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Abstract of the dissertation

PROBLEM: Juvenile court judges in Solano County, California, allocate delinquent students to educational programs of either a short term nature (Juvenile Hall School) or a long term nature (California Youth Authority). In allocating these students, on what bases do the judges make their decisions?

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study was to determine the comparative importance of information about educational, socio-economic, familial, and judicial administrative variables in the allocation decision.

PROCEDURES: A twenty percent stratified random sample was drawn from a universe of 906 delinquent students. One hundred thirteen students had been allocated to short term programs (Group One); seventy-eight, to long term programs (Group Two). Analysis of variance was used to test hypotheses concerned with the comparative importance of variables in three categories; educational (intelligence and achievement scores), socio-economic/familial (parental education and income), and judicial administrative (availability of legal counsel, prior probation department contacts, judicial seniority, court agenda, and probation officer recommendations).

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: All hypotheses relating to educational variables were rejected. It was concluded that educational variables play no part in the question of whether to allocate delinquents to long term or short term educational programs.

There were significant differences between Groups One and Two in the socio-economic and familial variables of parental education and family income. Allocations favored long term placements when parental education and income were low; short term placements, when parental education and income were high. Judicial administrative variables which proved significant were number of official contacts, number of cases on docket, completeness of probation officer's report, and probation officer's recommendation to the court.

The investigator concluded that factors of the judicial
administrative process, centering upon probation officer's role and pressures of a heavy docket, when combined with variables associated with the delinquent family's socio-economic status, completely outweigh the student's educational characteristics in influencing the allocation decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Findings suggest the following six recommendations: (1) in-service training for juvenile court judges to improve their utilization of achievement and intelligence test scores; (2) similar training for juvenile court probation officers; (3) increased communication between juvenile court probation officers and juvenile hall school administrators regarding academic and behavioral progress of students facing allocation; (4) appointment of a court psychologist to work specifically with juvenile court and juvenile hall school to interpret academic and behavioral profiles of students; (5) limitation of juvenile court agendas to no more than 18 students per court date; (6) establishment of a full-time juvenile court for Solano County to ease case load.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH: Five recommendations follow: (1) replication of this study using a state-wide universe; (2) study of why juvenile court judges neglect educational variables when allocating to educational programs; (3) study of the manner in which socio-economic variables influence the allocation process; (4) study of the processes of development of a juvenile court docket; (5) study in-depth of the role of the juvenile court probation officer in the allocation decision.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile hall schools in California were established by legislation. The California Education Code, sub-section Welfare and Institutions Code Section 857,\(^1\) specifically authorizes the County Superintendent of Schools and the County Board of Education to provide an educational program for students, between six and eighteen years of age, unless specifically exempted by other provisions of the California Education Code. In the State of California there are 58 counties; of these 58 counties, 44, or 76 percent, operate juvenile hall school programs within a juvenile hall under the direction of the County Superintendent of Schools.\(^2\)

Since 1967, interest in the study of students detained in juvenile hall schools in California has increased greatly.\(^3\) Accompanying this increased interest is an increased recognition and awareness of the importance of


\(^3\)Ibid., p. 3.
differentiating between those students who are released to their home communities after their detention in juvenile hall, and those who are committed to the California Youth Authority by a juvenile court judge.

Juvenile court judges must take into consideration many variables about each student before arriving at a decision. For example, the age of the offender; the act committed; family background; number of times the offender has appeared before the juvenile court; and public and juvenile hall school record. California state law requires an analysis of each delinquent student, as prepared by the County Probation Department, on the date of his court appearance. The major categories within this report include the nature of the offense, sociological and psychological data, school record, and recommendations made by the juvenile court probation officer and juvenile hall school administration to the court. These data are presented to the juvenile court judge for his analysis, final decision and disposition of the case.

In Solano County, California, from July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972, 8,051 students were admitted to the juvenile hall. Those detained for court hearings constituted

---

4Official Juvenile Court Reporting Forms, Solano County, California, dated June, 1967.

5,536 male and female students. The majority of students detained in juvenile hall attended the school program for various periods of time. Of these students allocated to the school program, 1,545, were enrolled in the educational program after their court appearance, for periods not exceeding 90 school days.

The primary reasons given by juvenile court judges for allocating students were: (1) to give them an opportunity to develop their basic educational skills, and to acquire a proper attitude toward school, learning, and society, which would enable them to experience success in the public setting and within society; (2) to give students who showed a serious lack of development in reading and arithmetic ability, an opportunity to participate in small groups (4 to 6 students) with a reading and arithmetic specialist in an attempt to further their achievement in those areas; and (3) to give them an opportunity to participate in the academic school program which was organized as a non-graded and individualized program designed to meet the needs of students whose achievement ranged from the non-achiever to those capable of grade-level work or higher.

Students who were allocated to the educational program for periods not exceeding ninety school days and were

6Ibid., p. 36.

7California State School Registrars, for the period of July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972.
successful in completing their educational programs, were subsequently released to their parents and were re-enrolled in public schools within their attendance areas.

Other students, detained in juvenile hall and who were committed to the California Youth Authority for long-term detentions (up to eighteen months) also participated in the school program for varying periods of time. Since 1961, this investigator was directly involved with the educational programs of delinquent students and was able to observe the juvenile judicial system in operation on a first-hand basis. In viewing the process, this question was raised: "What are the differences in educational background between students allocated to the juvenile hall school educational program, for periods not exceeding 90 school days, and other students who participated in the program, but were committed to the California Youth Authority?"

Statement of the Problem

Two educational characteristics which are invariably cited in studies of delinquency are intelligence and achievement.8 It is the purpose of this study to test certain hypotheses associated with these two aspects of educational characteristics: (1) are students scoring lower on intelligence tests more likely to be committed to the California Youth Authority?

---

Youth Authority than students making higher scores on such
tests? (2) are students who score lower on achievement tests
in reading and arithmetic more likely to be committed to the
California Youth Authority than students who make higher
scores on such tests? (3) do either intelligence or achieve-
ment test scores wholly determine the allocation of students
by juvenile court judges?; is it possible that criteria deal-
ing with socio-economic and administrative judicial systems
variables may be more influential in the allocation of stu-
dents to the California Youth Authority after their period in
juvenile hall school?

For the purpose of this study, those students who were
allocated to the juvenile hall school program shall here and
after be identified as Group One. Those students who were
allocated to the California Youth Authority shall be here and
after identified as Group Two.

The Operational Hypotheses for
this Study are as Follows

I. Educational

H₁ The mean of Group Two as measured by scores on
the full scale verbal Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children
(WISC) will be significantly higher than the mean scores of
Group One.

H₂ The mean of Group One as measured by scores on
the full scale performance WISC will be significantly higher
than the mean of the scores of Group Two.

H₃ The mean of Group One as measured by scores on
the full scale intelligence WISC will be significantly higher
than the mean of the scores of Group Two.
H₄ The mean of Group One as measured by scores on the California Achievement Test in reading will be significantly higher than the mean of the scores of Group Two.

H₅ The mean of Group One as measured by scores on the California Achievement Test in arithmetic will be significantly higher than the mean of the scores of Group Two.

II. Socio-economic

H₆ Students who live with their natural parents are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those who do not live with their natural parents.

H₇ Students whose mothers completed a higher grade in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges, than those students whose mothers completed a lower grade level in school.

H₈ Students whose fathers completed a higher grade in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students whose fathers completed a lower grade level in school.

H₉ Students with a greater number of siblings in the family are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students who come from families with fewer siblings.

H₁₀ Students whose parents' occupations correspond to the lower levels of Edward's occupational scale are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than
those whose parents' occupations correspond to the higher levels.

\( H_{11} \) Students whose parents have a greater monthly income are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students whose parents have less monthly income.

\( H_{12} \) Students whose parents are on welfare are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students whose parents are not on welfare.

\( H_{13} \) Students who are black are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students who are white.

III. Administrative Judicial System

\( H_{14} \) The higher the age of the students the more likely they will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.

\( H_{15} \) The closer the students live to the juvenile court the less likely they will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.

\( H_{16} \) Students represented by counsel are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those who are not represented by counsel.

\( H_{17} \) Students with a greater number of prior contacts with the probation department are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students with fewer contacts with the probation
Students who appear in court on a high-agenda court date are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who appear on a low-agenda court date.

The higher the seniority of the judge the less likely students will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.

The more complete the probation officer's report, the less likely the students will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges.

Students who admit their guilt are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who do not admit their guilt.

Juvenile court judges accept the recommendations of the court probation officers more often than they reject them when allocating students.

When a delinquent is formally detained in juvenile hall, within fifteen days a judge must make one of five decisions: (1) release the delinquent under proper constraints; (2) continue the case pending further information; (3) commit the student to the juvenile hall school program for a period not to exceed ninety school days; (4) commit the student to the California Youth Authority; or (5) place delinquents in other social or correctional agencies.
Since a majority of first offenders are released, the first-time offender is excluded from this study. In addition, this study is limited to those who were allocated to the juvenile hall school program for periods not to exceed 90 school days (Hypothesis #3) and to those who were committed to the youth authority (Hypothesis #4). Furthermore, the study is limited to consideration of black and white male students in grades 7, 8, and 9 in Solano County, California. The students specified above were detained in the Solano County Juvenile Hall School at some time during the period of July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972. The study is also limited to those students from each grade for whom there were available complete and identical, standardized intelligence and achievement test scores. This limitation is made because it is traditional for judges in Solano County, California, to be concerned with only these two educational characteristics: in the first instance, looking only at the verbal, performance and/or full scale intelligence scores of delinquents; in the second, only at reading and arithmetic achievement scores, and finally, the study is limited to the socio-economic and judicial administrative characteristics as reported and defined by the County Probation Department.

---


10California Achievement Test, Reading and Arithmetic Only, Junior High Level, 1957 edition.
Importance of Study

This study is important because it can help determine whether the judges in Solano County do or do not make use of the educational information made available to them in the assignment of the delinquent to an educational experience in juvenile hall school of short duration or to a long term educational program available in the California Youth Authority. In the event judges are using this information, it is important to know in which way it is utilized in making their decisions. It is furthermore important to the study to know whether or not such factors, dealing with socio-economic or judicial administrative processes affecting the delinquents, may be overriding the attention which would otherwise be given educational characteristics in the disposition of a case.

The importance of this study is highlighted by direct and indirect association with one of the major problems in American society, namely, the high rate of delinquency among juveniles in our society. This study is important because it has the potential for making a contribution to the integration of educational programs and delinquent adjudication in the county, state, and nation. Even though this is a case study of Solano County, the results have implications for any criminal justice system.

Definition of Terms

The definitions given below apply wherever they
Educational Characteristics: The reference to intelligence test scores (WISC) and achievement test scores (CAT) in reading and arithmetic only.

Educational Levels: This is used in the context to describe scores of the delinquent students in relation to the norms established for the standardized instruments used.

Juvenile Court: Each superior court shall exercise the jurisdiction conferred by this chapter, and while sitting in the exercise of such jurisdiction shall be known and referred to as the "Juvenile Court."\textsuperscript{11} Welfare and Institutions Code Section 601 and 602.

Judge: In counties having more than one judge of the superior court, the presiding judge of such court or senior judge if there is no presiding judge, shall annually, during the month of January, designate one or more judges of the superior court to hear all cases . . . as may be necessary for the prompt disposition of the judicial business before the juvenile court.\textsuperscript{12}

Probation Officers: There shall be in each county the offices of Probation Officer, Assistant Probation

\textsuperscript{11} California Laws Relating to Youthful Offenders. Department of Youth Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, California, 1972, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., p. 13.
Officer, and Deputy Probation Officer.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Juvenile Delinquent: Type 601.} Any person under the age of eighteen years who persistently or habitually refuses to obey the reasonable and proper orders of direction of his parents, guardian, custodian or school authorities, or who is beyond the control of such persons, or any person who is habitually truant from school within the meaning of the law of this state, or who from any cause is in danger of leading an idle, dissolute, lewd, or immoral life, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court.\textsuperscript{14}

Type 602. Any person who is under the age of eighteen years when he violates any law of this state or of the United States or any ordinance of any city or county of this state defining crime, or who, after having been found by the juvenile court to be a person described by section 601, fails to obey any lawful order of the juvenile court, is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, which may adjudge such person to be a ward of the court.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{The Petition:} A petition is a legal step to commence proceedings in the juvenile court to declare a minor a ward or a dependent child of the court . . . .\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 22.  
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 31.  
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 31.  
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 32.
Hearing Date: Upon filing of the petition, the clerk of the juvenile court shall set the same for hearing within thirty days, except that in the case of a minor detained in custody at the time of the filing of the petition, the petition must be set for hearing within fifteen judicial days from the date of the order of the court directing such detention. 17

Disposition by Court: When a minor is adjudged a ward of the court on the ground that he is a person described by Section 601, the court may order any of the types of treatment . . . and as an additional alternative may commit the minor to a juvenile hall school, ranch, camp or forestry camp. 18

Commitment to Youth Authority: When a minor is adjudged a ward of the court on the ground that he is a person described by Section 602, the court may order any of the types of treatment . . . and as an additional alternative, may commit the minor to the Youth Authority. 19

Juvenile Court Record: The order and findings of the superior court in each case under the provisions of this chapter shall be entered in a suitable book or other form of

17 Ibid., p. 42.
18 Ibid., p. 43.
19 Ibid., p. 51.
written record which shall be kept for that purpose and known as "juvenile court record."\(^{20}\)

_Inspection of Records:_ A petition filed in any juvenile court proceedings . . . may be inspected only by court personnel . . . and such other persons as may be designated by court order of the judge of the juvenile court . . . .\(^{21}\)

_Juvenile Hall:_ The juvenile hall shall not be in, or connected with, any jail or prison, and shall not be deemed to be nor be treated as a penal institution. It shall be conducted in all respects as nearly like a home as possible.\(^{22}\) The juvenile hall shall be separate from any jail facility and shall be of short term detention.

_Juvenile Hall School:_ The Board of Supervisors may provide for the establishment and maintenance of an elementary public school and of a secondary public school in connection with the juvenile hall for the education of the children in the juvenile hall.\(^{23}\)

_Maintenance of School:_ . . . shall be maintained by the County Superintendent of Schools in which case the County Board of Education shall have the same powers and duties with respect to such schools as the governing board of a school district . . . .\(^{24}\)

\(^{20}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 52.}\)

\(^{21}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 52.}\)

\(^{22}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 53.}\)

\(^{23}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 53.}\)

\(^{24}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 54.}\)
Diagnostic Data: This consists of data collected on individual students consisting of intelligence and achievement test scores, grade, sex and age.

Adjudicated: This refers to final disposition by a juvenile court judge in a court of law.

Background of Study

On May 15, 1967 the Supreme Court of the United States of America erected a milestone in the history of juvenile rights when it decided in the "Gault" case that "neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights is for adults only." The justice had this to say:

While there can be no doubt of the original laudable purpose of the juvenile courts, studies and critiques in recent years raise serious questions as to whether actual performance measures will be enough against theoretical purpose to make tolerable the immunity of the process from the reach of constitutional guarantees applicable to adults . . . There is evidence, in fact, that there may be grounds for concern that the child receives the worst of both worlds; that he gets neither the protections accorded to adults nor the solicitous care and regenerative treatment postulated for children.

The significance of the Gault case relative to the processing of juvenile cases was that juveniles are entitled to and do receive constitutional guarantees in court.


26 Ibid.
hearings such as the right to confidentiality of identification, the right to private hearings, the right to counsel, even if one must be appointed by the court, proper notice of charges, the right to confront and cross-examine witness, the right of silence, the right of trial by jury and the right to appeal.

In view of the Gault case, it was necessary for this investigator to request a court order from the presiding juvenile court judge. The presiding juvenile court judge decided that because four other judges sat as presiding juvenile court judges for one year terms, on a rotational basis, a meeting of all five judges was necessary. On August 10, 1972 in Superior Court Department Number 2, this investigator met with the five judges and stated his interest in pursuing the problem stated. It was decided by the judges that research relative to the study of delinquents in Solano County was greatly needed by the juvenile court. It was also felt by the judges that research of this nature was not only significant to Solano County but to the fields of education, corrections and the judicial system in California. Each judge expressed a great interest in researching the problem stated. On August 15, 1972 a court order was obtained (see Order Permitting Inspection, Appendix A) and recorded in the County Clerk's Office and placed on file.
Organization of Education Staff and Facility

During the period under examination, the educational staff of the Solano County Juvenile Hall School consisted of five teachers: three full-time, regular positions, one funded under the Elementary-Secondary Act of ESEA Title I, whose specialty was reading and arithmetic, and one student teacher on a semester basis from one of the following schools: Saint Mary's College, Moraga, California; Chico State College, Chico, California; and Sacramento State College, Sacramento, California; and the University of California Davis, Davis, California. There was one full-time building principal administering the educational program. In addition, the supportive staff consisted of one full-time para-professional and four part-time teacher aides who were students at the local community college.

Enrollment in the school program was restricted to those students who were officially detained in the juvenile hall for fifteen days or more. During the fifteen days, each student's home school was contacted and a request was made for current courses of study, current test data, and the student's transcript in the case of secondary students. A reading and arithmetic test was administered to all students at the juvenile school hall by the building principal who also was a school counselor. The results of the test were compared with the data received from the student's home school and an individual course of study was prescribed,
on a short term student contract, until the student's juvenile court appearance on the fourteenth day. In addition, during the fourteen days, the probation department made its investigation of the student's case and coordinated its findings with the juvenile hall school administration for its report to the juvenile court. The school department also prepared an official report for the court describing the student's educational profile. A recommendation for each student was made to the court for: (1) educational placement, or (2) additional testing by a county psychologist if necessary.

On court day, all reports were filed with the juvenile court and the judge made his review, analysis and final disposition of the case. Those students who were released to their parents and home school remained on court probation for approximately six months. Those students who were committed to the juvenile hall school for periods of up to ninety school days were also given the opportunity to earn weekend furloughs after one month of continuous detention. Students who were committed to the California Youth Authority for long term commitment remained in the juvenile hall school program for periods of up to thirty (30) additional school days before being delivered to the California Youth Authority facilities.

**Organization of School Program**

The juvenile hall school program was organized in
the following way: One elementary school for boys, one elementary school for girls, one secondary school for boys, and one secondary school for girls. Short term students, fourteen days, were separated from the longer term students in each school program. Students who were adjudicated to the California Youth Authority were included in the student population of the long term juvenile hall school students. Extensive testing in intelligence and achievement was administered to all long term commitments and California Youth Authority commitments by the Solano County School Psychologist. Based on the test results, long term educational programs were prescribed for each student while in detention and participating in the juvenile hall school program. In the case of those students who were committed to the California Youth Authority, the test data were forwarded to that agency as agreed upon by mutual consent of the juvenile hall school, the Probation Department, and the juvenile court.

Through the judicial process, this investigator became very aware of the importance of the effects that official reports, as submitted by the school and probation department, had in determining the destiny of so many delinquents appearing before the juvenile court. Therefore, he raised the question of whether or not there were educational differences between short term committed students detained in juvenile hall school and long term commitments to the California Youth Authority. In view of the percentage
of delinquents committed to the Youth Authority, as well as those detained in juvenile hall school for a second time or more, this investigator became extremely interested in researching the differentiating educational characteristics, if any, of both groups of delinquent students from Solano County.

Because of (1) personal convictions in the matter, (2) inconsistency among various members of the judicial branch regarding the value of educational profiles as submitted by the department, (3) lack of previous research relating specifically to the problem, it was decided to attempt a study in which the educational characteristics, intelligence and achievement test scores would be the focus. In addition, it was also decided that other factors would be included, namely, socio-economic and judicial administrative, in order to obtain the most complete profile possible on individual students.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the study will consist of four chapters. The second chapter will cover a review of the literature relating to the study. The third chapter is a detailed description of the study's methodology including the actual selection of students, a comparison of the two groups, and a discussion of the techniques utilized in obtaining the data. The fourth chapter will be an analysis of the data collected by the techniques discussed in the
third chapter. The last chapter will include a summary of the study and the presentation of conclusions which the investigator feels may be drawn from the study.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter includes a report of many studies concerned either wholly or partly with delinquency and a review of the literature relating to topics pertinent to the study. These topics include: (1) educational characteristics, (2) socio-economic and family factors, and (3) judicial administrative processes concerning the juvenile court. This investigator sought to examine empirical data and theoretical writings in the above areas that would lend credence to, and background for, this study. While the study has its principle concern with the educational characteristics, the complexities of the subject demand the wider review presented below for perspective. Therefore, the experiences and findings of the author's included in this review provide in large part the rationale for many of the assumptions and procedures used in this study.

EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Available evidence strongly suggests that delinquent commitments result in part from the negative school experiences of some youth, and, further, that there are fundamental defects within the educational system, especially as it touches lower income youth which actively contribute to
these negative experiences. This increases rather than decreases the chances that some youth will choose an illegitimate alternative. Despite the fact that the schools are meant to be the major agency for promoting progress along legitimate avenues to adulthood, prevailing conditions in education deter such progress for some youth and make the delinquent alternative more attractive. Evidence also suggests that because of its central and strategic place in the lives of youth, the school has the potential at least to partly neutralize pressures toward delinquency which have been set in motion by non-educational forces in the family and community, a potential that is not now being realized.

Available evidence further suggests that educational failure, which occurs most often among lower income and non-white pupils, is one of the school experiences contributing to delinquency. The question immediately confronting anyone interested in a broad program of delinquency prevention is this: What are the major factors contributing to school failure and hence to delinquency, especially among lower income and non-white pupils?

One explanation for low scholastic performance among lower income children is that home influences are such that they enter school with serious "cultural" deficiencies that are all but impossible for the school to overcome. As a result, educational retardation and failure are almost inevitable. Because of broken homes, crowded and inadequate housing, anti-intellectualism, and lack of effective
discipline, it is contended that these children come to school with educational handicaps such as the following: lack of "elaboration" of communication styles; poor auditory and visual discrimination; inability to think conceptually; inability to use "adults as sources of information, correction, and reality testing, and as instruments for satisfying curiosity;" unfamiliarity with books and writing material; inability to sustain attention; lack of development of internal controls over personal behavior; unfamiliarity with school rules of behavior; and inexperience in formal situations like the classroom.¹ In view of evidence that these deficiencies are frequently present, some account must be taken of this argument. But there is an alternative explanation for the low scholastic performance of lower income and non-white children that also must be carefully examined. This explanation holds that, while these handicaps are frequently present, the school itself contributes to failure by not designing its program, curriculum, and techniques of instruction so that such deficiencies are taken account of and effectively offset and so that the life experiences and cultural assets of such children are used by the school in a positive way. This position has been aptly stated by Roberts as follows:

Potential to learn is affected not only by the culture in which the child is raised, by the ethnic subculture to which he was born, by the socio-economic position of his family in the social structure, by his earlier experience in learning activities; but also by the school and teachers who may, through inhibiting procedures, decrease the child's capacity to use his learning potential.²

Advocates of this position point to research indicating that (1) most lower income children do recognize the importance of education and place a high personal value on educational success and attainment; (2) most of them do have the potential to learn and to develop into capable, responsible, and productive adults; and (3) many of them have shown remarkable development under educational conditions different from those prevailing in most schools, especially those in the urban slums. A frequently cited example of such progress is the Higher Horizons Program of the New York City public schools, which has produced substantial improvement in achievement among participants. Another often mentioned is the Bannecker Group Schools in St. Louis, which have had equally striking success.

The latter explanation clearly places part of the burden of failure at the doorsteps of the school and calls for educational changes that will make it possible for the schools to do whatever is necessary to stretch the capabilities and aspirations of all students as far as

possible. This position has been clearly summarized by Martin Deutsch as follows:

The lower class child probably enters school with a nebulous and essentially neutral attitude. His home rarely, if ever, negatively predisposes him toward the school situation, though it might not offer positive motivation and correct interpretation of the school experience. It is in the school situation, ... that the highly charged negative attitude toward learning evolves, and the responsibility for such large groups of children showing real scholastic retardation, the high drop-out rate, and to some extent the delinquency problem, must rest with the failure of the schools to promote the proper acculturation of the children. Though some of the responsibility may be shared by the larger society, the school, as the institution of that society, offers the only mechanism by which the job can be done.3

Supporting evidence for the second explanation—that the school as well as the family and community contributes to educational failure is to be found in a number of studies showing that, lower income and non-white children not only begin at low levels of performance, but their achievement shows progressive deterioration the longer that they study in school. Sexton found, for example, that children from the lowest income schools in "Big City" were already one-half year behind average in achievement test scores by the fourth grade, but that this gap has increased to three-quarters of a year by the sixth grade and to one and one-quarters of a year by the eighth grade.4 When compared to


students from the highest income schools in the city, these children were 1.36 years behind in the fourth grade, 1.82 years behind in the sixth grade, and 1.90 years behind in the eighth grade.

Similar findings have been reported in the predominantly Negro Washington, D.C. schools by a task force of the Committee on Education and Labor of the U.S. House of Representatives. For example, the percentage of students reading at grade level declined from the third to the sixth and to the eighth grade from 67 to 55 to 46, respectively, while the percentage reading at one or more years below grade level increased from 33 to 45 to 55\textsubscript{5} respectively.

In the same vein, the Coleman Report indicates that:

For most minority groups . . . and most particularly the Negro, schools provide no opportunity at all for them to overcome this initial deficiency; in fact, they fall farther behind the white majority in the development of several skills which are critical to making a living and participating fully in modern society.\textsuperscript{6}

In addition, the same pattern has been reported for Negroes and Puerto Ricans in the New York City Schools, and especially in the central Harlem areas. For example, the Haryou Report states that 22 percent of the third grade students in that area were reading above grade level, while

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{6}Coleman Report, op. cit., p. 21.
\end{flushright}
30 percent were reading below grade level. 7 But by the sixth grade, 12 percent of the students were reading above grade level and 81 percent were reading below level. Similar findings were reported for tests of arithmetic, work knowledge, and general intelligence. 8 The Haryou Report concludes from these data:

From this we can infer that the sources of educational problems of Harlem pupils lie in processes which occur during the time they are in school, rather than in processes prior to their entry into school. 9

After reviewing a considerable amount of literature on education of the disadvantaged, Silverman arrived at much the same conclusion:

The fact that the achievement deficit of these children is cumulative and increases over time seems to reflect some basic weaknesses in both curriculum and school practices for these children. 10

Relative to the research thus far reported, this investigator must conclude that there is strong indication that the school not only fails to offset initial handicaps of lower income and minority group children, but actively contributes to educational failure and deterioration. While available data do not allow him to assess the precise amount

7Youth in the Ghetto, op. cit., p. 168.
8Ibid., pp. 169, 170, 179.
9Ibid., p. 27.
10Silverman, in Bloom, Davis and Hess, op. cit., p. 74.
of the school's negative effect, he takes the position that may be of vital significance. If this is true, the school itself becomes an important active force in the generation of delinquency insofar as it is linked to failure.

Therefore, this chapter reports literature that will identify some of the defects in the schools which heighten educational failure and deterioration, and hence promote delinquency. The educational characteristics as defined in this study reflect the elements that relate to school conditions affecting lower income and non-white children and youth.

Some Misconceptions about Limited Potential of Disadvantaged and Delinquent Youth

A necessary condition of effective instruction is the belief by school personnel in the intellectual potential and the educability of the students being taught. If one begins with this assumption, it is more likely to develop approaches, techniques, and content that will elicit achievement. On the other hand, if one begins with the opposite assumption that students have limited capabilities and are essentially uneducable, it is less likely that very much will be accomplished in the classroom.

There is increasing agreement that educational failure and deterioration among lower income and non-white pupils, especially in large cities, results in part from the widespread acceptance of the idea that most of these children have limited capabilities and that not much can be done
as a result. The Haryou Report, for example, states that
"the data from the questionnaires and depth interviews sup-
port the contention that teachers and other school personnel
feel that the central Harlem child is intellectually
limited."11

This view is at least sometimes, and perhaps often,
promulgated and supported by school administrators. For
example, the report of principals in a major metropolitan
school system declared "there isn't too much we can do with
our children. Most of them are slow learners."12 It is not
difficult to perceive that many new teachers in lower income
schools quickly lose their optimism and zeal when such views
emanate from, or are at least supported by, administrators.

The connections between teachers' beliefs and
limited potential and educational failure has been clearly
described by Davidson and Lang.

It is therefore likely that a lower class child,
especially if he is not doing well in school,
will have a negative perception of his teacher's
feelings toward him. These negative perceptions
will in turn tend to lower his efforts to achieve
in school and/or increase the probability that he
will aggravate the negative attitude of his teachers
toward him, which in turn will affect his self-
confidence and so on.13

11Youth in the Ghetto, op. cit., p. 227.

12A Task Force Study, op. cit., p. 64.

13Helen H. Davidson and Gerhard Long, "Children's
Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related
to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior," Journal
A commonly used term to denote this deepening cycle of negative perception and failure is the "self-fulfilling prophecy," as noted by Ravitz:

Not infrequently teachers, counsellors, principals assigned to the depressed area schools have been people without any real concern for these children and with the common stereotype of them as children of low ability. As a result of this low estimate of potential, the self-fulfilling prophecy went into effect. The children were not encouraged to learn very much; the teacher expended little energy on anything but maintaining order and bemoaning her lot; as a consequence, the children fulfilled the lowest expectations, which in turn enforced the original assumption to prove that the teacher was right.14

This view receives additional support from several studies showing that the more positive the student's own belief in his ability to achieve, the greater his performance; and that the more positive the perception by the teacher, the greater the confidence of the student. Research by Gottlieb further suggests that the greater the social and cultural differences between students and teachers the more negative the perceptions of students. White teachers were found to have more negative perceptions than did Negro teachers of lower income, predominantly Negro pupils.15

As noted by Reissman, underestimation of the learning potential of lower income and non-white students often

14Mel Ravitz, "The Role of the School in The Urban Setting" (Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), p. 19.

takes the form of "patronization and condescension."

The specific forms of patronization are manifold: the tendency to talk down to a deprived child, to speak his language, to imitate slang and speech inflections; the assumption that these children are lacking intellectual curiosity and conceptual abilities; the lowering of academic standards and the failure to set high goals for the deprived; the too quick taken for granted they are not interested in learning.

Much of this is well meant. Academic standards are lowered because it is felt the educational traditions and aspirations of these children make it impossible for the teacher to demand more. The many people who defend these practices feel that they are being considerate and sensitive to the needs of children. Actually, they are being too understanding in surrendering to the level at which the child seems to be. Perhaps, it is not the disadvantaged who have capitulated to their environment, but the teachers who have capitulated to theirs.16

Belief in the educability of such students, whether it takes this or another form, is seen by the Haryou Report as the major determinant of inferior achievement among Harlem pupils.

On the evidence available to date, it must be concluded the major reason why an increasing number of central Harlem pupils fall behind in their grade level is that sub-standard performance is expected of them.17

While there is no question that the difficulties confronting the teachers in the inter-city classroom are great, there is every reason to believe that the academic and social problems which are so clearly manifested can be


17Youth in the Ghetto, op. cit., p. 237.
overcome, as has been demonstrated in isolated instances throughout the country. This position is also expressed by Kenneth Clark:

Given no evidence to the contrary, the assumption can be made that the cultural and economic backgrounds of pupils do not constitute a barrier to the type of learning which can be reasonably expected of normal children in the elementary grades.18

There is no question, then, that especially in inner-city schools where by 1974 one in every two students will be disadvantaged, "this vicious entanglement must be interrupted at some point."19 One approach for upgrading the perceptions and expectations of teachers is to focus on the teachers directly by fostering more positive views during the period of teacher training and by seeking to change the views of those currently serving in schools with low income and non-white pupils. This is the position taken by Davidson and Lang. "The best point of attack may well be the teachers whose capacity to reflect feeling to the child's growth should be a concern to educators."20

The Role of Ability and Achievement Tests, Grouping and "Tracking" in Delinquency

There is no longer any question that intelligence tests do not in any sense measure innate potential alone,


19Davidson and Lang, op. cit., p. 144.

20Ibid., p. 114.
but rather strongly reflect past learning opportunities and experiences.

Few thoughtful people today believe that the intelligence quotient reflects a purely innate hereditary ability of humans. Half a century of intelligent testing and research has made it clear that the person's environmental experiences help determine the I.Q. score he achieves. 21

Intelligence is a plastic product of heredity structure developed by environmental stimulation and opportunity, an alloy of endowment and experience. 22

Evidence is also clear that intelligence scores are heavily influenced by situational factors during the test and by familiarity with this kind of task and situation. Thus, Reissman refers to "the big three: practice, motivation, rapport" as critical ingredients in test performance. 23

There are two implications of these environmental and situational influences on test scores. One is that scores are highly unstable. For example, P. E. Vernon found an average increase of eleven points on I.Q. scores as a result of a few hours coaching on material similar to that found in I.Q. tests. 24 Similarly, Haggard found with three


23 Reissman, op. cit. p. 53.

hours of practice and encouragement, he was able to sharply increase the I.Q.s of a sample of disadvantaged children.  

In sum,

Numerous studies of identical twins and children in institutions, nursery schools and foster homes have shown that I.Q. scores can be raised by changing the environment, improving needed skills, and teaching children to take tests.  

A second implication is that tests of intelligence underestimate the talent of lower income and non-white children because of middle class-oriented test content, a lack of environmental stimulation (or more properly, a different kind of environmental stimulation), and also unfamiliarity with the testing situation itself.

Most presently used intelligence tests . . . are so constructed and so administered that scores on them are influenced by the cultural backgrounds of the children they test in such a way that children from certain kinds of cultural backgrounds receive scores that are not accurate reflections of their basic intelligence.  

Yet, Clark and Clark report from their investigation:

The results show clearly that intellectual retardation among such deprived people as have been studied here is not necessarily a permanent and irreversible condition.  


26Sexton, op. cit., p. 48.


The problem here is not so much the tests themselves but rather the uses to which they are put. Despite these well-known facts of instability and class bias, most school systems and teachers still use intelligence tests as though they were stable measures of innate potential independent of environment. One consequence is that individual teachers frequently underestimate the ability of particular youngsters and scale down their expectations and level of instruction accordingly. Another more formal result is that scores are used, often very early, as the basis for grouping students according to so-called "ability" or "readiness."

For example, in Washington, D.C. elementary schools...

"metropolitan (form R) reading readiness tests are given in kindergarten or first grade, and on the basis of these scores, pupils are sorted into 'ready to read first grade groups' or 'not ready' junior primary groups."^{29}

It is assumed that such practices are usually carried on, not to increase educational input for those who need it most and therefore to equalize educational opportunity and to maximize the development of "submerged talent," but to decrease performance standards and levels of instruction, thus ensuring eventual failure and heightening the chances of delinquency.

In segregating students the I.Q. test is used as the principal grounds for determining which students are "slow" (and should be made even slower).

^{29}A Task Force Study, op. cit., p. 37.
and which are "fast" (and should therefore be given special advantages and removed from contamination from other students).\textsuperscript{30}

This problem has been noted in the particular case of the Washington D.C. schools.

Critics have attacked the "junior primary" as the beginning of basic track grouping; they claim that school officials or principals set ceilings on how much can be taught them, and that as a result needy pupils never reach their "ready" point, but are doomed to basic classes for the rest of their school life.\textsuperscript{31}

The "self-fulfilling prophecy" is set in motion whereby pupils who, according to test performances, have low innate potential are grouped and instructed as though that were in fact the case, resulting in a further falling behind in their progress in development. As Hickerson has noted:

\begin{quote}
As time goes on the children of the slower group get further and further behind the children of the fast. The rationale for this phenomenon is two-fold: (1) The children in the slow groups are incapable of doing what children of the fast groups can do, so why burden them with what they cannot achieve? (2) The less that is offered the poorer becomes their reading in comparison with the other children, until the time comes when their reading levels are so far behind the levels of the fast that they truly can no longer expect to compete with them.\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

As Kenneth Clark has noted, "It is conceivable that the detrimental effects of segregation based upon intellect are similar to the known detrimental effects of schools

\textsuperscript{30}Sexton, op. cit., p. 43.

\textsuperscript{31}A Task Force Study, op. cit., p. 37.

\textsuperscript{32}Nathaniel Hickerson, Education for Alienation (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 34.
segregated on the basis of class, nationality, or race.\textsuperscript{33}

Adverse consequences are not limited just to delinquency but are more general. Because intelligence tests underestimate available talent, substantial talent is lost—
at a time in our national life when there is already an oversupply of undeveloped talent but a shortage of fully developed talent.

These remarks have referred to testing and grouping practices at all stages of the educational career. While they are certainly damaging during the elementary years, as the "gap" quickly widens between the "slow" and "fast," the negative effects of "tracking" in the secondary schools are just as serious in producing delinquency. The traditional procedure in American secondary schools has been to place students at the onset of junior or senior high school in two, three, or four tracks of curricula, according to past performance, parental preference, teacher or counselor judgment, test scores, or student aspirations.

These practices may have several adverse consequences for those assigned to the lower tracks. First, studies by Warner, Cicourel and Kitsuse, and Schafer and Armer suggest that lower status pupils are at a disadvantage in competing for upper track positions.\textsuperscript{34} This is illustrated by the

\textsuperscript{33}Kenneth B. Clark, "Educational Stimulation of Racially Disadvantaged Children," p. 152.

following observations of a junior high school teacher upon
being asked if there was "much class feeling in the school."

Oh, yes, there is a lot of that. We try not to
have it but of course we can't help it. Now, for
instance, even in the sections we have, it is
evident. Sections are supposed to be made up just
on the basis of records in school but it isn't and
everybody knows it isn't. I know right in my own
A section I have children who ought to be in B
section, but they are little socialites and so they
stay in A. I don't say there are children in B who
should be in A but in the A section there are some
who shouldn't be there. We have discussed it in
faculty meetings but nothing is ever done . . . 35

Although parents theoretically have the right to
overrule the judgments of teachers or counselors, Cicourel
and Kitsuse, Schafer, and the House Task Force on the
Washington, D.C. Schools, found that few lower income
parents felt at liberty to do so.36

Parents, according to printed policy, have always
had the right to protest the placement of their
children in basic or regular track. Relatively
few did, or do, however. Most parents of poverty
area pupils would feel themselves incapable of
arguing the point, even if they were aware of it.37

Second, assignment of a student to a lower track
usually means that the quality of instruction and the expec-
tations held of him are scaled down. Effects on lower
income pupils are especially devastating as noted by Pearl:
"special ability classes, . . . basic track . . . or slow


36 Walter E. Schafer, "Student Careers in Two Public
High Schools: A Comparative Cohort Analysis (unpublished

37 Ibid., p. 89.
learner classes" are various names for another means of systematically denying the poor adequate access to education.\textsuperscript{38}

The Roll of Economic and Racial Segregation Influencing Educational Characteristics

It is the position of this investigation as a result of reviewing the literature on this topic, that the school condition which has perhaps the greatest effect of all on educational failure and hence delinquency is economic and racial segregation. There are a number of points that can be made in support of this position.

First, a major finding of the Coleman Report was that pupils' achievement and aspirations are strongly related to the educational backgrounds and performance of other students in the same school.\textsuperscript{39} This single factor accounted for much more variation in student achievement than any other school conditions. The Coleman Report showed pupils who attend schools mostly filled with other students who achieve at low levels were lower in their own achievement than pupils who attend schools which had a better cross section or which had large numbers of students who achieved at high levels.


\textsuperscript{39}Coleman Report, pp. 22, 302.
Second, it is noted that despite equivalent or even higher levels of educational aspirations, non-white and lower income pupils attain lower levels of educational achievement than white and higher income pupils. Partly as a result, Coleman found that at least in certain parts of the country, "Negro pupils are more likely to be exposed to fellow students who have feelings of powerlessness over their environment."40

Third, it was found that most students attend schools mainly comprised of other pupils of their own racial and economic background. With respect to race, for example, the Coleman Report states that nearly 80 percent of all white pupils attend schools that are from 90 to 100 percent white, while more than 65 percent of all Negro pupils attend schools that are between 90 and 100 percent Negro.41 In the South, most pupils attend schools that are 100 percent white or Negro. While less adequate data are available on economic homogeneity within schools, there is some evidence that segregation by income is also very high. Havighurst in fact contends that:

There has probably been a growing amount of economic segregation in American public schools since 1940. That is, there has been a growing percentage of middle and lower class schools and a decreasing percentage of mixed class schools.42

41Ibid., p. 3.
Fourth, the review demonstrated that more students from lower income and non-white backgrounds are exposed to other students with inferior educational backgrounds and levels of achievement, than are students from higher income and white families. Although there is little direct evidence in support of this statement in terms of economic level, the Coleman Report clearly affirms it in terms of race.

The average Negro has fewer classmates whose mothers graduated from high school; his classmates more frequently are members of large rather than smaller families, they are less often enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum, and they have taken a smaller number of courses in English, Mathematics, Foreign Language, and Science.43

Fifth, it was clear that lower income and non-white pupils attain lower levels of educational performance than they would if they attended mixed or predominantly middle class or white schools.44 This is not only the conclusion of the Coleman Report with respect to race, but it has also been reported by a number of other investigators with respect to economic level (which partly overlaps with race.) Wilson found, for example, that at both the elementary and secondary levels in San Francisco Bay-Oakland area, working class boys received higher grades if they were in predominantly middle class or mixed class schools.45 In addition,

43Coleman Report, op. cit., p. 20.
44Ibid., p. 29.
he found that boys from a given income background and with a
given I.Q. were more likely to go to college if they were in
a middle class or mixed class school. Numerous other inves-
tigators have reported similar findings.46

Sixth, the studies revealed that by inference,
economic and racial segregation exert an indirect effect on
delinquency, insofar as it arises from educational failure.
Albert Reiss' Nashville study allows more than inference to
establish this relationship empirically, at least with
respect to economic composition of schools.47 He, as have
others, found that lower status students obtain higher
levels of performance in mixed or predominantly middle class
schools than in predominantly lower class schools. These
schools also appeared to produce higher rates of delinquency.

On the average, the schools which cross cut the
status structure and avoid concentration at lower
status levels were closest to optimizing the kind
of conforming conduct we want from adolescents both
in the school and in the community.48

If the evidence presented above is correct, then the
schools themselves help contribute to delinquency, insofar
as they duplicate homogeneous housing patterns, or impose

46 For a summary of these studies, see William H.
Sewall and S. Michael Armer, "Neighborhood Context and
College Plans," American Sociological Review, XXXI (April,
1966), pp. 159-168.

47 Reiss and Rhodes, A Sociopsychological Study, p.

48 Ibid., also see Albert S. Reiss and Albert J.
Rhodes, "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the
Social Class Structure," American Sociological Review, XXVI
school boundaries or other attendance criteria (like race) that create uniformity within particular schools with respect to educational backgrounds and performance of students. One educational change and perhaps the most important one, on the basis of the Coleman Report conclusion, is the economic as well as the racial desegregation of the schools which has taken place during the past ten years in the United States and has been very significant.

Socio-Economic Status and the Family as Factors in Juvenile Delinquency

The appraisal of the literature concerning the socio-economic factors and the family in juvenile delinquency in our society, while multi-faceted, is oriented in this section toward the task of analyzing major factors that apply to the family. The review will be concerned with (1) the Family and Delinquency, (2) Some Sociological Theories of Delinquency, (3) Some Relevant Findings, and (4) Some Economic Factors in Delinquency.

The Family and Delinquency

The family remains a social institution of undisputed importance, particularly in a discussion of delinquency prevention. It is in the family that a child develops his personality, his attitude to authority, his moral code, and his adaptations to social institutions. By the time of adolescence, particularly in urban lower class settings, the
peer group and other institutions may largely have displaced the family as a major reference group.

Social Stresses on the Family

Many of the strains of modern family life originate in the conditions of contemporary society. To understand the family, therefore, it is necessary to consider the situation of American society.

Modern economic and social forces provide the family with more material resources than at any other time in history, while at the same time, they exert influences that make it difficult for parents to give their children consistent guidance and support.

In an earlier period in our society, the family consisted of many other relatives in addition to parents and children who often lived together as a large family unit. This unit served as a social insurance system which provided maintenance for children and other dependent persons, and guaranteed care and affection for those children whose natural parents were unable to supply these necessities. In our society, this protective device is increasingly breaking down. The movement of people from one part of the country to another means that many families have only tenuous ties with their relatives and that the family, in the larger sense, can no longer be called upon to help with crises or to share in the responsibility of day-to-day living.49

49Catherine Chilman, "Family and Delinquency" (a paper prepared on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1970), p. 15.
The family has lost to specialized organizations many functions which had been central to it in the past. For example, the family is no longer economically integrated through the complementary efforts of its members. It is no longer the sole center of education, recreation, health care, or vocational preparation, to name but a few of the more significant activities it used to incorporate. The process is now reversed: the activities and content of community institutions determine, to a large extent, the welfare of the family. In today's world, the family is a focal point where institutional influences meet, and the way in which the family functions, depends, in large part, upon the nature of those institutional influences. Even before the child goes to school, his mind and body are reached by radio, television, records, his family's housing, his parents' income, the availability and quality of physicians, dentists, and his parents' religious views. Some parents, of course, are irresponsible, but basically, parents today have less control over their children because of the omnipresent institutional influences around them. Parents cannot be sure that their grown sons will carry on the father's business or profession. The grown child no longer lives in the same locality, or even the same State.
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The family today cannot provide through its own energies what the modern institutional complex does. The growth of institutions which perform functions previously performed by families places strains on parents, but it also creates new opportunities for children. The existence of a great variety of vocational and professional opportunities provides the individual with greater freedom to develop his potentialities; increased mobility means increased opportunities for varied and significant experiences; the development of specialists in education, industry, recreation, religion, art, and medicine makes it possible to provide a wider range of services than the family could provide. 52

The individual's freedom to achieve a variety of purposes no longer depends directly on his family, but rather upon his, and his family's relationship to institutions.

While the culture pattern of middle-class families calls upon the father to share in the child-care function, modern business arrangements make imperative his absence from the home during working hours and therefore leave the mother for significant periods of time without any adult assistance in coping with the emotional demands of purely physical tasks of child rearing. 53

52 Otis, op. cit., p. 20.
53 Ibid, p. 22.
From the child's point of view, the lonely presence of the mother may furnish an initial association of adult power with femininity and maternity which may persist into adulthood. As far as the family structure is concerned, the father plays the role of the weak male, not necessarily because of his personality characteristics, but simply because his vitality and resources are depleted by the demands of his job and commuting. His job in our organization and society is likely to frustrate his need for autonomy and decision-making through elaborate supervisory or hierarchical arrangements. Thus when the father comes home, he is likely either to regress into dependency or to release pent-up feelings of aggression and hostility which he had to keep under control on the job or on the road.54

The pace of social change in our modern world is so complicated and so rapid that it is difficult for parents to keep up with the interests and experiences of their children. Communication between the generations has always been uneven, but it becomes more difficult when a child's society is so decidedly remote and different from that of his parents.55

One of the many areas of poor communication and confusion relates to rapid changes in standards of sex behavior. These changes also affect the lives of many parents, who tend to be confused not only about what is wrong for the children,

54 Ibid., p. 23.

55 Ibid., p. 25.
but about what is right for them.\textsuperscript{56}

Special Strains on Poor Families

The problem of low income for certain groups is not a new one, but certain new elements are present in the current situation. One such element is the contrast between the prosperity of a large segment of the population and the low purchasing power of the other relatively small segment. The smaller the proportion of the population with this economic handicap, the more difficult the role of this group becomes in society.\textsuperscript{57} In our culture, it is assumed that people are able to supply themselves with material goods that are included in our increasingly high standard of living. The pressures for conformity, emphasized by movies, radio, television, and advertising, not only tend to make everyone desire certain goods, but to think that they must have them. Low-income families are not immune to these pressures. The resulting frustration creates many tensions between husband and wife, as well as between parents and children.\textsuperscript{58}

The way in which all families function in today's world depends in large part upon the activities and content of community institutions. This is particularly true for poor families whose functioning is almost completely

\textsuperscript{56}Otis, Ibid., p. 26.

\textsuperscript{57}Supra.

\textsuperscript{58}Colman, op. cit., p. 104.
dependent upon agencies and institutions, and government laws and policies. For poor families, the public institutions, such as education, law enforcement, health and employment, are the doorkeepers to opportunity: When middle and upper income families experience difficulty, they may choose to seek help from a private family agency, child guidance clinic, or a counseling service. For poor families, there is no such choice. Public agencies are usually the only place to turn. But many of the agencies who serve the poor are unable to serve them well. Restrictive legislation, inadequate budgets, the scarcity of personnel, and the fragmentation and lack of coordination among the public services mitigate against helping the people most dependent on public services which do exert control over them but which cannot provide lasting solutions. Such people are apt to give up. Parental surrender and failure play an important part in exposing the children to the many threats of the environment. These threats are much greater for low-income families than for others.

Persons who have been chronically deprived, particularly if they are unemployed, tend to suffer from defeatism and alienation; they are apt to relate to their environment with hopelessness, pessimism, and a general lack of interest. Lavarsfeld found that persons without jobs seemed to lose all perspective; they arrived late, if at all, for appointments.

59Saxton, op. cit., p. 59.
for job interviews or receipt of funds. Kamarovsky found that the sexual and authority aspects of marriage were severely disrupted when the male could not perform his socially defined role of breadwinner. These and other studies dramatically document the extent to which inability to perform a social role, such as holding a job, results in attitudes and behavior which are selfdefeating because they prevent the individual from altering his situation.

Chronically impoverished persons, for real and objective reasons, feel powerless to control their environment, and may therefore find it difficult to establish and maintain their parental authority. Children, with parents whose parental authority has been undermined, may be left to socialize themselves by dealing with their own problems or turning to their peers. Having experienced autonomy and independence at an early age, they may find it difficult to accept the legitimate authority of teachers, police, and other adults.

A study of delinquent gangs by Carl Werthman highlights some of the parental characteristics which contribute to a lack of authority in many low-income families. Almost

---

without exception, the gang members interviewed in his study reported that their relationships at home were extremely problematic. Either feelings of dependence were not cultivated and the source of parental control was lost, or the parental power that did exist was not actively and systematically used.

The most frequent complaints by gang members, however, are about fathers who make claims to authority in a style that begs to be resisted. The excessively authoritarian father does not reward obedience with affection, he simply demands conformity to the letter of his commands without establishing a basis for voluntary obedience. The child may go through the motions of obeying orders for fear of punishment, but it is force and not interpersonal commitment that forms the basis of the relationship.63

A second source of failure to cultivate dependence is parental indifference. The capacity of parents to deal with routine tasks may be reduced to a level that is equal if not beneath the potential capacity of their children to deal with these affairs. Everyone in the family is thus left to fend for himself as best he can and there is little energy and talent left over to expend on other members of the family.

Third, some of the parents of gang members seem to have lost control of their children because of ineffectuality.
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These parents caution their children against many things but the proscriptions are never acted upon. They behave more like friends than authorities, and thus the desires of parents are often compromised because authority is not exerted.

There is a considerable body of empirical support for these comments in the literature on delinquency. Nye, for example, finds that the delinquency rate is highest in homes where the child is given complete freedom and in homes where no freedom is allowed.\footnote{Ivan F. Nye, \textit{Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior} (New York: John Wiley \& Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 9.} The Gluecks also reported correlations between delinquency and extreme parental permissiveness, indifference, and overstrictness.\footnote{Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, \textit{Family Environment and Delinquency} (London: Routledge and Kagan Paul, 1962), pp. 100-102.} Moreover, a myriad of other family difficulties can stunt the growth of respect for authority in the eyes of the 8 to 12 year-old child, and a variety of psychological, structural, and interpersonal factors underlie these failures of parental control.

\textbf{SOME RELEVANT RESEARCH FINDINGS}

In a study of a statewide sample of Minnesota ninth-grade children, Gregory concluded that:

Family status of the parents was a significant antecedent variable in delinquency, delinquency in
boys was much more frequent than average among boys who lost their fathers by death, as well as among boys who experienced other varieties of parental loss in childhood. Delinquency in girls was most frequent among those whose parents had been separated or divorced, those who had lost their mother by death, those who were living with their father only, and those who were living with neither parent.66

Cohen similarly suggests that the relatively high rate of juvenile delinquency in the lower class is related in part to the father's frequent physical and/or psychological absence from the home, and to the aggressive "masculine protest" syndrome to which this gives rise in the sons.67 Bacon's cross-cultural study showed that in societies in which the father's effective presence in the household is at a minimum, there is also a relatively high rate of theft and personal crime.68

The Gluecks' classic delinquency research study compared five hundred delinquent boys with five hundred controls, equated for age, I.Q., ethnic deprivation and residence in underprivileged neighborhoods. Some of the significant differences they reported were: (1) the family backgrounds of the delinquents' parents revealed more mental


retardation, more emotional disturbance, more drunkenness, more criminality; (2) more fathers were poor workers and poor wage earners, and more families were on public welfare relief; (3) there was more incompatibility and conflict in the parental marriages; (4) more mothers failed to provide adequate supervision for the children, and parents knew less about the activities of their delinquent sons; (5) fathers were more lacking in warmth, sympathy, and affection toward their sons; and the boys did not perceive their fathers as suitable objects for emulation; (6) the picture of the mothers' relationship to their delinquent sons was less clear and consistent than that of the fathers, in that some mothers were overprotective, while others were indifferent and rejecting; (7) the total impression was of compelling evidence that the family backgrounds and atmosphere of the delinquent boys was less positive than those of the control boys. 69

Andry conducted a controlled study in London of delinquent boys, in which both the matched delinquents and nondelinquent controls lived in the same low socio-economic geographic area, in homes with both parents. He concluded that the role of the father was as crucial as that of the mother. The delinquent boys reported: (1) less open and strong love from their parents, especially from their

---

fathers; (2) less adequate communication from their parents, especially from their fathers; (3) a more tense home atmosphere; (4) less adequate parental training, especially from their fathers; (5) less parental knowledge of and action about their deviant behavior. The importance of considering both parents is thus highlighted by this study. 70

McCord, et al., found that extreme parental neglect and punitiveness, coupled with a pathologically aggressive parental mode, produced male aggressive antisocial behavior. They found that delinquent boys had apparently "passive" mothers, but not "passive" fathers, more often than the controls. They also found inconsistent discipline, rather than any specific form of discipline, to be more characteristic of these homes. 71

Bennett reported a comparison of fifty delinquent children, boys and girls, with fifty neurotic children. The delinquent youngsters were found significantly more often to have had (1) interrupted father-child relationships; (2) interrupted mother-child relationships; (3) unsettled homes, frequent moves; (4) parents separated; (5) time spent in foster homes; (6) more than three siblings; (7) overcrowded home conditions; (8) disturbed mother-father relationship;


(9) antisocial or morally unstable personality of father or mother; (10) inconsistent discipline.72

Keller, et al., investigated forty-five families which produced an habitual offender in an otherwise nondelinquent family. They reported a consistent finding that the delinquent offspring was isolated and singled out early in life as a "black sheep," and that this resulted in his feeling himself to be different and patterning himself on a delinquent ideal.73

These and many other studies support the presence of familial factors in various forms of juvenile delinquency. It must be kept in mind, however, that delinquency is caused by a variety of complex factors and that the family is not the sole determinant of behavior. Further, as was indicated earlier, the way in which the family functions is highly dependent on its relationships with community institutions.

THE JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS
CONCERNING THE JUVENILE COURT

The structure of the juvenile court and its position or status in the State's organizational pattern varies among and even within States. Relatively few are separate,


independent courts. Most are part of a circuit, district, superior, county, common pleas, probate, or municipal court. In a few jurisdictions, family courts have been established to deal with both children's and domestic relations' cases. Even where the jurisdiction of children's cases is in a court that is organizationally part of a larger system, the judge assigned to hear children's cases often operates his court quite independently.

Although there is variation among, and in some instances within, states in the jurisdiction of the courts hearing children's cases, jurisdiction generally includes delinquency, neglect, and dependency. Delinquency comprises cases of children alleged to have committed an offense that committed by an adult would be a crime called (type 602). It also comprises cases of children alleged to have violated specific ordinances or regulatory laws that apply only to children, such as curfew regulations, school attendance laws, restrictions on use of alcohol and tobacco; and children variously designated as beyond control, ungovernable, incorrigible, runaway, or in need of supervision called (Type 601). According to national court statistics, the latter two groups account for over 25 percent of the total number of delinquent children appearing before children's courts and

between 25 and 30 percent of the population of State institutions for delinquent children.\textsuperscript{75} In addition to cases of delinquent, neglected and dependent children, children's courts may deal with other types of actions involving children: Adoption, termination of parental rights, appointment of a guardian of the person of a minor, custody, contributing to delinquency or neglect, non-support.

In some states major offenses such as capital crimes are excluded from the juvenile court's jurisdiction. In other states the jurisdiction of the juvenile court is concurrent with that of the criminal court in more serious offenses.

Age, objective and readily ascertainable, has traditionally served to delimit the population subject to juvenile court jurisdiction. At present the upper age jurisdiction of juvenile courts varies from sixteen to twenty-one. Eighteen is the upper limit recommended by the Children's Bureau, and it has gained acceptance in about two-thirds of the states. In the remaining one-third of the states, the age is sixteen, seventeen, or twenty-one -- different, in some, for boys and girls. In the one or two states in which it is twenty-one, jurisdiction above eighteen is concurrent with the criminal court, and in practice youths over eighteen are almost invariably referred to the criminal court.

court.

Age is inevitably arbitrary and fails to take account of individual differences in maturity, past and present conduct, and other factors relevant to choosing between juvenile and adult court handling of a given youth. About forty states, therefore, provide for waiver or transfer by the juvenile court to the adult court, thus giving the juvenile court some discretion and flexibility in exercising its jurisdiction. Waiver laws vary greatly. Nearly half the states attach no conditions to the judge's exercise of discretion. In about one-third of the states, waiver is authorized for any offense but only of a youth above a specified age, the lowest being thirteen. In a fifth of the states, waiver is permitted without regard to age but only for specified offenses, or with both age and offense limitations; the lowest age being fourteen and the offense must usually amount to a felony. In one or two states, less stringent waiver criteria are provided when a child already under supervision or care for a previous offense is alleged to have committed an additional one.

Written criteria to guide the judge in deciding whether or not to waive are rare. Where they do exist, they are general: "not amenable to treatment in juvenile court," "not a fit subject" for juvenile court jurisdiction. Many state statutes heretofore have required no hearing or findings on the issue of waiver, a situation changed expressly in the District of Columbia, and called into question
elsewhere, by the Supreme Court decision that a juvenile is entitled to a hearing, the assistance of counsel, access to social records, and a statement of reasons for the judge's decision to waive.76

The statutes establishing juvenile courts contain few if any specific procedural requirements. Many provide simply that the hearing shall be conducted in an "informal manner," a degree of generality that reflects the juvenile court proponents' desire to eliminate adversary aspects of adjudication and justified on the grounds that more specific procedures would gradually be established through appellate decisions and formalized rules of court. In practice, however, upper court rulings have proved rare and have provided few guidelines, often instead reflecting, but not resolving, basic differences from state to state. Few formalized rules have developed.

A large portion of juveniles who appear in juvenile court are sent there by the police. Extensive screening and informal adjustment by the police on street and in the police station significantly reduce the number of apprehended juveniles referred to court. Parents, social agencies, and others may also have direct recourse to the court.

Juvenile court statutes frequently provide that when a complaint is received, the court shall make a preliminary inquiry to determine whether the interests of the child or

the public require court action. The inquiry may vary from a cursory investigation to a full-fledged social study involving contact with numerous persons and agencies in the community. It may include a hearing at which the child, his parents, and a lawyer representing the child are present. In many juvenile courts, especially the larger metropolitan ones, the preliminary screening function, known as intake, is performed by a special division of the probation department. Depending upon his judgment as to basis for court jurisdiction, sufficiency of evidence, and desirability of court action, the intake officer may dismiss the case, authorize the filing of a petition, or in many courts dispose of the case by "informal adjustment." In many juvenile courts approximately half the cases referred there are informally adjusted at intake -- by referral to another agency, by continuation on "informal probation," or in some other way.77

The intake officer also determines whether a juvenile should be detained pending court action. In about one-fifth of the jurisdictions the right to bail is extended by statute to juveniles. In most jurisdictions a juvenile taken into custody by the police has no right to bail but is to be released to his parents or another suitable person

unless no such individual can be found or the juvenile is believed to present a serious threat of immediate danger to himself or the community. The intake officer, having decided to authorize the filing of a petition, may continue the detention of a juvenile already detained, order him released, or order detention of a juvenile previously at large.

Where the petition is filed, the juvenile then appears before the judge for an initial hearing (arraignment). If the juvenile denies involvement, there may be, immediately or subsequently, an adjudication hearing. In most jurisdictions, as under the Standard Juvenile Court Act, there is no right to jury trial in juvenile court. In keeping with the desired informality and noncombative-ness of the courts proceedings, evidentiary rules are not strictly adhered to and heresay and unsworn testimony may be received and considered. The standard of proof varies, but it is generally lower than the proof beyond a reasonable doubt required in the adult criminal court. In most juvenile courts there is no prosecutor; in some the case is presented by a police or probation officer (such is the case in California and Solano County in specific). Appearance of a lawyer for the child, while still the exception, is less unusual than it once was. By virtue of recent

legislation at least one-third of the states now provide by statute for notice of right to counsel, assignment of counsel, or both; court rules reach the same result in other states. Great variation remains in practice, however, as to the time and manner of informing parents and child of the right to counsel, time and method of appointment of counsel, and extent and nature of counsel's participation in the proceedings.

In accordance with their emphasis on protecting and helping juveniles, many courts exclude from the proceedings all persons except those with a specific interest in them. Where newspaper reporters are admitted, they are generally requested to refrain from using names or otherwise making the juvenile publicly identifiable. Perhaps partly because of the consequent lack of public surveillance and more because of the absence of attorneys and records, juvenile court actions are rarely appealed, a circumstance that has reinforced the informality within, as well as the variations among, courts.

The disposition hearing is conducted separately from the adjudication proceeding in some courts. In many, however, it is held at the same time or is separate only in a minority of cases in which the allegations of the petition are at issue. In determining disposition, the court places great reliance on the social and clinical report (similar to the presentence investigation report in adult criminal court) prepared by the probation officer to whom the case
has been assigned for social study (an assignment made in some courts before and in others not until after a hearing has been held on contested allegations in the petition). The social study embodies the juvenile court's emphasis on inquiring into the child's background and its attempt to apply the social and behavioral sciences to diagnosing and dealing with the problems behind his errant conduct. Social information is of prime importance -- even more important, in the view of some, than the circumstances of the specific events on which the court's jurisdiction in a given case is based. That view is reflected in the fact that in many jurisdictions the social (in California this is referred to as the "court report"), reports, in theory a guide to disposition, in practice are given to the judge before the adjudication hearing. On the question of disclosing material in the social reports to parties and their lawyers, practices again vary among courts.

Most juvenile court judges have broad discretion in disposing of cases, being empowered to dismiss the case, warn the juvenile, fine him, place him on probation, arrange for restitution, refer him to an agency or treatment facility, or commit him to an institution. The length of institutional commitment is usually indefinite and in most states cannot extend beyond the juvenile's twenty-first birthday. Commitment of a young child may thus amount to a
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relatively lengthy term; recently developed standards therefore recommend that commitment be for an indefinite period not to exceed three years, renewable during minority on a finding that the child's welfare or the community's protection requires further institutionalization.80

There is as much variation in the structure and organization of agencies administering services and facilities for delinquent children as there is in the structure of courts, with the consequence that responsibility for a child often shifts back and forth among courts and a variety of public and private agencies, both state and local. A recent plan developed in response to that problem and already implemented in about one-third of the states vests responsibility for the administration and expansion of a state's control and treatment program in a single state agency to which all children adjudged in need of care are committed.81

In about ten states the juvenile court is authorized to commit juveniles directly to institutions for adult offenders. In another third of the states a child committed by the juvenile court to an institution for delinquent children may be administratively transferred to an

---


institution for adults convicted of crime. According to a recent report, more than five hundred children were so transferred in 1969. Appellate decisions are in conflict on the constitutionality of the practice.82

The juvenile court judge's right-hand man is the probation officer. Probation officers serve as investigators into the juvenile's all-important social history, establish a link between the legally trained or lay judge and the social scientists who guide him, and provide a vehicle for disposition with supervision but without institutionalization. Probation, therefore, was and still is central to the juvenile court's special functions, and its limitations are inseparable from the juvenile court's own shortcomings. Probation workers, trained in the social sciences and working with juveniles who have been adjudicated as well as with preadjudication court referrals, are commonly classified as corrections rather than court personnel.83

Studies conducted by legislative inquiries in various states, and reports by informed observers indicate

---


that the great hopes originally held for the juvenile court have not been fulfilled. It has not succeeded significantly in rehabilitating delinquent youth, in reducing or even stemming the tide of juvenile criminality, or in bringing justice and compassion to the child offender. To say that juvenile courts have failed to achieve their goals is to say no more than what is true of criminal courts in the United States.\textsuperscript{84}

One reason for the failure of the juvenile courts has been the community's continuing unwillingness to provide the resources -- the people, facilities, and concern -- necessary to permit them to realize their potential and prevent them from taking on some of the undesirable features typical of lower criminal courts in this country. In few jurisdictions, for example, does the juvenile court judgeship enjoy high status in the eyes of the bar, and while there are many juvenile court judges of outstanding ability and devotion, many are not.\textsuperscript{85} One crucial presupposition of the juvenile court philosophy -- a mature and sophisticated judge, wise and well-versed in law and the science of human behavior -- has proved in fact too often unattainable. A recent study of juvenile court judges revealed that half had not received undergraduate degrees; a fifth had received no college education at all; a fifth were not members of the

\textsuperscript{84}Center, op. cit., p. 35.

\textsuperscript{85}Center, op. cit., p. 84.
bar. Almost three-quarters devoted less than a quarter of their time to juvenile and family matters, and judicial hearings often are little more than attenuated interviews of ten or fifteen minutes per hearing. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency states that the family court in Cook County (Chicago), Illinois, averages a little over fifteen minutes per hearing -- about half the time the council estimates is needed for proper consideration of the issues. A California State study concluded:

Based upon estimates furnished by juvenile court judges, the average time spent on a juvenile court case is approximately 10 to 15 minutes. An appropriate question is whether the beneficent values of the juvenile court hearings implied by the philosophy expressed in the law can be achieved in the abbreviated time which most juvenile courts devote to each case. To what extent, for example, can a judge make a significant impact on the errant child and his parents in what is almost an assembly line judicial process? A corollary question is whether the juvenile court judge can actually explore in a brief hearing the behavioral complexities presented by each case?

Other resources are equally lacking. A survey of the juvenile court judges reveals the scarcity of psychologists and psychiatrists for over half a century after the juvenile court movement set out to achieve the coordinated application of the behavioral and social sciences to the

---

86 Center, op. cit., p. 50.


misbehaving child. Where clinics exist, their waiting lists usually are months long and frequently they provide no treatment but only diagnosis. And treatment, even when prescribed, is often impossible to carry out because of the unavailability of adequate individual and family caseworkers, foster home placement, treatment in youth institutions. Despite general acceptance of the fact that many children who cannot adjust successfully in their own homes could do so in another community setting without requiring incarceration, a study revealed that only ninety-nine of the 235 agencies in the sample studied use foster homes, and only ten operate group homes.89

The dispositional alternatives available even to the better endowed juvenile courts fall far short of the richness and relevance to individual needs envisioned by the court's founders. In most places, the only alternatives are outright release, probation, and institutionalization. Probation means minimal supervision at best. A large percentage of juvenile courts have no probation services at all, and in those that do, caseloads typically are so high that counseling and supervision take the form of occasional telephone calls and perfunctory visits instead of the careful, individualized service that was intended. Institutionalization

too often means **storage** -- isolation from the outside world -- in an overcrowded, understaffed, high-security institution with little **education**, little vocational training, little counseling or job placement or other guidance upon release. Programs are subordinate to everyday control and maintenance. Children spend weeks in limbo-like detention, awaiting bed space.⁹₀

The failure of the juvenile court to fulfill its rehabilitative and preventive promise stem, in important measure, from a grossly over-optimistic view of what is known about the phenomenon of juvenile criminality and of what even a fully equipped juvenile court could do about it. Experts in the field agree that it is extremely difficult to develop successful methods for preventing serious delinquent acts through rehabilitative programs for the child.⁹¹ There is no shortage of theories of the etiology of delinquency. They range from the intrapsychic to the sociological, from the genetic to the anthropological, even to theories turning upon analyses of body types and structures. Some have looked for basic, generalized explanations of all delinquency. Some have noted the enormous variety in the types of conduct officially denominated delinquency as well as in the types of juveniles found to be delinquents and have begun to suggest narrower explanation differentiating among kinds of deviant

⁹₀**NCCD**, op. cit., Appendix A.

⁹¹**NCCD**, op. cit., Appendix A.
behavior. Research studies by Johnson, Eissler, Matza and Sykes, Abrahamsen and the Gluecks provide many theories dealing with the psychiatric point of view. Other studies put forth by Reiss, Reckless, Nye, Redle and Wineman, Ball, Sykes and Matza, Cloward and Ohlin,
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Shaw and McKay,104 Kinch,105 Jenkins and Hewitt106 and Yablonsky107 and many others constitute the major theories from the sociological point of view. But fundamentally delinquency is behavior, and until the science of human behavior matures far beyond its present confines, comprehensive understanding of the kinds of behavior we call delinquency is not likely to be forthcoming. Study and research tend increasingly to support the view that delinquency is not so much an act of individual deviancy as a pattern of behavior produced by a multitude of pervasive societal influences well beyond the reach of the actions of any judge, probation officer, school, correctional counselor, or psychiatrist.

The literature selected for review is relevant to this study because it provides (1) an understanding of the variables included in the judicial administrative process, (2) an emphasis of the factors that influence the judgment of judges, and (3) an understanding of different theoretical points of view in attempting to explain the phenomenon called "delinquency."


Chapter 3

COLLECTING THE DATA

In this chapter attention is focused on the description of collecting the data. Discussed are the procedures and rationale in securing the data. Collecting the data involved the following: (1) selection of data collecting; (2) construction, content, and rationale for student data sheet and rationale for selecting variables; (3) selection of the population; (4) identification of the population; (5) procedures for identifying and verifying student records; (6) the method of randomly selecting the population, and recording the data; (7) the sample size; (8) data gathering procedure; and (9) the use of the Burroughs B-6700 computer and safeguards used to insure accuracy.

BACKGROUND PERIOD STUDIED AND GUIDELINES

Because the Gault case became effective in May, 1967, many procedures were changed in the juvenile court, probation department, and juvenile hall in Solano County. Implementation of the new guidelines set forth by the case required the services of the county public defender's office to defend those students not able to provide themselves with the legal assistance. Therefore, beginning with July 1, 1968 all
procedures required by law were firmly followed by all concerned and a new format, for probation officers writing reports on students, provided sufficient information on individual profiles to make this study possible.

July 1, 1972 was the cut-off date for this study. The major reasons were these: (1) the trend to allocate delinquents to the California Youth Authority was sharply curtailed by the creation of the Probation Subsidy Program; (2) the Department of Corrections philosophy allowed local probation departments to develop programs to deal with problem children on the local level through an Intensive Supervision Unit; and (3) very few students were allocated to the California Youth Authority. Therefore, the period of five years, July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972, provided the basis for the selection of the population to be studied. Prior to July 1, 1968, the probation officer's report to the juvenile court did not contain the necessary information required by this study.

CONSTRUCTION, CONTENT AND RATIONALE FOR STUDENT DATA SHEET AND RATIONALE FOR SELECTING VARIABLES

A student Data Sheet was constructed to obtain the necessary information from the student files. The data believed to be related to the measurement of delinquent profiles were carefully recorded. (See Appendix B for Data Sheet).
This investigator began by grouping all variables in the study into three categories. The first category related to the variables of primary concern relative to educational characteristics as defined by this study. The second relates to socio-economic factors in a juvenile's background that might reasonably be thought to be influential. The final category had to do with the administrative judicial characteristics of the prevailing system in Solano County.

The educational variables selected were these:
1. the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, full scale and utilizing the two subgroups identified as "verbal" and "performance," 
2. for achievement, the California Achievement Test for reading and arithmetic for grades 7, 8, and 9.

In determining which tests to select for measuring the general intelligence of the delinquents and for learning something of their school achievement, this investigator was guided by the County Mental Health Department and the county psychologists who tested the majority of the delinquents detained in juvenile hall school. Test scores for delinquents were determined to be primarily WISC scores. The California Achievement Test in reading and arithmetic is the test utilized in the testing program for the county schools as well as for those delinquent students allocated to the school program. Therefore, the educational variables selected for this study were based on the availability of complete and identical intelligence and achievement test scores on individual students. While it is difficult to say...
that any intelligence test reveals purely innate or purely acquired mental ability, the emphasis of the California Achievement Test is on the degree of learning actually acquired by a student, the test yielding age and grade equivalents for school achievement. This achievement, though conditioned by innate ability, is also dependent upon such extraneous factors as the regularity of school attendance.

The socio-economic variables were selected from the Edwards Scale and through the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. (Appendix C).

These variables are as follows: (1) family history; (2) occupation of head of household; (3) yearly income; (4) number of siblings; and (5) legal guardian. These variables are also the legal requirements as per the Gault case, for juvenile court records in the United States in general and for California in particular.

The third category deals with certain aspects of the administrative judicial system in Solano County. They were as follows: (1) presence or absence of an attorney; (2) reason for court appearance; (3) statement by the juvenile; (4) prior record; (5) number of official contacts by probation department; (6) completeness of probation report; (7) supplementary information; (8) recommendation to juvenile court judge by probation officer; (9) number of juvenile cases on court agenda on court date; (10) disposition by juvenile court judge; and (11) overall evaluation of the
juvenile by the juvenile court probation officer. All variables mentioned above are from a standard form used by most probation departments in California. Items 5, 6, and 11 were included by this investigator for the following reasons:

(1) the number of official contacts with juveniles is rarely included in the complete report as submitted to the juvenile court. The rationale for including this information is to give this study a comparison between the number of official contacts of those students who were allocated to the California Youth Authority and those who were not. Secondly, item number 6 was included because, over the years, the turnover of juvenile court probation officers presenting data on individual students to judges appeared to be inconsistent even though each probation officer followed a standardized court form. The rationale for this item may lend itself to influences not recognized by the juvenile court. Third, item 11 was included to determine whether or not the court probation officer evaluated each individual on the factual data collected in making his final recommendation to the court.

Items 5, 6, and 11 were based on a rating scale from 1 through 5. (1 designates an excellent rating while 5 is a poor rating.) This investigator rated 50 case files before applying this scale to the study.
SELECTION OF THE POPULATION

The population to be studied came from 8,051 students admitted to juvenile hall. Those detained in juvenile hall for court hearings constituted 5,536 male and female students. Of these, 1,545 were allocated to the school program after their court appearance for periods up to ninety school days. For reasons cited on page 9, 639 students were committed from this study. The balance, 906 students, were black and white males in grades 7, 8, and 9. Of these, 356 were allocated to the California Youth Authority (Group Two) after their period in the school program (these students, allocated to California Youth Authority, remained in the school program for periods up to thirty school days, after their court date, before they were delivered to the Youth Authority). The balance, 550 students (Group One) were allocated to the school program for periods specified by juvenile court judges which did not exceed ninety school days. After completion of their school program, the students in Group One were released to their home communities and re-enrolled in the public school programs.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE POPULATION

All students who were eligible for this study were among those allocated to the school program sometime during
the period of July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972. Of the 1,545 students allocated to the school program, 906 were identified as qualified for this study on the basis of the following criteria: (1) black and white students detained more than once; (2) students allocated to the school program for periods not exceeding 90 school days; (3) students who attended the school program during the period specified but were allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges; (4) students who attended public schools in Solano County in grades 7, 8, and 9; (5) students who had available complete and identical standardized intelligence and achievement test scores on the tests specified; and (6) students whose files were readily available in the school and probation departments.

PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING AND VERIFYING STUDENT RECORDS

The procedures used in identifying and verifying the eligible students were these: (1) a complete list of names was obtained from the schools' official files for the 1,545 students; (2) the total list of names was then submitted to the probation department for verification; (3) the students who did not meet the criteria outlined above were removed from the master list for the study.

The next procedure was a complete review of each individual file on the corrected master list of names in the
probation and school departments. The review consisted of verifying that each folder contained complete standardized intelligence and achievement scores on the tests specified to deal with the educational variables in the study, contained the proper socio-economic data required by the study, and contained the proper format utilized by the judicial and administrative system for Solano County. In addition to verifying the above, each student folder was marked for identification by using numerals serially from 1 through 906. Having made a complete and thorough inspection of the student files a Student Data Sheet was constructed to record the raw data (see Student Data Sheet, Appendix B).

THE METHOD OF RANDOMLY SELECTING THE POPULATION AND RECORDING OF DATA

Sax states that a ten percent sample is an adequate number for random selection purposes.\(^1\) However, due to the large number of variables investigated in the study a ten percent sample was of insufficient size, therefore, this investigator decided, after conferring with faculty advisors to double the size to twenty percent.

The population selected is described as a randomly stratified sample because the percentage factor was applied to the racial breakdown at each of the three grade levels. The procedure for the students to be studied involved the following: First, the students were trichotomized by respective grades, 7, 8, and 9. Second, the students were dichotomized by white and black. Third, each of these categorized were tabulated and distributed in racial breakdown by grade. Finally, a twenty percent sample was selected from each of the grades specified which involved (1) preparing an alphabetical list of the names of the student folders; (2) renumbering the student folders on each alphabetical list in consecutive order beginning with "I" and; (3) using a system of random numbers for the selection of the sample. As each folder was pulled, the information was recorded on the Student Data Sheet as was the student's identification number.

Data collected and recorded from the school files provided the educational variables in this study. Data collected from the probation files provided the socio-economic and judicial and administrative variables as specified by the study. According to Travers, this process of alphabetizing and numbering with a random selection avoids producing bias.²

This method of selection yielded a twenty percent random stratified sample where the total number of students in each category was greater than required for statistical treatment. Regarding this method of selection, the assumption was (1) that such sampling procedure would not adversely affect the study, and (2) that, since the selected sample matched the defined population parameters within each grade level, it would lend elegance to the study of the total number of students.

SAMPLE SIZE

From the total number of students eligible for this study (906), a twenty percent sample was taken from each grade level. The sample size then consisted of 191 cases which reflects the percentage factor for each grade level.

DATA GATHERING PROCEDURE

Through the complete cooperation of the personnel of the Solano County Juvenile Hall School, Solano County Probation Department, Solano County Clerk's Office and the five superior court judges, this investigator was supplied with the official records needed. The school department was most helpful in supplying information concerning the educational data from the school files. The Probation Department also was most cooperative: (1) in allowing this investigator to extract, from the active and inactive files, pertinent sociological data not found in the school files; (2) in providing this investigator with a key to the
Probation Department so that he could conduct his research on weekends when the files were not in use; and (3) in giving him the proper juvenile court calendars covering dates and case loads of each individual student appearing on his court date and the judge who heard the cases for the period of time specified by this study. The clerk's office was most helpful and cooperative in verifying the accuracy of the court calendars as they related to each individual case appearing before the juvenile court. The judges were most cooperative in supplying this investigator with legal opinions or documentation when requested. Since the study depended on researching information from three major sources, the school, probation, and clerk's office files and records, it was necessary to coordinate the most appropriate times in which these activities could be conducted. It was necessary to make appointments with the proper department heads when an activity occurred during the working day. The response to the study on the part of the agencies involved was most favorable. All were cordial and highly cooperative in any assistance required by this investigator.

THE USE OF THE BURROUGHS B-6700 COMPUTER AND SAFEGUARDS USED TO INSURE ACCURACY

The information recorded on individual students on the Student Data Sheet from the various files constituted the data for analysis for this study.
The data which were gathered from the files were carefully noted, then coded (see Code Book, Appendix C) and transferred to IBM work sheets. Safeguards used to insure accuracy of transferring data, a random 30 percent sample of the tabulated data were checked by three outside sources. Secondly, the data in quantitative form were then punched on IBM cards for data processing using the Burroughs B-6700 computer.
Chapter 4

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

This chapter is a report of the data obtained from the study and a discussion of the statistical techniques used. It includes a statement of the characteristics of the population and of each null hypothesis tested.

The sample as defined by the study, is a stratified, randomly selected, black and white male student group in grades seven, eight, and nine from Solano County. Since this sample is considered to be representative of the normal population all statistical treatment is parametric. All techniques used are as described in Haber and Runyon.¹

Testing the Null Hypotheses

In order to test the various hypotheses, one needs to search for a significant difference between the two groups of students, namely, (1) Group One consisting of those students who were allocated to the Solano County Juvenile Hall School program for periods not exceeding 90 school days

and (2) Group Two consisting of those students who attended the school program for a shorter period of time (up to forty-five days) but were ultimately allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges.

The statistical test used was a one way analysis of variance. The level of significance arbitrarily selected to reject the null hypothesis was the .05 level.

The research hypotheses, tested in the null form, are presented in three major categories; (1) hypotheses dealing with the educational characteristic variables; (2) hypotheses dealing with the socio-economic familial variables; and (3) hypotheses dealing with the judicial and administrative variables.

To carry out the test of the hypotheses, the writer selected a stratified random sample of black and white male students in grades seven, eight, and nine who were detained in juvenile hall school sometime between July 1, 1968 through July 1, 1972. The absolute number of students eligible for this study in the grades mentioned above were 906. From the 906 eligible students, a twenty percent stratified random sample was drawn. Group One numbered 113 and Group Two numbered 78. The total group consisted of 191 delinquent students.
I. Results of Educational Hypothesis Testing. All hypotheses are stated positively and tested in the null form.

\[ H_1 \] The mean scores of Group Two on the full scale verbal WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group One.

Table 1 shows the analysis of student full scale verbal WISC scores. When treated, the mean scores of Group Two (those students allocated to the California Youth Authority) compared to the mean scores of students in Group One (those students allocated to the juvenile hall school) show no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 1

A Comparison of Mean Full Scale Verbal WISC Scores for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34645</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>413.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td><em>n.s.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>34320.97</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>181.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 \( F(1,189) = 3.92 \)
The mean scores of Group One on the full scale performance WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Two.

Table 2 shows the analysis of student full scale performance WISC scores. When treated the mean scores of Group One compared to the mean scores of Group Two show no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 2

A Comparison of Mean Full Scale Performance WISC Scores for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36315</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>410.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>410.93</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>35903.65</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>18997</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$
The scores of Group One on the full scale intelligence WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Two.

Table 3 shows the analysis of student full scale intelligence WISC scores. When treated, the mean scores of Group One compared to the mean scores of students in Group Two show no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 3
A Comparison of Full Scale I.Q. WISC Scores for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26796</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td><em>n.s.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>26795.76</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>141.78</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92
The mean score of Group One on the California Achievement Test in reading will be significantly higher than the mean score of Group Two.

Table 4 shows the analysis of student reading scores. When treated, the mean score of Group One compared to the mean score of Group Two shows no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 4**

A Comparison of Mean California Achievement Reading Scores for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72683</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>489.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>489.55</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td><em>n.s.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>72193.51</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>381.98</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1, 189) = 3.92
The mean score of Group One on the California Achievement Test in arithmetic will be significantly higher than the mean score of Group Two.

Table 5 shows the analysis of student arithmetic scores. When treated, the mean score of Group One compared to the mean score of Group Two shows no significant difference. The null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 5

A Comparison of Mean California Achievement Arithmetic Scores for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73307</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>946.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>946.98</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>72360.20</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>382.86</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92
II. Results of Socio-economic Familial Hypotheses Testing. All hypotheses are stated positively and tested in the null form.

H₆ Students who live with their natural parents are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students who did not live with their natural parents.

Table 6 shows the analysis of students who lived with their natural parents, and those who did not. When treated, Group One, when compared to Group Two, shows no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Table 6**

A Comparison of Means for Students Who Lived With Natural Parents and Those Who Did Not in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>500.41</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92
H7 Students whose mothers completed a higher grade level in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose mothers completed a lower grade level in school.

Table 7 shows the analysis of the grade level completion for mothers of students in the two groups. The mothers of students in Group One compared to the mothers of students in Group Two show a significantly higher level of grade completion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 7

A Comparison of Means of Mothers' Education Completed for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2921</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>105.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105.30</td>
<td>*7.07</td>
<td>** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2815.30</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92

** Significant at the .001 level
H₈ Students whose fathers completed a higher grade level in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose fathers completed a lower grade level in school.

Table 8 shows the analysis of the grade level completion for fathers of students in the two groups. The fathers of students in Group One compared to the fathers of students in Group Two show a significantly higher level of grade completion. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

### Table 8

**A Comparison of Mean Scores for Fathers' Education for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>144.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144.61</td>
<td>*5.43</td>
<td>** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5035.50</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$

** Significant at the .05 level
H. Students with a greater number of siblings in the family are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students who come from families with fewer siblings.

Table 9 shows the analysis of the number of siblings in the families of the two groups. Group One families compared to Group Two families show no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>**n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>654.59</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix C for delineations of scale

**.95 F(1,189) = 3.92
$H_{10}$ Students whose parents' occupations correspond to the lower levels of Edward's Occupational Scale are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose parents' occupations correspond to the higher levels.

Table 10 shows the analysis of the occupations of parents on the Edward's Occupational Scale. Statistically treated, Group One parents compared to Group Two parents show no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 10

A Comparison of Means of Parent Occupations by the Edward's Occupational Scale for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S.) vs C.Y.A.</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>**n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>821.31</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix C for delineations of scale

** .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$
H11 Students whose parents have a greater monthly income are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose parents have less monthly income.

Table 11 shows the analysis of monthly income of parents. The average monthly income of the parents of students in Group One, when compared with the average monthly income of the parents of students in Group Two, was found to be significantly higher. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 11

A Comparison of the Means of Parent Monthly Income for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N: 113</td>
<td>N: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M: $636.81</td>
<td>M: $470.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD: 525.29</td>
<td>SD: 294.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38854561</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1271911.14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>37582649.81</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 0.95 F(1,189) = 3.92

** Significant at the .001 level
Students whose parents are on Welfare are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose parents are not on Welfare.

Table 11 shows the analysis of the number of parents on Welfare in each group. The difference between them is not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 12
A Comparison of Means of Welfare Status on Head of Household for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 \( F_{(1,189)} = 3.92 \)
Students who are black are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who are white.

Table 13 shows the analysis of the distribution of black and white students in each group. No significant difference is found between the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 13
A Comparison of Black and White Students Allocated to the California Youth Authority in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92
Table 14

A Comparison of the Age of the Students as to Allocation in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>163.93</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92
The closer the student lives to the juvenile court the less likely it is that he will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges.

Table 15 shows the analysis of the proximity to the juvenile court of the schools of the students. Group One compared to Group Two, shows no significant difference in the schools' proximity to the court. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 15

A Comparison of the Proximity of the Location of Students' Schools to the Location of Juvenile Court in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10788</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>121.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>10666.60</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>56.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92 See Appendix C for delineation of school proximity to court
III. Results of Judicial Administrative Hypotheses

Testing. All hypotheses are stated positively and tested in the null form.

\( H_{16} \) Students represented by counsel are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who are not represented by counsel.

Table 16 shows the analysis of the number of cases in each group where a student was represented by counsel. The number of such cases in Group One is not significantly different from that in Group Two. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 16

A Comparison of Students Represented by Counsel and Students Not Represented by Counsel in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 \( F(1,189) = 3.92 \)
$H_{17}$ Students with a greater number of prior contacts with the probation department are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students with fewer prior contacts with the probation department.

Table 17 shows the analysis of the number of prior student contacts with the probation department. Group Two students compared to Group One students show a significantly greater number of prior contacts. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 17

A Comparison of Student Contacts With the Probation Department for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>15.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6114</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>2301.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2301.50</td>
<td>*114.10</td>
<td>**.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3812.40</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $.95 \text{ F}(1,189) = 3.92$

** Significant at the .001 level
Students who appear in court on a heavy-agenda court date are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who appear on a light-agenda court date.

Table 18 shows the analysis of student appearances on heavy and light court-agenda dates. Group Two students compared to Group One students show a highly significant tendency to have appeared on heavy-agenda dates. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 18

A Comparison of Students Appearing on Days With Long vs Short Agendas Court Date for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20571</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>3717.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3717.54</td>
<td>*41.70</td>
<td>* .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>16853.60</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>89.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F(1,189) = 3.92

** Significant at the .001 level
The higher the seniority of the judge the less likely it is that a student will be allocated to the California Youth Authority.

Table 19 shows the analysis of the possible influence of the seniority of judges upon the allocation of students. Group One students compared to Group Two students show no significant difference relative to the seniority of the judge involved in their assignment. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 19

A Comparison of Seniority of Judges in Student Allocations for Students in Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 (J.H.S.)</th>
<th>Group 2 (C.Y.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td><em>n.s.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>418.80</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$
The more complete the probation officer's report the less likely it is that the student will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges.

Table 20 shows the analysis of the completeness of the probation officer's report. In regard to this item, the two groups show a difference which is significant at the .05 level. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 20
A Comparison of the Completeness of the Probation Officer's Report* to the Juvenile Court Judge and Student Allocations for Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>87.90</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix C for delineation of scale for completeness of probation officer's report.

** .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$
H_{21} Students who admit their guilt are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who do not admit their guilt.

Table 21 shows the analysis of students who admit their guilt and those who do not. Testing on this item shows no significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Table 21

A Comparison of Students Who Admit Their Guilt and Student Allocations for Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>*n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>51.23</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 F_{(1,189)} = 3.92
Juvenile Court judges accept the recommendations of the court probation officers more often than they reject them when allocating students in Group Two than when allocating students in Group One.

Table 22 shows the analysis of acceptance and rejection of the recommendations made to the court by the court probation officers as it bears upon student allocation in the two groups. When tested, Group One compared to Group Two shows a highly significant difference. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 22
A Comparison of Juvenile Court Judges Accepting or Rejecting the Recommendations Made by Court Probation Officers in Allocating Students for Grades Seven, Eight, and Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Ms</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups (J.H.S. vs C.Y.A.)</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>*232.71 **</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .95 $F(1,189) = 3.92$

** Significant at the .001 level
SUMMARY

Below is a summary of the result of the testing of the hypotheses in the three major categories.

I. Educational Hypotheses

In this section the research hypotheses numbers one through five dealing with intelligence and achievement scores were rejected because in each instance the null hypotheses could not be rejected at the .05 level.

II. Socio-economic Familial Hypotheses

In this section research hypotheses numbers six, nine, ten, twelve, thirteen, fourteen and fifteen were rejected. Research hypotheses numbers seven, eight and eleven were accepted because in each instance the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level or greater.

III. Judicial Administrative Hypotheses

In this section, research hypotheses numbers sixteen, nineteen, and twenty-one were rejected.

Research hypotheses numbers seventeen, eighteen, twenty and twenty-two were accepted because significant differences were found at, or above, the .05 level.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the educational characteristics by which judges in Solano County allocate students to either (1) the juvenile hall school or (2) the California Youth Authority. In the process of making this determination, two other areas had to be explored because the literature demonstrates that variables in these two areas, (1) socio-economic familial and (2) judicial administrative, are likely to influence court decisions. Therefore, a series of hypotheses were tested in the three major categories, namely, (1) educational characteristics variables, (2) socio-economic familial variables, and (3) judicial administrative systems variables. In the hypotheses, Group One is identified as those students allocated to the juvenile hall school and Group Two is identified as those students allocated to the California Youth Authority. The research hypotheses were as follows:

Hypotheses Tested Concerning Educational Characteristics Variables

1. The mean scores of Group Two on the full scale verbal WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores
of Group One.

2. The mean scores of Group One on the full scale performance WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Two.

3. The mean scores of Group One on the full scale intelligence WISC will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Two.

4. The mean scores of Group One on the California Achievement Test in reading will be significantly higher than the mean scores of Group Two.

5. The mean scores of Group One on the California Achievement Test in arithmetic will be significantly higher than the mean score of Group Two.

Hypotheses Concerning Socio-economic Familial Variables

6. Students who live with their natural parents are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students who did not live with their natural parents.

7. Students whose mothers completed a higher grade level in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose mothers completed a lower grade level in school.

8. Students whose fathers completed a higher grade level in school are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose fathers completed a lower grade level in school.
9. Students with a greater number of siblings in the family are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students who come from families with fewer siblings.

10. Students whose parents' occupations correspond to the lower levels of Edward's Occupational Scale are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students whose parents' occupations correspond to the higher levels.

11. Students whose parents have a greater monthly income are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students whose parents have less monthly income.

12. Students whose parents are on welfare are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students whose parents are not on welfare.

13. Students who are black are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority than those students who are white.

14. The higher the age of the students the more likely they will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.

15. The closer the students live to the juvenile court the less likely it is that they will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.
Hypotheses Concerning Judicial Administrative Systems Variables

16. Students represented by counsel are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges, than those who are not represented by counsel.

17. Students with a greater number of prior contacts with the probation department are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those students with fewer contacts with the probation department.

18. Students who appear in court on a heavy-agenda court date are more likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who appear on light-agenda court date.

19. The higher the seniority of the judge the less likely it is that a student will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by juvenile court judges.

20. The more complete the probation officer's report the less likely students will be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges.

21. Students who admit their guilt are less likely to be allocated to the California Youth Authority by judges than those who do not admit their guilt.

22. Juvenile court judges accept the recommendations of the court probation officer more often than they reject them when allocating students in Group Two than when allocating students in Group One.
2. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the case of the educational characteristics variables, all five research hypotheses were rejected. In tables one through five, in Chapter 4, the findings indicate students in Group Two are in the normal intelligence range. This parallels findings in studies conducted by the California Youth Authority. In addition, the Glucks found in their study of juvenile delinquency, that intelligence scores fall within normal parameters. In the area of achievement scores, the literature strongly indicates that delinquent students coming from the lower socio-economic levels are from one to two years below expected grade level in reading and arithmetic. However, the present study indicates that not only the students in Group Two but also those in Group One have the same sort of educational characteristics. This finding is extremely important because juvenile court judges in Solano County have been assuming that they have been allocating the academically stronger students to the more favorable academic climate of the juvenile hall school.

In the case of the socio-economic familial variables, the results show that (1) mothers education, (2) fathers education and (3) family income clearly influence the judges' decisions. These decisions move in the direction of long term placements in the California Youth Authority when parental education and income are low. When parental education and income are high, the decision decisively moves toward
placements in short term programs in the juvenile hall school. The three factors mentioned above show that there is a socio-economic bias in the allocation process. Based upon the findings and conclusions of this study, it is impossible to say how these factors influence the judges' decisions. One can only speculate that the judges somehow do recognize, and identify with, those parents who approach the middle-class standard in terms of education and income and give more favorable ratings to their offspring. Further, it is not known to what extent juvenile court probation officers may also recognize, and identify with, the middle-class oriented segment among the students. If probation officers identify in stronger terms with those parents with more education and income, it is logical to hypothesize that they would somehow present their sons to the judges for more favorable consideration in the allocation process even if it meant overlooking the academic records of the students themselves.

As for the judicial administrative systems variables, research hypotheses numbers seventeen, eighteen, twenty, and twenty-two were rejected. These rejections indicate that judges are influenced significantly by (1) the number of official probation contacts, (2) the number of cases on the judges' agenda on court date, (3) the completeness of the probation officer's report to the court, and (4) the probation officer's recommendation to the court.

The factors mentioned above clearly indicate that the court probation officer has an extreme influence upon the
allocation decision of judges in Solano County. This is in
keeping with the report of the literature in Chapter 2 where
the court probation officer is seen as the judge's "right-
hand man" in the allocation process. This study does not
indicate how these factors become a crucial part of the
judges' decisions. Again, the writer can only speculate as
to how things may occur. It could be that judges and court
probation officers meet on a regularly scheduled basis to
discuss the more complicated cases over lunch. Or, it could
be that, as the juvenile court appoints counsel, court pro-
bation officers and counsel agree to what they consider to be
proper allocation and thus, consciously or unconsciously,
influence the consideration and final decision of the judge.
Judges for their part, might favorably consider an agreement
between probation and counsel in order to get through the
lengthy and heavy court agenda dates. Whatever the possibili-
ties may be in relation to those factors mentioned above, the
present study only provides room for hypotheses for further
research. In conclusion, the findings of this study show that
(1) the judicial administrative systems variables were highly
significant in influencing the judges' decision in terms of
student allocation, (2) the socio-economic familial variables
were somewhat less significant in terms of influence and
allocation and (3) the educational variables were found to
be decidedly insignificant in the allocation process.
3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The literature reviewed in this dissertation demonstrated that society is very interested in the problem of juvenile delinquency. Moreover, institutions such as juvenile halls and juvenile hall schools throughout the United States, and California in particular, are having a great influence on the lives of juveniles who will become tomorrow's young adults. Thus, the allocation of youth to the appropriate educational institution, is an important decision in our society. Juvenile court judges, juvenile probation officers, and teachers, each have an important role in helping these students develop into productive members of our society. On the basis of the findings of this study, the writer specifically recommends that:

1. Juvenile court judges have in-service training in the proper use of intelligence and achievement test scores.

2. Juvenile court probation officers have in-service training in the proper use of intelligence and achievement test scores.

3. Juvenile court probation officers have increased communication with administrators and teachers in the juvenile hall school regarding the academic and behavioral progress of students facing allocation.

4. There should be an appointed court psychologist
to work specifically with the juvenile hall school as well as the juvenile court in helping to interpret to judges and probation officers the academic and behavioral profiles of delinquent students.

5. The juvenile court agenda should never contain more than 18 student allocations cases per court date.

6. The County of Solano establish and maintain one full-time juvenile court, in order to ease the case load of judges.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Five basic recommendations for future research are set forth below:

1. A replication of this study using a similar county and juvenile hall school. Such a study might yield additional information relevant to the question of whether other juvenile court judges are influenced as greatly by juvenile court probation officers when allocating students as are the judges in Solano County.

2. A study to determine why juvenile court judges neglect educational variables which they themselves say are important in the allocation process.

3. Study of the way in which education and family income influence the juvenile court probation officers and/or judges.

4. A study of the input and development of the juvenile court docket, including the details on amount of time
given each case by judges in the allocation process.

5. A study to determine the socio-economic and educational background of juvenile court probation officers and the manifest and latent dimensions of their relationship to judges in the allocation process.
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APPENDIX A

ORDER PERMITTING INSPECTION
IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SOLANO

DEPARTMENT NO. TWO

* * * * * * *

IN THE MATTER OF JUVENILE
COURT RECORDS.

ORDER PERMITTING INSPECTION

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that for research purposes PETER A. KALAMARAS is hereby authorized to inspect the official records of all Juvenile Court case files in the Office of the County Clerk, Probation Office and Juvenile Hall for the period July 1, 1968, through July 1, 1972, provided that the same shall not be removed from the possession of the custodian or custodians.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the said PETER A. KALAMARAS shall not disclose to any other person any confidential information, save in the form of impersonal statistics, summaries or conclusions concerning I.Q. scores, achievement scores and ethnic percentages.

MADE AND ENTERED this 15th day of August, 1972.

RAYMOND J. SHEVIN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
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STUDENT DATA SHEET
APPENDIX B

STUDENT DATA SHEET

Student Number_________ Age _________ Grade _________ Race _________

Public School________ WISC Scores: V ______ P ______ Fs ______

CAT: Reading ______ Arithmetic ______ Attorney: Yes ______ No ______

Reason for Court ______ Statement by Juvenile: Yes ______ No ______

Prior Record: Yes ______ No ______ Number of Contacts by Prob. Dept. ______

Completeness of Probation Report: 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 ______

Supplementary Information: Yes ______ No ______

Family History: Father/Mother ______; Step-Father/Mother ______;
Step-Mother/Father ______; Legal Guardian ______;
Occupation: ______ Yearly Income: ______

No. of Siblings: ______ Evaluation, over-all, of Prob. Officer ______;
1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 ______

Recommendation to Judge: Positive ______ Negative ______

Judge# ______ Disposition J. H. S. ______ C. Y. A. ______

Number of Juvenile Cases on Court Date ______

PAK: Lab
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ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
APPENDIX C

AN ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DELINQUENT STUDENTS AND STUDENT ALLOCATIONS IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF SOLANO COUNTY

CODE BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V#</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Student Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2  | 4   | Destination                          1-Juvenile Hall School
                                             2-Calif. Youth Authority
| 3  | 5   | Grade                                |
| 4  | 6   | Race                                 1-White
                                             2-Black
| 5  | 7,8,9 | Verbal WISC                         |
| 6  | 10,11,12 | Performance WISC                        |
| 7  | 13,14,15 | Full Scale WISC                        |
| 8  | 16,17,18 | California Achievement Level Grades |
                                             READING (Forms W.X.Y.Z.)
                                             Jr.High 1957 Edition
| 9  | 19,20,21 | California Achievement |
                                             ARITHMETIC Same as above
<p>| 10 | 22,23 | Age of student                        |
| 11 | 24,25 | School of attendance (Ordered by proximity to juvenile court in which highest number represents closest to court) |
| 12 |       | Crystal Intermediate                 |
| 13 |       | Charles I. Sullivan Intermediate      |
| 14 |       | Sem Yeto Continuation                |
| 15 |       | Green Valley Intermediate            |
| 16 |       | Vanden High School (Golden West Intermediate) |
| 17 |       | Travis Continuation                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>APPENDIX C</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII CC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABLE NAME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Willis Jepson Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Vacaville Continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Will C. Wood (9th grade only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Vallejo Peoples High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formerly Vallejo Workstudy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Solano Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Vallejo Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Franklin Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Springstown Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Benicia Continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Benicia Junior High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 C. A. Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 East Dixon Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rio Vista Continuation (High School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 26 Did student have an attorney 1-yes 2-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 27 Reason for court 1-Delinquency 2-Crimes against property 3-Crimes of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 26 Statement by juvenile 1-Admitted 2-Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 29 Prior Record 1-No 2-Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 30,31 Number of official contacts prior to allocation by juvenile court judges (five total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 32 Completeness of probation officer's report 5-Minimal 4-Below average 3-Average 2-Above average 1-Very thorough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 33 Family History 1-Father/mother 2-Father/Step Mother 3-Step father/mother 4-Father only 5-Mother only 6-Legal guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 34,35 Mother's education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V#</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36,37</td>
<td>Father's education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Occupation of Head of Household (Modified Edwards Scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Labor or Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Operatives (armed services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-Skilled Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-Technical (civil service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7-Managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39,40,41,42</td>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>43,44</td>
<td>Number of Siblings in current family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Probation officer's recommendations to juvenile court judge(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-Positive-Juvenile Hall School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Negative-California Youth Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Judge on date of allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-(One is the Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-judge to sit on the bench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-and 5 is the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4-junior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>47,48</td>
<td>Number of cases on judge's agenda on court day: Number of decisions required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>by judge(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Welfare status by head of household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CODING OF ALL VARIABLES