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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Currently in the state of Ohio, 2,040 juveniles ages 12 to 21 are confined in an institution at a cost of $82/day/juvenile. Ohio is second in the United States, only to California, in the number of incarcerated youth. These youth are housed in a system designed to accommodate only 1,300 youth per day (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1990).

Juvenile Crime

In 1987 the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services reported that the majority of crimes committed by juveniles in Ohio were property crimes (i.e., burglary, larceny, and theft). Juvenile arrests for these crimes peak at age 17 and drop in half by age 21. The decline in involvement is attributed to "maturational reform," which results when the individual reevaluates his/her involvement in peer group activities and becomes established in adult roles of work and marriage (Waegel, 1989).

The progression of criminal career patterns supports the theory that significant numbers of adult offenders were in trouble with the law prior to their eighteenth birthday. Those that become "career criminals" have a long history of felony offenses beginning at an early age and are beyond the reach of rehabilitation efforts (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987).
In Ohio, half of all serious violent crime and 40% of all property crime takes place within the largest cities according to the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services (1987). When suburban areas surrounding those cities are added, both figures jump to 80%.

**Characteristics of Juvenile Offenders**

Juveniles involved in crime are not distributed equally across all social class, gender, family structure, or place of residence categories (Waegel, 1989). There are important patterns in the relationship between social class and delinquency in the National Youth Survey data. Waegel reported no significant class differences in the prevalence (the proportion of youth population involved) of delinquency when all types of offenses were considered. However, when considering specific types of offenses, significant class differences were obvious. Middle-class youth had the highest rates of public disorder and minor theft, while working-class and lower-class youth had higher rates of felony assault and robbery. Males substantially exceed females in delinquency conduct. Culturally defined sex roles for males typically center on being tough, aggressive and achieving material success. Therefore, male delinquency spans a variety of offenses against persons and property (Waegel, 1989).

Females encounter more restrictive parental supervision and have socialization patterns centered around nonaggressive acts, interpersonal relationships, and attractiveness. Thus female delinquency concentrates on petty theft, sexual misconduct, and family offenses (Waegel, 1989). Recent trends show an increase in the amount of female delinquency as well as offenses such as robbery and burglary.
Waegel (1989) reported female delinquency rates may actually be higher than arrest rates indicate due to lenient treatment of females by police and intake officers.

From social theories (Stumphauzer, 1986), we know that criminal behaviors are often linked to social alienation, social structure, and social problems such as lower class status, unemployment, poverty, and racial/ethnic discrimination. In the psychological learning theories of crime, on the other hand, criminal behavior is viewed as a learned behavior following established psychological principles.

Cole, Chan, and Lytton (1989) found in their study that delinquent students perceived themselves as inferior to low achieving students in cognitive competence. This phenomenon could be due to delinquent students being more sensitive to failure situations, thus their perceptions of lower cognitive competence. Delinquents also reported lower perceptions of social competence, as compared to their nondelinquent counterparts.

Family size (Lamson, 1983) was identified as an influence on delinquency. Lamson reported social class or social status influences the relationship between family size and delinquency, which complicates both the family size and ordinal position arguments. In a study conducted by Calhoun, Connley, and Bolton (1984), middle-borns from black and brown large families were found to be involved in more delinquent behaviors than middle-borns in white families. The majority of the minority youth reported engaging in delinquent acts for economic gain while parental attention was the primary reason indicated by the white delinquents.
Family structure was reported to be a substantial factor in juvenile delinquency (Waegel, 1989). Juveniles living with both biological parents had substantially lower rates of delinquency than did youths from non-intact families. The most pronounced differences were seen in hard drug use and felony theft with substantial differences seen in all other offenses. The general pattern indicated lower rates of delinquent behavior by those from intact families.

Lundman (1984) reported findings which showed family cohesiveness to be a major factor in deterrence. Suitable, firm supervision and discipline by both parents were important factors. Lack of family support for society's values and rules was reported to result in antisocial attitudes and deviant behavior (Lamson, 1983).

Intervention often is used as punishment to make criminal activity less appealing. While punishment may not eliminate the criminal tendencies, it may suppress the antisocial behavior long enough for an individual to find rewards in more socially acceptable behavior (Lamson, 1983).

Juvenile Court System

Waegel (1989) reported that a 'get tough' attitude toward delinquency is a reality in states such as Colorado, Washington, and South Dakota. Other states are shifting emphasis away from treatment programs and giving greater weight to public protection and punishment.

Judges are appointed to the bench primarily by legal and political contacts (Waegel, 1989), thus their actions may often be sensitive to the political realities of their communities. Consideration of dispositional alternatives in a 'get tough'
environment may not provide opportunities for youth to participate in preadjudication options. Local court traditions formulated by views of influential judges or those with long tenures on the bench help determine whether the court functions in the due process philosophy (as in adult court) or in the more traditional procedures of a juvenile court setting. All may affect a judge's knowledge and use of preadjudication dispositional alternatives.

Prevention and control measures intervene at three major decision points in the juvenile justice system: Predelinquent, preadjudication; and postadjudication. The goal of predelinquent intervention, through individual treatment and area projects, is to stop delinquency before it begins, before juveniles come in contact with the juvenile justice system (Lundman, 1984).

Diversion options intervene at the preadjudication point. Short-term treatment services are provided to juveniles without referring them to court. Supporters of this option believe that diversion is better for first time offenders than detention, adjudication, and institutionalization. They report that the latter would only intensify juveniles' low self image and stigmatize them in the eyes of others (Lundman, 1984).

Postadjudication intervention is intended to control offenders by placing them under formal control of the state for purposes of rehabilitation, incapacitation, and deterrence. Options include: Probation; community treatment; institutionalization; and parole (Lundman, 1984).

The high cost of incarceration of juveniles, lack of jail space, and the tragic loss of human potential requires that the state of Ohio consider providing additional
dispositional options for juvenile offenders. The development of quality diversion programs can provide youth with the skills to make positive choices and thus, avoid participation in delinquent behaviors. When youth feel good about who they are, make healthy decisions, resist peer pressure, and set personal goals, they increase their potential for becoming positive contributing members of society.

**Problem Statement**

In 1990, Ohio was second in the nation in the number of incarcerated youth. The average daily number of youth who were incarcerated was 2,040 in a system designed to accommodate only 1,300 youth per day (Governor’s Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1990).

Juvenile courts are unable to focus their efforts exclusively on law-violating youth. These courts not only handle delinquency and status offense cases but a variety of matters pertaining to the welfare of youth, such as dependency and neglect cases, and cases of suspected child abuse (Waegel, 1989).

The judge’s perceptions of the personal characteristics of juveniles and the influence these characteristics had on the judge’s selection of the diversion dispositional option for the juvenile offender was unknown. Therefore, a concern of this study was the extent to which the judge’s perceptions affect the dispositional alternative selected.

The extent to which judges were familiar with the characteristics of the diversion dispositional alternative was also a concern of this study. There was concern that judges may not be equally knowledgeable about the diversion alternative
available. Thus juvenile offenders may not be provided the best opportunity for a positive outcome.

Personal characteristics of juvenile judges were perceived to play a role in the disposition of a juvenile offender to a diversion alternative. The extent of the unequal disposition of juveniles due to personal characteristics of the juvenile judge was a concern of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The number of youth incarcerated in Ohio has overextended the available correctional facilities within the state. Judges may not be considering all the preadjudication options as viable alternatives.

Currently The Ohio State University Cooperative Extension Service is offering educational/personal development diversion programs to juvenile offenders in five counties. These programs are based upon research which indicates that deviant behavior is directly influenced by low self-esteem and self concept, lack of moral reasoning, and low social skills (Clark, 1990). County Extension faculty have received requests to develop and provide similar programs in additional counties. In order to provide a statewide juvenile diversion program, it is important to understand what characteristics of juveniles and juvenile judges influence the dispositioning of a juvenile to diversion programs, as well as what expectations judges have of the programs.

The purpose of the study was to describe the factors related to the willingness of juvenile judges to use juvenile diversion programs based upon the characteristics
of the youth and judges, crimes committed, prior court appearances, knowledge of
diversion programs, and content expectations of diversion dispositional alternatives.

Variables of the Study

The following dependent variable and independent variables were used in the study:

I. Dependent Variable:
   A. The willingness of juvenile judges to use juvenile diversion programs based upon the summed score of:
      1. The willingness to place scale, and
      2. The overall willingness to disposition question.

II. Independent Variables:
   A. Characteristics of Youth
      1. Psychological characteristics
      2. Social skills
      3. Gender
      4. Age
      5. Ethnicity
      6. Decision making skills
      7. Gang membership
      8. Academic achievement
      9. Family structure
     10. Birth order
11. Place of residence
12. Substance abuse
13. Socioeconomic status
14. Employability

B. Nature of Crime
1. Crime committed
2. Number of prior court appearances

C. Diversion Programs
1. Knowledge of diversion alternatives
2. Availability of diversion programs

D. Recommended Program Content
1. Program content - youth
2. Parental involvement
3. Program content - families
4. Duration of program
5. Funding source
6. Goal of court

Research Objectives

The following research objectives were developed:

1. To determine what personal characteristics of juvenile offenders juvenile judges considered important when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.
2. To determine to what extent judges consider the crime committed by 
the juvenile when dispositioning the offender to a diversion alternative.

3. To distinguish the extent juvenile judges consider the number of prior 
juvenile court appearances when dispositioning a juvenile to a 
diversion program.

4. To determine the availability of juvenile diversion programs within 
Ohio counties.

5. To describe juvenile judge's knowledge of the different types of 
juvenile diversion programs available.

6. To determine from the juvenile judges the recommended duration of 
a juvenile diversion program series.

7. To distinguish the content of juvenile diversion programs as perceived 
important by juvenile judges.

8. To describe who, from the viewpoint of the juvenile judges, should 
fund juvenile diversion programs.

9. To determine the degree to which juvenile judges would disposition 
juveniles to various diversion dispositional options if available.

10. To determine the personal characteristics of juvenile judges in the 
Ohio court system.

11. To describe the county population and type of court in which the 
juvenile judge presides.
12. Determine what interrelationships exist between the juveniles' personal characteristics, nature of crime committed by juveniles, and judge's knowledge of diversion alternatives, with judge's gender, age, race, years of service, marital status, and number of children and type of court, county population and county description.

13. Determine what relationship exists between the availability of a juvenile diversion program and judges' knowledge of that program.

14. Determine what relationship exists between the independent variables in the study and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs.

Definitions

**Academic achievement** represents the juvenile's scholastic ability or current school status. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence academic achievement had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

**Adjudicate** is to find guilty.

**Age** the length of time a person has existed. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence age had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

**Alternative schools** are schools which provide effective alternative education opportunities and a warm, accepting relationship with adult instructors.
Birth order represents the numerical placement of an individual in the order of children's births within a family. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence birth order had upon their willingness to use diversion programs.

Characteristic is a distinguishing trait.

Community service projects are when a juvenile is required by the court to work for the mutual good of the community.

Community treatment programs provide extensive assistance and stricter enforcement of the conditions of probation.

Crimes of violence include murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault.

Criminal is a person who has committed a crime.

Decision making skills represent and individual's ability to recognize a problem, consider multiple alternatives to solve the problem, select a solution, activate that solution and evaluate the consequences. This independent variable was operationally defined by the perception of the influence juveniles decision making skills had upon the willingness of judges to use diversion programs.

Delinquency crimes are crimes against persons and property, use of drugs, and public disorder which include indecent exposure, weapons, prostitution, disorderly conduct and delinquent traffic.

Delinquent child is any child under 18 years of age who violates a law, ordinance, or regulation which would be a crime if committed by an adult. This
independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence a delinquent child offense had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

**Disposition** is the term for sentencing in a juvenile court.

**Dispositional alternatives** are sentencing options available for disposition of a juvenile offender.

**Diversion** programs are short term treatment programs designed to divert first time offenders away from the juvenile justice system. They are conducted at the preadjudication point.

**Employability** is the degree to which an individual has skills which would enable them to be a productive member of the work force. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence employability had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

**Employment training** is training which provides juveniles with relevant job skills that enhance their employability.

**Ethnicity** relates to the race of large groups of people classified according to common traits or customs. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence ethnicity had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

**Family counseling** is counseling of juveniles and their parents/guardians to help them develop communication, problem solving, interpersonal, and parenting skills.
Family structure is the pattern of relationships of individuals living under one roof. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence family structure had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Gang membership is a group of juveniles participating in delinquent behaviors. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence of gang membership upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Gender is the sex of the individual. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence the juvenile’s gender had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Individual treatment is individualized treatment to bolster or repair individuals who show tendencies to get in trouble with the law.

Institutionalization is incarceration of individuals in a correctional facility.

Juvenile is any person between 10 and 17 years of age.

Judge is an elected county official authorized to decide questions brought before a court of law.

Knowledge is something learned and kept in mind. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence their knowledge of diversion programs had upon their willingness to use diversion alternatives.

Offender is a person who has been accused of causing discomfort, pain, or loss.
Parole is a conditional release from a correctional facility.

Peer groups are groups for youth sanctioned by the juvenile court which are organized to provide meaningful relationships for juvenile offenders with like-age persons having nondelinquent values.

Perceptions are insights or knowledge through intuition which form a specific impression.

Personal refers to distinct affective, cognitive, or behavior qualities inherent in each individual.

Petitions are criminal complaints filed against a juvenile.

Philosophical approach is how a justice incorporates his/her personal convictions and beliefs to create a desired result.

Place of residence refers to the physical location of the home of the juvenile in relation to a rural, suburban or urban setting. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence place of residence had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Preadjudication is the process of diverting the juvenile into intervention options prior to the adjudication hearing and adjudication.

Postadjudication is the process of controlling juveniles by placing them under formal control of the state.

Probation is when individuals serve their sentences in the community.

Property offenses include burglary, larceny, theft, arson, and motor vehicle theft.
Psychological characteristics represent a person's mental and behavioral traits (e.g. self-esteem, ability to cope with stress, self gratification, aggressiveness) which define them as an individual. The degree to which these factors are perceived to influence a judge’s willingness to use juvenile diversion programs operationally defined these variables in this study.

Recidivism refers to the extent to which juveniles commit delinquent offenses following correctional interventions.

Rehabilitation is becoming right with society's values.

Referee is a person who works within the juvenile court system to which juvenile offender's cases are referred for investigation and recommendation of disposition.

Restitution is made back to the victim, primarily in the form of monetary payments.

Socialization skills represent the ability of an individual to interact with others. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence socialization skills had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Socioeconomic status represents the economic level of an individual or family. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges perception of the influence socioeconomic status had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.
Substance abuse represents the degree that a juvenile uses alcohol, illegal drugs, and other chemical substances. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges' perception of the influence substance abuse had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Unruly child or Status offenses are those for which adults cannot be charged, such as running away, home or school truancy, or failure to submit to control of a parent. This independent variable was operationally defined by the judges' perception of the influence an unruly child offense had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs.

Willingness is a favorable attitude, opinion or course of action toward doing something.

Limitations of the Study

A key limitation of the study was that a mail questionnaire was sent to the juvenile judges within the juvenile court system in Ohio. It was designed to measure their perceptions of the characteristics of juvenile offenders and the judge's knowledge of dispositional alternatives. It can only be assumed that the information provided by the returned questionnaires does represent the beliefs and knowledge levels of the juvenile judges surveyed.

The mail survey data collection method was selected to secure information from the juvenile judges statewide. Other data collection methodology could have provided information; however, due to time limitations and restricted financial
resources to make personal contact with each of the one hundred and one judges, the mail survey method was selected.

The study was limited to juvenile judges within the state of Ohio due to variance among states as to how judges are selected to serve on the bench and state statutes which regulate the juvenile court systems and disposition of juveniles. It was believed that by only surveying judges in Ohio, extraneous variables due to differences between states would be eliminated.

The scope of the study was limited to quantitative data provided by surveys returned by the juvenile judges. No attempt was made to secure qualitative data from judges, juveniles, or their families.

The Ohio Revised Juvenile Code specifically defines the dispositional alternatives for juveniles based upon the crimes committed (Baldwin's Ohio Revised Code Annotated, 1987). Juvenile judges do not have dispositional flexibility in cases which involve crimes of violence or property offenses. A limitation of this study was the reality that not all juvenile offenders could be dispositioned to preadjudication dispositional alternatives. Therefore, all dispositional decisions by juvenile judges would not be influenced by the recommended outcomes.

Police arrest policies of juvenile offenders were determined to be a limitation for this study. No speculation was made concerning the impact such policies may, or may not, have on the juvenile justice system in the state of Ohio.

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature and was designed to gather data concerning identified characteristics and the nature and strength of relationships
between these characteristics. One of the aims of the study was to produce results
generalizable to the population of judges in the State of Ohio who have responsibility
for the disposition of juvenile offenders. The intent of the study was not to generalize
findings to any state other than Ohio.

**Basic Assumptions**

It was an assumption for this study that the juvenile judges did, in fact, personally complete the questionnaire and responded with an honest intent to provide the most accurate data possible.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Juvenile crime is increasing nationwide according to the U.S. Department of Justice (1988a). They reported a 7% increase in delinquency cases petitioned and formally disposed of by Juvenile courts between 1984 and 1985. Ohio juvenile courts experienced an increase of 8% during the same time period (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987). Twenty one percent of the delinquency cases nationally were person offenses which included such crimes as robbery, and aggravated and simple assault (U.S. Department of Justice, 1989a). Only three percent of the juvenile arrests in Ohio during the same time period were for violent offenses which included murder, manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987).

Ohio juvenile courts had a higher number of cases (67%) of traffic violations, truancy, and running away than the national rate (24%) during the same time period (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987; U.S. Department of Justice, 1989a). Property offenses nationally were 55%, as compared to Ohio's rate of 30%, during the same time period.

The juvenile court system in Ohio is a specialized court system. Cases involving children under the age of 18 years of age are the exclusive jurisdiction of the juvenile court system, which is a separate division of the common pleas court. It can be combined with either the probate or domestic relations divisions of the court,
as is the case in 81 Ohio counties, or remain a separate division as is the case with the seven large urban counties (Governor’s Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987).

Considerable research has been done concerning the causal factors for delinquent behavior. Reported results are inconclusive concerning the primary variables studied. The focus of the review of literature for this study will be on characteristics of juvenile offenders and their support groups, educational experiences, brief descriptions of diversion options available to juvenile justices for disposition of juvenile offenders, and known characteristics of juvenile justices and the juvenile court system.

**Literature Related to Antecedent Variables**

Males dominate in the number of delinquency referrals to juvenile courts both nationally and in Ohio. Nationally in 1985, 85% of delinquency cases were males (U.S. Department of Justice, 1989a). The 1987 figures for Ohio indicated a similar trend. Females are arrested in Ohio for different types of crimes than males. Females have higher theft arrests (85%) than males (53%). Both sexes, however, showed increases in the number of arrests between 1984 and 1985. Nationally, male arrests increased 8% while female arrests increased 5% (U.S. Department of Justice, 1989a).

Waegel (1989) reported that culturally defined sex roles are the bases for the substantial difference in numbers of males and females involved in delinquent behavior. He indicated that males are socialized to be aggressive and tough and achieve material success, while female socialization focuses on nonaggressive behavior and relationships. More restrictive parental supervision of females may be
another influence on the numbers involved in delinquent behavior. Waegel (1989) also indicated the differences in arrest levels between males and females may be due to differential treatment by enforcement agents themselves. Waegel felt that police may be more inclined to arrest males than females for the same crimes.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice (1989a), 42% of youth begin their court careers at age 16 or 17. Seventeen is the peak age for Ohio crime arrests for both property and violent crimes. Property crimes drop in half by age 21 while violent crimes continue well into the adult years (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987). Those youth that begin their court careers at ages 9 to 11 will have, on the average, twice as many referrals in their careers as compared to youth who begin their careers at age 15. This statistic may be due to the fact that they have more time to return to the juvenile court as compared to the older youth who would move into the adult court system at age 18 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1989a).

The U.S. Department of Justice (1988a) indicated that 67% of all formally processed delinquency cases in 1985 involved whites. Waegel (1989), however, raised a question concerning the high proportion of Blacks involved in juvenile crime when compared to population statistics. Arrests indexes indicated 28.5% of all arrests were Black youths while they comprised only 15% of the population. He questioned whether they in fact were involved with more crime, or if they were the victims of arrest bias. Adjudicated cases for whites and nonwhites were equal, as were the proportions placed in out-of-the-home or on formal probation at disposition (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988a).
Voz (1967) indicated that delinquency behavior may be evenly distributed across socioeconomic strata. His research on 2,350 youth did not uncover significant differences between the income groups in relation to delinquent behavior. Chilton (1967), however, found a higher proportion of the lower income levels (42%) represented in the court system as compared to higher income youth (17%). Population demographics indicated a 40% and 20% ratio for the two income groups. In Chilton’s study, higher income youth were rarely referred to court for robbery, loitering, truancy, etc. but were over-represented in traffic offenses, liquor violations, curfew violations, incorrigibility, vandalism, and car theft. The lower income children committed more property offenses involving permanent material gains than the higher income youth.

Calhoun, Connley, and Bolton (1984) reported that the “soft core” acts committed by higher income youth may be primarily due to a need for more parental attention or to relieve boredom while youth from lower income levels engaged in crimes more for economic gain. Linden (1978) supported the theory that middle class adolescents are living in an age of affluence with little responsibility; therefore, they engage in delinquency behaviors chiefly as a pleasure seeking activity.

In a 1983 study conducted by Elliott, he concluded that there are differences between middle and lower class youth related to delinquency behaviors. Male delinquency acts are stronger, more widespread and more persistent over time than is true for females. Middle class youth are involved in lower incidence and prevalence rates on most serious offenses than lower class youth. Rates for truancy,
cheating, liquor violations, disorderly conduct, and evading payment were higher for middle class youth. Serious offenses, such as felony assault and robbery, were more prevalent with the lower class youth. Henggeler (1989) stated that these associations may be due to methodological difficulties with the self-report instruments that were used rather than an actual difference between the groups.

Arrest rates are highest in large urban areas and lowest in rural environments (Waegel, 1989). This statement is supported by data from the Ohio Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services (1987) in which it was reported that 62% of the juvenile arrests for property crimes and 75% of the arrests for violent crimes in 1980 were from the large urban counties with 51% of the juvenile population. Waegel (1989) attributed the large numbers of juvenile crimes in urban areas to the crowding, differences in social backgrounds, relative anonymity, and high level of opportunity for crime.

Hirschi (1969) reported that middle children were more likely to commit delinquent acts than first or last-born children. Lamson (1983) supported these findings regarding ordinal position, or birth order, in relation to juvenile delinquency. She also found that intermediate children tended to be over-represented among delinquents. Both authors reported that the intermediate child often feels "squeezed out" of parental affection.

Family size, however, may be more of a factor in delinquent behavior than ordinal position (Hirschi, 1969; Lamson, 1983). Considering the fact that a middle child must come from families of at least three children, family size may be more of
the issue. Relationships between ordinal position and delinquency becomes highly spurious when family size is controlled. The relationship between family size and delinquency may also be influenced by social class or social status (Lamson, 1983), which complicates both the family size and ordinal position arguments.

Wells and Rankin (1988) reported on several studies in which a small positive relationship between family size and delinquent behavior was found. They indicated the relationships could be due to: More difficulty in supervising and disciplining children; greater economic strain; delegation of child rearing responsibilities to older siblings; and increased risk of exposure to a delinquent sibling.

The family size (Lamson, 1983) issue has been supported by research which reported that family control, discipline, resources, and socialization are spread too thin in large families. The impact of family size on delinquency warrants further study as it has not been fully explained by research (Lamson, 1983).

Literature Related to Psychosocial Factors

Self perception, according to Calhoun et al. (1984), is made up of self concept and self-esteem. They defined self concept as "the way an individual perceives himself and his behavior, and his opinion of how others view him" (p. 323). Self-esteem then is how satisfied the individual is with his/her self concept. Poor self perception, according to the authors, contributes to participation in juvenile behaviors.

Kaplan (1982) developed the theory that delinquents use psychological defenses to enhance their self-esteem and to retain endorsement of socially accepted values. Youth maximize their behaviors to experience positive self attitudes while
minimizing the behaviors which produce negative ones. A delinquent youth's social group determines the normative social values by which the youth conforms. It is quite likely, according to Kaplan (1982), that the normative values deemed acceptable by that group and adhered to by the individual, may be deemed unacceptable, or deviant, by another group's value system. The other group then implements negative sanctions. Kaplan's (1982) theory has received support by research done by Zieman and Benson (1983), Burke, Midkiff, and Williams (1985), Bynner, O'Malley, and Bachman (1981), and Leung and Lau (1989).

The peer reference group, as reported by Leung and Lau (1989), is an approval group which endorses delinquent values and behavior. This peer approval has the most significant effect on the delinquent behavior according to their study. Zieman and Benson's (1983) study findings supported the belief that delinquency can be self-enhancing as peer groups endorse values which are similar to their own. Disguising deficiencies may well be the major defense mechanism employed by delinquent youth to raise their self-perceptions.

Kaplan's (1982) theory supported the results of a study conducted by Bynner et al. in 1981. They found that teenagers with low self-esteem who participate in delinquent behavior are able to restore their self-esteem through their actions. Their study indicated, however, that other behaviors besides delinquency influenced self-esteem as the individuals got older.

Other authors are reluctant to totally agree with Kaplan's (1982) theory. Henggeler (1989) reported a weak linkage between self-esteem and delinquency. He
felt that the influences of covariates were too great to isolate self-esteem as a cause of delinquency. He also felt that empirical evidence does not support the causal significance of self-esteem and delinquent behavior.

Authors of two other studies question Kaplan’s (1982) theory related to nonwhite youth. Leung and Drasgow (1986) conducted a study involving White, Black and Hispanic youth. Their data indicated that Kaplan’s (1982) theory only held true for whites. Because Kaplan collapsed data across racial groups, his theory did not address ethnic issues. Hispanics showed a lower self-esteem measure than did their White and Black counterparts although their delinquency rates were comparable with Whites.

Ethnic issues can influence self-esteem outcome measures according to Calhoun et al. (1984). The Mexican-American culture values manliness and independence. If arrested and confined, the youth are prevented from performing their valued role. Institutionalization would also interfere with the brown delinquent’s ability to fulfill obligations to the family, which is another valued role (Calhoun et al., 1984). In both situations, self-esteem would be lower. They would have a low perception of themselves as members of their families because they are unable to meet cultural expectations.

McCarthy and Hoge (1984) reported that the effect of self-esteem on delinquent behavior was negligible in their study. They reported that delinquent behavior in their sample was a cause of low self-esteem as compared with Kaplan’s (1982) theory that participation in delinquent behavior enhanced self-esteem. They
found that for subjects who were low in self-esteem at the onset of the study, there was no significant interrelationships with delinquency. Their data suggested that delinquent behavior is not central to self-esteem formation.

Henggeler (1989) reported that delinquent children often have deficits in problem-solving skills. He suggested the use of a five step decision-making process. The steps are: 1) Child recognizes that there is a problem; 2) examines the situation; 3) generates alternatives; 4) evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of each alternative; and 5) selects the best alternative and evaluates its efficacy. Maladjusted children, he reported, have difficulties with problem-solving skills. Delinquents often were unaware they had deficits in their knowledge of viable solutions to problems; therefore, they were less likely to recognize a need to consider all solutions fully (Henggeler, 1989).

Problem-solving skills of aggressive youth vary greatly, depending upon the perceived level of the other's hostile intent and interaction with the other person (Henggeler, 1989). Cognitive bias appears to be stable across different contexts for aggressive children. They underestimate their own aggressiveness when describing their interactions with others, especially under conditions of perceived threat. Henggeler (1989) also reported on the unpredictability of aggressive children. He reported that less predictable behavior along with cognitive distortions contributes to their antisocial behavior.

Henggeler (1989) reported that low social skills have an influence upon the delinquent child. There are mixed results produced by studies of social skill deficits.
Some studies have been conducted in institutional situations which would in itself have a negative influence upon the social skill level reported. Other factors, such as IQ and cultural issues, may influence the outcomes of studies beyond the reported social skills data. Henggeler (1989) indicated that aggression may be an adaptive and functional response to certain situations in certain sociocultural contexts. For example, an inner-city, adolescent male who is not willing to defend his rights against aggressive peers, may predispose himself to exploitation.

Breed (1990) reported concern that researchers have shown chronic delinquency results due to the breakdown of normal socialization processes. He believes that crime and delinquency issues will continue until such time that society is willing to address wider social problems such as poverty and poor education.

Literature Related to Support Systems

The family has been recognized as the most critical institution for shaping a child's personality, attitude, and behavior. The decline in many functions performed by the family has social commentators concerned (Jensen & Rojek, 1980). The family determines a youth's social standing, chances of getting ahead, and, ultimately, the probability of status problems.

Jensen and Rojek (1980) reported that the stronger the tie between parents and children, the less likely the involvement with delinquent behavior. The family is the primary source of learning and reinforcement for nondelinquent behaviors. Children seek approval from their parents by acting in ways that parents will approve (Jensen & Rojek, 1980). Therefore, when the reward for delinquent behavior from
peers is greater than the reward from parents for nondelinquent behavior, the undesirable behavior will continue.

Henggeler (1989) reported that there are two dimensions to parent-child relationships. The first dimension is affective in nature and is focused along a continuum. At one end are parents who are accepting, responsive, and child-centered. At the other end are parents who are rejecting, unresponsive, and parent-centered. The second dimension, according to Henggeler (1989), relates to different styles and types of parental control strategies. At one end of this continuum are parents who are undemanding and low in parental control and at the other end are parents who are demanding, controlling, and restrictive in their parenting style.

Henggeler (1989) suggests that the research the affective and control dimensions interact to produce different outcomes for youth. High parental demands and control along with low acceptance produce children who have deficits in moral internalization, social competence, and self-esteem. Low parental demands and control, along with the high acceptance context, result in youth who are highly impulsive and aggressive, and who are low in independence and responsibility. The highly demanding and controlling parent, when combined with high acceptance, results in a child who is highly independent, and has high self-esteem and social responsibility, but is low in aggression. The last dimension listed by Henggeler (1989) were parents with low demands and controls, combined with low acceptance. The results were youth who were severely deficient in cognitive and social development skills. Wells and Rankin's (1988) study supports the theory that both strict and
punitive as well as lax and erratic parental discipline styles were least effective in obtaining desirable results.

Highly parent-centered adults who are caught up in their own lives and do not provide love and attention to children cause their children to turn to others to fill the void (Lamson, 1983). McGee Banks (1989) describes these parents as products of the "me" generation. She reported that these adults are too involved with self-development and career advancement; thus, they have limited time for involvement with their children. In many cases, according to Lamson (1983), the delinquent peer group stepped in to fill the substitute parent role. These "Unattached Children" (Zinsmeister, 1990) never form a satisfactory relationship with their primary caregivers, thus grow up learning to not trust or love anyone.

Overly strict parents are rigid and absolute in their thinking (Lamson, 1983). Even though they may succeed in enforcing their rules, a child can rebel. Lamson (1983) reported that the child feels unfairly restricted and unfairly burdened. Counseling to help parents become more reasonable in their expectations and demands is advisable according to Lamson (1983).

Disturbed families (Henggeler, 1989) show low warmth and affection along with high conflict and hostility. These measures of family relations were reported by Henggeler (1989) to be the most powerful predictor of delinquent behavior when age, social class, and other demographic variables were held constant. Family relations accounted for 20% of the variance in adolescent arrest history (Henggeler, 1989).
Jensen (1972) found that attitudes toward public law and morality are affected by children's attitudes toward their parents and parental control. He reported that children will participate in delinquency acts because of attitudes and feelings toward their parents, not because of negative beliefs and attitudes toward the law.

Delinquent behavior in youth is often the result of physical abuse, emotional abuse, or neglect (Henggeler, 1989). In a 1990 news release, Ewing reported that juveniles are learning to become violent from their parents. They learn to be brutal, thus are highly likely to kill others.

Calhoun et al. (1984) and Jensen and Rojek (1980) found that juvenile delinquents tended to come from broken homes. According to Jensen and Rojek (1980), family disruption is a cause of delinquent behavior. Children from a broken home will have a greater chance of intervention by the juvenile court than a similar case from an intact home (Jensen & Rojek, 1980). Hirschi (1969) reported that juvenile courts have information available not only on the offense by the juvenile offender, but the child and family as well. It is his belief that the courts act on this information. He found that youth living in fatherless homes are more likely to have a police record than those living with both parents, their father or with a stepfather. Henggeler (1989) reported that children from one parent households are more likely to show deviant behavior and make decisions without parental input. These youth are more susceptible to negative peer pressure and engage in more deviant behaviors than those children from households with two parents present.
Rankin (1983) reported that the deviant behaviors of running away, truancy, and auto theft were strongly related to broken homes where both biological parents were absent. He indicated that different types of juvenile offenses occur in different types of broken home situations; therefore, broken homes as an etiological factor must be defined more explicitly. He found no significant difference between boys and girls related to the social conditions and delinquent behavior.

Von Voorhis, Cullen, Mathers, and Chenoweth Garner (1988) reported in their study the quality of the home environment itself had a greater influence on delinquency than did family structure. They found that other forms of family dysfunction (abuse, lack of affection and supervision, and conflict) proved to be significantly related to overall delinquency and status offenses. Family structure was only related to participation in status offenses (running away, skipping school, and disobeying parents). In their conclusions, Von Voorhis et al. (1988) supported the belief that policies need to address the issues of "bad homes," not "broken homes."

Jansen and Rojek (1980) found that juveniles living somewhere other than in an intact family are disproportionately represented in status and delinquency categories. Hirschi (1969) also found that there was a greater proportion of boys from broken homes in institutions than the proportion of boys from broken homes in the general population. Other studies referenced by Jansen and Rojek (1980) report inconsistent results which varied from no influence to strong relationships of broken homes with delinquent behavior.
Henggeler (1989) reported that there is strong evidence of the influence of peer groups on delinquent behavior. The peer group is a significant force in the development of cognitive, affective, and social competence. The quality of children's peer relationships is directly associated with children's later adjustment. He indicated that the development of emotional security and self-esteem and the acquisition of behavioral norms, moral values, and interpersonal skills are the result of interaction with peers.

Negative peer influences can be buffered by positive family relationships (Henggeler, 1989). The strongly predictive nature of association with deviant peer groups can become only slightly predictive under conditions of strong family support to the adolescent. Henggeler (1989) reported that “latchkey” children raised under authoritative conditions were less susceptible to antisocial peer influence than were those who were raised less stringently.

Cohen (1967) stated that delinquent gangs demand loyalty, reciprocity, sharing, and mutual subordination of one's own long-range goals for the good of the group. The gang provides much of what the ineffective family situation cannot. It provides a way of life for its members according to Cohen (1967). Henggeler (1989) indicated that a high percentage of deviant behavior was carried out with a peer group.

Gibbons (1970) profiled the gang boy based upon his pseudo-social personality patterns. He found that the boys inhabited neighborhoods of low socioeconomic status, and their parents were generally neglectful or subjected them to indifferent or lax discipline. Delinquent youth showed frequent residential mobility, were truant
more often than nondelinquent youth, had poor scholarship in school, and were most often from poor residential areas.

Recidivism in delinquent behavior and the use of alcohol and drugs are associated with deviant peer groups according to Henggeler (1989). The involvement of delinquent peers accounted for 33% of the variance as a predictor of self-reported delinquent behavior. Deviant peers are also a strong predictor of adolescent arrest history (Henggeler, 1989).

**Literature Related to Education and Employment**

Delinquent behavior has been found to be directly associated with poor school performance (Henggeler, 1989). Henggeler indicated that there is an inverse relationship between reading achievement, maternal ratings of school competence, and maternal ratings of homework performance with self-reported delinquent behavior and police contacts. The inclusion of third variables such as IQ, behavior problems, and dysfunctional family relations may also impact the school performance/delinquency issue.

Waegel (1989) addresses the educational issue from a different perspective. He describes public schools as middle class institutions with middle class values of competition, achievement and success, and self control, as well as planning for the future and making rational decisions. The lower class socialization, he reports, is a more easy going approach to life. These children are taught to be spontaneous and aggressive, with less emphasis on self discipline; therefore, conflict between the value systems is inevitable.
Waegel (1989) describes three approaches to school by youth from lower class backgrounds. The first approach is the "corner-boy" response. The youth quietly withdraws from competition into a comfortable and familiar world of like-minded peers. They simply avoid the painful, frustrating experiences of the middle class system.

The second solution is for the adolescent to become like those in the middle class system. They learn to play by middle class rules and pursue middle class goals despite all the obstacles they would face.

Joining the delinquent subculture is the third solution described by Waegel (1989). Behavior standards are set by the subculture and status must be earned through accepted behavior. Middle class standards are rejected and replaced with standards that are acceptable to that subculture. Thus, rationality, achievement, and deferred gratification are rejected in favor of negativism, maliciousness, short-run hedonism, and group autonomy.

It is Waegel's (1989) contention that the three solutions are ways for lower class youth to respond to the sense of personal failure and erosion of self-esteem they feel as they interact in the middle class school system. Interaction with the delinquent subculture enables youth to alleviate their problems of lower status and self esteem because they receive acceptance, support, and status from their new colleagues.

The delinquent subculture standards automatically include delinquent behavior, which can be, and often is, taken into the school system. The U.S. Department of Justice (1989b) reported that nearly three million attempted or
completed street crimes took place on school property in 1987. Administrators and
security personnel from the nation's largest urban school districts listed weapons on
campus as a major concern in a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice
(1989b). Learning and growth are impossible where students are afraid or intimidated
because others are disruptive.

Henggeler (1989) reported that the education of delinquent youth may be
hampered by the quality of the school attended. Marginal youth may be excluded
from school activities, sports, clubs, etc. There may also be a high student-to-teacher
ratio, instability in the student population, low student attendance, and poor
academic quality. All of these can be a detriment to the delinquent individual.
Research has shown that delinquency decreased when school policies were consistent
and fair, courses were relevant, principals were strong and consistent, students had
a degree of control over their school experiences, and a rational award system was
in place (Henggeler, 1989).

Hunter (1987) recognized the influence of the peer group in educational
environments. He encouraged teachers and administrators to use the energy and
influence of peer groups to strengthen the learning process in the classroom by
directly involving them in educational experiences.

Low intellectual abilities do not have a direct link with delinquent behavior
(Henggeler, 1989). Individuals who have low intellectual abilities are subject to a
viable process which links low abilities to delinquent behavior. Henggeler (1989)
reported that low intellectual abilities lead directly to difficulties in school, causing frustration and low esteem which in turn leads to the delinquent behavior.

Shine-Ring (1990) identified several indicators of risk for delinquency. Included in her listing were truancy, school failure, lack of attachment and commitment to school, negative peer related factors, school organization, lack of attachment to neighborhood, and mobility. She highly recommended school and community leaders become committed to addressing the issues with comprehensive, community-wide programs.

Dissatisfaction with school is a major cause of dropping out according to Ekstrom, Goertz, Pollack, and Rock (1986), Rumberger (1983, 1987), and Lloyd (1978). Rumberger (1987) cited the strong influence of family educational attainment of one or both parents as a major issue. Other variables identified by Ekstrom et al. (1986) include: Fewer study aids at home; broken homes; mothers with lower educational levels; mothers who are working; and parents who do not monitor school or out-of-school activities. Rumberger (1987) included: Poor performance in school; expulsion or suspension from school; economic reasons; marriage; and pregnancy. Other reasons given, but not widely documented according to Rumberger (1987), included retention in a grade, absenteeism, lower self-esteem, feelings of less control over their lives, poor attitudes, and low educational and occupational aspirations. Peer influence on the decision to leave school is believed to be a factor by Rumberger (1987); however, it is unclear the extent to which it may contribute.
In another study, Rumberger (1983) stated that there is a widespread racial difference in drop out rates. Minorities, particularly Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans, drop out of school at higher rates than do whites. Rumberger (1983) reported that one out of four Black youths and one out of three Hispanic youths do not finish high school as compared with one out of seven whites. Gay (1989) also reported high drop out rates for minority youth. She indicated that nationwide approximately 50% of Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans drop out of school before graduation. Drop out rates for Native Americans are not systematically reported but their drop out situation is even worse than for Blacks and Hispanics (Gay, 1989).

Rumberger (1983) reported that males drop out of school at higher rates than do females. Pregnancy or marriage was cited by females as their reasons for leaving school, while males cited economic reasons, dislike for school, or expulsion or suspension as reasons.

Recent studies have indicated that the propensity to drop out of school can be detected as early as the third grade. Lloyd (1978) investigated the belief that many dimensions related to dropping out can be identified at that point in the student’s academic career. He selected that grade because it is at that point that standardized tests are given. It is also the point that basic reading skills should have been taught, and at which an estimated 50% of future achievement patterns have been set.

DeRidder (1988) concurred with Lloyd’s findings. He reported that all too often the less advantaged student is grouped with other students who are like
him/her in academic achievement. Low grades and having to repeat a grade are highly significant indicators to dropping out in high school. Those students who have lower marks in the primary grades are those who lose interest and become less involved in the school experience (DeRidder, 1988).

DeRidder (1988) recommends that early remediation can stem the tide of drop outs. Equal educational access must be made available to all students, regardless of their race, social class, or economic standing, at the earliest possible grade level.

The economic and societal impacts of drop outs were addressed by Rumberger (1987). He reported that drop outs have lower academic skills than graduates which directly affects their ability to find secure, steady employment with an adequate income. In 1982, unemployment rates for drop outs were twice as high as those for high school graduates. The impact of dropping out of school is not only immediately felt by the individual but becomes a bigger disadvantage over time. Drop outs will have fewer opportunities for additional training and education, which directly affects their ability to remain current and competitive in the job market. Rumberger (1987) reported that not only are the economic impacts felt by drop outs, but psychological and physical impacts are felt as well. Drop outs experience higher rates of mortality, suicides, and admissions to state mental hospitals.

Societal consequences were also reported by Rumberger (1987). He indicated that those who fail to complete high school cost society in "forgone national income, forgone tax revenues for the support of government services, increased demands for
social services, increased crime, reduced political participation, reduced intergenerational mobility and poorer levels of health” (p 115).

Skills and educational requirements for jobs of the future could present even more problems for the school drop out (Rumberger, 1987). Cetron (1988) indicated that currently approximately 60% of jobs are open to those with a high school diploma. By the year 2000, 85% of jobs will require some job specific training after high school while college educations will be required for 15% of the jobs. Rumberger (1987) indicated that the drop out will be less able to learn new skills and adapt to the changing work environment, and will thus be less employable in the future.

Ekstrom et al. (1986) reported that over 50% of teen mothers do not graduate from high school. Those who identify themselves as fathers are 40% less likely to graduate than their peers who are not a parent. The lack of job training and a diploma presents a dismal view of the future. Ekstrom et al. (1986) reported that the range of employment opportunities for those females are both materially and psychologically quite limited.

**Literature Related to the Diversion Option**

Gamson (1978) reported that the passage of the Uniform Crime Reports in 1975 mandated procedural regulations, thus restricted the wide discretionary powers of judges. The change did provide increased protection for youth, but decreased flexibility by judges to balance the benefit of the ‘parens patriae’ approach while providing legal protection to insure justice (Gamson, 1978).
Juvenile diversion programs have sprung up in the last decade (Lotz, Poole, & Relogi, 1985). Diversion describes disposition prior to the juvenile becoming involved with the justice system. The term, however, can also be used to describe the process whereby cases are removed from the justice system after they have been admitted. Youth (Lotz et al., 1985) participate in a diversion program between apprehension and adjudication, in lieu of further processing. People feel that youth in diversion programs should receive positive life experiences that would enable them to enter society in legitimate roles. Diversion programs, therefore, must offer innovative approaches to treatment and rehabilitation (Lotz et al., 1985).

No convincing evidence supports the belief that placing a delinquent youth into a diversion program was more effective than another option (Lotz et al., 1985). Miller and Gold (1984) reported data on diversion projects which indicated there was no firm evidence that diversion was effective. Lundman (1984), however, reported outcome measures that indicated juveniles in diversion programs were arrested slightly less frequently than those processed by regular intake.

Intense ideological debates are being waged among proponents of the old and new agendas for juvenile justice reform. The concern for the well-being of youth as well as the need to protect the public are the basis for these debates (Krisberg, Schwartz, Litsky, & Austin, 1986). They reported a steady increase in the number of youth being referred to the juvenile court. The use of diversion programs, instead of arrests, would free the courts to address those who require more restrictive
dispositions. The 'get tough' public sector approach to youth crime, however, has become a trend, which has limited the use of this alternative (Krisberg et al., 1986).

Diversion programs may in fact bring more youth into the juvenile court system (Walker, 1989). More youth who would have otherwise never been arrested or would have exited the court system due to dismissal of the cases by prosecutors are now subject to social control. Diversion programs receive only low-risk offenders and are under pressure to demonstrate success according to Walker (1989). He indicated that most of these low-risk offenders would take care of their own problems without the program. He questions, therefore, the expenditure of funds for individuals who may in fact not need the program or would not have been involved in the court system without the availability of the diversion option.

Lack of conclusive evaluation data has not protected the diversion option from criticisms. Basta and Davidson (1988) summarized evaluation data from diversion programs published between 1980 and 1987. They found that recidivism rates varied from high to low, depending upon the study reported. Overall findings from meta-analysis of diversion studies did not provide substantial evidence for the success of diversion programs. Neither strong negative nor strong positive effects were found (Basta & Davidson, 1988).

A detention study conducted by Frazier and Cochran (1986) reported that juveniles who are detained prior to adjudication are more likely to receive harsher outcomes than nondetainers. Their detention is based upon the judges' perception that they will participate in further law violations and on discrimination or
arbitrariness. The authors indicated that those juveniles most likely to be detained are those who have prior records, are charged with both felonies and multiple offenses, and are Black, female, rural, and older. The juveniles represent groups which have higher probabilities of reoffending or failing to reappear in court (Frazier & Cochran, 1986).

Probation has been the juvenile court's first line of treatment for juvenile offenders for years (Waegel, 1989). Supervised probation, which involves the family, home, and community, has been a desirable context for working out problems with juvenile offenders. The juvenile is conditionally released into the community and is supervised and assisted by a probation officer according to Lundman (1984). Prior to the probation decision, a complete social history is developed on the juvenile, which includes: Information on their school, court and police records; results of family, teacher, employers', and complainants' interviews; medical, psychiatric, and psychological assessments; and a dispositional recommendation from the probation officer (Lundman, 1984). Periodic meetings between the juvenile and the probation officer occurs during the designated period to complete the conditions for probation. The probation officer and parole officer develop a preparole report. It is used to determine if the juvenile is to be released into the parole system. If paroled the juvenile reports to a parole officer rather than the probation officer (Lundman, 1984).

Restitution has become another option for the juvenile offender (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988b). Restitution, popular during the ancient civilizations,
fell into disfavor when formalized governments emerged, only to resurface in the mid-1960s as a new idea. Two restitution oriented sanctions are available: Direct compensation of the victim by the offender, either with money or services (victim restitution); and unpaid service given, not to the victim, but to the community (community service). According to the U.S. Department of Justice (1988b), victim restitution and community service result when all parties agree that this option is acceptable. It in essence diverts the defendant from court prosecution (U. S. Department of Justice, 1988b). Supporters contend that this option does avoid the stigma associated with conviction, which may be important to a juvenile, (U.S. Department of Justice, 1988b).

Employment training was recommended by Stumphauzer (1986) as an alternative sentencing option. He indicated that employment is a real problem for delinquent youth. If the juveniles were given the opportunity to learn how to get a job and keep it, they may well be separated from the delinquency cycle. No other authors referenced this option.

Family counseling is a diversion alternative which involves all members of the family (Stumphauzer, 1986). If in a family contracting format, the family contracts with a counselor as to what they will and will not do. The focus of family counseling is to address issues within the family which support the adolescent’s delinquent behavior (Lundman, 1984). By providing positive intervention with the family as a system, only 3.7% of the diversion referrals resulted in further court contact as compared with 19.8% of the regular probation referrals (Lundman, 1984). Kean
(1989) reported that family counseling can help parents understand their families and enable youth to reach their potentials. Because the entire family was involved in the training sessions, the youth benefitted from the parenting skills taught. Kean (1989) felt that if youth learned parenting skills during these sessions, they, in turn, would raise their own children better.

Snyder and Huntley (1990) recommended that clinical interventions for parents of troubled youth focus on developing effective discipline strategies, and problem solving and communications skills. They indicated that the duration and strength of remediation will be dependent upon the progression of the child along the developmental path of antisocial behavior. The earlier the intervention the more effective it will be according to Snyder and Huntley (1990).

A behavioral group training program, which involved court adjudicated youth and their families, was reported by Serna, Schumaker, Hazel, and Sheldon (1986). Parents were involved in a parent-adolescent communication program which focused on several reciprocal skills. Skill components included in the parent and youth programs were: Problem solving; communications; interpersonal interaction; and negotiations. The youth component also included a session on resisting peer pressure. Results indicated that youth whose parents participated in the program maintained a higher social skill level after ten months than the comparison group whose parents did not participate. Parent-child interactions were rated higher which improved family interactions and relationships (Serna et al., 1986).
Peer group formation, which focuses on social skills training has shown to be effective in influencing an adolescent’s locus of control (Long & Sherer, 1984). Long and Sherer reported that groups are more successful if youth are grouped according to the degree of deficiency of a social skill. Stumphauzer (1986) referenced assertion, social problem solving, and relating to authorities as specific adaptive social behaviors which could be included in peer group sessions.

Educational programming can take on many forms depending upon the community in which it operates (Price, 1987). Kean (1989) reported that the “School-Based Youth Services Program” brought together school and community agencies to work together to address issues. A "Comprehensive Interagency Diagnostic and Prescriptive Center" serves youth who experienced academic failure and low self-esteem (Mitchell & Johnson, 1986). The major emphasis of the program was to build self confidence and expand a child’s academic abilities in socially acceptable ways.

Law-Related Education (LRE) programs are offered to youth who have had poor academic records, low social acceptance in school, and no real stake in their community or school (Curd-Larkin, 1987). The LRE program emphasizes problem solving skills, mediation, and conflict management which meet the needs of the juvenile offender.

Price and Swanson (1990) recommended a comprehensive approach to student learning through the public school system. The mission should emphasize an approach which creates a learning environment and enables students to develop academic and life skills, build positive self concepts, and form effective relationships.
This model meets the needs of at-risk students who need learning environments that develop personal and academic growth (Price & Swanson, 1990).

**Characteristics of Juvenile Judges**

Maltz, Gordon, McDowall, and McCelary (1980) reported discrepancies in the disposition of juvenile offenders in the juvenile justice system. Due to an interaction of factors, and the judge’s influence on a decision, there were variances in dispositions from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, from judge to judge, as well as case to case. Maltz et al. (1980) reported that all judges did not use consistent criteria when dispositioning juveniles. Differences were due to the judge’s policies, characteristics of the offender, seriousness of the offense, and juvenile’s prior court records. These individualizing factors, or “rules of thumb,” which judges use add variance to the decision rule (Maltz, et al., 1980).

Provorse and Sarata (1989) felt judge’s roles and duties are not clearly defined, thus juvenile judges have considerable latitude in defining them. Provorse and Sarata (1989) interviewed Nebraska judges whose courts represented metro, trade-center, and rural communities. Each judge rated their function based on three categories: Impartial decision maker, activist, and coordinator. Metro court judges indicated an impartial decision maker role as their primary role as did a high proportion of trade-center judges. However, the rural judges who functioned in small rural communities with limited staff, detention facilities and services available, rated the activist role first. Provorse and Sarta (1989) reported that functions adopted by the judges were based upon their perception of the services needed by the juveniles
and their families. In communities where solutions are limited or not available, judges must actively find or create solutions to serve the needs of their community and protect the interest of the child.

Farnworth, Frazier, and Neuberger (1988) conducted a study on professionals in the Florida juvenile justice system. They reported that neither age of respondent nor job experience was significantly related to either the rehabilitation or the 'just desert' orientation. Significant variance was accounted for by the individual's functional role and job specialization. They found juvenile justice decision makers, which include judges, hold views consistent with both the rehabilitation and 'just deserts' orientations.

Sosin (1982) reported that local pressures influence the rehabilitative or 'just deserts' orientation of the local courts. He reported that pressures will influence the judge's record and vary by whether a judge is appointed, elected, or first appointed and then elected. Appointed judges are most likely to respond to their own orientation. Those judges who are elected or appointed than elected are most likely to respond to pressures from the local community, resulting in higher juvenile commitment rates (Sosin, 1982).

Currently there are one hundred and one juvenile judges in the Ohio court system (Stevens, 1990). The vast majority are male. They serve in one of four types of courts within the state court system: Juvenile Court only; Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court; Juvenile and Probate Court; and Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations and General Division Court (Stevens, 1990).
Juvenile judges enforce the juvenile laws of the state of Ohio as enacted by the Ohio General Assembly, thus are obligated to rule and disposition within the framework established by the juvenile statutes. Each judge, is elected via public vote for a six year term. Election times vary as election dates are set by the county in which the judge serves. No judge serves more than one court or county (Stevens, 1990).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The following are discussed in this chapter: Subject selection, research design, variables in the study, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

Subject Selection

The population for this study was 101 juvenile judges in the Ohio court system. They serve in one of four types of courts: Juvenile Court only; Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court; Juvenile and Probate Court, and; Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations and General Division Court. Due to the small number of individuals in the population, a census was used for this study.

Research Design

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature. A mail questionnaire (See Appendix C) was used to collect data. The study was designed to investigate the factors related to the willingness of juvenile judges in the Ohio court system to use diversion programs. Data identified characteristics of juveniles, judges, and diversion programs, and the nature and strength of relationships between the variables. Results are generalizable to the population of judges in the State of Ohio who have responsibility for the disposition of juvenile offenders. The intent of the study was not to generalize findings to juvenile judges in any state other than Ohio.
External validity, the degree to which results of a study can be generalized, is a major concern when conducting survey research. Frame error, sampling error, selection error, and nonresponse error are the four major threats to external validity of survey research.

To control for frame error, the discrepancy between the actual population and the list containing the names of the population, a complete up-to-date list of juvenile judges was used. To obtain an accurate list of names and addresses of current juvenile judges, the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services was contacted. The "1991 Directory of Family and Juvenile Courts," compiled by the Ohio Department of Youth Services, was provided. All juvenile and family court judges were surveyed.

The population of Ohio juvenile judges was identified to total 101 in number. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) recommended a random sample size of 80 judges would need to have been drawn from the frame of 101 to yield a margin of error of plus or minus 5%. Due to the accessibility of the total population, and the small difference between the recommended random sample size and the total population, it was determined that a census would be conducted. Sampling error was controlled when no random sample was drawn.

Selection error, when one person has a greater chance of being selected for the sample than others in the population, was controlled by the use of a census. The list of all juvenile judges was alphabetized by name to verify that there were no
duplications. None were found, as no judge in Ohio serves a juvenile court in more than one county.

Nonresponse error occurs when subjects in the sample do not cooperate or cannot be located. Nonrespondents are a serious threat as they can differ significantly from respondents on the major variables in the study. Nonresponse was controlled by comparing the scores of early respondents to scores of the late respondents on the dependent variable, willingness to use juvenile diversion programs. This strategy was selected as late respondents are often similar to nonrespondents in the nature of their replies. By comparing late respondents with early respondents, a researcher can generalize results from respondents to the census if no statistical difference is found between the two groups (Miller & Smith, 1983).

Differences between the mean score on the dependent variable for early respondents and late respondents were examined through the use of a t-test. The t-test yielded no significant difference between the two groups (See Table 1). Since the data were similar, they were pooled and generalized to the population.

Table 1

Comparison of Early and Late Respondents on the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Respondents</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Respondents</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t value = 1.22
Probability = .227
\( \alpha = .05 \)
Variables in the Study

The following dependent variable and independent variables were used in the study:

I. Dependent Variable:
   A. The willingness of juvenile judges to use juvenile diversion programs.

II. Independent Variables:
   A. Identify the influence of personal characteristics of juvenile offenders as perceived by the juvenile judge.
      Psychological Characteristics (i.e. self esteem, low ability to cope with stress, aggressiveness, ability to delay self gratification)
      Socialization Skills (i.e. likeable, lacks social skills)
      Gender
      Age
      Ethnicity
      Decision Making Skills
      Gang Membership
      Academic Achievement
      Family Structure
      Birth Order
      Place of Residence
      Substance Abuse
      Socioeconomic Status
Employability

B. Determine the influence of the crime committed and the number of prior court appearances by the juvenile on the willingness to use a diversion program.

Crime and Number of Prior Appearances

Unruly Child - no prior appearances
Unruly Child - one prior appearance
Unruly Child - two prior appearances
Unruly Child - three or more prior appearances
Delinquent Child - no prior appearances
Delinquent Child - one prior appearance
Delinquent Child - two prior appearances
Delinquent Child - three or more prior appearances

C. Determine the availability of diversion programs within the county, the perception by judges of their knowledge of those programs, and their willingness to use a juvenile diversion program which contain one of the following characteristics:

   Employment training
   Family counseling/education
   Peer groups
   Personal development
   Drug and alcohol treatment

D. Describe the recommendations of juvenile judges concerning:

   Program content of juvenile diversion programs
Involvement of parents/guardians

Content of parent/guardian programs

Number of sessions

Funding of programs

Goal of the juvenile court system

E. Describe the personal characteristics of the juvenile judges, type of court, and county population represented in the Ohio Juvenile Court System.

Gender

Age

Race/ethnic background

Years on the bench

Marital status

Number and ages of children in their families

Population of the county served

Description of county

Type of court in which justice serves

F. Determine what interrelationships exist between personal characteristics of judges (gender, age, race, years of service, marital status, and number of children), description of county, and type of court, and the personal characteristics of the juvenile offenders, crimes committed, and number of prior court appearances, judge’s knowledge of diversion program options, and their willingness to disposition a juvenile to diversion alternatives.
G. Determine what relationship exists between the availability of a juvenile diversion program and the judge’s knowledge of that program.

H. Determine what relationship exists between the independent variables and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument was designed by the researcher to collect data from juvenile and family court judges in the state of Ohio. Five sections containing 96 questions were used to gather information relating to the willingness of judges to use juvenile diversion programs. Forty personal characteristics of juvenile offenders were clustered to represent 14 subscales. Other subscales included influences of crimes committed and prior court appearances, and knowledge of and willingness to disposition to diversion alternatives. Expectations of the diversion dispositional alternatives were provided.

Section I, Characteristics of Youth, asked the juvenile judge to indicate their perceptions of the influence that personal characteristics of juveniles had upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs. The 40 characteristics were derived from the literature review and divided into the following 14 subscales: Psychological characteristics (Questions 1 - 8); socialization skills (Questions 9 & 10); gender (Questions 11 & 12); age (Questions 13 & 14); ethnicity (Questions 15 & 16); decision making skills (Questions 17 & 18); gang membership (Questions 19 & 20); academic achievement (Questions 21 - 23); family structure (Questions 24 - 26); birth order (Questions 27 - 29); place of residence (Questions 30 - 32); substance abuse
(Questions 33 & 34); socioeconomic status (Questions 35 - 37); and employability (Questions 38 - 40). The perceived importance of each subscale was measured through the use of a five point Likert-type scale assumed to be interval in nature.

To measure the perceived importance of each item respondents were asked to circle the number corresponding to the response that best described their perception of the importance of each characteristic to their decision making process. Anchors corresponding to the five scale points were:

1 = very little
2 = little
3 = some
4 = great
5 = very great

Scores for each subscale were summed per respondent. A mean score across all respondents was calculated to provide the measure of each subscale.

The same scale was also used to measure: Section II - Nature of Crime. Judges were asked to indicate the influence the crime committed and number of prior court appearances had upon their disposition of the juvenile. Crimes committed were broken into two constructs: Unruly child (Questions 41 - 44) and delinquent child (Questions 45 - 48). Each construct was further divided to reflect the number of prior court appearances (None, one, two, or three or more). Each construct was summed across the number of prior court appearances to determine if the type of
crime committed influenced the willingness of a juvenile judge to use a diversion program.

In Section III - Diversion Programs - judge's rated their level of knowledge and willingness to disposition to the available juvenile diversion programs. The variables were measured by a five point Likert-type scale. The judge's knowledge of five diversion programs -- employment training, family counseling/education, peer groups, personal development, and drug and alcohol treatment (Questions 49K - 53K) -- was measured. The knowledge scores were summed to indicate overall knowledge of diversion programs. Judges were asked to indicate (yes or no) if any of the listed diversion programs were available within their respective counties (Questions 49A - 53A). Simple frequency scores were tabulated to indicate the availability of diversion programs throughout the Ohio juvenile court system. The judge's willingness to use each of the five diversion programs was also measured. To determine the willingness to use a diversion program score, the five willingness to place scores (Questions 49W - 53W) across the five diversion programs and the overall willingness score (Question 56) were summed to produce the measure of the dependent variable.

Section IV - Diversion Program Recommendations - judges were asked to provide recommendations for juvenile diversion program content. Their responses were measured on a five point Likert-type scale. Judges were asked to rate the degree of importance of content in each of nine potential programs planned for development: Self-esteem; socialization, communication, decision-making, peer
resistance, leadership and citizenship skills; enhanced self concept; and knowledge of laws and legal system.

One question concerned the degree of involvement of parents/guardians in juvenile diversion programs. Judges rated the importance of parental involvement on a five point Likert-type scale. Judges were asked to briefly explain their answers which provided qualitative data.

Ten potential program content emphasis questions for parent/guardian programs were included. The programs would be designed to develop: Communication, decision-making, positive parenting, citizenship, leadership, and conflict resolution skills; self-esteem; ability to enhance self-esteem in child; and understanding of laws and the legal system.

Judges were asked to indicate the duration of a diversion program (one to six or more two hour sessions) and respond to the funding sources provided (law enforcement grant monies, jointly between sponsor and court, sponsoring group only, competitive grants, state subsidies, or other sources).

Judges indicated the importance of five potential juvenile court goals (rehabilitation, protection of society, punishment, maintaining social order or deterrence) and selected the one they felt best described the primary goal of the court. Frequencies were run for each question (57 - 85) in Section IV in order to provide researchers with the degree of importance of each item.

A key threat to the internal validity of the study was measurement error. In an attempt to control for measurement error, the questionnaire was presented to a
panel of experts in the field of juvenile justice, juvenile diversion education programs, and measurement (See Appendix B). The panel was asked to review the items for content and face validity. A decision was made a priori to delete or modify any item judged inappropriate or unclear by more than two members of the panel. Modifications were made as per suggestions from panel members. Two questions were deleted.

The questionnaire, as revised, was pilot tested with 31 juvenile court referees whose names were provided by the Ohio Department of Youth Services "1991 Directory of Family and Juvenile Courts." Juvenile court referees were selected due to their position within the court system. They investigate cases involving juvenile offenders and make recommendations for disposition to juvenile judges. Therefore, they are very familiar with the juvenile court system as well as the characteristics of the juveniles and their families who interact with the system.

Twenty-six pilot questionnaires were returned. From data collected, measures of reliability were conducted. Cronbach’s alphas were calculated to measure the internal consistency of the instrument and whether items in Section I - Characteristics of Youth, Section II - Nature of Crime, and Section III - Diversion Programs were contributing to the measure of the constructs. See Table 2, Summary of Reliability Analysis.
Table 2

Summary of Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Pilot study n = 26</th>
<th>Study with Judges n = 81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Skills *</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Skills</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Alternatives</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Place</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the low reliability of the Socialization Skills variable in the judges study, it was deleted from further analysis.
Section IV - Diversion Program Recommendations were tested for reliability by additional review by the panel of experts. They reported terminology used to be understandable and appropriate for the intended respondents.

Section V of the instrument provided information on selected demographic characteristics of judges.

**Gender** measured as either 1) male or 2) female. The level of measure for this variable was nominal.

**Age** of judges was measured as 1) 25 to 30, 2) 31 to 40, 3) 41 to 50, 4) 51 to 60, or 5) 61 to 70. The level of measure of this characteristic was ordinal.

**Race/Ethnic Background** of subjects as either 1) Asian, 2) Black, 3) Latino, 4) Native American, or 5) White. The measurement level for the characteristic of race was nominal.

**Number of Years Served as a Juvenile Court Judge** was measured as 1) less than one year, 2) 1 to 5 years, 3) 6 to 10 years, 4) 11 to 15 years, 5) 16 to 20 years, 6) 21 to 25 years, or 7) over 25 years. The level of measure for this variable is ordinal.

**Marital Status** of subjects as either 1) married, or 2) single. The level of measurement for this characteristic was nominal.

**Number of Children** in the family was measured by the indication of the number of children per age group provided: A) None; B) Newborn to 5 years; C) 6 to 10 years; D) 11 to 15 years; E) 16 to 20 years; and F) Over 21. The level of measure for this characteristic was ordinal.
Population of the County was measured as 1) less than 25,000, 2) 25,001 to 50,000, 3) 50,001 to 100,000, 4) 100,001 to 150,000, 5) 150,001 to 200,000, or 6) over 200,001. The level of measurement of this characteristic was ordinal.

Description of County was measured as either 1) Rural, 2) Rural/suburban/urban, or 3) Suburban/urban. The level of measure was nominal.

Type of Court was measured as either 1) Juvenile Court, 2) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 3) Juvenile and Probate Court, or 4) Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations, and General Division Court. The level of measure of this characteristic was nominal.

Data Collection

Data were collected in accordance to mailing procedures outlined by Dillman (1978). Questionnaires were mailed to juvenile judges on July 15, 1991 with a cover letter co-signed by Dr. Richard W. Clark, Assistant Professor, Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University and the Honorable Thomas E. Louden, President of the Ohio Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association (See Appendix C). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for use in returning the questionnaire. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed return card which contained the identification number. Both the return card and the questionnaire were to be returned by the deadline date of August 1, 1991. The return card was mailed by judges separately from the questionnaire to insure confidentiality of respondents. The identification numbers were used to aid in follow-up with non-respondents. A postcard reminder was sent to everyone who had not responded at
the end of the second week. A letter and replacement questionnaire were sent to non-respondents after three weeks. A second postcard reminder was sent to non-respondents during the fourth week. The deadline for return was August 15, 1991.

By the deadline, 82 responses had been received. Two questionnaires arrived before the data were entered for analysis. Three questionnaires arrived after the data had been analyzed, for a total return of 87 respondents (86.1%). Six responses were unusable. Therefore, data were calculated based on an accepting sample of 81.

To test for nonresponse error, a comparison was made of early and late respondents. Differences between the mean scores for early and late respondents on the dependent variable were statistically compared by use of a t-test. The data were not significantly different on the dependent variable, thus were pooled and used in the census.

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-PC) at The Ohio State University. The personal characteristics of the juveniles, the crimes committed and the number of court appearances, and knowledge of and willingness to place a juvenile in available diversion options were summarized using parameters. The availability of diversion programs in Ohio counties was represented by frequencies.

In the diversion program recommendations section, a mean was calculated per question across respondents to determine what program content for juvenile and family programs, duration of programs, and funding sources judges recommended.
A mean was also calculated across respondents concerning judges' recommendation as to what the primary goal of the juvenile court system should be.

Respondent demographics were described by descriptive statistics which were run for each characteristic. Frequencies, percentages, measures of central tendency, and variability were used to describe the data.

Correlations were run to determine the relationships between the personal characteristics of juvenile offenders, nature of the crime committed by juveniles, and judge's knowledge of diversion alternatives, with judge's age, gender, race, years of service, marital status, number of children, county population, type of court, and county description to determine the influence these characteristics had upon the judges' perception and use of a diversion program. Point-biserial and Kendall's Tau C correlation coefficients were calculated (see Table 3). Interval data were converted to ordinal data when the independent variables were correlated with those personal characteristics of judges which were ordinal in nature (age, years of service, number of children, and population of county served).

Measures of association were used to determine the strength of the relationship between variables. Davis' (1971) conventions for describing measures of association were used. These conventions are provided in Figure 1.
Figure 1

Conventions Used to Describe Measures of Associations

Correlations were run to determine the nature and strength of the relationship between the independent variables: (Personal characteristics of juvenile offenders, nature of the crime committed by juveniles, and judge’s knowledge of diversion alternatives) with the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. Pearson r was used to measure the strength and direction of the relationships.

Simultaneous multiple regression was used to determine the best predictors of the dependent variable "Willingness to place juvenile in a diversion program." The simultaneous multiple regression model was used because the literature review did not provide a significant logical variable sequence which would justify ordering the independent variables prior to entering them into the multiple regression model. The dependent variable for the regression model was the "willingness to place" and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.70 or higher</td>
<td>Very Strong Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .69</td>
<td>Substantial Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .49</td>
<td>Moderate Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10 to .29</td>
<td>Low Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01 to .09</td>
<td>Negligible Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Davis, 1971
"overall willingness to disposition" summed score. The independent variables entered into the model included: Psychological characteristics; gender; age; ethnicity; decision making skills; gang membership; academic achievement; family structure; birth order; place of residence; substance abuse; socioeconomic status; employability; unruly child; delinquent child; and knowledge. The total $R^2$ was computed to determine the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of independent variables.

A correlation was run between independent variables with Betas greater than ±.20. Knowledge of diversion programs, birth order, substance abuse, psychological characteristics, and decision-making skills were included in the correlation to determine the degree of multicollinearity between the variables.
Table 3

Statistics Utilized for Personal Characteristics of Judges and the Independent Variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Point-biserial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Kendall’s Tau C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic Background</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Point-biserial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Kendall’s Tau C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Point-biserial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Kendall’s Tau C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of County</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Kendall’s Tau C**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Description</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Point-biserial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Court</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Point-biserial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Independent Variables were interval data
** Interval data were converted to ordinal data
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the factors which influence the willingness of juvenile judges to use juvenile diversion programs. Data were based upon the judges' perceptions of the influence of characteristics of the youth, nature of crime, and knowledge of diversion programs had upon their willingness to use diversion programs. Judges' recommendations on content, funding, and duration of diversion programs were also collected.

Variables and Objectives of the Study

The following dependent variable and independent variables were used in the study:

I. Dependent Variable:

A. Willingness to use diversion programs.

II. Independent Variables:

A. Personal Characteristics of Youth

1. Psychological characteristics
2. Gender
3. Age
4. Ethnicity
5. Decision making skills
6. Gang membership
7. Academic achievement
8. Family structure
9. Birth order
10. Place of residence
11. Substance abuse
12. Socioeconomic status
13. Employability

B. Nature of Crime
1. Crime committed
2. Number of prior court appearances

C. Diversion Programs
1. Knowledge of diversion alternatives
2. Availability of diversion programs

D. Recommended Program Content
1. Program content - youth
2. Parental involvement
3. Program content - families
4. Duration of program
5. Funding source
6. Goal of court
III. Research Objectives

The following research objectives were established to guide the study:

1. To determine what personal characteristics of juvenile offenders juvenile judges considered important when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

2. To determine to what extent judges consider the crime committed by the juvenile when dispositioning the offender to a diversion alternative.

3. To distinguish the extent juvenile judges consider the number of prior juvenile court appearances when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

4. To determine the availability of juvenile diversion programs within Ohio counties.

5. To describe juvenile judges' knowledge of the different types of juvenile diversion programs available.

6. To determine from the juvenile judges the recommended duration of a juvenile diversion program series.

7. To distinguish the content of juvenile diversion programs as perceived important by juvenile judges.

8. To describe who, from the viewpoint of the juvenile judges, should fund juvenile diversion programs.

9. To determine the degree to which juvenile judges would disposition juveniles to various diversion dispositional options if available.
10. To determine the personal characteristics of juvenile judges in the Ohio court system.

11. To describe the county population and type of court in which the juvenile judge presides.

12. To determine what interrelationships exist between the juveniles' personal characteristics, nature of crime committed by juveniles, and judge's knowledge of diversion programs with judges's age, gender, race, years of service, marital status, number of children, county population, type of court and county description.

13. To determine what relationship exists between the availability of a juvenile diversion program and judges' knowledge of that program.

14. To determine what relationship exists between the independent variables in the study and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs.

**Subject Selection**

The population for this study were 101 juvenile judges in the Ohio court system as identified by the Ohio Department of Youth Services in the "1991 Directory of Family and Juvenile Courts." Due to the small number in the population, a census was used for this study. Eighty-seven (86.1%) of the judges responded to the mailed questionnaire. Eighty-one responses (80.2%) were usable and provided data for the study.
Demographic Variables

Data were collected related to the judges' gender, age, race/ethnic background, years of service, marital status, and number of children; the population and description of the county served; and type of court in which the judge serves. The analyses were based upon 81 usable instruments which represented a 80.1% return rate. Data are presented in Table 4 through Table 31. Frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency and variability were used to describe the characteristics.

Gender

Table 4 displays the frequency distribution for gender. Of the 81 judges, 75 (92.6%) were male and 6 (7.4%) were female.

Table 4

Distribution of Judges by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

Of the 81 respondents, no judges were under the age of 30. Thirteen (16%) were between 31 and 40 years of age, 27 (33.6%) were between 41 and 50, 26 (32.1%) were between 51 and 60, and 15 (18.5%) were between 61 and 70 years of age (See Table 5).
Table 5

Distribution of Judges by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 to 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnic Background

The majority of the 81 respondents in the characteristic race/ethnic background were white (See Table 6). Seventy-seven (95.1%) judges reported white as their ethnic background. Two (2.5%) Native Americans, one (1.2%) Asian, and one (1.2%) Black were reported. No Latinos were reported.

Table 6

Distribution of Judges by Race/Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years Served as a Juvenile Court Judge

Sixty-six (84.6%) judges have served as a juvenile court judge for fifteen years or less. Twenty (25.6%) individuals have served less than one year. As shown in Table 7, 16 (20.5%) served 1 to 5 years, 18 (23.1%) served 6 to 10 years, and 12 (15.4%) served 11 to 15 years. Nine (11.5%) respondents reported 16 to 20 years of service, two (2.6%) reported 21 to 25 years of service and 1 (1.3%) reported over 25 years of service to the juvenile court. Three judges did not provide information.

Table 7

Distribution for Years Served as a Juvenile Court Judge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Served</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status of Judges

Sixty-seven (85.9%) of the respondents were married as compared to 11 (14.1%) single individuals (see table 8). Three judges did not respond to the question.
Table 8

**Distribution by Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Children**

The majority of the 186 children reported were over 21 years of age. Judges reported 90 (48.4%) children in that age category. As shown in Table 9, 16 (8.6%) children were in the newborn to 5 years of age category, 23 (12.4%) between 6 to 10 years of age, 27 (14.5%) between 11 to 15, and 30 (16.1%) were between 16 to 20 years of age.

Table 9

**Number of Children in Judges' Families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborn to 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Population

The largest number of respondents (64.9%) served counties with populations of 100,000 or less (See Table 10). The remaining (35.1%) judges served counties with over 100,001 residents.

Table 10

Distribution of Judges by Population of County Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,001 to 50,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 to 100,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 to 150,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,001 to 200,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 200,001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Cases = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Description

The majority of respondents (60.3%) described their counties as rural (See Table 11). Twenty-one (26.9%) judges described their counties as rural/suburban/urban while 10 (12.8%) reported their counties to be suburban/urban. Three judges did not respond to the question.
Table 11

Description of County Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/suburban/urban</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban/urban</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Court Served

Fifty one (65.4%) of the respondents reported they served in a Juvenile and Probate Court (See Table 12). Ten (12.8%) judges serve in a Juvenile Court, and 10 (12.8%) in a Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. The remaining 7 (9.0%) judges reported they preside in a Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations and General Division Court.

Table 12

Description of Type of Court Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Court</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile and Probate Court</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations &amp; General Division Court</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Cases = 3
Independent Variables

Descriptive data were collected on the following: Psychological characteristics; gender; age; race; decision-making skills; gang membership; school achievement; family structure; birth order; place of residence; substance abuse; socioeconomic background; employability; unruly child; delinquent child; and knowledge and availability of diversion programs. Table 13 provides a summary of the central tendency and variance for all characteristics of youth variables.

Table 13

Description of Level of Perception of Influence of Characteristics of Youth Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Means based on a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great
Characteristics of Youth Variables

The highest mean scores reported for characteristics of youth variables were substance abuse (4.32), school achievement (3.92), and age (3.61) (See Table 13). Variables with the four lowest mean scores were race (1.43), birth order (1.92), place of residence (2.03), and gender (2.09). Mean scores for other characteristics of youth variables were psychological characteristics (3.48), decision-making skills (3.39), employability (2.99), gang membership (2.94), family structure (2.62) and socioeconomic status (2.26). Standard deviations ranged from a high of 1.06 for gang membership to a low of .63 for psychological characteristics. Seventy-six of the 81 judges responded to the gang membership questions, while 80 responded to the substance abuse questions. All other questions had responses from all 81 judges.

Nature of Crime

Table 14

Description of Level of Perception of Influence of Nature of Crime Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score based on a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great.

Eighty judges responded to the nature of crime questions. The mean score for unruly child offenders with no prior court appearances to three or more prior appearances was 3.68 with a standard deviation of .90. The delinquent child variable with no prior court appearances to three or more appearances had a higher mean
score (3.93). The standard deviation for the delinquent child variable was .69 (See Table 14).

Mean scores for the number of court appearances by unruly child and delinquent child offenders were calculated. For the unruly child offenses the mean score with no prior court appearances was 3.38. A 3.25 mean score was recorded for one prior court appearance. For two prior court appearances the mean score was 3.80 and for three or more prior court appearances the mean score was 4.29. Mean scores for the delinquent child offenses with no prior court appearances was 3.53, for one prior court appearance 3.54, for two prior court appearances 4.06, and for three or more prior court appearances 4.58. Standard deviations ranged from .80 to 1.46 for the unruly child and delinquent child prior court appearances subscale.
Table 15

**Mean Scores of Level of Perception of the Influence of Prior Court Appearances by Unruly Child and Delinquent Child Offenders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense/Number of Appearances</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean scores based upon a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great

**Knowledge of Diversion Programs**

The mean score on the knowledge variable was 3.68 with a standard deviation of .78. Seventy-seven judges responded to the questions (See Table 16).

Table 16

**Description of Perceived Level of Knowledge of Diversion Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score based upon a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great.
Availability of Diversion Programs

All 78 respondents reported having a family counseling/education diversion program available in their county while 77 of the 78 respondents had drug and alcohol treatment programs. Forty-six of the 78 respondents had employment training programs. Personal development and peer group programs were available in approximately half of the responding counties.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling/Education</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Groups</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Recommendations for Youth Programs

Eighty respondents indicated their recommendations for content of diversion programs for youth. High mean scores were reported for peer resistance (4.46), decision-making skills (4.35), and self-esteem development (4.26)(See Table 18). Mean scores for enhanced self concept, positive citizenship skills, social skills and communication skills ranged from 4.09 to 4.01. Leadership skills had a mean score
of 3.68 while knowledge of laws and the legal system had the lowest mean score of 3.36. Standard deviations ranged from .66 to .94.

Table 18

Judges' Recommendations for Content of Juvenile Diversion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Resistance Skills</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Self Concept</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Citizenship Skills</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Laws &amp; the Legal System</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score based upon a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great

Parental Involvement

Eighty-one judges responded to the degree of parental involvement in juvenile diversion programs question. A mean score of 4.67 was reported with a standard deviation of .52.

Comments accompanied the degree of parental involvement in juvenile diversion programs question. Three representative responses are:
"Very difficult to make a positive change in a child’s behavior without involving the whole family"
"Lack of parent or ineffective positive parent involvement is the main cause of juvenile problems"
"The home is a far greater influence on the child than any outside process (positive or negative)"

See Appendix D for a complete listing of all responses.

**Recommended Content for Family Programs**

The degree of importance judges placed on the potential family program content was measured. High mean scores were reported for the development of positive parenting skills (4.59), discipline/rules within the family (4.54), ability to enhance self-esteem in child (4.39), communication skills (4.37), and decision-making skills (4.25) (See Table 19). The development of self-esteem in adults (3.99), citizenship skills (3.69), and leadership skills (3.44) were of importance. Developing an understanding of laws and the legal system had the lowest mean score of 3.25. Eighty respondents provided data for all programs except communication skills which had 79 responses. Standard deviations ranged from .57 to .91.
Table 19

Judges' Recommendations for Content of Programs for Families of Juvenile Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Content</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making skills</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Parenting Skills</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/rules Within Family</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Skills</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem in Adults</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Self-esteem in youth</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand Laws &amp; Legal System</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score based upon a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great

Recommended Number of Sessions

A mean score of 5.37 was produced from data gathered from 74 respondents. A standard deviation of 1.40 was recorded on the data. Judges were to select from one to seven or more two hour sessions.

Funding Sources for Juvenile Diversion Programs

The majority (52.7%) of respondents favored the use of state subsidies to fund diversion programs (See Table 20). Fourteen (18.9%) respondents indicated programs should be jointly funded by the court and the sponsoring group while nine (12.2%) judges favored competitive grants. Law enforcement grants, only funded by
sponsoring group, and other sources each had four responses. Other responses included: "other than county budget;" "volunteers;" "state subsidy based on need, not population;" and "unknown." Seven judges did not respond to the question.

Table 20

**Judges' Recommendations for Funding Sources for Diversion Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Grants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointly - Court/Sponsoring Group</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Sponsoring Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Grant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Subsidies</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Cases = 7

**Goals of the Juvenile Court**

Eighty judges responded to the primary goal of the juvenile court question (See Table 21). Rehabilitation had the highest mean score of 4.65 with a standard deviation of .64. Protection of society followed with a mean score of 4.31 (sd = .74). Mean scores of 3.94 for deterrence (sd = .92), 3.51 for maintaining social order (sd = 1.02), and 2.84 for punishment (sd = .92) were recorded.
Table 21

Judges Responses to Goals of the Juvenile Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Society</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Social Order</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean score based upon a 1 to 5 Likert type scale with 1 = Very Little and 5 = Very Great

Table 22

Judges' Opinion on Primary Goal of the Juvenile Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Society</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Social Order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Cases = 36

Judges' Opinion on Primary Goal of the Juvenile Court

The majority (75.6%) of respondents indicated the primary goal of the court should be rehabilitation. Six (13.3%) respondents indicated it should be to protect society, four (8.9%) responses were to maintain social order, and one (2.2%)
reported deterrence should be the primary goal of the court. No judge indicated that the primary goal of the juvenile court should be punishment. Thirty-six judges did not respond to the question.

**Relationship Between Variables**

Tables 23 through 26 illustrate the relationship between the variables of psychological characteristics, gender, age, race, decision-making skills, gang membership, school achievement, family structure, birth order, place of residence, substance abuse, socioeconomic background, employability, unruly child, delinquent child, and knowledge of and willingness to use diversion program with characteristics of judges (gender, age, race, years of service, marital status, and number of children), population of county served, description of county served and type of court. Variables were converted from interval data to ordinal data to determine the relationships with judges’ age, number of children, years of service, and county population. Conversion of the data facilitated interpretation. All relationships are described using Davis' (1971) Measures of Association.

Table 27 illustrates the relationship between judges' knowledge of diversion programs and availability of programs in the county served. The point-biserial correlation coefficient was used to measure the relationship.

Table 28 provides the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. A Pearson product-moment coefficient was used to measure the linear relationship.
Table 29 illustrates the amount of variance in the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs, accounted for by the independent variables. A simultaneous regression model was used to determine the linear relationship.

All associations were rounded to 2 decimal points. If the third digit in the number series was 4 or lower, no change was indicated in the second digit. If the third digit in the number series was 5 or larger the second digit was increased by one.

Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Gender, Race and Marital Status of Judges

Relationships between the independent and dependent variables and gender, race and marital status of judges were all found to be of low or negligible associations (See Table 23). The negative and positive relationships reported were due to the function of coding used with the nominal variables, gender, race and marital status of judges. Therefore, interpretations will be made based upon the nature of the coding system used.

The gender of judge variable was coded male = 1 and female = 2. The low relationship (-.23) between gender of judge and socioeconomic background suggests that male judges tend to believe socioeconomic background is more important than do female judges.

The race of judge variable was coded 1 = Asian, 2 = Black, 3 = Latino, 4 = Native American, and 5 = White. Due to the nature of the coding system used with the nominal variable of race of judge, the low relationship with the delinquent child (.29) variable suggests that White judges tend to believe that a delinquent child
offense is more important than do judges who reported their race as Asian, Black or Native American.

Marital status of judges was coded married = 1, and single = 2. The relationships reported with the age (.20), gang membership (.22), unruly child (.23), and delinquent child (.26) variables suggests that married judges tend to believe that age, gang membership, unruly child and delinquent child offenses are less important than do judges who reported their marital status to be single.

**Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Judges’ Age and Years of Service and County Population**

The relationship between the independent and dependent variables and judges’ ages and numbers of years of service and county population were found to primarily fall between low negative (< -.29) and low positive (< .29) relationships (See Table 24). There was a moderate positive relationship of .34 between knowledge of diversion programs and age of judge. No relationship (.00) was found to exist between race of juvenile offender and population of county. Negative relationships were between gender of offender, decision-making skills, substance abuse, unruly child and delinquent child, and judges’ ages and years of service, and population of county served. Positive relationships existed between the variables gang membership and place of residence and judges’ ages and years of service and population of county served.
Table 23

Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Gender, Race, and Marital Status of Judges*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients reported as point-biserial
N = 62

* Exact correlation coefficients reported as they were determined during data analysis. Relationships were not interpreted to be positive or negative based on the fact that judges gender, race and marital status were coded as nominal variables.
Table 24

**Relationship Between Independent and Dependent Variables and Judges' Ages and Years of Service and County Population.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>County Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients reported as Kendall's Tau C

* Interval data of independent variables converted to ordinal data

N = 62
Relationship Between the Independent and Dependent Variables and Number of Children in Judges' Families

Relationships between the independent variable knowledge of diversion programs and newborn to 5 year old children (-.34) and birth order and 6 to 10 year old children (-.39) were negative in direction and moderate in strength. The relationship between place of residence and 6 to 10 year old children was a moderate negative in direction and strength (-.43). There were no relationships reported between place of residence and race of offender and newborn to 5 year old children (.00) and birth order and 16 to 20 year old children. Gang membership and children over 21 also recorded no relationship (.00). Other relationships between independent and dependent variables and number of children in judges' families by age groups ranged from low negative relationships (< -.29) to low positive relationships (< .29) (See Table 25).
Table 25

Relationship Between the Independent and Dependent Variables and the Number of Children in Judges' Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Newborn</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients reported as Kendall's Tau C
Interval data converted to ordinal data
N = 62
Table 26

Relationship Between the Independent and Dependent Variables and Description of County Served and Type of Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>County Description</th>
<th>Type of Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients reported as point-biserial

N = 62
Relationships Between the Independent and Dependent Variables and Description of County Served and Type of Court

Relationships between the independent and dependent variables and description of county and type of court served were primarily found to range between low negative associations (< -.29) and low positive associations (< .29). The relationship between the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs and description of court served was found to be a moderate negative association (-.32).

Table 27

**Relationship Between Knowledge of Diversion Programs and Availability of Programs Within County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Training</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling/Education</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Groups</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Treatment</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients reported as point-biserial

**Relationship Between Knowledge of Diversion Programs and Availability of Programs Within County**

Due to the coding of availability (yes = 1, no = 2), the relationships between knowledge and availability of diversion programs the relationship appeared negative in direction. There was a substantial negative relationship (-.52) between knowledge of personal development diversion programs and availability (74 responses).
Moderate negative relationships were found between availability and knowledge of employment training (-.39) with 77 responses and peer group (-.33) programs with 78 responses. Seventy-six respondents indicated that there was a negligible negative relationship between drug and alcohol treatment programs and availability. All 77 respondents indicated that they had a family counseling/education program available in their county which resulted in no variability within that data. Due to the lack of variance, no relationship could be calculated between family counseling/education and availability.

Relationship Between the Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable, Willingness to Use Diversion Programs

There was a substantial positive association (.52) between knowledge of and the willingness to use a diversion program (See Table 28). The relationship between substance abuse and the willingness to use score indicated a moderate positive association of .38. Low positive associations were reported between willingness to use a diversion program and psychological characteristics (.27), decision-making skills (.158), school achievement (.18), family structure (.10), place of residence (.17), socioeconomic background (.21), employability (.16), and unruly child (.15). The delinquent child (.08), birth order (.08), and gang membership (.09) variables recorded negligible positive relationships with the dependent variable. Three negligible negative associations were indicated between willingness and gender (-.07), age (.07), and race (-.04).
Table 28

*Relationship Between the Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable, Willingness to Use Diversion Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Willingness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficients interpreted as Pearson r  
N = 66

**Multiple Regression**

Multiple regression was performed to determine the amount of variance in the dependent variable, willingness to use a diversion program, accounted for by the independent variables (psychological characteristics, gender, age, race, decision-
making skills, gang membership, school achievement, family structure, birth order, place of residence, substance abuse, socioeconomic status, employability, unruly child, delinquent child, and knowledge of diversion programs). A simultaneous regression model was selected as there was no significant logical variable sequence identified prior to performing the multiple regression model.

Relationship Between the Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable Based Upon a Simultaneous Regression Model

Table 29 describes the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. The independent variables in the model accounted for 44.6\% of the variance in willingness to use diversion programs. Knowledge of diversion programs had the highest relative importance score (.48) with substance abuse (.37) and birth order (-.37) contributing to the regression equation. This table does indicate that 44.6\% of the variance in willingness to use diversion programs is accounted for by the linear relationship of the independent variables.
Table 29

Relationships Between the Independent Variables and Dependent Variable Based Upon a Simultaneous Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Achievement</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making Skills</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Background</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square = .446
Represents relationships for census data
Table 30

**Relationship Between Knowledge of Diversion Programs, Birth Order, Psychological Characteristics, Decision-Making Skills and Substance Abuse.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations:</th>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>SUBABUSE</th>
<th>BIRTH</th>
<th>PSYCH</th>
<th>DECMAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNOW</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBABUSE</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRTH</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECMAK</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N of cases: 76

Key for Variables: Know = Knowledge, Subabuse = Substance Abuse, Birth = Birth Order, Psych = Psychological Characteristics, and Decmak = Decision Making Skills

**Relationship Between Knowledge of Diversion Programs, Birth Order, Psychological Characteristics, Decision-Making Skills and Substance Abuse**

The correlation matrix indicated low to moderate associations between all variables (.11 to .48) except between psychological characteristics and decision-making skills. The relationship between these two variables had a substantial association (.68) (See Table 30).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes the following: Introduction; summary of procedures; summary of implications and findings; general summary of conclusions of the study; recommendations; and need for further study.

Introduction

The study was descriptive-correlational in nature. The purpose of the study was to investigate the willingness of juvenile judges in the Ohio Court system to use juvenile diversion programs. Data identified characteristics of juveniles, judges and diversion programs and the nature and strength of relationships between the variables.

The dependent variable utilized in this study was the willingness of juvenile judges to use juvenile diversion programs, as measured by the summed scores on the willingness to place and overall willingness to use questions. The independent variables in the study as measured by the judges' perceptions of the influence on their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs were: a) psychological characteristics; b) gender; c) age; d) ethnicity; e) decision making skills; f) gang membership; g) academic achievement; h) family structure; i) birth order; j) place of residence; k) substance abuse; l) socioeconomic status; m) employability; n) unruly child; o) delinquent child, and p) knowledge of diversion programs. Frequency data
were collected on the availability of diversion programs, and judges recommendations related to program content for youth programs, importance of parental involvement, program content for adult programs, duration of programs, funding sources, and goal of the juvenile court.

The following research objectives guided this study:

1. To determine what personal characteristics of juvenile offenders juvenile judges consider important when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

2. To determine to what extent judges consider the crime committed by the juvenile when dispositioning the offender to a diversion program.

3. To distinguish the extent juvenile judges consider the number of prior juvenile court appearances when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

4. To determine the availability of juvenile diversion programs within Ohio counties.

5. To describe juvenile judge's knowledge of the different types of juvenile diversion programs available.

6. To determine from the juvenile judges the recommended duration of a juvenile diversion program series.

7. To distinguish the content of juvenile diversion programs as perceived important by juvenile judges.

8. To describe who, from the viewpoint of the juvenile judges, should fund juvenile diversion programs.
9. To determine the degree to which juvenile judges would disposition juveniles to various diversion dispositional options if available.

10. To determine the personal characteristics of juvenile judges in the Ohio court system.

11. To describe the county population and types of court in which the juvenile judge presides.

12. To determine what interrelationships exist between the juveniles' personal characteristics, nature of crime committed by juveniles, and judge's knowledge of diversion alternatives, with judge's gender, age, race, years of service, marital status, and number of children and type of court, county population and county description.

13. To determine what relationship exists between the availability of a juvenile diversion program and judges' knowledge of that program.

14. To determine what relationship exists between the independent variables in the study and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs.

**Summary of Procedures**

This section includes a summary of the following: Research design, subject selection, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis.

**Research Design**

The study was descriptive-correlational, allowing the researcher to describe the respondents on selected variables and determine the nature and strength of relationships between these variables.
Subject Selection

The population of this study were 101 juvenile judges in the Ohio court system. A census was utilized to gather data from the population. Names and addresses of current juvenile judges were obtained from the "1991 Directory of Family and Juvenile Courts" published by the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

Instrumentation

A mail questionnaire was used to collect data. The instrument was divided into five sections: Characteristics of youth; nature of crime; diversion programs; diversion program recommendations and characteristics of judges; county and type of court served (Appendix C). A five-point Likert type scale, with one equal to very little and five equal to very great, was used to collect data in the first four sections of the instrument.

Section I of the questionnaire asked judges to provide their perception of the influence forty youth characteristics were to their dispositioning of juvenile offenders. All characteristics had been identified via an extensive literature search.

In Section II, judges were asked how much influence does the nature of the crime committed and the number of prior court appearances have upon their willingness to use juvenile diversion programs. Crimes committed were limited to unruly child and delinquent child offenses as Ohio juvenile statutes allow flexibility in dispositioning of these offenders. Other crimes do not permit flexibility as specific dispositions are defined by the statutes.
Judges were asked to rate their knowledge of and willingness to use five different types of diversion programs in Section III. They were to indicate if the diversion program was available in their county as well. One question asked the judges to rate their overall willingness to disposition a juvenile offender to a juvenile diversion program.

Recommendations related to program content for youth and adult programs, parental involvement, number of sessions, and potential funding sources were provided by the respondents in Section IV. Judges also provided, from their perspective, the primary goal of the juvenile court. Section V of this instrument was used to obtain demographic characteristics of judges and the county and type of court in which served.

To control for measurement error, a panel of experts in measurement, juvenile diversion educational programs, and the juvenile court system (Appendix B) were asked to review the items for content and face validity. All instruments were returned and used to revise the instrument. The revised instrument was pilot tested with 31 juvenile court referees. Twenty-five of the questionnaires were returned and found to be usable. Cronbach Alphas were calculated on data collected in Sections I through Section III of the pilot instrument (Appendix B).

Section IV, Diversion Program Recommendations, was tested for reliability by an additional review by the panel of experts. They reported terminology used to be understandable and appropriate for the intended respondents.
Data Collection

Questionnaires were mailed on July 15, 1991 to all 101 juvenile judges in the Ohio Court System. A reminder card was sent to nonrespondents during the second week. A compete packet, including the instrument, an endorsement letter from the Honorable Thomas E. Louden, President of the Ohio Association of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, a letter co-signed by Judge Louden and Dr. Richard W. Clark, Assistant Professor, Agriculture Education, The Ohio State University, a return card, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope were mailed on August 5, 1991 to all 39 who had not responded by the initial August 1, 1991 deadline (Appendix C). Eighty-two respondents had replied by the August 15, 1991 deadline. Two questionnaires arrived before the data were entered for analysis. Three questionnaires arrived after the data had been analyzed, for a total return of 87 respondents (86.1%). Six responses were unusable, therefore, data were calculated based on an accepting sample of 81.

Nonresponse error was handled using procedures described by Miller and Smith (1983). A statistical comparison, using a t-test, was made of early and late respondents scores on the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. The data were not significantly different on the dependent variable, thus were pooled and used in the census.

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-PC) at The Ohio State University. Frequencies, percentages, measures of central
tendency, and variability were used to describe the data. Davis' (1971) Measures of Association were used to determine the strength and direction of relationships between variables.

A simultaneous multiple regression model was used to determine the best predictors of the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. The independent variables entered into the regression model included: Personal characteristics; gender; age; ethnicity; decision making skills; gang membership; academic achievement; family structure; birth order; place of residence; substance abuse; socioeconomic status; employability; unruly child; delinquent child; and knowledge. The total $R^2$ was computed to determine the amount of variance accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables.

**Summary of Implications of Findings**

Findings, conclusions, and implications associated with the fourteen research objectives of the study are as follows:

**Objective One:** To determine what personal characteristics of juvenile offenders juvenile judges considered important when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

The three personal characteristics of youth which judges reported influenced their dispositioning of a juvenile, as indicated by the highest mean scores (on a scale of 1 to 5), were substance abuse (4.32), school achievement (3.92), and age (3.61). Race (1.43), birth order (1.92), place of residence (2.03), and gender (2.09) had the lowest mean scores which indicated these variables had the lowest amount of influence on the judges' decisions.
Literature supported the inclusion of psychological characteristics, gender, age, race, decision making skills, gang membership, school achievement, family structure, birth order, place of residence, substance abuse, socioeconomic status, and employability in the study. Each characteristic had been reported to have an influence on juveniles' involvement with delinquent behavior.

Judges' perceptions of the influence that each characteristic had upon their decision to use diversion programs indicated that all the variables cited in literature as influencing factors did not have equal impact upon the judges' disposition of juveniles. Substance abuse, school achievement, and age were reported to influence Ohio juvenile judges more than other characteristics when decisions are made related to the disposition of the juvenile.

**Objective Two: To determine to what extent judges consider the crime committed by the juvenile when dispositioning the offender to a diversion alternative.**

Judges in the study indicated that there is a difference in the amount of influence the crime committed has upon them as they disposition juvenile offenders to diversion programs. The mean score of 3.93 (on a scale of 1 to 5) for the delinquent child variable was higher than the unruly child variable mean score of 3.68. Eighty judges responded to the questions.

Ohio juvenile statutes (Baldwin, 1987) defines an unruly child as a juvenile who has been charged with an offense for which adults cannot be charged. Unruly offenses include running away, truancy from home or school, or failure to submit to the control of a parent. Delinquent offenses are those which violate a law, ordinance, or regulation which would be a crime if committed by an adult. Delinquent offenses
include crimes against persons and property, use of drugs, and public disorder (Baldwin, 1987). A concern for the well-being of the youth as well as the need to protect the public are of key concerns. The use of diversion programs frees the court to address those who require more restrictive dispositions (Krisberg et al., 1986).

Due to the more serious nature of the delinquent child offenses, judges consider these crimes to have more influence on their decision making process than the unruly child offenses. Judges would consider more stringent dispositions with a delinquent offender, due to the nature of their crime, as compared to an unruly offender, who would be dispositioned to a diversion program for rehabilitation rather than a detention option.

**Objective Three:** To distinguish the extent juvenile judges consider the number of prior juvenile court appearances when dispositioning a juvenile to a diversion program.

The mean scores (on a scale of 1 to 5) for unruly child with no prior court appearances (3.38) and one prior court appearance (3.25) and delinquent child with no prior court appearances (3.53) and one prior court appearance (3.54) were relatively equal. When a juvenile had two or more prior court appearances for both unruly child (two prior court appearances 3.80, three or more 4.29) and delinquent child (two prior court appearances 4.06, three or more 4.58) the mean scores increased dramatically. One judge commented that the more appearances for unruly/delinquent behavior, the more likely that individual would need a more aggressive intervention strategy.
A detention study conducted by Frazier and Cochran (1986) reported that juveniles most likely to be detained are those who have prior records, are charged with both felonies and multiple offenses, and are Black, female, rural, and older. These juveniles represent groups which have higher probabilities of reoffending or failing to reappear in court. The progression of criminal career patterns indicates that adult offenders were in trouble with the law prior to their eighteenth birthday. "Career criminals" have a long history of offenses beginning at an early age (Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, 1987).

Judges consider the number of prior court appearances during the dispositioning of juvenile offenders. Dispositions selected for juvenile offenders would become increasingly more restrictive in nature as the number of prior court appearances by the child increases. Diversion programs would be considered for first or second-time offenders, especially if their appearances were for unruly child offenses.

**Objective Four: To determine the availability of juvenile diversion programs within Ohio counties.**

Seventy-eight respondents reported having a family counseling/education diversion program available in their county while 77 of the 78 respondents had drug and alcohol treatment programs. Forty-six of the 78 respondents had employment training programs. Approximately half (51.3%) of the respondents reported having personal development and peer group programs within their counties. Thirty-two judges reported 23 additional programs being offered within their counties beyond those listed. Community service programs had the greatest number of responses (6),
while 4-H diversion, alternative education, school truancy, mentors and restitution programs had two responses each. All other programs reported had one response.

Stumphauzer (1986) reported employment to be a real problem for delinquent youth. Most are unable to get or keep a job which results in their remaining in the delinquent cycle. Family counseling programs focus on issues within the family which support the adolescent's delinquent behaviors. Positive intervention has been shown to decrease further court contact (Lundman, 1984). Peer groups which focus on social skills training have been shown to be effective in influencing delinquent youth (Long & Sherer, 1984). Recidivism in delinquent behavior and the use of drugs and alcohol are associated with deviant peer groups, who in turn support participation in negative behaviors (Henggeler, 1989).

Ohio courts are providing a variety of different disposition options for juveniles who interact within the system. The large number of family counseling/education programs indicate efforts by courts to address problems within families which have resulted in delinquent behavior by the juveniles. The prevalence of substance abuse among juveniles is apparent within those brought before the juvenile court system. Therefore, counties are providing treatment programs to help juveniles overcome their drug and alcohol use. Employment training, peer groups and personal development programs are being offered to those youth who could benefit from these approaches. Counties are also developing programs for juvenile offenders to meet the needs of their youth as well as using available resources to provide the programs.
Objective Five: To describe juvenile judges' knowledge of the different types of juvenile diversion programs available.

The mean score (on a scale of 1 to 5) for the knowledge variable was 3.60 with a standard deviation of .78. Seventy-five judges responded to the knowledge questions. Thirty-two judges listed 23 other diversion programs available in their counties. Seventeen judges reported very great knowledge of these programs while nine reported great knowledge, five reported some knowledge, and one judge reported little knowledge of other diversion programs in the county.

Knowledge as defined is something learned and kept in mind. The juvenile diversion programs listed were identified via the literature review and reported to have impact on the recidivism rate of juvenile offenders.

Judges reported that they had between some (3.0) and great (4.0) knowledge of the different types of juvenile diversion programs which were provided for them on the instrument. Twenty-three additional county sponsored programs are being offered to juvenile offenders.

Objective Six: To determine from the juvenile judges the recommended duration of a juvenile diversion program series.

Seventy-four judges responded to the number of two hour sessions they would recommend for juvenile diversion programs. A mean score of 5.37 (on a scale of 1 to 5) was produced. One respondent indicated that the number of sessions would depend upon the nature of the juvenile’s difficulties. Another judge indicated that the sessions should not be the traditional ‘education’ process, as he felt they will not work.
The question was to provide information as to how many sessions judges would recommend in order that program planners could best use the number of contact hours with juveniles. Snyder and Huntley (1990) indicated that the duration and strength of remediation will be dependent upon the progression of the child along the developmental path of antisocial behavior.

The number of two hour sessions averaged slightly over 5 when all responses were calculated. However, there is some feeling by judges that the number of contact hours with an individual would depend upon the juveniles and their problems as well as the content and methodology used within the sessions. It was evident that one judge felt that exposing a juvenile offender to a traditional school-type learning situation would not be of benefit. Many juvenile offenders have not had positive school experiences; therefore, a traditional school learning process would not be the best approach.

Objective Seven: To distinguish the content of juvenile diversion programs as perceived important by juvenile judges.

Eighty respondents, based on high mean scores (on a scale of 1 to 5), recommended content of diversion programs for youth include peer resistance skills (4.46), decision-making skills (4.35), and the development of self-esteem (4.26). Mean scores for enhanced self concept (4.09), positive citizenship skills (4.01), social skills (4.01), and communication skills (4.01) were also listed as being of great importance. Leadership skills (3.68) and knowledge of laws and the legal system (3.36) had the lowest means scores.
Recommendations for content for family programs included the development of positive parenting skills (4.59), discipline/rules within the family (4.54), ability to enhance self-esteem in child (4.39), communication skills (4.37), and decision-making skills (4.25). Mean scores for the development of self-esteem in adults (3.99), citizenship skills (3.69), and leadership skills (3.44) were also listed as important. Developing an understanding of laws and the legal system had the lowest mean score of 3.25. A mean score of 4.67 was reported when judges were asked to what extent parents should be involved in diversion programs. Comments provided by judges strongly supported the need for parents and families to be involved in the treatment of delinquent youth (See Appendix C).

Literature indicates that self-esteem (Kaplan, 1982), peer resistance skills (Serna et al, 1986; Stumphauzer, 1986); and decision-making skills (Henggeler, 1989) are deficient in delinquent youth. Low self concept (Calhoun et al., 1984) citizenship skills (Jensen, 1972; Stumphauzer, 1986; U. S. Department of Justice, 1988b); social skills (Henggeler, 1989; Long & Sherer, 1984) and communication skills (Snyder & Huntley, 1990) are all reported to be directly related to delinquent behavior. Price and Swanson (1990) reported leadership skills were an important life skill that needed to be developed.

The style of parenting (Henggeler, 1989; Lamson, 1983) has a direct influence upon the behavior of children. Henggeler (1989) reported family relations to be the most powerful predictor of delinquent behavior when age, social class, and other demographic variables were held constant. Family relations accounted for 20% of the
variance in adolescent arrest history. Snyder and Huntley (1990) recommended that clinical interventions for parents of troubled youth focus on developing effective discipline strategies, and problem solving and communication skills.

Responses from judges indicate that they recognize the influence of peers, poor decision-making skills, and low self-esteem on the behavior of juvenile delinquents. Judges recommended that programs for juveniles address these primary issues. Program content could also include training in the development of self concept, and citizenship, social, and communication skills, but not at the expense of the primary issues. There was only some support for the inclusion of leadership skills and knowledge of laws and the legal system. There was a very strong support for the need to involve parents in juvenile diversion programs. Judges reported that without addressing the issues within the family, treatment of the juvenile does not produce positive results.

Programs for families of juvenile offenders should offer training in positive parenting skills, setting rules and discipline, enhancing self-esteem in children, and communication and decision-making skill development. Helping parents develop their own self-esteem and developing citizenship and leadership skills should also be included. Judges felt that the development of strong families would provide positive support to the juvenile and help them overcome their delinquent behaviors.

**Objective Eight:** To describe who, from the viewpoint of the juvenile judges, should fund juvenile diversion programs.

The majority (52.7%) of the judges favored the use of state subsidies to fund diversion programs. Two judges referenced the reality of tight budgets from which
to operate their court. Fourteen (18.9%) judges favored joint funding for the program between the sponsoring group and the court while nine (12.2%) favored competitive grants. Law enforcement grants, funding only by sponsoring group, and other sources each had four responses. It was clear from the responses provided by the judges that funding for diversion programs must be provided outside of the individual court budgets.

**Objective Nine**: To determine the degree to which juvenile judges would disposition juveniles to various diversion dispositional options if available.

A mean score of 4.11 (on a scale of 1 to 5) was produced from the responses of 75 judges on the willingness to place and overall willingness to use diversion questions. One judge referenced the fact that judges do the best that they can to help each individual child.

Willingness is defined as a favorable attitude, opinion, or course of action toward doing something. Literature reported discrepancies in the dispositioning of juveniles within the juvenile court system (Maltz et al., 1980). Due to the interaction of factors, and the judge’s influence on the decision, there were variances in dispositions from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, from judge to judge, as well as case to case. Judges did not use consistent criteria when dispositioning juveniles. Differences were reported due to judge’s policies, characteristics of offenders, seriousness of the offense, and juvenile’s prior court records. All of these add variance to the decision rule (Maltz et al., 1980). Waegel (1989) reported that judges may be influenced by the political climate within the community they serve, court traditions, and the means by which judges are appointed to the bench.
The high mean score for willingness to use diversion programs indicates Ohio juvenile judges are concerned about juvenile offenders and want to provide opportunities for them to be rehabilitated. The one comment concerning the desire to do the best for each individual offender supports the willingness to use diversion programs focus.

**Objective Ten: To determine the personal characteristics of juvenile judges in the Ohio court system.**

Seventy-five (92.6%) of the respondents were male and 6 (7.4%) were female. Judges were primarily between 41 and 60 years of age (65.4%). No one reported being younger than 30 years of age, 13 reported they were between 31 and 40, and 15 indicated they were between 61 and 70 years of age. Seventy-seven (95.1%) reported White as their race/ethnic background. Two (2.5%) individuals reported they were Native American while one (1.2%) individual reported their race/ethnic background to be Asian and one (1.2%) person reported they were Black. Sixty-six (84.6%) judges have served as a juvenile judge for 15 years or less. Twenty (25.6%) individuals have served the court less than one year. Nine (11.5%) respondents reported they had served as a juvenile judge for 16 to 20 years, two (2.6%) reported 21 to 25 years of service, and one (1.3%) reported over 25 years of service to the juvenile court.

Sixty-seven (85.9%) of the judges reported they were married as compared to 11 (14.4%) single individuals. The majority of children in judges families were over 21 years of age. Ninety (48.4%) children were reported in that age category. In the newborn to 5 years of age category, 16 (8.6%) children were reported; 23 (12.4%)
between 6 to 10 years of age; 27 (14.5%) between 11 to 15; and 30 (16.1%) were between 16 and 20 years of age.

The data indicated that juvenile judges in the Ohio court system are primarily white males between the ages of 41 and 60, who are married and have children over 16 years of age. The majority have served the court as juvenile judge for less than 15 years.

**Objective Eleven:** To describe the county population and type of court in which the juvenile judge presides.

The largest number of respondents (64.9%) served counties with populations of 100,000 or less. The remaining (35.1%) judges serve counties with over 100,001 residents. The majority of respondents (60.3%) described their counties as rural. Twenty-one (26.9%) judges described their counties as rural/suburban/urban while 10 (12.8%) reported their counties to be suburban/urban. Fifty-one (65.4%) respondents reported they served in a Juvenile and Probate Court. Ten (12.8%) reported that they served in a Juvenile Court, 10 (12.8%) in a Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, and seven (9.0%) indicated that they served in a Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations and General Division Court. The majority of Ohio judges reported they serve in the Juvenile and Probate Court located in rural counties with less than 100,000 residents.

**Objective Twelve:** Determine what interrelationships exist between the juveniles' personal characteristics, nature of crime committed by juveniles, and judges' knowledge of diversion alternatives, with judges' gender, age, race, years of service, marital status, and number of children and type of court, county population and county description.
Relationships between the independent variables and gender, race, age, years of service and marital status of judges and county population, description of county and type of court were all found to be of low or negligible associations. Knowledge of diversion programs and age of judge had a moderate relationship of .34. No relationship (.00) was found between race of juvenile offender and population of county. Davis' (1971) Measures of Association were used to describe the relationships.

There was a low relationship found between the independent variables and the number of children in judges' families. The relationship between knowledge of diversion programs and newborn to 5 year old children (-.34) and birth order and 6 to 10 year old children (-.39) were moderate in strength. There was a moderate negative relationship recorded between place of residence and 6 to 10 year old children (-.43). There were no relationship (.00) reported between place of residence and race of offender and newborn to 5 year old children and gang membership and children over 21 years of age.

The relationships found indicate that the personal characteristics of judges, county population and description and type of court served do not have strong influences upon how the judge perceives the independent variables: Psychological characteristics; gender; age; race; decision-making skills; gang membership; school achievement; family structure; birth order; place of residence; substance abuse; socioeconomic background; employability; unruly child; delinquent child; and knowledge.
There was a moderate positive relationship between the age of judge and knowledge of diversion programs. This would indicate that those judges who were older had more knowledge of diversion programs. This would support the belief that older professionals would have more experiences and knowledge from which to draw when functioning within their role as compared to individuals who are relatively new to the profession.

Moderate relationships were found between judges who had children between newborn and 10 years of age and knowledge of diversion programs. Parents of children within these age groups tend to be younger and have less judicial experience, thus less knowledge of diversion programs available.

No relationships were found between place of residence and race of offender and judges with newborn to 5 year old children, birth order and judges with 16 to 20 year old children, gang membership and children over 21 years of age, and race of offender and population of county served. The number of residents living in the county served by the judge has no influence upon the judge’s willingness to use a diversion program when dispositioning a juvenile. Those judges who have very young children are not influenced by the place of residence or race of the offender when making a disposition of a juvenile. Those with children over 16 years of age are not influenced by birth order or gang membership.

Literature reported that there is an interaction of factors which influence a judge when making a disposition decision. Decisions will vary from judge to judge, jurisdiction to jurisdiction and from case to case.
The reported low influence of race of offender upon the disposition decisions is consistent with U. S. Department of Justice (1988a) figures which indicate that adjudicated cases for whites and nonwhites were equal, as were the proportions placed in out-of-the-home or on formal probation at disposition. The study data supports the literature which indicates race is not a determining factor when dispositioning a juvenile offender.

**Objective Thirteen:** Determine what relationship exists between the availability of a juvenile diversion program and judges’ knowledge of that program.

The summed mean score for knowledge was 3.60 based upon 77 responses. The majority of judges who responded indicated that they had each of the diversion programs within their county.

There was a substantial negative relationship (\(-.52\)) between knowledge of personal development diversion programs and availability of this program within counties. A moderate negative relationship was found between availability and knowledge of employment training (\(-.39\)) and peer group (\(-.33\)) programs. A negligible negative relationship (\(-.04\)) was reported between drug and alcohol treatment programs and availability. No relationship could be computed between family counseling/education programs and availability due to the fact that all judges reported having this type program in their county, thus no variance within the data.

The data indicates that judges reported between some and great knowledge of diversion programs within their counties. Due to the way availability was coded (yes = 1, no = 2), the negative associations indicate that judges’ knowledge of diversion programs increased with its availability to them.
**Objective Fourteen:** Determine what relationship exists between the independent variables in the study and the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs.

A simultaneous multiple regression model was used to determine the best predictors of the dependent variable, willingness to use a diversion program. This model was used because the literature review did not provide a significant logical variable sequence which would justify ordering the independent variables prior to entering them into the multiple regression model.

The data reported a substantial positive relationship (.48) between knowledge of and the willingness to use a diversion program. The relationship between substance abuse and the willingness to use a diversion program indicated a moderate positive association of .38. The variable birth order reported a moderate negative association of -.37. All other independent variables reported between low negative associations (<-.29) and low positive associations (<.29) with the dependent variable, willingness to use a diversion program.

The model indicated that 44.6\% of the variance in willingness to use diversion programs is accounted for by the linear relationship of the independent variables.

A correlation was run between independent variables with Betas greater than ±.20. Knowledge of diversion programs, birth order, substance abuse, psychological characteristics, and decision-making skills were included in the correlation to determine the degree of multicollinearity between the variables.

The correlation matrix indicated low to moderate associations between all the variables (.11 to .48) except between psychological characteristics and decision-
making skills. The relationship between these two variables had a substantial association of .68. Judges are more willing to use a diversion program if they know about the program and what benefits that program has to offer. They are less likely to use a program if they do not know what it has to offer a juvenile offender. Judges' willingness to use a diversion program option is also influenced by whether the juvenile offender is a substance abuser. These individuals would be dispositioned to drug and alcohol treatment programs rather than be sent into an educational based diversion program. Birth order of the juvenile offender was not a major factor in looking at the overall importance score as indicated by the 1.92 mean score (pg. 80). However, the -.37 relationship would indicate that those judges who felt birth order was an important factor, tended not to use diversion programs as a disposition option.

**General Summary of Conclusions of the Study**

The majority of Ohio juvenile court judges are white males, between the ages of 41 and 60, who are married and have children over 16 years of age. They preside in Juvenile and Probate Courts in rural counties with populations under 100,000 and have less than 15 years of service.

Juvenile judges within the Ohio court system do not report gender, race, birth order, place of residence, or socioeconomic status to have much influence upon their decision to disposition a juvenile to a diversion program. Substance abuse, school achievement, decision-making skills, age, and psychological characteristics are reported to have more influence upon their decisions.
The number of prior court appearances by the juvenile does influence judges’ use of juvenile diversion programs. The more prior court appearances by the juvenile, the greater the influence on their decision related to the use diversion programs.

The juvenile's use of illegal substances has a strong influence on a judge’s dispositioning of a juvenile to a diversion program. The availability of drug and alcohol treatment programs in counties indicates that judges disposition substance abusers to that program option.

Judges felt strongly that families should be involved in any diversion program, that without the support of the family the juvenile would quickly return to participation in negative behaviors. Many judges reported that the dysfunctional family unit was often a major cause of the delinquent’s problems. Therefore, providing education and training for parents in positive parenting skills, how to discipline effectively and set rules, conflict resolution, and communication skills, and enhancement of self-esteem in youth was important.

Programs for youth should definitely address the development of peer resistance skills, self-esteem, and decision making skills. The development of social, communication and citizenship skills, and enhanced self concept were also recommended. Leadership skill development was reported below the other program components in importance.

Judges recommended a program duration of five two-hour sessions. One judge commented that the length of duration would depend upon the “nature of the difficulties” of the child while another indicated that "each child is unique and some
require more (sessions) than others." An overwhelming majority preferred the diversion programs be funded via state subsidies rather than other funding options. With the limited budgets within the court system, outside funding would be necessary to provide additional services.

The more a judge knows about a program, the more he/she is likely to use that diversion option. Therefore, it is important that judges be informed about the goal and benefits of juvenile diversion programs in their counties. Availability within the county does increase knowledge of the program.

The linear combination of the independent variables accounted for 44.6% of the variance in the dependent variable, willingness to use a diversion program. Knowledge of diversion programs, substance abuse, and birth order provided the most significant relative importance in the regression equation.

Recommendations

Considerable research has been done related to the causal factors which result in delinquent behaviors. An extensive literature review related to characteristics of offenders, their support groups, and educational experiences as well as juvenile diversion program options provided the basis for this study. Little has been done however, to determine the influence the personal characteristics of juveniles, the crimes they commit, and the judge’s knowledge of diversion program options has upon the decision making process used by juvenile judges.

Non profit youth organizations currently offer juvenile diversion educational/personal development programs in counties throughout the state. These
programs work closely with the juvenile court in each county. Youth professionals have received requests to develop and provide similar programs in additional counties. In order to provide a statewide juvenile diversion program, it is important to understand what factors influence a juvenile judge's willingness to use a juvenile diversion program.

The findings of this study can be used to assist program administrators to design educational/personal development programs for juvenile offenders and their families. Programs would be based upon the factors identified as important, when designing educational programs for youth who are at-risk of delinquent behavior.

Based upon the findings, conclusions and implications of the study the following recommendations were made:

1. Youth organizations should work in cooperation with the Ohio juvenile court system to develop educational programs for juvenile offenders across the state. Interdisciplinary teams need to be formed which represent the land-grant university, county agencies and organizations, and youth professionals to develop this program thrust.

2. Coalitions between the court system, education, youth serving agencies and organizations, law enforcement, Social Services, and other interested groups should be formed within Ohio counties to address community issues which affect youth and families. It is through this cooperative effort that communities can impact the negative factors which precipitate negative behaviors by youth.
3. A statewide juvenile diversion program curriculum should be developed which provides teaching packages to help youth develop self-esteem, decision-making and peer resistance skills, and the ability to cope with stress. The teaching packages need to include multiple delivery methods which can be adapted to meet the needs of different cultural groups.

4. A statewide curriculum for the families of juvenile offenders which provides teaching packages to help parents/guardians to develop their self-esteem and to enhance self-esteem in children, communication skills, the ability to establish and maintain discipline/rules within the home, decision-making skills, and conflict resolution skills needs to be developed. The teaching packages need to include multiple delivery methods which can be adapted to meet the needs of different cultural groups.

5. Juvenile Diversion Program Development training should be provided for youth professionals to develop their ability to understand the juvenile court system, and the characteristics of youth and families interacting within that system. They need to know to effectively use the teaching packages for juvenile delinquents and families of juvenile offenders, and the process by which to develop community coalitions which will develop positive approaches to addressing community-wide issues affecting youth and families.

6. Youth serving organizations need to take a proactive role with juvenile judges to help them understand the goals and benefits of the available juvenile diversion programs for youth and families. Judges need to be actively involved in
adapting the teaching packages to meet the needs of the youth and families coming through their court and dispositioned to juvenile diversion programs.

7. Funding sources beyond the Ohio Juvenile Court System should be located to provide the resources to develop the materials, initiate the program thrust, and support the programs via long-term financial commitment.

8. Actively recruit qualified individuals for the Ohio court system who are female and/or represent minority cultures to serve as juvenile judges. The juvenile court system is currently dominated by white males who are between 41 and 60 years of age and have children over 16 years of age. The court needs to better reflect the population demographics within the state.

9. Youth serving organizations need to take a more proactive prevention role in developing programs which reach at-risk youth within urban communities. Programs are needed which help youth feel good about themselves, develop decision-making, communication, peer resistance, and job skills, and which will help them to avoid participation in negative behaviors. The programs should have a strong emphasis on positive learning experiences which enable youth to appreciate learning, thus inspiring them to remain in school.

10. Agencies and organizations need to take a more proactive role in developing programs for families of at-risk youth living within urban communities. Programs which help parents develop positive parenting skills, the ability to set discipline/rules for their children, an ability to cope with stress, communication skills, decision-making skills, and their own self-esteem as well as to enhance the self-
esteem in their children. Without family programs support, programs for at-risk youth will not provide the level of impact needed to positively influence the system.

Need For Further Study

Youth serving organizations' involvement in programs for juvenile offenders is relatively new; therefore, no direct thrust has been developed to reach this audience. Efforts that are currently in effect in Ohio counties have shown positive success with the audiences that they have reached. This study was designed to determine what factors influence the willingness of juvenile judges to use a juvenile diversion program option. A literature review provided the basis for the following independent variables: Psychological characteristics; gender; age; race; decision-making skills, gang membership; school achievement; family structure; birth order; place of residence; substance abuse; socioeconomic status; employability; unruly child; delinquent child; and knowledge. The researcher was interested in what variables influenced the judges willingness to use juveniles diversion program options. Relationships were run between the independent variables and the dependent variable, demographic data on judges with the independent variables and between knowledge and availability. The study indicated that 44.6% of the variance in the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs, was accounted for by a linear relationship with the independent variables.

The study was also designed to gather data related to what juvenile judges would recommend for: Program content for juvenile and family programs; the duration of such programs; and potential funding sources.
Based on the judgement of the researcher, the following recommendations for further study have been made:

1. Replications of this study need to be conducted in other states to determine similarities and/or differences.

2. This study did not compare the characteristics of youth identified in the literature with the actual characteristics of Ohio youth interacting with the juvenile court system. Therefore, it is suggested that an additional study look at the characteristics of Ohio juvenile offenders and compare them with those defined in literature as representing juvenile delinquents.

3. No attempt was made in this study to determine if judges in Ohio disposition juveniles differently than indicated by the study data. An analysis of juvenile court dispositioning records would either confirm or raise questions as to whether judges' actions followed the outcomes of this study.

4. The study accounted for 44.6% of the variance in the dependent variable, willingness to use diversion programs. Further study needs to be conducted to determine additional variables which may influence the willingness variable.

5. No attempt was made to collect data from other professionals within the juvenile court system beyond the juvenile judges. An additional study involving juvenile court referees, probation officers or law enforcement officers may provide further data related to factors which influence the use of diversion programs within the juvenile court system.
6. Research indicates that individual philosophies make a difference in sentencing strategies used. This study did not attempt to determine the influence, if any, that the personal philosophy of the juvenile judge had upon his/her use of the diversion alternative. Further study of this issue would be warranted.

7. Further study is needed to determine the direction of influence two or more prior court appearances by a juvenile have upon a judge's willingness to use a juvenile diversion program. The data reported in this study indicated that more appearances have greater influences on judges decisions; however no indication is given as to whether that greater influence is a factor for determining use or nonuse of juvenile diversion programs.

8. Youth serving organizations should look at what they are currently providing for juvenile offenders in light of the outcomes of this study.
APPENDIX A

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY
Seven individuals were selected to serve on the Panel of Experts. They represented expertise in Juvenile Diversion Educational Programs, the Juvenile Court System, and Measurement. They were:

### Juvenile Diversion Educational Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Susan Shockey</td>
<td>County Extension Agent, Home Economics</td>
<td>1945 Frebis Avenue, Columbus, OH 43206</td>
<td>(614) 443-6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Beryl Jo Jackson</td>
<td>County Extension Agent, Home Economics</td>
<td>6970 SR 88, Ravenna, OH 44266</td>
<td>(216) 296-6432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Juvenile Court System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Swisher</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>400 E. Town Street, Suite 120, Columbus, OH 43215</td>
<td>(614) 466-7782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Diroll</td>
<td>Governor’s Specialist, Criminal Justice Services</td>
<td>400 E. Town Street, Suite 120, Columbus, OH 43215</td>
<td>(614) 466-7782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Emmalou Norland</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Ag. Education</td>
<td>309 Ag. Administration, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, OH 43210</td>
<td>(614) 292-6671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard W. Clark</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Ag. Education</td>
<td>203 Ag. Administration, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, OH 43210</td>
<td>(614) 292-0202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kathryn Beckham</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Human Development &amp; Family Rel.</td>
<td>315 Campbell Hall, 1787 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210</td>
<td>(614) 292-4753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 14, 1991

To: Selected Court Referees

The Ohio State University Cooperative Extension Service has been working with the Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association to facilitate a study with judges later this summer. We will be investigating the factors associated with judge's decisions related to placement of juvenile offenders into diversion disposition alternatives. The factors of interest in our study are: the personal characteristics of juvenile offenders and judges; influence of the crime committed and prior court appearances; and knowledge and content expectations of diversion disposition programs.

In order to facilitate our study with the judges, we are asking you as a court referee to help test our instrument to see if it is measuring what it is designed to measure and doing so consistently. We ask you to complete the instrument based upon your knowledge of the juvenile court system and your close working relationship with the judges.

Please complete and return the instrument in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by July 1, 1991. The numbered postcard is to be mailed at the same time as the envelope containing the instrument. The postcard will protect your anonymity as well as indicate you have returned your questionnaire. Thus, no follow up would be necessary. If you have any questions about the study or the instrument feel free to call (614) 292-0202 or (614) 292-4444, Monday through Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and ask for Dr. Richard Clark or Sue Cummings.

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to assist us. Your help is greatly appreciated. It will enable us to produce relevant data in our study with the judges. The data will then be used by Ohio Cooperative Extension Service youth professionals to develop programs which will provide positive experiences for juvenile offenders.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard W. Clark
Assistant Professor
Agriculture Education
## Summary of Reliability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alphas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot study n = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Characteristics</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Skills *</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making Skills</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Membership</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Order</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Residence</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Crime</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unruly Child</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Child</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversion Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Alternatives</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Place</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to the low reliability of the Socialization Skills variable in the judges study, it was deleted from further analysis.*
APPENDIX B

DATA COLLECTION LETTERS
AND INSTRUMENT
Members:

Ohio Association of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Dear Judge,

I have been contacted by Sue Cummins and Dr. Richard N. Clark with the Ohio State University as part of their staff in the Land Grant College Extension Service 4-H Program. Enclosed is a survey to assist them in designing diversion programs for any interested court.

The diversion program would vary depending on each County Extension Office and the local court. The program could be as much as a turn-key operation or a joint program by the Extension office and court as they agreed.

Enclosed is their letter and survey to assist them in designing various diversion programs. They intend to monitor and assess the effectiveness of diversion programs that result from their Extension office involvement.

I encourage you to complete the survey by return mail or in the near future.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Louden
President

TEL/jt
Enclosure
July 15, 1991

Honorable Juvenile Justice
County Juvenile Court
State of Ohio

Your Honor:

The Ohio State University Cooperative Extension Service in cooperation with the Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association is in the process of conducting an investigation of the factors associated with judge's decisions related to disposition of juvenile offenders to the diversion dispositional alternative. The factors of interest are: personal characteristics of juvenile offenders and judges; the influence of the crimes committed and prior court appearances; and the knowledge and content expectations of the diversion dispositional alternative.

In order to collect information related to the study we have developed an instrument that is to be completed only by juvenile judges throughout Ohio. We are requesting that you help by completing the instrument as soon as possible.

Please complete and return the instrument in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by August 1, 1991. The numbered postcard is to be mailed at the same time as the instrument. The postcard will protect your anonymity as well as indicate you have returned your questionnaire. Thus, no follow up would be necessary. If you have any questions about the study or the instrument feel free to call (614) 292-0202 or (614) 292-4444, Monday through Friday 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and ask for Dr. Richard Clark or Sue Cummings.

Thank you very much for taking time from your busy schedule to assist us. Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard W. Clark
Assistant Professor
Agricultural Education

Honorable Thomas E. Louden
President
Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association
PERCEPTION AND USE OF
JUVENILE DIVERSION PROGRAMS
BY JUVENILE JUDGES
IN THE OHIO COURT SYSTEM
GENERAL INFORMATION

The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, 4-H Program in cooperation with the Juvenile and Family Court Judges Association, is conducting this study to collect data which will help youth professionals to develop educational/personal development juvenile diversion programs. Judges are asked to provide information which will help professional youth workers to better understand the potential clientele who will participate in their diversion programs, as well as judges' expectation concerning program content. The study includes judges in the state of Ohio who make decisions related to disposition of juvenile offenders in juvenile court system.

The different parts of this instrument ask for your reactions to a number of statements and questions. Your complete and honest response to each item will provide accurate information upon which to compile data on relationships of variables in the study.

The information you provide will be held in strict confidence. The instrument is not numbered. The number only appears on the corresponding postcard which accompanied your questionnaire. We ask you to mail the postcard at the same time as your completed instrument. The card and the instrument will arrive separately, thus responses you give cannot be connected to you. The numbered postcard will be used to assist in the follow up of non-respondents to reduce non-response error.

We thank you for your time in completing this instrument. Your input will be greatly appreciated.
Perception and Use of Juvenile Diversion Programs by Juvenile Judges in the Ohio Court System

This instrument is for you to indicate your perceptions of the importance of each variable in regards to the disposition of juvenile offenders to the diversion dispositional option.

Please circle the number which best represents your perceptions regarding the following questions.

Key:

1. = Very Little (VL)
2. = Little (L)
3. = Some (S)
4. = Great (G)
5. = Very Great (VG)

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

E 1:
To what degree are juvenile diversion programs needed to help youth avoid further contact with the Juvenile Court System? 1 2 3 4 5

This response means that the respondent feels that this statement has very great importance.
SECTION I - CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH

To what degree do the following personal characteristics of juveniles influence the placement you order when making a disposition of a case?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH</th>
<th>INFLUENCE ON THE DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High self-esteem</td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Low self-esteem</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aggressive behavior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submissive behavior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unable to cope with stress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Able to cope with stress</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cannot delay self gratification</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Able to delay self gratification</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lacks socialization skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personable/likeable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Male</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is 13 years of age or younger</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is 14 to 18 years of age</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Race - white</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Race - non-white</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Has poor decision-making skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Has good decision-making skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little (VL)</td>
<td>Little (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VL</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>VG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Is a member of a gang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is not a member of a gang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Has high achievement in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Has low achievement in school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Is a school drop out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Is from a single parent family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Lives with both biological parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Lives in a step-family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Is the oldest child in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Is a middle child in their family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Is the youngest child in the family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Lives in a rural area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Lives in a suburban area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Lives in an urban area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Substance abuse - consumes alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Substance abuse - uses drugs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. From low socio-economic background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. From a middle income background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. From a high income background</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Is currently employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Is currently employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Has low employment potential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II - NATURE OF THE CRIME

How much influence does the nature of the crime committed and the number of court appearances by the juvenile have upon your placement of an offender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME/APPEARANCES</th>
<th>INFLUENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Unruly Child - no prior appearances</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Unruly Child - one prior appearance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Unruly Child - two prior appearances</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Unruly Child - three or more appearances</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Delinquent child - no prior appearance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Delinquent child - one prior appearance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Delinquent child - two prior appearances</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION III - DIVERSION PROGRAMS

The next set of items refer to different types of diversion programs. How would you rate your level of knowledge of each type of diversion program? How would you rate your willingness to place a juvenile in each type program? What diversion programs are available in your county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVERSION PROGRAMS</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE LEVEL</th>
<th>WILLINGNESS TO PLACE</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Employment training</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Family counseling/education</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Peer groups</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Personal development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III - Diversion Programs Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Willingness To Place</th>
<th>Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. Drug and Alcohol Treatment

54. Other - Specify below

55. Other - Specify below

56. What is your overall willingness to disposition a juvenile offender to a juvenile diversion program?

   VL   L   S   G   VG
   1    2    3    4    5

SECTION IV - DIVERSION PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

If you were helping to design a juvenile diversion program, what would you recommend for the following:

To what degree is the following juvenile diversion program content important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Of:</th>
<th>Importance Of Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. Self-esteem</td>
<td>VL L S G VG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Social skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Communication skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Decision-making skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Peer resistance skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Leadership skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of diversion program content - continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. An enhanced self concept</td>
<td>VL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Positive citizenship skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Knowledge of laws and the legal system</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. To what degree do you believe parents/guardians should be involved in a juvenile diversion program? (Circle one)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly explain your response: ________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What program content would you feel is important for parents/guardians who interact in family situations with juvenile offenders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT OF:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORTANCE OF CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Communication skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Decision making skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Positive parenting skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Discipline/rules within the family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Citizenship skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Leadership skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Self-esteem in adults</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Ability to enhance the self-esteem in child</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent/guardian program content - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little (VL)</th>
<th>Little (L)</th>
<th>Some (S)</th>
<th>Great (G)</th>
<th>Very Great (VG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75. An understanding of laws and the legal system

76. Conflict resolution skills

77. Other, please specify:

78. Number of sessions based upon two hour time blocks. \textbf{(Circle one)}

a. One  

b. Two  

c. Three  

d. Four  

b. Two  

c. Three  

d. Four  

e. Five  

g. More than six - Please specify #

79. How do you recommend juvenile diversion programs be funded? \textbf{(Circle ONE you most prefer)}

a. By law enforcement grant monies

b. Jointly between court and sponsoring group

c. Only by sponsoring group

d. By competitive grants (Private and Public)

e. State subsidies

f. Other, Please specify: ___________________________
From your respective the primary goal of the juvenile court system should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Description</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80. Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Protection of Society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Punishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Maintaining Social Order</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Deterrence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85. Please circle the one number from the listing above (80 - 84) which best describes the primary goal of the court in your opinion.

SECTION V - PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF

(CIRCLE ONE RESPONSE PER QUESTION)

88. What is your gender?
   a. Male       b. Female

89. In what age category are you?
   a. 25 to 30   d. 51 to 60
   b. 31 to 40   e. 61 to 70
   c. 41 to 50

90. What is your race/ethnic background?
   a. Asian      c. Latino     e. White
   b. Black      d. Native American
91. How many years have you served as a juvenile court judge?
   a. Less than one year           e. 16 to 20 years
   b. 1 to 5 years                f. 21 to 25 years
   c. 6 to 10 years               g. Over 25 years
   d. 11 to 15 years

92. What is your marital status? (circle one)
   a. Married                      b. Single

93. Please enter the number of children you have in your family by age group?
   a. None ___
   b. Newborn to 5 years ___
   c. 6 to 10 years ___
   d. 11 to 15 years ___
   e. 16 to 20 years ___
   f. Over 21 ___

94. What is the population of the county in which you serve? (circle one)
   a. Less than 25,000           d. 100,001 to 150,000
   b. 25,001 to 50,000           e. 150,001 to 200,000
   c. 50,001 to 100,000          f. Over 200,001

95. What is the best description of the county in which you serve? (circle one)
   a. Rural                       c. Suburban/urban area
   b. Rural/suburban/urban

96. What best describes the type of court in which you serve? (circle one)
   a. Juvenile Court             c. Juvenile and Probate Court
   b. Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court d. Juvenile, Probate, Domestic Relations and General Division Court
Return by August 1, 1991 to:

Sue Cummings
State 4-H Office
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1084
APPENDIX C

COMMENTS OF RESPONDENTS
Responses to Question 66 - To what degree do you believe parents/guardians should be involved in a juvenile diversion program? Briefly explain your response.

"Without follow up it can’t succeed"
"Parents need to be a part of the solution"
"Parents are an integral component in any treatment plan"
"Is a family problem, not just juvenile"
"Very difficult to make a positive change in a child’s behavior without involving the whole family"
"To reinforce their children’s involvement and cooperation"
"Parents must know child’s responses to program therefore must be knowledgeable of program"
"Children cannot be served in isolation"
"Must understand purpose and understand consequences need not be punitive only"
"Depends upon the family situation"
"Will be child’s support after program - communication is two way street"  "Parents need to be actively involved with their children"
"Without involvement - juvenile will recidivate"
"Involvement of family system critical to youth development"
"Once in diversion, a parent must cooperate fully. Parents cooperation will transfer to the child most often"
"Without the family nothing is done"
"Won’t work otherwise"
"Parent education and training is a key element of diversion programs"
"Parental involvement is necessary to maintain the family"
"Parents need to be educated - too many enablers"
"Parents need to know exactly what’s going on. Parents are often the cause of the child being in court"
"Without parental guidance or support the program has less chance of success"
"The involvement of parents insures long term success"
"It is imperative the parents are part of the problem, therefore have to be part of the solution"
"There should be at least one or more sessions with parents and children"
"Parents/guardians in most programs are irresponsible and any involvement is negative or counter productive"
"The juvenile needs the support of parents"
"Most problems are environmentally based need to fix both"
"Parents should help reinforce goals, but child must be the active participant"
"Parents are the cause of unruly and delinquent children"
"The home is a far greater influence on the child than any outside process (positive or negative)"
"Inadequate and ineffective parents are primary cause of delinquency"
"Parents are normally the greatest influence"
"You can’t deal with kids in a vacuum"
"Unless there is family involvement success is unlikely"
"Parents must be involved"
"Unless parents/guardians cooperate program cannot function"
"They are the core ingredient to success"
"Child cannot possibly benefit without support of parents"
"Won't work otherwise"
"Home life very important must have all parties understand it is a joint problem"
"They should be familiar with the program and be willing to cooperate with agency"
"Family must reinforce what is learned, experienced in diversion program"
"Parents need to understand the purpose, support it, may need to participate in many aspects"
"Can't work with child without working with environment"
"When we bypass parents to train children we help one person at a time and lose our influence when we are finished. If we work with parents we help siblings and the influence is ongoing"
"Everyone close to child should be involved"
"Parents must help their child correct their behavior"
"If the court can gain control over the 'delinquent parent' most of the children 'will follow suit'"
"Lack of parent or ineffective positive parent involvement is the main cause of juvenile problems"
"Parents should bear most of responsibility for monitoring and being able to be involved"
"Parents - guardians must be involved in order for the program to work"
Judges Comments Related to Study Topic

"My court functions with the use of $50,000 DYS grant funds and very little else. The bulk of the grant is used for salaries. We use intensive probation a lot and we send juveniles to a detention center. We have little $ for anything else"

"Each child is unique, some require more (Sessions) than others"

"The more appearances - unruly/delinquent the more likely to need more aggressive intervention"

"Any outside help will certainly be appreciated due to budget problems"

"Court should control program"

"Discipline/rules with the family - should be a 10"

"Dumb - what difference does it make? You do the best you can to help each individual kid"

"Question whether a few hours of counseling will result in change of behavior problems"

"Alcohol is a drug - please remember this"

"Unruly child has not really committed a criminal act. No crime" (willingness scores) "would increase with positive knowledge"

"Sessions of what? The traditional 'education' process won’t work"

"Number of sessions depends upon nature of difficulties"

"Education on what community services and support is available"
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