presented the research design employed in analyzing YAV program effectiveness in terms of school reentry and reducing recidivism. The research design included both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis for the purpose of yielding data that neither research method could provide independent of one another. The researcher used a student survey for the quantitative data and focus groups, interviews and document analysis for the qualitative data. These instruments were developed by the researcher according to the independent variables and research questions for the study.
CHAPTER V
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between program effectiveness and the independent variables. The researcher sought to determine if the program was achieving its intended goals of reducing juvenile delinquency and successfully reentering program participants into institutions of education and/or the community. The data were collected at the site of the Youth Against Violence program and included respondents who either worked with the program as administrators, facilitators/volunteers, or current and former program participants. Participants of this study were informed of the purpose of the study prior to data collection.

This chapter discusses the results of the data collected by survey, focus group, and interviews. The researcher collected quantitative data via a survey instrument, which included 53 questions related to the independent variables: (a) extended family involvement, (b) school attendance and truancy, (c) family history with law enforcement, (d) mentoring relationships, (e) gang membership and/or affiliation, (f) participant status (court referred, school referred, parent referred, first-time offender, repeat offender, or non-offender), (g) participant demographics, (h) parental involvement, and (i) program curriculum. The researcher’s sample for the survey instrument included a total of 40 current YAV program participants, male and female between the ages of 11 and 22 years old. The researcher collected qualitative data utilizing three focus groups and two
interviews. Focus Group A included seven YAV staff members, Focus Group B included four parents/extended family members of current and former YAV program participants, and Focus Group C was comprised of four former YAV program participants over 18 years of age. The qualitative data collection sought to determine and explain the impact of staff and facilitator training, the implications of YAV participants’ family history for program strategies, and the effects of participation in terms of understanding and adhering to juvenile law and various social control agencies. The results from the aforementioned data collection methods are presented according to the respective research questions.

**Quantitative Data Analysis and Strategies**

This section describes the research sample used in the study to measure the perceived effectiveness of Youth Against Violence program. The researcher collected a total of 40 surveys from participants who were enrolled in the program between December 28, 2013 and February 15, 2014. The participants attended eight Saturday sessions for 4 hours per Saturday. At the start of session 1 (registration and program overview), the researcher collected the informed consent of participants, their parents/guardians (participants 17 and under), and YAV staff members. At the conclusion of session 8 (program graduation), participants were informed of the contents included within the survey instrument, confidentiality, and the purpose and significance of the study by the researcher and senior level program administrator. The participants’ gender, race, type, age, and household composition are explained below.
Table 4 shows the distribution of participants based on gender. In total, 17 participants were male, which accounted for 42.5% of the total distribution, while 23 participants were female, which accounted for 57.5% of the total distribution.

Table 4

Distribution of Participants by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Table 5, the participants in this study primarily identified as black. There were a total of 29 black respondents (72.5%), 5 white respondents, 2 Latino/Hispanic respondents, 1 Asian respondent, and 3 respondents who identified their race as other.

Participants in this study were asked to identify the manner in which participation in YAV had been established. To identify the type of participant, the researcher applied six category types: (a) court ordered, (b) school referred, (c) parent referred, (d) first-time offender, (e) repeat offender, and/or (f) non-offender. More than half of the respondents were court ordered to complete the YAV program.
Table 5

*Distribution of Participants by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 reflects that 56.4% were court referred, 20.5% were school referred, and 7.7% were parent referred. None of the respondents reported their program participation type as first time or repeat offender; however, six respondents reported that they were nonoffenders. Respondents who elected the non-offender category may account for voluntary participation in the YAV program, which was not reflected in the survey instrument.
### Table 6

*Distribution of Participants by Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent Valid</th>
<th>Percent Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Ordered</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Referred</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Referred</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-Time Offender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Offender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoffender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing System      | 1         | 2.5           |
| **Total**           | **40**    | **100.0**     |

Table 7 reflects the age distribution of the sample. There were a total of 40 respondents who completed the survey; however, only 30 respondents provided their age. The table shows that roughly 50% of the respondents were below the age of 17 and 50% were 18 years or older. The breakdown of participants by age consisted of one 11 year old, four 12 year olds, three 14 year olds, one 16 year old, five 17 year olds, five 18 year olds, three 19 year olds, one 20 year old, five 21 year olds, and two 22 year olds.
Table 7  
*Distribution of Participants by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 displays the household composition of the respondents included in this analysis. Over 60% of YAV participants lived with either both parents or their mother’s only. Fifteen percent of respondents lived with the biological mother and stepfather, 7.5% lived with the biological dad and stepmother, 2.5% lived with a grandparent(s), and 12.5% reported a household composition not reflected in the survey.
Table 8

_Distribution of Participants by Household Composition_

| Household Composition          | Valid | Mother & Father | Frequency | Percent | Cumulative
|-------------------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|---------|-------------
|                               |       |                 | 12        | 30.0    | 30.0        |
| Mother Only                   | 13    |                 | 6         | 15.0    | 77.5        |
| Father Only                   | 0     |                 | 0         | 0       | 62.5        |
| Bio. Mom & Stepfather         | 3     |                 | 7.5       | 85.0    |             |
| Bio. Dad & Stepmother         | 1     |                 | 2.5       | 87.5    |             |
| Grandparents                  | 5     |                 | 12.5      | 100.0   |             |
| Other Household Comp          | 40    |                 | 100.0     | 100.0   |             |
| Missing System                | 0     |                 | 0.0       |         |             |
| Total                         | 40    |                 |           |         |             |

The five respondents who indicated a household composition not reflected in the survey may account for YAV participants who live in a foster home, group home, other relative/friend’s home, or live on their own.

**Analysis of Data According to Research Questions**

To examine YAV program effectiveness the researcher developed nine research questions based upon the independent variables of this study. The purpose of each research question was determine the relationship between YAV program effectiveness and each of the independent variables. Pearson’s Correlation tests were uses to determine if there was a significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables.
The level of significance was determined at .05 level of probability. In the following section, the research questions are restated and an analysis of the data is provided.

RQ1: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and extended family involvement?

The data analysis of Table 9 reflects that there was not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and extended family involvement with a level of probability at .949. However, the data analysis showed a significant finding between the frequency of extended family support and YAV program effectiveness. The level of significance for the frequency of extended family support was .032.

Table 9

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Extended Family Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YAV Program Effects</th>
<th>Extended Family Support</th>
<th>Frequency of Extended Family Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.949*</td>
<td>.032**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant

**Significant

RQ2: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and school attendance and truancy?
The data analysis of Table 10 reflects that there was not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and school attendance and truancy with a level of significance at .199. The data analysis showed that 72.5% of YAV participants report that school attendance occurs daily (see Table 11) and over 67.5% of respondents report missing school 0-2 days per month (see Table 12). While the data indicate that there is no significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and school attendance and truancy, descriptive statistics were also used to explain the respondents' perceptions of program effectiveness.

Table 10

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and School Attendance and Truancy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you attended school every day?</th>
<th>Days per month absent from school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YAV Program Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not significant
Table 11

*Daily School Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

*Days Absent per Month*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 days</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that 55% of respondents currently attend a traditional middle or high school, 5% attend an alternative school, 22.5% report not being enrolled in any formal school, and 12.5% of respondents are attending college.
Table 13

*Current School Enrollment Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid Enrollment Status</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Attending traditional Middle/High School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Alternative School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Attending School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents were asked if they had been suspended or expelled during the current academic year. Table 14 shows that 20% of the YAV participants had been suspended or expelled during the current academic year, while 67.5% of YAV participants stated that they had not been expelled from school. Survey respondents were also asked to identify the reasons for previous suspension. The descriptive statistics in Table 15 show that 15% were suspended for violence and/or violent acts, 5% were suspended for smoking (on school campus or school events away from campus), and 3% were expelled of suspended for other reasons not included on the survey.
Table 14

*Suspended or Expelled in Current Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

*Reasons for Suspension/Expulsion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Other selections for school suspension or expulsion included (a) poor attendance/truancy, (b) disrespect to school personnel, (c) public display of affection, (d) drug/alcohol use, (e) possession of a weapon, and (f) dress code violations. Finally, respondents were asked to report the reasons for absences during the school year. Table 16 shows that 42% of respondents reported that school absences were related to sickness.

Table 16

Reasons for Absence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of Peers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Obligations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System | 12 | 30.0 |

Total | 40 | 100.0 |

RQ3: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement?

The Pearson Correlation reflected in Table 17 shows that there is a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement.
enforcement with a level of significance of .037. There is an inverse relationship between program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement. Respondents who report that their parents were or had previously been incarcerated disagree or strongly disagree that the parents’ incarceration influenced their behavior and agree or strongly agree that the YAV program is effective. The descriptive statistics in Table 18 show that 50% of respondents reported awareness of a parent/guardian’s incarceration. Participants were also asked if their family’s history with law enforcement negatively influences their behavior. Table 19 shows that 64.5% of respondents disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that family history with law enforcement negatively influences their behavior.

Table 17

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Family History with Law Enforcement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YAV Program Effects</th>
<th>Family History with Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant*
### Table 18

*Parents Incarcerated*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19

*Influence of Family History on Behavior*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ4: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and mentoring relationships?

The Pearson Correlation in Table 20 shows that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and mentoring relationships with the level of significance at .736. The respondents were asked whether or not they had a mentor. Table 21 shows that 67.5% of respondents have a mentor and 32.5% of respondents do not have a mentor.

Table 20

*Not Significant

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RQ5: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and gang membership and/or affiliation?

The data analysis shows that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and gang membership and/or affiliation. Table 22 shows that the correlation between YAV program effects and gang membership was .589; the correlation between YAV program effects and participants who are friends or associates of gang members was .426; the correlation between YAV program effects and attraction to gangs was .394; the correlation between YAV program effects and committing illegal acts as a gang member was .774; and the correlation between YAV program effects and gang membership influencing decision making was .131. The descriptive analysis showed that 7.5% of respondents identified as gang members while 87.5% reported no gang membership or affiliation. Additionally, 15% of respondents reported having friends who were gang members, while 77.5% reported having no friends as gang members. Final descriptive statistics showed that 7.5% of respondents were attracted to gangs, while 87.5% had no attraction to gangs. Tables 23, 24, and 25 illustrate the aforementioned descriptive statistics.
Table 22

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Gang Membership/Affiliation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Committed Membership</th>
<th>Membership Influenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends are Member</td>
<td>Illegal Acts Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Gang</td>
<td>Attracted as Gang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Gangs Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAV Program Effects</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coeff.</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.589*</td>
<td>.426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Significant

Table 23

*Gang Membership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

*Friends in Gangs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

*Attracted to Gangs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RQ6:** Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the frequency of contact with law enforcement?
The Pearson Correlation in Table 26 shows that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the frequency of contact with law enforcement with a level of significance at .370.

Table 26

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Frequency of Contact with Law Enforcement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency Contact with Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YAV Program Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Significant

RQ7: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and participant status (i.e. court referred, school referred, parent referred, first-time offender, repeat offender, or nonoffender)?

The Pearson Correlation in Table 27 reflects that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and participant status with a level of significance at .893.
Table 27

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Participant Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YAV Program Effects</th>
<th>Participant Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.893*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Significant

RQ8: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and youth offender demographics (age, gender, and race)?

The Pearson Correlation in Table 28 reflects that there is a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and participant age with a level of significance of .038. The relationship between YAV program effectiveness and age is inverse meaning that older participants agree or strongly agree that the program is effective, while younger participants disagree or strongly disagree that the program is effective. Table 28 also shows that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the participant’s gender or race, with the level of significance being .174 and .861, respectively.
Table 28

*Relationship between Program Effectiveness and Youth Offender Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YAV Program Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.038*</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.861**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant

**Not Significant

RQ9: Is there a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and parental involvement?

The Pearson Correlation in Table 29 reflects that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and parental involvement with a level of significance at .665.

Table 29

*Relationship between YAV Program Effectiveness and Parental Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parental Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YAV Program Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.665*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Significant
Qualitative Data Analysis and Strategies

As data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted for this study, the researcher was able to modify varying elements of the research design in order to establish common or recurring themes. Particularly, as the researcher identified sources and analyzed data collected in the early stages, data collection strategies for subsequent interviews and focus groups, were modified in order to better focus the study and address the research questions.

Robert E. Stake (cited in Creswell, 2007) identifies four forms of data analysis and interpretation appropriate for case study research. Categorical aggregation occurs when the researcher looks for multiple instances for identifying issue-relevant meanings that may emerge during the analysis (Creswell, 2007). This strategy was utilized as the researcher analyzed the interviews with the YAV senior level administrator and the YAV facilitator who was responsible for the lectures related to ethics, criminal procedure, and cost of crime. Direct interpretation refers to “identifying one instance and drawing meaning from it without looking for multiple instances” (Creswell, 2007, p. 163). A third form of data analysis involves establishing patterns that occur in the data and identifying correlations between and among patterns. This method was used as the researcher transcribed and reviewed the focus group data with parents, former participants, and YAV program personnel. Finally, naturalistic generalizations refer to elements of the data analysis that emerge during the study that can be applied to individuals or other groups of study in general (Creswell, 2007). This research study employed the aforementioned techniques to varying degrees, but the most frequently uses strategy relied on categorical aggregation.
In order to analyze the qualitative data, the researcher identified emergent themes that revealed a significant correlation to the research questions. Each focus group and interview consisted of questions that would provide insight on YAV program effectiveness that could not be identified in quantitative terms. The researcher utilized a coding matrix to aggregate the data into 98 categories and subsequently reduce the categories into 9 major themes. The emergent themes identified through the coding matrix include (a) Behaviors, Decisions, and Outcomes (BDO); (b) Legal Rights and Outcomes (LRO); (c) Receptiveness to Change (RC); (d) Internal Characteristics (IC); (e) Education and Training (ET); (f) Family (F); (g) Reality (R); (h) Gangs (G); and (i) Ethics and Life Skills (ELS) (see Table 30).

Table 30

*Emergent Themes Aggregated from Interviews and Focus Group Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergent Theme</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors, Decisions, and Outcomes</td>
<td>(BDO)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Rights and Outcomes</td>
<td>(LRO)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptiveness to Change</td>
<td>(RC)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Characteristics</td>
<td>(INC)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Training</td>
<td>(ET)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Relationships</td>
<td>(DR)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Factors</td>
<td>(GF)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Life Skills</td>
<td>(ELS)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the analysis matrix, the most frequent codes and/or themes reflected in the interviews and focus groups were behaviors, decisions, and outcomes (BDO), legal rights and outcomes (LRO), receptiveness to change (RC), internal characteristics (IC), education and training (ET), domestic relationships (DR), reality (R), gang factors (GF), and ethics and life skills (ELS).

Figure 1 illustrates the emergent themes that were revealed among the qualitative data collection sources. The most significant theme was behaviors, decisions, and outcomes (BRO). This theme emerged most frequently as participants of the focus groups and interviews relayed the importance and impact of decision-making on a YAV participant. The staff focus group revealed that many of the YAV participants enroll in the program due to poor decision that have been made in the home, community, or school which resulted in juvenile delinquency and some formal consequence. The YAV program personnel also discussed the importance in implementing program curriculum that would help participants make better choices and decisions that would assist in successful school and community reentry.

The subsequent emerging themes reflect frequencies ranging from 17 (ethics and life skills) to 113 (legal rights and outcomes). From highest to lowest frequency, the emergent themes and their respective percentages are as follows: behavior, decisions, and outcomes 22%, legal rights and outcomes 20%, receptiveness to change 15%, internal characteristics 11%, education and training 11%, domestic relationships 7%, reality 7%, gang factors 4%, and ethics and life skills 3%. Each theme was further coded to identify subthemes within. Each theme and subtheme is presented and analyzed in descriptive figures.
As previously stated, the theme that appeared most frequently among the focus groups and interviews was behavior, decisions, and outcomes (BRO). The subthemes within the BRO theme included decision making, mistakes, self control, choices, accountability, alternatives, and trouble. Figure 2 represents the frequency percentage for each item. The subtheme in this category with the highest frequency was decision making at 36%, followed by trouble at 34%, accountability at 11%, choices at 8%, mistakes at 6%, and alternatives with the lowest frequency percentage at 3%. 

*Figure 1. Frequency of Emergent Themes*
The subthemes within the BRO emergent theme reflect a set of interrelated behaviors and outcomes influencing the dependent variable of YAV program effectiveness. These subthemes were most frequently evident in the data collected from Focus Groups A and B and the interview with a YAV facilitator.

Within the legal rights and outcomes emergent (LRO) theme, 13 subthemes were identified. The subthemes and their respective frequency by percentage are as follows: cost of crime 25%, criminal procedure 10%, juvenile arrest rate 1%, court ordered 7%, school referred 2%, bond condition 2%, law enforcement agency 9%, recidivism rate 6%, laws 26%, minor offenses 3%, pretrial intervention program 7%, and legal rights 1%. As the pie chart illustrates, the subthemes within this category that appeared most frequently were law (LW) and cost of crime (COC). These subthemes were discussed most frequently within the interviews with the YAV facilitator and the YAV senior level
administrator and Focus Groups A and B. The respondents were asked questions such as (a) What are the expected outcomes from your contribution as an attorney to the participants and the program in general? (b) In your opinion, is it possible for youth offenders to be rehabilitated, reduce juvenile delinquency, and successfully reenter secondary schools? (c) Why did you begin Youth Against Violence and why was there a need for the program? and (d) How has this program been beneficial to your child’s school reentry efforts and diminishing juvenile delinquency? The themes with the lowest frequency percentages were juvenile arrest rate (JAR), legal rights (LR), minor offenses (MO) school referred (SR), and bond condition (BC), making up less than 10% in the legal rights and outcomes (LRO) theme. These subthemes emerged during the interview with the YAV facilitator and Focus Group C responses (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Frequency of Legal Rights and Outcomes Subthemes
The participants receptiveness to change (RC) was a theme that emerged across all qualitative data collection methods. According to the analysis of the respondents included in focus groups and surveys, the subthemes express the factors perceived as necessary for change in youth behavior and increased program effectiveness. The subthemes and their respective frequency percentages within this category include participant receptiveness to information (13%), transformation (13%), listening (10%), impact (14%), internal change (4%), change (29%), and communication (17%). The subthemes with the highest frequencies were change ($C^2$) and communication (COMM) making up just under 50% of the total frequency for the receptiveness to change (RC) theme. The lowest frequency was internal change (IC); however, it should be noted that this subtheme is strongly related to change ($C^2$) in general. The researcher extracted change and internal change separately due to the context in which statements or phrases were made by respondents of the focus groups and interviews. In the instances of the repeated internal change (IC) subtheme, the respondents stated these words verbatim when describing the desired outcomes for participants of the Youth Against Violence program, whereas in the recurrence of the change ($C^2$) theme, respondents used phrases that which echoed the sentiments of change either in behavior, thinking, and/or attitude (see Figure 4).

The research discovered eight subthemes within the internal characteristics (INC) emergent theme. The subthemes and their respective frequency percentages included coping mechanisms (12%), progression (3%), determination (2%), forgiveness (5%), anger (32%), respect (27%), motivation (4%), and traumatic experiences (15%).
Figure 4. Frequency of Receptiveness to Change Subthemes

The subthemes with the highest frequencies were anger (AG), respect (RS), and traumatic experiences (TE). Of the subthemes that recurred most repeatedly the anger (AG) and traumatic experiences (TE) were most often found within the responses of Focus Group A. The YAV staff connected the two themes as interdependent upon one another. Participants who had issues with anger or managing anger were most often did not have the necessary coping mechanisms to deal with their personal traumatic experiences. The subthemes with the lowest frequency percentages, progression (PG), determination (DT), and motivation (MO²), represent less than 10% of the total contribution to the internal characteristics theme; however, these subthemes emerged most frequently from respondents of Focus Group C. The former YAV participants reflected upon these internal characteristics as the indicators for positive change following the intervention (see Figure 5).
Figure 5. Frequency of Internal Characteristics Subthemes

The education and training (ET) theme emerged most frequently during the interview with YAV’s senior level administrator and in the responses of Focus Group A. The administrator and YAV staff (volunteer and facilitators) discussed education and training in two distinct contexts. When asked questions such as (a) What training or qualifications do you have that assist you in being an effective program facilitator?; or (b) Have you participated in any YAV training for YAV personnel? If so, is the training effective?; or (c) How often does the program facilitate staff training and who is responsible for curriculum content?, the respondents relayed that formal training for YAV personnel was not ongoing from one 8-week session to the next, nor was it done on a quarterly or biannual basis. However, the respondents noted that each member of YAV personnel had received formal training at the inception of the program approximately 7 years ago. Additionally, the respondents reported their individual professions as the
qualification for being an effective YAV facilitator, volunteer, or staff member. Most of the occupations represented among focus group participants were within law enforcement (current police officers and/or detectives, deputy chief of police, or juvenile court probation officer). One participant of Focus Group A was a former gang member who served 13 years in a Georgia State Penitentiary. This participant was largely responsible for shaping the YAV program components in collaboration with the senior level administrator. In regards to education, the respondents of both interviews and the three focus group cited that education regarding juvenile laws and secondary education and/or postsecondary education as significant to program outcomes.

The subthemes that emerged from the education and training (ET) category includes education (37%), knowledge (5%), lecture (7%), dissemination of information (5%), training (22%), program components (12%), curriculum (2%), core classes (7%), and law classes (3%). As previously alluded to, education and training reflect the highest frequency percentages as these items materialized most frequently in the interviews and focus groups (see Figure 6).

The domestic relationships (DR) theme revealed four subthemes within including family (60%), lack of family support (9%), family history (7%), and background of participant (24%). These themes were grouped together based upon the respondents’ (particularly Focus group C) references to family support, the importance changed behaviors to meet or exceed the expectations of family members, the experiences of participants’ family members related to delinquency, and family involvement in positive activities and/or participant goals (i.e. returning to school, securing a good job, taking care of children or younger siblings, or staying out of jail) (see Figure 7).
Figure 6. Frequency of Education and Training Subthemes

Figure 7. Frequency of Domestic Relationships Subthemes
The reality subthemes consist of realism (37%), realize (19%) and real life experiences (44%). Each of these subthemes appeared in the interviews and focus group responses. The real life experiences (RLE) of the program facilitators appeared to be the most significant in the presentation of program curriculum to YAV participants. The responses of Focus Group A and the interview with the YAV facilitator highlighted the program’s use of the experiences of former participants, adult parolees/probationers, professionals (lawyers, entreprenuers, judges, city officials, and motivational speakers), and ex-gang members to resonate with the participants in a way that would impact future behavior positively (see Figure 8).

*Figure 8. Frequency of Reality Subthemes*

Figure 9 illustrates the relationship between gang factors (GF) and the subthemes gangs (G), gang unit (GU), and combat gang influence (CGI).
Figure 9. Frequency of Gang Factors

The gang factors emergent theme ranked eighth in frequency among the previously discussed emergent themes. The subthemes that resulted most frequently appeared in the interview with the senior level administrator and the responses of Focus Group A (which also included the senior level administrator and former gang member turned facilitator). Gangs (G) represent 85% of the frequency percentage, followed by the gang unit (GU) subtheme representing 10% of the frequency, and combat gang influence (CGI) rounding out the frequency at 5%.

The interview question which addressed this theme was asked during the initial interview of this study and was posed as, Why did you begin Youth Against Violence? The question was subsequently followed by the question, Why was there a need for that program? Again, this question was specifically answered by the senior level
administrator description of an incident that occurred in the locale of the study. That response is discussed in Chapter VI of this analysis.

The final subtheme that emerged during the analysis of the qualitative data were ethics and life skills (ELS). This emergent theme’s subcategories and respective frequency percentages consisted of life skills (29%), ethics (35%), values (6%), beliefs (18%), and morals (12%). Of all the emergent themes, the ethics and life skills theme had the lowest frequency; however, the subthemes found within this category provided significant insight on the YAV program’s intent for positive inputs to be imparted on program participants. Ethics had the highest frequency of appearance in the interviews with the YAV facilitator and senior level administrator, followed by life skills second highest frequency appearing in the responses from the interview with the senior level administrator and Focus Groups B and C (see Figure 10).

Figure 10. Frequency of Ethics and Life Skills Subthemes
Application of Data Analysis to Qualitative Research Questions

This study included three qualitative research questions focused on staff and facilitator training, participant family history with law enforcement, and program curriculum in relation to program effectiveness. The research questions are restated and answered according to the emergent themes and responses of the participants.

RQ10: What is the relationship between YAV program effectiveness and program curriculum?

To address this question, survey respondents were asked to identify the most youthful YAV workshop from the following choices: (a) ethics and values/cost of crime, (b) consequences of conforming to peer pressure, (c) identifying and conquering bullying/peer pressure, (d) sex crimes/miranda rights, (e) abstinence/std, (f) study skills, (g) decisions/choices, (h) conflict resolution/anger management, (i) violent crimes/theft laws, (j) police and you, (k) gang laws, (l) breaking the cycle of addictive thinking, and (m) domestic violence. The responses are reflected in Table 31.

Respondents were asked to check all workshops that apply when selecting among the available choices. To determine the frequency of the most valued YAV workshops, the researcher tallied the first three responses provided by survey participants. The data show that the most useful program workshops as observed by the program participants were ethics and values/cost of crime (EVCC) with a frequency of 16, followed by consequences of conforming to peer pressure (CCPP) with a frequency of 14, and identifying and conquering bullying/peer pressure (ICB/PP) with a frequency of 13.
### Table 31

**Participants’ Perceptions of Workshop Usefulness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Title/Focus</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Values/Cost of Crime</td>
<td>EVCC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of Conforming to Peer Pressure</td>
<td>COCPP</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Conquering Bullying/Peer Pressure</td>
<td>ICB/PP</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Crimes/Miranda Rights</td>
<td>SC/MR</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstinence/STD</td>
<td>A/STD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Skills</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions/Choices</td>
<td>D/C</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution/Anger Management</td>
<td>CR/AM</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes/Theft Laws</td>
<td>VC/TL</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and You</td>
<td>PY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Laws</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Cycle of Addictive Thinking</td>
<td>BCAT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, the data show that the least useful program workshops according to program participants were study skills (SS) with a frequency of 4, gang laws (GL) with a frequency of 2, breaking the cycle of addictive thinking (BCAT) with a frequency with only one respondent selecting this among their top three choices.

**RQ11**: How does the implementation of staff and facilitator training(s) impact the effectiveness of the YAV intervention program?
To address this questions, participants of Focus Group A were asked the questions, (a) How often does the program facilitate staff training? (b) Who decides who is going to be responsible for what content will be covered?, and (c) What training and/or qualifications do you have specifically that has allowed you to be an effective facilitator or volunteer in the program? The responses to question one revealed that staff training was not ongoing and had not been done in at least one year. One respondent stated, "We haven’t had training in probably a year because everybody here has went through the initial training that we do for our volunteers and our staff. Again, it depends on what area that a volunteer is working in. You know . . . if we feel that it needs to be critiqued in a certain area, then we’ll sit down and discuss that and look at that and then figure out what we need to do to do that. But pretty much, everybody has their own area of expertise of what they are working in. Like primarily Ms. AT . . . she is our administrator so she deals with all documents, our database and all different things that we have with the program. And Ms. NF . . . she deals with the probation cases and our community services cases." (Participant 1, Focus Group A: Black Male-AP, personal communication, January 8, 2014)

The senior level administrator reported that while ongoing training does not currently exist for the YAV staff as a whole, he is responsible for approving all volunteer prior to working with the YAV program. Background checks are completed by the police department on all individuals who come into contact with the program participants. The senior level administrator also stated that he is the decision maker for deciding and establishing the YAV curriculum; however, developing the core curriculum is done collaboratively with all volunteers, staff members, and in some instances with the
participants themselves. Finally, the senior level administrator indicated that the YAV program intends to get better at training and program organization.

The question related to trainings and qualifications of each YAV staff participants demonstrated the real life experiences (RLE) of each of the staff members that were perceived by respondents as the characteristics which positively contribute to program effectiveness. As previously mentioned, many of the YAV staff members worked in law enforcement or in some capacity or an agency/organization which could be categorized as a social control agent. Of the seven respondents available for the focus group, four were currently or had previously worked for the police department: one as a detective and ordained minister, one as a deputy chief of police, one former law enforcement agent, and one as a probation officer and retired army veteran. In the opinions of the respondents, their life experiences related to criminal law or past experiences as adult offenders (respondent “AP” was formerly a gang member and had served 13 years in prison prior to working with the program) were the qualifications that most significantly influenced the program’s effectiveness. In the interview with a YAV facilitator (also a lawyer and program personnel responsible for lecturing on ethics and the cost of crime), the individual stated that the YAV program participants benefited from the mere exposure to the diverse backgrounds of the program personnel:

These participants are being exposed to people in their everyday travels they more than likely would not get to be exposed to who in there everyday travels under the same circumstances. Most of them talking to a judge . . . the judge would be addressing them as a defendant, not by their name. Most of them would not have the opportunity to see the Deputy Chief of Police . . . Attorneys . . . my hourly rate
is $450 per hour. So you’re [participant] getting an opportunity to ask me legal questions for free. (Participant SC, Interview 2: Black Male-SC, personal communication, January 13, 2014)

In sum, the respondent relayed the value of the visual exposure YAV participants are able to gain as a result of seeing facilitators and program personnel. These individuals are most often members of law enforcement; however, they are also professional people who not only carry guns or wear badges and robes, but also have families and often times look like the participants in various forms [i.e. style of dress, skin color, etc.] (Atty. SC, personal communication, January 13, 2014).

The emergent themes related to this research question include legal rights and outcomes (LRO), reality (R), education and training (ET), gang factors (GF), and ethics and life skills (ELS). These elements were most repeatedly found within the data gathered from the focus groups and interviews.

RQ12: What are the implications of the youth offender’s family history with law enforcement in terms of the success (reduction of recidivism and program effectiveness) of YAV intervention strategies?

To address this research question, participants in Focus Group B and C were asked, (a) How has your parent’s involvement influenced your behavior in terms of returning to school or completing school?; (b) How has your parent/guardian/extended family’s contact with law enforcement had an impact on your behavior and school attendance?, (c) What factors prevented your parent or guardian from participating in the Youth Against Violence activities?, (d) Do you or the participants extended family
members have a history of contact with law enforcement? Please explain., and (e) How has that contact had an impact on the participant’s behavior and school attendance?

The participants of Focus Group C conveyed that their parents were not typically involved in the YAV program or its activities. Two reported that their parents attended the YAV graduation and maybe one other session, while the two other former participants reported that their parents did not attend any YAV sessions and their parents were typically not available to bring them to the Saturday sessions over the course of the 8-weeks. To explain the lack of family support surrounding YAV activities, the responses included:

I think my mom just didn’t wanna be here. She had other stuff she had to do. She came one day, but...and I drove most of the time so she ain’t really. . . she just stayed home. (Respondent 1, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

I would have to find a ride and sometimes she would drop me off, but she just . . . she’s not really one to…she doesn’t like people. (Respondent 2, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

I mean, I told my mom about the program and she came to graduation (respondent had been court referred to the YAV program). (Respondent 3, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

One participant in Focus Group B (a parent of a former YAV graduate) expressed the sentiments of many parents in her response to why parent attendance/participation is low. She explained that parents often feel as though they are being punished for the
misbehavior of their youth and do not really understand the benefit of attending the YAV sessions along with their child. Parents often do not think beyond the child’s court ordered or school referred punishment and their desire for the child to suffer the consequence of their behavior on their own.

In response to parental influence on returning to school or completing school, participants of Focus Group C uniformly reported that the expectations of their parents or extended family members to pursue education was a major influence for completing high school and moving on to other educational pursuits. One respondent stated that his desire to continue his education was due to his need to provide for his young children. The other respondents stated that school attendance in addition to high school completion was an expectation that their parents had for them, but may not have been expected by extended family members.

When probed for their knowledge on parental contact with law enforcement, the respondents provided varying responses. Respondent 1 of Focus Group C stated that she was the child of a single parent and to her knowledge, her mother had never been involved with law enforcement in a negative way. Respondent 1 reported that an older brother had repeated stints of jail time, but that she was not influenced by the older brother’s behavior because interaction with him was minimal (personal communication, February 15, 2014). Respondent 2 of Focus Group C stated that her mother had been involved in some criminal activity (related to drug use) prior to her birth, but was clean and had no interaction with law enforcement recently (personal communication, February 15, 2014). Respondent 3 of Focus Group C reported that he also lived in a single parent household and none of his immediate family members had any interaction with law
enforcement (personal communication, February 15, 2014). Finally, Respondent 4 of Focus Group C discussed the contact that his immediate and extended family had with law enforcement. Of the focus group participants, respondent 4 was the only individual who had immediate family members (an older sibling and mother’s live in boyfriend) were currently or previously incarcerated (personal communication, February 15, 2014). Despite contact with law enforcement by family members, respondent 4 reported that his older siblings contact with law enforcement had a positive impact on his own behavior.

. . . He called me from prison or whatnot and we’ve talked a few times. You know and what he’s telling me and whatnot it helps me get through. Knowing that he’s straight and he’s able to get through in that situation. It’s like, well if you can get through on the other side [prison], I damn sure can get through here. And you [imprisoned older sibling] got it way harder than I do because you’re behind bars. You got people telling you when you when to wake up and eat. Come on. It ain’t nearly that hard for me, so I know I can do it. (Respondent 4, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

The respondents of Focus Group B (YAV parents or family members of former participants) reported that three out of four respondents did not have any contact with law enforcement. Only one respondent who was the aunt of a former participant had been incarcerated previously. The respondent was a female and she reported that a number of the participants family members had a previous history with law enforcement.

Respondent 4 was previously incarcerated for 6 years prior to becoming a volunteer for
the YAV program. Respondent 4 summarized the impact of the family history of contact with law enforcement as follows:

My nephew... he still kinda... he has a self-esteem issue. His dad was in prison for 15 years, so all his life his dad’s been gone. He [participants dad] just got out like a year ago and now that [YAV participant/nephew] is turning 16 its been... you know more of a positive impact just having that male. He always had his stepdad for the last 10 years, but that wasn’t enough for him. (Respondent 4, Focus Group B, personal communication, January 25, 2014)

Research question 12 revealed the emergent themes domestic relationships (DC), education and training (ET), reality (R), ethics and life skills (ELS), and behaviors, decisions, and outcomes (BRO) were the most common themes addressed.

RQ13: How does participation in the YAV intervention program lead to an increased understanding of juvenile law and adherence to various social control agencies as it relates to YAV program curriculum?

To determine the relationship between the effectiveness of YAV’s program curriculum and participant’s understanding of juvenile law and adherence to various social control agencies, the researcher asked the following questions: (a) What did you learn during the 8-week program that provided you with a better understanding of juvenile laws?, (b) What has caused you to engage or prevented you from engaging in delinquency since the completing the program?, and (c) What skills have you put to use as a result of participation in this program in your everyday life?

In regard to question 1, respondents reported that the sessions on Georgia state juvenile laws were most beneficial to their acquired understanding of juvenile laws.
Three of the four respondents were from out of state (California, New York, and New Jersey), and stated that there were laws for which they were unknowingly in violation of according to Georgia law. The YAV program helped them to identify what those laws were and the applicable consequences for violation. The respondents also reported that the program assisted them to establish positive decision-making habits and manage their emotions (such as anger). Respondent 2 of Focus Group C surmised her transformation as a result of the program in the following quote:

... I think it changed me a lot. Because I was so angry. I was an... an angry ball of fire. I was a tiny person with so much anger. I was angry about so much and then my grandfather passed away and I was here. I was going here and all the love that everybody showed me... they wer just here for me. I remember I came in after he passed and I just cried and they just held me. It really showed me that life... this place showed me that life can be different. You don’t have to be angry. You don’t have to beat up on everybody... you don’t have to walk around like somebody owed you something because they don’t owe you nothing. ... It showed me how to have self control because I didn’t have no type of self control. (Respondent 2, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

When asked about the factors that caused or prevented engagement in further delinquency, participants of Focus Group C gave varying responses describing the nature of subsequent delinquency, but did not provide an explanation for why they did or did not engage in delinquency in their initial response. The offenses reported appeared to be minor.
Yeah, I got into trouble again. I went to . . . uhm . . . Kennesaw State this school year and then some stuff happened and then the police got involved and all that. . . I had court and everything (Respondent 1, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014).

I’ve had traffic tickets, but I haven’t had any arrests…just community service, stuff like that for minor traffic tickets. (Respondent 2, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

Messing with the wrong person…got jammed up [hesitation]. Well yeah, I got jammed up. (Respondent 3, Focus Group C, personal commnunicaiton, February 15, 2014)

The researcher further probed the respondents to ascertain the reasons for behavioral change upon completion of the program. The following responses were offered:

I just don’t like to be involved in the court system. It’s too much money. I learned that its’s too much money. It’s time consuming. Having to be in trouble in Georgia, but I live in Alabama since I go to school [postsecondary institution] out there…it’s just too much work to be going back and forth all the time. (Respondent 1, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

I mean this program just taught me the decisions that you make in life . . . I mean, I was young when I first started this program so I ain’t really know too much about the law, but this program like really . . . I mean. Like exited me from the
people that make wrong decisions. (Respondent 3, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

I got children to look after. You know, at first and for awhile even after I had children, I still had a messed up mindset of a young gut that wouldn’t do right . . . I was just making excuses and making life harder for myself. I’ve grown out of that mindset and I’ve gotten myself straight. (Respondent 4, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

According to the respondents, the skills most frequently put to use as a result of the YAV program related to decision making and moral development. The participants reported that they understood the importance of making good decisions and the implications of all decisions for their life outcomes. One respondent went further to describe the YAV program as more than an intervention program concerned with teaching participants the laws. The environment created by staff members according to respondent 2 fostered encouragement to pursue goals, provided mechanisms for dealing with traumatic experiences, and taught the power of forgiveness.

It’s not just the laws. I thinks it the morals and stuff they teach us . . . they taught us how to have morals, to keep calm, to put our faith in God, to just . . . just love one another. It wasn’t always about the law. They give us a reason behind it [laws] and if you give us moral behind it too and ethics behind it, we’ll be more prone to do it [adhere to the law]. They interacted with us. They treated us like family. That’s why I love this place. (Respondent 2, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)
The aforementioned questions were primarily answered by Focus Group C participants. The themes that emerged most frequently were legal rights and outcomes (LRO), internal characteristics (IC), domestic relationships (DR), behaviors, decisions, and outcomes (BDO), and receptiveness to change (RC).
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Reentry programs for youth offenders are a relatively new phenomenon. In the United States juvenile justice policy has favored more punitive approaches to the problem of juvenile delinquency. There is an abundance of research literature focusing on the causes of juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system’s approach to curbing the problems witnessed in urban, suburban, and rural communities. The paradigm shift in juvenile justice policy approach has only recently supported progressive policies focusing on intervention and rehabilitation. Even with the shift in policy approach, programs that focus on intervention and rehabilitative strategies often find difficulty in effectively reducing the risk factors for juvenile delinquency, successfully reentering youth offenders into mainstream institutions, and reducing the recidivism rate among youth offenders.

Given the challenges faced by law enforcement agencies, school, parents, and communities it is incumbent upon practitioners to critically examine reentry and/or intervention and prevention models. As stated in chapter one of this analysis, prevention and intervention programs abound across the United States and often have the best intentions for implementation; however, many models neglect to demonstrate program effectiveness in scientifically measured terms.
The researcher’s intent for examining a locally implemented intervention and prevention program was to determine the effectiveness of program implementation and facilitation based upon the perceptions of the program’s respective stakeholders. The independent variables selected were assumed to be appropriate for the given population as these variables were expected to have an impact on YAV program effectiveness, measured in terms of school reentry and reduced juvenile delinquency. This chapter discusses the research findings and conclusions derived from the data. Additionally, this chapter addresses the implications of the data for all stakeholders, and closes with recommendations for practice, policy, school administrators, and subsequent research.

**Findings**

In Chapter V of this study, the quantitative data analysis discussed the relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the independent variables: (a) extended family involvement, (b) school attendance and truancy, (c) family history with law enforcement, (d) mentoring relationships, (e) gang membership and/or affiliation, (f) frequency of contact with law enforcement, (g) participant status (i.e. court referred, school referred, parent referred, first-time offender, repeat offender, repeat offender, or nonoffender), (h) participant demographics, and (i) parental involvement.

**Significant Findings (Quantitative)**

**Demographics (age-only):** The data showed there is a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the participant’s age. Younger program participant’s perceived the intervention strategies and program overall as less effective compared to older participants. As shown in Table 7 (Chapter V), the distribution of the
age of respondents reflects nearly 50% of participants were below the age of 17 and nearly 50% of participants were over the age of 17. This finding does not mean the younger participants perceive the program as completely ineffective, but rather do not hold the same value or measurement of program effectiveness as their older counterparts.

**Family History with Law Enforcement:** The data showed that there is a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the participant’s family history with law enforcement. Participants who reported a family history with law enforcement perceived the intervention program and its strategies as effective and also believe that family history did not bear negative implications for their own behavior. The data shows that family history with law enforcement does not negatively impact YAV program effectiveness.

**Insignificant Findings (Quantitative)**

**Extended Family Support:** The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and extended family support. Participants did not perceive the absence or presence of extended family involvement in YAV program activities influences their behavior or perception of the program. To examine this independent variable, participants were asked survey questions related to academic support, support of personal goals, and inquiries surrounding negative school or community behaviors.

**School Attendance and Truancy:** The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and school attendance and truancy. As shown in Tables 11 through 16 (Chapter V), over 70% of respondents report daily school
attendance, over 65% of respondents report being absent from school 0-2 days per month with the largest proportion of those absences being related to sickness. Additionally, 20% of respondents reported suspension or expulsion from school during the current academic year. The reason for suspension or expulsion typically involved school violence.

**Mentoring:** The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and mentoring relationships. The data showed that 67.5% of respondents reported having a mentor while 32.5% did not have a mentoring relationship. The perception of YAV program effectiveness is not influenced by the presence or absence of the participants mentoring relationships.

**Gang Membership and/or Affiliation:** The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and gang membership and/or affiliation. The descriptive tables presented in data analysis showed that 87.5% of respondents do not identify as gang members and 77.5% of respondents do not have friends who are gang members or affiliates. Further, 87.5% of respondents reported that they are not attracted to gangs. The perception of YAV program effectiveness is not influenced by the participant’s identification as a gang member or non-gang member.

**Frequency of Contact with Law Enforcement:** The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the frequency of contact with law enforcement. The number of times a participant has encountered law enforcement in a negative manner (arrest, interrogation, sentencing, probation, etc.) does not appear to have an impact of the participants’ perception of program effectiveness.
Participant status: The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the participant’s status. Whether the respondent was referred by the courts, school system, parent or was a first-time offender, repeat offender, or non-offender (voluntary participation), the perception of program effectiveness was not influenced.

Demographics (gender and race): The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and the participants’ gender or race. The data does not show that the perception of program effectiveness is higher or lower according to the gender or race of the participants. As described in the descriptive tables in Chapter V, 42.5% of respondents were males and 57.5% of respondents were females. Additionally, the largest racial group reflected in the sample was black with over 70% of respondents identified as black.

Parental Involvement: The data showed that there is not a significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and parental involvement. Participants did not perceive the presence or absence of their parents in YAV program activities as having a significant impact on program effectiveness.

Emergent Themes

The qualitative data supports the statistical data reflected in the significant relationship between YAV program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement, gang membership and affiliation, and parental involvement. However, in regards to the remaining independent variables, the qualitative findings do not explicitly
support the quantitative data. In addition, the qualitative data was more useful in
determining the impact of some variables not measured in quantitative terms
including staff training and implementation, YAV program curriculum, and the
participants’ understanding and adherence to law enforcement as a result of program
completion.

Chapter V also included an analysis of data based upon the focus groups with
parents, volunteers/staff/facilitators, and former participants. As a result of the analysis, a
number of themes emerged including (a) behaviors, decisions, and outcomes (BDO),
(b) legal rights and outcomes (LRO), (c) receptiveness to change (RC), (d) internal
characteristics (INC), (e) domestic relationships (DC), (f) reality (R), (g) gang factors
(GF), and (h) ethics and life skills (ELS). A summary of both qualitative and quantitative
findings will be discussed as they apply to YAV program effectiveness.

Conclusions and Implications

Given the research findings, there are a number of conclusions to be drawn
concerning YAV program effectiveness. The program participants included in this study,
as well as focus group respondents (YAV personnel and parents/family members of
program participants) provided insight on factors both accounted for and unaccounted for
in the initial research design. This insight has allowed the researcher to make
conclusions about the independent variables and the scope of YAV program
effectiveness. The conclusions are discussed within this section based upon the
researcher’s interpretation of the data.
According to the basic premises of control theories, conformity is only realized when individuals are able to reconcile the two components of the self: (a) the civilized member of society and (b) the egotistical self. The two components of the self typically find balance where agents of control are present in the person’s life and/or when the individual reaches the capacity to control internal impulses and whims. The data included in this study reflected that the age at which intervention is introduced to the participant is critical to program effectiveness. Younger participants do not perceive the program as effective when compared to older participants. One must consider why this is in fact the case and in turn determine methods to have a greater impact in the intervention of youth who come into contact with law enforcement agencies. The reasons for younger participants’ lower level of belief in the effectiveness of the YAV program may vary as a result of unspecified factors; however, the researcher has come to the following conclusions based upon the theoretical framework and available data.

**Level of Maturity or Receptiveness to Information**

One of the major themes that emerged during this study was the youth’s receptiveness to the information being given. The older respondents (age 18-24) in Focus Group C echoed the sentiments that the internal change resulting in behavioral change was the result of their willingness to receive the information being given to them. During the lectures over the course of the 8-weeks, the respondents recalled their personal receptiveness to the information that was being shared. Regardless of whether the information had been previously given to them in another setting, as a participant, a choice was made to be open to the experiences of the facilitators and program staff as
these experiences resonated due to their perceived realness. It may be argued that younger adolescents who come into contact with law enforcement (particularly under the age of 17) and are subsequently required to this type of treatment program do not have the level of maturity or desire to change their behaviors because the consequences have not yet become real. The participants in this intervention program that come through the court system receive a bond condition rather than a more punitive consequence like youth detention in a secured facility. Again, the consequences are not realized because the punishment is not the severest form of punishment. Older participants’ perception of program effectiveness may be related to their level of maturity and receptiveness to the information, but also due to an awareness that with age comes a greater degree of accountability and consequence for delinquency. As Hirschi (1969) suggests with social bond theory, the control variable in effect is likely commitment in which an individual is committed to his or her self-interests and the desire to protect those interests. Whether those interests are family, job, or school related, older participants seem to understand the need to conform to conventional norms to ensure that expected or desirable life outcomes are realized and enjoyed. When asked what had caused or prevented the respondents from engaging in delinquency since the program, one respondent stated matter-of-factly,

Well . . . I got a lot of reasons why I can’t get in no more trouble. I mean, I’m on papers now. That ain’t no good. I got children to look after . . . you know.

(Respondent 4, Focus Group C, personal communication, February 15, 2014)

The respondent was indicating that he was currently on probation (referred to as being on papers) and had a family to look after and take care of financially, emotionally,
and mentally. This respondent was over 21 years of age and could understand the implications of nonconformity and continued delinquency.

**Unanticipated Impact of Family History with Law Enforcement**

There is a commonly held myth that children whose immediate family members (mother or father) are or were previously incarcerated are at a greater risk to become adult criminals themselves (Bouchet, 2008). This notion is held by much of society in general, but more significantly, the belief is often propagated by individuals who have a significant role in the socialization of these very children including their schoolteachers, law enforcement agents (police, judges, etc.), and even policy makers. Despite the lack of reliable research evidence, this myth goes widely unchallenged and undeservingly embraced by the children of incarcerated parents. While there are cases in which children of the incarcerated or individuals who have had some negative acquaintance with law enforcement engage in delinquent behaviors as a result of parental influence, many adolescents purposely avoid repeating the delinquency of their parents.

The research findings showed that there was a significant relationship between program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement. There was an inverse relationship between program effectiveness and family history with law enforcement in that youth whose parents had been incarcerated or had negative contact with law enforcement did not believe their behaviors were influenced by their parents past experiences. Regardless of parental history with law enforcement, participants considered the program strategies and curriculum to have positive implications. The most obvious positive implication was for the YAV participants who were court ordered
to complete the program, was resolving their bond or probation conditions. Additionally, for the school referred participant participation and completion of the program assured a return to traditional high school rather than extended enrollment in an alternative school or expulsion.

**The Significance of Insignificant Findings**

When examining the quantitative research findings according to relationship among the variables, it was found that a majority of the independent variables did not have a significant impact on YAV program effectiveness. While these variables did not represent significant data findings, a five of the variables are worthy of discussion as the researcher was able to reach several conclusions.

**School Attendance.** While there was not a significant relationship between school attendance and YAV program effectiveness, it is very important to note the possibility as to why school attendance was not significant. Approximately 50% of program participants were secondary school-aged children who were either court or school referred. At the time of attendance, these participants were not only required to complete the program, but to attend school regularly. If regular school attendance was not adhered to the school or court may have revoked the bond or suspension/expulsion condition and imposed more severe consequences. Again, it was in the best interest for the program participants to attend school regularly, thus when they reported in the survey, school absences were reported to be relatively low. Additionally, in the program curriculum, participants are reminded of the importance of pursuing education and making decisions that positively impact their future goals: school attendance and
completion being one of them. It can be concluded that school absenteeism among program participants is low because of the impact of the program curriculum and training received during participation. The implication is that younger program participants may find themselves engaging in delinquent behaviors more frequently than older participants. As a result, their consequences may become more severe and have lasting negative effects. The recidivism rate for the younger participant could potentially be higher because of their lack of receptiveness to intervention. For the older participant, the implications according to the research data are more positive and likely to diminish the potential of adult criminality.

**Mentoring.** The literature revealed that mentoring relationships are critical to the successful reentry of youth offenders and that mentoring strategies must be clearly focused on the types and individual need of the youth. While over 65% of respondents reported having a mentor, the survey instrument did not capture data that would clearly identify if the mentor was a YAV volunteer or staff member, nor did the focus on mentoring activities provided by YAV program staff. This absence in the survey in addition to the YAV program not having a formal mentoring structure allowed the researcher to conclude that the research was not equipped to accurately gage the influence of mentoring on program effectiveness. The implication for this analysis is that mentoring relationships were difficult to measure in this study; however, program efforts for developing a mentoring structure may assist program personnel with reaching all participants, but in particular, reaching the younger participants.

**Gang membership.** The findings related to this variable allowed the researcher to reach two distinct conclusions. The first is positive in its implication for YAV
program effectiveness in that gang membership or affiliation was less than 10% and did not have an impact on program effectiveness assuming that the participants were reporting truthfully. This implies that participants are not attracted to the gang culture and criminal behaviors, which may be a result of the curriculum or lack of a gang problem as a whole in their respective communities. An opposing conclusion however, is that respondents provided answers that may be considered politically correct due to their fear of being exposed as gang members (especially for the court referred participants) or some participants lacked a clear understanding of the factors which constitute gang membership and activity according to Georgia law. The researcher is inclined to believe that the respondents provided truthful responses and have a clear understanding of gang membership and gang laws due to the fact that the YAV program offers a specific course on the subject.

**Parental Involvement.** There was not a significant finding for family support, likely due to the lack of family attendance in YAV weekly sessions. As the respondents of Focus Group C stated, their parents often dropped them off for the session every Saturday morning and picked them up when the class was over. The structure of the YAV program does not currently offer consistent programming for parents of participants, thus parents are inadvertently excluded from participation. If a parent is not inclined to engage program staff or ask their child how he or she may be involved in their child’s completion of the program (outside of graduation), then the opportunity is missed to expand parental knowledge on the critical program components and requirements. The onus is not completely the obligation of the YAV program either. A parent must acknowledge behavioral problems that result in referral into these programs and play his
or her role in redirecting those behaviors, especially when the behaviors have negative consequences school reentry and completion.

**Staff Training and Implementation of Training.** The research findings showed that there was not a significant relationship between staff training and implementation of training. As the program stands in its current format for training and the implementation of curriculum, the YAV program is relatively unstructured with no defined curriculum focused on school reentry. One conclusion that can be made relates to the structure of the YAV program. As with an enormous number of intervention and reentry programs across the United States, the Youth Against Violence program does not follow a specific model that has been empirically tested. This has many implications, but one most significant implication is in securing sizeable funding for the program. Monetary funds, whether coming from tax dollars, corporate sponsorships, or private donations are often difficult to obtain in an environment where there is minimal documented evidence confirming success or failure. This is not to say that the YAV program is ineffective by any means, but rather, to note the importance of implementing programs that have proven to yield intended results. The program is well intentioned in its efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency and assisting participants in successfully reentering secondary schools and the community; however, at the time of this research, the YAV program had not undergone any scientific study to assess its effectiveness and program outcomes. A second conclusion can be made regarding the research findings on staff training and implementation of training. Among Focus Group C respondents, over 50% of volunteers and staff were law enforcement agents. This is an undeniable advantage for the program and highlights the exceptionality of the YAV program. During this study, the researcher
investigated a number of intervention programs specifically in the state of Georgia that were similar in scope, structure, and organization. The result of this investigation uncovered various faith-based, community-based, or school-based programs seeking to combat the problems of youth crime and delinquency. Nevertheless, these programs did not have one specific strength within the respective model: a program that was administered by the very institution responsible for sanctioning youth offenders for their delinquency. The YAV program staff includes personnel from all spectrums of law enforcement including a deputy police chief, police detectives, probation officers, judges, lawyers, and even current inmates in addition to members of the business community and faith-based organizations. Subsequently, this blend of professionals serves as an asset to the program because the volunteers and administrators have professional training and experiences that afford participants the opportunity to experience prevention and intervention within a structure and setting that rarely occurs in many prevention and intervention arrangements.

**Recommendations for Practice**

**Recommendations for Curriculum**

- YAV program should partner with schools and other educational organizations to assist youth with transitioning back into schools if they are expelled or sent to alternative schools.

- YAV program should focus on positive behaviors and good decision-making habits for youth.
• YAV should develop strategies that focus efforts on younger participants to increase program impact.

• Continue using the real life experiences of volunteers that are able to relay the consequences of poor ethics and values.

• YAV should incorporate curriculum that is gender specific.

• Identify experts who are able to speak on or incorporate activities that are specific to each gender.

• Reevaluate and modify program curriculum when necessary according to the social, political, economic, and historical context surrounding prevention of juvenile delinquency.

**Recommendations for Program Structure**

• Consider restricting the number of students who may enroll in each session and separate the classes by age group so that strategies and curriculum are better focused.

• Introduce a parent component that involves the parents on a weekly basis and aligns with student classes.

• Develop a plan for parental engagement and identify staff members/volunteer who will be responsible for making parent contacts.

• Structure a mentoring component that includes YAV volunteers/staff, probation officers, and former participants as applicable.
Recommendations for YAV Personnel

- Conduct research and collect data on similarly structured programs that follow a scientifically proven model and implement the model with fidelity.
- Complete an intake interview with participants prior to the start of each session.

Recommendations for Staff Training

- Facilitate ongoing staff training for YAV volunteers and administrators in various areas including, but not limited to (a) effective communication strategies with youth offenders, (b) how to identify behavioral problems common or uncommon among participants and appropriate referral methods, and (c) trends in youth crime.
- Attend conferences that focus on evidenced-based program and adopt best practices of programs that are similar in scope, structure, and organization.

Recommendations for Policy

Recommendations for YAV Administrators

- Conduct annual program evaluation by an external evaluator.
- Develop a governing system for the organization.
- Develop program policies that support schools and school policies and also reaffirm the goals of education.
- Collaborate with the state juvenile justice agency to develop a statewide model for dealing with juvenile delinquency across the state of Georgia.
• Provide input on how to reform the juvenile justice system with juvenile justice policy makers.

Recommendations for Juvenile Justice Policy

• Restore progressive policies for dealing with youth offenders and punishment.

Recommendations for Future Research

• Conduct a longitudinal and comparative study on the YAV program to ascertain program effectiveness and determine the implications for program participants and the community.

• Continue to focus on prevention and intervention models to measure program effectiveness.

• Consider other independent variables to measure the relationship between those variables and the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programs.

• Conduct research on reentry programs that are used as follow-up programs to expand treatment students receive at short-term or non-secured juvenile facilities.

Summary

The purpose of this mixed-methods study was to investigate the effectiveness of the YAV intervention program. The YAV program focuses its efforts on reducing juvenile delinquency in the community and helping youth offenders successfully reenter schools and the community. To achieve this end, YAV program administrators and staff offer a prevention and intervention program to youth living in the surrounding
community over the course of 8-weeks. The researcher developed instruments for measuring program effectiveness and collected data that extracted the perceptions held by program participants and personnel related to the independent variables. The independent variables selected for this study bared findings that ought to be considered by educators, administrators of community based programs, law enforcement agencies, and parents. In particular, parental involvement is critical to effective program interventions, especially for younger populations who come into contact with law enforcement agencies. Parents, educators, and law enforcement agencies must advocate for progressive policies rather than punitive policies because the implications of punitive policy are too devastating to youth and society in general as argued in chapter one of this analysis. If juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs continue to undergo scientific exploration to measure effectiveness and use the data to guide strategies, implementation practices, and governance, the researcher contends that gains will be made in reducing the rate of recidivism among youth offenders and increase successful transition into secondary schools even after contact with law enforcement agencies.
APPENDIX A

Student Survey

I am interested in investigating factors that impact program effectiveness which lead to reduced youth delinquency and increase secondary school reentry. Your contribution to this research is invaluable and will provide beneficial information for educators and law enforcement agencies. It will also add depth to this research.

A. Demographic Information

1. What is your gender? _____ (1) Male    _____ (2) Female ______

2. What is your race?
   _____ (1) Latino or Hispanic    _____ (2) Black    _____ (3) White
   _____ (4) Asian                _____ (5) Native American   _____ (6) Other

3. Type of participant. Check all that apply.
   _____ (1) Court ordered        _____ (2) School referred
   _____ (3) Parent Referred     _____ (4) First time offender
   _____ (5) Repeat offender     _____ (6) Nonoffender

4. How old are you? _______

5. Who do you live with?
   _____ (1) Both mother and Father    _____ (2) Mother-only
   _____ (3) Father-only              _____ (4) Biological Mother and Stepfather
   _____ (5) Biological Father and    _____ (6) Grandparent(s)
       Stepmother                      _____ (7) Other guardian _______________

B. Extended Family Involvement

1. Do extended family members (grand parents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.) take time to talk with you about your academics? _____ (1) Yes     _____ (2) No

2. How frequently do extended family members talk with you about your academics?
   _____ (1) Never      _____ (2) Rarely     _____ (3) Sometimes
   _____ (4) Often      _____ (5) Always
3. Do family extended family members talk with you about negative school and community behavior?  _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No

4. How often do extended family members talk with you about negative behaviors and the consequences?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes
   _____ (4) Often   _____ (5) Always

5. Do you believe that extended family members support your goals?  
   _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No

6. How often do extended family members attend and participate in YAV activities?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes
   _____ (4) Often   _____ (5) Always

C. School Attendance/Truancy

1. What is your current school enrollment status?
   _____ (1) Attending traditional middle/high school
   _____ (2) Attending an alternative school
   _____ (3) Not attending school

2. What middle/high school do you currently attend? ____________________________

3. Have you been suspended or expelled from school during the current academic year?
   _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No

4. For what reason were you suspended or expelled from school? Check all that apply.
   _____ (1) Violence  _____ (2) Poor Attendance/Truancy
   _____ (3) Smoking  _____ (4) Disrespect of School Personnel
   _____ (5) Public Display of Affection  _____ (6) Drug/Alcohol use
   _____ (7) Possession of a weapon  _____ (8) Dress Code Violation
   _____ (9) Other ____________________________

5. Do you attend school every day?  _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No

6. How many days per month are you absent from school?
   _____ (1) 0-2   _____ (2) 3-5   _____ (3) 6-8   _____ (4) Over 9

7. What are the reasons that prevent you from attending school? Check all that apply.
   _____ (1) Sickness  _____ (2) Dislike of School  _____ (3) Dislike of Peers
   _____ (4) Bullying  _____ (5) Familial Obligations  _____ (6) Work
   _____ (7) Difficulty learning  _____ (8) Other ____________________________
D. Family History with Law Enforcement

1. To your knowledge, has either parent or guardian ever been incarcerated?
   _____ (1) Yes    _____ (2) No

2. Are you aware of the reason you parent/guardian is/was arrested or incarcerated?
   a. _____ (1) Yes    _____ (2) No
   b. What is the reason? ____________________________________________

3. Does either parent or guardian work for or with a law enforcement agency?
   _____ (1) Yes    _____ (2) No

4. My family’s history with law enforcement negatively influences my behavior.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree

E. Mentoring Relationships

1. Do you have a YAV mentor?    _____ (1) Yes    _____ (2) No

2. Mentor gender.    _____ (1) Male    _____ (2) Female

3. My relationship with my YAV mentor has positively influenced my behavior.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree

4. My relationship with my YAV mentor has negatively influenced my behavior.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree

5. My relationship with my YAV mentor has positively influenced my academic commitment.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree

6. My relationship with my YAV mentor has negatively influenced my academic commitment.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree

7. I believe that my mentor supports me.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree    _____ (2) Agree    _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree    _____ (5) Strongly disagree
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8. When making academic or behavioral decisions, I think about the advice of my mentor.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree  _____ (2) Agree  _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree  _____ (5) Strongly disagree

F. Gang Membership/Affiliation

1. I am a member of a gang. _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No  _____ (3) No opinion

2. My friends/peers are members of a gang.
   _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No  _____ (3) No opinion

3. I am attracted to gangs.  _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No  _____ (3) No opinion

4. I have committed delinquent acts as a gang member.
   _____ (1) Yes  _____ (2) No  _____ (3) No opinion

5. Gang membership has influenced my decision making at school and in the community.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree  _____ (2) Agree  _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree  _____ (5) Strongly disagree

G. Frequency of Contact

1. How many times have you had negative contact with law enforcement related to juvenile delinquency prior to YAV participation?
   _____ (1) 0-2  _____ (2) 3-5  _____ (3) Over 6

2. How many times have you had negative contact with law enforcement related to juvenile delinquency during YAV participation?
   _____ (1) 0-2  _____ (2) 3-5  _____ (3) Over 6

3. How many times have you had negative contact with law enforcement related to juvenile delinquency after to YAV participation?
   _____ (1) 0-2  _____ (2) 3-5  _____ (3) Over 6

4. How many times have you had positive contact with law enforcement after YAV participation?
   _____ (1) 0-2  _____ (2) 3-5  _____ (3) Over 6
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H. Parental Involvement

1. What is the relationship like between you and youth parent/guardian?
   ______ (1) Positive and Open (meaning you feel comfortable talking to your parent/guardian about anything)
   ______ (2) Positive but not very open
   ______ (3) Somewhat positive and somewhat open
   ______ (4) Negative relationship and not open at all

2. How often do you spend time with your mom and dad at the same time?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes    _____ (4) Often    _____ (5) Always

3. Are you usually left alone without parental/guardian supervision?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes    _____ (4) Often    _____ (5) Always

4. Do your parents/guardian take time to talk with you about your academics?
   _____ (1) Yes   _____ (2) No

5. How frequently do your parents/guardian talk with you about your academics?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes    _____ (4) Often    _____ (5) Always

6. Do your parents/guardian talk with you about negative behavior? _____ (1) Yes   _____ (2) No

7. How often do your parents/guardian talk with you about negative behaviors and the consequences?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes    _____ (4) Often    _____ (5) Always

8. Do you believe that your parents/guardian support your goals?
   _____ (1) Yes   _____ (2) No

9. How often do your parents/guardian attend and participate in YAV activities?
   _____ (1) Never   _____ (2) Rarely   _____ (3) Sometimes    _____ (4) Often    _____ (5) Always
I. Program Curriculum

1. The most useful YAV workshop for me was: (Check all that apply).
   _____ (1) Ethics values, cost of crime
   _____ (2) Consequences of Conforming to Peer Pressure
   _____ (3) Identifying and Conquering Bullying/Peer Pressure
   _____ (4) Sex Crimes/Miranda Rights
   _____ (5) Abstinence/STD
   _____ (6) Study Skills
   _____ (7) Decision/Choices
   _____ (8) Conflict Resolution/Anger Management
   _____ (9) Violent Crimes/Theft Laws
   _____ (10) Police & You
   _____ (11) Gang Laws
   _____ (12) Breaking the Cycle of Addictive Thinking
   _____ (13) Domestic Violence

2. As a result of participating in the YAV program, I have developed a positive self-concept.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree  _____ (2) Agree  _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree  _____ (5) Strongly disagree

3. As a result of participating in the YAV program, I will return to school.
   _____ (1) Strongly agree  _____ (2) Agree  _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree  _____ (5) Strongly disagree

4. As a result of participating in the YAV program, I will refrain from engaging in juvenile delinquency?
   _____ (1) Strongly agree  _____ (2) Agree  _____ (3) No opinion
   _____ (4) Disagree  _____ (5) Strongly disagree
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Parent Focus Group Protocol

I am interested in investigating factors that impact program effectiveness which lead to reduced youth delinquency and increase secondary school reentry. Your contribution to this research is invaluable and will provide beneficial information for educators and law enforcement agencies. It will also add depth to this research.

Focus Group Protocol: Focus Group with YAV Participant’s Parents
Time of Interview: TBA
Date: TBA
Place: Police Department Public Safety Complex
Interviewer: N. Latrice Richardson
Interviewee: 4-5 YAV Parents/Guardian
Position of Interviewee: Parent/Guardian

Parent Focus Group
1. Do you or the participant’s extended family members have a history of contact with law enforcement? Please explain.

2. How has that contact had an impact on the participant’s behavior and school attendance?

3. In your opinion, does your child value education?

4. Do you participate in YAV activities or volunteer?

5. What prevents you from participating in YAV sponsored activities?

6. How has this program been beneficial to your child’s school reentry efforts and diminishing juvenile delinquency?

7. What do you intend to do to ensure that your student successfully reenters school?

8. What do you intend to do to ensure that your student refrains from engaging in juvenile delinquency?
APPENDIX C

Staff Focus Group Protocol

I am interested in investigating factors that impact program effectiveness which lead to reduced youth delinquency and increase secondary school reentry. Your contribution to this research is invaluable and will provide beneficial information for educators and law enforcement agencies. It will also add depth to this research.

Focus Group Protocol: Focus Group with YAV Staff
Time of Interview: TBA
Date: TBA
Place: Police Department Public Safety Complex
Interviewer: N. Latrice Richardson
Interviewees: 4-5 YAV personnel
Position of Interviewee: Staff/Volunteer/Facilitator

Staff Focus Group Questions
1. How often does the YAV program facilitate staff training?
2. What is the structure of YAV staff training?
3. What is your role as a staff member/volunteer/facilitator?
4. How is the curriculum developed?
5. Who is responsible for developing the curriculum?
6. How do you go about implementing the YAV curriculum?
7. What are the most significant factors influencing staff training and implementation of training?
8. How did you become a YAV staff/volunteer/facilitator?
9. In what ways are the participants affected by the YAV curriculum?
10. How does the mentoring component manifest in program facilitation?
APPENDIX D

Administrator Interview Protocol

I am interested in investigating factors that impact program effectiveness which lead to reduced youth delinquency and increase secondary school reentry. Your contribution to this research is invaluable and will provide beneficial information for educators and law enforcement agencies. It will also add depth to this research.

**Interview Protocol:** Interview with Senior Level Administrator  
**Time of Interview:** TBA  
**Date:** TBA  
**Place:** Police Department Public Safety Complex  
**Interviewer:** N. Latrice Richardson  
**Interviewee:** ‘GS’  
**Position of Interviewee:** Deputy Chief, County Police Dept.

**Interview with Senior Level YAV Administrator**

1. Please provide your title and role with the county police department?

2. What caused you to begin a program like Youth Against Violence in the county?

3. Was the program always structured at 8 weeks?

4. Who is responsible for developing YAV curriculum?

5. How is the program funded?

6. Does program funding impact the effectiveness of the program?

7. Is there a tool in place for evaluation or measurement of success?

8. What are the follow-up procedures for participants upon completion of the 8-week intervention?

9. How does reporting occur within the program (i.e. to the courts, the community, schools, etc.)?

10. What is the age range of students seen most frequently?

11. What are the common participant demographics?

12. What leadership style do you use to facilitate staff training and implementation of training in YAV programming?
APPENDIX E

Parent Focus Group Protocol

I am interested in investigating factors that impact program effectiveness which lead to reduced youth delinquency and increase secondary school reentry. Your contribution to this research is invaluable and will provide beneficial information for educators and law enforcement agencies. It will also add depth to this research.

Focus Group Protocol: Focus Group with Program Participants
Time of Interview: TBA
Date: 2/15/2013
Place: Police Department Public Safety Complex
Interviewer: N. Latrice Richardson
Interviewee: 5 Former YAV Participants
Position of Interviewee: YAV Participant

Participant Focus Group Questions
1. Since completing the YAV program, have you remained enrolled in school?

2. Since completing the YAV program, have you engaged in any juvenile delinquency, which resulted in a negative consequence (i.e. arrest, school suspension, etc.)?

3. Why have you remained in school or not returned?

4. What has caused or prevented you from engaging in delinquency?

5. What skills have you put to use as a result of participation in the program?

6. What relationships have been affected by your participation? In what way?

7. What do you think the implications regarding delinquency and school reentry would have been if you had not participated in the YAV program?

8. How has you parents/guardian involvement influenced your behavior in terms of returning to school or engaging in delinquency?

9. What factors have prevented your parent/guardian from participating in YAV activities?
10. In what way has your parent/guardian participated in YAV activities? How does that involvement influence your success in the program?

11. How has your parent/guardian’s contact (i.e. arrest, incarceration, etc.) with law enforcement had an impact on your behavior and school attendance?

12. What have you learned during the 8-week intervention program that has provided you with a better understanding of juvenile laws?

13. Do you understand the consequences of breaking laws or school policy as a result of participation in YAV?
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