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This research investigates the effect of social skills training on 46 first-time adjudicated males, ages 13 through 15 and placed on traditional probation. The independent variable was the type of group. Three types of groups were conducted:

Group I (youth who received social skills training with their parents or guardians), Group II (youth who received social skills training without parents' or guardians' participation), and Group III (a control group of youth who did not receive social skills training). The dependent variable was the Jesness Inventory scales and subscales scores, and the type of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony). The research design used to assess changes in behavior was the three-group pretest, posttest 1 and posttest 2 design, with testing occurring at the beginning of placement into each group (pretest), 11 weeks later (posttest 2) and 11 weeks after the posttest 2 date or when a youth was discharged from probation (which ever came first). The data obtained for this study were analyzed in two ways: (1) A one-way analysis of variance was used to assess the mean number of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony) committed by members of all three groups to evaluate the initial mean differences among groups,
and (2) the repeated measures analysis of variance assessed time/group interaction for mean number of offenses (status, misdemeanor and felony) and the Jesness Inventory scales and subscales scores. The significance level of this study was set at .05.

Results for the initial pretest showed that groups were homogeneous. Results for the repeated measures analysis of variance could not reject the null hypotheses; no significant changes in behavior (as measured by the Jesness Inventory and recidivism) occurred. Some explanations are offered to account for the absence of significant results.
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6” x 9” black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“For I know the plans I have for you’, declares the Lord, ‘plans to prosper you and not to harm you, plans to give you hope and a future’.

Jeremiah 29:11

Thanks to my committee: to Dr. John Geisler, my chair, for his encouragement to begin the doctoral program and his commitment to following me through. To Dr. Judy Halseth, whose words and encouragement I carry and am continually being transformed by. To Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom for so kindly and graciously stepping in near the end, your direction and guidance sparked my interest in this project.

Heartfelt thanks to my people at the Kent County Juvenile Court. Special thanks to Judges Carpenter, Haynes, Steketee, DeYoung, and Gardner, Court Director Jack Roedema, Intake Supervisor Jim Koetsier, and all the supervisors and probation officers for not only the financial but also personal support for this research. You make me feel like I never left; thank you for the “open door”. Sincere thanks to my friend, supervisor, and mentor, Ken VanWoerkom. His work with youth is a model of excellence for all who know him. Thank you, Ken, for the constant encouragement and prayers you offered up on my behalf. Thank you to the therapists, Angie, Becky, Mike, Phil, and Virginia for lending your expertise and commitment to this project. It was a pleasure to work with some of the best in the field. Special thanks to Mike and Angie for doing the testing and Mike for taking the unique role of
facilitator for this project. Mike, your kind words, smile, and interest in this study kept me going . . . especially on those days when we had to hunt down kids.

I offer a sigh of relief and thanks to Dr. Dott Freeman at GVSU for her encouragement and help in funding this project. Your belief in the value of smaller, as well as larger, community foundations undergirds this study.

Very profound thanks to Dr. Agnes Baro who is a master teacher, researcher, friend, and mentor. Dr. Baro, you have greatly influenced my understanding of the field. Your encouragement and direction have transformed me both personally and professionally. Agnes, when someone knows and cares, like you have, we pay more attention to what we are doing. Thank you for your ability to “celebrate” your students and friends.

A joyous thanks to my students and the youth I have been privileged to work with. You remind me why I do what I do. Your growth and excitement are my rewards. A special thanks in recognition of the prayers and support of many friends, including Joanie, Sharon, Virginia, Jean, Marijo, Lorna, Cindy, Jon, Sharon, Kris, Jill, and Dave. To the Graham family (especially my long-time friend Sandy) who provided me the opportunity to live in this most beautiful country home, I am grateful. The cows and corn kept me sane. And, of course, to my beloved dog Skyler, for his company and valuable distractions on long days. I miss you.

I have a “spacious place” of thankfulness to Dr. Suzanne Wolfe, who walked
Acknowledgements—Continued

with me through not only the summer of the dissertation (my thanks to your commitment and patience to edit, re-edit, and lend direction to this project), but for the summer of healing, growth, and discovery. You help me see the God of nature and reminded me to always think and feel deeply about life and what it is I am doing here.

My deepest gratitude and thankfulness goes to my family, Sue, Mark, Sheryl, Brian, Rebekah, Meagan, and Zach. I love, appreciate, and am truly blessed by you all. You have walked with me in the dark and painful hours as well as the happy ones. Thank you for listening and providing direction, for letting me borrow from your strength and rest in your assurances, and for providing a sense of security. Your aim has always been to help me grow in grace, faith, hope, and love. Your “staying put” has made all the difference.

For all that He’s done and all He is going to do, I thank God who has loved me and drawn me with His loving kindness. Let me live in adoration, praise, and gratitude for who He is and all He has come to mean to me.

Kathleen A. Bailey
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................................................... ii

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................. ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................... 1

Statement of the Problem .................................................................................. 3

Research Questions ......................................................................................... 8

Background of the Problem ........................................................................... 9

Definition of Terms ....................................................................................... 12

Limitations of the Study ................................................................................. 14

Significance of the Study ................................................................................. 16

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .................................................................... 17

Introduction .................................................................................................... 17

Brief History of the Juvenile Court ............................................................ 17

Definitions of Juvenile Delinquency ............................................................ 21

Delinquency: The Statistical Picture ............................................................... 22

The Juvenile Justice Process ........................................................................... 25

Theories of Delinquency ................................................................................. 27

Individual Trait Theories ............................................................................. 28

Social Structure Theories ............................................................................. 33
# Table of Contents—Continued

**CHAPTER**

Social Reaction Theory ......................................................... 36
Feminist Theories ................................................................ 37
Social Learning Theory ......................................................... 39
Summary Discussion of Theories ................................................. 41
Social Skills Training for Juvenile Offenders ......................... 42
Families and Delinquency ......................................................... 45

**III. METHODOLOGY** ................................................................. 48
Design and Variables ............................................................... 48
Sample ................................................................................. 49
Sample Mortality ................................................................ 52
Procedures ........................................................................... 53
Setting and Format of Social Skills Training ......................... 54
Social Skills Training Materials .............................................. 56
Instrumentation .................................................................. 58
Reliability ............................................................................ 60
Validity ............................................................................... 62
Hypotheses and Statistical Analysis ........................................ 68

**IV. RESULTS** ................................................................. 71
Introduction ........................................................................... 71
Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Pretest Analysis .................................................................71

Summary of Pretest Analysis of Scores on the Jesness
Inventory and Offense Numbers ..............................................73

Summary of Repeated Measure Analysis of Variance ..........94

Null Hypothesis Two .............................................................94

Null Hypothesis Three ..........................................................94

Null Hypothesis Four ............................................................95

V. DISCUSSION ........................................................................96

Introduction .............................................................................96

Program Integrity and Efficacy .................................................98

Attendance .............................................................................99

Length of Treatment ............................................................102

Narrow Versus Wholistic Approach .......................................102

Directions for Future Research ..............................................103

Implications From the Research on Delinquency ..................106

Contextual Interventions .......................................................106

Individualized Relational Therapy as an Intervention ..........110

Intensive Probation ...............................................................112

Mentoring Programs ............................................................114

vii
Table of Contents—Continued

APPENDICES

A. Endorsement From the Western Michigan University
   Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.......................... 116

B. Endorsement From the Kent County Juvenile Court.................... 118

C. Coding Sheet .......................................................... 120

D. Letter From the Court About Social Skills Training.................... 122

E. Pretest, Posttest 1 and Posttest 2 Mean Scores for All Groups 1, 2, and 3... 124

BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................................................... 126
LIST OF TABLES

1. Three-Group Pretest, Posttest 1, and Posttest 2 Design .................................................. 49
2. One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Status Offense: Baseline ........................................... 72
3. One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Misdemeanor Offense: Baseline ................................ 72
4. One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Felony Offense: Baseline ........................................... 73
5. The Mauchly's W Test - Sphericity Satisfied ........................................................................... 74
6. Greenhouse-Geiser Sphericity Correction ................................................................................ 75
7. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Value Orientation (VO) Scale ........................................ 76
8. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Immaturity (Imm) Scale ................................................ 76
9. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Alienation (Al) Scale ..................................................... 77
10. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Manifest Aggression (MA) Scale ............................... 77
11. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Withdrawal-Depression (Wd) Scale ......................... 77
12. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Social Anxiety (SA) Scale .......................................... 78
13. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Repression (Rep) Scale ............................................. 78
14. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Denial (Den) Scale ..................................................... 78
15. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Asocial (AI) Scale ...................................................... 79
17. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Unsocialized Passive/Undersocialized Passive (AP) Subscale ........................................................................... 79
List of Tables—Continued

18. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Immature Conformist/Conformist (CFM) Subscale ................................. 80

19. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Cultural Conformist/Group-oriented (CFC) Subscale ................................. 80

20. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Manipulator/Pragmatist (MP) Subscale .................. 80

21. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Neurotic Acting-out/Autonomy-oriented (NA) Subscale ................................. 81

22. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Neurotic, Anxious/Introspective (NX) Subscale ........................................ 81

23. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Situational Emotional Reaction/Inhibited (SE) Subscale ................................. 81

24. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Cultural Identifier/Adaptive (CI) Subscale ................................. 82

25. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Status Offenses ........................................ 82

26. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Misdemeanor Offenses ........................................ 82

27. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Felony Offenses ........................................ 83

28. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Social Maladjustment (SM/SM) Scale ...... 83

29. Summary of Analysis of Variance for Autism (Au) Scale ........................................ 83

30. Summary of Dunnett’s Multiple Comparison Test for Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) Scale ........................................ 84

31. Summary of Dunnett’s Multiple Comparison Test for Autism (AU) Scale ........ 84

32. Pretest, Posttest 1 and Posttest 2 Mean Scores for All Groups 1, 2, and 3 ...... 125
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Studies examining social skills deficits in early childhood and adolescence demonstrate that such childhood maladjustments are strongly related to an assortment of behavioral problems. For this reason, social skills training (SST) has become a popular treatment alternative for youth involved in the juvenile court system. Although the literature pertaining to the various uses of SST is plentiful, the research regarding its effectiveness with newly-adjudicated youth is nonexistent. Similarly, there is very little research on differences between youth whose parents or guardians also participate in SST and those who participate without parental or guardian involvement. Thus, the purpose of this dissertation is to provide information on the effectiveness of SST for newly-adjudicated youth and to explore differences between those who participate with parents or guardians and those who do not.

The population for this study was composed of male youth who were between 13 and 15 years of age. These youth were adjudicated (formally processed through the juvenile court system) for the first time and placed on traditional probation. Two groups of these first-time adjudicated youth received SST and one group was the control group and received no SST.

Social skills training is an intervention that consists of youth learning positive
skills to assist them in their interactions with others. These social skills enhancements often include learning new ways to communicate, negotiate, give positive and negative feedback, and resist peer pressure.

A substantial body of research has indicated that delinquent youth and their parents or guardians are often deficient in the use of social skills. In an effort to provide early, legitimate, behavior-changing treatment to youth and their families, it is imperative that the juvenile court develop a treatment program that complements traditional probation. The research also shows that SST can be a promising intervention for youth in schools, detention centers, and other institutions. A thorough discussion of SST will be provided in Chapter II.

This study compared the behavior-changing effects of SST on first-time adjudicated youth. The Jesness Inventory (JI) and recidivism were used to assess self-reported and reported changes. The JI was developed to predict delinquency and to assess the treatment-related behavioral changes of delinquent youth. Recidivism (recurrence of delinquent behavior) was also measured by assessing the offenses youth committed. The research design used to assess changes in behavior was the three-group pretest, posttest 1, posttest 2 design. Hypotheses were tested using one-way analyses of variance and the repeated measures analysis of variance for measuring time, group, and time-group interaction. The methodology will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter III.

Chapter I includes a statement of the problem, definitions of terms, research questions, and the limitations and significance of the study. Chapter II provides a brief
history of the juvenile court, definitions of juvenile delinquency, referral processing, and statistical information about the prevalence of delinquency. This chapter also includes a discussion of leading delinquency theories and a summary of social skills research findings. The study methodology will be described in Chapter III and Chapter IV will contain a review of the results. Finally, Chapter V is a discussion of the results and implications for further research.

Statement of the Problem

The juvenile justice system was designed to prevent future criminal conduct by providing rehabilitative services. However, many features of the system actually diminish its rehabilitative potential. For example, workers are overburdened and often lack training in rehabilitative processes (Braswell, McCarthy, & McCarthy, 1996). In addition, programs designed to change offender behavior typically do not have the social or community support needed to assure adequate funding (Petersilia, Turner, Kahan, & Peterson, 1985). With such shortages of resources, even those workers with the best intentions and training are forced to settle for what amounts to minimal case management. Thus, facilitation of meaningful, positive change is simply not characteristic of most juvenile justice agencies.

The most widely used response to adjudicated juvenile offenders is probation (Waegel, 1989; Whitehead & Lab, 1990). Probation is conditional freedom granted by the court to adjudicated offenders, as long as they avoid further law violations and meet specified conditions (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1996). Probation orders usually
require compliance with all laws, regular school attendance, a set curfew, and occasional visits with probation officers for "treatment" (Regoli & Hewitt, 1994; Siegel & Senna, 1994).

The Kent County, Michigan, Juvenile Court's Annual Reports (1990-1996) indicate that most newly-adjudicated youth are placed on traditional probation regardless of the offense. This reflects the pattern across the nation, in which 60% of all adjudicated delinquents received probation in 1991 (Butts & Sickmund, 1992; U.S. Department of Justice, 1988).

Although traditional probation is the primary intervention in juvenile justice, some criticize its failure to provide adequate supervision of offenders. Probation is also less than adequate because many probation officers have very large caseloads and therefore are not able to provide treatment (Drowns & Hess, 1990). Indeed, juvenile court probation officers have such large caseloads that counseling and supervision usually occurs only in the form of an occasional phone call or limited visit (Trojanowicz, 1987). In essence, the main task of traditional probation is usually documentation of delinquent behavior, rather than activities that might result in positive behavioral change.

Paralleling the lack of corrective involvement and supervision from the juvenile court is the situation in many delinquents' homes. Research suggests that most delinquent youth are not provided with adequate parental or guardian support and supervision, both of which are necessary to assist youth in avoiding delinquent behavior (Baumrind, 1991; Laub & Sampson, 1988; Lerner, Peterson, & Brooks-Gunn, 1991).
The typical juvenile delinquent often not only lacks good supervision at home, but is punished in harsh and critical ways, and has parent(s) who model poor social skills and criminal behaviors (Farrington, 1988). This suggests that most delinquent youth receive from the court little different than what they acquire from their own parent(s). This “familiar position” often perpetuates a cycle of reoffending (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Riley & Shaw, 1985).

The field-based observations of this writer also suggest that parents of youthful offenders often feel helpless and mystified by their children’s behavior. When youth are placed on probation, little opportunity is provided to the parent(s) or guardian(s) to resolve the problems that brought their children to court. Once on probation, systematic family interventions for treatment of first-time adjudicated youth and their parent(s) or guardian(s) are rare. The feelings of helplessness and hopelessness of the caregivers are simply not addressed.

The Michigan Juvenile Code opens with the statement, “All youth coming under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court have the right to be rehabilitated, preferably in their own home or a homelike environment” (Michigan Public Act 54, PA 1944 as amended, 712A.1). This statute, however, does not address what might constitute rehabilitation.

In the past, efforts to rehabilitate youth included removing them from their homes and placing them in an institution that provided treatment. After these youth were “rehabilitated,” they were then returned to the home environment. However, though the youth had presumably learned new skills, the family environment to which
they returned had not changed (Braukmann, Fixsen, Phillips, & Wolf, 1975). The statistics of the 1980s demonstrate the limited benefits of incarceration of youthful offenders (Schwartz, 1989). These limited benefits include little positive effect on recidivism (Whitehead & Lab, 1988), and little success for youth deeply involved in delinquent behavior (Garrett, 1985).

Since delinquent behavior is often understood to be a product of the interaction between individual, familial, and extra-familial forces, the family can be viewed as a component that could either promote or impede change (Barnes & Farrell, 1992). A supportive home environment might help maintain improvement in a youth's behavior. Therefore, the provision of services for youth and their families may prove fruitful in the treatment of adjudicated youth. Additionally, during the evaluative process, field probation officers often discover that both their charges and caregivers lack appropriate social skills.

Social skills refer to “positive skills that are at least minimally acceptable according to societal norms and that are not harmful to others. This excludes exploitative, deceitful, or aggressive ‘skills’ which may be of individual benefit” (Combs & Slaby, 1977, p. 162). Skills that are mutually beneficial to the user and others include the ability to communicate, give and receive negative feedback, negotiate, and problem-solve. Social skills training is the foundation for utilizing a family treatment approach.

Youth who lack these skills may struggle with the ability to successfully direct their lives or function well in the world. This inability, in turn, leads to frustration and
emotional stress. This emotional state can result in further delinquency, as the individual, lacking problem-solving skills and social resources, turns to "solutions" that violate the law (Elliot, Huizinga, & Menard, 1989; Henderson & Hollin, 1986; Hollin, 1990; Huff, 1987; Renwick & Emler, 1991).

One remedy for this "vicious circle" utilized by some juvenile courts is SST. Social skills training is a treatment approach that provides opportunities for youth to learn and experience useful social skills (Leiber & Mawhorr, 1995; Simons, Whitbeck, Conger-Rand, & Conger, 1991). Such training programs have been used extensively as a treatment technique for juvenile offenders (Renwick, 1987), and have been used in conjunction with other procedures with different offender populations (Priestley, McGuire, Flegg, Hemsley, Welham, & Barnett, 1984). These populations include sex offenders (Abel, Blanchard, & Becker, 1976), arsonists (Rice & Chaplin, 1979), chronically aggressive and conduct-disordered youth (Goldstein & Glick, 1994; Hansen, St. Lawrence, & Christoff, 1989), and incarcerated delinquent youth (Shivrattan, 1988).

Although there are many studies researching the effects of social skills training, few have explored the effects of utilizing SST programs that include both youth and their families (Serna, Schumaker, Hazel, & Sheldon, 1986). It seems likely that the behavior of a delinquent youth may be positively enhanced and strengthened by the modeling, reinforcement, and practice of social skills in her or his own family or home environment. Additionally, little research has been conducted on first-time adjudicated youthful offenders and SST. This is unfortunate because effective early
intervention is the best prevention against recidivism (Zigler, Taussing, & Black, 1992).

This dissertation study addresses both of the above dimensions: intervention and prevention. Specifically, this research was designed to determine if SST is a viable treatment approach in changing the behavior of first-time adjudicated youth. This study also investigated the impact of family involvement in SST on the behavior of first-time adjudicated youth. This study compared youth who received no SST with those who received SST together with their parents, and with those who received SST without their parents' participation.

Research Questions

This research examined the effects of SST on two samples: newly-adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation, (a) with, and (b) without parent or guardian participation. The results of each of these approaches were then compared with a convenience sample of newly-adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation who did not receive any SST. This study explores the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference in behavior between newly-adjudicated youth who receive SST without their parents' or guardians' participation and newly-adjudicated youth who do not receive SST, as measured by the Jesness Inventory?

2. Is there a difference in behavior between newly-adjudicated youth who participate with their parents or guardians in SST and those newly-adjudicated youth who do not receive SST, as measured by the Jesness Inventory?
3. Is there a difference in behavior between newly-adjudicated youth who participate with their parent(s) or guardian(s) in SST and those newly-adjudicated youth who receive SST without their parent(s) or guardian(s) participation, as measured by the Jesness Inventory?

4. Is there a difference in behavior between newly-adjudicated youth who receive SST without their parents’ or guardians’ participation and newly-adjudicated youth who do not receive SST, as measured by recidivism and type of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony)?

5. Is there a difference in behavior between newly-adjudicated youth who participate with their parent(s) or guardian(s) in SST and those newly-adjudicated youth who do not receive SST, as measured by recidivism and type of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony)?

6. Is there a difference between newly-adjudicated youth who participate with their parent(s) or guardian(s) in SST and those newly-adjudicated youth who receive SST without their parents’ or guardians’ participation, as measured by recidivism and type of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony)?

Background of the Problem

The concept of juvenile delinquency as a legal concern is only about 100 years old. However, records of legal interdictions for specific behaviors of juveniles extend into ancient history. The oldest set of written laws, the Code of Hammurabi, dating from 2270 BC, shows evidence of Babylonia’s treatment of youth: “If a son strikes his
father, one shall cut off his hand” (cited in Regoli & Hewitt, 1994, p. 26). Although there is scant written record of juvenile delinquency in the Middle Ages, penalties for children are documented in 10th Century English laws. Regoli and Hewitt (1994) note that King Aethelstan (920-939 AD) “proclaimed that ‘any thief over 12-years-old received the punishment of death if he stole more than [12] pence’” (p. 27). Some English settlers in early America viewed their children as cheap laborers (Sharp & Hancock, 1995), and until the late 19th Century, corporal punishment of children was the rule and not the exception (Dorne, 1989).

In the United States, a profound change in the treatment of children occurred in 1899 with the creation of the juvenile court, which separated youth from adult offenders and changed the ideology from a punishment-based emphasis to a treatment-based emphasis (Hurley, 1977). From this foundation, treatment programs were developed for juvenile delinquents. Juvenile delinquency nevertheless continued to occur. By the late 1960s, delinquent activities had reached alarming proportions and many of the activities were serious enough to require official processing (Giller & Rutter, 1984). A public outcry over juvenile crime mounted; pressure was directed at juvenile court judges, prosecutors, and politicians to take new action. “The result was an avalanche of ‘get tough’ policies and practices that were implemented throughout the mid and late 1970s and early 1980s” (Schwartz, 1989, p. 7). These policies again “drove up the population of detention centers and training schools” (Schwartz, 1989, p. 9). Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the juvenile court provided few options for these youngsters; many were institutionalized.
In the 1970s, a movement of reformers began lobbying for deinstitutionalization and the closure of training schools (Schwartz, 1989). During this time, many research studies addressed the practical use of community-based alternatives for juvenile offenders and advocated the need to treat youth in their own homes and communities (Austin, Krisberg, & Joe, 1987; Barton & Butts, 1990; Coates, 1981; Gendreau & Ross, 1987; Greenwood, 1986; Kobrin & Klein, 1983; McCarty, 1987).

In the late 1980s, the pendulum swung back again, as institutions were reevaluated. The movement back to incarceration of delinquent youth has once again steadily gained momentum. Bernard (1992) believes that this cyclical pattern of restraint and then reaction has occurred three times in the past 200 years. The swing toward greater restriction occurs at times when justice officials and the general public are convinced that juvenile crime is at an exceptionally high level, that the current policies worsen the problem, and that changing these policies will reduce juvenile crime (Bernard, 1992). This movement back to institutional care for youthful offenders has been especially evident in Michigan, where sweeping reforms have been made in the area of juvenile delinquency. Laws now exist that sanction 14-year-olds to be tried as adults, require children who are convicted of a specific juvenile offense to be sentenced as adults, and change the criteria for making these determinations (Chase, 1996).

Alternatives (e.g., early prevention and intervention) to this cycle need to be developed. The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995) calls for "strong, immediate, well planned, and decisive action to intervene early
with efforts to prevent younger children from following in the self-destructive footsteps of their older brothers and sisters” (p. 3). The authors of this government document hoped to challenge the nation to develop and provide effective and promising strategies and programs to help balance and restore justice, and to enhance protective factors in a child’s life. Inconsistent disciplinary practices and maltreatment of youth were targeted problems. The provision of SST to youth and their caregivers is one response to this challenge.

Definition of Terms

In this study, a number of terms will be used that are intended to convey specific meanings. These include the following terms, whose definitions are provided.

**Juvenile delinquency:** In Michigan, a juvenile delinquent is a youth under the age of 17 who is referred to the juvenile court for violation of a city, state, or federal law, on whom a legal petition is filed, and who is adjudicated a delinquent and ordered to be made a ward of the juvenile court. Laws with which they are in violation include status, misdemeanor, and/or felony offenses.

**Adjudicate:** This is a judicial determination that a youth has committed the offense for which he or she is accused. The term adjudication can also refer to the process by which the court reaches a decision regarding a case.

**Disposition:** A disposition is the course of action the court decides is needed to rehabilitate a youth. The disposition can include a dismissal of a case, or placement of the youth on probation or in an institution or state correctional facility.
**Status offense:** Status offenses are acts that are regarded illegal if committed by juveniles. These acts include, for example, truancy, curfew violations, incorrigibility, smoking, and running away from home.

**Misdemeanor offense:** Misdemeanor offenses are law violations not included in the definition of a felony, such as shoplifting or simple assault.

**Felony offense:** Felony offenses are law violations that would be punishable by a year or more incarceration in a state prison if the offender was an adult.

**Other offense:** Other offenses do not fall into the felony or misdemeanor category. Instead, they are other acts committed by a juvenile that can result in a court review of the case. Examples of “other acts” are traffic offenses, placement failures, or probation condition infractions and failures to abide by placement conditions.

**Review of order:** A review of order is a review or reevaluation by a judge of prior dispositional orders when the juvenile has not committed a status, misdemeanor, or felony offense, but has committed an “other offense.”

**Social skills:** Social skills are the skills needed for competence in relating with others in such a way as to bring about positive results from the interchange and to be reciprocally favorable to all people involved in the interaction. Examples of these social skills are negotiating and problem-solving.

**Rehabilitation:** Rehabilitation is defined as the return to law-abiding status.

**Recidivism:** Recidivism is defined in this study as a youth’s return to committing delinquent acts.
Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to the present study. One limitation is that the sample was gathered only from a juvenile court located in a mixed urban-rural area of western lower Michigan. Youth were selected from both urban and rural areas and no distinctions are made in the study. Another limitation is that the sample was composed of only young male delinquents between the ages of 13 and 15 who had been adjudicated for the first time and placed on traditional probation. This study did not assess differences by age. Additionally, this study did not assess the impact of gender, socioeconomic status, race or ethnicity, previous treatment, history of abuse or neglect, parent or guardian history of criminal activity, and certain kinds of offenses (crimes against person versus property crimes, or specific offense types as reported in a criminal warrant manual) for which the youth were adjudicated. Prior research suggests that these are all important factors.

In addition, there were two significant sources of extraneous variance: history and maturation. Data collected at the beginning of the SST and data collected after youth complete the SST program could therefore reflect numerous issues and effects other than changes facilitated specifically by the SST.

Another limitation of this study is that the longer-term effects of SST were not examined. Youth were placed on traditional probation for a period of 6 to 9 months; long-term changes after probation was completed were not studied. The effects of SST were observed only while youth are on probation, or at the time of the follow-up
testing at 3 months, which ever came first.

It is also important to note that there is a debate in the literature on the merits of different outcome measures in studies on delinquency. Some suggest that it is more important to assess behavioral changes than recidivism because, they contend, behavioral changes are the best measure of treatment success and failure (Murray & Cox, 1979). Recidivism rates as measures of success may mask other positive results. That is, a single arrest or violation is enough to categorize a juvenile as a recidivist and possible placement failure, which may overshadow other, positive effects of a program (Tate, Reppucci, & Mulvey, 1995). Additionally, recidivism may be a problematic evaluative criterion because it clouds differentiation between short-run and long-run benefits. For example, an intervention that guards society from a youth in the short-run, such as institutional placement, may have long-run negative consequences (Reppucci & Clingempeel, 1978).

If the goals of the juvenile court are to rehabilitate youth, the usefulness of an intervention should be measured on the evidence of its capability to reintegrate youth into worthwhile social roles, not simply to decrease illegal behavior. In keeping with this concept, Murray and Cox (1979) assert that if recidivism is to be a meaningful outcome criterion, it must be viewed on a continuum with variable weight given for different programs with different individuals and with different offenses.

Although this research was not able to take the approach described by Murray and Cox (1979), the need to examine both changes in behavior and recidivism is important. This research study investigated not only behavioral change but differentiated
between the types of offenses committed. There are different issues that need to be addressed in treating a repeat status offender versus a repeat felony offender. In evaluating the effectiveness of a program on offender behavior, a continuum of less serious to more serious (or status versus felony offenses) must be considered.

Significance of the Study

The implementation of SST has been shown to reduce the recidivism rate when conducted with inpatient and incarcerated young offenders (Hains & Hains, 1987; Shivrattan, 1988). To date, very little is known about the effect of SST when implemented in the community with caregivers and their children who are youthful offenders, or about the effects of SST on first-time adjudicated youth. This study provides data on SST effectiveness for this population. It is believed that this investigation will contribute to the development of early intervention services that can reduce recidivism rates and promote social adjustment among juvenile delinquents.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature pertinent to the link between social skills development and juvenile delinquency. To establish a context for this study, the review will begin with a brief history of the juvenile court and a presentation of the rates of delinquency in America. The history will be followed by an overview of the prevailing theories about juvenile delinquency. These theories include: individual trait theories, social structure theories, social reaction theories, feminist theoretical perspectives, and social learning theories. Social learning theory is the most closely associated with social skills training (SST).

Brief History of the Juvenile Court

Over time, the trends in social perceptions of youth have influenced the ways in which offending youth have been treated. A number of historical threads have converged to facilitate the development of the juvenile justice system. These threads, presented below, suggest a growing concern for the well-being of children and the gradual refinement of due process for this population.

In the 15th Century, the Chancery Court system in England first recognized
that youth were a distinct social group with special needs. This court emphasized protection and treatment rather than punishment for juveniles (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

During the 17th Century, and again in the 19th Century, concerns were raised about criminal accountability and the need for separate facilities for juvenile offenders. As efforts to understand, explain, and treat juvenile delinquents became more widely accepted, some child advocates warned about the harmful effects of juveniles' association with adult offenders in prisons and jails. The reformers believed that such contact could train the children for careers in crime (Siegel & Senna, 1994). Eventually, these concerns led to the development of juvenile reform schools in both England and the United States.

Another area of concern for juveniles that affected the development of the juvenile justice system was that of child labor. During the 18th and 19th Centuries, immigration, urbanization, and industrialization had a profound effect on children. As parents and older children worked long hours in factories, younger youth at home were left with little supervision (Bernard, 1992). In time, more children joined the work force, becoming a vital aspect in economic activity. Concerns gradually surfaced about youth and their involvement in the work force. Beginning in the early 19th Century, child labor laws were slowly instituted, and, such as they were, were commonly violated.

The eventual outcry of reformers about these practices helped to educate the public toward a new mindset regarding the place of children in society. This mindset included concerns about youth in urban areas who seemed to be lacking moral training.
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and were involved in numerous delinquent activities. As a result of these concerns, people began to establish programs to address neglected and delinquent youth.

By the 1850s, the foundation was laid for change in juvenile justice (Cox & Conrad, 1996). As the movement to separate youth from adult offenders and an emphasis on treatment became driving forces, the social climate became increasingly favorable for significant change. The first juvenile court was created in 1899 in the state of Illinois. There, the originators envisioned that this special court for children would be less like a court and more like a social welfare agency. Children who were brought to the attention of the juvenile court were to be helped rather than punished. Thus, the court was less concerned about determining guilt or innocence and more focused on identifying the causes of a child's misbehavior and providing individualized treatment (Schwartz, 1989, p. 151).

The system of the juvenile court expanded quickly across the United States. By 1925, juvenile courts had been established in all but two states (Mennel, 1973). The early juvenile court, subject to much scrutiny and criticism, evolved through a number of reforms. One of the more notable adjustments was the initiation of due process. Youth who are petitioned before the juvenile court are now entitled to this basic constitutional right (Jensen & Metsger, 1994).

Federal officials continued to review policies and make provisions for delinquent youth. In 1974, The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was passed (Siegel & Senna, 1994). This federal law instituted an Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) within the Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration (Krisberg, 1995). This office was designed to provide federal funds for the control of juvenile crime and work towards reducing the stigma associated with juvenile delinquency. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention also began developing programs that made the identification and control of chronic, violent offenders a priority (OJJDP, 1989).

The federal government's passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act has had a significant impact on juvenile justice policy. States were required to remove status offenders from jails and detention centers in order to be eligible for this federal funding. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention also began funding innovative and effective programs for delinquent youth (Krisberg, 1995). In addition, OJJDP aided in the establishment of a number of new programs and stimulated many grant applications that targeted the improvement of educational and mental health services for juveniles (Schwartz, 1989). The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention also mandated the right for a juvenile to have a lawyer at every stage of the petition process, provided thoughtful options to incarceration, and motioned to remove status offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction (U.S. Congress, 1977).

Although OJJDP mandates federal regulations and laws for the treatment of juveniles, each state has its own Juvenile Code. This Code dictates the philosophy and treatment of youth in that state. In Michigan, the juvenile court is a division of probate court and, therefore, its proceedings are not considered criminal. The underlying premise of the Juvenile Code in Michigan (1989) is treatment:
This chapter shall be liberally construed to the end that each child coming within the jurisdiction of the court shall receive the care, guidance, and control, preferably in his or her own home, as will be conducive to the child's welfare and the best interest of the state. If a child is removed from the control of his or her parents, the child shall be placed in care as nearly as possible equivalent to the care which should have been given to the child by his or her own parent. (Michigan Juvenile Code: 712A.1 Section [2])

Thus, Michigan Juvenile Code is based on rehabilitation of youth rather than punishment. That is, under this Code, priority is given to provisions that are made to render rehabilitative services.

Definitions of Juvenile Delinquency

Juvenile delinquency is not easily defined. In a broad sense, it could be defined as behaviors exhibited by a juvenile that violate social norms (Haskell & Yablonsky, 1982). However, this definition is too broad. If delinquency were defined according to this perspective, virtually every child in America would be considered a juvenile delinquent. In a narrower sense, “Juvenile delinquency is defined as any action by someone designated a juvenile (non-adult) that would make such a young person subject to action by the juvenile court” (Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1996, p. 2). This definition is also problematic insofar as many youth who commit delinquent acts are not reported or subjected to official juvenile court action. This raises the question: Is every young person who is guilty of such behavior a delinquent, or only those youth who are apprehended and processed? Definitions of delinquency have changed in response to the changing ways society has regarded youth (Regoli & Hewitt, 1994).

Delinquency is not only a legal issue. It must be viewed in light of
psychological and treatment implications as well (Mulvey & Phelps, 1988). Moreover, Barlow and Ferdinand (1992) maintain that delinquency should be conceptualized along a continuum that emphasizes not only occurrence, but also frequency, seriousness, and duration of the offending behavior. From this view, adjudicated delinquent youth tend to have committed more, and more serious, offenses, and those offenses have occurred over a longer period of time.

Delinquency: The Statistical Picture

A number of data sources and measurements are used to assess the prevalence and types of delinquency. These include official records (including police, juvenile court, juvenile corrections, school, and mental health records), and unofficial records (including self-report and victimization surveys) (Bachman, Johnston, & O’Malley, 1995). Each data source has its limitations in presenting an accurate and complete picture of the law-violating activities of youth.

The Uniform Crime Report (UCR) is probably the most extensively used official record providing information on the arrests of youth in the United States (Reaves, 1993). Approximately 97% of police agencies submit crime data to the UCR (Regoli & Hewitt, 1994). However, because these figures obtained are arrest rates, they do not show a true measure of juvenile crime. It is estimated that only 37% of all crimes are reported and of that only about 21% result in arrest (Flanagan & Maguire, 1992). Underreporting to the UCR results in an underestimate of crimes committed by youth (Flanagan & Maguire, 1992). Additionally, the UCR may reflect as much about police
behavior as it does youth crime. Walker (1992) cautions that police have much discretion in deciding how a crime should be recorded and that crime reports can be misplaced or lost, either accidentally or deliberately.

Of the unofficial records of crime, the most famous and much relied upon record is the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) (Wells & Rankin, 1995). The NCVS was intended to measure victimization in the United States. Interviews with crime victims are designed to uncover information on household and personal crime. The important use of the NCVS is to verify the notion that many crimes are not reported and to uncover the reasons why victims do not report crime (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1994). However, these unofficial records, too, can be misleading. For example, self-report measures are known to be susceptible to respondents' memories, distortions, misunderstandings, and lies (Huizinga & Elliott, 1987). Youth may also exaggerate the criminal activities in which they have been involved.

Nevertheless, Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weiss (1981) conclude that official and unofficial measures of delinquency are reliable and valid. They further suggest that the data produced by unofficial measures can be used with as much, if not more, confidence as official data. This statement is supported by a number of studies that found a high correlation between what juveniles report and what official records indicate (Blackmore, 1974; Erickson & Empey, 1963). Who, then, is delinquent and how delinquent are they? In February 1997, the US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention published the Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1996 Update on Violence, which is based on the Uniform Crime Report.
According to this report, law enforcement agencies arrested 2.7 million persons under the age of 18 in 1996. This number represents only 17% of all people arrested across ages, and only 6% of the population of youth (people under age 18) in the United States. Of the 2.7 million youth arrested, 6% were arrested for violent crimes, 50% were under the age of 16, 50% were White, and 1 in 7 was a female. Of the total number of crimes reported in the United States, juveniles account for a much larger proportion of property crimes (33%) than violent crimes (14%) or drug arrests (13%) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995). Minority group members are overrepresented: Blacks accounted for 13% of the total juvenile population in 1993, but were charged with 27% of all property crimes committed by juveniles and 50% of the violent crime arrests of juveniles (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995).

The typical juvenile offender, as described by the United States Department of Justice's Juvenile Arrests 1995 (Snyder, 1997) was male. Black and Hispanic youth are overrepresented. Arrested youth are likely to be economically disadvantaged, and are likely to exhibit behavioral problems both in school and on the job. Arrested youth often come from one-parent families or families with inordinate amounts of conflict, instability, and inadequate supervision.

With regard to recidivism, Kelly (1983) conducted a study that investigated the differences between status offenders and youth who committed misdemeanors and felony offenses. Kelly found that 44% of felony offenders, 40.8% of misdemeanor offenders, and 41.4% of status offenders recidivated. One significant difference among the groups studied was that the status offenders became less of a problem over
time than did youth in the other two categories.

The Juvenile Justice Process

In the United States, youth enter the juvenile justice system in a number of ways. Most often, a referral is sent to the juvenile court by police officers reporting delinquent activity (Krisberg & Austin, 1978). Occasionally, schools will submit a referral to the juvenile court reporting a truant youth. The juvenile court itself can deem a child incorrigible as a result of a parent's initial complaint, which has been followed by an official, albeit informal, investigation (Kent County Annual Report, 1996).

Most referrals to the juvenile court are submitted to the prosecutor who decides whether the court has sufficient evidence to process the case. If so, the referral is then sent to an intake department, which is responsible for reviewing each referral sent by the prosecutor. The intake process is designed to screen out cases that will not require a formal court hearing (Atkins & Pogrebin, 1978). The intake department then issues a summons to the youth and his or her parent(s) or guardian(s) requiring them to meet with an intake worker.

At this meeting, the intake worker can process the case either formally or informally. The decision to process a case formally or informally is based on a number of variables including the severity of the offense, social and background issues, school-related issues, family issues, the behavior of the youth in the meeting, and community concerns (Cox & Conrad, 1996). A formal processing of the case will lead to a formal
hearing at the juvenile court. An informal processing of the case will result in the intake department handling the referral in some other way than through a formal procedure (Cohen & Kluegel, 1979).

In the juvenile court used in this study (the Kent County Juvenile Court of Kent County, Michigan) a decision to handle a case in a unofficial manner provides a number of options. The intake department actively seeks to "adjust" particular cases that might best be handled informally outside the court system. Although not limited to the following options, the court can informally process a case by: (a) lecturing the youth about his or her behavior, warning that any further violations of the law can result in the juvenile court's formal involvement, and then releasing the offender from further court demands; (b) requiring the youth to participate in counseling to rectify issues that have brought her or him to court; (c) directing the youth to complete a number of demands that may include, for example, a letter of apology, restitution to the victim, or community service; or (d) placing the youth on the "consent calendar" (an informal probation program designed to supervise youth on an unofficial basis, typically for about a 3 month period) (Kent County Annual Report, 1995).

If the intake procedure results in a decision to process the case in a formal court hearing, a petition is filed to that effect. In Kent County, the cases that result in a formal hearing are those in which the intake workers have concluded that there is sufficient evidence against a child, and the charge is serious enough to warrant juvenile court adjudication (Kent County Annual Report, 1996). The intake worker will inform the youth and his or her parent(s) or guardian(s) about the events that will then
occur in the formal processing.

This formal process will include assignment and transfer of the case to a field probation officer. The field probation officer will be responsible for generating a field investigative report based on the type of offense and social background of the offender. The field probation officer will also be responsible for authorizing a petition on the referral that will start the constitutional due process afforded each youth. Social background investigations, and psychological, medical, or other evaluative information may be pursued in an effort to understand the youth and her or his special needs (Cox & Conrad, 1996). Once a youth has been adjudicated either a delinquent or status offender, a disposition hearing is held to decide what rehabilitative services should be set in place to provide opportunities to help the youth change his or her negative behaviors. Dispositional orders can include: (a) dismissing the case, (b) probation, (c) institutional placement, or (d) placement in a state correctional institution.

Theories of Delinquency

The choices of treatment offered reflects an underlying theoretical perspective on delinquency. There are many theories regarding the causes of juvenile delinquency that span across disciplines. These theoretical paradigms can be categorized as: (a) individual trait theories, (b) social structure theories, (c) social reaction theories, (d) feminist theories, and (e) social learning theory. A brief summary of each is provided below. Special attention is given to social learning theory (Williams & McShane, 1988), since this is the theoretical perspective adopted for this investigation.
**Individual Trait Theories**

The individual trait theories focus on the individual's mental and behavioral processes. Among the theories that focus on the relationship between juvenile delinquency and individual characteristics, three broad views can be identified: (1) choice theory, (2) biosocial theory, and (3) psychological theory.

**Choice Theory**

Choice theory has origins in the 18th Century classical school of political philosophy. Beccaria and Bentham were early proponents of this theory, which is based on the axiomatic assumption that humans are essentially rational but hedonistic actors who freely choose to obey or disobey the law (Bohm, 1997). The basis for decisions is hedonistic in that humans are expected to think about how much pain versus how much pleasure an act will produce (Beccaria, 1977). Thus, crime prevention was, and for some still is, viewed as a relatively simple matter: To deter crime, governments just have to convince people that punishment will be swift, certain, and severe (Cornish & Clarke, 1986; Geis, 1955).

Yet, some youth do continue to engage in criminal activity even after suffering punishment. Moreover, what is rational to an adult may not be what is rational to a child. Choice theory has been adapted to accommodate these realities. Delinquents may be viewed as “sick” and as influenced by extenuating circumstances to violate the law (Taylor, Walton, & Young, 1974). This neoclassical compromise can be seen in
the parens patriae philosophy of the juvenile justice system, in which the state acts on behalf of youth to provide care and protection as a parent would be expected to. The neoclassical concept of rehabilitating youth has been the impetus behind continued efforts to diminish punishment for youth in the 20th Century (Siegel & Senna, 1994).

**Biosocial Theory**

Positivist thought holds that the universe is essentially orderly and knowable, regulated by certain patterns, principles, or laws that can be discovered. Knowledge of these patterns is obtained through scientific study and the purpose of knowledge is to be able to predict and control (Comte, 1974). Similarly, human beings can be understood by removing them from their environments and studying their behavior by scientific methods (Vold & Bernard, 1986).

From this perspective, human behavior is viewed as the result of often uncontrollable (albeit knowable) forces. Cesare Lombroso (1968) suggested that criminals are born as such, with distinct physical anomalies that are physiologically similar to primitive, less orderly ancestors. In contrast, Raffaele Garofalo (1885, 1914) and Enrico Ferri (1881, 1917) contended that delinquency could not be predicted merely on the basis of physical attributes and social factors.

Eugenics emerged out of the positivist perspective. Charles Goring (1972) conceptualized delinquent youth as having “defective intelligence,” which was inherited and should be controlled. Goring postulated that to reduce delinquency, society must prevent certain types of people from breeding, such as those that appeared to be
Critics of positivism argued that the perspective ignored the influence of cultural context and social structure, reducing complex social and political issues to the level of the individual. Also, the work of early positivists was often criticized for unsound methodology and lack of control group comparisons (Siegel & Senna, 1994). However, modern biosocial and psychological theories had their roots in 19th Century positivism (Bohm, 1997). Biosocial and psychological theories pose that criminal behavior is a result of predisposition's and factors based on mental and physical properties and traits (Vold & Bernard, 1986).

Modern biosocial theory takes as axiomatic the concept that environment and genetics coalesce to create individual human patterns (Fishbein, 1990). The three major areas of research in biosocial theory are: (1) biochemical reaction, (2) neurological dysfunction, and (3) genetic influences (Siegel & Senna, 1994). Briefly, those interested in biochemical reaction view body chemistry, influenced by diet, as governing behavior and personality. Scholenthaler (1987) proposed that the regulation of diet produced a significant reduction in disciplinary actions in an institution. Scholenthaler and Doraz (1983) found that regulating diet reduced the number of assaults, thefts, fights, and acts of disobedience by about 45%.

Studies based on neurological dysfunction and brain chemistry have linked aggressive behavior to chemical imbalances (Fishbein, Lozovsky, & Jaffe, 1989). Additionally, minimal brain dysfunctions were linked to lifestyle and social maladjustments. A number of death row studies found that there was a high rate of occurrence
of childhood head injuries in this population (Lewis, Pincus, Fledman, Jackson, & Bard, 1986). Other neurological studies of habitually aggressive youth have found abnormal EEG patterns in delinquent youth to be five times greater than in the general population (Monroe, 1978). Still other studies have shown that arrested and incarcerated youth have significantly higher learning disability and attention deficit disorder rates (Johnson & Pelham, 1987; Pasternak & Lyon, 1982; Williams, 1969; Zimmerman, Rich, Keilitz, & Broder, 1981).

Genetic studies have searched for a link between delinquency, crime, and physiology. For example, the discovery of 47 XYY chromosomes on Richard Speck (Sandberg, Koeph, Ishiara, & Hauschka, 1961) triggered a host of inconclusive studies on chromosomal deviations in criminals (Sarbin & Miller, 1970). Another example of research targeting genetic bases for criminal behavior is the comparison of adopted children's behavior with that of their biological and adoptive parents' behavior (Hutchings & Mednick, 1977). Hutchings and Mednick (1977) found that where both the adoptive and biological father had criminal records, 36% of their sons were criminals. They also found that when only the biological father had a criminal record, 22% of the sons were criminals; however, when the adoptive father had a criminal record, 12% of the sons were criminals. This research also reported that when neither of the fathers (adoptive or biological) were criminal, only 10% of the sons were criminals.

Thus, in biosocial theory, crime is considered in light of such biological factors as: (a) vitamin deficiencies, (b) diet or other food allergies, (c) hormone or chemical imbalances, or (d) predispositions inherited from parents. The strength of this theory
is in its ability to show how the environment and personal characteristics interact to bring about certain behaviors. Biosocial theorists contend that biological traits must be considered just as thoroughly as social environmental issues. Biosocial theories are important when attempting to explain and understand such crimes as irrational violence.

**Psychological Theory**

Psychological theory generally views criminal behavior as the result of mental and/or emotional disorders. Three major psychological perspectives on delinquency are psychodynamic, behavioral, and cognitive.

The psychodynamic perspective originated from Freud's psychoanalytic theory, which differentiated personality into the id, the ego, and the superego, and saw personality as shaped through a series of life stages. Any trauma during a particular stage was considered to affect the emerging personality; therefore, early trauma is responsible for later delinquency (Freud, 1925). Post-Freudian psychodynamically-informed theory emphasizes the influence of family life and especially parents on the later delinquent's intrapsychic structures (Sommerville, 1990).

Behavioral perspectives propose that behavior is learned from observing and experiencing others' reactions. A particular behavior is triggered by a stimulus; this behavior may be reinforced and therefore perpetuated or strengthened, or may be either punished or not reinforced and therefore weakened or extinguished (Skinner, 1953; Watson & Rayner, 1920). From this view, youth will engage in delinquent
activities because they are more rewarding, or because they have not been sufficiently punished.

Cognitive theory, focusing on mental processes, asserts that personality is shaped largely by experience that is internally adjusted via mental activities. People do not passively assimilate their environmental conditions (Bandura, 1977; Rotter, Chance, & Phares, 1972). How they perceive and mentally represent the world determines how youth will process information; they try to maximize their outcomes based on personal beliefs (Lochman, 1987).

Psychological theories are useful in that they provide an explanation for the onset of delinquent behavior and crime. These theories help explain the part others (including family) play in the crime process. These theories also provide understanding of how behavior changes as people mature and develop.

Social Structure Theories

Individual trait theories tend to minimize the influence of broad social forces; in contrast, social structure theories emphasize that dimension. Social structure theorists argue that the way societies transmit values and norms is through social institutions such as class, church, family, school, and economy (Auletta, 1982; Lewis, 1966). Regarding juvenile delinquency, this theory focuses less on why a youth turns to criminal activity and more on why certain “ecological” areas experience high delinquency rates.

Two examples of social structure theory are social disorganization theory and
strain theory. Briefly, social disorganization theory maintains that delinquency is a byproduct of economic and social inequalities. According to Durkheim, when social structures (such as family, economic conditions, and cultural values) break down, "anomie" or "normlessness" results (Williams & McShane, 1988). When people, especially youth, are in a state of anomie they no longer internalize or act on social norms and this makes crime much more likely.

Although the empirical research on social structure theory is inconclusive, it has exerted a strong influence on public policy. The 1960s delinquency prevention policies endorsed by Robert Kennedy, for example, were grounded in this approach, and focused on refurbishing deteriorated neighborhoods and the creating of educational and employment opportunities.

Social disorganization theory is exemplified in the work of Shaw and McKay (1972), who collected data on infant mortality, juvenile delinquency, high school dropout rates, and other social variables in Chicago during the 1930s. In mapping the prevalence of those social conditions, they found a phenomenon, called "zones of transition," in which a population group moved in and then out when they became financially able. The flux in these areas and also the heterogeneity of the populations seemed to correlate with rates of delinquency (Bursik & Grasmick, 1992). Shaw and McKay (1972) viewed delinquency as a normal adaptation to an extremely disorganized environment.

Relatedly, Blau (1964) explored the widening gap in income between the rich and the poor. Blau's theory of relative deprivation suggests that where these two
socioeconomic classes live in close proximity, the contrast increases frustration in the poor, which leads to higher rates of juvenile delinquency and crime. A number of research studies support this finding that the best variable in predicting crime rate is the closeness of rich to poor (Ebbe, 1989; Sampson & Groves, 1989; Suttles, 1972).

Strain theory, another social structure theory, asserts that when conventional means of obtaining success are blocked, the resulting frustration and anger may lead to delinquency. For example, Clowards and Ohlin (1960) examined the opportunities available in different neighborhoods. They found an uneven distribution of legitimate and illegitimate means available to achieve personal goals.

Cultural goals of success are proposed for all members of society, but not all groups have equal access to the means for their attainment. This dysfunction between cultural prescriptions and access to desired goals can create an acute sense of strain on the individual level. (Farnworth & Leiber, 1989, p. 264)

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) further found that low-income neighborhoods provided individuals with opportunities to connect with organized crime. These researchers posit that low income neighborhoods put youth directly at risk for initiation into a gang lifestyle.

In essence, social structure theories suggest that competition for success produces conflict and crime. These theories propose that social circumstances and not personality are key components in understanding crime. These social structure theories stress how the conditions and conflicts of lower class culture drive people into crime. Social structure theories also show how illegal activities are structured in society and why certain people become entangled in only certain types of crimes.
Social Reaction Theory

Social reaction theory examines how economic and social institutions bring about delinquent behavior, and how the legal system influences delinquency (Matza, 1974). It is less concerned with the specific acts of delinquency, and more concerned with the public/social responses to those acts. There are two branches of social reaction theory: (1) conflict and (2) labeling theory. Conflict theory explores how laws and justice are differentially applied to people; labeling theory looks at the effects of negative labeling by the justice system.

Conflict theory assumes that crime and delinquency are created by class conflict, and that, more specifically, criminal law benefits those already in power (Quinney, 1977). Arising in the 1960s and 1970s, an era characterized by the questioning of justice and social institutions, conflict theory maintains that the aim of those in power is to retain their power, and that this can occur because their activities are not susceptible to punishment. Youthful crime is the result of the rebellion against boundaries placed on those with less power by those with more (Krisberg & Austin, 1978).

Labeling theory is concerned with the effect of the juvenile justice system's response to delinquent acts. This view holds that the extent to which a youth is viewed as criminal is the result of being labeled by authorities. The prominence of the label, the type and asperity of its usage, the extent and severity of negative feedback received from others, and the confirmation of the label from others in the youth's life
will affect the likelihood of future criminal activity (Paternoster & Iovanni, 1989; Ray & Downs, 1986). Negative labels are considered to produce a self-fulfilling prophecy, as a new identity is fostered in the individual.

These theories seek to understand and explain the role of social control agents and how they contribute to the subsistence of deviant behavior. Social reaction theories also consider class differences and their influence on behavior and delinquency rates.

Feminist Theories

The prevalent theories of delinquency have tended to be male-oriented, insofar as they have aimed to explain the behavior of male juvenile offenders and to have research based on samples of male subjects (Daley & Chesney-Lind, 1988). It cannot be assumed that these theories also apply to female juvenile delinquency (Smith & Paternoster, 1987).

In 1994, the arrest ratio of male to female juveniles was 7.2 to 1 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1995b). “Gender differences in crime suggest that crime may not be so normal after all. Such differences challenge us to see that in the lives of women, men have a great deal more to learn” (Daley & Chesney-Lind, 1988, p. 527).

The feminist approach to understanding delinquency is based on the assumption that gender is a social construct: one is born male or female, but becomes a man or a woman. Knowledge is gendered as well, and gender must be considered in the understanding of crime (Daley & Chesney-Lind, 1988). Messerschmidt, for example,
in *Masculinity and Crime* (1993), proposes that for boys, crime can be a source in the construction of masculinity, and therefore, the development of masculinity is central to the study of criminology. In an effort to understand female delinquency issues and why the crime rate is rising, three prominent types of feminist theory will be discussed: (1) liberal (or opportunity), (2) socialist, and (3) radical.

According to liberal theories, crime rates and gender differences can be explained by examining the social and economic standards that exist in the United States. These theories contend that the changes in social roles have affected female delinquency and crime rates (Simon, 1976). They maintain that as the economic and social gaps between males and females diminish, male and female delinquency rates will become more evenly distributed. Although this theory could account for why female delinquency rates have risen faster than male delinquency rates, the data do not support this perspective. Much of the discussion concerning the data and the increase in female delinquency can be explained by changes in policy. According to Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1980), the rise can be accounted for as a result of the "get tough" policies on crimes such as drunk driving and as a result of policy weakness as in mandatory sentencing.

Socialist theory presents the assumption that girls are socialized to be more dependent than boys. According to this theory, girls who lack affection and love in their families will seek alternative ways of procuring love and affection in the streets (Konopka, 1966). This theory can illuminate why females are more likely than males to engage in the status offense of running away. However, this view does not account
for the rise in misdemeanor and felony offenses committed by females.

Radical theory contends that female delinquency is the outcome of repressive and oppressive circumstances that females endure (Simpson, 1989). These circumstances include physical domination, exploitation, and sexual abuse by male authority figures. According to this view, capitalism favors male domination; the logical outcome of this oppression and abuse of females is female delinquency (Daley & Chesney-Lind, 1988).

Social Learning Theory

The research for this study is rooted in social learning theory, which proposes that learning, social experiences, values, and expectations combine to determine behavior (Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory has its origins in the work of Thomas and Mead, early symbolic interactionists, who viewed the self as a social construct (Williams & McShane, 1988). Mead asserted that people create and recreate themselves in a dynamic, never-ending process out of their interactional experiences with others.

From this view, and supported by research, the primary socialization influence is the family. Hence, family relationships are critical in the formation of delinquent behavior (Mead, 1934). Mead (1934) maintained that a delinquent is defined as someone whose personality and behavior is shaped by social relationships that are different from those of traditional society. Family conflict, absent or separated/divorced parents, and a paucity of love and support contribute to delinquency (Akers, 1985).
Peer group relations and other social interactions also contribute (Burgess & Akers, 1966).

According to the early work by Mead (1934), socialization occurs on both macro- and micro-levels. The macro-level is the social group with the power to provide definitions of who people are. At the micro-level, the definitions provided become constructs of the self. This is Mead's concept of the "looking glass self" (Mead, 1934). For example, as a youth is defined as a juvenile delinquent, he or she will create a self as juvenile delinquent. Similarly, Thomas asserts that if a situation is defined as real it becomes real in its consequences (Williams & McShane, 1988).

Social learning theory is concerned with how youth learn attitudes, morals, skills, and behavior, including delinquency, from others. It postulates that just as positive behaviors are learned, so are negative behaviors.

In the 1930s, the famous criminologist, Edwin Sutherland, examined the process of becoming a criminal. His groundbreaking work, presented in his book, Principles of Criminology (1939), set forth the basic premises of differential association theory. First, Sutherland (1939) assumed that behavior is not inherited, but is learned, most especially in "intimate groups." Second, he posited that learning occurs from communication and interaction with others, and that learning to be delinquent follows the same process. How the delinquent's familiar groups define behavior must be considered in understanding the development of delinquency: where favorable connotations of criminal behavior outweigh negative definitions, youth will learn to become delinquent (Sutherland, 1939).
Burgess and Akers (1966) added to Sutherland's theory with an elaboration of the influence of behavioral principles on delinquency. Their differential reinforcement theory attends to rewards and punishments, which will define whether behavior is viewed as good or bad to an individual. Although research supports the relationship between criminal behavior and reward and punishment, Akers and others have struggled with defining what is "rewarding."

Social learning theories link sociological and psychological factors in an effort to understand criminal behavior. Why do some people who are exposed to antisocial conduct learn to commit crime, while others similarly exposed do not? One of the implications in social learning theories is that youth who grow up in homes where criminal and delinquent behaviors are the norm may learn to believe that this behavior is acceptable. The contention is that some youth are more likely to follow what parents do and not what they say. Bandura maintains that this pattern is a result of disrupted dependency relations with parents (Bandura & Walters, 1959).

Summary Discussion of Theories

Why people behave as they do and the role of society in shaping behavior are questions that beg answers, as these theories have major implications on policy and treatment. One's theoretical perspective will point to who or what to blame and who or what requires treatment. Logic suggests that not all these theories can be correct, since many of them contradict each other. Different perspectives demonstrate that it is possible to look at the world and construe similar facts and data in different ways.
Social Skills Training for Juvenile Offenders

Social skills are conceptualized as learned behaviors with those learned behaviors occurring primarily within intimate groups. Bulkeley and Cramer (1990) define SST as "the application of certain specific techniques to produce development in defined areas of social functioning" (p. 451). How social skills are defined will shape the goals of training programs. Some definitions are derived from the positive or negative consequences or particular behaviors (Golden, Twentyman, Jensen, Karan, & Kloss, 1990); others are situation-specific (Combs & Slaby, 1977).

If youth are deficient in the prosocial skills necessary for positive movement toward their hopes and goals, they have a greater propensity to turn to delinquency (Renwick & Elmer, 1991). For example, if a youth is disruptive, rude, and unable to accept negative feedback appropriately, his or her ability to be successful in school is jeopardized. A number of researchers maintain that success in life is closely tied with success in school (Siegel & Senna, 1994). Youth who are unsuccessful in school have a greater propensity to move into delinquent behavior and become involved with the juvenile court (Hawkins, Catalano, Morrison, O'Donnell, Abbot & Day, 1992; Wolford & Koebel, 1995). Other research supports the use of SST with youthful offenders (Abel et al., 1976; Guerra & Slaby, 1990; Hawkins, Catalano, & Weiss, 1986; Rice & Chaplin, 1979).

Positive social skills are needed for mutually beneficial interactions with others. The lack of positive social skills may lead to problems in interpersonal
relationships. Social skills training has been established as an effective treatment for adult offenders (Alexander & Parsons, 1973). Social skills training is used for children and adolescents, who must learn to interact positively with a multitude of people, including peers, teachers, parents, and even police (Guerra & Slaby, 1990). Social skills training has been used for enhancing the lives of those with mental retardation (Matson, 1980), and for treating drug abuse (Hawkins et al., 1986) and depression (Sanchez & Lewinsohn, 1980). Social skills training has been shown to reduce aggression (Guerra & Slaby, 1990), and for treating sex offenders (Abel et al., 1976) and arsonists (Rice & Chaplin, 1979).

If social skills are not taught early in life, youth may later suffer from serious adjustment problems (Combs & Slaby, 1977). The lack of social skills has been shown to correlate with many problems, including: delinquency (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960; Erickson, 1959; Roff, Sells, & Golden, 1972); dropping out of school (Ullman, 1957); problem-solving ability and peer popularity (Oden, 1980); school adjustment (Gronlund & Anderson, 1963); and impulse control, aggression, and antisocial behavior (Elder, Edelstein, & Narick, 1979; Goldstein, Sprafkin, Gershaw, & Klein, 1980; Jones & Offord, 1989; Kazdin, 1987; Patterson, 1982). Additionally, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) hypothesized that adolescents deficient in social skills and social supports will join together in groups to cope with failure. Strain (1981) reported that inadequate social skills, left ignored, become more debilitating over time. Deficient social skills have been identified as the single most significant predictor of adjustment problems in adulthood (Roff, 1961).
A study by Roedell, Slaby, and Robinson (1977) showed that social skills are learned in three ways: (1) from adult direction, teaching, and reinforcement; (2) from watching others' social behaviors and their consequences; and (3) from experiencing connection with others and collaborative efforts to work through social situations. Other studies have demonstrated that youth can learn new behaviors from observation alone, and that modeling procedures can be effectively used to eliminate various patterns of avoidance (Bandura, 1969). Peer group interaction in a directed, supportive setting decreases the chances that a youth will be avoidant and thus can help to overcome social fears (O'Conner, 1969).

Keller and Carlson (1974) assessed the use of video tape training in developing prosocial skills. Although they found face-to-face modeling to be a better indicator of social skills retention, their work encouraged further study in the use of video tapes. In 1981, Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman, and Sheldon (1995) developed a multiskills video training program (A Social Skills Program for Adolescents, ASSET), in order to teach social skills to delinquent youth. The resulting consumer satisfaction reports were mixed, however, recidivism rates were lower for the trained youth than for the untrained youth (Serna, Schumaker, Hazel, & Sheldon, 1986).

In summary, the improvement of social skills among delinquent youth is of increasing concern. Research in the area of SST for delinquent youth has shown this intervention to be useful in changing offenders' behaviors. Unfortunately, most of this research has been conducted on youth in institutional settings. Research on the effects of SST with first-time adjudicated youth in a community-based setting (youth who are
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treated in their own home and environment) is nonexistent.

Families and Delinquency

Theories and research on families and delinquency span many disciplines, including sociology, criminology, psychology, and psychiatry. More than 45 years ago, Glueck and Glueck (1960) initiated a longitudinal research study to identify the causes of juvenile delinquency and adult criminality. This 15 year study was designed to assess the overall efficacy of rehabilitation programs in changing criminal patterns. The data from one of their studies indicated that the parent-youth relationship influences delinquent behaviors (Glueck & Glueck, 1951). Although criticized for their methodology (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967; Reiss, 1951), their work challenged many in the field of juvenile corrections to explore the family’s contribution to the development of juvenile delinquency.

Although the studies are numerous, the data reported in much of the research are inadequate and inconclusive (Wells & Rankin, 1991). Nevertheless, the literature yields a number insights into delinquency and family relationships. “Violence breeds violence,” said Curtis (1963, p. 386), suggesting that abused and neglected children would be likely to become criminals in the future. Widom (1989) established that neglected and abused subjects had a higher rate of arrests for violent offenses.

The research associated with attachment theory does suggest an intergenerational transmission of certain patterns of behavior, including aggression, noncooperation, and social isolation (Hirschi, 1969). Some attachment studies have been able to
predict, before birth, a child's later attachment style. A maladaptive attachment style can be linked to the mother's history with her own family (Farrington, Gundry & West, 1985; Fontana, 1974; Gelles & Cornell, 1990). Other research has shown that antisocial and socially aggressive behaviors are developed at home and are not "outgrown" with maturity (Eron, Walder, & Lefkowitz, 1971). Based on an extensive literature review, Gelles (1980) noted that one of the consistent conclusions of domestic violence research is that individuals who have experienced violent and abusive childhoods are more likely to grow up and become child and spouse abusers than individuals who have experienced little or no violence in their childhood (p. 878).

Robin (1966) followed 524 clinic-referred antisocial children for 25 years. Seventy-one percent of these children were later arrested as adults, and their children exhibited similar rates of antisocial behavior.

In a study on "broken homes" (defined as having only one or no biological parent in the home), Wells and Rankin (1991) explored the influence of family on juvenile delinquency. They concluded that the incidence of delinquency is 10 to 15% higher in broken homes than in intact homes. Wells and Rankin (1991) also found that the correlation between broken homes and delinquency is strongest for minor offenses (status offenses) rather than for more serious types of criminal behavior, such as larceny and crimes against persons.

It must be noted that some researchers challenge these studies. Garbarino and Gilliam (1980), contend that the results of research relating child abuse and neglect to delinquency must be viewed with caution because what the researchers claim to
measure may not be what is indeed measured. They propose that other factors could color the results of such studies. These researchers wonder if child abuse and neglect cause a youth to become delinquent, or do youth become delinquent because they lack other social supports that could help them survive the trauma of abuse and neglect?

In any case, the effectiveness of family therapy and treatment programs that include both youth and their parents has been established. Positive research results in these areas include communication training (Alexander & Parsons, 1973), negotiation skills (Weathers & Liberman, 1975), and problem-solving and negotiation skills (Robin, 1981; Robin, Kent, O'Leary, Foster, & Prinz, 1977). All of these treatment efforts promoted a number of improvements, including more supportive and less destructive communication patterns (Alexander & Parsons, 1973) and more effective use of negotiation skills under problem conditions in client homes (Robin, 1981; Robin et al., 1977).

In conclusion, the literature cited in this section supports the need for this study. Because social skills can be learned and have been shown to be effective in positive behavior change in a number of populations, this study focused on teaching social skills to first-time adjudicated youth. Further, this study was supported by the literature on the impact of family on children's behavior. Thus, the study compared a sample of youth who received SST with their parent(s) or guardian(s) with youth whose caregivers did not receive SST.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research investigated the effect of social skills training (SST) on first-time adjudicated youth from two samples: first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation, with and without parent or guardian participation. The results of each of these approaches were then compared with a convenience sample of first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation who have not received any SST. The framework presented in this chapter includes the design, sample, procedure, instrumentation, hypotheses, and the statistical analyses that apply.

Design and Variables

The design for this study was the three-group pretest, posttest 1, posttest 2 design for change experiments (Ary, Jacobs & Ravick, 1972). The independent variables (as depicted in Table 1) are SST for youth alone and SST with youth and their parents or guardians. The dependent variables were: (a) the self-reported behavior changes as measured by the Jesness Inventory (JI) Personality and scales and subscales scores, and (b) posttreatment offense type and number (ON).

The study consisted of three sample groups. One group was the control group of youth ordered into traditional probation and testing. The two treatment groups
Table 1
Three-Group Pretest, Posttest 1, and Posttest 2 Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Posttest 1</th>
<th>Posttest 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 1</td>
<td>JI/ON</td>
<td>Social skills with parent(s) or guardian(s)</td>
<td>JION2</td>
<td>JI/ON3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group 2</td>
<td>JI/ON</td>
<td>Social skills without parents or guardian(s)</td>
<td>JI/ON2</td>
<td>JI/ON3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group 3</td>
<td>JI/ON</td>
<td>No treatment</td>
<td>JI/ON2</td>
<td>JI/ON3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

involved youth who were ordered and placed on traditional probation and also received SST and testing but under two conditions: (1) with parent(s) or guardian(s), and (2) without parent(s) or guardian(s). Each group was assessed three times: (1) pretest, (2) posttest 1, and (3) posttest 2.

Sample

The original research sample was composed of 60 males, ages 13 through 15, selected from the population of first-time adjudicated youth at the Kent County Juvenile Court. Since youth were court-ordered into treatment, it was originally expected that dropout rates would be limited. Unfortunately, dropout rates were a concern and will be discussed in the section concerning sample mortality.

Of the 60 youth referred and placed in the research study, only 46 completed
the treatment and testing. Of these 46 youth, 8 (17.4%) were 13 years of age, 18
(39.1%) were 14 years of age, and 20 (43.5%) were 15 years of age. Of the 46 youth
who completed this research study, 29 (63%) were African American, 13 (28.3%)
were White, and 4 (8.7%) were Hispanic.

Of the 46 youth who completed the research study, 16 youth were placed in
Group I (youth who received SST with parents or guardians). Of these youth, 3
(19%) were 13-years-old, 7 (44%) were 14-years-old, and 6 (37%) were 15-years-
old. Sixteen youth were placed in Group II (youth who received SST without parents
or guardians). Of these youth, 3 (19%) were 13 years of age, 6 (37%) were 14 years
of age, and 7 (44%) were 15 years of age. The last group, Group III (the control
group of youth who did not receive SST), contained 14 youth. Of these youth, 2
(14%) were 13-years-old, 5 (36%) were 14-years-old, and 7 (50%) were 15-years-
old.

The breakdown according to race was as follows: The 16 youth in Group I
(youth who received SST with parents or guardians) were comprised of 8 (50%)
African Americans, 6 (37%) Whites, and 2 (13%) Hispanics. The 16 youth in Group
II (youth who received SST without parents or guardians) consisted of 11 (69%)
African Americans, 4 (25%) Whites, and 1 (6%) Hispanic. The 14 youth in Group III
(youth who did not receive SST) contained 10 (71%) African Americans, 3 (21%)
Whites, and 1 (7%) Hispanic.

Although only 46 youth completed the study, the original groups were each
composed of 20 adolescent males, for a total sample of 60. Each group was selected
in clusters of 10, as described below, so that SST "pods" (classes) could be formed that were a manageable size (10 participants in each). Thus, the sample was divided into six "pods" of 10 members each, with two pods in the Control Group, two pods in the SST Without Parents Group, and two pods in the SST With Parents Group.

Due to scheduling docket conflicts and adjudication hearing time constraints, it was necessary to select the sample of youth as they were organized at the Kent County Juvenile Court's Intake Department. The assignment of youth to one of the three groups was conducted in the order that the referrals were received at the Intake Department. The first set of 10 youth (Pod 1) were assigned to the SST With Parents group. The next 10 youth (Pod 2) were assigned to the SST Without Parents group. The third set of 10 youth (Pod 3) were assigned to the Control group. This cycle of selection was then repeated for the second set of pods (the fourth set of 10 youth were assigned to the SST With Parents group; the fifth set of 10 youth were assigned to the SST Without Parents group; and the sixth set of 10 youth were assigned to the Control group). Youth were assembled into each pod as they were received at the court's Intake Department. An approximate length of five months was needed to assign youth into all six pods.

Since the random assignment of youth to one of the three subsample groups was not possible, youth were placed into groups on the basis of "availability or convenience sampling" (Miller & Whitehead, 1996). According to these researchers, "The problem with such a sample is that it can contain numerous biases that make it an inaccurate representation" (Miller & Whitehead, 1996, p. 120). For example, in
this sample, the bias might reflect arrest trends such as a police “sweep,” in which numerous individuals are arrested and processed on the same charge at the same time. The effects of a sweep on a sample could therefore be a lack of variance within one group and a lack of homogeneity among all groups.

Although availability or convenience sampling contains a number of biases, this researcher attempted to be sensitive to the aforementioned problems. A one-way analysis of variance was used to assess homogeneity of variance among all groups for offense types (status, misdemeanor, and felony). Since sweeps are rare occurrences and all of the sample members came from the population of first-time adjudicated youth referred by the Intake Department, there was little chance that the subsamples would not reflect similar variance structures.

Sample Mortality

Sample mortality became an issue for this research. Of the 60 youth ordered into the study, only 46 youth completed the program and/or testing. Of the 14 youth who did not complete the study, one youth was murdered, one youth was transferred to the adult system, one youth moved out of state, and the remaining 11 youth refused to abide by the terms of their probation by submitting to the testing and attending the SST classes.

The sample mortality distribution across the three groups was: (1) of Group I (youth who received SST with parents), four youth refused to participate; (2) of Group II (youth who received SST without parents), one youth was murdered, one
youth who transferred to the adult system, and two youth refused to participate; and (3) of Group III (the control group of youth who did not receive SST), six youth refused to participate.

Procedures

The collection of available intake data on the subjects' history of delinquency was compiled by the Kent County Juvenile Court Intake supervisor. The data collected for this study were obtained from the Kent County Juvenile Court's computer information system, Intake Department supervisor, interviews with juvenile court probation officers, and juvenile court social and legal files.

The first step in implementing the study was obtaining the endorsement of the project by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (Appendix A) and the Kent County Juvenile Court (Appendix B). Confidentiality of the data was guaranteed to the court administrators. Confidential file searches were conducted under the authority and regulations of the court director and intake supervisor. All files were individually searched by members of the court staff and this researcher and recorded on coding sheets (Appendix C). To ensure confidentiality, no probationers' names were used in the data collection and subsequent analysis. Only file numbers were used as identifiers for each case. Upon completion of the data collection, the master file list with the identifier numbers were returned to the intake supervisor.

The procedures for all groups were as follows: Once a juvenile was
adjudicated and ordered into traditional probation and into SST and testing (or just testing for the control group), that youth's probation officer scheduled an interview and testing date for him immediately following the adjudication hearing. Those youth ordered into the SST Program (both with and without parent or guardian involvement) were sent a letter (Appendix D) from the Court announcing the program requirements and dates of SST sessions.

The Jesness Inventory (JI) was administered one week prior to the beginning of the SST Program for all youth in the treatment groups. The JI was administered to youth in the control group the week after all youth in the control group youth had been adjudicated. The JI was administered again to all youth in the treatment groups one week after the SST had been completed (11 weeks). The JI was administered again to all youth in the control group 11 weeks after their first test. The last JI posttest 2 was administered 10 weeks after the post-test 1 was given or at the time a youth was discharged from probation, whichever came first.

The JI (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) was administered by one of two Master's level psychologists. Testing of each juvenile took place at the Kent County Juvenile Court's Crisis Intervention Department office.

Setting and Format of Social Skills Training

The SST Program for Adolescents (ASSET) is designed to be presented and taught in a well-organized manner. The ASSET program design ensures that regardless of the particular instructor or place of learning, the material and method are
approximately the same. Several additional steps were taken to assure uniformity of presentation. First, the ASSET program skills presenters all followed the skills presentation format as designed in the ASSET Leader's Guide (Hazel, Schumaker, Sherman & Sheldon, 1995). This format was presented to all experimental groups. Second, the same location and setting were used for all SST experimental groups (the Kent County Juvenile Court’s “all-purpose room”).

The ASSET program is a 10-session program. Social skills training with all experimental groups occurred once a week for 10 weeks, with each session lasting 1 hour and 30 minutes. The first 60 minutes of each session were spent in introducing a particular social skill, and discussing the skill steps, implications, and use. The last 30 minutes were devoted to practicing the skill and role-playing.

The SST with youth and their parent(s) or guardian(s) took place at the same time and on the same day in the partition-separated all-purpose room. Group I (youth and parents) were sight- and sound-separated during the skills training section and then reunited for the last 30 minutes of skill rehearsal and criterion testing. The facilitators worked with the juveniles and their parents or guardians as they practiced the skills and role-played with each other.

Two leaders co-facilitated each SST pod and one group leader facilitated the parent group. The group leaders were either Master's level social workers or Master's level psychologists, and had training and/or experience with the ASSET program. The group leaders followed the format described in detail by the ASSET Leader’s Guide (Hazel et al., 1995). There are 10 basic teaching steps for each group session:
(1) review of the previously learned skill, including a homework review; (2) explanation and description of the new skill being introduced; (3) discussion of the rationales for the new skill; (4) discussion and example situations for the new skill; (5) examination of the new skill steps; (6) modeling of the new skill; (7) verbal rehearsal of the new skill; (8) behavioral rehearsal of the new skill; (9) behavioral rehearsal and criterion performance of the new skill; and (10) assignment of homework.

As youth learned the social skill designated for that day, their parent(s) or guardian(s) learned the same skill. Parents were presented the same material and rehearsed scenarios that they might encounter with their youth. The parent/guardians' section also includes the following additional components:

(a) trouble-shooting component for the discussion of successful and unsuccessful parent-youth interactions in the home during the previous week; (b) a rationale component for encouraging the parents to learn new parenting behaviors to build a positive and reciprocal parent-adolescent relationship; and (c) an information component for providing the parents with information about adolescent growth, simple behavioral techniques and their effects, and adolescent social behaviors concerning peer groups, parents, and authority figures that related to recent parent-youth problems. (Serna et al., 1986, p. 69)

Social Skills Training Materials

All of the SST material used with the selected youth and their parents or guardians was adopted from the ASSET program (Hazel et al., 1995). The ASSET program targets the teaching of eight social skills, and is especially designed for delinquent youth (Hazel et al., 1995). These eight skills include: (1) giving positive feedback, (2) giving negative feedback, (3) accepting negative feedback, (4)
negotiation, (5) resisting peer pressure, (6) following instruction, (7) problem-solving, and (8) communication.

The rationale for the researcher's adoption of the ASSET program is that the format teaches the new social skills in a format that accommodates a number of learning styles. According to Gardner (1991):

There is ample evidence that some people take a primarily linguistic approach to learning, while others favor a spatial or a quantitative task. By the same token, some students perform best when asked to manipulate symbols of various sorts, while others are better able to display their understanding through a hands-on demonstration or through interaction with other individuals. (p. 12)

Gardner emphasizes the need to address all learning styles when presenting new information. The ASSET program presents information in diverse ways in an effort to reach all learning styles.

The components of the ASSET program include a Leader's Guide, Videotapes, and Program Material. The Leader's Guide provides a comprehensive guide to using and implementing the program, in addition to information on the research and development of the ASSET program. The Video Tapes consist of eight videotapes to be used during the sessions. Each of the videos covers one of the eight targeted social skills, affording viewers the opportunity to visualize how the skills are used. Videos are also used to model skills and to facilitate discussion about the skills. The Program Material contains Skill Sheets, which cover the steps needed to learn the skill; Home Notes, to be completed by the youth, or by the youth and parent(s) or guardian(s), as they practice the skill outside of the sessions; and a Criterion Checklist, used by the group facilitators to record the successful completion of the skill steps by the youth,
or the youth and their parent(s) or guardian(s).

Instrumentation

The Jesness Inventory (JI) was originally developed by Dr. Carl Jesness for the assessment and classification of young male delinquents (Jesness, 1988). The more recent JI has been modified and revised for older male adolescents, females, and adults (Jesness, 1996). The revised JI was used in this study. The JI was specifically developed to predict delinquency and to evaluate the responsiveness of delinquent youth to treatment (Jesness, 1988; Munson & Revers, 1986).

Initial normative and validation studies were based on a sample of 970 male delinquents and 1,075 male nondelinquents between the ages of 8 and 18, and on a sample of 450 female delinquents and nondelinquents ranging in age from 11 through 18. All delinquents were adjudicated, and most were awaiting placement in California Youth Authority institutions. The nondelinquent sample was obtained at 10 public schools in northern California. (Jesness, 1996, p.5)

The JI is a 155 item forced choice inventory designed to measure self-reported behaviors related to effective personal functioning. The examinee is instructed to select the one statement in each pair that is deemed most representative of his or her sense of self. The JI includes 11 personality scales and 9 subtype scales. The 11 personality scales include: (1) Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM), (2) Value Orientation Scale (VO), (3) Immaturity Scale (Imm), (4) Autism Scale (Au), (5) Alienation Scale (Al), (6) Manifest Aggression Scale (MA), (6) Withdrawal-depression Scale (Wd), (7) Social Anxiety Scale (SA), (8) Repression Scale (Rep), (9) Denial Scale (Den), and (10) Asocial Index (AI). The nine subtype scales are: (1)

Validity and reliability studies of the JI have established it as both an effective measure of delinquent behavior and a predictor of delinquency. The Jesness Inventory has been extensively validated and has been used in hundreds of published articles and unpublished reports and dissertations (Jesness, 1988). Reviews of the JI indicate that it is the most appropriate measure of delinquent youth behavior available (Biggs, Bender, & Foreman, 1986; Carpenter & Sandberg, 1985; Jesness, 1977; Kunce & Hemphill, 1983; Munson & Revers, 1986).

Reliability

The reliability or "the accuracy or precision of the measuring instrument" (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 405) of the JI has been measured in a number of ways. The reliability of the 11 personality scales was evaluated using the Cronbach's alpha and test-retest reliability; the results are presented in the JI manual to demonstrate the consistency in the JI items (Jesness, 1996).

The Cronbach alpha reliability was based on a sample of 1,862 delinquent and nondelinquent males. The age range of these youth was from 10 to 18 years. The
values expected for full-length scales presented were based on the Cronbach formula. The Cronbach alpha reliability was used to evaluate only 10 scales. For these 10 scales the Cronbach’s alpha were: (1) Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) (.85), (2) Value Orientation Scale (VO) (.87), (3) Immaturity Scale (Imm) (.43), (4) Autism Scale (Au) (.66), (5) Alienation Scale (Al) (.78), (6) Manifest Aggression Scale (MA) (.81), (7) Withdrawal-depression Scale (Wd) (.61), (8) Social Anxiety Scale (SA) (.67), (9) Repression Scale (Rep) (.61), and (10) Denial Scale (Den) (.77). According to Jesness (1996), these coefficients are comparable to those obtained from similar personality measures, but internal consistency differs from scale to scale. Several scales (i.e., Social Maladjustment [SM/SM], Values Orientation [VO], and Manifest Aggression [MA]) have very good internal consistency, while acceptable levels of internal consistency were observed in other scales (i.e., Autism [Au], Alienation [Al], Withdrawal-depression [Wd], Social Anxiety [SA], Repression [Rep], and Denial [Den]). In this sample, the internal consistency for Immaturity (Imm) was quite low, indicating that this scale should be interpreted with the utmost caution.

Additionally, test-retest reliability data were presented to verify the stability of the JI. Test-retest reliability of the JI was conducted on a sample of 131 delinquents, ranging in age from 14 through 21, who were retested after an 8 month period. Jesness (1996) reported test-retest reliability for the 11 major scales as follows: (1) Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) (.79), (2) Value Orientation Scale (VO) (.79), (3) Immaturity Scale (Imm) (.60), (4) Autism Scale (Au) (.66), (5) Alienation Scale (Al) (.40), (6) Manifest Aggression Scale (MA) (.76), (7) Withdrawal-depression
Scale (Wd) (.70), (8) Social Anxiety Scale (SA) (.70), (9) Repression Scale (Rep) (.55), (10) Denial Scale (Den) (.68), and (11) Asocial Index (AI) (.31). Jesness (1996) urges caution in “exclusive reliance on this [Asocial] scale with children or younger adolescents over an extended period. Fifteen-year-old delinquents (at the Macaroon School for boys) obtained a one-week test-retest correlation of .74” (p. 26).

Putnins (1980) also examined the reliability of the Asocial scale with 467 male delinquents, ages 13 through 17, from South Australia. Using a subsample of 83 youth, Putnins reported that youth with retest interval of a year achieved a test-retest coefficient of .26 for the Asocial Index. This study raised concerns about the use of the JI Asocial Index in predicting future behavior within this and other delinquent groups.

Reliability research for the nine subscales is less abundant. According to the research presented in the JI manual (Jesness, 1996), the JI was given to a group of 416 seventh graders (12- to 13-years-old), with a retest given a year later. The JI manual (1996) reported that a median test-retest correlation of .65 was achieved for the nine subtype scale scores. Of these 416 youth, 284 (48%) who had a single classification, obtained the same classification after a year. According to Jesness (1996), agreement was at its poorest for the AP, SE, CI and CFM subtypes.

Jesness (1996) reports that subtypes were developed as a procedure to arrive at a youth's classification. The underlying premise for the subtypes was based on the I-Level Theory. The I-Level theory states that the developmental progression of
perception is uniquely shaped by each youth and is based on a continuum (Warren, 1966). The continuum could be conceptualized with the “normal” person with few problems at one end of the continuum and those with maladjustment at the other. The changing of the subscales would characterize the “maturing” process that all youth go through as they develop.

Jesness (1996) maintains that the JI was intended to be used as a multipurpose instrument, but its main function is as a tool that can evaluate the most sensitive of changes in attitude and perceptions. “Consequently, items not subject to change were excluded, such as biographical items related to the person’s history. Including such items would undoubtedly have increased the measure’s reliability but at the price of decreased sensitivity to changes in attitudes” (p. 39).

Validity

Jesness and Wedge (1984) examined the validity of the JI and found the instrument to accurately measure the phenomena of delinquency that it is supposed to measure. A number of other researchers undertook a cross-validation of the JI with delinquents and nondelinquents. Martin (1981) used the JI to compare patterns of two groups of institutionalized delinquent youth ages 12 through 16: those who had been formally adjudicated, and those who had not been formally charged. These groups were compared with a matched control group and a "socially acting-out" group. Statistically significant group differences were found on the SM Scale, AI Scale, VO subscale, Au subscale, MA subscale, and Wd subscale, with the predictive direction
and predictable linear progression to be consistent with the movement from nondelinquent to more serious adjudicated delinquent.

Graham (1981) reported that the Asocial (AI) scale distinguished serious juvenile delinquents from nondelinquents, and those with less severe records of delinquency from those who had a more serious record. In the study by Graham, three male juvenile delinquent groups (juvenile intake, probation, and incarcerated) and one nondelinquent control group (school sample) were analyzed. "An analysis of variance of the Asocial Index scores of the four sample groups revealed a main effect for group" (Graham, 1981, p. 741). The mean scores for AI scale for the four samples included: (1) intake sample (m=15.94), (2) probation sample (m=18.15), (3) incarcerated sample (m=24.50), and (4) school sample (m=14.57). Again, higher scores reflected more serious delinquency. The findings confirmed that the JI was a valid instrument for both distinct and aggregate aspects of delinquency.

Content validity can be assumed to exist if the JI "samples adequately the domain which it is supposed to measure" (Miller & Wilson, 1983, p.120). The JI was examined for validity in a study of British delinquent youth (Saunders & Davies, 1976). This study was an effort to test the validity of the scale in differentiating between those youth who would and would not continue to engage in delinquent behavior. These researchers administered the JI to 854 delinquent youth who were either on probation or in a detention center. Results indicated that most of the subscales of the inventory differentiated between those who would continue to engage in delinquent behavior and those youth who would not. This research also concluded
that the JI is not a valid predictor of recidivism. Jesness (1996) cautions that the JI is not designed to measure or predict recidivism (that is, recurring formal processing for law-violating behavior).

Miller and Wilson (1983) maintain that concurrent validity exists if a measure "correlates well with other measures of the same concept" (p. 120). Graham (1981) analyzed only the JI Asocial Index scores for predictive and concurrent validity. A total of 91 male juvenile delinquents ages 11 through 18 were divided into 3 groups: (1) unadjudicated juveniles at intake, (2) adjudicated youth, and (3) incarcerated juvenile delinquents. These three groups were compared to a control group of 35 non-delinquent youth. All groups were administered the JI. The researchers found that the incarcerated subjects scored higher than all the other groups on the Asocial Index scores. The incarcerated subjects were also found to be more successfully classified as delinquents from the use of cutoff scores. Youth who were on probation scored higher than the control group but were not substantially more elevated in their frequency of delinquency classifications. The unadjudicated youth involved with the intake group did not differ from the control group, except that those who became adjudicated offenders within one year scored higher and were more often classified as delinquent by Graham (1981).

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the JI were both used as a measure of effectiveness to investigate treatment outcomes on inpatient conduct-disordered youth (Roberts, Schmitz, Pinto, & Cain, 1990). The purpose of the study was to determine what effect a "locked" behavioral/cognitive treatment
setting would have on youth and upon both tests. Thirty males and 20 females were admitted to a conduct disorder unit and administered both the MMPI and the JI for pre- and posttreatment testing to assess behavioral changes. The researchers were most interested in the HS scale (Hypochondriasis) and the PD scale (Psychopathic deviance) of the MMPI (there was a significant decrease in the HS scale for males, but not for females). The researchers hypothesized that if the program were effective, the effectiveness could be measured using the MMPI with the PD score being significantly decreased. Roberts et al. (1990) stated:

Most of our subjects were high scorers on the PD scale. Characteristics of these adolescents include delinquent behavior, difficulty incorporating values and standards of society, along with rebelliousness and hostility toward authority. Many subjects were serious sex offenders, and demonstrated marked self-centeredness and a poorly developed conscience. Improvement on this scale reflects movement toward a more conventional, conforming lifestyle, with respect for authority, a lower probability of delinquency, and greater concern for the rights and property of others. (p. 994)

There was significant improvement on the PD scale. The researchers found statistically significant changes on both inventories. After treatment scores decreased on the JI (with higher scores reflecting higher levels of delinquency).

The JI was also tested for its relationship with the Eysenck Personality Inventory (Smith, 1974). The Eysenck was also developed to demonstrate personality differences between delinquent and nondelinquent youth. Rather uniquely, this research article also investigated the I-level subtypes. Subjects in this study consisted of 153 males ages 16 through 20 who had been sentenced to borstal training.

Scores on five scales from the Eysenck and five scales from the JI were
intercorrelated. According to Smith, values greater than 0.16 are statistically significant at the 0.05 level of probability and values greater than 0.21 are significant at the 0.01 level. Smith (1974) reported that the intercorrelated variables for the subjects on Eysenck’s Psychoticism Scale correlated 0.62 with their scores on Jesness’s Autism Scale; and that their scores on Eysenck’s Neuroticism Scale correlated 0.55 and 0.45 with their scores on Jesness’ Social Anxiety and Withdrawal Scales respectively. Eysenck’s Impulsiveness and Sociality Scales had smaller but statistically significant correlations with several of the Jesness scales. Thus, it appears that to some extent scales from these two personality inventories are tapping similar variables.

Construct validity, “the extent to which the test appears to conform to predictions about it from theory or other relevant observation” (Miller & Wilson, 1983, p.120), is also present with the JI. Jesness (1996) reported construct validity correlations between the MMPI and the JI. The following correlations between scales of the MMPI and JI were based on a sample of 685 male and 168 female wards of the courts. The Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) correlated positively with the following MMPI scales: Infrequency (F) (.50), Schizophrenia (Sc) (.49), and Psychasthenia (Pt) (.49).

Jesness (1996) also presented data from a longitudinal study of 2,582 serious juvenile offenders paroled from institutional placements. The JI was given to each youth upon admission to the institution. The results revealed that the chronic offenders obtained higher scores on the SM (M=66) and the AI (M=70) than those youth who had no offenses and only a limited number of minor offense arrests (SM: M=63;
AI: M=67) after being paroled. The JI's agreement with theoretically-related concepts support construct validity.

One issue of particular concern to the present research is the level of susceptibility of the JI to subjects attempting to present a better image of themselves (i.e., "faking good"). If the JI is an inventory that can easily be "faked," its effectiveness as an instrument by which delinquency can be evaluated would be sharply limited. According to Jesness (1996), the susceptibility of youth to falsifying JI responses is limited. Youth in this study were tested and retested on consecutive days under different conditions. Before the first test, youth were told that the results would be used only for confidential research purposes. Prior to the second test, youth were told the results would be used for nonconfidential purposes.

In those instances where scores would be expected to rise, as on Repression Scale and Denial Scale, a slight, though insignificant, rise occurred. On other scales that include some obvious socially undesirable attitudinal items, scores tended to go down. The lower mean scores on Social Maladjustment Scale, Value Orientation Scale, and Alienation Scale were statistically significant. However, presumably because of the manner in which scores are combined to form the Alienation Scale, no change took place on the means of this scale (Jesness, 1966).

According to Buros' Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook (1978), "the Jesness Inventory is a valuable tool for those dealing with asocial and antisocial behavior. It deals with significant problems, it provides much data for the user, and the author supplies clinically-oriented comments for the consideration of practitioners" (p.
Hypotheses and Statistical Analysis

The data obtained for this study were analyzed in two ways using parametric statistics: (1) one-way analysis of variance, and (2) repeated measures analysis of variance. The repeated measures analysis of variance is a powerful design and is appropriate for this research because it allows the researcher to study the main effects for time, group, and time/group interaction (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994).

The independent variable was the type of group. Three types of group were tested: Group I (youth who received SST with parents or guardians); Group II (youth who received SST without parents or guardians); and Group III (the control group of youth who did not receive SST). The dependent variables were the Jesness Inventory scales and subscales scores, and the type of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony.)

The one-way analysis of variance was used to measure differences in the number of offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony) committed by members of all three groups. The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether all three groups were homogeneous before treatment. Data for the offenses history were gathered from legal files and social files received from the field probation officers assigned to each case. All significance levels for this study was set at .05.

The following hypothesis was tested prior to any intervention:

**Null Hypotheses Set 1:** There will be no significant differences in the mean
pretest number of proven offenses (status, misdemeanor, and felony) among the three groups.

The following hypotheses were tested after the treatment intervention with Groups I and II, and an equal time lapse for Group III. The repeated measures analysis of variance was applied to II pretest and posttest 1 and posttest 2 scores for all three groups in order to assess the differences among mean changes for the groups. The following null hypotheses tested were:

**Null Hypotheses Set 2:** There will be no significant differences in the mean change scores of the pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 scores among the three groups with respect to the 11 scales of the Jesness Behavior Inventory: (1) Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM), (2) Value Orientation Scale (VO), (3) Immaturity Scale (Imm), (4) Autism Scale (Au), (5) Alienation Scale (Al), (6) Manifest Aggression Scale (MA), (7) Withdrawal-depression (Wd), (8) Social Anxiety Scale (SA), (9) Repressions Scale (Rep), (10) Denial Scale (Den), and (11) Asocial Index Scale (AI).

**Null Hypotheses Set 3:** There will be no significant differences in the mean pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 scores among the three groups with respect to the 9 subscales of the Jesness Behavior Inventory: (1) Unsocialized Aggressive/Undersocialized Active (AA), (2) Unsocialized, Passive/Undersocialized, Passive (AP), (3) Immature Conformist/Conformist (CFM), (4) Cultural Conformist/Group-oriented (CFC), (5) Manipulator/Pragmatist (MP), (6) Neurotic Acting-out/Autonomy-oriented (NA), (7) Neurotic, Anxious/Introspective (NX), (8) Situational Emotional Reaction/Inhibited (SE), and (9) Cultural Identifier/Adaptive (CI).
Null Hypotheses Set 4: There will be no significant differences in the mean pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 among the three groups with respect to the three offense types of: (1) status offenses, (2) misdemeanor offenses, and (3) felony offenses.
This chapter presents the results of the research on the effects of social skills training for three groups of first-time adjudicated youth. Two groups received social skills training: Group I, youth with parent(s) or guardian(s), and Group II, youth without parent or guardian participation. Group III, a convenience sample of first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation, did not receive any social skills training. The data were analyzed using a repeated measure analysis of variance. No significant differences were found.

Pretest Analysis

To ensure homogeneity across the groups, the one-way analysis of variance was performed to assure that there were no statistically significant differences across the three offense groups in the pretest measurements. Statistically significant means become critical when evaluating the results of the repeated measure ANOVA at Stage 2 testing.

The null hypotheses for the one-way ANOVA stated that there would be no significant differences in the mean pretest number of proven offenses of the (a) Group
I, (b) Group II, and (c) Group III on the three offense types of: (a) status offense, (b) misdemeanor offense, and (c) felony offense. The mean number of status offenses across the three groups were: Group I (.18), Group II (.25), and Group III (.14). At the 0.05 level of significance there was not sufficient evidence to conclude that at least one of the mean number of status offenses differed from the other mean number of status offenses (see Table 2).

Table 2
One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Status Offense: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Group</td>
<td>.0873</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>7.151</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.239</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean number of misdemeanor offenses across the three groups were: Group I (.68), Group II (.12), and Group III (.28). There was not sufficient evidence to conclude that at least one of the mean number of misdemeanor offenses differed from the other mean number of misdemeanor offenses (see Table 3).

Table 3
One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Misdemeanor Offense: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Group</td>
<td>5.281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>50.044</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.326</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I (1.00), Group II (1.81), and Group III (1.35). There was not sufficient evidence to conclude that at least one of the mean number of felony offenses differed from the other mean number of felony offenses (see Table 4).

Table 4
One-way Analysis of Variance Pretest Felony Offense: Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Group</td>
<td>5.304</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>75.651</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.956</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Pretest Analysis of Scores on the Jesness Inventory and Offense Numbers

The results of the data derived from the repeated measure ANOVA is summarized for each of the 11 scales and 9 subscales of the Jesness Inventory (JI), and 3 offense types (status, misdemeanor, and felony) in Table 5 through Table 27. The first step taken in the repeated measure ANOVA was to check for sphericity. The Mauchly's W test was used with the alpha level set at 0.25, in order to assess the determination of unequal variance across groups. The alpha level of 0.25 was used because it is a more serious error to assume equal variances when there are not equal variances than it is to assume that there are not equal variances when there are equal variances. Sphericity (if the p value that tests this hypothesis is 0.25 or less, the null hypothesis is rejected that sphericity holds in favor of the alternative hypothesis that sphericity is violated) was satisfied in the following scales, subscales, and offense
types: Value Orientation (VO) Scale (.873), Autism (AU) Scale (0.550), Alienation (AL) Scale (0.518), Repression (REP) Scale (0.372), Denial (Den) Scale (.75), Unsocialized Aggressive/Undersocialized Active (AA) Subscale (0.701), Manipulator (MP) Subscale (0.308), Neurotic Acting-out/Autonomy-oriented (NA) Subscale (0.474) and Neurotic, Anxious/Introspective (NX) Subscale (0.587) (see Table 5).

Table 5

The Mauchly's W Test - Sphericity Satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales and Subscales</th>
<th>Sphericity</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vo Scale</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Scale</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL Scale</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Scale</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Scale</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Subscale</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Subscale</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Subscale</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NX Subscale</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If sphericity was not satisfied a corrected F-test was needed. The correction used in this study was the Greenhouse-Geiser correction, a commonly-used corrected F-test. A number of scales, subscales, and offense types required the use of the Greenhouse-Geiser corrected F-test because sphericity was not satisfied. Sphericity (p value) was not met and required correction in the following scales, subscales, and offenses: Social Maladjustment (SM/SM) Scale (0.038), Immaturity (Imm) Scale
Manifest Aggression (MA) Scale (0.053), Social Anxiety (SA) Scale (0.026), Withdrawal-depression (Wd) Scale (0.214), Asocial (AI) Scale (0.097), Unsocialized, Passive/Undersocialized Passive (AP) Subscale (0.076), Immature Conformist/Conformist (CFM) Subscale (0.239), Cultural Conformist/Group-oriented (CFC) Subscale (0.128), Situational Emotional Reaction/Inhibited (SE) Subscale (0.160), Cultural Identifier/Adaptive (CI) Subscale (0.05), Status Offense (0.076), Misdemeanor Offense (0.00), and Felony Offense (0.00) (see Table 6).

Table 6

Greenhouse-Geiser Sphericity Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales and Subscales</th>
<th>Sphericity</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM Scale</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm Scale</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Scale</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Scale</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wd Scale</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI Scale</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Subscale</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM Subscale</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC Subscale</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Subscale</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Subscale</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offense</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor Offense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Offense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the sphericity condition had been satisfied, the correct F-test output from the repeated measure ANOVA was performed. The results of the data derived from
the repeated measures ANOVA demonstrated no significant interaction at the .05 alpha level between time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) and group (Group I [SST With Parents], Group II [SST Without Parents], and Group III [Control]) for the following scales, subscales, and offense types: VO Scale (0.15, see Table 7), Imm Scale (0.30, see Table 8), AL Scale (0.11, see Table 9), MA Scale (0.89, see Table 10), WD Scale (0.50, see Table 11), SA Scale (0.28, see Table 12), REP Scale (0.78, see Table 13), Den Scale (0.86, see Table 14), AI Scale (0.37, see Table 15), AA Subscale (0.37, see Table 16), AP Subscale (0.24, see Table 17), CFM Subscale (0.06, see Table 18), CFC Subscale (0.56, see Table 19), MP Subscale (0.18, see Table 20), NA Subscale (0.69, see Table 21), NX Subscale (0.29, see Table 22), SE

Table 7

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Value Orientation (VO) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>286.607</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143.304</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12401.226</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>288.401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>163.255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.814</td>
<td>1.728</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2031.542</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Immaturity (Imm) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>671.768</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>335.884</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14201.051</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>330.257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>572.189</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>304.496</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>173.113</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>46.062</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>3009.351</td>
<td>80.803</td>
<td>37.243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Alienation (Al) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>69.820</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.910</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>9947.955</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>231.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>16.155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.078</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>186.418</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.604</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2212.089</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25.722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Manifest Aggression (MA) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>232.866</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>116.433</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>17900.301</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>416.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>30.607</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>17.298</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>44.512</td>
<td>3.539</td>
<td>12.578</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>4066.387</td>
<td>76.086</td>
<td>53.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Withdrawal-Depression (Wd) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>280.249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140.124</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8681.744</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>201.971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>27.482</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>14.714</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>115.660</td>
<td>3.735</td>
<td>30.964</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>3019.238</td>
<td>80.311</td>
<td>37.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscale (0.67, see Table 23), CI Subscale (0.35, see Table 24), Status Offense (0.935, see Table 25), Misdemeanor Offense (0.18, see Table 26), and Felony Offense (0.17, see Table 27).
Table 12
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Social Anxiety (SA) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>605.341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>302.67</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>0.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11011.935</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>256.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.08847</td>
<td>1.724</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>148.050</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td>42.932</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2471.762</td>
<td>74.142</td>
<td>2471.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Repression (Rep) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>167.873</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.936</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12129.932</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>282.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>19.545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.772</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>59.267</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.817</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2967.560</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Denial (Den) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>201.677</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.839</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8489.598</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>197.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>37.303</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>18.897</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>42.353</td>
<td>3.948</td>
<td>10.727</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2930.589</td>
<td>84.884</td>
<td>34.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because there was a significant difference on two scales, SM/SM Scale (0.03, see Table 28) and AU (0.01, see Table 29), the Dunnett's Multiple Comparison Test was used to examine this significant interaction. The Dunnett's Multiple Comparison
Table 15

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Asocial (AI) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>25.484</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.742</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13230.458</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>307.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>139.871</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>77.286</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>400.565</td>
<td>3.620</td>
<td>110.667</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>1125.667</td>
<td>77.821</td>
<td>56.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Under Aggressive/Undersocialized Active (AA) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>279.495</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>139.747</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12947.643</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>301.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>7.869</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.934</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>96.216</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.054</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>1928.929</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Unsocialized Passive/Undersocialized Passive (AP) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>181.700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.850</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>14549.872</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>338.369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10.014</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>159.941</td>
<td>3.586</td>
<td>44.606</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2426.030</td>
<td>77.091</td>
<td>56.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test was the Stage 2 test selected because it is designed to test treatments against a control.

The results of the data derived from the Dunnett's multiple comparison test
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Table 18
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Immature Conformist/Conformist (CFM) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>40.246</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.123</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13469.030</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>313.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>157.017</td>
<td>1.876</td>
<td>83.680</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>184.287</td>
<td>3.753</td>
<td>49.107</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2338.220</td>
<td>80.685</td>
<td>28.980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Cultural Conformist/Group-Oriented (CFC) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>129.051</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.525</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6405.884</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>148.974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>17.508</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>9.570</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>71.326</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>19.493</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2116.500</td>
<td>78.669</td>
<td>26.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Manipulator/Pragmatist (MP) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>490.336</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>245.168</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13784.244</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>320.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>23.059</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.529</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>170.058</td>
<td>42.514</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2313.667</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

demonstrated no significant interaction at the .05 alpha level for either Group I (SST with youth and parents or guardians), or Group II (SST without parents or guardians), as compared to Group III (control group), across time (pretest, posttest 1, and
Table 21

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Neurotic Acting-out/Autonomy-Oriented (NA) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>164.608</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>82.304</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>12906.848</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>300.159</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>55.585</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.793</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>98.280</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.570</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>3780.286</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Neurotic, Anxious/Introspective (NX) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>329.999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165.000</td>
<td>1.218</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>5824.646</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>135.457</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>18.797</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.399</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>140.504</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.126</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2405.917</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>27.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Situational Emotional Reaction/Inhibited (SE) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>88.911</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.456</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>111314.893</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>263.137</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>448.379</td>
<td>3.692</td>
<td>13.105</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>1857.143</td>
<td>79.372</td>
<td>23.398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Cultural Identifier/Adaptive (CI) Subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>60.772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.386</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8409.467</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>195.569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>36.668</td>
<td>1.766</td>
<td>20.766</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>125.024</td>
<td>3.531</td>
<td>35.403</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2439.845</td>
<td>75.927</td>
<td>32.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Status Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.03241</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4.515</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>3.589</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>3.585</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>7.315</td>
<td>77.086</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

Summary of Analysis of Variance for Misdemeanor Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2.979</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>23.289</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10.767</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>8.603</td>
<td>12.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>2.957</td>
<td>2.503</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>1.720</td>
<td>0.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>36.970</td>
<td>53.812</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

posttest 2). The results were as follows for the SM/SM Scale (see Table 30): SM/SM Scale Pretest: Group I with Group III (.362), and Group II with Group III (.563); SM/SM Scale Posttest 1: Group I with Group III (.524), and Group II with Group III...
Table 27
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Felony Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>31.196</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>49.226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.226</td>
<td>37.919</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>4.570</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>55.821</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Social Maladjustment (SM/SM) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>593.741</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>296.871</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26811.244</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>623.517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>26.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.933</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>501.356</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>143.378</td>
<td>2.778</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>2879.702</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Autism (Au) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>190.060</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.030</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>10181.244</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>236.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>38.477</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.239</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Time</td>
<td>289.181</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.295</td>
<td>3.416</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(Time)</td>
<td>1820.167</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>21.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(.628); SM/SM Scale Posttest 2: Group I with Group III (.114), and Group II with Group III (.063).

The results for the AU Scale (see Table 31) were: AU Scale Pretest: Group I
Table 30
Summary of Dunnett’s Multiple Comparison Test for Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>4.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM Scale 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>6.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM Scale 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>-10.73</td>
<td>5.815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31
Summary of Dunnett’s Multiple Comparison Test for Autism (AU) Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>3.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECOND GROUP (youth only)</td>
<td>THIRD GROUP (control)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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with Group III (.638), and Group II with Group III (.543); AU Scale Posttest 1: Group I with Group III (.749), and Group II with Group III (.982); AU Scale Posttest 2: Group I with Group III (.228), and Group II with Group III (.698).

Since the interaction effect was not between either of the experimental groups as compared to the control group, further post hoc testing between Group I against Group II was not necessary. That is, the treatment did not produce significant changes when compared to the control group.

It must be noted that two scales, the IMM scale (see Table 8) and all three offense types (status, misdemeanor, and felony) (see Tables 25, 26, and 27) showed statistically significant changes over time. There were no significant group/time interactions or main effects. No post hoc analysis was run because there was not sufficient evidence supporting a time/group effect.

For the group/time interaction, there were statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean change scores in the SM/SM Scale score (0.039) across the three groups over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean SM/SM Scale score (0.624) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean SM/SM Scale score (0.72) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 28).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the VO Scale score (0.151) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the
group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean VO Scale score (0.612) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean VO Scale score (0.984) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 7).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Imm Scale score (0.302) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Imm Scale score (0.370) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were statistically significant differences in the mean Imm Scale score (0.001) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 8).

For the group/time interaction, there were statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Au Scale score (0.012) across the three groups, which did vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Au Scale score (0.672) across the three groups. For the main effect for time, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Au Scale score (0.407) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 29).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Al Scale score (0.134) across the three groups which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Al Scale score
(0.860) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean A1 Scale score (0.731) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 9).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean change scores in the MA Scale score (0.899) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean MA Scale score (0.757) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean MA Scale score (0.698) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 10).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Wd Scale score (0.507) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Wd Scale score (0.505) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Wd Scale score (0.663) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 11).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the SA Scale score (0.284) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean SA Scale score (3.16) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no
statistically significant differences in the mean SA Scale score (0.997) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 12).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Rep Scale score (0.787) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Rep Scale score (0.744) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Rep Scale score (0.754) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 13).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Den Scale score (0.868) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Den Scale score (0.604) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Den Scale score (0.578) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 13).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the AI Scale score (0.118) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean AI Scale score (0.959) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically
significant differences in the mean AI Scale score (0.118) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 15).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the AA Subscale score (0.375) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean AA Subscale score (0.632) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean AA Subscale score (0.839) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 16).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the AP Subscale score (0.240) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean AP Subscale score (0.766) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean AP Subscale score (0.814) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 17).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the CFM Subscale score (0.163) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean CFM Subscale score (0.938) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were
no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean CFM Subscale score (0.065) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 18).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the CFC Subscale score (0.566) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean CFC Subscale score (0.651) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean CFC Subscale score (0.683) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 19).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the MP Subscale score (0.187) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean MP Subscale score (0.472) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean MP Subscale score (0.653) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 20).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the NA Subscale score (0.693) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean NA
Subscale score (0.761) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean NA Subscale score (0.534) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 21).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the NX Subscale score (0.294) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean NX Subscale score (0.306) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean NX Subscale score (0.716) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 22).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the SE Subscale score (0.679) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean SE Subscale score (0.845) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean SE Subscale score (0.946) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 23).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the CI Subscale score (0.359) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the
group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean CI Subscale score (0.857) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean CI Subscale score (0.508) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 24).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Status Offenses score (0.935) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Status Offenses score (0.736) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were statistically significant differences in the mean Status Offenses score (0.037) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 25).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Misdemeanor Offenses score (0.181) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Misdemeanor Offenses score (0.075) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were statistically significant differences in the mean Misdemeanor Offenses score (0.000) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 26).

For the group/time interaction, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean change scores in the Felony Offenses score (0.176) across the three groups, which did not vary over time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). For the
group main effect, there were no statistically significant differences in the mean Felony Offenses score (0.493) across the three groups. For the time main effect, there were statistically significant differences (at the .05 alpha level) in the mean Felony Offenses score (0.000) across the three time periods (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) (see Table 27).

The results of the data derived from the Dunnett's Multiple Comparison Test demonstrated no significant interaction at the .05 alpha level for either Group I (SST with youth and parents or guardians), or Group II (SST with youth alone), as compared to Group III (control group), across time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2). The results were as follows for the SM/SM Scale: SM/SM Scale Pretest: Group I with Group III (.362), and Group II with Group III (.563); SM/SM Scale Posttest 1: Group I with Group III (.524), and Group II with Group III (.628); SM/SM Scale Posttest 2: Group I with Group III (.114), and Group II with Group III (.063) (see Table 30).

The results for the AU Scale were: AU Scale Pretest: Group I with Group III (.638), and Group II with Group III (.543); AU Scale Posttest 1: Group I with Group III (.749), and Group II with Group III (.982); AU Scale Posttest 2: Group I with Group III (.228), and Group II with Group III (.698) (see Table 31).

Appendix E provides information describing the mean scores (i.e., pretest, posttest 1 and posttest 2) for all three groups on the offense types (status, misdemeanor, and felony) and a JI scales and subscales (see Appendix E).
Summary of Repeated Measure Analysis of Variance

The preceding section presented the results of the study by individual variables. This section will relate those results of the repeated measure analysis of variance to the specific hypotheses.

Null Hypothesis Set Two

The second hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences in the mean pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 scores across the: (a) Group I (SST with youth and parents or guardians), (b) Group II (SST with youth alone), and (c) Group III (control group), on the 11 scales of the Jesness Behavior Inventory: (1) Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM), (2) Value Orientation Scale (VO), (3) Immaturity Scale (Imm), (4) Autism Scale (Au), (5) Alienation Scale (Al), (6) Manifest Aggression Scale (MA), (7) Withdrawal-depression Scale (Wd), (8) Social Anxiety Scale (SA), (9) Repression Scale (Rep), (10) Denial Scale (Den), and (11) Asocial Index Scale (AI). The repeated measure analysis of variance showed nonsignificant main effect. Therefore, the results indicated that there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis Set Three

The third hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences across the mean pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 scores of: (a) Group I (SST with
youth and parents or guardians), (b) Group II (SST with youth alone), and (c) Group III (control group), on the 9 subscales of the Jesness Behavior Inventory: (1) Unsocialized Aggressive/Undersocialized Active (AA), (2) Unsocialized, Passive/Undersocialized, Passive (AP), (3) Immature Conformist/Conformist (CFM), (4) Cultural Conformist/Group-oriented (CFC), (5) Manipulator/Pragmatist (MP), (6) Neurotic Acting-out/Autonomy-oriented (NA), (7) Neurotic, Anxious/Introspective (NX), (8) Situational Emotional Reaction/Inhibited (SE), and (9) Cultural Identifier/Adaptive (CI). The repeated measure analysis of the variance did not indicate a significant main effect. Therefore, the results indicated that there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis Set Four

The fourth hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences in the mean pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 number of proven offenses across (a) Group I (SST with youth and parents or guardians), (b) Group II (SST with youth alone, and (c) Group III (control group), on the three offense types of (1) status offense, (2) misdemeanor offense, and (3) felony offense. The repeated measure analysis of the variance did not indicate a significant main effect. Therefore, the results indicated that there was a failure to reject the null hypothesis.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to examine the effects of social skills training provided to youth and their families as a complement to traditional probation. Other research (Abel et al., 1976; Goldstein & Glick, 1994; Guerra & Slaby, 1990; Hansen, St. Lawrence, & Christoff, 1988; Hawkins et al., 1986; Priestley et al., 1984; Renwick, 1987; Rice & Chaplin, 1979; Sanchez & Lewinsohn, 1980; Shivrattan, 1988) has shown that social skills training is a promising intervention for youth in schools, detention centers, and institutions. It was reasonable, therefore, to expect that this type of training would also be effective with first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation in a noninstitutional setting.

This study investigated the effect of social skills training on first-time adjudicated male youth between the ages of 13 through 15 in two samples: first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation, with and without parent or guardian participation. The results of each of these approaches were then compared with a convenience sample of first-time adjudicated youth placed on traditional probation who had not received any social skills training. The design for this study was the three-group pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2 design for change experiments. The
independent variables were social skills training for youth alone and social skills training with youth and their parents or guardians. The dependent variables were (a) the changes in the Jesness Inventory scales and subscales scores, and (b) offense type and number.

The original research sample was composed of 60 males, ages 13 through 15, selected from the population of first-time adjudicated youth at the Kent County Juvenile Court. The samples were selected as they were organized at intake. Of the 60 youth placed in the program, only 46 completed the social skills training and/or testing.

The repeated measure analysis of variance to assess group by time interaction was conducted at the 0.05 alpha level. The results of the data derived from the repeated measures analysis of variance demonstrated no significant interaction at the 0.05 alpha level between time (pretest, posttest 1, and posttest 2) and group (Group I [youth with parents or guardians], Group 2 [youth without their parents' or guardians' participation], and Group 3 [control group]) for the offense types (status, misdemeanor, and felony) and all of the Jesness Inventory scales and subscales except for the Social Maladjustment Scale (SM/SM) and Autism Scale (AU). Post hoc testing failed to describe where the interaction occurred. Results of this research indicated that there were no significant differences among these groups.

The following discussion will explore possible reasons for these findings, and examine issues related to program integrity and program efficacy. Other approaches to providing delinquent youth with opportunities for change will also be discussed as
will possibilities for future research on the effectiveness of social skills training.

Program Integrity and Efficacy

Questions about program integrity are questions about the ways in which programs are implemented and maintained. A serious, yet common, problem in correctional treatment (both adult and juvenile) is that of program integrity (Gendreau & Ross, 1984). Program integrity is examined to review whether or not the program was implemented as planned (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973). According to Hudzik and Cordner (1983), criminal justice programs are often not implemented and/or maintained as planned. When this occurs, serious concerns for measurement and evaluation arise. As will be discussed, poor attendance was the most serious program integrity issue in this study.

Program efficacy refers to the scope or strength of a program. Relevant here are questions about the extent to which the program actually has the potential to address the issues or problems associated with delinquency. Concerns about program efficacy were expressed by the therapists who taught the social skills groups. In particular, they were concerned about the adequacy of the length of treatment, and about what they perceived to be a relatively narrow approach to complex issues underlying delinquent behavior. These concerns will be discussed.
Attendance

The attendance rates were poor. In Group I (youth with parents or guardians), attendance rates at the treatment sessions were 55.6% for youth, and 55% for parents and guardians. For Group II (youth without parents' or guardians' participation in the SST), attendance rates at the treatment sessions were 76.25%. Some absences were due to lack of transportation, childcare problems, and work schedule conflicts. Another factor contributing to poor attendance was level of probation officers' follow through (discussed below).

The disparity between Group I and Group II attendance rates for youth is noteworthy. In addition to work schedule conflicts, and childcare and transportation difficulties, it is possible that parents or guardians did not encourage their teenagers to attend sessions that they themselves did not want to attend. This raises the question of whether involving parents or guardians encourages or hinders youth from attending treatment services. Future research on the assumption that parental or family involvement will have positive effects is needed before this question can be answered.

With regard to work schedule conflicts, and childcare and transportation difficulties, these obstacles could have been overcome by providing related program services. For example, instead of meeting at the same time every week, a more flexible scheduling system might have been able to accommodate conflicting work schedules. Similarly, transportation for those without vehicles may have increased attendance. For this study, the local bus service stopped at 6:00 p.m; participants without vehicles
or funds for taxi service could get to the meetings on the bus but had no way to get home.

Childcare was a problem. Many parents or guardians had additional children at home needing care and childcare was not provided. Parents or guardians often were unable to afford or secure childcare services for their children to attend the required meetings.

In the sessions where youth attended by themselves, their parents often could not provide or afford transportation for their children to attend. Additionally, a number of youth reported that they were required to stay home and baby-sit for younger siblings while their parents or guardians worked.

Attendance was also affected by the absence of court sanctions for those who did not attend. This research was conducted as a one-time effort that provided social skills training for a small number of youth without consequences if sessions were missed. Although participants were ordered into the program, few options were available to probation officers to insure that youth would attend, by way of either negative or positive sanctions. After offenders were ordered into the treatment, probation officers prepared them for this treatment intervention, reminded them to attend, and confronted them when they did not attend. Probation officers could not insist that they finish the ASSET program before they were discharged from probation because once this research study was completed, no further social skills training programs were offered. Youth were reminded that at their review hearing, a judge would be notified of attendance and participation in the program and it would be to their
advantage to attend and participate. While some youth and parents had a number of valid reasons why they were unable to attend, others were simply undaunted by the courts' demand that they attend the social skills training.

Another unforeseen problem that impacted attendance was if a youth was incarcerated during the time he was in social skills treatment, provisions were not in place to continue the treatment during the period of incarceration. Because of security concerns, such youth could not be transported and allowed to participate in the social skills training programs; thus, a youth might miss numerous weeks of treatment while in locked custody. This obstacle to treatment success pointed to what seems to be a conflict in theoretical and treatment commitments within the juvenile justice system regarding "What works?" In this case, the commitment was to punishment rather than rehabilitation efforts. In fairness, it must be noted, however, that this one-time research project intruded upon a system already in place. Court personnel simply followed their prescribed agenda.

Some responsibility must be shared by this researcher for issues not addressed at the start of this research with the court. A number of potential problems were not foreseen and therefore were not given consideration for establishing potential solutions. Also important to note is the fact that probation officers carry large caseloads that stretch them to the limits. Baseline case management is often all that is possible. It must be noted that a number of probation officers did go beyond simply lecturing and warning youth about attendance by helping youth and parents or guardians with their transportation and childcare issues.
Length of Treatment

Another explanation for the lack of positive results from social skills treatment might be the length of treatment using the ASSET program. The ASSET program is a 10-session program. Social skills training with all experimental groups occurred once a week for 10 weeks, with each session lasting 1 hour and 30 minutes. The first 60 minutes of each session were spent in introducing a particular social skill, and then discussing the skill steps, implications, and use. The last 30 minutes were devoted to practicing the skill and role-playing. For some youth, 10 weeks of instruction may not have provided ample time for them to develop the inner resources necessary to make meaningful or significant changes in their lives.

One possible solution would be to lengthen the time of the project, thereby increasing the amount of training. Repeated practice over a longer period of time might have provided a stronger foundation for change. Additionally, at the end of the 10 weeks, no follow-up was offered. Follow-up would provide opportunities to reinforce and encourage the utilization of newly-acquired skills.

Narrow Versus Wholistic Approach

One of the fundamental errors of most rehabilitation programs is that they isolate certain behaviors for change and fail to consider the client (in this case, delinquent youth) within the context of a larger framework. In such narrow approaches (in this case, teaching only social skills to delinquent youth), treatment strategies are
concerned with the measurable behavior, while failing to take into account why those behaviors occur in the first place. The therapists for this project said that it was often difficult to follow the program’s social skills building format and yet attend to the overwhelming concerns that youth and their parents or guardians often brought to the sessions. Every week, the therapists voiced their dilemma about trying to attend to other issues, such as street and family violence, drugs, peer pressure, and school truancy.

The research did not address any of these other critical factors. The ASSET program targets only one area: social skills. Yet, some of the issues that should be addressed in any treatment program involving delinquent youth are the variables that put these youth most at-risk. The concerns stated above need to be incorporated into an integrated approach within the program format. These pressing concerns brought by youth and their parents or guardians to sessions suggest that, in order to change, youth and their caregivers need help, opportunities, and motivations and hope for the future.

Directions for Future Research

Given what is known about the complex and socially-imbedded nature of delinquency and the inadequacy of services, it is perhaps unreasonable to hope that any one treatment would be consistently appropriate and efficacious. Certainly, this social skills training approach was not. What does emanate from this study are some directions about strategies for establishing future research that might provide a more
complete picture of its successes and failures, and more promising services and approaches.

In this experiment, the formal results were based on 46 boys, which allowed for fewer than 15 youth in each group under investigation. According to Kerlinger (1986), "the smaller the sample the larger the error, and the larger the sample the smaller the error" (p.117). A larger sample size would permit more confidence in conclusions drawn from the research.

It was reported by the program leaders that the total number of sessions should be increased to 15 or 20. Also, an increase in the number of sessions would better accommodate the intellectual functioning of some of the youth, some of whom had difficulty in conceptualizing the skills and their uses.

Other factors for consideration should be the optimal length of the SST and the what should be done to insure the transfer of these social skills to other areas in the youth's life (i.e. school, job). Transition training or follow-up services for adolescents has been discussed in the literature, but little research has been conducted in this area. What is unknown is the degree to which these behaviors are generalized to other environments. For example, while this study examined behavioral change as measured by the Jesness Inventory and recidivism, it did not systematically examine other behavioral or cognitive measures to determine the effects of the program on the attitudinal change and general social performance of the youth. Useful behavioral or cognitive measures might include: (a) school behavior reports, (b) detention behavior reports, and (c) pre- and post-training questionnaires from youth and/or parents to
assess their perceptions of change. Future efforts should attempt to ensure that the
cognitive-behavioral component of SST is extensive enough for youth to generalize
treatment gains to their post-treatment environments, assess those changes, and
provide corrections when necessary.

Another area for future study with SST would be to discriminate between
different types of offenders, possibly targeting three groups of low, medium, and high
risk youth offenders, as defined by a risk assessment. Questions arise about the
ASSET program's ability to be more or less successful with these different types of
offenders. Additional background information such as family structure, race, prior
court involvement, and type of offense (person vs. property) might reveal discrepan­
cies in behavioral changes for youth in the aforementioned categories.

Other future research might offer more supports to enhance family participa­
tion. These supports could include: (a) providing childcare, (b) offering an array of
session times from which to choose, and (c) providing transportation. Offering the
SST at different times would enable youth and parents or guardians to choose a time
conducive to their schedule. These provisions would increase attendance.

Another important question for future research is whether delinquent youth are
actually deficit in their knowledge of social skills. When confronted with a dilemma
that would involve using a social skill to bring about an amiable result, some delin­
quent youth may actually wish to create a bad impression. Some youth may deliber­
ately choose a hostile style in an effort to present themselves as mean, hard, and
remorseless. If social skills are to be of help, these youth must be motivated to
acquire and use them in the first place.

Implications From the Research on Delinquency

The discussion above highlights the complex nature of juvenile delinquency. A treatment approach that addresses only one aspect of the problem is unlikely to effect long-term change in individuals or their families. Research has identified a number of issues that correlate with delinquency, as well as more systemic, wholistic treatment approaches that show promising results. These are presented below.

In addition, this writers’ 15 years of experience as a probation officer and counselor have provided anecdotal evidence in support of psychological treatment for delinquent youth. The following section will present a relational psychotherapeutic approach for changing the internal structures that contribute to delinquency. The writer believes that this dimension is critical to promoting meaningful and enduring change in these youth.

Contextual Interventions

Some of the issues that should be addressed in any treatment program involving delinquent youth are the variables that put these youth most at risk. The issues that need to be incorporated into a more integrated approach include: poor parental supervision (Udansky, 1994), lack of community activities and recreation (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; Gendreau, 1991; Hollin, 1993, Regoli & Hewitt, 1997, Shelden, Tracy, & Brown, 1997), poor school performance (Hawkins et al., 1992;
Wolford, & Koebel, 1995), substance abuse problems (Carpenter, Glassner, Johnson, & Loughlin, 1988; Farrow & French, 1986; Watters, Reinarman, & Fagan, 1985; Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1996), and other social and relational concerns (Gendreau, Cullen, and Bonta, 1994). The need to address these areas when working with this population is supported in the literature that examines factors that might promote delinquent behavior.

According to the National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995), community action is the foundation for addressing and reducing the impact of juvenile violence and delinquency. This plan was founded on the premise that no single person, organization, or agency is able to address the causes of juvenile delinquency in isolation. Juvenile delinquency requires a multifaceted approach to treatment that addresses the intertwined psychological and social needs of these youth.

Most community-based treatment programs are based on an integrated theoretical model which uses a variety of concepts from three theoretical orientations: (1) social learning theories, (2) strain theory, and (3) social control theory. Such an integrated approach takes into consideration the psychological and sociological contributions to delinquency, and also the individual and environmental factors. Weis and Hawkins (1981), early supporters of so-called integrated theory, held that an integrated approach was significant in producing a model that is exegetic, especially since these three theories encapsulate legitimate and exhaustive explanations about delinquent behavior. A number of researchers contend that this integrated theory can explain delinquency far more efficiently than the use of any single theory (Elliott,
Huizinga, & Ageton, 1985; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1981). The integrated model is an empirically-informed theoretical base that is established on five underlying principles: (1) to prepare youth for gradual trust and autonomy in the community; (2) to work with both the youth and targeted community support systems (including families, schools, peers, employers, and churches) on characteristics needed for the youth's successful reintegration back into the community; (3) to assist youth and community interactions; (4) to generate appropriate resources and supports where required; and (5) to supervise, evaluate, and analyze youth and the community on their capability to resolve issues in a collaborative way (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1981).

To effect positive change with delinquent youth, a community-based program requires several therapeutic directions. According to Henggeler (1996), families, school personnel, and effective services within the community must be engaged. Services delivering a variety of youth- and family services that are individualized and exhaustive must be utilized from a community-based foundation. Research supporting the use of community-based services reported not only a cost-effective therapeutic model, but also statistically significant improvements in the behavior of violent and chronic delinquents who were not only violators of the law but also substance abusive, suicidal, and homicidal (Henggeler 1996; Henggeler, Pickerel, Brondino, & Crouch 1996). These community-based treatments included individual, group, family, and community interventions and treatment in a multidynamic team approach designed to deal with youth in comprehensive ways.
Research from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP, 1996) endorses the use of community-based systems to impose “restorative sanctions” on juvenile offenders, such as community service, victim involvement, mediation, and restitution. This treatment modality seeks to attain a balance between the legitimate needs of the community, the juvenile offender, and the victim, while enhancing community protection, competency development, and accountability (Bazemore & Umbreit, 1994).

Since delinquent behavior is often understood to be a by-product of the interaction between individual, familial, and extra-familial forces, the community-based treatment approach must be considered a major treatment modality. Ohlin and Miller (1985) wrote:

Delinquency is a community problem. In the final analysis the means to its prevention and control must be built into the fabric of community life. This can only happen if the community accepts its share of responsibility for having generated and perpetuated paths of socialization that lead to sporadic criminal episodes for some youth and careers in crime for others. (p. 116)

Much research indicates that many serious and habitual offenders are being successfully rehabilitated through the use of well-structured community-based treatment programs (Coldren & Bynaum, 1989; Conrad & Hedin 1987; Hawkins & Catalano, 1993; Hawkins & Nederhood, 1987; Howell, 1995; and Mendel, 1995). However, a need remains for more thorough evaluations of this community-based treatment modality (Krisberg, 1992).
Individualized Relational Therapy as an Intervention

Gendreau, Cullen, and Bonta (1994) argue that the only probation programs that have shown any reduction in recidivism were programs that "also attempted to provide a significant treatment component" (p. 74). Delinquency is the result of not only social context, but of internal psychological structures that have been shaped by life experiences. For example, the internal expectations that a person holds will affect his or her perception of possibilities. Likewise, a sense of self-confidence and inner security will affect behavioral choices. The individual who feels a healthy sense of empowerment and hope for his or her future will be less likely to disempower or injure others (Wolfe, 1998), and will be better able to withstand and address the negative impacts of the social context. For these reasons, treatment must address the internal dynamics of juvenile offenders.

In the current structure of the juvenile justice system, probation officers have many opportunities to provide this kind of individual relational treatment that can change the internal "causes" of delinquency. In order to implement such an approach, three changes will need to occur: (1) systems-wide support, which may entail the adoption of a new paradigm of treatment that is intra- and interpersonal/social in nature; (2) training in relational therapy; and (3) smaller caseloads for probation officers to allow time to implement this strategy. Probation officers have an enormous demand placed on them to provide corrective experiences useful to each unique youth. Probation officers must create a special interpersonal environment that facilitates
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change. In this writer's experience, a simple model of relational therapy has proven highly effective in rehabilitating juvenile delinquents. Briefly, this model is as follows and is based on attachment and object relations theory as described by Trembley (1996).

The underlying assumptions are that the self emerges out of relationship and that people have an innate need to be in relationship and to attach to others. Early attachment experiences profoundly affect later experiences by shaping one's beliefs about self, others, and the world. These beliefs, in turn, filter perceptions and therefore restrict possibilities to certain (expectable) pathways.

It follows that in order to change behavior, new possibilities need to be experienced and the old, limiting, beliefs need to be changed through a new set of relational interactions. These interactions must follow a process similar to that which instilled the original beliefs. Certain relational therapeutic provisions must be offered: holding, contradicting, and "staying put" (Kegan, 1982). These provisions then allow a youth to attach, differentiate, and integrate new ways of being and becoming in the context of this relationship.

More specifically, for probation officers working with delinquent youth, this model would be applied in the following manner. A probation officer would provide a safe and accepting environment in which a youth could share his or her history and explore beliefs about self and others and living (Trembley, 1996). This "holding function" allows the youth to attach to the probation officer and establishes the foundation for change from this base of trust. Then the probation officer can help the youth to
call into question some of his or her long-standing beliefs. This is accomplished by offering ideas and a “here and now” relational experience that contrasts with the youth’s familiar ways of thinking, being, and relating. As the youth learns different ways of being in the world and of getting needs met in responsible ways that do not violate the rights of others, the probation officer remains in relationship with the youth, or “stays put.” Staying put means to stay in relationship as the youth begins changing, remaining available to the youth as he or she makes healthy movements. This provides opportunities for the youth to work on and integrate self-change.

These therapeutic provisions move the external motivations for change, such as court sanctions, to internal motivations founded on hope and belief in oneself. Unfortunately, courts are under incredible pressure just to keep up with huge increases in petitions without any increase in staff or resources (Siegel & Senna, 1997). Smaller caseloads would offer probation officers opportunities to establish change-promoting relationships with the youth on their caseloads.

Intensive Probation

As noted above, many research studies have addressed the practical use of community-based alternatives for juvenile offenders (Austin et al., 1987; Barton & Butts, 1990; Coates, 1981; Gendreau & Ross, 1987; Greenwood, 1986; Kobrin & Klein, 1983; and McCarty, 1987). Specifically, Gendreau and Ross (1987) and Greenwood (1986) support the usefulness of certain community-based programs, such as intensive probation and home detention. The literature on intensive probation
programs for juveniles, although limited, attests that these intensive programs are as effective as incarceration in reducing recidivism (Barton & Butts, 1988; Murray & Cox, 1979). Additionally, Barton and Butts (1988) state that intensive supervision programs provide a cost-efficient approach in juvenile corrections. In their research, the estimated costs of such programs were reported as less than one-third of the cost associated with traditional incarceration.

Intensive probation programs are usually defined as programs in which a probation officer carries a caseload of between 10 and 12 youth. Intensive individual contact is emphasized in an effort to provide individualized intervention and treatment within the family and community. The intensive probation programs offer youth individual, group, and family counseling, either as part of the responsibility of the probation officer or through a contract with both public and private mental health systems. Along with the smaller ratio of youth-to-probation officers, increased court supervision for youth who demonstrate the need for closer attention, therapeutic intervention, and increased services are provided. In this way, a probation officer is available to work with a youth on the individual, family, community, and school issues that have brought her or him to the juvenile court. Another difference between traditional probation and intensive probation models is that the probation officer is available as issues arise. As critical incidents happen, a probation officer or member of the community-based team is ready to provide a corrective experience at a moment’s notice (Krisberg, 1992). Few other treatments have the “intensity, flexibility, and comprehensives needed to address such issues” (Henggeler, 1996, p.138).
Mentoring Programs

Mentoring programs are being investigated and supported by the federal government (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998). Mentoring programs usually involve volunteers spending time with youth in a supportive, role-modeling capacity. Mentors are often nonprofessional and untrained (Howell, Krisberg, Hawkins, & Wilson, 1995). Although the research on mentoring programs has not supported it as an intervention that produces significant changes (McPartland & Nettles, 1991; Slicker & Palmer, 1993), this research involves only untrained and nonprofessional mentors involved in the mentoring programs.

A program currently being developed at the Kent County Juvenile Court involves the use of trained professionals as senior mentors, who also train “apprentice” mentors to work with first-time adjudicated youth. This mentoring program has a number of objectives: (a) to provide immediate intervention, appropriate sanctions, and treatment for delinquent youth; (b) to provide new, healthy opportunities for children and youth; (c) to reduce at-risk youth involvement with guns, drugs, and gangs; and (d) to promote relational experiences that facilitate positive inner change.

A unique feature of this program, called the Community Mentoring Program (CMP), is its more wholistic approach to mentoring. Although each youth will be assigned a primary mentor, this mentor will work both individually and in groups with other mentors, community volunteers, and students to provide a wide range of opportunities and services for all youth in the program. These services and opportunities
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will consist of educational tutoring (including vocational, educational, and job skills),
counseling (including but not limited to social skills training and drug and alcohol
awareness), and recreational opportunities. This approach will also involve other
community organizations in collaborative working relationships with the juvenile court
to provide early intervention services for newly-adjudicated youth. Mentoring pro-
grams such as this, however, cannot replace the role of the probation officers.

Intensive probation and mentoring programs have the advantage of offering
treatment that includes some of the external factors and internal factors that contribute
to youthful crime. Corrective relational experiences can occur along with the provi-
sion of new opportunities in the social context. Additionally, few treatment programs
are as cost-effective as community-based treatment programs. For example, 70% of
the dollars the United States spends for children and adolescents is spent on out-of-
home placements (Burns, 1991). As stated earlier, institutionalization has little, if any,
success in rehabilitating youth offenders. Money is being squandered senselessly on
programs that have been proven ineffective. Unfortunately, this trend continues in
Michigan, where a movement to incarcerate youthful offenders is being supported.

In order for the juvenile courts to truly assist these youth and their families,
they must be more willing to engage in and evaluate the efficacy of more comprehen-
sive services, both community-based and relational, that empower youth. Dealing
with the issues that “cause” juvenile delinquency, creating positive opportunities for
change, and providing strong positive role models in their lives are among the goals
that offer hope for these youth.
Appendix A

Endorsement From the Western Michigan University
Human Subjects Institutional Review Board
Date: 25 March 1997

To: John Geisler, Principal Investigator
    Kathleen Bailey, Student Investigator

From: Richard Wright, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 97-03-10

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "The Effects of Social Skills Training and Reciprocal Social Skills Training with Parent/Guardian(s) on Behavior and Recidivism with First Time Adjudicated Youth" has been approved under the full category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: 25 March 1998
Appendix B

Endorsement From the Kent County Juvenile Court
Kathleen Bailey
Grand Valley State University

Dear Ms. Bailey,

The Kent County Juvenile Court is eager to work with you in the research project regarding the "effects of social skills training and reciprocal social skills training with parent/guardians on behavior and recidivism of first-time adjudicated youth." We understand that this study will compare a sample of youth who receive social skills training with their parent and youth whose caregivers are not trained in social skills, with a control group of youth who receive only traditional probation. Our support and consent to participate is indicated by way of this letter to you. We will provide the cases for this research, along with a place to run the groups. We will also provide some funding for this project. The Kent County Juvenile Court does, however, reserve the sole right to cancel this project at any time if it is determined that this project does not serve the best interests of the juvenile court.

The Kent County Juvenile Court understands that information regarding the names of juveniles and their parents/guardians will be confidential and that the names of youth and/or their parents or guardians will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded.

The Kent County Juvenile Court will commit the amount of $1,500 to this research along with whatever funds are left-over from our previous social skills grant. We will also provide a site for the program activities and testing to take place.

If you need more information that indicates our willingness and commitment to cooperate and work with you in this research/study, then contact me as soon as possible. We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with you.

Sincerely,

Jack Roedema
Court Administrator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID NUMBER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>HEARING DATE:</th>
<th>FINAL HEARING:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTING #1</th>
<th>TESTING #2</th>
<th>TESTING #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISDEMEANOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>JESNESS INVENTORY SCORES PRETEST</th>
<th>JESNESS INVENTORY SCORES POSTTEST I</th>
<th>JESNESS INVENTORY SCORES POSTTEST II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Letter From the Court About Social Skills Training
Dear _______________________:

Your son, ________________ has been ordered into the Kent County Juvenile Court's Positive Interaction Program. This program will consist of 10 group sessions during which the groups facilitator work with you on select skills. These skills include: 1) Giving Positive Feedback, 2) Giving Negative Feedback, 3) Accepting Negative Feedback, 4) Resisting Peer Pressure, 5) Problem Solving 6) Negotiation, 7) Following Instructions and 8) Conversation. These groups are designed to assist your teenager with skill building opportunities so that they can be in better control of different situations. These groups will also help your teenager to be more comfortable and responsible in different social situations.

Since most of your teenager’s learning will occur at home, it is important for you as the parent to be involved in this learning process.

Groups sessions are as followed:

#1:

#2:

#3:

#4:

#5:

#6:

#7:

#8:

#9:

#10:

All groups for you will start at 6:30pm and end at 8:00pm. We ask that you arrive at these meetings about 10 minutes before group starts as the court doors will not be opened sooner. We ask that you not be late to these session as late arrivals will disrupt the group process.

You will be asked to complete various questionnaires before and after this training. We appreciate your cooperation very much and encourage you to call me if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,
Appendix E

Pretest, Posttest 1 and Posttest 2 Mean Scores for All Groups 1, 2, and 3
Table 32

Pretest, Posttest 1 and Posttest 2 Mean Scores for All Groups 1, 2, and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesness Scale, Subscales and Offense Type</th>
<th>Group #1</th>
<th>Group #2</th>
<th>Group #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest 1</td>
<td>Posttest 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/SM Scale</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO Scale</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm Scale</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au Scale</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Scale</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Scale</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wd Scale</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Scale</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep Scale</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Den Scale</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI Scale</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>67.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Subscale</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Subscale</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFM Subscale</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFC Subscale</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Subscale</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA Subscale</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NX Subscale</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Subscale</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI Subscale</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offense</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Offense</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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