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The events of the past few years have increased interest in the study of juvenile delinquency (criminal behavior committed by minors). The media has focused on incidents involving youth gangs, violence in schools, and teenage substance abuse. Adolescents seem more violent today than ever before. And while the justice system seems incapable of controlling youth crime, the general public demands that police guarantee community safety and the courts rigorously punish dangerous adolescent offenders. Because these issues are so critical to the quality of life in the United States, an on-going effort has been made to study and understand the causes of delinquent behavior and to devise strategies to control or eliminate its occurrence (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

Criminologists have been concerned and are looking for solutions but with limited success as to why individuals who have been released from the criminal justice system continue to commit crimes. The purpose of this study is to determine the role of a military style counseling and vocational program in reducing recidivism. I am evaluating a program in Riverside County, California to determine its ability to reduce the recidivism of its graduates. The recidivism of juveniles who graduated from
Twin Pines Ranch will be compared to the recidivism of juveniles who completed probation in Riverside County. This study was requested by the Riverside County Probation Department to determine what effect the programs at Twin Pines Ranch had on wards after they graduated. For purposes of this study, the recidivism rate includes only convictions and probation violations after graduating from the program.

Delinquency is not a problem that appears alone. Delinquent youths are also at higher than average risk for drug use, problems in school, dropping out of school, and teenage pregnancy. Given this perspective, any intervention that reduces one of these problem behaviors is likely to reduce the others as well (Greenwood, Model, Rydell, & Chiesa, 1996).
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CHAPTER ONE
THE PROBLEM

History of Rehabilitation

Little is known about family during the Middle Ages (700 A.D. to 1500 A.D.). During this period, the concept of childhood as we know it today did not exist. Children were not seen as a distinct social group with unique needs. However, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a number of developments in England started the movement toward the recognition of the rights of children. In many instances, these events eventually affected the juvenile legal system as it emerged in America. They include changes in family style and child care, the English Poor Laws, the apprenticeship movement, and the role of the Chancery Court (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

As the nineteenth century began; delinquent, neglected, dependent, and runaway children were not treated as separate groups. The adult criminal code applied to children, and no juvenile court existed before the end of the nineteenth century (Siegel & Senna, 1994). The treatment of the criminal up to the latter part of the nineteenth century was dominated by the theories of the classical school of criminology. This school was based upon the thought of eighteenth century philosophers. Its chief founder was the Italian physician, Cesare Beccaria.
(Lombroso, 1918). The classical school in criminology argued that people act according to free will. All persons, including children are thought to weigh the costs and benefits of their proposed actions before they embark on them and it is assumed all persons possess the ability to do so (Beccaria, 1996).

Although the American legal system is based on the notions of free will and individual responsibility, it has been recognized for some time that not all individuals have the same ability to reason and weigh the outcome of their behavior. For this reason, juveniles are thought to be less responsible than adults for their behavior and an entire system of juvenile justice has been established for them (Shoemaker, 1996).

This concern for juveniles led to the establishment of juvenile courts in the United States. The Illinois Juvenile Court Act (1899) established a separate court for delinquent, dependent, and neglected children. Children were to be separated from adults in courts and institutional programs. In addition, probation programs were to be developed to assist the court in making decisions in the best interests of the state and the child. Following its passage, similar legislation was enacted throughout the nation (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

With the assumption that young delinquents need
special treatment, the idea developed that explanations of crime among juveniles must be applied specifically to experiences common to youth. Thus what came to be known as the positive school of criminology was initiated in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Radzinowicz, 1966). The name positive can be applied to any theory that systematically and empirically analyzes the causes of crime and delinquency and concludes that personal or social and environmental factors determine criminal behavior (Shoemaker, 1996). Lombroso was one of the philosophers of the nineteenth century who applied the positive, inductive method of modern science to the study of human and social phenomena (Lombroso, 1918).

Since many experts believe children can be reformed or rehabilitated, it makes sense to treat their law violations more leniently than those of adults. Therefore; care, protection, and treatment became the primary goals of the juvenile justice system (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

Ideally, the purpose of rehabilitation is to change the attitudes and behavior of offenders (Shichor, 1992). The idea of rehabilitation developed during the Enlightenment period and continued to grow in the 20th century. During this time it was believed that the convicted offender should receive therapy to effect changes in his or her behavior. This was thought to be
beneficial to the offender as well as to society (Shichor, 1992).

The effectiveness of rehabilitation again became an issue in the mid-1970's. During this time Martinson and others challenged it in the form of a 735 page review of juvenile and adult correctional intervention programs (Palmer, 1992). Intervention was defined as any program, treatment, resource, or expenditure designated to a group of people with the goal of changing patterns of delinquency (Greenwood, 1986). The Martinson (1974) study included detailed information on 231 individual studies published between 1945 and 1968. It concluded that very little works: "With few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism".

In the last twenty years there has been an unprecedented decline in the primary function of juvenile courts, which was the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents. The decline of rehabilitation has many causes. First, there was an abuse of power by judges who attempted to impose their standards of acceptable childhood behavior and morals. Second, there were correctional authorities bent on improving institutional control. Third, the costs for treatment was escalating. Finally, there were changes in the sociocultural
atmosphere. However, the alternative of a juvenile justice system without rehabilitation is not pleasant to ponder even with all these deficiencies. (Greenwood, 1986).

In the next chapter the pattern many youth follow toward delinquency as well as some rehabilitative methods which are used to try to correct their behavior will be discussed.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Rehabilitation Programs

Rehabilitation focuses on individual offenders. It seeks to reduce criminal activities by changing offenders' attitudes and patterns of behavior (Sechrest, White, & Brown, 1979). The ideal placement maintains a balance of community protection, accountability, and personal development (Zachariah, 1992). The skillful matching of the appropriate program and individual is the key to success for both the juvenile and the juvenile justice system.

Criminal behavior of juveniles involves all types of activity and is committed by youth from all backgrounds. In addition to criminal behavior, juveniles can commit illegal acts that apply only to juveniles. These crimes are called status offenses (Shoemaker, 1996).

Status offenders in the criminal justice system are youth who have been brought to the notice of the police or courts because they have engaged in behavior that is not illegal for adults, but is considered illegal for juveniles (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985). According to the National Center for Juvenile Justice, the most common status offenses involves the possession and use of alcohol, truancy, running away, and ungovernability
The claim that status offenders have comprised a large number of the clientele of juvenile courts and probation offices seems indisputable (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985). Available evidence suggests that status offenders re-enter the system with recidivism rates ranging from (17%) to (50%), (Kramer, 1988).

Even where there are separate legal categories for delinquents and status offenders, the distinction between them has become blurred (Siegel & Senna, 1994). The repeat offender often begins with a pattern of misdemeanor offenses that lead to the commission of serious felonies (Bernard, 1988). Analysis of the offense patterns of status offenders and delinquents have focused on two major issues, recidivism rates and escalation in seriousness from initial to subsequent offenses. They hypothesize that over time, status offenders will escalate their acts into delinquent offenses. However, these two predictions may not be mutually exclusive in that those who have repeated involvement with the police and courts may comprise a group that is quite different from the one time offenders whether they be status or delinquent (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985).

One of the earlier studies that compared the offense patterns of status offenders and delinquents is Thomas'
(1976) review of the court records of 2,092 youth brought before the Portsmouth and Virginia Beach juvenile courts during 1970-74. Thomas was interested in recidivism rates and types of repeat offenses for youth charged with status offenses, misdemeanors, or felonies. Thomas found that the most frequent initial charge was misdemeanors (50.3% of the sample), followed by status offenses (27.3%), and felonies (23.3%). Only about (28%) of the total sample returned to court at least once. However, those initially charged with a status offense had a recidivism rate of (38%), followed by felons (32%), and those arrested for misdemeanors (22%), (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985).

Another study (Kobrin, Hellum, & Peterson, 1980; Kobrin & Klein, 1982) provides an even more differentiated view of status and delinquent youth. In the course of evaluating the effectiveness of diversion programs for status offenders, Kobrin and his colleagues assembled a sample of more than 3,000 youth from eight locations around the country. Of the 3,017 youth, (52%) had no prior offense, while (69%) had no subsequent offenses. Almost half of the sample (43%) were one time status offenders. The recidivism of the first-time offenders in this study was about (17%). The recidivism rate for repeat delinquent/mixed youth was (48%) (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985).
A longer term study of recidivism rates and offense patterns of youthful offenders is provided by an analysis of 2,574 youth committed to the Georgia Department of Youth Services (Roberg & Webb, 1981). The researchers followed the offense careers of these youth by monitoring entry into the Georgia adult prisons during the period 1975 to 1980. Some of the main findings were that (26%) of the juvenile offenders became adult offenders, but only (6%) of the 680 recidivists were originally juvenile status offenders (Weisheit & Culbertson, 1985).

Collectively, illegal acts (whether status or criminal) committed by youth under the age of eighteen are called delinquent behaviors. Thus the youth committing these crimes are called juvenile delinquents. Perhaps the concern over youthful deviance stems from the thought that today's delinquent is tomorrow's criminal, if nothing is done to change the antisocial behavior of the youth (Shoemaker, 1996).

After attempts to divert juveniles from juvenile court have failed and after the juvenile has had an adjudicatory hearing at which he has been declared delinquent, the judge must make a decision concerning proper disposition of the juvenile (Cox & Conrad, 1978). The alternatives available to the judge are probation, foster home placement, or detention in a public or private
correctional facility. One alternative available is community-based corrections.

The use of small, community-based corrections programs brought up new issues and controversies in juvenile corrections. These programs included the early experiments in Provo (Empey & Erickson, 1972), Silverlake (Empey & Lubeck, 1971) and the UDIS program in Chicago (Murray & Cox, 1979). The Provo experiment in delinquency rehabilitation was one of the first attempts to provide a community alternative to incarceration for persistent delinquent offenders. The Provo Program resided in the community and did not involve permanent incarceration. The boys assigned to the program were repeat offenders ages 14-18. No more than twenty boys were assigned to the program at a time. Overall the results were not encouraging when the dropout and recidivism rate are considered. (Empey & Erickson, 1972).

The Silverlake study began in the mid-1960's in Los Angeles. Program participants included status and property offenders. Excluded from the study were serious sex offenders, drug addicts, those suffering from retardation, and offenders who were psychotic. All subjects were male and had prior offenses. Recidivism rates were collected within twelve months of release from the program. Recidivism was defined as being re-arrested for a new
offense. This study found that there were no significant differences in recidivism rates between the Silverlake residents and the juveniles at Boys Republic (the comparison group). However, one of the most impressive findings in the Silverlake experiment was that there did not seem to be any set of personal or background characteristics that were consistent with offender behavior. Thus, the findings argue against the common and simplistic conclusion that because recidivism rates for different programs are about equal, they produce the same effect on all offenders. Offenders who do well in one program may not do well in another and vice versa (Empey & Lubeck, 1971).

The UDIS program in Chicago evaluated the "suppression effect" (arrests prior to treatment versus one year treatment) of 317 juveniles sentenced to training schools (experimental group) with 266 juveniles sentenced to less drastic placement alternatives (control group). The findings indicate that the experimental group had a (68%) reduction of recidivism after twelve months and the control group had a (53%) reduction. The overall conclusions indicate that many types of intervention suppress delinquency. This includes incarceration, non-residential services and residential services. Secondly, when the intervention in question is incarceration,
deterrence is likely to be the reason offenders suppress involvement in delinquency. Finally, when the interventions in question are non institutional, deterrence is only one of several reasons offenders suppress involvement in delinquency (Murray, Thomson, & Israel, 1978).

Another intervention available are state training schools. The effect of limiting an institutional program to a twenty-bed living unit instead of a fifty-bed unit was studied at the Fricot Ranch School operated by the California Youth Authority. Two hundred eighty-one youth were randomly assigned to programs which were the same except for the size of the living unit. As with several of the studies already reviewed, a program emphasizing smaller sized living units does not contribute to any marked decrease in recidivism. However, there were more immediate benefits. The use of lockup to control youth in smaller cottages was reduced (Wedge, White, & Palmer, 1980).

Gendreau and Ross (1979) also found empirical support for effective rehabilitation programs. They looked at behavior modification programs as part of their review of juvenile correctional treatment literature (1973-78). The most common type of behavior modification programs have been contingency management programs with a token system.
as one of their main features. Contingency management is operationalized through the awarding of credits for appropriate behavior. The goal is to change social behaviors in the home, school and on the job (Gendreau & Ross, 1979). They determined that contingency management programs seem to be less successful with passive and substantially neurotic youth. However, they found evidence supporting both community-based and institutional programs. The programs achieved short-range goals such as increased school attendance, appropriate classroom behavior, reduced curfew violations, and increased basic skills. Some juvenile correctional programs also had positive effects on long-range goals. For example, there was a reduction in post program recidivism rates (Finckenauer, 1982).

Behavior modification attempts to understand, analyze, and intervene on various personal and social behaviors (Morris & Braukmann, 1987). However, one of the criticisms of behavior modification is that it works well in changing certain behaviors while the juvenile is in the structured environment of the program, but, it does not effect behavior after the juvenile has left the program (Finckenauer, 1982).

Goldstein (1990) looked at delinquent youth's perspective on the cause, prevention, and reduction of
juvenile delinquency. It was discovered that youth perceived their dysfunctional families, peers, and drugs to be the causes of their delinquency. Furthermore, they believed stricter parenting, education, and harsher punishment by the criminal justice system would prevent recidivism. These findings were based on interviews of 250 delinquent males and females in nineteen juvenile residential facilities in seven states.

Overall, the literature reviews of the 1980's indicate the following. When individual programs have been grouped together and analyzed as a single undifferentiated type (counseling), many seemed unsuccessful in terms of recidivism reduction. However, at a broad level; the interventions usually regarded as the most successful were behavioral, cognitive-behavioral, family intervention, and vocational training. Nevertheless, a minority of the literature reviews found some of these approaches to be unsuccessful, mainly behavioral and family intervention programs (Palmer, 1991).

The extent to which skills and behaviors learned in programs are internalized is critical to understanding recidivism and for determining the effectiveness of programs (Fagan, 1990). In the next chapter, the programs at Twin Pines Ranch are reviewed to determine if it had any impact in reducing the recidivism of its graduates.
Twin Pines Ranch Juvenile Camp

Overview

Generally, minors ordered to placement have a substantial history of law violations and behavioral problems. These are best addressed in a highly structured treatment oriented environment. The goal of each treatment facility is to return the minors to their homes as soon as possible. However; the minor's emotional adjustment, family situation, and the safety of the community are also considered.

Twin Pines Ranch is one of the oldest programs of its kind in the state of California. For over fifty years, the Ranch has provided services to boys ages 15-18. On December 31, 1947 Twin Pines Ranch was established. Operated by the Riverside County Probation Department, it is a 24-hour program (Riverside County Probation Department).

The rehabilitation program at Twin Pines Ranch consists of three inter-related learning areas. These three learning areas are vocational training, counseling, and academic studies. Each ward admitted to the Ranch participates in these three components of the program. The program is arranged so that each ranch hand can attend
both high school and vocational classes daily, spending half a day in each. Twin Pines High School, under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of County Schools, is an accredited school. The goal of the program is to help each individual become more self-reliant by developing personal and vocational skills (Riverside County Probation Department).

Admission Criteria

1. Minors must be 15-18 years of age.

2. Minors must reside in Riverside or San Bernardino County.

3. Minors must be a 602 offender (ideally with an I.Q. of 85 and motivated to participate in the program).

Exclusion Criteria

1. Minors with an indication of mental retardation, mental illness, repeated assaultive behavior, and/or drug addiction would not be appropriate candidates for this program.

2. The program will not accept juveniles from Los Angeles County due to heavier and hard-core gang involvement which the program is not equipped to deal with.

3. Additionally, the program will not accept juveniles convicted of murder due to the seriousness of the offense. In addition, juveniles convicted of arson will not be accepted due to the location of the camp.

Referrals

The placing Deputy Probation Officer must first present the minor's case before the Juvenile Division Screening Committee. The screening committee consists of a therapist from Riverside juvenile hall, a supervising and
a senior probation officer, and a member from ASAP (a specialized drug treatment program). In addition, if the juvenile is not a ward of the court, a representative from the Department of Social Services will also be present. They will determine if placement is warranted. If Twin Pines Ranch is recommended, the deputy is to contact the Ranch for a formal screening date. The minor is interviewed by the Screening Committee to determine suitability and motivation. The deputy must provide a completed departmental screening form and a psychological evaluation. In addition, the most recent court report, delinquency record, and updated school information is required. Medical consents, immunization record, clothing order, court minute order, and birth certificate must be submitted prior to admittance to the Ranch (Riverside County Probation Department).

Treatment Programs

Once wards are admitted to Twin Pines Ranch, there is an induction group to help them get settled into the program. Within the first thirty days new admissions are more likely to run away. Wards are evaluated at two months, four months, six months, then every month after the sixth month. School, vocational counseling, group counseling, and behavior reports are considered in the evaluation. Evaluations are individualized and take into
account if the ward is working on his program and up to his potential. The average stay required to graduate the program is from six months to one year. Most wards have had one or two prior placements and are reunited with their family after graduating (Riverside County Probation Department).

Counseling Programs

**A.G.A.S.T.** *(Alternative to Gang Association with Street Terrorists)* This program has received federal support through a one year grant award of $275,000. It's goal is to assist the program in providing rehabilitation services to "hard-core" gang members. The program was implemented in June 1991. The program specifically addresses the impact of gang related behavior. It utilizes high impact learning experiences such as a tour of the morgue to view the remains of victims of gang violence and counseling groups conducted at adult detention facilities. Prior to the implementation of this program, ranch hands with gang affiliation were enrolled in the quest/values assessment program (Riverside County Probation Department).

**"Quest"** This program is three months in duration. The intent is to provide value clarification and survival skills. The approximate enrollment is ten ranch hands. It is taught by Twin Pines High School teachers and
"Fresh Start" Drug Abuse Recovery Program This criminal justice planning grant was implemented in 1992 at Twin Pines Ranch and Van Horn Youth Center for one year. The program focuses on substance abuse treatment and prevention of relapse by combining an in-custody phase of intensive treatment/education and an aftercare phase of intensive probation supervision/monitoring. This four stage program is offered to ranch hands who have been identified as being high risk to develop a substance abuse problem. The assessment is done by Twin Pines Ranch staff. The program involves attendance in community Narcotics Anonymous meetings, as well as relapse prevention and individual counseling. Volunteers are utilized throughout the six month program. Prior to the implementation of this program, ranch hands with substance abuse issues were enrolled in the relapse prevention program (Riverside County Probation Department).

Assertion Training Program This program is six weeks in duration. It is taught by Twin Pines Ranch staff and has an enrollment of ten to twelve ranch hands. The intent is to develop social skills, appropriate assertion techniques, and anger management skills. This is a mandatory program (Riverside County Probation Department).

Victim Awareness Program This program is eight weeks in
duration. It is based on the C.Y.A. (California Youth Authority) program developed by English and Campbell. It has an enrollment of fifteen to twenty ranch hands. The intent is to create awareness of the impact of crime on victims. The major focus is on property crimes (primarily burglary), assault and sexual offenses. This is a mandatory program (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Individual/Group Counseling** All ranch hands are provided with weekly individual and group counseling. This is conducted by Twin Pines Ranch staff (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Family Life Skills Program** This program started on 7-1-90. It is offered to ranch hands with children. The intent is to provide counseling and education related to parenting skills. It is for the ranch hand and the mother of the child. Prior to this program ranch hands with children were enrolled in the parent justification program (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Referral to Licensed Therapists** Through the cooperation of the Mid-County office of the Riverside County Mental Health Department, licensed therapists are available to select ranch hands who have mental health issues beyond what can be offered by Twin Pines Ranch staff. The typical need is for victims of depression and sexual abuse (Riverside County Probation Department).
**Religious Services** Weekly Catholic and Protestant

Church services are offered to those ranch hands who request such services. Individual spiritual advisement is also available upon request (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Escape to Reality** In conjunction with "Fresh Start," the intent of this program is to teach ranch hands self confidence, teamwork, and accomplishment. Offered through Canyon Springs Hospital it is a one day program where the ranch hands experience controlled challenges and risk taking (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Vocational Programs**

Twin Pines Ranch currently offers vocational training in carpentry, culinary arts, plumbing, agriculture, automotive mechanics, and masonry. Upon completion of their vocational training, each student is awarded a certificate verifying his apprentice level skills for entry level employment. The vocational instructors are employed by the Riverside County Probation Department (Riverside County Probation Department).

**Military Program**

In March 1994, through a federal grant, Twin Pines Ranch began a military style boot camp program. The residents dress in military style uniforms and participate in military marching, drilling, daily inspections, and
physical training. They adhere to a strict schedule which begins at 5:30 a.m. and ends with a 9:00 p.m. bedtime. Although it is referred to as a "boot camp" program, the program more closely follows a military school model (Riverside County Probation Department).
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the recidivism of juvenile delinquents who have graduated from Twin Pines Ranch juvenile camp will be compared to juvenile delinquents who have completed probation but who have never been in any type of court ordered placement.

Subjects

The experimental group consists of 100 male juvenile delinquents who graduated from Twin Pines Ranch between June 1990 and July 1991. The control group consists of 100 male juvenile delinquents who completed probation during the same time period, but had no prior placement history. The offense data includes only convictions and probation violations, not arrests. The method used to analyze post-release failure is recidivism.

A juvenile delinquent is a youth within the age established by statute, who has been adjudicated by a juvenile court to have committed a prohibited act or to be in need of supervision (Senna & Siegel, 1990). A misdemeanor is a less serious offense punishable by incarceration for not more than one year in a county jail (Senna & Siegel, 1990). A felony is a more serious offense which carries a penalty of incarceration in a state prison, usually for one year or more (Senna & Siegel,
Variables

The independent variable is the type of treatment received. The dependent variable is the amount of recidivism.

Hypotheses

**Twin Pines Ranch** (Null Hypothesis) The present study proposes that there is no difference in recidivism between Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation.

**Probation** (Alternative Hypothesis) The present study proposes that there is a reduction in recidivism for Twin Pines Ranch graduates as compared to juveniles who completed probation.

Sample Selection

The sample for this study was chosen by random selection from three sources. Random sampling is a procedure that provides an equal opportunity of selection to each unit in the population. The first source came from files located at Twin Pines Ranch juvenile camp which is located in Banning, CA. Inactive files A-Z from June 1990 to July 1991 were used. The second source came from files at the Riverside Juvenile Probation Department. Closed cases A-Z from June 1990 to July 1991 were used. The third and final source came from files at the San Bernardino
Juvenile Probation Department. However, only the files of juveniles who had been placed at Twin Pines Ranch between June 1990 and July 1991 were used.

Data Collection

The empirical data for this study was gathered from three sources: the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS), juvenile records at the Riverside Probation Department, and juvenile records at the San Bernardino Probation Department (JJIS). CLETS is part of the California Department of Justice. It is a database for adult arrests and convictions. The Criminal Justice Information System manual provides instruction on the use of CLETS. In addition, it provides instruction on the use of the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) wanted persons files. The data include adult felony, misdemeanor, and temporary records of wanted persons (WPS). Wanted persons record types and retention include: temporary warrants (48-72 hours), misdemeanors (3 years), and felonies (5 years). The age limit for making a wanted person file is nine to ninety-nine.

The second source, Riverside juvenile records were checked by looking through a "chain index". Once the juvenile in question was located (this was done by looking up the full name and the juvenile number, also referred to as the "J" number), I checked to see if the file was open.
or closed. The names of juveniles that had closed files were checked to see if they had any new convictions or probation violations.

The third and final source, San Bernardino County juvenile records was on an automated system. This system is called the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). This system tracks dependency and delinquency cases from referral or arrest through disposition. In order to locate the juvenile in question all that was needed is the name or juvenile number. This system was developed by the Office of Management Service (OMS). It was done in conjunction with Juvenile Court, the Department of Public Social Services, the Public Defender, and the District Attorney's Office. San Bernardino County also has a Juvenile Housing Information Tracking System (JHITS). Implemented in July 1991, it includes intake, booking, housing, and placement information for minors maintained in county and private facilities from San Bernardino County.

Authorization was given to view all juveniles files at Twin Pines Ranch. Therefore, getting a large sample for this study did not pose any problems. However, because the files were not on an automated system (except for those in San Bernardino) it took a lot of time to review the pertinent information in the files.
There were minor concerns with obtaining the data. Because of security concerns, the names of all juveniles with adult convictions were checked by an employee of the Riverside County Probation Department. Therefore, it was necessary to wait until a Riverside County Probation Department employee with the appropriate security clearance could check the names.

There were no limitations in obtaining San Bernardino County juvenile records. The system was automated. Therefore, the information was retrieved within a matter of hours.

However, obtaining records from Riverside Juvenile Probation Department was much more challenging. Not only was the system manual, but the records were not located in one central location. The records were located at the Riverside, Corona, Indio, and Palm Springs Probation offices. The majority of the subjects were located at the Riverside Probation office therefore, this is the only office that I went to. Consequently, juvenile convictions and probation violations that occurred on any subject who graduated from Twin Pines Ranch who was on probation in Corona, Indio, or Palm Springs is not included in this study. However, since the follow-up period was four years all adult offenses would be included as recorded from CLETS.
Statistical Procedures

Chi-square was used to determine the statistical significance between the reduction in recidivism and the programs at Twin Pines Ranch.

Recidivism is derived from the Latin word "recidere" which means to fall back. A recidivist is one who after release from custody for having committed a crime is not rehabilitated. Instead, he or she falls back or relapses into former behavior patterns and commits crimes (Maltz, 1984). Recidivism is usually measured in terms of the time interval between two events: time of release and time of recidivism (Maltz, 1984). Maltz gives various options at how to look at recidivism. It includes the following.

**Arrest and Conviction** This time interval runs from the date of release to the date of arrest. However, it is counted as a recidivism event only if the arrest results in a conviction.

**Violation and Return to Custody** This time interval runs from the date of release to the date of violation of the terms and conditions of probation and/or parole. However, it is counted as a recidivism event only if the violator is returned to custody.

Much recidivism research uses actual juvenile court convictions subsequent to the disposition of the offense. Offender self-reports, reports from parents, parole
counselors, children's protective service reports, or actual arrests would have probably yielded valuable information, but would have compounded methodological problems (Kahn & Chambers, 1991).

From a social science perspective the primary consideration is how to use the available data to develop the most appropriate indicator, the one that is closest to what one thinks of as recidivism. In practical terms this comes down to a choice between using raw arrest data or using data from arrests only if it is followed by a conviction (Maltz, 1984).

The argument against using raw arrests is based on the standard for arrest being less rigorous than that for conviction. Probable cause is sufficient to arrest an individual, but proof beyond a reasonable doubt is needed for a conviction. In many cases people known to be guilty of a crime are not convicted or even arrested. For example, an offender may be put in a diversion program in lieu of prosecution. An offender may be granted immunity from prosecution in return for testimony. In addition, the offender may offer to make restitution if the victim agrees to drop charges or withhold testimony (Maltz, 1984).

One can see the problems associated with an operational definition of recidivism using criminal
history records, even when the records are complete. On the one hand, you have errors of commission if a person who has been arrested is called a recidivist when she or he has not actually committed an offense. On the other hand, there are errors of omission if arrestees who are factually guilty are labeled non recidivists because they have not been convicted for the variety of reasons discussed (Maltz, 1984).

In this study, recidivism was defined as having any new conviction or probation violation after graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and after completing probation. The follow-up period was four years. Success was defined as not having any new conviction or probation violation after graduating from Twin Pines Ranch or after completing probation. A check for new offenses was done in March 1995.

Recidivism was examined in three ways. First, it was examined in terms of individuals, whether each subject recidivated and if so, the frequency which he did so. Second, it was examined in collective terms, by comparing the total volume of delinquency committed after release. And third, it was examined in terms of the seriousness of the recidivating offense(s).
CHAPTER FIVE
ANALYSIS OF DATA

The names of 200 subjects were checked through the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System for adult records and through Riverside and San Bernardino Probation Juvenile Probation records in March 1995. Shown in Table 1 is the number and percentage of Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation who had new convictions and/or probation violations at that time (recidivists).

The probability level shown in Table 1 indicates there is no relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and reduction in recidivism when looking at the total number of juveniles who were recidivists or non recidivists between the two groups. Forty one percent of juveniles who completed probation were recidivists compared to 37% of the juveniles who graduated from Twin Pines Ranch.
TABLE 1

Number and Percentage of Twin Pines Ranch Graduates and Juveniles who Completed Probation who were Recidivists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists</td>
<td>37 (37%)</td>
<td>41 (41%)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Recidivists</td>
<td>63 (63%)</td>
<td>59 (59%)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>100 (100%)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = .189
p < .66
Shown in Table 2 is the number and percentage of misdemeanor/felony convictions and probation violations committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation.

The probability level shown in Table 2 indicates there is a relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and reduction in recidivism when looking at the total number of misdemeanors and felonies. Twin Pines Ranch graduates had 60 total convictions, 72% felonies and 28% misdemeanors. In comparison, juveniles who completed probation had 116 total convictions, 85% felonies and 15% misdemeanors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>17 (15%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonies</td>
<td>43 (72%)</td>
<td>99 (85%)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>116 (100%)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 3.9

p < .05
Shown in Table 3 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations received by individual Twin Pines Ranch graduates and individual juveniles who completed probation.

Of the thirty-seven individual Twin Pines Ranch graduates who received convictions and probation violations; 67.6% had one conviction, 16.2% had two convictions, 2.7% had three convictions and 13.5% had four convictions.

In comparison, of the forty-one individual juveniles who completed probation; 29.3% had one and four convictions, 7.3% had two convictions, 26.8% had three convictions, 2.4% had five convictions, and 4.9% had six convictions.
**TABLE 3**

Number and Percentage of Convictions and Probation Violations Received by Individual Twin Pines Ranch Graduates and Juveniles who Completed Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convictions</th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Conviction</td>
<td>25 (67.6%)</td>
<td>12 (29.3%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Convictions</td>
<td>6 (16.2%)</td>
<td>3 (7.3%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Convictions</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>11 (26.8%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Convictions</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>12 (29.3%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Convictions</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Convictions</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shown in Table 4 is a summary of offenses committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation. The data include only convictions and probation violations, not arrests.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates; there were twenty-nine (48.3%) convictions for property crimes, twelve (20%) convictions for crimes against persons, and nineteen (31.7%) total convictions for victimless crimes, drug offenses, and vehicle code violations.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation; there were forty-one (35.3%) convictions for property crimes, twenty-four (20.7%) convictions for crimes against persons, and fifty-one (44%) total convictions for victimless crimes, drug offenses, and vehicle code violations.

The probability level shown in Table 4 indicates there is a relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and reduction in recidivism when comparing the total number of convictions and probation violations committed between the two groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Crimes</td>
<td>29 (48.3%)</td>
<td>41 (35.3%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against Persons</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
<td>24 (20.7%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimless Crimes, Drug Offenses, and Vehicle Code Violations</td>
<td>19 (31.7%)</td>
<td>51 (44%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60 (100%)</td>
<td>116 (100%)</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 4.75

p < .03
Shown in Table 5 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations for property crimes committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation as of March 1995.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates, there were twelve (41.4%) total convictions for theft (vehicle theft and petty theft). Vehicle theft is defined as the theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle. This definition excludes the taking of a motor vehicle for temporary use by those persons having lawful access (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1980). Larceny theft is defined as the unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession of another. It includes crimes such as shoplifting, pocket-picking, and purse snatching (F.B.I., 1980).

There were nine (31%) total convictions for burglary (first degree burglary and second degree burglary). Burglary is defined as the unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. The use of force to gain entry is not required to classify an offense as burglary. Burglary is categorized into three subclassifications. These are forcible entry, unlawful entry where no force is used and attempted forcible entry (F.B.I., 1980).

In addition, there were eight (27.6%) total convictions for other crimes. These include receiving
stolen property, having burglary tools in one's possession, loitering school property), trespassing, and vandalism.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation, there were twenty-two (53.7%) total convictions for theft. These include vehicle theft, theft from a merchant, theft/petty theft, and grand theft.

There were eight (19.5%) convictions for burglary.

In addition, there were eleven (26.8%) total convictions for other crimes. These include receiving stolen property, loitering, trespassing, throwing substances at a vehicle, and vandalism.

The probability level shown in Table 5 indicates there is no relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and reduction in recidivism when comparing the total number of convictions for property crimes by both groups. However, the juveniles who completed probation had more convictions in each category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>12 (41.4%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7%)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>9 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 (27.6%)</td>
<td>11 (26.8%)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29 (100%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 1.46

p < .48
Shown in Table 6 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations for crimes against persons, drug offenses and vehicle code violations committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation as of March 1995.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates, there were twelve (44.4%) convictions for crimes against persons. These include attempted robbery, first degree robbery, second degree robbery, shooting at an inhabited dwelling/vehicle, having sex with a minor, voluntary manslaughter, and first degree attempted murder. Robbery is defined as the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person by force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear (F.B.I., 1980). Manslaughter is defined as the willful (non negligent) killing of a human being by another. The classification of this offense is based solely on police investigation as opposed to the determination of a court, medical examiner, coroner, jury, or other judicial body. Not included in this offense classification is death caused by negligent suicide or accident, and justifiable homicides. Attempts to murder or assaults to murder are classified as aggravated assaults (F.B.I., 1980).

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation, there were twenty-four (45.3%) convictions for crimes
against persons. These include attempted robbery/robbery, battery and assault with a deadly weapon.

Also shown in Table 6 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations for drug offenses committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates, there were ten (37.1%) drug related offenses. These include being under the influence of a controlled substance, having a syringe in one's possession, having a controlled substance with the intent to sell, and having a controlled substance in one's possession.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation, there were twenty (37.7%) convictions for drug related offenses. These include Dui alcohol/drugs, possession of marijuana, possession of a controlled substance for sale, and distribution of a controlled substance.

In addition, shown in Table 6 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations for vehicle code violations committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates, there were five (18.5%) convictions for vehicle code violations. All of these offenses were related to safety.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation,
there were nine (17%) convictions for vehicle code violations. These include not being a licensed driver, driving without a license, not having evidence of auto insurance, driving with a suspended license, and not reporting an accident.

The probability level shown in Table 6 indicates there is a relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and reduction in recidivism when comparing the total number of convictions and probation violations for crimes against persons, drug offenses, and vehicle code violations between the two groups. In addition, the juveniles who completed probation had more convictions in each category.
TABLE 6

Number and Percentage of Convictions and Probation Violations for Crimes Against Persons, Drug Offenses, and Vehicle Code Violations Committed by Twin Pines Ranch Graduates and Juveniles who Completed Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes Against Persons</td>
<td>12 (44.4%)</td>
<td>24 (45.3%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offenses</td>
<td>10 (37.1%)</td>
<td>20 (37.7%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Code Violations</td>
<td>5 (18.5%)</td>
<td>9 (17%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>53 (100%)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = .029

p < .99
Shown in Table 7 is the number and percentage of convictions and probation violations for victimless crimes committed by Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation as of March 1995.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates, there were four convictions for victimless crimes. These include disobeying a court order, criminal conspiracy, and having a weapon in one's possession.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation, there were twenty-two convictions for victimless crimes. These include having a concealed weapon in one's possession, giving false identification, evading/resisting arrest, malicious mischief, escaping from a probation officer, probation violation, and indecent exposure.

As shown in Table 7, juveniles who completed probation had more convictions in both categories however, there isn't enough data to determine a statistical relationship.
**TABLE 7**

Number and Percentage of Convictions and Probation Violations for Victimless Crimes Committed by Twin Pines Ranch Graduates and Juveniles who Completed Probation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Description</th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disobey Ct Order, Conspiracy, and Poss of a Weapon</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>13 (59.1%)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Id, Evade/Resist Arrest, Malicious Mischief, Esc Probation Officier, Probation Violation, and Indecent Exposure</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 (100%)</td>
<td>22 (100%)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shown in Table 8 is the number and percentage of Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation who had convictions and/or probation violations as of March 1995 according to race.

For Twin Pines Ranch graduates; seventeen (46%) were Hispanic, eleven (29.7%) were Caucasian, seven (18.9%) were African-American, and two (5.4%) were from other ethnic groups than those listed above.

In comparison, for juveniles who completed probation; eighteen (43.9%) were Hispanic, thirteen (31.7%) were Caucasian, eight (19.5%) were African-American, and two (4.9%) were from other ethnic groups than those listed above.

The probability level shown in Table 8 indicates there is no relationship between graduating from Twin Pines Ranch and race. However, for Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation; Hispanics had the most convictions and probation violations, followed by Caucasians, African-Americans, and the ethnic group listed as other.
TABLE 8

Number and Percentage of Twin Pines Ranch Graduates and Juveniles who Completed Probation who Received Convictions and Probation Violations According to Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Twin Pines Ranch</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic</strong></td>
<td>17 (46%)</td>
<td>18 (43.9%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caucasian</strong></td>
<td>11 (29.7%)</td>
<td>13 (31.7%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African-American</strong></td>
<td>7 (18.9%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37 (100%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = .057

p < .99
CONCLUSION

In comparing data on convictions and probation violations by Twin Pines Ranch graduates in 1995 to juveniles who completed probation but had not been in any type of confinement program, these data indicates the following. When comparing the total number of juvenile recidivists, there is little differentiation. Twin Pines Ranch graduates had a 37% recidivism rate compared to 41% by juveniles who completed probation. Therefore, the hypothesis stated on page twenty-four is not supported.

However, when comparing the type of offenses there were greater differences. Twin Pines Ranch graduates had a total of 60 convictions and probation violations, 17 misdemeanors and 43 felonies. In comparison, juveniles who completed probation had a total of 116 convictions and probation violations, 17 misdemeanors and 99 felonies. In addition, of the thirty-seven Twin Pines Ranch graduates with convictions and/or probation violations, the majority (67.6%) had one conviction. However, for juveniles who completed probation, the majority (29.3%) had one and four convictions.

Finally, when comparing the total number of convictions and probation violations in each category (property crimes, crimes against persons, victimless crimes, drug offenses, and vehicle code violations):
juveniles who completed probation had more convictions and probation violations in each category. Furthermore, the majority of juveniles with convictions and probation violations were Hispanic.

Although the original hypothesis was not proven, the most significant finding of this study is that there were significant differences in the type of recidivism found between Twin Pines Ranch graduates and juveniles who completed probation. These differences were in the number of convictions and probation violations (misdemeanors and felonies) between the two groups. Some type of rehabilitative intervention, therefore, appears to be better than no treatment at all.
DISCUSSION

The ultimate test of any rehabilitation program is not the technique it uses, or where it takes place, or how hard it tries (characteristics normally used to describe a model program). The ultimate test is its effect on the criminal behavior of the youth after he or she leaves the program (their recidivism rate compared with that of similar youth the program did not treat), (Greenwood & Zimring, 1985).

No single program is suitable for every juvenile. Thus, a variety of options will probably increase success rates. The juvenile justice system needs all of the following options; foster homes, group homes, mental health programs, community supervision, work programs, and victim restitution programs (Mixford, 1989).

Crimes against people or property perpetrated by individuals under age eighteen have been a major concern (Goldstein & Glick, 1987). Thus, an effective system balances community risk factors with the personal needs of the juvenile (O'Rourke, 1989). The four generally acknowledged objectives to be met by a criminal justice system are:

- deterrence The convicted individual and those who observe the convict's treatment are deterred from engaging in criminal acts (Duffee and McGarrell, 1990).
punishment The infliction of pain or loss on the criminal is retribution for the crime committed (Champion, 1990).

incapacitation The ability of the criminal to engage in crimes is limited. (Blumstein, 1983).

rehabilitation Creating a change in the criminal's attitude or resources so that crime is neither desired nor necessary (Duffee & McGarrell, 1990; Champion, 1990).

Rehabilitation is the result of any planned intervention that reduces an offender's criminal activity. This applies even if that reduction is mediated by personality, behavior, abilities, attitudes, values, or other factors. The effects of maturation and the effects associated with fear or intimidation are excluded (Sechrest et al., 1979).

Recidivism has been the traditional measure for assessing effectiveness of rehabilitation efforts. However, as an outcome measure; recidivism represents difficulties, not the least of which is that there is no agreement on a definition (Sechrest et al., 1979). Recidivism indicates that a person has relapsed into criminal behavior. In practice, it means that an official action has been taken against an offender. Deciding which measure of recidivism to use (arrest, conviction, revocation, or re-entry into a program/institution) is as
problematic as deciding whether to measure crime by convictions, police reports, or victim surveys. Generally speaking, revocation and arrest are far more liberal measures than conviction and re-entry into specific programs. Thus, recidivism will usually be much higher using the former measures rather than the latter (Pepinsky, 1980).

The literature suggests that human beings who have lived in a particular cultural milieu for at least eighteen years cannot easily be changed permanently. However, it is likely that some offenders are changed into more law abiding citizens by being exposed to certain programs (Doob & Brodeur, 1989). Less sensational programs which may be very viable for a smaller portion of the inmate population are less conducive to extensive press coverage. As a result, they are inclined to be ignored even when they may prove to be effective (Cullen & Gilbert, 1982).

The premise of many if not all interventions is the notion of curing criminals of their tendencies to commit crimes. Such notions of cure by a specific intervention are simplistic and misguided. Criminal behavior is likely to be the result of a complicated set of circumstances, individual characteristics, and social conditions (Sechrest et al., 1979).
For an intervention program to be effective as a crime control strategy it must reduce the rate of subsequent criminality of its subjects below what would be expected without the intervention (Greenwood & Zimring, 1985).

If society were to concede that treatment programs had no beneficial effects, the effects of this concession on juvenile justice programs would be disastrous. Rehabilitation considerations would no longer be a valid criteria for placement decisions. Punishment and incapacitation would become the principal objectives of sentencing, as they are in the adult system today. The high rate of recidivism for juveniles committed to institutional care would guarantee a continuing large supply of career criminals for the adult system to deal with. As long as there is a governmental agency concerned with juvenile delinquency or juvenile justice, one of its primary concerns must be to continue looking for more effective methods of reducing criminal behavior among the young (Greenwood, 1986).
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