

**ASSESSING THE GENDER SPECIFIC PROGRAM AND SERVICE NEEDS FOR  
ADOLESCENT FEMALES IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM**

Final report

Presented to the Office of Criminal Justice Services  
Columbus, Ohio

November 27, 1999

Kristi Holsinger, Ph.D.  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Joanne Belknap, Ph.D.  
University of Colorado

Jennifer L. Sutherland  
University of Cincinnati

This research project was funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Services. The report does not necessarily reflect the opinions or interpretations of this office, but rather, those of the authors.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors of this document are grateful to so many individuals and agencies. First and foremost we are grateful to the girls and boys who completed, often struggling through, our youth survey. Their willingness to do so and the very important, often traumatic reports of their short lives, leave us in awe and with the deepest gratitude. Although the judge and treatment center surveys were not as lengthy and personal, we are also very appreciative of these officials who took the time from their busy schedules to complete the surveys and offer significant insight and suggestions. Thus, similar to many researchers we cannot thank the participants in our study adequately.

It is unlikely that this project would have gotten off the ground were it not for the support and encouragement of Dr. Alice Franklin Elder. In addition to her powerful understanding of research, her dedication to youth and improving the Ohio responses to better serving delinquent youth flowed over into this project's design and implementation. Dr. Elder offered invaluable criticisms and insights, in addition to encouragement and support. The authors also thank Dr. Patricia O'Reilly, Professor of Education and Women's Studies at the University of Cincinnati, for her contributions as a consultant on the youth survey and implementation of it. Her dedication to girls is apparent in her daily work and activism, and it also benefitted this study immensely. Drs. Elder and O'Reilly represent to us what change is really about: intellectual and personal commitment to get the best information possible in the most ethical and understanding ways possible.

The distribution and collection of the youth surveys was a strategically and sometimes physically daunting chore. The authors were particularly concerned with how the boys in this study would respond to an all-female staff distributing surveys, and we couldn't have found a more perfect research assistant than Mr. Anthony Flores. His demeanor is both professional and warm, and his presence and behaviors likely led to the high response rate of both the male and female youth. Mr. John Schwartz in the Division of Criminal Justice Research Center at the University of Cincinnati was always ready to answer any technical and budgeting problems we ran into and his help made this project run far more smoothly than it might have. We are also grateful to Dr. Sandra L. Browning, Assistant Professor at the University of Cincinnati, for her willingness to step in to provide some logistical assistance and represent the project at the University of Cincinnati after Joanne Belknap moved to Colorado. Finally, we thank OJJDP for funding the very important work on delinquent girls' needs, and OCJS and the Ohio Gender-Specific Work Group for allowing and helping us to find some answers. Ms. Diana Ramos showed great patience in waiting for our results. It has been an often difficult, but ultimately, extremely rewarding research experience, and we believe that our findings greatly enhance the current understanding of what "gender-specific" needs really means.

## INTRODUCTION

One of the greatest limitations of existing criminological and criminal justice research is the low priority that has been given to the etiology, processing, and treatment of female offending. In fact, what we know about the adolescent female pales in comparison to what is known about the adolescent male. Leonard (1982) noted that although sex as a variable offers the most explanatory power regarding crime, it has been ignored. Theories of delinquency, empirical research on the processing and treatment of offenders, and program models have been based almost exclusively on the male experience, largely ignoring or offering shallow, sexist explanations regarding the female experience. In order to develop a more complete knowledge of girls and young women, it is necessary to explore the biases of the past and present and realize how these biases have played a detrimental role in shaping how delinquent girls are seen -- and in many ways not seen -- by the criminal and juvenile processing system and by criminological theorists.

A number of reasons have been offered regarding the low priority of addressing female delinquency in empirical research. First, as Smart (1976) pointed out, girls were perceived as low status, in part, because they do not pose as serious a threat to the social order as boys. Additionally, several studies noted that boys were more likely to leave behind a victim, whereas girls were more likely to hurt themselves (Dembo, Williams, Wothke, Schmeidler, and Brown 1992; Wells 1994; Widom 1989a). Another justification offered for the lack of research on girls has been their less frequent involvement in delinquency compared to boys. In this regard, when females were included in theories, the focus was on why their participation in crime was lower than that of boys. Instead of addressing the unique motives and circumstances of females, theorists have sought to explain the gender gap in crime and delinquency (Artz 1998). Although data clearly show that males are more likely to engage in delinquent and criminal behavior, this is not an adequate justification for ignoring girls or simply *comparing* them to boys.

Focus on delinquent girls is critical for two reasons. First, most criminological theories on the etiology of offending are on juvenile delinquency. Ignoring females, then, is an incomplete as well as a sexist representation of juvenile delinquency. A second reason that including girls is important is the growing recognition of gender differences in the "pathways" to offending (e.g., American Correctional Association 1990; Arnold 1990; Belknap and Holsinger 1998; Bottcher 1993; Chesney-Lind 1989; Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez 1983; Daly 1992; Dembo, Williams, and Schmeidler 1993; Felthous and Yudowitz 1977; Gilfus 1992; Silbert and Pines 1981; Widom 1989a). At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that gender differences and similarities cannot truly be assessed without including delinquent boys in the study. Finally, in order to adequately assess the current situation for

delinquent youth, it is useful to include data from not only the youth, but also from key decision-makers. Thus, the study reported herein includes self-report data from delinquent youth, juvenile judges, and juvenile treatment center officials.

To understand how the juvenile justice system might ideally respond to girls' delinquency, it is necessary to examine the theories of delinquency and to accurately assess gender differences and similarities in youths' turning to crime. No one can answer this better than the youth themselves. This is also true regarding attempts to assess how youths are processed through the system and how they experience institutionalization and treatment, if convicted. That is, we need the youth themselves to document their experiences before offending, in both officially recorded and non-officially recorded instances (those offenses not detected by authorities), and their experiences with the police, courts, and correctional institutions. Additionally, it is necessary to retrieve feedback from those responsible for sentencing and treating delinquent youth in our efforts to assess gender-specific needs for delinquent girls. Key informants for this feedback are juvenile judges and institutional/treatment officials. This is precisely what the study reported in this report was designed to accomplish.

First, we very briefly review some of the most valuable theoretical contributions on the causes of offending and the existing research on gender differences and similarities in offending rates.<sup>1</sup> Next we describe the current efforts, sponsored primarily by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), to assess the gender-specific needs of delinquent girls. The focus of this monograph, however, is to present the design and findings of Phase II of the OJJDP-funded research on gender-specific needs in Ohio.<sup>2</sup> Thus, by collecting data from delinquent girls and boys, juvenile judges, and juvenile institutional treatment authorities, we attempted to answer the following research questions:

### **The Research Questions**

- What gender differences exist in girls' and boys' pathways to offending?
- Is gender related to delinquent youths' self-reported experiences with the juvenile justice system?
- How does the context of offending differ based on gender?

---

<sup>1</sup>For more complete reviews see Belknap (1996a), Belknap and Holsinger (1998), Chesney-Lind and Shelden (1992), and Naffine (1987).

<sup>2</sup>Phase I, also sponsored by OJJDP through the Office of Criminal Justice Services in Ohio, was an exploratory study, using focus groups with institutionalized delinquent girls and those who worked with them across Ohio (see Belknap, Dunn, and Holsinger, 1997; Belknap, Holsinger, and Dunn 1997)

- Is gender related to the type of programming and treatment delinquent youth request?
- Is gender related to the type of programming and treatment delinquent youth receive?

### **GENDER, THEORY, AND RESEARCH ON THE PRECURSORS TO DELINQUENCY**

Since the 1970's, the interest in studying female crime and delinquency has increased, particularly in the past few years. This increased interest resulted from increasing numbers of women involved in research and the perception that female crime and delinquency is on the rise (Artz 1998). Fortunately, several recent perspectives offer more useful contributions for conceptualization and research in this area. First, the cycle of violence theories acknowledge the long-term consequences of childhood victimization (Widom 1989a). It has been established that children who are physically harmed early in their lives are more likely than their non-abused counterparts to engage in juvenile delinquency, particularly delinquency that involves violence (Dodge et al. 1990; Felthous and Yudowitz 1977; Gray 1988).

Second, feminist perspectives offer sophistication in thinking about gender that includes a critique of how the social structure and patriarchy have *shaped* the experiences of girls (Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988). Recently, feminist theorists have made significant advances in how female deviance is conceptualized and how pathways to crime often differ based on gender. To this end, beginning in the 1980s, numerous studies (typically, but not exclusively, focusing on females) have documented the high-risk of childhood trauma (e.g., sexual abuse, child neglect, loss of a parent, and so on) as a precursor to subsequent offending (e.g., Arnold 1990; Artz 1998; Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez 1983; Chesney-Lind and Sheldon 1992; Dembo et al. 1992; Gilfus 1992; Silbert and Pines 1981; Widom 1989a, 1989b). Third, the life-course perspective is an emerging perspective within criminology that offers several important and potentially less-sexist advantages over the traditional criminological theorizing. This perspective looks at the intersection of individual differences and structural characteristics over the course of a person's life (Cairns and Cairns 1994; Caspi, Lynam, Moffitt, and Silva 1993; Farrington 1994; Laub and Sampson 1993; Loeber and Le Blanc 1990; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986; Sampson and Laub 1992; Stattin and Magnusson 1990). Given that the theories just described often point to the importance of childhood trauma, particularly in the form of abuse, it is useful to briefly describe some of these studies. First, it is significant to recognize that neglect and abuse are also important issues in the delinquency of boys. Studies suggest, however, that abuse problems within families are more common, start at an earlier age, and last longer for girls than for boys (Chesney-Lind 1989; Miller, Trapani, Fejes-Mendoza, Eggleston, and Dwiggin 1995). For example, a study that estimated the prevalence of sexual abuse in the general population as one quarter of females, estimated that one-eighth of all males have been sexually victimized as children (Briere and Runtz 1987). A study of 297 juvenile

detainees found sexual abuse in 65 percent of the female sample and 24 percent of the male sample (Dembo, et al. 1992). A study of the Illinois Youth Center, the state's only correctional facility for female offenders in the Juvenile Division, found 42 percent of the young women reported prior physical abuse compared to 22 percent of the young men (Howell and Davis 1992). The gap was larger when looking at sexual abuse: Half of the girls reported having been sexually abused, whereas only 2 percent of the boys reported sexual abuse. Ninety-eight percent of the girls had a history of running away.

The nature and context of the victimization also differs by gender. In intensive interviews with 51 homeless young people in Australia, Alder (1991) found that 76 percent of the girls had been victims of sexual assault in the past year compared to 29 percent of the males. The young women were also more likely than the males to experience sexual harassment, be victimized by the friends or acquaintances they sought help from, and to be victimized in private places, typically the very places they went to for help. Young men were more likely to experience a physical confrontation in public by a stranger.

A national study of girls in juvenile correctional settings was conducted by the American Correctional Association in 1988. They reported that 61 percent experienced physical abuse (nearly half reported they were abused 11 times or more). Just over half of the sample experienced repeated instances of sexual abuse (one-third reported abuse occurring 3 to 10 times, just under one-third reported abuse occurring 11 or more times). Moreover, four-fifths of these sexually abused girls ran away from home. Importantly, this study linked abuse with running away and with subsequent arrest for running away. Girls in correctional settings reported their first arrests were for running away from home (20 percent) or for larceny theft (25 percent) (American Correctional Association 1990). This attempt to survive and cope with a harmful family situation, then, seems to have been criminalized by the criminal and juvenile processing system (Arnold 1990; Federle and Chesney-Lind 1992).

Owen and Bloom (1997) in a report to determine the needs of young female offenders in California found that 67 percent of the young women report ongoing physical abuse and 45 percent had experienced sexual abuse. Robinson (1994) conducted interviews with 30 delinquent girls. Twenty-three of the girls' life stories recounted sexual abuse. Ten of the girls experience abuse by more than one person, six by their father, and 14 by at least one relative. Eight experienced abuse by family friends, neighbors, or foster family members. The lack of a forum for the girls to talk about and deal with this victimization was troubling to the author, particularly in light of the self-blame, guilt, and inability to trust other adults experienced by the girls.

## **GENDER DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES IN OFFENDING**

Males still report substantially greater involvement in delinquency than females (Bjerregaard and Smith 1993; Canter 1982; Cernkovich and Giordano 1979; Feyerherm 1981; Figueira-McDonough 1985; Hindelang 1971; Lawrence and Shireman 1980; Richards 1981; Teilmann and Landry 1981). Cernkovich and Giordano (1979), in a self-report study of high-school students, found that with the exception of a few minor offenses, males reported engaging in more delinquent acts. The ratio of male to female involvement, however, was considerably lower than the gender ratio found in official reports. Regarding the extent of involvement, 28 percent of the gender differences were non-significant, including running away from home.

Self-report studies have best supported what is found in official statistics related to boys and violent and serious offending. This area of offending represented the greatest divergence between male and female delinquency patterns (Canter 1982; Feyerherm 1981; Figueira-McDonough et al. 1981). Feyerherm (1981) found males disproportionately reported involvement in activities like fighting, property damage and serious theft. As the seriousness of the offenses goes up, so does the male to female ratio (Figueira-McDonough et al. 1981). However, a summary of 70 self-report studies found that for violent behavior, boys were twice as likely to report involvement than girls, compared to the four to one ratio reported in arrest data (Lawrence and Shireman 1980).

A more current account of gender and time trends in delinquency in the U.S. indicates that while girls' percent of offending, as measured by arrest rates, may be slightly increasing, girls typically account for between 20 and 25 percent of juvenile arrests (Belknap and Holsinger 1998). Consistent with previous research, this overview of national data reported that boys also tend to commit far more types of crimes in general, and that the gender differences are typically greatest for the most serious and violent offenses.

## **GENDER AND THE PROCESSING OF DELINQUENT YOUTH**

Tracking delinquent youth through the system, it is apparent that significant gendered distinctions exist. First, girls are more likely than boys to be turned over to the official authorities (the police or juvenile courts) (Chesney-Lind 1973; Chesney-Lind 1989; Chesney-Lind and Shelden 1992; Hiller and Hancock 1981). Second, girls are more likely to be referred by their parents for *status offenses* and female status offenders are more likely than male status offenders to be formally processed and receive harsher treatment for the same offenses (Beger and Hoffman 1998; Chesney-Lind 1973, 1977; Bishop and Frazier 1992; Conway and Bogdan 1977; Datesman and Aikin 1984; Datesman and Scarpitti 1980; Dembo et al. 1993; Kempf-Leonard et al. 1997; Krohn, Curry, and Nelson-Kilger 1983; Pope and Feyerherm 1982; Rhodes and Fischer 1993; Rosenbaum and Chesney-Lind 1994; Sarri 1983; Terry 1970).

Race also holds significant implications in the juvenile processing system. One study found that higher proportions of black than white youths reported that at least 90 percent of their offenses were status offenses, yet more whites were referred to court for status offenses. When it comes to status offenses, white females were most likely to be officially processed and black males were least likely to be officially processed (Datesman and Aikin 1984; Datesman and Scarpitti 1980). When comparing the treatment of black girls with white girls, Datesman and Scarpitti (1980) suggested that lower-class black families are matrifocal with an emphasis on self-sufficiency and a tendency to avoid dependence on males. This difference in socialization may lead to black females being more likely than white females to violate stereotypic gender roles and receive harsher treatment by the juvenile justice system. Once again, the ideal standard of femininity is established using a stereotypic image of middle-class, white females, which has perpetuated racist treatment. Research has consistently reported that females of color are given less chivalrous treatment than white females by both the juvenile and adult criminal processing systems (Chigwada-Bailey 1989; Kruttschnitt 1981; Spohn, Gruhl, and Welch 1987).

The same findings hold for class as poorer females are also given less chivalrous treatment than their wealthier counterparts (Kruttschnitt 1981; Worrall 1990). Notably, the harsher treatment of white female status offenders compared to African-American girls was attributed to greater expectations for white girls to conform to gender stereotypical roles (Datesman and Scarpitti 1980; Ferber 1998).

### **GENDER DIFFERENCES IN INSTITUTIONALIZING AND TREATING DELINQUENTS**

By reinforcing stereotypical gender roles and applying policies in sexist ways, correctional facilities for girls reinforced and rewarded appropriate gender role behavior (Gelsethorpe 1989). One study in Britain found that girls were encouraged to engage in activities that would enable them to become successful wives and mothers, for example, programs to encourage emotional development and cooking skills were aimed at girls, while the boys were encouraged to participate in sports (Gelsethorpe 1989).

In a review of statistics, Chesney-Lind and Shelden (1992) found that increasing numbers of girls were being held in public correctional facilities, typically for less serious offenses than boys. This study reported that commitments of girls to public training schools were down slightly, but the numbers of girls being held in private institutions (usually for status offenses) was up. Moreover, these institutions tend to reinforce gendered role behavior (Chesney-Lind and Shelden 1992; Gelsethorpe 1989). Young (1994) examined the influence of race on the history of juvenile institutions and found that, from their inception, juvenile institutions have been based on not just sexist themes, but racist themes as well. Similarly, Federle and Chesney-Lind (1992) reported that institutionalization practices were different for racial minorities in the juvenile justice system, in child welfare services, and in the

mental health systems. Whereas paternalism was seen as influencing the treatment of girls, racism shaped the treatment of racial minorities. Racial minorities were over-represented in child welfare placements, yet received less contact with social workers, fewer services, and were less likely to benefit from adoptive services. They also found preferential treatment for white children in mental health services (Federle and Chesney-Lind 1992). In focus groups in Missouri, delinquent girls identified that African-American girls were not treated as well as white girls and that this racial bias was so pervasive that it also had a negative effect on white youth with minority friends (Kempf-Leonard et al. 1997).

Although this profile does not fit every girl in every state, the “typical” female juvenile offender is a 15 to 16 year-old girl of color, who is a victim of physical, sexual, or emotional abuse, a status offender, living in poverty and instability, who has a history of family incarceration and a history of substance use and abuse (Greene et al. 1997). An examination of the characteristics of delinquent adolescent females leads to the conclusion that these girls and young women have unique circumstances and needs. Some of these characteristics include the higher incidence of victimization and the effects of gender as exhibited by self-image problems and dependency. Several other characteristics that differentiate the experience of adolescent female and males are mental health issues and the use of drugs and alcohol.

Feinman (1984) argued that attempts to improve the treatment of females will continue to fail as long as they are based on stereotypical gender roles rather than on the unique needs of this population. Although girls and boys have some of the same problems, there are some problems that have unique application to girls “in a gendered society” (Chesney-Lind and Shelden 1992). Some of those needs that have typically been ignored by the correctional system include the issues around adequate medical care -- physical health care (Acoca 1998; Austin, Bloom, and Donahue 1992; Belknap 1996b; Ingram-Fogel 1991), substance abuse treatment (Austin et al. 1992; Belknap 1996b; Marcus-Mendoza and Briody 1996; Morash et al. 1994; Owen and Bloom 1997; Snell and Morton 1994), pregnancy and dependent children (Austin et al. 1992; Belknap 1996b; Wooldredge and Masters 1993), mental health care (Belknap 1996b; Timmons-Mitchell et al. 1996), and a history of sexual and physical abuse (Austin et al 1992; Belknap 1996b; Belknap and Holsinger 1998; Chesney-Lind 1989; Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez 1983; Chesney-Lind and Shelden 1992; Dembo et al. 1992; Dembo et al. 1993; Gilfus 1992; Silbert and Pines 1981; Widom 1989a). Indeed, one area of major difference between the needs of girls and boys who have been incarcerated is in the area of health care.

## THE GENDER-SPECIFIC FOCUS

The juvenile justice system has not historically provided services which respond to the needs of girls (Hoyt and Scherer 1998). A gender-specific focus begins with the assumption that girls and boys have differences, so services provided should also be different. In the past, equality has been the goal in the treatment of delinquents. However, the goal of equality has not always been beneficial for girls. Equal treatment has often meant less adequate care for females, as treatment for males was used as the standard for equality and important gender differences were ignored (Cain 1989; Rafter 1993). At the same time, girls have not been offered true equality anyway: Their delinquent institutions typically offer far less educational, recreational and sports, and health programs than boys' institutions. Where special programs for girls have existed, they have often been to reinforce gender stereotypes and not be of great importance to the girls (such as hygiene and cosmetology types of classes). More recent attempts to determine gender equality in delinquency treatment suggest that it must be redefined as providing opportunities (which may be different) to girls and boys that mean the same to each gender (Albrecht 1997).

The recent movement toward creating a gender-specific focus for female delinquents and their unique needs has resulted in recommendations by feminist scholars as to ways to improve programs for girls. Gender-specific programming refers to unique program models and services that comprehensively address the special needs of a targeted gender group (Greene et al. 1997). In addition to the areas highlighted in the previous section, there are additional recommendations that have been made by scholars on how to improve programs for girls.

During the 1992 Reauthorization of the JJDP Act of 1974 (Section 223 [a] [8] of the JJDP Act, as modified in 1992), Congress listened to professionals who identified a need to address the gender-specific needs of girls. Challenge grants were authorized to address many areas and one of these areas was gender bias and the creation or improvement of gender-specific services. Ohio was one of 23 states that applied for money to study the needs of adolescent females in Ohio's juvenile processing system. The Office of Criminal Justice Services in Ohio assembled a workgroup to begin this initiative and to ultimately make recommendations for improving programs and services for girls. The Ohio workgroup decided to implement two phases of study. First, acknowledging the exploratory nature of the research questions regarding girls' needs and experiences, Phase I was designed for professionally conducted focus group with incarcerated girls and the professionals who work with them and resulted in a Report to the Governor of Ohio (Belknap, Dunn, and Holsinger 1997). Phase II of the Ohio Gender-Specific Work Group, reported in the remainder of this monograph, was carefully designed to implement a thorough analysis of gender differences and similarities in pathways to crime (e.g., childhood experiences) and the processing and treatment of delinquent youth. To this end, three sources of data were collected across Ohio: (1) detailed surveys for delinquent

youth, (2) detailed surveys of judges processing delinquent youth, and (3) detailed surveys of workers in treatment centers for delinquent youth. Although these surveys were primarily quantitative (closed-ended) they included some qualitative (open-ended) items, as well.

## **METHOD**

### The Measurement Instruments

The measurement instruments used in this study drew on Phase I of this study (the focus group [Belknap et al. 1997]) and the existing literature. The judicial and treatment center interviews were almost verbatim a replication of the instruments Kempf-Leonard et al. (1997) designed and used in the gender-specific study of Missouri. However, the youth surveys were far more comprehensive and are considered the most important aspect and contribution of this study. This survey draws on existing work (outlined briefly previously in this document) and the results of girls' focus groups in Ohio conducted through OCJS (Belknap, Dunn, and Holsinger 1997; Belknap, Holsinger, and Dunn 1997). Additionally, the survey includes measures of items contained in the Youthful Level of Service Inventory (YO-LSI), a dynamic risk/needs assessment instrument used to predict risk and classify offenders. The areas drawn from the YO-LSI covered in this assessment include criminal history, family circumstances and parenting, education and employment, peer relations, substance abuse, leisure/recreation, personality and behavior, and attitudes.

The 15 page survey includes four parts. The first section asks questions about the youths' demographic characteristics (e.g., age, education, race/ethnicity, family status, and so on), questions about abuse, and various other questions to be answered in a traditional Likert fashion (this section is nine pages). The second section asks questions about the offenses for which the youth is currently incarcerated as well as other self-reported behaviors (this section is about four pages). The third section (one page) asks for information about the youths' experiences in the juvenile justice system (both in processing and treatment/programming). The fourth and final section asks the youths to identify the services that they are currently receiving as well as those they would like to receive (this section is about two pages).

Dr. Patricia O'Reilly, a nationally recognized specialist on adolescent girls, reviewed the measurement instrument and offered suggestions that were then incorporated into it. Of particular concern was developing a measurement instrument that was compatible with the reading level and vernacular of the youth surveyed. For example, instead of using the word, "incarceration," the words, "been in jail or prison" were substituted. "Independent living" became "living on my own," and "Educationally, I have completed..." became "I have finished \_\_\_ grade." The stems of the Likert questions were shortened where possible. In general, the amount of reading was

reduced to enable the survey to be completed in the allotted time. The Youth Survey has also been examined by the University of Cincinnati's Human Subjects Committee and was approved on May 26, 1998. Finally, Dr. Alice Franklin Elder, Administrator, of Ohio Department of Youth Services Office of Research, reviewed and commented on the Holsinger and Belknap Youth Survey and endorsed its implementation (See letter in Appendix B).

A release form was used to verify voluntary participation from the youth, convey the goals of the survey to the youth, and assure them of confidentiality and anonymity in the study reports. Once signed by the youth, these sheets were collected so that the name of the respondent could in no way be linked to the completed survey.

A pilot test of the Youth Survey was conducted with eight youths at the Hamilton County Juvenile Detention Center. Four girls completed the survey within 35 minutes and offered numerous helpful suggestions. For example, they suggested types of drugs that needed to be added to the self-report drug use question, like over-the-counter medications. Additional reasons that youth might drop out of school besides the choices they were given were also added. Several minor suggestions were incorporated to make the survey questions clearer. Of the four boys that took the survey, only one completed the survey during the allotted 45 minutes. This factor suggested that a longer time period was necessary to complete the Youth Survey than originally anticipated. The most significant problem appeared to be a low reading level. Those administering the survey were made aware that help reading the survey would be needed throughout the entire time youth completed the survey. Several words were not understood by the boys. These words were removed from the survey and replaced with "easier" words. The boys expressed confusion with several questions which have since been clarified.

#### Data Collection on Institutionalized Delinquent Youth

In order to properly assess the gender differences and gender-specific needs of delinquent girls, the first population surveyed was girls currently incarcerated by the Department of Youth Services (DYS) in the state of Ohio. One DYS institution, Scioto Village, houses the majority of delinquent girls. At any given time, there are between 120 and 150 girls incarcerated at Scioto Village. In December of last year, 109 girls residing at Scioto Village completed the survey used in this project. Additionally, in March of 1999, surveys were completed by another 30 girls at Scioto Village, who were not incarcerated until after the first data collection date, in order to increase the sample size. The survey was also given to the small group of girls held at Freedom Center, a minimum security facility. All 24 girls being held completed the survey. Ultimately, 163 surveys were completed by incarcerated juvenile females. No surveys were excluded for being incomplete or for suspicion of untruthful responses. At Scioto Village, a small, but undetermined number of girls were unable to participate since they were being processed, having visitors, or receiving programming. In order to truly assess gender differences and gender-

specific needs, the survey was given to delinquent boys as well. In the state of Ohio, boys are held in one of ten DYS institutions. Using the most recent list of admissions for DYS institutions, the Department of Research at DYS assisted in drawing a random sample of 350 boys. From this sample, the placement of each boy selected was identified allowing for the survey to be administered at a particular institution (See Table 1 for the distribution of facilities from which the boys were drawn). The boys' facilities were rarely able to make every selected boy available to complete the survey. However, 83 percent of the sampled boys filled out a survey. Surveys were excluded from the sample for one of two reasons. Either they were deemed incomplete for having six or more blank pages, or, they were excluded for containing many untruthful responses (for example, "I killed a bus full of nuns"). Once these exclusions were made, the response rate of boys who completed a survey was 89 percent.

The survey distribution method involved informing the sampled youth what the survey was attempting to address and how their participation would help to improve the processing and treatment of delinquent youth in the juvenile justice system. It was noted that participation was voluntary, that youth could choose not to take part in the study, could quit at any time, and could choose to not answer any questions that made them uncomfortable. One method shown to improve the accuracy of self-reporting was to provide assurances to respondents that the surveys are anonymous and confidential (Harrison 1995, Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weiss 1981). Thus, youth were instructed not to put their names or any identification numbers on their surveys.

The youth were informed that the survey was lengthy, taking approximately 60 minutes to complete. Overall, the survey took a longer time to be completed by the boys than the girls. The majority of the boys finished after an hour and a half, with a very few requiring up to two hours. The majority of the girls, on the other hand, were finished in 45 minutes, with a handful requiring an additional 20 or 30 minutes to finish. In almost every facility, the staff or administrator allowed us to exceed the one hour time period (by up to one hour) in order to allow those still taking the survey to finish. Refreshments were given to most of the girls participating, but the boys institutions did not allow us to provide refreshments to the boys.

The persons distributing the survey were either the author of this proposal or one of two trained graduate assistants who were available for questions while the survey was being taken. One of the graduate students was male, and he was present each time the survey was administered to boys. This decision was made to acknowledge that some boys might be more comfortable relating to a male due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions. Similarly, only female researchers administered the survey to the girls. There was usually one researcher present for every twenty respondents. This was necessary since those distributing the survey, spent the entire time answering questions respondents had, providing assistance reading the survey, or actually reading the whole survey to an

illiterate respondent. Sometimes those needing assistance reading identified themselves, and sometimes they were identified by the staff or the researcher. Overall, the boys had more questions and required more assistance in completing the survey than the girls. Those distributing the surveys were also able to refer any youth upset by the survey to a counselor, although this situation did not occur during any of the data collection.

Even with promised confidentiality, the boys in particular expressed concern about who would have access to the surveys and how the information would be used. For example, one boy asked, “What is this survey ‘really’ about?” Once they were reassured that the surveys were leaving with us and would only be seen by us, they usually were willing to comply.

There was a tremendous amount of variety in how the correctional staff responded to the survey and to our presence in the institution. They ranged from helpful and positive to unprepared and resentful. For example, one boys’ institution was ill prepared for the survey to take place, and it became clear that the youth were not prepared or expected by the staff to fill out the surveys. Another group of staff communicated to the respondents that they were expected to fill out the survey, be courteous to us, and respond truthfully. It was clear that the institution’s expectation of the youths’ performance largely impacted their willingness to participate in the survey.

Staff varied tremendously in how they controlled the environment. Some were very strict about the respondents not talking, while other times, staff had to be asked by the researchers to help control the amount of disturbances. In the boys’ institutions in particular, once the survey was completed, the youth who were done would begin talking and this became distracting to those still working on the survey. As the staff started to take the youth away who were finished, the youth still working on the survey had the tendency to quit so that they could leave with the others. This situation helps to explain the lower response rate from the male participants.

Although we encouraged questions to come directly to us, on several occasions the youth would address their questions to staff who were usually helpful in responding to them. We encouraged staff not to look at the survey while the youth were taking the survey, but several times this advice was disregarded. In fact, the disrespect displayed toward the youth by staff at several institutions was alarming.

Overall, we were impressed with the cooperation of the youth. Many seemed to enjoy taking the survey and in some cases they found it to be therapeutic. One girl wanted a copy of her completed survey to give to her judge since she felt like it provided a holistic picture of who she was and why she was involved in the criminal justice system. Although requested not to put their names on the survey, some youths did along with an offer to be of further assistance if needed. There were many requests made for how to spell words. Even when youth were assured that spelling did not have to be correct, they would respond as one boy did, “But I want it to be right for this.”

### Sampling and Data Collection from Juvenile Judges and Delinquent Treatment Centers

*Juvenile Judges.* From the State of Ohio's directory of judges, we surveyed one judge from each county (88 counties) in Ohio. In the majority of counties, there was only one judge presiding over the County's juvenile division. Thus, in these instances, the county's only judge was mailed a judge's survey. In the larger counties, however, there were several judges presiding over juvenile cases. When this occurred, we randomly selected one judge from that county's directory. In the end, 88 judges were surveyed, 2 judges declined to participate (one judge wrote us that he/she did not complete surveys, and a second judge called us because he/she was new to the court and he/she did not feel comfortable completing the survey), and 59 surveys were returned to us.

Unless a judge returned her or his survey and indicated who she or he was, every judge received three mailings. First, the judges were mailed an introductory letter describing to them the purpose of this study. This letter was accompanied with a survey and a self-addressed stamped envelope, to be returned to the University of Cincinnati. Second, approximately two weeks later, the judges were mailed a follow-up letter requesting that they complete the survey, if they had not already done so. Third, approximately one month later, the State of Ohio mailed each judge a second survey and a letter from the Director encouraging judges to participate in the survey.

*Residential Treatment Officials.* Unfortunately, the State of Ohio does not have a specific listing of residential treatment centers that service girls. If a facility receives funds from the State, they are listed in a general book, but the book does not identify whether the facility accepts girls, boys, or both. As a result, it became difficult to identify the residential treatment centers that serviced girls. In order to circumvent this problem, we solicited the names of centers through two methods. First, as we received the judge's surveys, we recorded the names of the treatment centers that were identified by the judges. Second, we called each juvenile court to ask for at least three names of the residential treatment centers that they used to service girls. Most commonly, each court used only one or two centers. From both of these actions, we then called all of the reported and listed centers to verify that they accepted girls (several did not), and we asked for the name of the person in charge of the treatment of delinquent girls. In total, we secured names of 46 facilities. Although we attempted to locate all of the centers that service girls, we may have missed some centers, given that we could not reference a previously compiled list of residential treatment centers for girls.

After we identified the residential treatment centers, all centers received four mailings. First, we mailed the centers an introductory letter describing to them the purpose of this research and asking them to complete the survey, if they met our definition of a residential treatment center. This survey was accompanied by a self-addressed

stamped envelope, which was to be returned to the University of Cincinnati. The following statement was our definition of a residential treatment center.

A facility that houses delinquent girls on either a semi-permanent or permanent bases; the girls may be sent to your facility from either an adjudication or a court order. Specifically, we are in need of surveying facilities that house delinquent girls, regardless of the amount of time, and regardless of how transient the population may be (e.g., a group home that periodically receives delinquent girls in between placements at home, as well as long-term DYS facilities).

If they did not meet our definition of a residential treatment center, we requested that they return the survey to us, indicating that the survey was not applicable to them, so that we could remove their names from our total sample size (it was important to us that they notify us if they were not applicable for the survey because we wanted to delineate between facilities that did not return their surveys, and facilities that did not return their surveys because the surveys were not applicable to them).

After the first mailing, a second mailing occurred approximately two weeks later. At this time, we mailed the centers a follow-up letter requesting that they return their surveys to us, if they had not already done so. Approximately two weeks after the second mailing, we mailed the treatment centers a second survey and a brief letter asking them to complete the survey, again, if they had not already done so. Finally, approximately one month after the third mailing, the State of Ohio mailed the treatment centers a letter encouraging them to complete the survey.

Through our process of providing the workers with our definition of a residential treatment center (i.e., not a “foster home”) and calling the courts and reviewing the judge’s surveys, we learned that many courts rely heavily upon foster care to place delinquent girls. Calling the institutions to verify that they accepted girls, and calling the institutions to verify that they were located in the State of Ohio (one facility was located in a neighboring State), our sample size decreased to 37. Of the 37 surveys that were mailed, 17 (45.9 percent) surveys were returned to us.

### **DELINQUENT YOUTH SURVEY FINDINGS**

Table 1 provides the distribution of the youth respondents by county. Of the 88 counties in Ohio, youth from 58 of those counties were represented in the sample. The greatest percentage of respondents came from the two major metropolitan cities of Cleveland (18.9 percent), and Cincinnati (13.7 percent). The counties containing the cities of Dayton, Akron, Columbus, and Toledo, made up 30.1 percent of the sample. The remaining 37.3 percent of the sample is made up of respondents from more rural counties (although there are certainly respondents from the more urban counties living in rural communities).

## Demographic Characteristics

The sample demographics are in Table 2. The sample in this study was 444 youth of which 163 (36.7 percent) were girls and 281 (63.3 percent) were boys. Almost half of the sample was White and about two-fifths African-American, with the remaining 15 percent of the sample describing themselves as Native American, Hispanic, Puerto Rican, Spanish, Asian South African, or Bi-Racial. The sample ranged in age from 12 to 20 years old with a mean age of 16.35 years old. Less than 3 percent of the sample identified as homosexual, about one-tenth as bisexual, and the vast majority (87 percent) as heterosexual. Girls were more likely than boys to identify as homosexual (4.6 percent and 2.7 percent, respectively) and bisexual (22.4 percent and 10.6 percent, respectively) ( $\chi^2=39.85$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). It is difficult to assess whether this difference is due to actual gender differences in sexual orientation, or whether the males were less honest about their sexual orientation. The Youth Survey measured social economic status three ways: the identification of class status, the number of poor people in the neighborhood, and whether the family received welfare. Regarding class identification, one-tenth of the sample identified themselves as “poor,” over one-quarter as “working class,” about half as “middle-class,” and one-tenth as “upper-class.” Using this variable alone to gauge social class is problematic since it clearly inflates the economic status of the youth in the juvenile justice system. A little over two-fifths of the sample described their neighborhoods as having “few poor people,” another two-fifths as “a medium number of poor people,” with the remaining 16 percent describing their neighborhoods as “lots of poor people.” By examining whether a respondent’s family received public assistance or welfare, a more accurate picture of social class was obtained. Approximately one in five of the respondents were unsure if their family received welfare, and over two-fifths reported that their family did receive welfare. Just over one-third of the respondents reported that their family did not receive some type of assistance. To determine how this variable would impact reported economic status, all who indicated that their family received welfare were re-coded into the “poor” category. This produced a recalculated economic status where almost 46 percent were now classified as “poor,” as opposed to the original one-tenth of the sample in the poor category. “Working- class” and “middle-class” were deflated to just over one-tenth and one-third respectively. Meanwhile, “upper-class” dropped slightly to almost nine percent.

Now turning to gender differences in the demographic characteristics, there were no significant differences between the boys and girls on any of the four measures of socioeconomic status or regarding racial/ethnic identity. For age, however, there were significant gender differences. Specifically, almost one-third of the girls were age 15 or younger, while only about one-fifth of boys were in this youngest age group. Over one-fifth of the boys were in the “oldest” age group, 18 to 20 years old, while only a little over one-tenth of girls were in this category. The mean age of the boys (16.6 years) was significantly older than that of the girls (15.9 years) ( $t = 4.77$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

### Youths' Relationship, Pregnancy and Parenthood Characteristics

Table 3 describes the intimate relationship characteristics of the youth in terms of their relationship status, the age-difference between them and their “partners” (boyfriends, girlfriends, husbands, or wives), their parenthood status, and the girls’ reproductive histories. Regarding significant differences in gender based on intimate relationship characteristics, boys and girls were indistinguishable in terms of relationship status (whether they were single, married, and so on). Not surprisingly, girls tended to be far more likely than boys to be involved with partners older than themselves. On the average, boys were involved with partners just under one year older than themselves while girls were involved with partners 3.5 years older than themselves ( $t=-8.40$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

Twenty-nine percent of the boys reported that they had fathered children and almost 14 percent of the girls reported giving birth ( $\chi^2=12.78$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). There were significant gender differences in where the respondent reported the children were living ( $\chi^2=29.39$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). *Boys were three times as likely as girls to report that the child(ren) lives with the other parent and girls were almost 10 times as likely as boys to report that the child lived with someone other than one of the child’s parents.* Indeed almost two-thirds of the girls and only 7 percent of the boys reported their children living in these “other” placements, such as another family member, the Department of Health Services, foster care, or the child was formally placed in adoption.

Several questions were asked that were only applicable to the girls about their histories regarding pregnancies, miscarriages, and abortions. Almost two-thirds of the girls surveyed reported never having been pregnant. About one-fifth of the girls had been pregnant once before and 9 percent had been pregnant twice before. Nine of the girls reported three or more pregnancies. Over one-quarter of the girls reported that they had experienced a miscarriage. Of the 158 girls responding to the question addressing abortion rates, 9 reported an abortion (5.7 percent).

### Educational Background

Table 4 describes the youths’ general educational background. Notably, the only significant differences between the boys and girls regarding their educational backgrounds was that the boys tended to have completed higher grades than the girls, but this may be due to the fact that they were generally older than the girls. About two-thirds had completed seventh to ninth grade and about one-third had completed 10 -12 grade. Almost three-quarters were attending school prior to their incarceration. Seventy percent attended regular classes, about one-quarter attended any special education classes, and about 5 percent attended vocational classes only. There were no gender differences in the youths’ reported overall rating of their educational experience (about half rated it as “good,” about one-third as “adequate,” and only about one in eight as “poor”), report card grades, how frequently they were in trouble in school (with both reporting significant levels of being in trouble), how well they got along with their

fellow students (generally reporting fairly congenial relationships) and their teachers (a little less favorably, but still overwhelmingly positive), and their educational expectations (about one-third of both sexes expected to have post-high school experiences and about two-fifths expected to graduate from college). There were no gender differences reported in observing or experiencing racism, but notably, about four-fifths of the youth reported observing racism and half reported experiencing it. A little over one-quarter of the sample reported “never” having skipped school, while over one-third reported skipping on a daily basis. Thirteen percent reported skipping school on a monthly basis while almost double that reported skipping on a weekly basis. About half of the sample dropped out or quit school.

Almost one-quarter of the sample reported having been suspended from school, while slightly fewer reported being expelled from school (22 percent). About 13 percent of the sample reported dropping out or being expelled when they were twelve years old or younger, half the sample reported dropping out or being expelled when they were 13 to 15 years old, and over one-third of the sample reported dropping out/expulsion when they were between the ages of 16 and 18. The mean age for dropping out of school was 14.5 years old. Two-thirds of the youth reported having repeated a school grade, with seventh to ninth grades appearing as the grades delinquent youth are most at risk of repeating (36 percent reported this). One-fifth of the youth reported repeating a grade between kindergarten and third grade, 15 percent repeating fourth, fifth or sixth grade, and about 3 percent repeating tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades.

Table 5 presents the youths’ self-reported reasons for dropping out of or quitting school. (For obvious reasons, these analyses were only conducted on youth who reported dropping out or quitting.) Of the twelve reasons, there were gender differences in five. Surprisingly, girls and boys were equally likely (about 8 percent) to report dropping out of school for “pregnancy-related” reasons, trouble with the law (about two-thirds of both boys and girls), and conflict with teachers (about one-quarter of both boys and girls). However, girls and boys were also equally likely to provide the following reasons for dropping out of or quitting school: their family moved a lot (about 9 percent of each sex), had to work to help family earn money (about 7 percent), transportation problems (fewer than 5 percent), and health problems (fewer than 2 percent).

Girls (42 percent) were more than twice as likely as boys (19 percent) to report quitting/dropping out because they could not keep up at school ( $\chi^2=9.32, p\leq.01$ ), because they (the youth) had left home (48 percent of girls, 22 percent of boys,  $\chi^2=11.80, p\leq.001$ ), and because “no one cared if I learned or attended” (12 percent of girls, 4 percent of boys,  $\chi^2=4.20, p\leq.05$ ). Girls (52 percent) were also more likely than boys (34 percent) to report quitting school because they were “bored” ( $\chi^2=5.15, p\leq.05$ ), and because “nobody liked me at school” (12 percent of girls, 3 percent of boys,  $\chi^2=4.20, p\leq.05$ ).

### Childhood Background: Parents, Punishment, and Abuse

Table 6 presents the youths' self-reported information about their parents. Again, although the gender differences were uncommon (five significant differences out of the twenty variables in the table), they are potentially important. Forty-five percent of the youth reported that their parents were divorced and, on average, the divorce took place when the youth were six years old. Girls were more likely than boys to report desertion by a parent, with over half of the girls and just under two-fifths of the boys experiencing this type of parental neglect ( $\chi^2=11.83$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls were also more likely than boys to report having a family member go to a mental hospital ( $\chi^2=16.48$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), although there were no gender differences if that family member was a parent. Overall, seven percent of the sample experienced having a parent in a mental institution. A surprisingly and disturbingly large percentage of this youthful sample reported the death of a parent. One in ten boys and 12 percent of girls experienced the loss of a parent. Slightly over half of the girls and boys who reported the death of a parent indicated that the death was by murder, drugs, suicide, accident, or AIDS.

Youth were asked whether they were the first person to be incarcerated in their family or if others in their family had been to jail or prison. One-fifth of the sample, 16 percent of the girls and 22 percent of the boys, reported being the first incarcerated. (This gender difference was not significant.) The remaining four-fifths reported that a parent, sibling, grandparent, aunt or uncle had been incarcerated. Of that four-fifths, 65 percent reported that it was a parent who was incarcerated.

Most youth (89 percent) report being raised by at least one parent if not both, but many more girls than boys reported that they were raised by persons other than a parent ( $\chi^2=12.33$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). When asked who they were raised by, respondents were given the opportunity to circle all the choices that applied, and almost half of the girls indicated someone besides their parent(s) had helped to raise them. Only 30 percent of the boys reported being raised by someone other than a parent. The youth were also asked who they were living with prior to their incarceration. Although fewer girls (64 percent) than boys (72 percent) reported living with their parents and more girls (32 percent) than boys (24 percent) reported living with persons other than their parents, the differences were not statistically significant.

To determine the alcohol and drug use that the youth were exposed to growing up, they were asked to report on the alcohol and drug use of the adult they lived with who used the substance the most. With no significant gender differences, just under two-fifth of girls and boys reported that alcohol use of that adult who used the most was "sometimes" or "frequent" (as opposed to "never" or "seldom"). Almost one-quarter of the youth reported "sometimes" or "frequent" drug use by the adult they lived with. When asked whether they felt like the adults they

lived with provided for their basic needs, 88 percent of the sample agreed, with the remaining 12 percent disagreeing. Over one-fifth of the juveniles reported feeling that the adults they lived with did not like them. An important gender difference was that girls (14 percent) were more than twice as likely as boys (6 percent) to indicate that they would rather be “here” (in the correctional institution) than at home, suggesting significantly worse experiences for delinquent girls compared to delinquent boys in their homes.

Finally, the youth were asked to rate their relationship with their parents. Boys and girls rated their relationship with their father similarly. Twenty-eight percent of the youth indicated that they did not have a relationship with their father. The other responses indicated that the relationship was either “poor” (13.3 percent), “OK” (29 percent), or “great” (29 percent). However, when it came to rating their relationship with their mother, the responses indicated gender difference, specifically a more negative relationship between girls and their mothers ( $\chi^2=12.55, p\leq.01$ ). About one in ten girls reported having no relationship with their mother, while 7 percent of boys reported no relationship. Boys and girls reported similar rates of a “poor” relationship with their mothers, but in the category of “OK” and “great” the gender differences become more apparent ( $\chi^2=12.55, p\leq .01$ ). Over one-quarter of boys reported that their relationship with their mother was “OK,” while more girls (over two-fifths) reported their relationships with their mothers as “OK.” Three-fifths of boys reported a “great” relationship with their mothers, while just over two-fifths of the girls classified their relationship this way.

Table 7 reports the results of parental control and punishment reported by the youth. All questions were phrased to refer to one or both parents or guardian(s). Regarding parental supervision, girls and boys reported similar experiences. When asked if their parents knew where they were when they were not in school, just under one-third responded “never,” almost two-fifths responded “sometimes,” one-sixth reported “usually,” and another one-sixth reported “always.” Half of the youth indicated that it was always important for her or his parents to know where they were at all times. The responses of “usually” and “sometimes” made up about two-fifths of the sample with only 9 percent responding “never.” The Youth Survey inquired if it was important for parents to know who the respondents’ friends are; about one-third reported “always,” over one-fifth reported “usually,” over one-quarter reported “sometimes,” and over one-sixth reported “never.” To ascertain if parents enforced a curfew, the youth were asked if their parent(s) made sure they were home by a certain time at night. Half indicated that this was “sometimes” or “usually” true, over one-third said this was “always” true, and one-sixth said this was “never” true. Half of the sampled youth noted that they were always expected to call home if they were going to be late or if going someplace different than planned. Thirty-seven percent indicated that this was sometimes or usually the arrangement, while 13 percent reported that they were never expected to call under these circumstances. Just over

half of the youth responded that their parent(s) always or usually punish them if they break the rules, and just under half reported that their parents sometimes or never punish them for breaking rules.

When the youth reported on their experiences and perceptions about their parents, there were significant gender differences reported. One question reads, “I really go to the place or activity that I tell my parent or guardian I am.” Girls (20 percent) were more likely than boys (12 percent) to indicate that they do *not* tell their parents where they are going. In contrast, almost one-fifth of the boys indicated that they always informed their parents where they were, versus 12 percent of the girls ( $\chi^2=7.85$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Another statement that generated a significant difference between girls and boys was, “My parent(s) or guardian have a hard time controlling my behavior” ( $\chi^2=29.47$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Half of the girls reported that this statement was “always” or “usually” true while only 28 percent of the boys responded this way. Thirty-seven percent of the girls and 41 percent of the boys reported that parents “sometimes” had difficulty controlling their behavior. Finally, 12 percent of the girls and 31 percent of the boys reported that parents “never” had difficulty maintaining parental control.

Girls were more likely than boys to report that punishment from parents was ineffective ( $\chi^2=9.16$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). In response to the statement, “When my parent(s) or guardian punishes me it works and I behave better,” 38 percent of girls reported that this is “never” the case while only 26 percent of boys reported this. The response of “sometimes” was quite similar for girls and boys, about 40 percent. Responding that punishment usually works, 15 percent of girls, contrasted with 24 percent of boys fell into this category. Only about 8 percent of boys and girls reported that punishment was “always” effective in controlling their behavior.

Finally, in regards to the *main* ways the youth are disciplined, 11 percent reported that they are not punished, 10 percent reported they are talked to, 15 percent reported they were screamed or yelled at, 41 percent reported that privileges were taken away or they were grounded, and 24 percent noted that they were physically punished. There were no significant gender differences on this variable: the most common method of punishment received while growing up.

Table 8 reflects the findings from the youths’ self-reported victimization/abuse histories. *Notably, this table on childhood abuse and victimization involves the most consistent gender differences of any table/topic in this study: girls report far more abuse and more serious abuse histories than boys, who themselves report significantly abusive pasts.* First, regarding verbal abuse, two-thirds of the girls and slightly over one-half of the boys reported experiencing verbal abuse from a family member ( $\chi^2=5.60$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). When examining verbal abuse which came from those other than a family member (excluding a parent, step-parent or sibling, but including a spouse or boy/girlfriend), over half of the girls reported such abuse compared to one-third of the boys ( $\chi^2=20.83$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

Physical abuse included a wide range of behaviors: spanking or slapping, pushing or grabbing, having something thrown at you, kicking or hitting, beating, choking, burning or having weapons used or threatened to be used against you. A high rate of youth, 68 percent, reported physical abuse from a family member, but once again the rate was even higher for girls (75 percent) than for boys (63 percent) ( $\chi^2=6.23, p\leq.05$ ). The gender differences became more noticeable when reported physical abuse from others was examined. Sixty-five percent of the girls and just over one-third of boys reported physical abuse from others ( $\chi^2=34.20, p\leq.001$ ). When asked if the physical abuse was repeated over time, over three-fifths of the girls, compared to over two-fifths of the boys, responded, “yes” ( $\chi^2=14.45, p\leq.001$ ). “Unwanted sexual contact” was used to measure all types of sexual abuse. First, when looking at sexual abuse from “anyone,” the findings indicate that almost three-fifths of the girls and under one-fifth of the boys experienced some type of sexual abuse ( $\chi^2=75.73, p\leq.001$ ). Sexual abuse from a family member was reported by nearly one-quarter of the girls and less than 9 percent of the boys (17.45,  $p\leq.001$ ). Sexual abuse from “others” was reported by over half of the girls compared to 14 percent of the boys ( $\chi^2=77.10, p\leq.001$ ). As with physical abuse, sexual abuse was more likely to be repeated over time for the girls. Almost half of the girls reported repeated unwanted sexual contacts while “only” 14 percent of the boys indicated ongoing sexual abuse ( $\chi^2=42.70, p\leq.001$ ). On average, girls were more likely to experience a greater number of sexual abusers compared to boys. Including all respondents (whether reporting abuse or not), the average number of abusers for girls was just over one, while the average number for boys was 0.3. Almost 12 percent of girls reported three or more sexual abusers compared to less than 3 percent of boys ( $\chi^2=8.55, p\leq.001$ ). The youth were asked to indicate if they felt any of the abuse they experienced was related to them getting into trouble. Over three-fifths of girls reported that this was the case, while two-fifths of the boys reported such a connection ( $\chi^2=13.05, p\leq.001$ ).

Finally, the youth were asked if they had witnessed any family members being verbally, physically, or sexually abused by another family member. The question was asked in such a way the respondent could fill in the blanks indicating which family members were involved. Well over half of the girls (56 percent), compared to two-fifths of the boys, reported witnessing verbal abuse within their family, making this another significant gender difference ( $\chi^2=7.93, p\leq.01$ ). Almost half the girls and almost one-third of the boys reported witnessing physical abuse, yet another gender difference regarding abuse ( $\chi^2=15.04, p\leq.001$ ). The numbers were quite a bit lower, but still statistically significant, regarding witnessing sexual abuse. Twelve percent of the girls and half that many boys reported witnessing sexual abuse of family member ( $\chi^2=5.23, p\leq.05$ ). It is important to remember that these statistics do not include abuse in which the respondent was directly involved (rather, abuse the respondent “only” witnessed). It is worth noting that although the response rate was very high for the abuse questions mentioned above, the four

questions that followed; whether the abuse, physical and sexual, was repeated over time, whether the abuse lead to getting into trouble, and several fill in the blank questions about witnessing abuse were more frequently skipped over with a response rate ranging from 70 to 85 percent.

### Role Models, Peers, and Recreation

Girls' and boys' responses to questions about their role models, peers, and recreation were almost identical (see Table 9). Over four-fifths of both sexes reported that they had positive role models. At the same time, about one-quarter of the youth noted that they were currently gang members, with no gender differences in reporting this. Eight-four percent indicated that they had friends who were involved in crime, yet 67 percent also reported that they have friends who always stay out of trouble. The vast majority of girls and boys (93 percent) reported that they have friends who use drugs and alcohol. Thus, regarding peers, there were no significant gender differences.

When asked if they were part of any clubs, organizations, or sports before coming to the correctional facility, about half indicated that they were active in this regard. However, boys were more likely to participate in these activities (56 percent) than girls (45 percent) ( $\chi^2=4.25, p\leq.05$ ). Three-fifths of the respondents reported that before their incarceration they had a lot of time where they had nothing to do, and about nine-tenths reported having hobbies or interests. Regarding these measure of recreation, girls and boys did not differ significantly.

### Self-Esteem Factors

A considerable amount of research suggests that girls are challenged more than boys in maintaining a positive self-esteem. The findings from this study support that. Ten statements written with Likert responses formed the measures of self-esteem. In addition, the youth were asked to rate themselves as to how "cool" they perceive themselves. Found in Table 10, for 6 of the 11 self-esteem statements, girls' and boys' responses were significantly different. First we will address the self-esteem responses without gender differences. Girls and boys were equally likely to view themselves as a person of worth (86 percent), having good qualities (93 percent), doing things as well as most people (90 percent)<sup>3</sup>, being satisfied with themselves (about three-quarters), and ranking their own "coolness" levels (both sexes averaged about 7.6 on a scale of 10 with 10 being "the coolest").

Second, we report the gender differences in the youths' reported self-esteem items. Girls (21 percent) were significantly more likely to than boys (12 percent) to agree with the statement, "All in all, I feel that I am a failure" ( $\chi^2=5.93, p\leq.05$ ). Girls (28 percent) were more likely than boys (20 percent) to agree with the statement, "I do not

---

<sup>3</sup>Interestingly, some of the boys questioned whether this statement was meant to apply to drug use and criminal abilities.

have much to be proud of” ( $\chi^2=3.91$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Girls (72 percent) were much more likely than boys (56 percent) to agree with the statement that they wished they could have more respect for themselves ( $\chi^2=11.00$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (51 percent) were more likely than boys (41 percent) to agree with the statement “I feel useless at times” ( $\chi^2=4.22$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). And finally, girls (45 percent) were far more likely than boys (29 percent) to agree with the statement “At times I think I am no good at all” ( $\chi^2=11.94$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Thus, for all of these gender differences in self-esteem, girls’ self-esteem was worse than boys’.

### Moral Judgement Statements

Borrowing from Artz (1998), six statements were used to assess the moral judgements of the youth to examine gender differences (see Table 11). Only one of the statements produced significant differences between girl and boys: “If someone has something you really want, it’s OK to make them give it to you.” Girls, at 22 percent, were more inclined to agree with this statement than boys (15 percent) ( $\chi^2=4.02$ ,  $p\leq 0.5$ ). When asked if was “OK” to punch or hit someone when having an argument, over one-fifth of the youth agreed. Responding to the statement, “Fighting is a good way to defend your friends,” 30 percent of the youth responded positively. Using threats to get what you want was deemed acceptable by half that many. Eighteen percent agreed that it was “OK” to damage buildings and property as a way of getting even and 17 percent concurred that if you don’t like your teacher, it is “OK” to act up in school. Interestingly, these statements were not useful to distinguish those convicted of violent offenses or of assault, as expected.

### Personality and Attitudes

The personality and attitude variable analysis can be found in Table 12. The first group of questions discussed examined how youth deal with anger and frustration. This was the component of personality and attitudes that was most illuminating in regard to gender differences. While most boys and girls admitted that they become easily frustrated, girls (77 percent) were more likely than boys (61 percent) to report that they lose their patience easily ( $\chi^2=11.64$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (67 percent) were also more likely than boys (45 percent) to report losing control when they were angry ( $\chi^2=20.40$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (45 percent) were also more likely than boys (36 percent) to report that when they were angry they start fights with others ( $\chi^2=9.52$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Girls (75 percent) were far more likely than boys (59 percent) to report yelling when they are angry ( $\chi^2=25.07$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). There were no gender differences in the youths reports of feeling they were better than most other people they knew (29 percent), having trouble concentrating (about three-quarters), wanting to make changes in their lives so that they do not get into trouble (97 percent), willingness to follow advice from authorities (92 percent), and concern for others (the majority of both youth reporting the concern as “frequent” or “sometimes”). Surprisingly, then, the gender differences in self-esteem

mostly had to do with girls reporting a greater likelihood than boys of being easily frustrated, angered and losing control. It is hard to assess whether they really are more likely to exhibit these behaviors, or whether they are due to gender differences in society that views girls' loss of control, anger and frustration as more problematic than boys. On the other hand, girls have plenty to be angry and frustrated about given the abusive histories that they reported.

### Mental Health

In addition to abuse histories and self esteem, another area that showed profound gender differences was that of mental health, as seen in Table 13. Girls (52 percent) were almost twice as likely as boys (29 percent) to report thinking about suicide ( $\chi^2=23.34$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), and over twice as likely as boys to report attempting suicide (46 percent of girls and 19 percent of boys,  $\chi^2=36.19$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (54 percent) were one and one-half times as likely as boys (32 percent) to report purposely harming themselves, and more than twice as likely to report cutting or burning themselves (43 percent of girls, 18 percent of boys,  $\chi^2=30.92$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). The only one of the 5 variables assessing mental health that showed no gender differences was reported levels of sadness. On a scale of 1 to 10 (with 10 being the saddest), both sexes reported an average of 5. Thus, similar to the youths' reported abuse histories, for their reports of mental health levels, the gender differences, were common, pronounced, and always reporting girls as "worse off" than boys. These findings on mental health and girls likelihood of turning their anger towards themselves either through suicide thoughts and attempts or through physical harming of themselves are consistent with prior research, but are also somewhat ironic given the findings from above of girls higher rates of self-reported frustration, anger, and losing control.

### Drug and Alcohol Use

Drug and alcohol use items examined a number of illegal and legal substances, as seen in Table 14. Beginning with the substance of greatest use to the substance least used, reported use and age of first use are reported in this section. The most commonly used drug was marijuana, with 91 percent of all youth reporting that they have used it. Most youth reported that they first used this substance, on average, at age 12.

The next most commonly used substance was alcohol, with 87 percent of the youth reporting alcohol use. The mean age reported for alcohol use was slightly lower, with the youth first using it towards the end of their eleventh year. About 29 percent reported cocaine use, typically beginning at about age 14. Twenty seven percent reported LSD use, with first use usually occurring just prior to age 14. Just over a quarter of the youth report using prescription drugs. The first use of this type of drug most typically occurred during the latter half of the twelfth year. One-quarter of the respondents reported using amphetamines, with first use generally at age 13. Almost a quarter of the youth reported using barbiturates at this age as well. One-quarter also used inhalants, but use was more likely to begin at a slightly younger age, when the youth were 12.

The next largest category was the use of some type of over-the-counter medication (19 percent), with first use typically starting just prior to the youth turning 12. A newer drug use reported by these youth was embalming fluid. Most commonly, the youth reported using this drug by dipping cigarettes in embalming fluid, allowing them to dry, and smoking them. Approximately one-sixth of the respondents reported this drug use, with an older average age reported for the initial use, at age 14. PCP and crack were reported to be used by 12 percent of the youth. However, the age for first use of these drugs differed. The average age for first PCP use was 13 and the average age for first crack use was 14. The most infrequently used drug was heroin, with 7 percent reporting use and drug initiation averaging at age 14. Finally, less than 4 percent of the sample reported that they did not use any of these substances.

Drug use and age of first drug use differed significantly between girls and boys for several drugs. More girls reported using cocaine, prescription drugs, and crack (all significant at  $p \leq .001$ ), heroin ( $p \leq .01$ ), inhalants, and PCP (both significant at  $p \leq .05$ ). Regarding age of first use, girls were more likely to begin using cocaine and crack before boys. While cocaine use began for boys at the end of their 14th year, use of this drug began a full year earlier for girls ( $t=2.97$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). Crack use began at the end of the 13th year for girls, but not until age 15 for boys ( $t=2.32$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

The respondents had the opportunity to indicate on the Youth Survey the effects, including what sorts of problems they experienced, due to their use of alcohol and drugs, reported in Table 16. The youth were asked whether drug and alcohol use preceded them getting into trouble or if once they started getting into trouble, they started using. There was also a category for respondents who reported that these two events occurred at approximately the same time. Although the sample was split quite evenly between these three choices, there were significant gender differences. More girls (71 percent) indicated that drug and alcohol use came at the same time or prior to them getting into trouble, while two-fifths of the boys were more likely to have getting into trouble precede their substance use ( $\chi^2=11.72$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). In general, girls seemed to experience more problems related to drugs and alcohol than boys. For example, over three-fifths of the girls reported being addicted to a substance while two-fifths of the boys reported such an addiction. Yet, there were no gender differences regarding reported treatment: Three-fifths of the youth reported that they have received some type of treatment in the past for drug or alcohol problems.

Consistent with the finding about addiction, almost two-fifths of the girls, compared to less than one-quarter of the boys, reported experiencing withdrawal symptoms ( $\chi^2=8.91$ ,  $p \leq .01$ ). There were two other significant differences between girls and boys regarding problems related to use. Girls were more likely to report that use led to being sexually abused (26 percent) than boys (7 percent) ( $\chi^2=28.46$ ,  $p \leq .001$ ). Also more than three-fifths of the girls

experienced “getting into more trouble with “family and friends” as a result of chemical use, while only half of the boys reported this experience ( $\chi^2=5.67, p\leq.05$ ). The rest of the problems reported as associated to chemical use did not produce gender differences. The greatest problem resulting from use for all youth was that use led to missing school (58 percent) and getting into trouble with the police (57 percent). Just over half of the youth reported the following problems: “use led to losing my temper,” “use led to doing poorly in school,” and “use led to physical fights.” Just over two-fifths reported that use led to getting into trouble with teachers or the principal, and just under two-fifths indicated that use led to them getting sick or ill. Finally, over one-quarter noted that use led to them having an accident.

Table 17 reflects the youths’ reported motivations for beginning drug and alcohol use. Most youth (57 percent) reported that they started to use because of their own curiosity. The next most common reason, reported by less than half of the youth, was that they started to use because of a friend. Girls (32 percent) were twice as likely as boys (15 percent) to report that their use began because of depression ( $\chi^2=14.33, p\leq.001$ ), and girls (27 percent) were twice as likely as boys (13 percent) to report that their use began due to the influence of an intimate relationship with a boyfriend or girlfriend ( $\chi^2=13.31, p\leq.001$ ).

#### Prior Criminal Processing System History

Table 18 presents the findings related to youths’ prior experience in the system. Although girls, on average, reported being arrested ( $\bar{x}=15.6$ ) and sentenced ( $\bar{x}=11.5$ ) more times than their male counterparts ( $\bar{x}=13.4$  and  $\bar{x}=8.0$ , respectively), these differences were not statistically significant. The analysis showed that both boys and girls were, on average, 13 years old at first arrest, and almost 14 years old at first conviction. Over half of the sample (58 percent) had received a technical violation, and of these, over half had three or more violations. Eighty-six percent of respondents have been on probation. Four-fifths of the youth (81 percent) had not previously been in the institution they were currently incarcerated. When asked if they had been at another institution (juvenile or adult detention facility) other than the one they were currently in, over three-quarters of the youth reported that they had. However, more girls (86 percent) than boys (71 percent) reported that they had been in a different institution previous to their current incarceration ( $\chi^2=13.02, p\leq.001$ ). This was surprising given that there are far fewer facilities available for girls. Finally, the respondents were asked to indicate if they had gotten in trouble since they were children or only during their teenage years. Over half of the youth reported getting in trouble only since they have been teenagers. Over one-third saw their problems as beginning in childhood. Fewer than one in ten of the youth felt that neither of these categories adequately explained their situation and they wrote in various experiences that they felt led to their

involvement in the juvenile justice system. With the exception of the gender differences in the age of first arrest and conviction and the gender differences in previous placements in detention facilities, there were no other significant gender differences in prior criminal history.

### Self-Reported Delinquency

Youth self-reported on a variety of offending behaviors, ranging from minor delinquency to serious criminal acts. Table 19 presents these findings. For gender comparison purposes, Table 20 provides a presentation of the top 15 offenses for which youth reported engaging. Each offense represented in Table 19 was reported by between 56 and 79 percent of respondents within each sex. Nine acts of delinquency were found in both the girls and boys “top 15” list. There were no significant differences in six of these offenses: fighting in the street, trespassing, carrying a weapon, stealing something/money less than \$50, stealing something/money more than \$50, and physically assaulting someone. Three of the offenses which appear in both lists, however, were significantly different based on gender. Girls (74 percent) were more likely than boys (63 percent) to admit to shoplifting ( $\chi^2=4.95$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Boys, on the other hand, were more likely than girls to report driving without a license (70 percent and 64 percent, respectively) and selling drugs (66 percent and 61 percent, respectively) (both offenses were significant at  $p\leq.05$ ). Of the top 15 girls’ offenses that were not on the boys’ list, three were engaged in significantly more by girls than boys: running away (79 percent and 53 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=29.28$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), phone pranks (57 percent and 34 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=14.81$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), and cheating on a school test (64 percent and 53 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=5.10$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Stealing liquor, littering, and trouble because of drinking were only on the girls’ list, but did not represent significantly different responses compared to the boys’ reports of the same offenses. Additionally, there were three offense on the boys’ list, not present on the girls’ list, all of which represented significant gender differences with boys reporting these offenses more often than girls: stealing a bike (65 percent and 34 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=39.91$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ), stealing from parked cars (59 percent and 47 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=5.85$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), and breaking a window (59 percent and 48 percent, respectively,  $\chi^2=4.70$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Breaking and entering, throwing objects at people or cars, and damaging something in a public place, were found solely in the boys top 15, but did not represent significantly different responses compared to the girls.

Of the offenses that did not make “the top 15” in either list, there were significant gender differences found in seven self-reported acts of delinquency. Beginning with those which occurred most often in the sampled youth, over half of the boys reported damaging a parked car while not quite two-fifth of the girls reported such damage ( $\chi^2=6.54$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Girls (41 percent) were almost twice as likely as boys (22 percent) to report using a phoney identification ( $\chi^2=18.33$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Boys (34 percent) reported letting off fire extinguishers almost twice as often as

girls (18 percent) ( $\chi^2=13.17$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Forgery was committed by one-third of the girls and less than a quarter of the boys ( $\chi^2=6.27$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Almost twice as many girls (36 percent) as boys (17 percent) reported hitting a parent ( $\chi^2=19.33$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). One in six boys reported sexually abusing someone, while only 3 percent of girls reported this behavior. The last significant gender difference in self-reported offending of these youth was prostitution, with 16 percent of the girls and 5 percent of the boys reporting “prostituting” ( $\chi^2=15.87$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

Lastly, for a number of offenses girls and boys participation rates did not differ significantly. These combined boys’ and girls’ rates for these offenses were: unauthorized use of a vehicle (51 percent), struggling to get away from a police officer (51 percent), graffiti (50 percent), use of weapons in a fight (44 percent), damaging school property (44 percent), driving under the influence (41 percent), starting a fire (38 percent), stealing school property (38 percent), damaging traffic sign or road works equipment (36 percent), using force to get money from someone older (35 percent), damaging something belonging to a parent (33 percent), using force to get money from someone the respondent’s age or younger (32 percent), stealing goods or money from a machine (31 percent), setting a false alarm (30 percent), being cruel to animals (25 percent), using another’s credit card (22 percent), and murder/manslaughter (14 percent). While there are no gender differences in these findings, they are worthy of careful examination, particularly given the seriousness of many of these offenses and the relatively high rates for which the youth report them.

#### Current Offense Characteristics

Respondents were asked to list all offenses for which they were currently serving time, with up to seven offenses were listed by any one respondent (see Table 21). The most commonly occurring offenses, burglary, assault, robbery, and sex offenses, were examined. Additionally, the offenses were divided up into “violent” offenses, “property” offenses, and “drug-related” offenses. Almost one quarter of the youth reported being held for assault, about one-fifth for burglary, one-sixth for a sex-offense, and 12 percent for robbery. Gender differences were found in assault with almost one-third of girls and just under one-fifth of boys reporting this offense ( $\chi^2=8.82$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). More than twice as many boys (16 percent) than girls (7 percent) reported robbery as one of the offenses for which they were incarcerated ( $\chi^2=7.10$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Not surprisingly, the most dramatic differences was in sex offenses, with almost one-quarter of the boys and only about 5 percent of the girls reporting involvement in this type of offense ( $\chi^2=25.06$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

Over half of the respondents reported having committed a violent offense as a current offense, over one-third committed a property offense, and about 13 percent committed a drug-related offense. Although a lower percent of girls than boys reported violent offenses, the gender differences were not significant. Girls (53 percent), however, were far more likely to report a property offense than boys (31 percent) as one of their current offenses ( $\chi^2=19.79$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Drug offenses were reported by almost one-sixth of the boys and about half that many girls ( $\chi^2=4.99$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

Now turning to the incarceration and sentence characteristics, girls and boys differed significantly in the number of months they had been incarcerated and the length of their sentences. On average, the girls had been incarcerated for five and a half months compared to almost seven and a half months of time served reported by the boys ( $t=2.16$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Girls typically had shorter sentences, at almost one year, compared to just over 16 months reported by the boys ( $t=2.30$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

### Context of Offense

Table 22 provides the results on the context of offending. Over half of the youth identified themselves as leaders in committing an offense, over one-quarter identified themselves as followers, with the remaining classifying themselves in some other way. Just under half of the sample indicated that they had acted alone. When asked to reveal aspects of the setting in which the offense occurred, almost two-fifths reported that the offense occurred on the street, one-third identified someone's home as the place, 7 percent reported a business and 4 percent said that a school was the setting. There were no gender differences in these variables.

The youth were asked to report who was involved if they acted with others. There were no gender differences in the youths' reports of committing their offenses alone. However, girls (11 percent) were more likely than boys (4 percent) to report that an adult was present during the ( $\chi^2=6.82$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Boys (75 percent) were almost twice as likely as girls (40 percent) to report boys as also being involved in committing the offense ( $\chi^2=28.24$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (62 percent) were almost six times as likely as boys (11 percent) to report that (other) girls were involved in the offense ( $\chi^2=64.89$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Girls (11 percent) were also almost three times as likely as boys (4 percent) to report that women were involved in the offense ( $\chi^2=4.22$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). About one-third of both boys and girls reported that men were involved with the offense. There were no gender differences in the youths' reports. Thus, while there is some degree of delinquent youth committing their offenses with members of the opposite sex, boys tend to be more likely to commit offenses with other boys, and girls more likely with other girls. Examined another way from the reports in Table 22, both boys and girls are most likely to commit their acts alone, and least likely to commit them with women. If the youth acts with others, girls are most likely to report committing the offense with other girls, and boys are most likely to report committing the offense with other boys. If the youth act with others, girls are next most likely (after other girls) to act with other boys, and then men (and finally, women), whereas boys are next most likely (after other boys) to act with men, then girls (and finally, women).

Regarding substance use, one-third of the youth reported that they themselves were on drugs at the time the offense was committed, with a little less than half that many reporting that others they were committing the crime

with were on drugs. One-quarter of the sample was using alcohol at the time of the offense and again half that many reported others using alcohol. There were no significant gender differences regarding these variables.

Boys and girls both reported an average of about two and a half victims. However, there were important distinctions in the victim's identity. Almost two-fifths of the boys and less than one-quarter of the girls indicated a stranger as a victim. Rates of "acquaintance" as the victim were almost identical at 22 percent. However, well-known victims, including relatives and intimate relationships, accounted for almost half of the girls' victims and just over one-third of the boys' victims ( $\chi^2=15.26$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ).

When asked what weapons were used, three-fifths indicated that no weapons were used. The interesting gender distinction was in the use of knives and guns. Girls (13 percent) were more than twice as likely as boys (6 percent) to report using a knife in the context of their offense ( $\chi^2=6.63$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). On the other hand, boys (25 percent) were almost three times as likely as girls (9 percent) to report using a gun in the context of the offense ( $\chi^2=16.67$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ).

In an open-ended question, the youth were asked what damage their offense caused. Almost one-third reported there was no damage. The next most common response was physical damage to the victim (28 percent). Over one-fifth wrote that there had been property damage and one-fifth mentioned emotional or mental damage caused to others. About five percent reported that they had hurt themselves in some way and almost five percent reported that they had caused a death. There were no significant gender differences in these variables assessing "damage caused."

Another open-ended question tried to tap motivation toward the offense. The youth were asked to write why they committed the offense. Up to five responses were given by any one respondent. The answers varied widely, but several answers were reported about one-quarter of the time. One such group of responses included: "I felt like it," "I was bored," "I did it for thrills," "It was stupid," or "I wasn't thinking." Another quarter had responses that indicated the respondent believed she or he was innocent, acting in self-defense, or misled. Slightly less than one-quarter of the youth noted that they did it to get revenge, because they were angry, or rebellious, or wanted power. One-fifth of the respondents noted that they committed the offense for money or to get expensive things. This response was given by almost one-quarter of the boys and 14 percent of the girls ( $\chi^2=4.98$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Others indicated that the reasons were drug-related (9 percent), due to feeling of sadness, fear or mental problems (3 percent), due to the negative influence of peers (3 percent) or related to abuse (2 percent).

Another response that was infrequently given but produced a significant gender difference was that the offense was committed because the individual was “on the run.” This explanation was reported by 10 percent of the girls and two percent of the boys ( $\chi^2=13.59$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Seven percent of boys and no girls reported sexual desire as a reason for committing an offense ( $\chi^2=10.59$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Thus, most of the reasons reported for committing the crimes showed no evidence of gender differences. The exceptions were that boys were more likely than girls to be motivated by money and sexual desire, while girls were more likely than boys to report that committing the crime was related to “being on the run.” All three of these fit gender stereotypes reported in previous research.

#### Youths’ Evaluation of the Criminal/Juvenile Processing System

Youths’ perceptions of the criminal processing system are presented in Table 23. They evaluated police, court personnel, and institutional/correctional staff in terms of whether they were “fair” or “unfair” and in terms of whether they believed they agreed or disagreed that boys and girls were treated the same by these actors. They were also asked to assess whether medical services were available. Notably, this was another area with considerable gender distinctions. Girls (51 percent) were almost one and one-half times more likely than boys (38 percent) to rate police behavior as “fair” ( $\chi^2=5.91$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), but boys (57 percent) were more likely than girls (45 percent) to rate the court personnel as “fair” ( $\chi^2=4.52$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Notably, there were not gender differences in the youths’ assessments of whether the police and courts treat girls and boys the same. A little over one-quarter of both sexes reported the police treat girls and boys the same, and a little over one-third of both sexes reported the courts treat girls and boys the same. The youth also showed no gender differences in evaluating whether the “correctional” staff at their institution was “fair”: About two-thirds of both boys and girls reported these staff as “fair.” However, boys (51 percent) were more likely than girls (33 percent) to report that boys and girls are treated the same in the delinquent “correctional” institutions ( $\chi^2=7.01$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Moreover, boys (75 percent) were more likely than girls (62 percent) to report that medical services were available.

#### Youths’ Responses to Open-Ended Items

Responses to three open-ended questions from the Youth Survey can be found in Table 24. The first question asked, “Can you identify anything in your life that you feel contributed to your offending? For example, what happened in your life that led you to commit a delinquent act or acts?” Only half of the sample (N=222) responded to this question. The most popular response (27 percent), and the only one with significant gender differences was “family problems or a bad childhood.” One-fifth of boys and almost two-fifths of girls gave this response ( $\chi^2=7.38$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). The other areas related to onset named by the youth were sexual abuse or rape (16 percent), negative peer influences (14 percent), drugs or alcohol (14 percent), the loss of a relationship or death of a loved one (13 percent), making bad choices or having fun (11 percent), and anger or hatred (10 percent). It is

certainly noteworthy that there was no significant gender difference in reporting sexual abuse/rape as a “cause” of their delinquency.

Youth were also asked to report what was going well in their lives or what made them happy. The response rate for this question was higher, at 86 percent. The most common response was family relationships, and ironically given the indictment of the family in the preceding onset question, this response was more likely to be given by the girls. Forty-three percent of the girls compared to 33 percent of the boys identified various family relationships as what was going well or made them happy ( $\chi^2=3.93$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). Girls (13 percent) were almost twice as likely as boys (7 percent) to list friends as a positive force in their lives. The only response that boys were more likely to give than girls was to list a hobby, the most frequent mentioned one being sports. One in ten boys noted “a hobby” as a positive feature of their lives, while half that many girls responded this way ( $\chi^2=3.96$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). The following responses regarding positive forces in their lives did not differ significantly between girls and boys (thus overall percentages are reported): education (17 percent), love/sex/partner (17 percent), myself or expressions of high self-esteem (14 percent), the future (13 percent), recovery (12 percent), my child or children (9 percent), God or spirituality (6 percent), and “nothing” (6 percent).

Respondents were also asked how they would change the institution to make it better for them. With a wide variety of responses, five were most frequently reported. In order of frequency, these were: more privileges (28 percent), better staff (25 percent), better programs (20 percent), nothing/don’t change it (19 percent), and more contact with family and friends (13 percent). There were gender differences for the two most commonly reported changes. Boys were more likely to request more privileges (33 percent) than girls (20 percent) ( $\chi^2=6.13$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ), and girls (34 percent) were almost twice as likely as boys (18 percent) to request better staff ( $\chi^2=9.81$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ).

### Desired Programs and Services

Eighteen programs were listed on the survey along with the question, “Would you like to participate in any of the following services?” The possible responses included, “yes,” “no,” or “I already do or have.” This section presents information on which programs the youth report that they “want” as shown in Table 25. The next section presents findings on programs actually received by the youth.

Ten of the programs listed were requested significantly more by girls than boys. Overall, one-third of the youth who responded wanted drug and alcohol education and treatment. However, over two-fifths of girls contrasted with just over-one quarter of boys desired this type of programming ( $\chi^2=10.54$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Anger management training was requested by just under half of the boys and over three-fifths of the girls ( $\chi^2=7.02$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Girls also were more

likely to express interest in learning how to have good relationships. Although over half of the boys requested this type of programming, almost 70 percent of girls wanted to better their relationship skills ( $\chi^2=7.72$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ).

Girls indicated more interest than boys for *each* of the types of counseling mentioned: counseling to deal with sexual abuse, physical abuse, emotional abuse, depression, family counseling, and individual counseling. The most common type of counseling requested was individual. Almost three-fifths of the girls, and over two-fifths of the boys reported a desire for individual counseling ( $\chi^2=9.06$ ,  $p\leq.01$ ). Family counseling was wanted by almost two-fifths of the sample, but over half of the girls versus 29 percent of the boys requested this type of treatment. The next most commonly requested treatment was described on the survey as, “help with depression or other mental problems. While 46 percent of girls indicated an interest, just under one-quarter of the boys did ( $\chi^2=21.00$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). More of the youth requested emotional abuse counseling over any other type of abuse counseling. Over two-fifths of the girls and one-fifth of the boys reported wanting to participate in counseling related to emotional abuse ( $\chi^2=22.44$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). About one-fifth of the respondents were interested in physical abuse counseling and sexual abuse counseling. Girls (35 percent) were about three times as likely as boys (11 percent) to desire sexual abuse counseling ( $\chi^2=32.04$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). About one-third of the girls and 14 percent of the boys requested physical abuse counseling ( $\chi^2=22.18$ ,  $p\leq.001$ ). Thus, girls were significantly more interested in both types of abuse (sexual and physical) counseling than boys.

Two additional programs were desired more by girls and than boys. Sex education, while requested by 42 percent of the sample, was requested by almost half of the girls, and 37 percent of the boys ( $\chi^2=4.45$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ). General health education was requested even more frequently. Over half of the girls wanted to participated in this type of programming compared to about two-fifths of the boys ( $\chi^2=5.49$ ,  $p\leq.05$ ).

Now the programs that were similarly desired by youth will be examined. The most commonly desired program by all youth was “learning job or career skills” with 71 percent requesting this type of help. Two-thirds of the youth wanted “sports, health, and/or fitness training. Sixty-two percent wanted help learning how to live on their own and 58 percent requested assistance in learning how to better student. Problem-solving skills training was desired by just over half of the youth. Half of the respondents wanted to “learn how to be a parent.” Fourteen percent requested sex offender treatment and with more girls responding positively to this than boys (although not significant), it is speculated that this question may have been misunderstood by some of the girls given that this doesn’t fit well with their self-reports of sexually abusing others.

#### Received Programs and Services

Youth indicated programs that they have already received at some time in the past or programs they are

currently receiving (see Table 26), and importantly, there were few gender differences reported. The most common programming received by this delinquent sample was drug and alcohol education and treatment. About one-quarter of respondents reported receiving this type of treatment. Just over one-fifth reported having had some type of sex education, although it is possible this took place in the school system outside their institutions. The third and fourth most common response to treatment received were anger management and individual counseling, both reported by almost one-fifth of the sample. Notably, although anger management was requested by more girls, it was boys who reported receiving more of this programming. Almost one-fifth of boys, compared to less than one in ten girls was given anger management training of some kind ( $\chi^2=6.38, p\leq.05$ ). There was no gender difference in the youths' reports of receiving individual counseling, about one-fifth of both boys and girls reported receiving this. Problem-solving skills training was received by 12 percent of the youth. Eleven percent of the respondents received family counseling.

The remaining programs were received by less than 10 percent of the youth: help with depression or other mental problems (10 percent), learning how to live on their own (9 percent), job or career skills (9 percent), general health education (9 percent), sex offender treatment (8 percent, received by significantly more boys than girls), sports-related training (8 percent), learning how to have good relationships (8 percent), learning how to be a better student (7 percent), sexual abuse counseling (6 percent), learning how to be a better parent (6 percent), emotional abuse counseling (6 percent), and physical abuse counseling (5 percent). Of these programs reported received by fewer than 10 percent of the youth, two resulted in a gender difference. First, boys (12 percent) were more than twice as likely as girls (5 percent) to report receiving a program on "learning to live on my own" ( $\chi^2=5.95, p\leq.05$ ). Second, boys were almost three times as likely as girls to report receiving a program on "learning how to be a better student" ( $\chi^2=4.99, p\leq.05$ ). Clearly, the interest in various types of programming was not matched by programming received. Many of the types of programs desired by the girls are of low priority in the types of programs received.

### **FINDINGS FROM THE JUDICIAL SURVEYS**

As noted in the methods section of this report, 59 judges completed surveys regarding issues, practices, and resource availability for delinquent girls in their counties. The judicial survey, obtained from the Kempf-Leonard et al. (1997) Missouri Gender-Specific study, included items on judges' reports of county resources available to them (see Table 27). A little over half of the judges (56 percent) reported that their county operates a *detention facility* for girls. In those cases where a detention facility for girls was available, the number of beds available for girls ranged from 2 to 42, with an average of 16 beds per facility. Slightly over one-third (36 percent) of the judges reported that the court provides its own *out-of-home treatment care* for delinquent girls. The beds available for these programs ranged from 1 to 29, with an average of 10 beds available per facility. Next judges were asked to check from a list of

options, descriptions of the county's residential treatment options for girls. Over half of the judges reported that there were an inadequate number of beds available for girls (56 percent) and that there were not enough beds for status offenders and/or abuse/neglect victims (54 percent). One-third of the judges (34 percent) reported that although there were not adequate numbers of beds available for girls, they "managed to get by." Over one-quarter of the judges (29 percent) reported that there were not enough beds for serious, violent, or chronic female delinquents. Twelve percent of the judges reported that there were enough beds for male youth but not female youth, and 3 percent reported that there were enough beds for female, but not male youth (Table 27). Seventeen percent of the judges reported that there were enough private beds, but not enough public beds, and 15 percent reported that they had a "unique" situation where none of the items in the survey applied. Three judges reported that their situations were "unique" in that they had adequate options for their needs. However, other judges' written comments exemplify some of the problems:

- "Bed space is available, but money for contracting bed space is lacking."
- "Budget constraints."
- "Not enough beds for girls with serious mental health issues."
- "Not enough money for status offender beds; not enough money for chronic offenders."
- "All beds are secure. There are no non-secure treatment beds except in private residential treatment and funds for these beds are limited."
- "Treatment options outside of our own residential facility are very limited for females."

The judicial survey also queried judges about the funding of the girls' residential treatment centers (Table 27). The most common source of funding reported was county funds (57 percent), followed by state funds (53 percent), the youth's family providing funds (48 percent), and the circuit's budget (state and local) funds (47 percent). Sixteen percent of the judges reported that external grants helped fund the residential treatment for girls in their counties, and 22 percent listed "other" sources not listed in the survey check list. Their hand-written resources listed here included mostly children's services money.

When asked about whether there were an adequate number of treatment programs available for girls and boys, the judges were less likely to agree that there were an adequate number of treatment programs for girls ( $\bar{x}=3.65$ ) than for boys ( $\bar{x}=2.78$ ) (t-test  $p \leq .001$ ). Indeed, over one-fifth of the judges "strongly disagreed" and over three-fifths disagreed or strongly disagreed that there were adequate treatment facilities available for delinquent girls. In contrast, fewer than 10 percent of the judges "strongly disagreed" and 30 percent of the judges strongly disagreed or disagreed that there was not adequate treatment for boys (Table 27). Regarding the judges' assessments of the quality of treatment provided by public versus private facilities, 70 percent of the judges reported no

difference in the quality, while 30 percent reported that the private facilities were generally better. None of the judges reported that the public facilities were generally better than the private facilities in terms of quality (Table 27).

The judicial survey also requested the judges to list the top five treatment facilities they used for referrals of delinquent girls (see Table 28). Seventy-five facilities were reported at least once by the judges in this survey, with many of the judges reporting no institutions or any number less than five. Of the 75 reported facilities, almost three-fifths (59 percent) were private facilities and two-fifths (41 percent) were public facilities. The most commonly listed facility, reported by 8 judges, was Adriel Foster Care, followed by 7 judges listing St. Anthony's Villa. The next most commonly reported referral facilities, each reported by five judges in their "top five" list were the Ohio Christian Children's Home, Osterlain Services for Youth, and The Marsh Foundation. Four facilities were reported by four judges: The United Methodist Children's Home, Parmadale, Lincoln Place, and Buckeye Ranch. The Ohio Department of Youth Services was reported by only 3 judges. Notably, of those facilities reported by 4 or more judges as in their "top five," *all of the facilities were private*. Of the thirty facilities judges reported in their "top five" referrals, only 6 (20 percent) were public facilities.

In the judge survey, the respondents were asked for each of their "top five" listed referral agencies for girls, what factors influenced their decisions to choose that particular facility (see Table 29). Given that judges could report numerous facilities, the N for this analysis was as high as 134. The factors most commonly reported as influencing judges' decisions for facilities, reported as influential in approximately three-fifths or more of the referrals, were:

1. The program accepts minor law offenders (66 percent)
2. The youth's mental health problems (65 percent)
3. The quality/reputation of the staff at the facility (63 percent)
4. The program accepts status offenders (62 percent)
5. The program accepts abuse/neglect victims (59 percent)
6. The effectiveness of the treatment program (58 percent)

Between approximately two-fifths and about half of the facilities were reported to be chosen by the judges because: the youth exhibited disruptive/violent behavior (52 percent), the relatively close proximity of the facility (50 percent), the youth's chemical dependency problems (47 percent), the youth's sexual victimization history (46 percent), the youth's physical health problems (46 percent), the program accepts serious law offenders (44 percent),

long-term treatment is available in the program (44 percent), the facility has programs specifically for females (42 percent), and the facility has a low per diem cost (38 percent). Judges reported that in about one-third of the facilities their decisions were influenced by: the facility has culturally diverse programs and staff (36 percent), the facility offers a secure environment (36 percent), the youth's family receives Medicaid (36 percent), the program accepts sex offenders (34 percent), and a short-term treatment program was available (31 percent). Approximately one-fifth of the programs were reportedly referred by the judges due to that the program had an aftercare component (22 percent) or it was the only facility with a bed available (20 percent).

Finally, the survey ended with asking judges to respond to open-ended questions. The judges' verbatim accounts are helpful in flushing out the more quantitative findings reported thus far. First, the judges were asked about which programs stand out as especially effective in meeting delinquent girls' needs in Ohio:

- ✓ Adriel is exceptional for the mental health/DD population they serve best. Not enough experience with others to say.
- ✓ So far as teaching delinquent behavior is concerned, DYS (juvenile prison) is particularly effective.
- ✓ Butler County Juvenile Rehabilitation Center has made a big impact on several high risk females and their families. Several of these young ladies have not returned to the system. Mid-western Children's Home has also been an effective placement.
- ✓ The programs control the population very well, therefore, they are able to provide them programming. These programs also are specific to female offenders. They are not merely a male program, replicated for females. They address issues that impact the population to be served.
- ✓ We are proud of our Multi-County Juvenile Attention System. In addition, Christian Children Home of Ohio has done an outstanding job in providing services.
- ✓ Passages — residential therapeutic treatment for juvenile families.
- ✓ Our experience with Adriel has been very good with girls that need extra supports to feel safe and settle into treatment.
- ✓ Syntaxis home is excellent
- ✓ Mentoring programs through the Family and Children First Councils and the county extension project 4-H agent working with at-risk girls.

Notably, two of the judge respondents wrote that there were no good available treatment centers for them in Ohio, and while they were appreciative of the excellent programming offered in Abraxis, it is in Pennsylvania and they have to send girls out of state.

Next, the survey asked if there was anything else that we needed to know about residential treatment programs for girls. Here are some of the judges' responses:

- ✓ Residential placements are over used because of inadequate and insufficient community based programs and day treatment.

- ✓ There are few public facilities except DYS.
- ✓ More opportunities for boys and care is more in-depth for boys.
- ✓ There are few beds available for females, private and public. Society has not kept up with the problem of female delinquency or for that matter teen pregnancy. It appears that society is about 25 years behind in its ability to effectively treat and care for females in a residential environment.
- ✓ Mid-size counties are experiencing the increase in delinquent females including many with mental health issues and a need for out of home placements. However, these placements are very limited.
- ✓ Lack of available bed space in time of need along with high per diem costs make it difficult to place a female in residential treatment.
- ✓ More programs for rural areas are needed.
- ✓ Ross County is forced to use out of county private placement for the majority of its female population. It appears that the boys' placement is always available (one week waiting period minimum), whereas female placement takes much longer (3 to 4 week minimum). This wait detracts from the child's willingness to participate if they are in this "limbo" status too long. Those who are in charge MUST provide adequate care for females in South Central Ohio.
- ✓ Our concern is finding "good" service providers within or near our county. We feel it is very important to include the family in the service plan. If the placement is an hour or two or more, many times, the family is not able to participate.
- ✓ Very limited programming for misdemeanor sex offender and violently acting out girls.
- ✓ Establish them locally so families can be involved. Most must be secure as the girls run all the time.
- ✓ We need more options.
- ✓ We are a small county of 40,000 and have very few females in need of residential treatment. Therefore each has individual needs and treatment and it is difficult to obtain a reliable statistical report with so few individuals.
- ✓ We need funding due to special problems that females face.
- ✓ Need for more treatment group homes geared for females.
- ✓ We need more facilities with lower daily per-diem.
- ✓ Residential treatment does not work in the long run. Our society must change its view of children altogether. They do create huge revenue and lower unemployment but as far as treatment and rehabilitation, forget it.
- ✓ I believe there is a need for more and better independent living programs. Both boys and girls need these programs but we seem to have many more girls who are abandoned by their parents and therefore need these skills and a place to live at age 16 or 17.

In conclusion, the judicial surveys point to the need for more resources for delinquent girls, particularly ones which are local, gender-specific, and public. What is currently available for girls is often inadequate, too far from girls' families (to provide team-family treatment and visits from family members), does not deal with girls' unique

needs, and/or is cost prohibitive, largely due to the best and most available programming often being private institutions.

### **FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY OF YOUTH TREATMENT CENTERS**

The final data source for this study was surveys distributed to treatment centers in Ohio that respond to delinquent girls. Although slightly fewer than half (17 out of 37) of the treatment centers which were mailed surveys responded, we report these findings due to the lack of knowledge in these areas. As stated previously, this measurement instrument sent to the treatment centers is a fairly precise replica of the one used by Kempf-Leonard et al. (1997) in the Missouri Gender-Specific study.

First, the survey asked respondents for general descriptions of the treatment center (Table 30). The number of girls treated at the centers ranged from 7 to 80, with an average of 36 girls treated per year per center. The average length of treatment ranged from 4 to 360 days, with an average of 166 days of treatment. Slightly less than half of the centers (47 percent) provided an aftercare component for the girls. Over four-fifths of the centers (82 percent) provided a secure environment, and this was established most consistently by the staff that were hired (100 percent), followed by the fact that the facility had locked rooms (50 percent), and then that the facility had walls or a fence (36 percent). The average cost per diem per child at the centers ranged from fifty to two-hundred-and-fifty dollars, with the average cost about 120 dollars per diem per child. Four out of five of the facilities (80 percent) reported that there were variations in the cost at the facility, and slightly more than that (86 percent) reported that they received funding from other sources, such as grants and gifts.

Table 31 provides a general description of the facilities' clientele. One of the seventeen participating centers did not indicate what percent of their clientele were boys and girls. Of the 16 centers reporting gender make-up, 4 (25 percent) reported that they served only girls. Notably, for about one-third of the facilities, girls constituted less than one-third of the clientele, and for a little over one-third of the facilities (38 percent) girls constituted between 26 and 50 percent of the center's clientele. One of the reporting facilities did not have beds for girls (or boys). In general, of the reporting facilities, more beds were available for boys than girls, unless the reporting facility was "girl only." Of the twelve facilities in the study that reported treating both boys and girls, the average number of beds available for girls was 16 and the average available for boys was 31 per facility (not reported in the tables). Regarding the racial make-up of the facilities, the percent of African Americans ranged from 0 to 75 percent, with the average percent African American at one-third of the population (33 percent). This suggests a highly disproportionate rate of institutionalizing Black youth in Ohio. About two-fifths (41 percent) of the respondents

reported that one-quarter or fewer of the youth in their facility were indigent, and about one-fifth reported that between 26 and 50 percent were indigent, about one-fifth reported that 51 to 75 percent were indigent, and about one-fifth reported that 76 to 100 percent of their clientele were indigent.

The treatment center respondents were also queried as to the original location of their clientele (Table 31). Three-fifths (59 percent) reported that over 75 percent of their clientele were from the local area, and about one-quarter of the centers (24 percent) reported that 25 percent or fewer of their clientele were from the local area. Two-thirds (65 percent) of the respondents reported that 25 percent or fewer of their clientele were from elsewhere in Ohio, but almost one-fifth (18 percent) reported that over three-quarters of their clientele were from elsewhere in Ohio. Over four-fifths (82 percent) of the respondents reported that none of the youth in their program were from outside of Ohio, and none of the respondents reported that their more than 10 percent of their clientele were from outside of Ohio.

Table 32 presents data on the treatment centers' personnel and health care provisions. About two-fifths (41 percent) of the centers reported having "no" certified teachers, and one-quarter reported having one certified teacher. Approximately one-quarter (24 percent) of the centers reported having between 1 and 10 direct treatment providers, another quarter (24 percent) reported having between 11 and 20 direct treatment providers, and yet another quarter (24 percent) reported having 51 or more treatment providers. One-third of the centers (35 percent) reported one administrator and almost half (47 percent) reported 2 to 5 administrators. Almost one-fifth (18 percent) of the respondents reported no support staff, almost one-third (29 percent) reported between 1 and 5 support staff members, over one-third (35 percent) reported between 6 and 10 support staff members, and almost one-fifth (18 percent) reported between 11 and 50 support staff members. Almost 70 percent reported no physicians at the institution, and one-quarter reported one physician at the facility. Almost half (47 percent) reported no nurses at the facility, and about two-fifths (41 percent) reported 1 or 2 nurses on staff. About three-fifths (62 percent) of the centers reported no psychologists or sociologists on staff, and over one-quarter (29 percent) reported having 1 or 2. Physicians were reported to be present between 0 and 20 hours per week (never more than 20), with the average number of hours per facility at 3 hours per week. The number of hours per week that institutions reported having nurses on staff ranged from 0 to 105, although almost half (47 percent) reported zero hours per week was a nurse on staff. A little over half (53 percent) of the facilities reported that private health insurance was accepted and three-quarters (76 percent) reported that Medicaid was accepted.

Another aspect of the treatment survey instrument was designed to collect information on youth referrals. The most frequently reported referral source was judicial court-ordered (94 percent), followed by family/guardians

(56 percent), juvenile officer recommendations (50 percent), and physicians (38 percent) and schools (38 percent), and the police (25 percent). However, almost seventy percent reported “other” referral sources, and when asked to list these many indicated child services, mental health agencies, and other delinquency institutions. Only six (of the seventeen) respondents completed questions on the average number of referrals from various sources on any given day. These responses indicate that the judicial court ranks highest, followed by juvenile officers and “other” (unlisted) sources, the police, and finally physicians and schools.

Table 34 represents the treatment and other programs available, distinguishing by the youth’s gender. Of the 13 respondents reporting they serviced boys as well as girls, all of these programs reported that for the boys the staff and program were culturally diverse, that status offenders were accepted, that abuse and neglect victims were accepted, and that minor law offenders were accepted. This unanimous reporting for these programs was identical for girls’ access, except that one of the treatment centers responding did not treat abused/neglected girls. For both boys and girls, about three-fifths of the programs accepted serious law offenders. Notably, the facilities were more likely to accept male (69 percent) than female (53 percent) sex offenders.

There was little gender difference in terms of the facilities’ treatments available to boys and girls, except that chemical dependency treatment was reported available ten percent more frequently for boys (69 percent) than for girls (59 percent). For both boys and girls, approximately four-fifths of the agencies provided sexual victimization treatment, about nine-tenths provided physical health programs, over nine-tenths provided disruptive/violent behavior treatment, and all of the programs provided mental health treatment for both boys and girls. The survey asked if other treatments were also provided for girls, to which 71 percent of the participants responded “yes.” These commonly included programs on self-esteem or empowerment, independent living, and/or some type of educational access (e.g., nutrition, sex education, or charter school). When asked whether the institution provided programs specifically designed for girls, almost three-fifths (59 percent) reported “yes.” These “gender-specific” programs most commonly dealt with male violence against females, mostly sexual abuse, but also domestic violence. Other gender-specific programs offered included courses on substance abuse, self-esteem, pregnancy and parenting, and sexuality.

The survey of the treatment centers asked respondents to note the frequency of provisions of progress and outcome reports to families and courts. Over 90 percent of the institutions reported that progress reports were provided to the families and to the courts on a “routine” basis. Outcome reports were provided somewhat less frequently: routinely to courts in 88 percent of the cases and routinely to families in about three-quarters (76 percent) of the cases. Four-fifths (81 percent) of the respondents also noted that other procedures (in addition to reports) were

used to supply information to families and courts. Many of those offered were “team” meetings, usually between the child and her/his family.

Similar to the judicial survey, the treatment center survey asked some open-ended questions at the end, and the responses of these treatment center officials is illuminating of the quantitative data reported thus far, and of delinquent girls’ needs in general, and the personnel who respond to them in a treatment setting. The first open-ended question queried the treatment center officials: “If you were granted a wish list to develop specific treatment programs for females, what would make your top priorities? That is what would be at the top of your list?” Here are some of the treatment center officials’ responses:

- (1) More intensive treatment for sexual abuse survivors, (2) On site medical staff (psychiatrist, nurse, doctor), and (3) Ability to have on site classes in cooking and nutrition by having a usable kitchen.
- (1) Transitional living/independent living programs, (2) Programs for violence prevention, (3) Programs specifically for young adults, and (4) Collaborative programs or full continuum of services.
- Self-esteem issues.
- Sexual abuse groups for males and females
- Independent living services with successful minority staff to model “How to make it in this life.”
- Continuum of services, early intervention program. Safe settings, well trained staff to deal with abuse issues, chemical dependency issues, and appropriate residential settings, foster home placements and group homes.
- (1) Self-esteem, (2) Personal hygiene, (3) Health awareness (S.T.D., pregnancy, puberty, etc.), (4) Victimization classes, (5) Parenting classes, and (6) Living skills.
- (1) Sex offender specific treatment for females and (2) Group home/transitional living.
- Exclusively female treatment for domestic violence, sexual abuse, and family planning.
- (1) Alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment programs, (2) Abstinence and safe sex programs targeting females, (3) Placement options for dependent or unruly girls in D.H.S. custody other than locked facility or foster homes.
- I would like to see the programs begin at an earlier age where females are not so damaged. The top of my list would be not to allow young girls to be victimized — teach them about victimization. Teach young girls to feel worthwhile.
- One hour daily spent in individual counseling.
- An independent living unit and an aftercare program.

Next, the treatment center officials were asked whether federal and/or state regulations caused any difficulties in the treatment of females. These responses are reported here:

- Regulations regarding utilization of service delivery (Medicaid) have not necessarily hurt but interpretation of the standards has been problematic. Threats of new regulations relative to restraint and seclusion

utilization are looming as it is speculated that new rules will preclude rather than regulate the utilization of these interventions.

- Regulations do not cause difficulties other than the lack of ability to keep up with the necessary and overwhelming amount of paperwork required by these entities. It would appear it continues to group therefore sapping the strength previously used to interact with residents.
- Drowning in paperwork.
- Yes, but not just for females. Difficulties apply to both genders.
- No more so than for treatment of males.
- We have lost the use of certain techniques that were highly effective with females due to ODHS regulations.

Next, the treatment center officials were asked: “Among all of the treatment programs available in Ohio (private, public, residential or in-home), what treatment programs are especially good?” Their responses follow:

- Unsure. I am new to working in this state. However, at my last job in Kentucky, I had a child placed at the Buckhorn Children’s Center of Ohio located in Chesterview, OH. I was extremely impressed with their abilities in working with the young lady I had placed there. She was an extremely difficult child to work with and had exhausted all resources in Kentucky.
- Programs which offer a full continuum of services either themselves or within collaborative arrangements.
- Question is extremely subjective, based on knowledge and training. Although private programs tend to have more adequate funding and therefore more opportunities, all programs have benefit depending on the client, family, and presenting issues.
- Beechbrook in Cleveland.
- Heterock, Bassett House, Parmadale, ARC.
- Those who engage the parents in treatment plan.
- It is difficult to answer this question certain programs do certain things well. There is no one program that is the place for every child. One way farm does well with kids that need structure, but cannot deal with the intimacy of a foster home. Foster homes do well for kids that need a lower level of structure, but also need the intimacy. Each program as its strength and weaknesses as far as the children that it can serve.

The treatment center respondents were then asked, “Why are these programs especially good?” Here are their responses:

1. They (Buckhorn) operate as a family by having married couples work 24-hour shifts. It gives the clients a sense of normalcy.
2. These programs offer a full range of comprehensive services from assessment through aftercare in a planful [sic], systemic way.
3. Dedicated staff.
4. Excellent facilities, well-trained staff, high client/child ratios.

5. Because once a resident finished the program they have to go back to the same environment. Maybe if the parents have been involved the environment at home care be more secure and able to deal with the girl returning.
6. They afford youth and the progressions working with them the opportunity to experience consistent treatment in a secure, nurturing and supportive environment.

Finally, the treatment center respondents were asked about both the positive and negative aspects of working with delinquent girls. First, we will list the positive aspects, and these will be followed by the officials' reported negative aspects of working with delinquent girls.

What are the positive aspects of working with delinquent girls?

- Working with delinquent girls is extremely rewarding because they can be dynamic, fun, and eager to learn. Usually when they do get a particular concept they soak it up like a sponge and run with it. I have worked with adult males and females as well as adolescent boys and girls. Teen girls are by far my favorite population to work with.
- I believe this to be a very general question. There are many positive aspects in working with girls who present with anti-social behaviors. However, the work is focused on the individual within the group and not the label.
- Positive aspects in social work are obvious rewards when client makes positive choices and gains necessary skills. Most positives in field are internal rewards for staff.
- Yes — kids can excel if given range of freedom to meet basic needs — love, power, fun, freedom — to see girls grow after years of neglect and abuse is wonderful.
- Helping them turn their lives around if given proper treatment and support as they work through issues that have contributed to delinquent behavior.
- Work on parenting, domestic violence prevention, self-esteem, vocational education.
- When they respond to the point of making life changes.
- It is very enjoyable to watch girls who are feeling poorly about themselves mature into self confident young women.
- Yes, the opportunity to influence future mothers.
- Yes, we have enjoyed a great deal of success in our program over the years. We have seen girls placed with a very negative attitude and discharged with a positive attitude. When you see this change and the growth that comes along with it, there is a feeling that cannot be expressed. Also, I would say that the relationships that are developed truly last a lifetime.

Are there any negative aspects of working with delinquent girls?

- You have to be able to personally deal with their stories of their lives. Many have been through so much. In addition developing therapeutic relationships can sometimes be difficult between an adult female and a teen girl because so many similar relationships have been antagonistic.
- There are often system issues involving the courts, the community, children services which require a lot of coordination and work?
- Paperwork, lack of control at times due to system red tape, high burn-out rate due to emotional stress.

- Yeah, girls are smarter than boys. They are much more aware of their position on the chances of success.
- If rest of youth are not delinquent, at times, other youth will “pick up” delinquency behaviors.
- Not enough services available to support them upon release. Girls are viewed as not having serious problems.
- Girls are more difficult to reason with and they tend to come to us at an older age with more severe and established problems.
- Yes, they are difficult to deal with because they usually do not deal with their anger direction and they tend to carry anger a long time before the deal with it.
- Yes, they are more emotional and have specific health issues such as being pregnant while in program.
- The reality is that no matter how successful placement is, usually, these girls return to the same family environment that helped create their situation. This leads to repetitive problems and at times repetitive placement. It is a sad reality that a lot of times we are working to help these girls learn to succeed in their environment, more than helping them be the best person they can be. Unfortunately, this is not the same thing in too many cases.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The findings on adolescent offenders, particularly girls, provided in this report, are, for the most part, consistent with other previous research on delinquent youth. First, the profiles presented of the youth involved in the criminal and juvenile processing systems are in line with existing research. For example, this study reported that youth involved in the system are disproportionately racial minorities from lower socio-economic groups. These youth have difficult experiences in the educational system demonstrated by high rates of skipping school, dropping out, as well as other academic difficulties. The family backgrounds of this sample depict a family life with a great deal of instability and difficult life circumstances. A minority of these juveniles report being the first person in their family to be incarcerated, indicating a generational pattern of involvement with the criminal justice system in many of the respondents’ families.

The modeling the incarcerated youth receive from their families extends into areas of drug and alcohol use and witnessing different types of abuse within their homes. This research found that many youth report receiving inadequate supervision or ineffective discipline from parents. Clearly, abuse is a factor in the lives of both boys and girls, although significant gender differences exist. Almost one-quarter of these young people are confronted with having children. Many of the youth report self-use of drugs and alcohol with half reporting being addicted to a substance. Additionally, many risk factors for youth show up in the findings of this study: exposure to delinquent peers, anti-social attitudes, temperament/ personality problems, and emotional problems.

Most of the youth surveyed report considerable involvement with the criminal and juvenile processing system and delinquency. The majority of girls and boys report experiencing gender differences in how they are treated by the police, the courts, and the correctional staff. However, the girls and boys are close to being equally divided on perceptions of whether the system treats them fairly or unfairly. Overall the percentages for desired services are high, particularly compared with the services and programs the youth report receiving.

An important finding from the current study is that many of the issues that delinquent youth face are the same for girls and boys. This suggests, as implied in some of our earlier work (Belknap, Holsinger, and Dunn 1998), that the “pathways” approach to examining offending is useful for males as well as females. It also suggests that many of the same programs need to be made available for both girls and boys. Clearly, many important experiences of incarcerated girls and boys are not gender distinctive. At the same time, however, it is useful and necessary to note that there are some important gender differences that emerge from these data as well, that indicate the significance of coordinating appropriate programming. Throughout the findings, a significantly gendered theme is that girls were far more likely than boys to report problematic relationships with their family members. For example, girls were far more likely than boys to (1) run away from home, (2) drop out of school because they left home, (3) be deserted by a parent, and (4) have poor relationships with their mothers. Girls were also more likely than boys to name family problems or a bad childhood as factors that contributed to their offending.

Related to these problems within the family and consistent with previous research, there were significantly greater amounts of abuse reported by delinquent girls (as compared to delinquent boys). Virtually every variable examining abuse, regardless of type or whether by a family member or someone else, showed girls to experience more. Girls were also more likely than boys to report (1) relationships with older “partners,” (2) lower self-esteem, (3) more problems dealing with anger, (4) more problems with addiction to drugs and alcohol, and (5) worse mental health. These significant findings indicate that gender-specific developmental processes are at work increasing girls’ vulnerability to delinquency in terms of these particular phenomenon.

The findings confirm existing research suggesting the far greater variety and number of programs available to boys than girls (e.g., Dobash et al. 1986; Gelssethorpe 1989; Kempf-Leonard et al. 1997; Wells 1994). In the current study, six of the 18 programs listed were more likely to be received by boys than girls.

**Research Question #1: What gender differences exist in girls’ and boys’ pathways to offending?**

The findings discussed above support the notion that incarcerated girls and boys differ, with the areas of greatest divergence reported in problematic relationships with family members, abuse histories, drug use and

addiction, self-esteem, mental health, and anger management. These data suggest that girls and boys differ in their pathways to delinquency and in fact, girls may have unique vulnerability to offending in terms of these factors.

Problematic relationships with family members were evidenced by girls being more likely than boys to report running away from home. Running away or leaving home was also a more common response given by girls than boys in explaining why they dropped out of school. When looking at experiences with parents, girls were more likely than boys to report that they were dishonest with their parents about their whereabouts. Girls were also more likely than boys to report that parents had difficulty controlling their behavior and that parental punishment was ineffective. Finally, girls reported having worse relationships with their mothers compared to boys. These findings suggest that girls, particularly in adolescence, perceive their relationships with their parents or guardians as more negative than boys. Indeed, this perception is strong enough to warrant more girls acting on the situation and running away.

Abuse is clearly another area where strong gender differences were present. Whether the abuse was verbal, physical, or sexual, girls experienced significantly more abuse than boys. Further, girls experienced more abuse than boys whether the abuse was from a family member or someone else. The number of sexual abusers was greater for girls and girls were more likely to experience repeated abuse when compared to boys. Girls were more likely than boys to report witnessing different types of abuse. Girls were also more likely than boys to link abuse to their involvement in delinquency. Very few studies have been conducted to examine gender differences in incarcerated youths' abuse experiences. This study clearly highlights the magnitude of the difference in abuse rates between girls and boys suggesting that this is an important gender difference in understanding pathways to delinquency.

There were gender differences in response to the questions regarding drug and alcohol use. More girls reported that drug and alcohol use came at the same time or prior to them getting into trouble, while boys were more likely to have getting into trouble precede their substance use. In general, girls seemed to experience more and earlier use as well as more problems related to use than boys. Girls were more likely to report addiction and withdraw symptoms when they stopped using. For girls, use was linked to sexual abuse and getting into trouble with family and friends to a degree not experienced by boys. Girls were significantly more likely than boys to report using drugs or alcohol to cope with depression or due to the influence of an intimate relationship.

Consistent with previous research on girls, the girls reported lower self-esteem compared to the boys (American Association of University Women 1991). Girls were more likely to indicate that they perceived themselves as failures or useless, without much to be proud of. Over 70 percent of the girls reported that they wished

they had more respect for themselves. Girls were also more likely than boys to report having thought about suicide and having tried suicide. Additionally, girls were more likely to report self-injurious behavior than boys.

On the survey, girls were more likely than boys to report various problems dealing with anger. However, it is difficult to know if this is a real gender difference or the result of bias within the instrument. Due to gender socialization, girls may be more aware of their difficulty negotiating anger and therefore quicker to recognize anger as problematic for them. These findings will be discussed below for how they could impact the development of gender-specific services. It is also important to note that some of the judges and treatment officials reported in their surveys that girls have a “unique” entry (relative to boys) into the system, and that is most frequently exemplified by victimization histories.

**Research Question #2: Is gender related to delinquent youths’ self-reported experiences with the juvenile processing system?**

As the youth move through the juvenile justice system, their perceptions of unfair treatment decline. In other words, about 58 percent of the youth perceive the police to be unfair, 47 percent see court personnel as unfair, and 36 percent rate the staff at the correctional facility as unfair. Yet, many of the comments written in on the open-ended questions of the survey reflected youth perceptions of unfair treatment from staff. Of those who wrote in something about how they would change the institution, one-quarter of the youth complained about how staff treated them. Girls were more likely than boys to write in comments about poor staff treatment. The allegations against staff ranged from staff favoritism and disrespectful treatment, to staff beating up youth and encouraging racial fights among the youth. Also, several gender differences emerged in how youth in the juvenile justice system perceived how they were treated. Girls were more likely than boys to see police behavior as fair. Boys were more likely than girls to perceive court personnel behavior as fair.

It is important to note the bivariate finding regarding the availability of medical services. Girls (38 percent) were more likely than boys (25 percent) to report that medical services were not available to them. This is consistent with previous research on the significantly worse access to medical care in incarcerated females facilities compared to incarcerated males (Acoca 1998). Girls were not only more likely to write about this concern of inadequate medical services in the open-ended questions, they were also more likely to approach the research staff distributing the survey with medical issues they believed were unaddressed. For example, one girl was very concerned about the lack of medical attention she was receiving for her foot, which she believed to be broken. Not only did she verbally report this, but several other girls wrote about this incident on their surveys.

### **Research Question #3: How does the context of offending differ based on gender?**

As previously noted, there were some problems with variables related to the context of offending due to the number of crimes listed by the youth as the current offenses for which they were incarcerated. Youth listed up to seven offenses for which they were incarcerated, while questions about the context of the offense were phrased as if referring to only one offense. Therefore, when they were asked a series of questions about the offense for which they were incarcerated, there may have been some confusion. Nonetheless, some general comments can be made about differences in the way girls and boys responded to these questions.

Previous research by Alarid et al. (1996) suggests that females are more likely to play a follower role in the commission of crime. When the youth were asked to report whether they were a leader or a follower in committing the offense in the current study, however, girls and boys did not differ in how they responded. In fact, a minority of girls (29 percent) perceived themselves as "followers." Previous research also reported that females, compared to males, cause fewer injuries, use fewer weapons, and are less likely to be on drugs (Campbell 1986; Triplett and Myers 1995). In the current study, however, boys and girls reported no significant differences in injuries caused, whether a weapon was used, or the likelihood of being on drugs at the time of the offense. Surprisingly, there were important gender differences in the choice of weapon. Girls were twice as likely as boys to use a knife, while boys were almost three times more likely than girls to use a gun. As expected from existing studies, however, girls were more likely than boys to report the victim was someone well-known to them, whereas boys were more likely than girls to report a stranger as the victim of their offense (Chesney-Lind and Brown 1998; Bunch et al. 1983).

The differences in who acted with the youth in committing the crime are worth noting. Almost two-fifths of the girls reported that boys were involved, one-third of the girls reported that men were involved, 62 percent reported other girls were involved, and more than one in ten reported women involved. Boys reported other boys involved three-fourths of the time, men involved about one-third of the time, girls were involved about 11 percent of the time and women were rarely involved (4 percent). Not only were boys more likely than girls to commit their offenses with other boys, and girls more likely than boys to commit their offenses with other girls, but overall, many more males were involved in crimes with multiple offenders (92 percent) compared to females (39 percent).

Finally, regarding motivations for committing the crime, it is worth noting that of the youth who responded to the question on why their offense was committed, one in ten of the girls, as opposed to only about 2 percent of the boys, noted that their offense was related to being "on the run." This finding supports the cycle many researchers have found of abuse or problems at home leading to running away, and, consequently, further involvement in the criminal justice system.

**Research Question #4: Is gender related to the type of programming and treatment delinquent youth request?**

In the bivariate findings, girls indicated a significantly higher interest than boys in eleven of the 18 programs listed (e.g., sex education, drug/alcohol treatment/education, anger management, learning to have good relationships, sexual abuse counseling, physical abuse counseling, emotional abuse counseling, family counseling, individual counseling, depression/mental health problems, and general health education). There were no desired services that males reported at a significantly greater rate than females. Notably, there were no gender differences in the youths' requests for sex offender treatment, problem solving skills, learning to live on their own, learning how to parent, learning how to be a better student, job/career skills, and sports or fitness training.

Thus, there are two important overall findings regarding this section. First, these findings suggest that many delinquent youth are quite aware of their needs and often desire the programs or service that best responds to the negative experiences they have had. Second, the gender differences in program needs are likely based on gender differences in girls' and boys' lives (not biological sex differences). More specifically, multivariate and scale analysis (not reported in the tables) suggests that it is these experiences measured by the scales, not the youth's sex, that predicts the programs the youth want. Or alternatively stated, delinquent and potentially delinquent youth appear to need programs based on their experiences and individual challenges, not so much based on their sex per se. Given that many of these experiences vary by gender, it is likely that some programs will be needed by a greater portion of the youth population in girls' than boys' institutions. For example, given that abuse histories are far more commonly reported by delinquent girls than delinquent boys, there is a greater need per capita for programs addressing abuse in girls' than boys' facilities and treatment programs, but it is very important that all youth, regardless of sex, have access to the varied programs.

**Research Question #5: Is gender related to the type of programming and treatment delinquent youth receive?**

Sex was significantly related to only four of the 18 programs listed on the survey. Boys were more likely than girls to report receiving programming on anger management training, independent living skills, learning how to be a better student, and sex offender treatment. This finding confirms previous research regarding gender differences in access to programs for delinquent youth once they are incarcerated (e.g. Dobash et al. 1986; Gelsehorpe 1989; Kempf-Leonard et al. 1997; Wells 1994), although it certainly could be a more extreme difference.

These data also provide an assessment of sorts as to how well the juvenile justice system responds to the programming desires of incarcerated youth. On average, 44 percent of youth reported desiring any program, but only an average of 11 percent of youth reported receiving any program. Some of the more profound differences between

programs desired and program received were job and careers skills (62 percent, percent desired minus percent received), sports/fitness training (58 percent), good relationship skills (53 percent), independent living (53 percent), better student skills (52 percent), parenting skills (44 percent), problems-solving skills (39 percent), anger management (39 percent), and general health education (37 percent). Programs received that came closer to matching program requested were sex offender treatment (6 percent, again, difference in desired versus received) and drug and alcohol treatment and education (8 percent).

Finally, it is important to remember that the judges and treatment center workers also noted the lack of available treatments. In particular, many of the judges appeared frustrated that they had few or even no adequate options available to send delinquent and troubled girls. The findings from the judge surveys also note the severe lack of public treatment services for girls. Although the private ones tended to be valued more by the judges and perhaps be more likely to include gender-specific services for girls, they were limited due to cost constraints in their abilities to send girls to these institutions.

### **The Development of Gender-Specific Services**

Gender-specific services refers to unique program models and services that comprehensively address the special needs of a targeted gender group (Greene et al. 1997). Based on the findings of this study, gender-specific services must address the following areas to be relevant for girls' lives: (1) parenting and childcare needs, (2) unique academic challenges, (3) various types of abuse experiences, (4) problematic family relationships and experiences, (5) greater substance use and abuse, (6) manifestations of poor mental health, (7) low self-esteem and negative gender identities, and (7) staff training in gender-specific services.

First, although boys were more likely to report fathering children, girls with children are more likely to accept the responsibility for raising that child once they are no longer incarcerated. Therefore, parenting skills and infant and toddler care may be especially pertinent to them. On the other hand, perhaps the opportunity (or requirement) in boys' institutions to take parenting skills may make boys more responsible about birth control and/or more responsible about their parental obligations. With only about 4 percent of girls reporting receiving parenting skills, there is clearly a need for more of this type of programming for girls. Significantly more girls were interested in sex education, another area related to reproductive health that would be beneficial for girls (and to the general public given the public concern with teenage and "welfare" mothers). Girls need more education about their bodies related to pregnancy and contraception. It is important to acknowledge that half of all youth (girls and boys) desired parenting skills, while few receive them (6 percent).

Although there were few educational differences between boys and girls, girls reported receiving less skills to help them become better students, and reported reasons for dropping out that were different from boys. Almost two-fifth of the girls quit school because they felt like they could not keep up, compared to 7 percent of the boys. Girls were more likely to leave school due to boredom, because no one cared if they learned or attended, or because they felt no one liked them. Because of the serious disadvantage academic failure creates for youth, there is reason to provide additional academic assistance to girls. This is especially relevant given the high rates of female-headed households and the supposed governmental concern to get people off of welfare.

One of the obvious challenges in developing gender specific programming is responding to the greater abuse histories of incarcerated girls. It has been suggested that abuse and neglect start youth down a pathway of running away, avoiding home, being taken out of their home, and early sexual experimentation (Arnold 1990; Belknap and Holsinger 1998; Chesney-Lind and Rodriguez 1983; Chesney-Lind and Sheldon 1992; Federle and Chesney-Lind 1992; Gilfus 1992; McCormack et al. 1986; Silbert and Pines 1981). In this study, 60 percent of the girls reported experiencing sexual abuse, 35 percent reported desiring sexual abuse counseling, and 9 percent actually report having received this type of treatment. Significant gender differences were present for virtually every variable examining abuse histories (including witnessing various types of abuse by family members). Significantly more girls (61 percent) than boys (40 percent) reported believing there is a connection between the abuse they experienced and their subsequent offending. Certainly, the same type of programming must be available to boys who have experienced abuse.

Neglect is another issue which was found to be perceived differently based on gender. Over half of the girls (56 percent) reported desertion by a parent compared to less than two-fifths of the boys. This is one of many findings that indicated delinquent girls perceive even more problematic family experiences than boys. As previously mentioned, girls were more likely than boys to report problematic relationships with their mothers, to report their parents have a difficult time controlling their behavior, and to report family problems related to their onset of offending. Additionally, self-reports of delinquency found girls more likely to report running away, with 79 percent of girls reporting having run away from home, as compared to 53 percent of boys.

Focus groups with professionals who work with girls also found blaming and punitive attitudes directed toward parents (Belknap et al. 1997). Yet girls were also more likely to report family relationships as what is going well in their lives and what makes them happy. Ideally, the family should be an important part of the solution, not just the problem. Family involvement in treatment for girls would be beneficial to help families cope with these negative experiences.

This study revealed important gender differences in drugs and alcohol use which suggest the need for gendered approaches in the treatment of incarcerated youth. Girls were more likely than boys to report the use of inhalants, PCP, cocaine, crack, heroin, prescription drugs and over-the-counter drugs, with girls reporting a younger age of first use for cocaine and crack. Even more revealing, however, were the gender differences related to the effects of drug or alcohol use. Many more girls than boys reported being addicted, which was supported by more girls than boys reporting withdrawal symptoms and trouble with family and friends because of drug use. Girls were more likely to report that their use preceded or was at the same time they started getting into trouble. This suggests that drug and alcohol use is more likely to cause girls than boys to get into trouble, while it is more likely to occur for boys after they start getting into trouble with the law. Also, girls were more likely to report starting to use because of a boyfriend or because of depression (consistent with findings that girls use drugs and alcohol to self-medicate, Girls Incorporated 1993).

The findings regarding mental health in this study indicate that delinquent girls are at a much greater risk for suicide and self-injurious behavior than boys. In the bivariate analysis almost half of the girls and less than one-quarter of the boys requested treatment for depression or other mental health problems. Unfortunately, only 12 percent of girls report receiving this type of treatment. An unexpected finding of this research project concerns gender differences in anger. Girls reported being more likely than boys to start fights when angry, lose control when angry, become easily frustrated, and yell when angry. In the bivariate analysis, girls were more likely to desire anger management training.

Although it was difficult to tap girls' experiences with sexism in this survey, building a positive gender identity seems to be an important aspect of gender-specific programming. Artz (1998) reported that the girls she interviewed saw few, if any, positive consequences associated with being female. Perhaps the best indicator of this phenomenon on the survey is seen in the results of the self-esteem, where girls were significantly more likely than boys to report being "failures," not having much to be proud of, not feeling "OK" about themselves, wishing they had more respect for themselves, feeling useless, and thinking they are "no good" sometimes.

Finally, a vital aspect of gender-specific programming involves staff training. Based on the findings of the focus groups with professionals who work with girls in Phase I of the Ohio Gender-Specific Services Workgroup (Belknap et al. 1997) and the responses to the open-ended questions on the current survey (Phase II of the OGSSWG), staff and youth would benefit from staff having this type of training. Girls are often described by staff as more difficult to work with than boys and more demanding on an emotional level. Understanding the relationship-orientation of girls, their struggles with self-esteem, and many of the other issues presented here, would give staff the

insights needed to be more responsive to the girls' needs. Overall, the youth need to be provided with the opportunities that would allow them to make positive changes in their lives.

### **Future Research**

Correctional programming for juveniles is at a crossroads, as many states, Ohio among them, begin to look at the unique needs of female offenders. As this research is being conducted, along with newer ways of theorizing about female delinquency, gender-specific services are beginning to take shape. There are several issues that should remain at the forefront as gender-specific services are developed.

First, as mentioned, in the past, both equal treatment and unequal treatment have worked to the disadvantage of girls. Equal treatment has meant that the unique needs of girls were ignored by a system based on boys' needs. Unequal treatment has been based on stereotyped ideas about what the needs of girls are. As argued by Albrecht (1997) it is important that equality be defined as providing opportunities, some different, some the same, to both girls and boys. Further, good services should be highly structured services, utilizing sensitive assessment techniques and incorporate effective evaluation mechanisms (Albrecht 1997).

Second, little has been done to incorporate knowledge about gender-specific services with existing correctional treatment literature. It is important to blend these two perspectives. For example, the principles of effective intervention (Andrews and Bonta 1994; Gendreau, Little, and Goggin 1996; and Palmer 1992) and meta-analyses conducted to determine what type of treatment works for offenders (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen 1990; Garrett 1985; Lipsey 1992; Whitehead and Lab 1989) should guide the development of gender-specific services for youth.

More research is needed to explain and develop explanations of female delinquency. Both all-girl research and cross-gender research will be needed to do this. Additionally, more qualitative studies are needed to better understand motivations and processes at work in girls' lives that are difficult to capture in quantitative research. Longitudinal studies that allow for observing family processes would be helpful as well. Clearly, the recommendations made in research guided by cycle of violence theories, feminist perspectives, and life-course theories are necessary to pursue. As indicated in this study, the context of offending and how that varies by gender requires further exploration.

Finally, the development of a curriculum to for those working with girls is essential to delivering gender-specific services. This work is underway with a document published by The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "Guiding Principals for Promising Female Programming: An Inventory of Best Practices" (Greene, Peters, and Associates 1998) that provides practical information on the design and implementation of

gender-specific programming for girls. From understanding the goals of the programs, to a deeper understanding of girls' development, staff training is at the center of successful interventions with girls. Training and improved awareness for police officers, prosecutors and judges, particularly those working with juveniles would also be beneficial. In taking these actions, the priorities of the juvenile justice system will change, improving the processing, and treatment of female delinquency.

Table 1. Institution and County Characteristics for Youth Sample

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>DYS Institution (N=444)</b>						
Freedom Center	24	(14.7)				(5.4)
Scioto Juv. Corr. Center (T1)	109	(66.9)				(24.6)
Scioto Juv. Corr. Center (T2 <sup>1</sup> )	30	(18.4)				(6.8)
Indian River School			23	(8.2)		(5.2)
Circleville Youth Center			45	(16.0)		(10.1)
Maumee Youth Center			19	(6.8)		(4.3)
Training Institute Central Ohio			22	(7.8)		(5.0)
Cuyahoga Hills Boys School			54	(19.2)		(12.2)
Mohican Youth Center			17	(6.0)		(3.8)
Ohio River Valley			45	(16.0)		(10.1)
Opportunity Center			7	(2.5)		(1.6)
Scioto Juv. Corr. Center			19	(6.8)		(4.3)
Riverview Juv. Corr. Center			30	(10.7)		(6.8)
<b>County respondent is from<sup>2</sup> (N=444)</b>						
Allen	5	(3.1)	6	(2.1)	11	(2.5)
Butler	2	(1.2)	10	(3.6)	12	(2.7)
Cuyahoga	30	(18.4)	54	(19.2)	84	(18.9)
Franklin	3	(1.8)	17	(6.0)	20	(4.5)
Hamilton	19	(11.7)	42	(14.9)	61	(13.7)
Licking	5	(3.1)	8	(2.8)	13	(2.9)
Lorain	7	(4.3)	9	(3.2)	16	(3.6)
Lucas	5	(3.1)	12	(4.3)	17	(3.8)
Mahoning	5	(3.1)	6	(2.1)	11	(2.5)
Montgomery	12	(7.4)	18	(6.4)	30	(6.8)
Stark	8	(4.9)	14	(5.0)	22	(5.0)
Summit	6	(3.7)	13	(4.6)	19	(4.3)
Other <sup>3</sup>	56	(34.4)	72	(25.6)	128	(28.8)

1. Data were collected from the girls at Scioto at two different time to increase sample size.

2. Thirty of Ohio's 88 counties were not represented.

3. Counties with 10 or fewer respondents were included in the "other" category. A total of 46 counties are included in this category.

Table 2. Youth Demographic Characteristics

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N (%)	
<b>Sex</b> (N=444)	163	(36.7)	281	(63.3)	444	(100.0)
<b>Sexual orientation</b> <sup>1</sup> (N=404)						39.85***
Heterosexual	111	(73.0)	239	(94.8)	350	(86.6)
Homosexual	7	(4.6)	4	(1.6)	11	(2.7)
Bisexual	34	(22.4)	9	(3.6)	43	(10.6)
<b>Race</b> (N=441)						3.05
African-American	59	(36.2)	122	(43.9)	181	(41.0)
White	78	(47.9)	123	(44.2)	201	(45.6)
Other <sup>1</sup>	26	(16.0)	33	(11.9)	59	(13.4)
<b>Age</b> (N=444)						4.77***
12 to 13	10	(6.1)	5	(1.8)	15	(3.4)
14 to 15	43	(26.4)	50	(17.8)	93	(20.9)
16 to 17	90	(55.2)	162	(57.7)	252	(56.8)
18 to 20	20	(12.3)	64	(22.8)	84	(18.9)
		$\chi^2 = 15.94$		$\chi^2 = 16.59$		
<b>Economic status</b> (N=438)						1.75
Poor	14	(8.7)	32	(11.6)	46	(10.5)
Working-class	43	(26.7)	81	(29.2)	124	(28.3)
Middle-class	88	(54.7)	135	(48.7)	223	(50.9)
Upper-class	16	(9.9)	29	(10.5)	45	(10.3)
<b>Describe neighborhood</b> (N=436)						9.22**
Lots of poor people	18	(11.2)	51	(18.5)	69	(15.8)
Medium poor people	57	(35.4)	116	(42.4)	173	(39.7)
Few poor people	86	(53.4)	108	(39.3)	106	(44.5)
<b>Family received welfare</b> (N=433)						1.14
Yes	65	(40.6)	125	(45.8)	190	(43.9)
No	61	(38.1)	93	(34.1)	154	(35.6)
Don't know	34	(21.3)	55	(20.1)	89	(20.6)
<b>Recalculated economic status</b> <sup>2</sup> (N=440)						1.75
Poor	71	(43.8)	130	(46.8)	201	(45.7)
Working-class	22	(13.6)	33	(11.9)	55	(12.5)
Middle-class	56	(34.6)	90	(32.4)	146	(33.2)
Upper-class	13	(8.0)	25	(9.0)	38	(8.6)

1. This category includes Native American, Hispanic, Puerto Rican, Spanish, Asian, South African, and Bi-racial.

2. Those who reported that while growing up their family received public assistance or welfare were placed into the "poor" category.

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except age, in which case a t-test was used.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 3. Youths' Relationship, Pregnancy, and Parenthood Characteristics

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>Relationship Status (N=436)</b>						4.57
Single	33	(20.4)	57	(20.8)	90	(20.6)
Boy/Girlfriend	120	(74.1)	212	(77.4)	332	(76.1)
Married or common-law	9	(5.6)	5	(1.8)	14	(3.2)
<b>Age difference between respondent and boyfriend or girlfriend (N=348)</b>						-8.40***
1-7 yrs. younger <sup>2</sup>	8	(6.2)	46	(21.1)	54	(15.5)
Partner same age	15	(11.5)	66	(30.3)	81	(23.3)
1-3 yrs. older <sup>3</sup>	53	(40.8)	88	(40.4)	141	(40.5)
4-13 yrs. older	54	(41.5)	18	(8.3)	72	(20.7)
		$\chi^2 = 3.45$		$\chi^2 = .97$		
<b>Children (N=412)</b>						12.78***
Yes	22	(13.8)	73	(29.0)	95	(23.1)
No	138	(86.3)	179	(71.0)	317	(76.9)
<b>Children live with<sup>4</sup>: (N=78)</b>						29.39***
Me	2	(11.8)	10	(16.4)	12	(15.4)
Other parent	4	(23.5)	47	(77.0)	51	(65.4)
Other <sup>5</sup>	11	(64.7)	4	(6.6)	15	(19.2)
<b>Pregnancy (N=158)</b>						
Never	102	(64.5)				
Once	33	(20.9)				
Twice	14	(8.9)				
Three or more	9	(5.7)				
<b>Miscarriage (N=158)</b>						
Yes	44	(27.8)				
No	114	(72.7)				
<b>Abortion (N=158)</b>						
Yes	9	(5.7)				
No	149	(94.3)				

1. This finding should be interpreted with caution since one cell has expected count of less than 5.

2. Partner is younger than respondent.

3. Partner is older than respondent.

4. This should be interpreted with caution due to small cell sizes.

5. This category includes children living with another family member, living in DHS, or foster care, or given up for adoption.

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except age differences between respondent and boyfriend or girlfriend, in which case a t-test was used.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 4. Youths' Educational Background

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Grade completed<sup>1</sup></b> (N=434)							4.39**
1 to 6	6	(3.7)	7	(2.6)	13	(3.0)	
7 to 9	112	(69.6)	167	(61.2)	279	(64.3)	
10 to 12	43	(26.7)	99	(36.3)	142	(32.7)	
		$\bar{=} = 8.75$		$\bar{=} = 9.12$			
<b>School attendance</b> (N=433)							0.02
Yes	117	(72.2)	194	(71.6)	311	(71.8)	
No	45	(27.8)	77	(28.4)	122	(28.2)	
<b>Type of classes attended</b> (N=430)							2.41
Regular classes	111	(69.4)	191	(70.7)	302	(70.2)	
Special ed. classes	37	(23.1)	68	(25.2)	105	(24.4)	
Vocational only	12	(7.5)	11	(4.1)	23	(5.3)	
<b>Skipped school</b> (N=441)							1.49
Never	42	(25.9)	80	(28.7)	122	(27.7)	
Monthly	19	(11.7)	38	(13.6)	57	(12.9)	
Weekly	38	(23.5)	68	(24.4)	106	(24.0)	
Daily	63	(38.9)	93	(33.3)	156	(35.4)	
<b>Ever suspended</b> (N=389)							1.79
Yes	42	(27.8)	52	(21.8)	94	(24.2)	
No	109	(72.2)	186	(78.2)	295	(75.8)	
<b>Ever expelled</b> (N=389)							1.34
Yes	38	(25.2)	48	(20.2)	86	(22.1)	
No	113	(74.8)	190	(79.8)	303	(77.9)	
<b>Age when dropped or expelled</b> (N=190)							1.26
9 or younger	1	(1.4)	3	(2.5)	4	(2.1)	
10-12	7	(9.7)	14	(11.9)	21	(11.1)	
13-15	45	(62.5)	51	(43.2)	96	(50.5)	
6-18	19	(26.4)	50	(42.4)	69	(36.3)	
		$\bar{=} = 14.26$		$\bar{=} = 14.65$			
<b>Repeated grade</b> (N=429)							0.47
Yes	101	(63.9)	182	(67.2)	283	(66.0)	
No	57	(36.1)	89	(32.8)	146	(34.0)	
<b>Grade repeated<sup>2</sup>:</b> (N=429)							
K-3	30	(19.0)	56	(20.7)	86	(20.0)	0.18
4-6	18	(11.4)	46	(17.0)	64	(14.9)	2.45
7-9	59	(37.3)	97	(35.8)	156	(36.4)	0.10
10-12	6	(3.8)	8	(3.0)	14	(3.3)	0.23
<b>Educational experience</b> (N=442)							0.18
Poor	21	(12.9)	34	(12.2)	55	(12.4)	
Adequate	53	(32.5)	96	(34.4)	149	(33.7)	
Good	89	(54.6)	149	(53.4)	238	(53.8)	
<b>Ever dropped out or quit</b> (N=444)							
Yes	67	(41.1)	88	(31.3)	155	(34.9)	4.35*
No	96	(58.9)	193	(68.7)	289	(65.1)	

Table 4. Youths' Educational Background, (Continued.)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Report card grades (N=437)</b>							-1.66
A's	7	(4.4)	9	(3.2)	16	(3.7)	
A's and B's	35	(21.9)	47	(17.0)	82	(18.8)	
B's	3	(1.9)	12	(4.3)	15	(3.4)	
B's and C's	44	(27.5)	56	(20.2)	100	(22.9)	
C's	11	(6.9)	30	(10.8)	41	(9.4)	
C's and D's	32	(20.0)	69	(24.9)	101	(23.1)	
D's	13	(8.1)	20	(7.2)	33	(7.6)	
F's	15	(9.4)	34	(12.3)	49	(11.2)	
		$\bar{=} = 4.50$		$\bar{=} = 4.17$			
<b>Trouble in school (N=444)</b>							1.21
Never	16	(9.8)	25	(8.9)	41	(9.2)	
Sometimes	69	(42.3)	128	(45.6)	197	(44.4)	
Usually	36	(22.1)	67	(23.8)	103	(23.2)	
Always	42	(25.8)	61	(21.7)	103	(23.2)	
<b>Got along with other kids at school (N=443)</b>							2.95
Never	6	(3.7)	18	(6.4)	24	(5.4)	
Sometimes	38	(23.5)	58	(20.6)	96	(21.7)	
Usually	69	(42.6)	107	(38.1)	176	(39.7)	
Always	49	(30.2)	98	(34.9)	147	(33.2)	
<b>Got along with teachers (N=442)</b>							1.71
Never	22	(13.6)	37	(13.2)	59	(13.3)	
Sometimes	43	(26.5)	90	(32.1)	133	(30.1)	
Usually	58	(35.8)	88	(31.4)	146	(33.0)	
Always	39	(24.1)	65	(23.2)	104	(23.5)	
<b>Educational expectations (N=437)</b>							6.53
Less than high school	10	(6.2)	29	(10.5)	39	(8.9)	
High school	25	(15.5)	59	(21.4)	84	(19.2)	
Post-high school	52	(32.3)	89	(32.2)	141	(32.3)	
Graduate college	74	(46.0)	99	(35.9)	173	(39.6)	
<b>Observed racism (N=438)</b>							2.96
Agree	133	(82.1)	207	(75.0)	340	(77.6)	
Disagree	29	(17.9)	69	(25.0)	98	(22.4)	
<b>Experience racism (N=438)</b>							0.02
Agree	80	(49.4)	138	(50.0)	218	(49.8)	
Disagree	82	(50.6)	138	(50.0)	220	(50.2)	

1. Where interval level data are used and means are reported, significance is based on t-tests.
2. Respondents reported all the grades they repeated, therefore, the ns total more than the number of individuals who answered this question. Respondents were able to report up to 3 grades they had repeated.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 5. Youths' Reasons Reported for Why Dropped Out or Quit School<sup>1</sup> (N=155)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Pregnancy related reasons</b>						0.24
Yes	6	(9.0)	6	(6.8)	12	(7.7)
No	61	(91.0)	82	(93.2)	143	(92.3)
<b>Trouble with the law</b>						1.10
Yes	48	(71.6)	56	(63.6)	104	(67.1)
No	19	(28.4)	32	(36.4)	31	(32.9)
<b>Could not keep up at school</b>						9.32**
Yes	28	(41.8)	17	(19.3)	45	(29.0)
No	39	(58.2)	71	(80.7)	110	(71.0)
<b>Family moved a lot</b>						0.35
Yes	5	(7.5)	9	(10.2)	14	(9.0)
No	62	(92.5)	79	(89.8)	141	(91.0)
<b>I left home</b>						11.80***
Yes	32	(47.8)	19	(21.6)	51	(32.9)
No	35	(52.2)	69	(78.4)	104	(67.1)
<b>I was bored</b>						5.15*
Yes	35	(52.2)	30	(34.1)	65	(41.9)
No	32	(47.8)	58	(65.9)	90	(58.1)
<b>Conflict with teachers</b>						0.03
Yes	16	(23.9)	22	(25.0)	38	(24.5)
No	51	(76.1)	66	(75.0)	117	(75.5)
<b>No one cared if I learned or attended</b>						4.20*
Yes	8	(11.9)	3	(3.4)	11	(7.1)
No	59	(88.1)	85	(96.6)	144	(92.9)
<b>Nobody liked me at school</b>						4.20*
Yes	8	(11.9)	3	(3.4)	11	(7.1)
No	59	(88.1)	85	(96.6)	144	(92.9)
<b>Had to work to help family earn money</b>						0.23
Yes	4	(6.0)	7	(8.0)	11	(7.1)
No	63	(94.0)	81	(92.0)	144	(92.9)
<b>Transportation problems</b>						1.69
Yes	3	(4.5)	1	(1.1)	4	(2.6)
No	64	(95.5)	87	(98.9)	151	(97.4)
<b>Health problems</b>						0.12
Yes	1	(1.5)	2	(2.3)	3	(1.9)
No	66	(98.5)	86	(97.7)	152	(98.1)

1. Respondents were to report as many reasons/all reasons they dropped out of or quit school. These analyses were only conducted on the 155 youth who reported dropping out of or quitting school who provided reasons why they did so.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 5. Youths' Reasons Reported for Why Dropped Out or Quit School<sup>1</sup> (N=155)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Pregnancy related reasons</b>						0.24
Yes	6	(9.0)	6	(6.8)	12	(7.7)
No	61	(91.0)	82	(93.2)	143	(92.3)
<b>Trouble with the law</b>						1.10
Yes	48	(71.6)	56	(63.6)	104	(67.1)
No	19	(28.4)	32	(36.4)	31	(32.9)
<b>Could not keep up at school</b>						9.32**
Yes	28	(41.8)	17	(19.3)	45	(29.0)
No	39	(58.2)	71	(80.7)	110	(71.0)
<b>Family moved a lot</b>						0.35
Yes	5	(7.5)	9	(10.2)	14	(9.0)
No	62	(92.5)	79	(89.8)	141	(91.0)
<b>I left home</b>						11.80***
Yes	32	(47.8)	19	(21.6)	51	(32.9)
No	35	(52.2)	69	(78.4)	104	(67.1)
<b>I was bored</b>						5.15*
Yes	35	(52.2)	30	(34.1)	65	(41.9)
No	32	(47.8)	58	(65.9)	90	(58.1)
<b>Conflict with teachers</b>						0.03
Yes	16	(23.9)	22	(25.0)	38	(24.5)
No	51	(76.1)	66	(75.0)	117	(75.5)
<b>No one cared if I learned or attended</b>						4.20*
Yes	8	(11.9)	3	(3.4)	11	(7.1)
No	59	(88.1)	85	(96.6)	144	(92.9)
<b>Nobody liked me at school</b>						4.20*
Yes	8	(11.9)	3	(3.4)	11	(7.1)
No	59	(88.1)	85	(96.6)	144	(92.9)
<b>Had to work to help family earn money</b>						0.23
Yes	4	(6.0)	7	(8.0)	11	(7.1)
No	63	(94.0)	81	(92.0)	144	(92.9)
<b>Transportation problems</b>						1.69
Yes	3	(4.5)	1	(1.1)	4	(2.6)
No	64	(95.5)	87	(98.9)	151	(97.4)
<b>Health problems</b>						0.12
Yes	1	(1.5)	2	(2.3)	3	(1.9)
No	66	(98.5)	86	(97.7)	152	(98.1)

1. Respondents were to report as many reasons/all reasons they dropped out of or quit school. These analyses were only conducted on the 155 youth who reported dropping out of or quitting school who provided reasons why they did so.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 6. Youths' General Information about Their Parents

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Parents divorced (N=389)</b>							2.16
Yes	70	(49.6)	104	(41.9)	174	(44.7)	
No	71	(50.4)	144	(58.1)	215	(55.3)	
<b>Age when parents divorced<sup>i</sup> (N=140)</b>							-.02
0-5	31	(52.5)	44	(54.3)	75	(53.6)	
6-10	14	(23.7)	19	(23.5)	33	(23.6)	
11-15	12	(20.3)	15	(18.5)	27	(19.3)	
16 plus	2	(3.4)	3	(3.7)	5	(3.6)	
		$\chi^2 = 6.37$		$\chi^2 = 6.36$			
<b>Deserted by a parent (N=411)</b>							11.83***
Yes	83	(55.7)	100	(38.2)	183	(44.5)	
No	66	(44.3)	162	(61.8)	228	(55.5)	
<b>Family member to mental hospital (N=436)</b>							16.48***
Yes	56	(35.0)	49	(17.8)	105	(24.1)	
No	104	(65.0)	227	(82.2)	331	(75.9)	
<b>Parent to a mental hospital (N=436)</b>							.15
Yes	12	(7.5)	18	(6.5)	30	(6.9)	
No	148	(92.5)	258	(93.5)	406	(93.1)	
<b>Death of a parent (N=444)</b>							.40
Yes	20	(12.3)	29	(10.3)	49	(11.0)	
No	143	(87.7)	252	(89.7)	395	(89.0)	
<b>Death of a parent under tragic circumstances<sup>ii</sup> (N=444)</b>							.49
Yes	12	(7.4)	16	(5.7)	28	(6.3)	
No	151	(92.6)	265	(94.3)	416	(93.7)	
<b>First person in family incarcerated (N=425)</b>							2.34
Yes	25	(15.7)	58	(21.8)	83	(19.5)	
No	134	(84.3)	208	(78.2)	342	(80.5)	
<b>Parent incarcerated (N=425)</b>							2.01
Yes	110	(69.2)	166	(62.4)	276	(64.9)	
No	49	(30.8)	100	(37.6)	149	(35.1)	
<b>Raised by parents<sup>iii</sup> (N=437)</b>							1.16
Yes	140	(86.4)	247	(89.8)	387	(88.6)	
No	22	(13.6)	28	(10.2)	50	(11.4)	
<b>Raised by others<sup>iv</sup> (N=437)</b>							12.33***
Yes	76	(46.9)	83	(30.2)	159	(36.4)	
No	86	(53.1)	192	(69.8)	278	(63.6)	
<b>Lived with parents before coming here (N=434)</b>							3.72
Yes	103	(63.6)	197	(72.4)	300	(69.1)	
No	59	(36.4)	75	(27.6)	134	(30.9)	
<b>Lived with others before coming here (N=434)</b>							3.15
Yes	52	(32.1)	66	(24.3)	118	(27.2)	
No	110	(67.9)	206	(75.7)	316	(72.8)	
<b>Adult I've lived with who used alcohol the most, used alcohol: (N=437)</b>							3.13
Never	56	(34.6)	103	(37.5)	159	(36.4)	
Seldom	34	(21.0)	72	(26.2)	106	(24.3)	
Sometimes	31	(19.1)	45	(16.4)	76	(17.4)	
Frequent	41	(25.3)	55	(20.0)	96	(22.0)	

Table 6. Youths' General Information about Their Parents (Continued)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>Adult I've lived with who used drugs the most, used drugs:</b> (N=440)						4.97
Never	85	(52.1)	174	(62.8)	259	(58.9)
Seldom	26	(16.0)	37	(13.4)	63	(14.3)
Sometimes	24	(14.7)	30	(10.8)	54	(12.3)
Frequent	28	(17.2)	36	(13.0)	64	(14.5)
<b>Adults I lived with provided basic needs</b> (N=438)						.04
Agree	140	(87.5)	245	(88.1)	385	(87.9)
Disagree	20	(12.5)	33	(11.9)	53	(12.1)
<b>Adults I lived with did not like me</b> (N=436)						.28
Agree	39	(24.1)	60	(21.9)	99	(22.7)
Disagree	123	(75.9)	214	(78.1)	337	(77.3)
<b>Rather be here than at home</b> (N=438)						8.68**
Agree	23	(14.1)	16	(5.8)	39	(8.9)
Disagree	140	(85.9)	259	(94.2)	399	(91.1)
<b>Relationship with mom</b> (N=429)						12.55**
Don't have one	15	(9.4)	19	(7.1)	34	(7.9)
Poor	11	(6.9)	15	(5.6)	26	(6.1)
OK	68	(42.5)	77	(28.6)	145	(33.8)
Great	66	(41.3)	158	(58.7)	224	(52.2)
<b>Relationship with dad</b> (N=427)						4.89
Don't have one	41	(25.5)	80	(30.1)	121	(28.3)
Poor	26	(16.1)	31	(11.7)	57	(13.3)
OK	53	(32.9)	71	(26.7)	124	(29.0)
Great	41	(25.5)	84	(31.6)	125	(29.3)

i. Where interval level data are used and means are reported, significance is based on t-tests.

ii. The category "tragedy" includes death by murder, drugs, suicide, accident, or AIDS.

iii. Youth being raised by parents includes youth being raised by at least one parent or their mother and father living together.

iv. This category includes all others that were reported as raising the respondent. The most frequently mentioned others were grandparents, siblings, aunts, uncles, foster parents and group homes.

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 7. Youths' Reports of Parental Control and Punitive Behavior

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total N	Chi-Square (%)
	n	(%)	n	(%)		
<b>Main way punished (N=439)</b>						4.86
Not punished	19	(11.8)	30	(10.8)	49	(11.2)
Talked to	10	(6.2)	32	(11.5)	42	(9.6)
Screamed at	26	(16.1)	38	(13.7)	64	(14.6)
Privileges revoked	72	(44.7)	109	(39.2)	181	(41.2)
Physically punished	34	(21.1)	69	(24.8)	103	(23.5)
<b>Parents know where I am (N=439)</b>						1.02
Never	52	(32.3)	79	(28.4)	131	(29.8)
Sometimes	57	(35.4)	107	(38.5)	164	(37.4)
Usually	25	(15.5)	48	(17.3)	73	(16.6)
Always	27	(16.8)	44	(15.8)	71	(16.2)
<b>Important for parents to know where I am (N=439)</b>						1.51
Never	15	(9.3)	26	(9.4)	41	(9.3)
Sometimes	35	(21.7)	67	(24.1)	102	(23.2)
Usually	26	(16.1)	54	(19.4)	80	(18.2)
Always	85	(52.8)	131	(47.1)	216	(49.2)
<b>Important for parents to know my friends (N=441)</b>						5.65
Never	30	(18.4)	43	(15.5)	73	(16.6)
Sometimes	40	(24.5)	83	(29.9)	123	(27.9)
Usually	43	(26.4)	51	(18.3)	94	(21.3)
Always	50	(30.7)	101	(36.3)	151	(34.2)
<b>Parents make sure I come home at a certain time (N=440)</b>						.41
Never	27	(16.7)	42	(15.1)	69	(15.7)
Sometimes	38	(23.5)	71	(25.5)	109	(24.8)
Usually	39	(24.1)	69	(24.8)	108	(24.5)
Always	58	(35.8)	96	(34.5)	154	(35.0)
<b>Parents expect me call if I'll be home late (N=440)</b>						4.85
Never	20	(12.3)	36	(12.9)	56	(12.7)
Sometimes	23	(14.2)	46	(16.5)	69	(15.7)
Usually	27	(16.7)	66	(23.7)	93	(21.1)
Always	92	(56.8)	130	(46.8)	222	(50.5)
<b>I really go where I tell my parents I am going (N=440)</b>						7.85*
Never	32	(19.8)	33	(11.9)	65	(14.8)
Sometimes	73	(45.1)	116	(41.7)	189	(43.0)
Usually	38	(23.5)	81	(29.1)	119	(27.0)
Always	19	(11.7)	48	(17.3)	67	(15.2)
<b>Parents punish me if I break the rules (N=439)</b>						2.70
Never	25	(15.3)	56	(20.3)	81	(18.5)
Sometimes	58	(35.6)	90	(32.6)	148	(33.7)
Usually	35	(21.5)	66	(23.9)	101	(23.0)
Always	45	(27.6)	64	(23.2)	109	(24.8)
<b>Parents have hard time controlling my behavior (N=437)</b>						29.47***
Never	20	(12.4)	86	(31.2)	106	(24.3)
Sometimes	59	(36.6)	112	(40.6)	171	(39.1)
Usually	48	(29.8)	44	(15.9)	92	(21.1)
Always	34	(21.1)	34	(12.3)	68	(15.6)
<b>Punishment from parents works, I behave better (N=436)</b>						9.16*
Never	62	(38.0)	71	(26.0)	133	(30.5)
Sometimes	64	(39.3)	113	(41.4)	177	(40.6)
Usually	24	(14.7)	65	(23.8)	89	(20.4)
Always	13	(8.0)	24	(8.8)	37	(8.5)

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 8. Youths' Abuse History

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Reported verbal from family<sup>i</sup></b> (N=444)							5.60*
Yes	108	(66.3)	154	(54.8)	262	(59.0)	
No	55	(33.7)	127	(45.2)	182	(41.0)	
<b>Reported verbal from others<sup>ii</sup></b> (N=444)							20.83***
Yes	90	(55.2)	93	(33.1)	183	(41.2)	
No	73	(44.8)	188	(66.9)	261	(58.8)	
<b>Reported physical abuse from family</b> (N=444)							6.23*
Yes	122	(74.8)	178	(63.3)	300	(67.6)	
No	41	(25.2)	103	(36.7)	144	(32.4)	
<b>Reported physical abuse from others</b> (N=444)							34.20***
Yes	106	(65.0)	102	(36.3)	208	(46.8)	
No	57	(35.0)	179	(63.7)	236	(53.2)	
<b>Physical abuse repeated over time</b> (N=379)							14.45***
Yes	90	(62.9)	101	(42.8)	191	(50.4)	
No	53	(37.1)	135	(57.2)	188	(49.6)	
<b>Reported sexual abuse from anyone<sup>iii</sup></b> (N=444)							75.73***
Yes	96	(58.9)	52	(18.5)	148	(33.3)	
No	67	(41.1)	229	(81.5)	296	(66.7)	
<b>Reported sexual abuse from family</b> (N=444)							17.45***
Yes	37	(22.7)	24	(8.5)	61	(13.7)	
No	126	(77.3)	257	(91.5)	383	(86.3)	
<b>Reported sexual abuse from others</b> (N=444)							77.10***
Yes	86	(52.8)	39	(13.9)	125	(28.2)	
No	77	(47.2)	242	(86.1)	319	(71.8)	
<b>Sexual abuse repeated over time</b> (N=343)							42.70***
Yes	65	(45.8)	28	(13.9)	93	(27.1)	
No	77	(54.2)	173	(86.1)	250	(72.9)	
<b>Total number of sexual abusers<sup>iv</sup></b> (N=444)							-8.55***
None	67	(41.1)	229	(81.5)	296	(66.7)	
One or two	77	(47.2)	45	(16.0)	122	(27.5)	
Three or more	19	(11.7)	7	(2.5)	26	(5.8)	
		= 1.14		= .29			
<b>Total number of sexual abusers (of those who reported any sexual abuse)</b> (N=148)							-1.78
One or two	77	(80.2)	45	(86.5)	122	(82.4)	
Three or more	19	(19.8)	7	(13.5)	26	(17.6)	
		= 1.93		= 1.58			
<b>Did abuse lead to getting into trouble</b> (N=310)							13.05***
Yes	78	(60.9)	73	(40.1)	151	(48.7)	
No	50	(39.1)	109	(59.9)	159	(51.3)	
<b>Witnessed verbal abuse</b> (N=444)							7.93**
Yes	91	(55.8)	118	(42.0)	209	(47.1)	
No	72	(44.2)	163	(58.0)	235	(52.9)	
<b>Witnessed physical abuse</b> (N=444)							15.04***
Yes	80	(49.1)	86	(30.6)	166	(37.4)	
No	83	(50.9)	195	(69.4)	278	(62.6)	
<b>Witnessed sexual abuse</b> (N=444)							5.23*
Yes	20	(12.3)	17	(6.0)	37	(8.3)	
No	143	(87.7)	264	(94.0)	407	(91.7)	

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

i. This category includes father, step-father, mother, step-mother, brother, or sister.

ii. This category includes boyfriend, girlfriend, spouse, friend, stranger, or anyone else.

iii. This category includes sexual abuse from family or others.

iv. Where interval level data are used and means are reported, significance is based on t-tests.

Table 9. Youths' Reports of Role Models, Peers and Recreation

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total N	Chi-Square (%)
	n	(%)	n	(%)		
<b>Positive role models (N=441)</b>						1.40
Yes	141	(87.0)	231	(82.8)	372	(84.4)
No	21	(13.0)	48	(17.2)	69	(15.6)
<b>Currently a gang member (N=427)</b>						.23
Yes	35	(22.6)	67	(24.6)	102	(23.9)
No	120	(77.4)	205	(75.4)	325	(76.1)
<b>Friends involved in crime (N=430)</b>						1.49
Yes	129	(81.1)	232	(85.6)	361	(84.0)
No	30	(18.9)	39	(14.4)	69	(16.0)
<b>Friends that always stay out of trouble (N=429)</b>						2.06
Yes	100	(62.9)	188	(69.6)	288	(67.1)
No	59	(37.1)	82	(30.4)	141	(32.9)
<b>Friends use drugs or alcohol (N=431)</b>						.08
Yes	149	(93.7)	253	(93.0)	402	(93.3)
No	10	(6.3)	19	(7.0)	29	(6.7)
<b>Participation in clubs, organization or sports (N=442)</b>						4.25*
Yes	74	(45.4)	155	(55.6)	229	(51.8)
No	89	(54.6)	124	(44.4)	213	(48.2)
<b>Lots of time with nothing to do (N=435)</b>						1.88
Yes	103	(64.0)	157	(57.3)	260	(59.8)
No	58	(36.0)	117	(42.7)	175	(40.2)
<b>Hobbies or interests (N=440)</b>						.02
Yes	144	(88.9)	246	(88.5)	390	(88.6)
No	18	(11.1)	32	(11.5)	50	(11.4)

\*  $p \leq .05$ .\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Table 10. Youths' Reported Self-Esteem

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>I'm a person of worth</b> (N=435)						.88
Agree	136	(84.0)	238	(87.2)	374	(86.0)
Disagree	26	(16.0)	35	(12.8)	61	(14.0)
<b>I have good qualities</b> (N=440)						3.66
Agree	147	(90.2)	263	(94.9)	410	(93.2)
Disagree	16	(9.8)	14	(5.1)	30	(6.8)
<b>I am a failure</b> (N=439)						5.93*
Agree	34	(21.0)	34	(12.3)	68	(15.5)
Disagree	128	(79.0)	243	(87.7)	371	(84.5)
<b>I do things as well as most people</b> (N=443)						.86
Agree	144	(88.3)	255	(91.1)	399	(90.1)
Disagree	19	(11.7)	25	(8.9)	44	(9.9)
<b>I do not have much to be proud of</b> (N=440)						3.91*
Agree	46	(28.4)	56	(20.1)	102	(23.2)
Disagree	116	(71.6)	222	(79.9)	338	(76.8)
<b>I feel OK about myself</b> (N=441)						5.84*
Agree	132	(81.5)	250	(89.6)	382	(86.6)
Disagree	30	(18.5)	29	(10.4)	59	(13.4)
<b>I am satisfied with myself</b> (N=431)						3.05
Agree	117	(72.2)	214	(79.6)	331	(76.8)
Disagree	45	(27.8)	55	(20.4)	100	(23.2)
<b>I wish I could have more respect for myself</b> (N=437)						11.00***
Agree	117	(71.8)	153	(55.8)	270	(61.8)
Disagree	46	(28.2)	121	(44.2)	167	(38.2)
<b>I feel useless at times</b> (N=435)						4.22*
Agree	82	(51.3)	113	(41.1)	195	(44.8)
Disagree	78	(48.8)	162	(58.9)	240	(55.2)
<b>At times, I think I am no good at all</b> (N=438)						11.94***
Agree	74	(45.4)	80	(29.1)	154	(35.2)
Disagree	89	(54.6)	195	(70.9)	284	(64.8)
<b>Coolness (1 to 10 with 10 being the coolest)</b> (N=424)						-.30
1 - 3	7	(4.4)	10	(3.8)	17	(4.0)
4 - 6	33	(20.6)	60	(22.7)	93	(21.9)
7 & 8	65	(40.6)	100	(37.9)	165	(38.9)
9 & 10	55	(34.4)	94	(35.6)	149	(35.1)
		= 7.69		= 7.63		

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except for the respondents rating of their "coolness," in which case a t-test was used.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 11. Girls' Moral Judgement Statements<sup>i</sup> (*Lost Original by Mistake this is all Girls*)

Question	African-American		White		Total		Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>If someone has something you really want, it's OK to make them give it to you. (N=136)</b>							
Agree <sup>ii</sup>	15	(25.9)	17	(21.8)	32	(23.5)	.31
Disagree	43	(74.1)	61	(78.2)	104	(76.5)	
<b>It's OK to punch or hit someone when you are having an argument. (N=136)</b>							
Agree	13	(22.4)	23	(29.5)	36	(26.5)	.86
Disagree	45	(77.6)	55	(70.5)	100	(73.5)	
<b>Fighting is a good way to defend your friends. (N=135)</b>							
Agree	14	(24.1)	26	(33.8)	40	(29.6)	1.47
Disagree	44	(75.9)	51	(66.2)	95	(70.4)	
<b>It's OK to use threats to get what you want. (N=136)</b>							
Agree	6	(10.3)	18	(23.1)	24	(17.6)	3.71*
Disagree	52	(89.7)	60	(76.9)	112	(82.4)	
<b>It's OK to damage buildings and property as a way of getting even. (N=136)</b>							
Agree	9	(15.5)	17	(21.8)	26	(19.1)	.85
Disagree	49	(84.5)	61	(78.2)	110	(80.9)	
<b>If I don't like my teacher, it's OK to act up in school. (N=136)</b>							
Agree	12	(20.7)	13	(16.7)	25	(18.4)	.36
Disagree	46	(79.3)	65	(83.3)	111	(81.6)	

i. From Artz (1998) *Sex, Power and the Violent School Girl*. Toronto: Trifolium Books, Inc.

ii. "Agree" includes the categories "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" while "Disagree" includes the categories "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree".

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

Table 12. Youths' Personalities and Attitudes

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Better than most people you know (N=435)</b>						.08
Yes	49	(30.2)	79	(28.9)	128	(29.4)
No	113	(69.8)	194	(71.1)	307	(70.6)
<b>When angry, start fights (N=438)</b>						9.52**
Yes	73	(44.8)	83	(30.2)	156	(35.6)
No	90	(55.2)	192	(69.8)	282	(64.4)
<b>Lose control when angry (N=432)</b>						20.40***
Yes	108	(67.1)	121	(44.6)	229	(53.0)
No	53	(32.9)	150	(55.4)	203	(47.0)
<b>Problems concentrating (N=436)</b>						3.60
Yes	126	(77.3)	188	(68.9)	314	(72.0)
No	37	(22.7)	85	(31.1)	122	(28.0)
<b>Easily frustrated (N=433)</b>						11.64***
Yes	125	(77.2)	166	(61.3)	291	(67.2)
No	37	(22.8)	105	(38.7)	142	(32.8)
<b>Feel bad about latest trouble (N=439)</b>						1.33
Yes	135	(82.8)	216	(78.3)	351	(80.0)
No	28	(17.2)	60	(21.7)	88	(20.0)
<b>Yell when angry (N=433)</b>						25.07***
Yes	118	(74.2)	136	(49.6)	254	(58.7)
No	41	(25.8)	138	(50.4)	179	(41.3)
<b>Want to make changes to avoid trouble (N=436)</b>						1.10
Yes	158	(98.1)	265	(96.4)	423	(97.0)
No	3	(1.9)	10	(3.6)	13	(3.0)
<b>Willing to follow advice from authority (N=429)</b>						.44
Yes	146	(93.0)	248	(91.2)	394	(91.8)
No	11	(7.0)	24	(8.8)	35	(8.2)
<b>How concerned are you about others (N=438)</b>						6.79
Never	9	(5.5)	19	(6.9)	28	(6.4)
Seldom	19	(11.7)	32	(11.6)	51	(11.6)
Sometimes	71	(43.6)	148	(53.8)	219	(50.0)
Frequently	64	(39.3)	76	(27.6)	140	(32.0)

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 13. Youths' Self-Reported Mental Health

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Thought about suicide</b> (N=428)							23.34***
Yes	82	(51.9)	77	(28.5)	159	(37.1)	
No	76	(48.1)	193	(71.5)	269	(62.9)	
<b>Tried suicide</b> (N=429)							36.19***
Yes	74	(46.3)	51	(19.0)	125	(29.1)	
No	86	(53.8)	218	(81.0)	304	(70.9)	
<b>Purposely harmed yourself</b> (N=425)							19.55***
Yes	86	(54.1)	86	(32.3)	172	(40.5)	
No	73	(45.9)	180	(67.7)	253	(59.5)	
<b>Cut or burned self</b> (N=444)							30.92***
Yes	70	(42.9)	52	(18.5)	122	(27.5)	
No	93	(57.1)	229	(81.5)	322	(72.5)	
<b>Sadness (1 to 10 with 10 being the saddest)</b> (N=431)							-.77
1 - 3	53	(33.1)	104	(38.4)	157	(36.4)	
4 - 6	66	(41.3)	91	(33.6)	157	(37.6)	
7 & 8	20	(12.5)	42	(15.5)	62	(14.8)	
9 & 10	21	(13.1)	34	(12.5)	55	(12.8)	
		$\chi^2 = 4.93$		$\chi^2 = 4.71$			

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except for the respondents rating of their "sadness," in which case a t-test was used.

\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 14. Youths' Self-Reported Drug and Alcohol Use, Addiction, and Treatment

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>Used alcohol (N=429)</b>						1.02
Yes	142	(89.3)	232	(85.9)	374	(87.2)
No	17	(10.7)	38	(14.1)	55	(12.8)
<b>Used marijuana (N=429)</b>						.21
Yes	144	(90.6)	248	(91.9)	392	(91.4)
No	15	(9.4)	22	(8.1)	37	(8.6)
<b>Used inhalants (N=429)</b>						4.08*
Yes	48	(30.2)	58	(21.5)	106	(24.7)
No	111	(69.8)	212	(78.5)	323	(75.3)
<b>Used embalming fluid (N=429)</b>						3.17
Yes	33	(20.8)	38	(14.1)	71	(16.6)
No	126	(79.2)	232	(85.9)	358	(83.4)
<b>Used amphetamines (N=429)</b>						2.15
Yes	46	(28.9)	61	(22.6)	107	(24.9)
No	113	(71.1)	209	(77.4)	322	(75.1)
<b>Used barbiturates (N=429)</b>						.05
Yes	38	(23.9)	62	(23.0)	100	(23.3)
No	121	(76.1)	208	(77.0)	329	(76.7)
<b>Used PCP (N=429)</b>						5.72*
Yes	27	(17.0)	25	(9.3)	52	(12.1)
No	132	(83.0)	245	(90.7)	377	(87.9)
<b>Used cocaine (N=429)</b>						13.16***
Yes	62	(39.0)	61	(22.6)	123	(28.7)
No	97	(61.0)	209	(77.4)	306	(71.3)
<b>Used crack (N=429)</b>						17.91***
Yes	33	(20.8)	19	(7.0)	52	(12.1)
No	126	(79.2)	251	(93.0)	377	(87.9)
<b>Used heroin (N=429)</b>						8.53**
Yes	19	(11.9)	12	(4.4)	31	(7.2)
No	140	(88.1)	258	(95.6)	398	(92.8)
<b>Used LSD (N=429)</b>						.17
Yes	45	(28.3)	72	(26.7)	117	(27.3)
No	114	(71.7)	198	(73.3)	312	(72.7)
<b>Used prescription drugs (N=429)</b>						12.70***
Yes	58	(36.5)	56	(20.7)	114	(26.6)
No	101	(63.5)	214	(79.3)	315	(73.4)
<b>Used over the counter medications (N=429)</b>						8.09**
Yes	42	(26.4)	41	(15.2)	83	(19.3)
No	117	(73.6)	229	(84.8)	346	(80.7)
<b>Didn't use any of these substances (N=429)</b>						.73
Yes	4	(2.5)	11	(4.1)	15	(3.5)
No	155	(97.5)	259	(95.9)	414	(96.5)
<b>Addicted (N=414)</b>						23.22***
Yes	101	(64.7)	104	(40.3)	205	(49.5)
No	55	(35.3)	154	(59.7)	209	(50.5)
<b>Received Treatment (N=411)</b>						.64
Yes	97	(62.6)	150	(58.6)	247	(60.1)
No	58	(37.4)	106	(41.4)	164	(39.9)

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , and \*\*\* $p \leq .001$

Table 15. Youths' Ages for Starting Drug and Alcohol Use

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test-Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>Age of first alcohol use<sup>i</sup> (N=338)</b>						.03
under 9	20	(15.6)	47	(22.4)	67	(19.8)
10 - 12	57	(44.5)	68	(32.4)	125	(37.0)
13 - 15	42	(32.8)	77	(36.7)	119	(35.2)
16 - 18	9	(7.0)	18	(8.6)	27	(8.0)
		$\_ = 11.71$		$\_ = 11.72$		
<b>Age of first marijuana use (N=355)</b>						.28
under 9	14	(10.8)	30	(13.3)	44	(12.4)
10 - 12	56	(43.1)	84	(37.3)	140	(39.4)
13 - 15	54	(41.5)	95	(42.2)	149	(42.0)
16 - 18	6	(4.6)	16	(7.1)	22	(6.2)
		$\_ = 12.13$		$\_ = 12.20$		
<b>Age of first inhalant use (N=90)</b>						1.08
under 9	3	(6.8)	2	(4.3)	5	(5.6)
10 - 12	20	(45.5)	16	(34.8)	36	(40.0)
13 - 15	19	(43.2)	22	(47.8)	41	(45.6)
16 - 18	2	(4.5)	6	(13.0)	8	(8.9)
		$\_ = 12.36$		$\_ = 12.85$		
<b>Age of first embalming fluid use (N=64)</b>						-.03
under 9	0	(0.0)	1	(2.9)	1	(1.6)
10 - 12	5	(16.7)	5	(14.7)	10	(15.6)
13 - 15	20	(66.7)	17	(50.0)	37	(57.8)
16 - 18	5	(16.7)	11	(32.4)	16	(25.0)
		$\_ = 14.13$		$\_ = 14.12$		
<b>Age of first amphetamines use (N=94)</b>						1.02
under 9	1	(2.3)	2	(3.9)	3	(3.2)
10 - 12	16	(37.2)	13	(25.5)	29	(30.9)
13 - 15	25	(58.1)	30	(58.8)	55	(58.5)
16 - 18	1	(2.3)	6	(11.8)	7	(7.4)
		$\_ = 13.05$		$\_ = 13.43$		
<b>Age of first barbiturate use (N=87)</b>						.61
under 9	1	(2.9)	2	(3.8)	3	(3.4)
10 - 12	10	(29.4)	14	(26.4)	24	(27.6)
13 - 15	20	(58.8)	29	(54.7)	49	(56.3)
16 - 18	3	(8.8)	8	(15.1)	11	(12.6)
		$\_ = 13.29$		$\_ = 13.55$		
<b>Age of first PCP use (N=45)</b>						1.95
under 9	1	(4.0)	0	(0.0)	1	(2.2)
10 - 12	7	(28.0)	6	(30.0)	13	(28.9)
13 - 15	15	(60.0)	10	(50.0)	25	(55.6)
16 - 18	2	(8.0)	4	(20.0)	6	(13.3)
		$\_ = 13.00$		$\_ = 14.00$		
<b>Age of first cocaine use (N=106)</b>						2.97**
under 9	2	(3.5)	1	(2.0)	3	(2.8)
10 - 12	9	(15.8)	6	(12.2)	15	(14.2)
13 - 15	36	(63.2)	18	(36.7)	54	(50.9)
16 - 18	10	(17.5)	24	(49.0)	34	(32.1)
		$\_ = 13.82$		$\_ = 14.88$		
<b>Age of first crack use (N=46)</b>						2.32*
under 9	2	(6.9)	0	(0.0)	2	(4.3)
10 - 12	4	(13.8)	1	(5.9)	5	(10.9)
13 - 15	18	(62.1)	8	(47.1)	26	(56.5)
16 - 18	5	(17.2)	8	(47.1)	13	(28.3)
		$\_ = 13.83$		$\_ = 15.12$		

Table 15. Youths' Ages for Starting Drug and Alcohol Use (Continued)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test-Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Age of first heroin use (N=26)</b>						1.37
under 9	1	(6.3)	0	(0.0)	1	(3.8)
10 - 12	2	(12.5)	2	(20.0)	4	(15.4)
13 - 15	11	(68.8)	2	(20.0)	13	(50.0)
16 - 18	2	(12.5)	6	(60.0)	8	(30.8)
		$\bar{x} = 13.88$		$\bar{x} = 15.00$		
<b>Age of first LSD use (N=46)</b>						1.94
under 9	2	(4.9)	1	(1.7)	3	(3.0)
10 - 12	7	(17.1)	10	(16.7)	17	(16.8)
13 - 15	27	(65.9)	34	(56.7)	61	(60.4)
16 - 18	5	(12.2)	15	(25.0)	20	(19.8)
		$\bar{x} = 13.51$		$\bar{x} = 14.20$		
<b>Age of first prescription drug use (N=93)</b>						-31
under 9	4	(8.5)	6	(13.0)	10	(10.8)
10 - 12	15	(31.9)	11	(23.9)	26	(28.0)
13 - 15	23	(48.9)	23	(50.0)	46	(49.5)
16 - 18	5	(10.6)	6	(13.0)	11	(11.8)
		$\bar{x} = 12.87$		$\bar{x} = 12.70$		
<b>Age of first over the counter drug use (N=65)</b>						-1.24
under 9	4	(11.8)	9	(29.0)	13	(20.0)
10 - 12	10	(29.4)	5	(16.1)	15	(23.1)
13 - 15	18	(52.9)	14	(45.2)	32	(49.2)
16 - 18	2	(5.9)	3	(9.7)	5	(7.7)
		$\bar{x} = 12.38$		$\bar{x} = 11.23$		

i. Where interval level data are used and means are reported, significance is based on t-tests.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , and \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Table 16. Youths' Reports of Effects of Drug/Alcohol Use

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test-Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Which came first (N=384)</b>							11.72**
Drugs/alcohol use	51	(34.0)	89	(38.0)	140	(36.5)	
Getting into trouble	43	(28.7)	94	(40.2)	137	(35.7)	
Same time	56	(37.3)	51	(21.8)	107	(27.9)	
<b>Used drugs and alcohol before or at the same time as getting into trouble (N=384)</b>							5.27*
Yes	107	(71.3)	140	(59.8)	247	(64.3)	
No	43	(28.7)	94	(40.2)	137	(35.7)	
<b>Use led to missing school (N=396)</b>							.61
Yes	92	(60.5)	138	(56.6)	230	(58.1)	
No	60	(39.5)	106	(43.4)	166	(41.9)	
<b>Use led to doing poorly in school (N=396)</b>							.02
Yes	82	(53.9)	130	(53.3)	212	(53.5)	
No	70	(46.1)	114	(46.7)	184	(46.5)	
<b>Use led to getting into trouble with teachers and principal (N=396)</b>							.47
Yes	67	(44.1)	99	(40.6)	166	(41.9)	
No	85	(55.9)	145	(59.4)	230	(58.1)	
<b>Use led to having an accident (N=396)</b>							.47
Yes	40	(26.3)	72	(29.5)	112	(28.3)	
No	112	(73.7)	172	(70.5)	284	(71.7)	
<b>Use led to losing my temper (N=396)</b>							2.82
Yes	91	(59.9)	125	(51.2)	216	(54.5)	
No	61	(40.1)	119	(48.8)	180	(45.5)	
<b>Use led to withdrawal symptoms (N=396)</b>							8.91**
Yes	56	(36.8)	56	(23.0)	112	(28.3)	
No	96	(63.2)	188	(77.0)	284	(71.7)	
<b>Use led to getting into physical fights (N=396)</b>							.20
Yes	82	(53.9)	126	(51.6)	208	(52.5)	
No	70	(46.1)	118	(48.4)	188	(47.5)	
<b>Use led to getting in trouble with family and friends (N=396)</b>							5.67*
Yes	94	(61.8)	121	(49.6)	215	(54.3)	
No	58	(38.2)	123	(50.4)	181	(45.7)	
<b>Use led to getting into trouble with the police (N=396)</b>							.24
Yes	84	(55.3)	141	(57.8)	225	(56.8)	
No	68	(44.7)	103	(42.2)	171	(43.2)	
<b>Use led to getting sick or ill (N=396)</b>							.48
Yes	62	(40.8)	91	(37.3)	153	(38.6)	
No	90	(59.2)	153	(62.7)	243	(61.4)	
<b>Use led to being sexually abused (N=396)</b>							28.46***
Yes	40	(26.3)	17	(7.0)	57	(14.4)	
No	112	(73.7)	227	(93.0)	339	(85.6)	

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , and \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Table 17. Youths' Reasons for Starting Drug/Alcohol Use

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test-Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	
<b>Started to use because of a boyfriend or a girlfriend (N=385)</b>						13.31***
Yes	41	(27.5)	30	(12.7)	71	(18.4)
No	108	(72.5)	206	(87.3)	314	(81.6)
<b>Started to use because of friends (N=385)</b>						.07
Yes	69	(46.3)	106	(44.9)	175	(45.5)
No	80	(53.7)	130	(55.1)	210	(54.5)
<b>Started to use because of family (N=385)</b>						1.39
Yes	40	(26.8)	51	(21.6)	91	(23.6)
No	109	(73.2)	185	(78.4)	294	(76.4)
<b>Started to use because of own curiosity (N=385)</b>						.12
Yes	86	(57.7)	132	(55.9)	218	(56.6)
No	63	(42.3)	104	(44.1)	167	(43.4)
<b>Started to use because of depression (N=385)</b>						14.33***
Yes	47	(31.5)	36	(15.3)	83	(21.6)
No	102	(68.5)	200	(84.7)	302	(78.4)

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , and \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Table 18. Youths' Self-Reported Prior Criminal Justice System History

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Test-Stat.	
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N		(%)
<b>Number of times arrested<sup>i</sup></b> (N=426)							- .91
Zero	4	(2.6)	9	(3.3)	13	(3.1)	
Once	15	(9.7)	41	(15.1)	56	(13.1)	
Two or three times	25	(16.2)	58	(21.3)	83	(19.5)	
Four or more times	110	(71.4)	164	(60.3)	274	(64.3)	
		$\bar{M} = 15.61$		$\bar{M} = 13.42$			
<b>Age of first arrest</b> (N=421)							- .62
8 or younger	3	(1.9)	17	(6.5)	20	(4.8)	
9 or 10	11	(7.0)	29	(11.0)	40	(9.5)	
11 or 12	54	(34.2)	65	(24.7)	119	(28.3)	
13 or 14	59	(37.3)	81	(30.8)	140	(33.3)	
15 or 16	27	(17.1)	57	(21.7)	84	(20.0)	
17 or older	4	(2.5)	14	(5.3)	18	(4.3)	
		$\bar{M} = 12.90$		$\bar{M} = 12.75$			
<b>Number of times sentenced</b> (N=425)							-1.82
Zero	2	(1.3)	9	(3.4)	11	(2.6)	
Once	29	(18.4)	71	(26.6)	100	(23.5)	
Two or three times	42	(26.6)	71	(26.6)	113	(26.6)	
Four or more times	85	(53.8)	116	(43.4)	201	(47.3)	
		$\bar{M} = 11.45$		$\bar{M} = 8.01$			
<b>Age of first conviction</b> (N=374)							.12
8 or younger	1	(.7)	7	(2.9)	8	(2.1)	
9 or 10	3	(2.2)	12	(5.0)	15	(4.0)	
11 or 12	29	(21.6)	44	(18.3)	73	(19.5)	
13 or 14	59	(44.0)	74	(30.8)	133	(35.6)	
15 or 16	33	(24.6)	76	(31.7)	109	(29.1)	
17 or older	9	(6.7)	27	(11.3)	36	(9.6)	
		$\bar{M} = 13.67$		$\bar{M} = 13.72$			
<b>Technical violations</b> (N=427)							1.27
Yes	96	(61.1)	150	(55.6)	246	(57.6)	
No	61	(38.9)	120	(44.4)	181	(42.4)	
<b>Number of technical violations</b> (N=243)							1.13
One or two times	37	(39.4)	69	(46.3)	106	(43.6)	
More than two times	57(60.6)	80	(53.7)	137	(56.4)		
<b>Probation</b> (N=426)							.77
Yes	140	(88.1)	227	(85.0)	367	(86.2)	
No	19	(11.9)	40	(15.0)	59	(13.8)	
<b>Been in this institution before</b> (N=441)							.28
Never	132	(81.0)	224	(80.6)	356	(80.7)	
Once or twice	19	(11.7)	30	(10.8)	49	(11.1)	
Three or more	12	(7.4)	24	(8.6)	36	(8.2)	
<b>Been in other detention facilities</b> (N=438)							13.02***
Yes	140	(86.4)	197	(71.4)	337	(76.9)	
No	22	(13.6)	79	(28.6)	101	(23.1)	
<b>Gotten in trouble:</b> (N=419)							2.42
As a child	51	(32.3)	103	(39.5)	154	(36.8)	
During teen years	93	(58.9)	134	(51.3)	227	(54.2)	
Other	14	(8.9)	24	(9.2)	38	(9.1)	

i. Where interval level data are used and means are reported, significance is based on t-tests.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , and \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$

Table 19. Youths' Self-Reported Delinquency (N=430)

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
Running Away	126	(78.8)	142	(52.6)	268	(62.3) 29.28***
Shoplifting	118	(73.8)	171	(63.3)	289	(67.2) 4.95*
Hit Parent	58	(36.3)	47	(17.4)	105	(24.4) 19.33***
Cheat on School Test	102	(63.8)	142	(52.6)	244	(56.7) 5.10*
Phone Pranks	91	(56.9)	102	(37.8)	193	(44.9) 14.81***
Use Phoney I.D.	66	(41.3)	59	(21.9)	125	(29.1) 18.33***
Prostitution	25	(15.6)	12	(4.5)	37	(8.6) 15.87***
Forgery	54	(33.8)	61	(22.7)	115	(26.8) 6.27**
Steal from Parked Car	75	(46.9)	159	(58.9)	234	(54.4) 5.85*
Damage Parked Car	62	(38.8)	139	(51.5)	201	(46.7) 6.54*
Drive without a License	102	(63.8)	200	(74.1)	302	(70.2) 5.12*
Steal a Bike	54	(33.8)	176	(65.2)	230	(53.5) 39.91***
Break Windows	77	(48.1)	159	(58.9)	236	(54.9) 4.70*
Let off Fire Extinguisher	29	(18.1)	93	(34.4)	122	(28.4) 13.17***
Selling Drugs	97	(60.6)	188	(69.9)	285	(66.4) 3.86*
Robbery	60	(37.5)	134	(49.8)	194	(45.2) 6.14*
Sexually Abusing Someone	5	(3.1)	44	(16.4)	49	(11.4) 17.36***
Carrying a Weapon	109	(68.1)	194	(71.9)	303	(70.5) .67
Damage Thing in Public Place	89	(55.6)	154	(57.2)	243	(56.6) .11
Damage Something of Parent	54	(33.8)	89	(33.0)	143	(33.3) .03
Starting a Fire	55	(34.4)	109	(40.5)	164	(38.2) 1.61
Set False Alarm	55	(34.4)	75	(27.8)	130	(30.2) 2.07
Steal Something/Cash < \$50	107	(66.9)	174	(64.4)	281	(65.3) .26
Steal Something/Cash > \$50	107	(66.9)	179	(66.3)	286	(66.5) .02
Breaking and Entering	89	(55.6)	166	(61.5)	255	(59.3) 1.43
Steal Goods/Cash fr. Machine	46	(28.8)	85	(31.5)	131	(30.5) .35
Unauthorized Use Mot. Veh.	81	(50.6)	137	(50.7)	218	(50.7) .00
Fighting in the Street	116	(72.5)	199	(73.7)	315	(73.3) .07
Struggle to Escape Police	74	(46.3)	147	(54.4)	221	(51.4) 2.70
Force/Threat to Get Cash from Someone My Age or Younger	49	(30.6)	87	(32.2)	136	(31.6) .12
Force/Threat to Get Cash from Someone Older	52	(32.5)	100	(37.0)	152	(35.3) .91
Use Weapon in a Fight	67	(41.9)	124	(45.9)	191	(44.4) .67
Trespassing	116	(72.5)	177	(65.6)	293	(68.1) 2.23
Littering	96	(60.0)	149	(55.2)	245	(57.0) .95
Damaged School Property	74	(46.3)	115	(42.6)	189	(44.0) .55
Graffiti	88	(55.0)	126	(46.7)	214	(49.8) 2.79
Damage Traff. Sign/Rd Equip.	52	(32.5)	101	(37.4)	153	(35.6) 1.06
Steal School Property	69	(43.1)	95	(35.2)	164	(38.1) 2.68
Stealing Liquor	100	(62.5)	146	(54.1)	246	(57.2) 2.91
Trouble Due to Drinking	90	(56.3)	128	(47.4)	218	(50.7) 3.14
Throw Object at People/Cars	81	(50.6)	160	(59.3)	241	(56.0) 3.04
Cruel to Animals	33	(20.6)	75	(27.8)	108	(25.1) 2.73
Driving under the Influence	67	(41.9)	109	(40.4)	176	(40.9) .09
Using Another's Credit Card	36	(22.5)	60	(22.2)	96	(22.3) .00
Physically Assaulting Someone	93	(58.1)	151	(56.1)	244	(56.9) .16
Murder/Manslaughter	17	(10.6)	41	(15.2)	58	(13.5) 1.83

\*  $p \leq .05$ .\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 20. Youths' Top Fifteen Self-Reported Delinquency Offenses (N=430)

Girls	%	Boys	%
1. Running away	79	1. Driving without license	74
2. Shoplifting	74	2. Fighting in the street	74
3. Fighting in the street	73	3. Carrying a weapon	72
4. Trespassing	73	4. Selling drugs	70
5. Carrying a weapon	68	5. Stealing more than \$50	66
6. Stealing less than \$50	67	6. Trespassing	66
7. Stealing more than \$50	67	7. Stealing a bike	65
8. Cheating on school test	64	8. Stealing less than \$50	64
9. Driving without license	64	9. Shoplifting	63
10. Stealing liquor	63	10. Breaking and entering	62
11. Selling drugs	61	11. Throwing objects at people	59
12. Littering	60	12. Stealing from parked cars	59
13. Assaulting someone	58	13. Breaking windows	59
14. Making prank phone calls	57	14. Damaging public place	57
15. Trouble because of drinking	56	15. Assaulting someone	56

Table 21. Youths' Current Offense and Incarceration Characteristics<sup>1</sup>

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Burglary as offense<sup>2</sup></b> (N=405)							3.06
Yes	38	(25.3)	46	(18.0)	84	(20.7)	
No	112	(74.7)	209	(82.0)	321	(79.3)	
<b>Assault as offense<sup>3</sup></b> (N=405)							8.82**
Yes	47	(31.3)	47	(18.4)	94	(23.2)	
No	103	(68.7)	208	(81.6)	311	(76.8)	
<b>Robbery as offense<sup>4</sup></b> (N=405)							7.10**
Yes	10	(6.7)	40	(15.7)	50	(12.3)	
No	140	(93.3)	215	(84.3)	355	(87.7)	
<b>Sex offense as offense<sup>5</sup></b> (N=405)							25.06***
Yes	7	(4.7)	61	(23.9)	68	(16.8)	
No	143	(95.3)	194	(76.1)	337	(83.2)	
<b>Violent offense</b> (N=405)							2.90
Yes	71	(47.3)	143	(56.1)	214	(52.8)	
No	79	(52.7)	112	(43.9)	191	(47.2)	
<b>Property offense</b> (N=405)							19.79***
Yes	80	(53.3)	79	(31.0)	159	(39.3)	
No	70	(46.7)	176	(69.0)	246	(60.7)	
<b>Drug offense</b> (N=405)							4.99*
Yes	12	(8.0)	40	(15.7)	52	(12.8)	
No	138	(92.0)	215	(84.3)	353	(87.2)	
<b>Months incarcerated</b> (N=402)							2.16*
1 - 6	118	(78.7)	175	(69.4)	293	(72.9)	
7 - 12	21	(14.0)	50	(19.8)	71	(17.7)	
13 - 18	4	(2.7)	5	(2.0)	9	(2.2)	
19 - 24	2	(1.3)	11	(4.4)	13	(3.2)	
25 - 36	4	(2.7)	7	(2.8)	11	(2.7)	
37 - 48	1	(.7)	1	(.4)	2	(.5)	
49 and up	0	(0.0)	3	(1.2)	3	(.7)	
		$\bar{M} = 5.41$		$\bar{M} = 7.40$			
<b>Sentence length in months</b> (N=377)							2.30*
1 - 6	68	(48.6)	96	(40.5)	164	(43.5)	
7 - 12	52	(37.1)	91	(38.4)	143	(37.9)	
13 - 18	2	(1.4)	6	(2.5)	8	(2.1)	
19 - 24	9	(6.4)	13	(5.5)	22	(5.8)	
25 - 36	4	(2.9)	11	(4.6)	15	(4.0)	
37 - 48	1	(.7)	6	(2.5)	7	(1.9)	
49 and up	4	(2.9)	14	(5.9)	18	(4.8)	
		$\bar{M} = 11.96$		$\bar{M} = 16.15$			

1. Respondents were able to list all offenses for which they were currently in this institution. The greatest number of offenses listed by some respondents was seven. All offenses reported for current offense were classified at violent, property, drug or other offenses.

2. This category includes breaking and entering, attempted burglary, aggravated burglary and complicity to burglary.

3. This category includes assault and battery, domestic violence, felonious assault, aggravated assault, and vehicular assault.

4. This category includes aggravated robbery and attempted robbery.

5. This category includes rape, gross sexual imposition, sexual battery, and child molestation.

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except months incarcerated and sentence length, in which case t-tests were used.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 22. Youths' Self-Reported Context of Offense

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total		Test Stat.
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)	
<b>Describe Yourself (N=429)</b>							
Leader	81	(50.3)	147	(54.9)	228	(53.1)	1.12
Follower	46	(28.6)	65	(24.3)	111	(25.9)	
Other	34	(21.1)	56	(20.9)	90	(21.0)	
Used Alcohol (N=420)	36	(22.8)	70	(26.7)	106	(25.2)	.81
Others Used Alc.(N=420)	19	(12.0)	32	(12.2)	51	(12.1)	.00
I Was on Drugs (N=420)	61	(38.6)	79	(30.2)	140	(33.3)	3.17
Others on Drugs (N=420)	31	(19.6)	33	(12.6)	64	(15.2)	3.77
Adult Was Present (N=420)	17	(10.8)	11	(4.2)	28	(6.7)	6.82**
In a School (N=420)	9	(5.7)	9	(3.4)	18	(4.3)	1.23
In Person's Home (N=420)	56	(35.4)	85	(32.4)	141	(33.6)	.40
On the Street (N=420)	58	(36.7)	109	(41.6)	167	(39.8)	.99
At a Business (N=420)	10	(6.3)	20	(7.6)	30	(7.1)	.25
Acted Alone (N=437)	69	(42.6)	139	(50.5)	208	(47.6)	2.59
Boys Involved (N=222)	36	(39.1)	97	(74.6)	133	(59.9)	28.24***
Men Involved (N=222)	31	(33.7)	40	(30.8)	71	(32.0)	.21
Girls Involved (N=222)	57	(62.0)	14	(10.8)	71	(32.0)	64.89***
Women Involved (N=222)	10	(10.9)	5	(3.8)	15	(6.8)	4.22*
<b>Number of victims (N=350)</b>							
One	58	(45.3)	123	(55.4)	181	(51.7)	-.07
Two or three	45	(35.2)	61	(27.5)	106	(30.3)	
Four or more	25	(19.5)	38	(17.1)	63	(18.0)	
		= 2.64		= 2.61			
<b>Victim Type (N=352)</b>							
Stranger	29	(22.5)	88	(39.5)	117	(33.2)	15.26**
Acquaintance	28	(21.7)	51	(22.9)	79	(22.4)	
Well-known	62	(48.1)	78	(35.0)	140	(39.8)	
Other	10	(7.8)	6	(2.7)	16	(4.5)	
<b>Weapon Used (N=427)</b>							
Knife	20	(12.7)	15	(5.6)	35	(8.2)	6.63**
Guns	14(8.9)	67	(24.9)	81	(19.0)	16.67***	
Stick or bat	8(5.1)	13	(4.8)	21	(4.9)	.01	
Other weapon	31(19.6)	29	(10.8)	60	(14.1)	6.44*	
No weapon	96	(60.8)	166	(61.7)	262	(61.4)	.04
<b>Damage (N=354)</b>							
Property	35	(26.7)	42	(18.8)	77	(21.8)	3.01
Physical	43	(32.8)	57	(25.6)	100	(28.2)	2.15
Emotional damage to others	20	(15.3)	51	(22.9)	71	(20.1)	2.98
Hurt self	7	(5.3)	12	(5.4)	19	(5.4)	
Death	6	(4.6)	10	(4.5)	16	(4.5)	.00
No damage	33	(25.2)	78	(35.0)	111	(31.4)	3.67
<b>Why offense was committed (N=379)</b>							
Innocent/self-defense/misled	43	(29.3)	49	(21.1)	92	(24.3)	3.24
Revenge/anger/rebel/power	36	(24.5)	48	(20.7)	84	(22.2)	.75
Wanted money	21	(14.3)	55	(23.7)	76	(20.1)	4.98*
Drug related	16	(10.9)	17	(7.3)	33	(8.7)	1.43
Felt like it/bored/thrills/stupid	35	(23.8)	56	(24.1)	91	(24.0)	.01
Abuse/sexual abuse	2	(1.4)	6	(2.6)	8	(2.1)	.65
Related to being on the run	15	(10.2)	4	(1.7)	19	(5.0)	13.59***
Peers bad influence/tough	2	(1.4)	9	(3.9)	11	(2.9)	2.03
Sad/scared/hurt/mental probs.	7	(4.8)	5	(2.2)	12	(3.2)	1.99
Sexual desire	0	(0.0)	16	(6.9)	16	(4.2)	10.59***

Note: Chi-square tests were used for all variables except number of victims, in which case a t-test was used.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 23. Youths' Evaluation of the Criminal Justice System

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Police behavior<sup>1</sup></b> (N=339)						5.91*
Fair	62	(51.2)	82	(37.6)	144	(42.5)
Unfair	59	(48.8)	136	(62.4)	195	(57.5)
<b>Police treat girls and boys the same way<sup>2</sup></b> (N=343)						.29
Agree	37	(28.5)	55	(25.8)	92	(26.8)
Disagree	93	(71.5)	158	(74.2)	251	(73.2)
<b>Court personnel behavior</b> (N=367)						4.52*
Fair	59	(45.4)	135	(57.0)	194	(52.9)
Unfair	71	(54.6)	102	(43.0)	173	(47.1)
<b>Court personnel treat boys and girls the same way</b> (N=301)						.01
Agree	42	(34.1)	64	(36.0)	106	(35.2)
Disagree	81	(65.9)	114	(64.0)	195	(64.8)
<b>Staff (at this institution) behavior</b> (N=372)						.95
Fair	87	(62.1)	151	(65.1)	238	(64.0)
Unfair	53	(37.9)	81	(34.9)	134	(36.0)
<b>Staff here treat girls and boys the same way</b> (N=217)						7.01**
Agree	43	(32.6)	43	(50.6)	86	(39.6)
Disagree	89	(67.4)	42	(49.4)	131	(60.4)
<b>Medical services available</b> (N=424)						7.83**
Agree	99	(62.3)	199	(75.1)	298	(70.3)
Disagree	60	(37.7)	66	(24.9)	126	(29.7)

1. "Fair" includes "Very fair" and "Fair" while "Unfair" includes "Very unfair" and "Unfair."

2. "Agree" includes "Strongly agree" and "Agree," "Disagree" includes "Strongly disagree" and "Disagree."

\*  $p \leq .05$ .

\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .

Table 24. Youths' Responses to Open Ended Questions

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total	Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
<b>What contributed to your offending? (N=222)</b>						
Bad Childhd./Fam. Probs.	32	(37.2)	28	(20.6)	60	(27.0) 7.38**
Sexual Abuse/rape	17	(19.8)	18	(13.2)	35	(15.8) 1.69
Negative Influences/peers	12	(14.0)	20	(14.7)	32	(14.4) .02
Drugs/alcohol	11	(12.8)	20	(14.7)	31	(14.0) .16
Loss of Relationship/death	11	(12.8)	17	(12.5)	28	(12.6) .00
Fun/bad Choices/rebel	10	(11.6)	14	(10.3)	24	(10.8) .10
Anger/hatred	7	(8.1)	14	(10.3)	21	(9.5) .29
<b>What is going well/what makes you happy? (N=384)</b>						
Family relationships	65	(43.0)	77	(33.0)	142	(37.0) 3.93*
Friends	20	(13.2)	16	(6.9)	36	(9.4) 4.39*
Hobbies	7	(4.6)	24	(10.3)	31	(8.1) 3.96*
Education	26	(17.2)	38	(16.3)	64	(16.7) .06
Love/sex/boyfriend/ girlfriend	22	(14.6)	42	(18.0)	64	(16.7) .79
Myself	19	(12.6)	34	(14.6)	53	(13.8) .31
The future	16	(10.6)	33	(14.2)	49	(12.8) 1.05
Recovery	21	(13.9)	25	(10.7)	46	(12.0) .88
My child	12	(7.9)	22	(9.4)	34	(8.9) .25
God/spirituality	8	(5.3)	16	(6.9)	24	(6.3) .39
Nothing	12	(7.9)	10	(4.3)	22	(5.7) 2.27
<b>How would you change this institution? (N=303)</b>						
Better staff	42	(34.1)	33	(18.3)	75	(24.8) 9.81**
More privileges	25	(20.3)	60	(33.3)	85	(28.1) 6.13*
Better programs/Oppor- tunities to improve	29	(23.6)	32	(17.8)	61	(20.1) 1.53
More contact with family and friends	14	(11.4)	25	(13.9)	39	(12.9) .41
Don't change it	21	(17.1)	33	(18.3)	54	(17.8) .08

\*  $p \leq .05$ .\*\*  $p \leq .01$ .\*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 25. Youths' Reported Desired Services

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total N	Chi-Square
	n	(%)	n	(%)		
Sex Education (N=332)	62	(48.8)	76	(37.1)	138	(41.6) 4.45*
Drug/alcohol Education/ Treatment (N=314)	70	(43.5)	73	(27.9)	143	(33.8) 10.54***
Sex Offender Treatment (N=384)	26	(16.7)	29	(12.7)	55	(14.3) 1.18
Problem-solving Skills Training (N=372)	81	(55.5)	111	(49.1)	192	(51.6) 1.44
Anger Management Training (N=360)	91	(62.3)	103	(48.1)	194	(53.9) 7.04**
Learning How to Live on My Own (N=386)	98	(64.1)	141	(60.5)	239	(61.9) .49
Learning How to Parent (N=400)	69	(44.5)	133	(54.3)	202	(50.5) 3.63
Learning to Have Good Relationships (N=392)	106	(69.3)	132	(55.2)	238	(60.7) 7.72**
Learning How to Be a Better Student (N=400)	95	(60.9)	137	(56.1)	232	(58.0) .88
Sexual Abuse Counseling (N=394)	51	(34.9)	28	(11.3)	79	(20.1) 32.04***
Physical Abuse Counseling (N=398)	50	(33.6)	34	(13.7)	84	(21.1) 22.18***
Emotional Abuse Counseling (N=396)	64	(43.0)	51	(20.6)	115	(29.0) 22.44***
Family Counseling (N=375)	75	(54.0)	69	(29.2)	144	(38.4) 22.60***
Individ. Counsel'g (N=341)	73	(57.5)	87	(40.7)	160	(46.9) 9.06**
Depression /Mental Problems (N=380)	65	(46.1)	56	(23.4)	121	(31.8) 21.00***
Job/Career Skills (N=386)	106	(72.1)	168	(70.3)	274	(71.0) .15
Sports, Health And/or Fitness Training (N=391)	100	(66.2)	157	(65.4)	257	(65.7) .03
Gen'l. Health Ed. (N=379)	78	(53.8)	97	(41.5)	175	(46.2) 5.49*

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ .

Table 26. Youths' Reported Received Programs

Variable	Girls		Boys		Total N	Chi-Square	
	n	(%)	n	(%)		N	(%)
Sex Education (N=422)	34	(21.1)	56	(21.5)	90	(21.3)	0.01
Drug/Alcohol Education/ Treatment (N=423)	38	(23.6)	71	(27.1)	109	(25.8)	0.64
Sex Offender Treatment (N=419)	5	(3.1)	30	(11.6)	35	(8.4)	9.41**
Problem-solving Skills Training (N=424)	15	(9.3)	37	(14.1)	52	(12.3)	2.10
Anger Management Training (N=423)	15	(9.3)	48	(18.3)	63	(14.9)	6.38*
Learning How to Live on My Own (N=426)	8	(5.0)	32	(12.1)	40	(9.4)	5.95*
Learning How to Parent (N=426)	6	(3.7)	20	(7.5)	26	(6.1)	2.55
Learning to Have Good Relationships (N=425)	8	(5.0)	25	(9.5)	33	(7.8)	2.83
Learning How to Be a Better Student (N=428)	5	(3.1)	23	(8.6)	28	(6.5)	4.99*
Sexual Abuse Counseling (N=421)	15	(9.3)	12	(4.6)	27	(6.4)	3.66
Physical Abuse Counseling (N=420)	12	(7.5)	10	(3.9)	22	(5.2)	2.58
Emotional Abuse Counseling (N=421)	12	(7.5)	13	(5.0)	25	(5.9)	1.07
Family Counseling (N=423)	22	(13.7)	26	(9.9)	48	(11.3)	1.39
Individ. Counsel'g (N=422)	34	(21.1)	47	(18.0)	81	(19.2)	0.62
Depression/Mental Problems (N=420)	20	(12.4)	20	(7.7)	40	(9.5)	2.55
Job/Career Skills (N=425)	14	(8.7)	25	(9.5)	39	(9.2)	0.07
Sports, Health And/or Fitness Training (N=425)	10	(6.2)	24	(9.1)	34	(8.0)	1.13

Table 27. Judges' Reports of County Resources

Variable	N	%	(n)
Does your court operate a detention facility for girls?	57		
Yes		56.1	(32)
No		43.9	(25)
If "yes," how many beds does it have? <sup>i</sup>	29		
2-5		24.1	(7)
6-10		20.7	(6)
11-20		27.6	(8)
21-42		27.6	(8)
Does your court provide its own out-of-home treatment for girls?	58		
Yes		36.2	(21)
No		63.8	(37)
If "yes," how many beds does it have? <sup>ii</sup>	17		
1-5		11.8	(2)
6-10		58.8	(10)
11-20		17.6	(3)
21-29		11.8	(2)
Which of the following describes your county's residential treatment options for girls? <sup>iii</sup>	59		
Inadequate number of available beds		55.9	(33)
Not enough, but we manage to get by		33.9	(20)
Enough private beds, but not enough public beds		16.9	(10)
Enough beds for males but not for females		11.9	(7)
Enough beds for females but not for males		3.4	(2)
Not Enough beds for serious/violent/chronic		28.8	(17)
Not enough beds for status &/or abuse/neglect victims		54.2	(32)
None of the above, our situation is unique		15.3	(9)
How does your county fund residential treatment for girls? <sup>iii</sup>	58		
State Funds		53.4	(31)
Circuit's Budget (state and local funds)		46.6	(27)
County Funds		56.9	(33)
External Grants		15.5	(9)
Child's Family		48.3	(28)
Other		22.4	(13)

Table 27. Judges' Reports of County Resources (Continued)

Variable	N	%	(n)
There are an adequate number of treatment programs for girls. <sup>iv</sup>	52		
Strongly Agree		0.0	(0)
Agree		19.2	(10)
Neutral		17.3	(9)
Disagree		42.2	(22)
Strongly Disagree		21.2	(11)
There are an adequate number of treatment programs for boys. <sup>v</sup>	51		
Strongly Agree		2.0	(1)
Agree		54.9	(28)
Neutral		13.7	(7)
Disagree		21.6	(11)
Strongly Disagree		7.8	(4)
Is there a difference in the quality of treatment provided by public v. private facilities?	47		
No		70.2	(33)
Yes, private usually better		29.8	(14)
Yes, public usually better		0.0	(0)

i. Twenty-nine of the 32 respondents reporting a detention facility for girls responded to this question. The mean number of beds was 15.9 the median 12, and the mode 5.

ii. Seventeen of the 21 respondents reporting out-of-home treatment for girls responded to this question. The mean number of beds was 9.8, the median 8, and the mode 6.

iii. Respondents could check as many options as applied. Only the percent checking (indicating this is true regarding residential treatment for girls) is reported for each item here.

iv. With "strong agree" coded as "1" and "strongly disagree" coded as "5," the mean response was 3.65.

v. With "strong agree" coded as "1" and "strongly disagree" coded as "5," the mean response was 2.78. A t-test comparing this mean with that of the above item (3.65) indicates a statistically significant difference at the  $p \leq .001$  level.

Table 28. Judges' Reports of Top Five Treatment Facility Referrals for Delinquent Girls (N=53)

Facility/Institution	n	private	or	public
Adriel Foster Care	8	✓		
St. Anthony's Villa	7	✓		
Ohio Christian Children's Home	5	✓		
Osterlain Services for Youth	5	✓		
Marsh Foundation	5	✓		
United Methodist Children's Home	4	✓		
Parmadale	4	✓		
Lincoln Place	4	✓		
Buckeye Ranch	4	✓		
Rosemont	3	✓		
Ohio Department of Youth Services	3			✓
Multi-County Juvenile Attention System	3			✓
Midwestern Children's Home	3	✓		
Jefferson County Detention	3			✓
Berea Children's Home	3	✓		
Bellefaire	3	✓		
Bassett House	3	✓		
Abraxis of Pennsylvania	3	✓		
West Central Gate Detention Program	2	✓		
Talbert House Passages	2	✓		
One Way Farm	2	✓		
Ohio's Teaching Family	2	✓		
Milestone's Foster Care	2	✓		
Genesis Treatment Foster Care Network	2			✓
Family Resource Center	2			✓
D.H.S. Foster Care	2			✓
Detmer Hospital	2	✓		
Detmer Adloesc. Services	2	✓		
Crittenden Home	2	✓		
Beechbrook	2	✓		
Wood J.R.C.	1			✓
Wilson's	1	✓		
Therapeutic Foster Homes	1			✓
Thompkins Center	1			✓
St. Joseph's/Dayton	1	✓		
Shoemaker's Christian Homes for Adols.	1	✓		
Shelter Care, Inc.	1	✓		
Seneca County Youth Center	1			✓
Scioto Village	1			✓
SAFY (foster care)	1	✓		
Richland County	1			✓
Residential Treatment Center	1			✓
Parables Group Home	1	✓		

Table 28. Judges' Reports of Top Five Treatment Facility Referrals for Delinquent Girls (N=53) (Continued)

Facility/Institution	n	private	or	public
Paint Valley	1			✓
Our Lady of Wayside	1	✓		
New Philadelphia Group Home	1			✓
N.Y.O. Juvenile Rehab	1			✓
N.C.O.R.C.	1			✓
Ed Neko & Assoc.	1	✓		
Multi-County R.T.C.	1			✓
Maryhaven	1			✓
Marian County Detention	1			✓
Lutheran Homes Fam. & Youth Serv.	1	✓		
Logan County Group Home	1			✓
Lifeway Group Home	1	✓		
J.R.C. of Northwest Ohio	1			✓
Inner Peace	1	✓		
Health Recovery Services	1	✓		
Hannah Neil	1	✓		
Group Home	1			✓
Greene County Residential Trtmt. Ctr.	1			✓
Gallia County Children's Home	1			✓
Fox Run Hospital	1	✓		
Foster Care	1			✓
Focus on Youth	1	✓		
Detention Center	1			✓
Dellwood	1	✓		
County Children's Home	1			✓
Cochocton Rec. Home	1			✓
Choices	1	✓		
Children's Resource Center	1	✓		
Butler County Juvenile Rehab. Center	1			✓
Belmont Harrison Juvenile District	1			✓
Boys' Town	1	✓		
Act 1	1	✓		
Totals				
75	142	44		31

Table 29. Judges' Reports of Whether the Availability of Various Services and Treatments at Top Five Listed Referral Agencies/Institutions Influenced Their Decisions to Choose the Facility

Variable	N	%	(n)
Chemical Dependency	134	47.0	(63)
Sexual Victimization	133	45.9	(61)
Disruptive/Violent Behavior	134	52.2	(70)
Mental Health Problems	134	64.9	(87)
Physical Health Problems	134	45.5	(61)
Program Accepts Status Offenders	134	61.9	(83)
Program Accepts Abuse/Neglect Victims	134	59.0	(79)
Program Accepts Minor Law Offenders	133	66.2	(88)
Program Accepts Serious Law Offenders	134	44.0	(59)
Program Accepts Sex Offenders	134	34.3	(46)
Facility Offers Secure Environment	133	36.1	(48)
Facility Has Low Per Diem Cost	134	38.1	(51)
Youth's Family Receives Medicaid	134	35.8	(48)
Facility Has Programs Specifically for Females	134	42.5	(57)
Facility Has Culturally Diverse Programs/Staff	129	36.4	(47)
Quality/Reputation of Staff Influences Decision	134	62.7	(84)
Effectiveness of Trtmt. Prgm. Influences Decision	134	58.2	(78)
Short Treatment Program Available	134	30.6	(41)
Long Treatment Program Available	134	44.0	(59)
Program Has Aftercare Component	134	22.4	(30)
Relatively Close Proximity of Facility	133	49.6	(66)
Only Facility with Bed Available	134	20.1	(27)

Table 30. General Description of Treatment Centers

Variable	N	%	(n)
No. of Girls Treated Here in Last Year <sup>a</sup>	14		
7-20		28.6	(4)
21-39		28.6	(4)
40-59		35.7	(5)
60-80		7.1	(1)
Girls' Average Length of treatment (in days) <sup>b</sup>	16		
4-14		12.5	(2)
15-49		6.2	(1)
50-150		25.0	(4)
151-300		43.8	(7)
301-360		12.5	(2)
Does the facility have an aftercare component for girls?	17		
Yes		47.1	(8)
No		52.9	(9)
Does the facility provide a secure environment?	17		
Yes		82.4	(14)
No		17.6	(3)
If secure, what makes it secure? <sup>c</sup>	14		
Walls or Fence		35.7	(5)
Locked Rooms		50.0	(7)
Staff		100.0	(14)
Other		21.4	(3)
Average Per Diem Cost per child <sup>d</sup>	12		
\$50-75		41.7	(5)
\$76-150		25.0	(3)
\$151-250		33.3	(4)
Is there a variation in cost?	15		
Yes		80.0	(12)
No		20.0	(3)
Are there any other funding sources (e.g. grants, gifts)?	14		
Yes		85.7	(12)
No		14.3	(2)

<sup>a</sup>The mean number of girls treated in past year was 36.2 the median was 37.5, and the mode was 50.

<sup>b</sup> The mean of the average length of treatment in days per center was 166.1, the median 180.0, and multiple modes existed. Twelve of the facilities reported the range of treatment (in days) available. Of these, only one started at one day, one at 30 days, two at 60 days, five at 90 days, and three between 120 and 180 days. At the outer edge, the treatment could extend from 56 to 1440 days.

<sup>c</sup> This question only applies to those 14 center respondents indicating they operated a secure facility. Respondents could check as many options as applied. Only the percent checking (indicating this is true regarding this treatment center) is reported for each item here.

<sup>d</sup> This variable ranged from \$52 to \$250 per day per child. The mean was \$119.42, the median was \$115.00, and multiple modes existed.

Table 31. General Description of Treatment Centers' Clientele

Variable	N	%	(n)
What is the total number of beds available for girls? <sup>a</sup>	17		
0-5		11.8	(2)
6-15		41.2	(7)
16-30		47.1	(8)
31+		0.0	(0)
What is the total number of beds available for boys? <sup>b</sup>	16		
0-5		31.2	(5)
6-15		18.7	(3)
16-30		12.5	(2)
31+		37.5	(6)
Approximate percent of clientele that is female <sup>c</sup>	16		
0-25%		31.2	(5)
26-50%		37.5	(6)
51-75%		6.2	(1)
76-100%		25.0	(4)
Approximate percent of clientele that is African American <sup>d</sup>	15		
0-10%		26.7	(4)
11-25%		26.7	(4)
26-50%		20.0	(3)
51-75%		26.7	(4)
Approximate percent of indigent (aid recipient) clientele <sup>e</sup>	17		
0-25%		41.2	(7)
26-50%		23.5	(4)
51-75%		17.6	(3)
76-100%		17.6	(3)
Approximate percent of clientele that is from local area <sup>f</sup>	17		
0-25%		23.5	(4)
26-50%		11.8	(2)
51-75%		5.9	(1)
76-100%		58.8	(10)
Approximate percent of clientele from elsewhere in Ohio <sup>g</sup>	17		
0-25%		64.7	(11)
26-50%		5.9	(1)
51-75%		11.8	(2)
76-100%		17.6	(3)
Approximate percent of clientele from other states <sup>h</sup>	17		
none		82.4	(14)
1-5%		11.8	(2)
6-10%		5.9	(1)

<sup>a</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 29. The mean number of beds available for girls was 15.8, the median was 14.0, and the mode was 10.0.

<sup>b</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 67. The mean number of beds available for boys was 23.1, the median was 17.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>c</sup> This variable ranged from 20 to 100 percent. The average/mean reported percent was 51.3, the median was 40.0, and the mode was 100.0.

<sup>d</sup> The variable ranged from 0 to 75 percent. The average/mean reported percent was 33.5, the median was 25.0, and multiple modes existed. The survey also asked what percent was white and what percent was "other" races. Over half of the respondents reported 0 percent "other" and the most reported (by 2) was 5 percent. Thus, this variable percent African American is a "good" indicator of the racial make-up of the treatment center populations.

<sup>e</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 95 percent. The average/mean reported percent was 43.7, the median was 33.3, and there were multiple modes. Other questions, not reported in the table, asked the percent of affluent, middle and working class clients served. The mean percent for affluent was 2.7%, for middle-class 16.1%, and for working poor 37.4%.

<sup>f</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 100 percent. The mean was 68.5, the median 95.0, and the mode was 100.0

<sup>g</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 100 percent. The mean was 30.5, the median was 5.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>h</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 10 percent. The mean was 1.0, the median was 0.0, and the mode was 0.0.

Table 32. Treatment Centers' Reports of Personnel and Health Care Provisions

Variable	N	%	(n)
Number of Certified Teachers <sup>a</sup>	17		
none		41.2	(7)
1		23.5	(4)
2-5		17.6	(3)
6-8		17.6	(3)
Number of Direct Treatment Providers <sup>b</sup>	17		
none		11.8	(2)
1-10		23.5	(4)
11-20		23.5	(4)
21-50		17.6	(3)
51+		23.5	(4)
Number of Administrators <sup>c</sup>	17		
none		5.9	(1)
1		35.3	(6)
2-5		47.1	(8)
6-20		11.8	(2)
Number of Support Staff <sup>d</sup>	17		
none		17.6	(3)
1-5		29.4	(5)
6-10		35.3	(6)
11-50		17.6	(3)
Number of Physicians <sup>e</sup>	16		
none		68.8	(11)
1		25.0	(4)
3		6.3	(1)
Number of Nurses <sup>f</sup>	17		
none		47.1	(8)
1-2		41.2	(7)
3-9		11.8	(2)
Number of Psychologists/Sociologists <sup>g</sup>	16		
none		62.5	(10)
1-2		29.4	(5)
3+		6.3	(1)
How many hours per week is a Physcian there? <sup>h</sup>	15		
none		73.3	(11)
1-5		6.7	(1)
6-10		6.7	(1)
11-20		13.3	(2)

Table 32. Treatment Centers' Reports of Personnel and Health Care Provisions (Continued)

Variable	N	%	(n)
How many hours per week is a Nurse there? <sup>i</sup>	17		
none		47.1	(8)
1-10		0.0	(0)
11-25		17.6	(3)
26-50		17.6	(3)
51-105		17.6	(3)
Are Some Forms of Private Health Insurance Accepted?	17		
Yes		52.9	(9)
No		47.1	(8)
Is Medicaid Accepted?	17		
Yes		76.5	(13)
No		23.5	(4)

<sup>a</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 8. The mean was 2.0 the median was 1.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>b</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 171. The mean was 36.1, the median 16.0, and multiple modes existed.

<sup>c</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 19. The mean was 3.6, the median was 2.0, and the mode was 1.0.

<sup>d</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 50. The mean was 8.8, the median was 7.0, and the mode was 10.0.

<sup>e</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 3. The mean was 0.4, the median was 0.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>f</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 9. The mean was 1.4, the median was 1.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>g</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 28. The mean was 2.1, the median was 0.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>h</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 20. The mean was 3.1, the median was 0.0, and the mode was 0.0.

<sup>i</sup> This variable ranged from 0 to 105. The mean was 24.9, the median was 14.5, and the mode was 0.0.

Table 33. Treatment Centers' Reports on Youth Referrals

Variable	N	%	(n)
Treatment Centers' Willingness to Accept Referrals <sup>a</sup>	16		
From Family/Guardians		56.3	(9)
From Physicians		37.5	(6)
From Schools		37.5	(6)
From Judicial Court-Order		93.8	(15)
From Juvenile Officer Recommendation		50.0	(8)
From Police		25.0	(4)
From Other Sources		68.8	(11)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Family/ Guardians Per Day	6		
None		66.7	(4)
1		16.7	(1)
5		16.7	(1)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Physicians Per Day	6		
None		100.0	(6)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Schools Per Day on any Given Day	6		
None		100.0	(6)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Judicial Court Orders on any Given Day	6		
None		16.7	(1)
1-20		50.0	(3)
21-50		0.0	(0)
51-75		16.7	(1)
76-100	16.7		(1)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Juvenile Officer on any Given Day	6		
None		50.0	(3)
1-5		16.7	(1)
6-14		0.0	(0)
15-20		33.3	(2)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Police on any Given Day	6		
None		83.3	(5)
1		16.7	(1)
Approximate Number of Referrals from Any Other Source on any Given Day	6		
None		50.0	(3)
1-5		33.3	(2)
70		16.7	(1)

<sup>a</sup> Respondents could check as many options as applied. Only the percent checking (indicating this is true regarding this treatment center) is reported for each item here.

Table 34. Treatment Centers' Reports of Treatments and Programs Availability for Girls and Boys

Variable	N	For Girls		N	For Boys	
		%	(n)		%	(n)
Characteristics of Facility <sup>a</sup>	17			13		
Culturally diverse program & staff		100.0	(17)		100.0	(13)
Status offenders accepted		100.0	(17)		100.0	(13)
Abuse/neglect victims accepted		94.1	(16)		100.0	(13)
Minor law offenders accepted		100.0	(17)		100.0	(13)
Serious law offenders accepted		64.7	(11)		61.5	(8)
Sex offenders accepted		52.9	(9)		69.2	(9)
Available Treatments <sup>a</sup>	17			13		
Chemical dependency		58.8	(10)		69.2	(9)
Sexual victimization		82.4	(14)		84.6	(11)
Disruptive/violent behavior		94.1	(16)		92.3	(12)
Mental health		100.0	(17)		100.0	(13)
Physical health		88.2	(15)		92.3	(12)
Does Your Facility Provide any Other Types of Treatment for Girls?	17					
Yes		70.6	(12)			
No		29.4	(5)			
Does Your Facility Provide Programs Specifically Designed for Girls?	17					
Yes		58.8	(10)			
No		41.2	(7)			

<sup>a</sup> Respondents could check as many options as applied to this item. They did so alternatively in terms of what was available for girls, and what was available for boys at that institution. All of the 17 reporting treatment centers serviced females, and 13 serviced males as well.

Table 35. Treatment Centers' Reports on Provisions of Youths' Progress and Final Outcome Reports

Variable	N	%	(n)
How Often Are <i>Progress</i> Reports Provided to <i>Families</i> ?	17		
Routinely		94.1	(16)
Sometimes		0.0	(0)
Hardly Ever		5.9	(1)
How Often Are <i>Final Outcome</i> Reports Provided to <i>Families</i> ?	17		
Routinely		76.5	(13)
Sometimes		11.8	(2)
Hardly Ever		11.8	(2)
How Often Are <i>Progress</i> Reports Provided to Juvenile and Family <i>Courts</i> ?	17		
Routinely		94.1	(16)
Sometimes		5.9	(1)
Hardly Ever		0.0	(0)
How Often Are <i>Final Outcome</i> Reports Provided to Juvenile and Family <i>Courts</i> ?	17		
Routinely		88.2	(15)
Sometimes		11.8	(2)
Hardly Ever		0.0	(0)
How Often do Other Procedures Used to Provide Information to Families and Courts?	16		
Routinely		81.2	(13)
Sometimes		6.2	(1)
Hardly Ever		12.5	(2)

## REFERENCES

- Acoca, Leslie (1998) "Defusing the Time Bomb: Understanding and Meeting the Growing Health Care Needs of Incarcerated Women in America." Crime & Delinquency 44(1):49-69.
- Albrecht, Linda (1997) "Theory in Practice." Presentation made at RECLAIM Ohio Conference. June.
- Alder, Christine (1991) "Victims of Violence: The Case of Homeless Youth." Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology 24:1-14.
- American Correctional Association (1990) "The Female Offender: What Does the Future Hold?" Laurel, MD: Author.
- Arnold, Regina A. (1990) "Women of Color: Processes of Victimization and Criminalization of Black Women." Social Justice 17(3):153-66.
- Artz, Sibylle (1998) Sex, Power, and the Violent School Girl. Toronto: Trifolium Books Inc.
- Austin, James, Barbara Bloom and Trish Donahue (1992) "Female Offenders in the Community: An Analysis of Innovative Strategies and Programs." National Council on Crime and Delinquency: San Francisco, CA.
- Beger, Randall R. and Harry Hoffman (1998) "The Role of Gender in Detention Dispositioning of Juvenile Probation Violators." Journal of Crime and Justice 21(1):173-88.
- Belknap, Joanne (1996a) The Invisible Woman: Gender, Crime, and Justice. Cincinnati: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Belknap, Joanne (1996b) "Access to Programs and Health Care for Incarcerated Women." Federal Probation 60(4):34-9.
- Belknap, Joanne, Melissa Dunn, and Kristi Holsinger (1997a) Moving Toward Juvenile Justice and Youth-Serving Systems that Address the Distinct Experience of the Adolescent Female. A Report to the Governor. Office of Criminal Justice Services, Columbus, Ohio, 36 pp.
- Belknap, Joanne and Kristi Holsinger (1998) "An Overview of Delinquent Girls: How Theory and Practice Have Failed and the Need for Innovative Changes." In Ruth T. Zaplin (ed.), Female Crime and Delinquency: Critical Perspectives and Effective Interventions, pp. 31-64. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.
- Belknap, Joanne, Kristi Holsinger, and Melissa Dunn (1997b) "Understanding Incarcerated Girls: The Results of a Focus Group Study." The Prison Journal 77(4):381-404.
- Bishop, Donna and Charles Frazer (1992) "Gender Bias in Juvenile Justice Processing: Implications of the JJDP Act." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 82:1162-1186.
- Bjerregaard, Beth and Carolyn Smith (1993) "Gender Differences in Gang Participation, Delinquency, and Substance Use." Journal of Quantitative Criminology 9(4):329-355.
- Bottcher, Jean (1993) "Dimensions of Gender and Delinquent Behavior: An Analysis of Qualitative Data on Incarcerated Youths and Their Siblings in Greater Sacramento." California Office of Criminal Justice Planning.
- Briere, John and Marcia Runtz (1987) "Post Sexual Abuse Trauma." Journal of Interpersonal Violence 2(4):367-79.
- Cain, Maureen (ed.), (1989) Growing Up Good: Policing the Behavior of Girls in Europe. London: Sage.
- Cairns, Robert B. and Beverly D. Cairns (1994) Lifelines and Risks: Pathways of Youth in Our Time. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Canter, Rachelle J. (1982) "Family Correlates of Male and Female Delinquency." Criminology 20(2):149-67.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1982) "Sex Differences in Self-Report Delinquency." Criminology 20:373-93.
- Caspi, Avshalom, Donald Lynam, Terrie E. Moffitt, and Phil A. Silva (1993) "Unraveling Girls' Delinquency: Biological, Dispositional, and Contextual Contributions to Adolescent Misbehavior." Developmental Psychology 29(1):19-30.
- Cernkovich, Stephen and Peggy Giordano (1979) "A Comparative Analysis of Male and Female Delinquency." The Sociological Quarterly 20: 131-45.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda (1973) "Judicial Enforcement of the Female Sex Role: The Family Court and the Female Delinquent." Issues in Criminology 8(2):51-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1977) "Judicial Paternalism and the Female Status Offender: Training Women to Know Their Place." Crime and Delinquency 23:121-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1989) "Girls' Crime and Woman's Place: Toward a Feminist Model of Female Delinquency." Crime and Delinquency 35(1):5-29.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda and Noelle Rodriguez (1983) "Women Under Lock and Key." The Prison Journal 63:47-65.
- Chesney-Lind, Meda and Randall G. Sheldon (1992) Girls, Delinquency and Juvenile Justice. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Chigwada-Bailey, Ruth (1989) "The Criminalisation and Imprisonment of Black Women." The Probation Journal 100-05.
- Conway, Allan and Carol Bogdan (1977) "Sexual Delinquency: The Persistence of a Double Standard." Crime and Delinquency 23: 131-35.
- Daly, Kathleen (1992) "A Women's Pathway to Felony Court." Review of Law and Women's Studies 2:11-52.
- Daly, Kathleen and Meda Chesney-Lind (1988) "Feminism and Criminology." Justice Quarterly 5(4):497-535.
- Datesman, Susan K., and Mikel Aickin (1984) "Offense Specialization and Escalation Among Status Offenders." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 75:1246-75.
- Datesman, Susan K. and Frank R. Scarpitti (1980) "Unequal Protection for Males and Females in the Juvenile Court." In S.K. Datesman and F.R. Scarpitti (eds.), Women, Crime, and Justice, pp. 300-19. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dembo, Richard, Linda Williams, and James Schmeidler (1993) "Gender Differences in Mental Health Service Needs Among Youths Entering a Juvenile Detention Center." Journal of Prison and Jail Health 12(2):73-101.
- Dembo, Richard, Linda Williams, Werner Wothke, James Schmeidler, and C. Hendricks Brown (1992) "The Role of Family Factors, Physical Abuse, and Sexual Victimization Experiences in High-Risk Youths' Alcohol and Other Drug Use and Delinquency: A Longitudinal Model." Violence and Victims 7(3):245-66.
- Dodge, Kenneth A., John E. Bates, and Gregory S. Pettit (1990) "Mechanisms in the Cycle of Violence." Science 250:1678-83.
- Farrington, David P. (1994) "Human Development and Criminal Careers." In Mike Maguire, Rod Morgan, and Robert Reiner (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, pp. 511-84. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Federle, Katherine Hunt and Meda Chesney-Lind (1992) "Special Issues in Juvenile Justice: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity." In Ira M. Schwartz (ed.), Juvenile Justice and Public Policy: Toward a National Agenda, pp. 165-95. New York: Macmillan.
- Feinman, Claire (1984) "An Historical Overview of the Treatment of Incarcerated Women: Myths and Realities of Rehabilitation." The Prison Journal 63:12-26.
- Felthous, Alan R. and Bernard Yudowitz (1977) "Approaching a Comparative Typology of Assaultive Female Offenders." Psychiatry 40:270-76.
- Ferber, Abby L. (1998) White Man Falling: Race, Gender and White Supremacy. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Feyerherm, William (1981) "Gender Differences in Delinquency: Quantity and Quality." In L.H. Bowker (ed.), Women and Crime in America, pp. 82-93. New York: Macmillan.
- Figueira-McDonough, Josefina (1985) "Are Girls Different? Gender Discrepancies Between Delinquent Behavior and Control." Child Welfare 64:273-89.
- Figueira-McDonough, Josefina, William H. Barton, and Rosemary C. Sarri (1981) "Normal Deviance: Gender Similarities in Adolescent Subcultures." In M. Q. Warren (ed.), Comparing Female and Male Offenders, pp. 17-45. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelsethorpe, Loraine (1989) Sexism and the Female Offender. Aldershot, England: Gower Publishing.
- Gilfus, Mary E. (1992) "From Victims To Survivors to Offenders: Women's Routes of Entry and Immersion into Street Crime." Women & Criminal Justice 4:63-90.
- Gray, Ellen (1988) "The Link Between Child Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency: What We Know and Recommendations for Policy and Research." In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, and M. A. Straus (eds.), Family Abuse and its Consequences, pp. 109-25. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Greene, Peters, & Associates (1997) "Gender-Specific Programming for Girls." From a handout/presentation at ASC (San Diego, November).
- Harrison, Lana D. (1995) "Validity of Self-Reported Data on Drug Use." Journal of Drug Issues, 25(1):91-111.
- Hiller, Anne Edwards and Linda Hancock (1981) "The Processing of Juveniles in Victoria." In S.K. Mukherjee and J. A. Scutt (eds.), Women and Crime, pp. 92-126. North Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Hindelang, Michael J. (1971) "Age, Sex, and the Versatility of Delinquent Involvements." Social Problems 18:522-35.
- Hindelang, Michael J., Travis Hirschi, and J. G. Weis (1981) Measuring Delinquency. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Howell, Nic and Su Perk Davis (1992) "Special Problems of Female Offenders." Corrections Compendium, 17(9):5-20.
- Hoyt, Stephanie and David G. Scherer (1998) "Female Juvenile Delinquency: Misunderstood by the Juvenile Justice System, Neglected by Social Science." Law and Human Behavior, 22(1):81-107.
- Ingram-Fogel, Catherine (1991) "Health Problems and Needs of Incarcerated Women." Journal of Prison & Jail Health 10(1):43-57.

- Kempf-Leonard, Kimberly, Elicka S. L. Peterson, and Lisa L. Sample (1997) Gender and Juvenile Justice in Missouri.
- Krohn, Marvin, James P. Curry and Shirley Nelson-Kilger (1983) "Is Chivalry Dead? An Analysis of Changes in Police Dispositions of Males and Females." Criminology 21:417-37.
- Kruttschnitt, Candace. (1981) "Social Status and Sentences of Female Offenders." Law and Society Review 15:247-65.
- Laub, John H. and Robert J. Sampson (1993) "Turning Points in the Life Course: Why Change Matters to the Study of Crime." Criminology 31:301-25.
- Lawrence, Janet. S. and Charles H. Shireman (1980) Findings of Self-Report Studies on Juvenile Misbehavior - A Summary. University of Chicago National Center for Assessment of Alternatives to Juvenile Justice Processing. US Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Leonard, Eileen (1982) Women, Crime and Society. New York: Longman.
- Loeber, Rolf and Marc Le Blanc (1990) "Toward a Developmental Criminology." In Michael Tonry and Norval Morris (eds.), Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research, vol. 12, pp. 375-473. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loeber, Rolf and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) "Family factors as Correlates and Predictors of Juvenile Conduct Problems and Delinquency." In Michael Tonry and Norval Morris (eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, vol.7, pp. 29-149. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus-Mendoza, Susan and Robert Briody (1996) "Female Inmates in Oklahoma: An Updated Profile and Programming Assessment." Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium 3:85-105.
- Miller, Darcy, Catherine Trapani, Kathy Fejes-Mendoza, Carolyn Eggleston, and Donna Dwiggins (1995) "Adolescent Female Offenders: Unique Considerations." Adolescence 30 (118):429-35.
- Morash, Merry, Robin N. Harr, and Lila Rucker (1994) "A Comparison of Programming for Women and Men in U.S. Prisons in the 1980s." Crime and Delinquency 40(2):197-221.
- Naffine, Ngaire (1987) Female Crime: The Construction of Women in Criminology. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Owen, Barbara and Barbara Bloom (1997) "Profiling the Needs of Young Female Offenders." A Summary Report presented to the American Society of Criminology, November.
- Pope, Carl E. and William H. Feyerherm (1982) "Gender Bias in Juvenile Court Dispositions." Social Service Research 6:1-16.
- Rafter, Nicole Hahn (1993) "Equality or Difference." In Female Offenders: Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Population, pp. 7-11. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Rhodes, Jean and Karla Fischer (1993) "Spanning the Gender Gap: Gender Differences in Delinquency Among Inner City Adolescents." Adolescence 28:880-89.
- Richards, Pamela (1981) "Quantitative and Qualitative Sex Differences in Middle-Class Delinquency." Criminology 26:151-70.
- Robinson, Robin A. (1994) "Private Pain and Public Behaviors: Sexual Abuse and Delinquent Girls. In C.K. Riessman (ed.), Qualitative Studies in Social Work Research, pp. 73-94. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Rosenbaum, Jill Leslie and Meda Chesney-Lind (1994) "Appearance and Delinquency: A Research Note." Crime and Delinquency 40(2):250-61.
- Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub (1992) "Crime and Deviance in the Life Course." Annual Review of Sociology 18:63-84.
- Sarri, Rosemary (1983) "Gender Issues in Juvenile Justice." Crime and Delinquency, 29:381- 98.
- Silbert, Mimi H. and Ayala M. Pines (1981) "Sexual Child Abuse as an Antecedent to Prostitution." Child Abuse and Neglect 5:407-11.
- Smart, Carol (1976) Women, Crime and Criminology: A Feminist Critique. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Snell, Tracy L., and Danielle C. Morton (1994) Women in Prison. Washington, D.C., Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report.
- Spohn, Cassia, John Gruhl and Susan Welch (1987) "The Impact of the Ethnicity and Gender of Defendants on the Decision to Reject or Dismiss Felony Charges." Criminology 25:175- 91.
- Stattin, Hakan and David Magnusson (1990) Pubertal Maturation in Female Development. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Teilmann, Katherine S. and Pierre H. Landry (1981) "Gender Bias in Juvenile Justice." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 18:47-80.
- Terry, Robert M. (1970) "Discrimination in the Handling of Juvenile Offenders by Social Control Agencies." In P. G. Garabedian and D. C. Gibbons (eds.), Becoming Delinquent. Chicago: Aldine Press.
- Timmons-Mitchell, Jane, Christie Brown, S. Charles Schulz, Susan E. Weber, Lee A. Underwood and William E. Semple (1996) "Comparing the Mental Health Needs of Female and Male Incarcerated Juvenile Delinquents." Presented at the Tenth Annual Research Conference, A System of Care for Children's Mental Health: Expanding the Research Base. Tampa, Florida.
- Wells, Ruth Herman (1994) "America's Delinquent Daughters Have Nowhere To Turn for Help." Corrections Compendium 19(11):4-6.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz (1989a.) "The Cycle of Violence." Science 244:160-6.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz (1989b) "The Intergenerational Transmission of Violence." In N. A. Weiner and M. E. Wolfgang (eds.), Pathways to Criminal Violence, pp. 137-201. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Wooldredge, John and Kimberly Masters (1993) "Confronting Problems Faced by Pregnant Inmates in State Prisons." Crime and Delinquency 39(2):195-203.
- Worrall, Anne (1990) Offending Women: Female Lawbreakers and the Criminal Justice. New York: Routledge.
- Young, Vernetta D. (1994) "Race and Gender in the Establishment of Juvenile Institutions: The Case of the South." The Prison Journal 73(2):244-65.