

SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS AND CRIMINALITY: AN ANALYSIS INTO THE TYPES OF SCHOOL
INTERVENTIONS AND CRIMINALITY

by

HOLTON SILAS HEMBY

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements
For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2015

Copyright © by Holton Hemby 2015

All Rights Reserved



Acknowledgements

My sincerest gratitude goes to my thesis chair, Dr. Seokjin Jeong. Your guidance and expertise were essential throughout this research process. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Richard Smith, and Dr. John Rodriguez for the assistance and guidance they provided during this project. Lastly, I would like to recognize the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department for allowing me to conduct research at their location. I would also like to recognize the entire faculty of the UTA Criminology and Criminal Justice Program for their teaching and assistance in completing this project.

Lastly, I want to thank my family, friends, and colleagues who have supported me throughout this journey. My sincerest gratitude goes to my parents Christie Hemby and Mike Hemby for providing me with the tremendous support throughout my educational endeavors.

April 17, 2015

Abstract

SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS AND CRIMINALITY: AN ANALYSIS INTO THE TYPES OF SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS AND CRIMINALITY

Holton Hemby, MA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2015

Supervising Professor: Seokjin Jeong

The study focuses on the types of school interventions used in the educational system in order to understand a correlation with criminality. The participants consist of 105 individuals that were sentenced to probation in Parker County, Texas, from January 1, 2015 to February 28, 2015. The research displays gender, race, education, school interventions, juvenile criminality, and adult criminality from the participants of Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department. The variables of the participants were then analyzed through a cross tabulation and logistical regression. According to the results, there is no significant association with school interventions and adult criminality. In contrast, the relationship between juvenile criminality and school interventions is statistically significant. Specifically, students are more likely to be involved in juvenile criminality when referred to a secondary school than students that were not referred. Policy implications at both the state level and school level are that policy makers and school officials need to have disciplinary alternatives than school interventions.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Tables.....	vi
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	3
School Interventions in the Educational system.....	3
Zero Tolerance & School Interventions in the Educational System.....	6
Zero Tolerance Policies and Criminality.....	11
School Interventions and Adult Criminality.....	16
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	21
Chapter 4 Results and Findings.....	25
Descriptive Results.....	25
Sample Characteristics.....	30
School Interventions and Adult Criminality.....	32
School Interventions and Juvenile Criminality.....	36
Chapter 5 Conclusions.....	42
Chapter 6 Limitations.....	44
Chapter 7 Implications.....	47
State Level Implications.....	47
School Level Implications.....	50
References.....	54
Biography Information.....	57

List of Tables

Table 1: Juvenile Criminality and Adult criminality.....	26
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics.....	27
Table 3: Logistical Regression: Adult Criminality.....	28
Table 4: Logistical Regression: Juvenile Criminality.....	28
Table 5: Correlation Matrix.....	29

Chapter 1

Introduction

Education is a cornerstone of the development of adolescents in society. Education is an essential component that will affect individuals throughout every aspect of their childhood, adolescence, and into adulthood. Additionally, educational curriculum in the educational system teaches students many different concepts. One of the concepts is correcting unacceptable behavior and disciplining this behavior appropriately. In the Texas public school system, 56.9% of students experienced some form of suspension or expulsion in middle school or high school (Fabelo, 2011). According to Monahan, et al (2014), all U.S middle schools and high schools have policies put in place that allow students who threaten the well-being of classmates and/or students that disrupt the quality of the educational environment to be removed or be temporarily suspended or permanently expelled. There are five hypotheses that are presented.

The first hypothesis presented is that school interventions or zero tolerance policies in the educational system increase adult criminality. The second hypothesis is that school interventions or zero tolerance policies in the education system increase students contact with the juvenile justice system. This type of discipline in the educational system is an intervention which is used to correct deviant behavior within the school environment. According to the School Crime and Discipline Handbook (2013), discipline can consist of removal from the class room, suspension from school, removal to a disciplinary alternative education program, expulsion from school, and placement into juvenile justice alternative education program. This intervention has the same intentions as the criminal justice system which is to correct behavior that is antisocial, and behavior that is deviant from the societal norm. However, in the criminal justice system deviant behavior is corrected to improve the relationship with society. Comparably, in the educational system interventions are to correct behavior, and the relationship with the learning environment.

As a result, school interventions lead to suspensions and to expulsions from the educational system. School interventions such as suspensions and expulsions are due to zero tolerance policies in the education system. Policies such as zero tolerance have increased the number of students that are suspended or expelled from school for disciplinary purposes, which expedites student contact with law

enforcement (Skiba, 2014). The third hypothesis is that males are more likely to be referred to school interventions. According to Casella (2003), zero tolerance policies have taken students from being disciplined by school officials to being referred to the criminal justice system for disciplinary action. Additionally, there are differences in gender and school interventions. The fourth hypothesis is that nonwhites are at an increased risk of being referred to school interventions. Zero tolerance policies are based on the theory that when disruptions and/or disorders threaten the educational system, it operates under the assumption that the greater authority and suppression is required to keep schools secure (Skiba, 2014). The fifth hypothesis is that school interventions can decrease graduations rates. Additionally, outcomes of zero tolerance policies and school interventions have created unintended consequences for children, families, and communities (Skiba, 2014). In conclusion, this research will examine school interventions and the correlation with the juvenile justice system, criminal justice system, and criminality.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

School Interventions in the Educational System

Throughout the history of the American educational system, education and discipline have been a cornerstone development that is ingrained into the functions of the educational system. The importance that is placed on the educational development of adolescences and youths is equally congruent to the importance that is placed on discipline. According to Hirschfield (2008), order and discipline have always been a key component in the American educational system. The importance of education for youths during adolescence is paramount in the development of cognitive ability. Therefore, the importance of correcting disruptive behavior is essential in the educational setting.

However, discipline in the educational system has been evolving throughout history. Traditionally, discipline in the educational system was intended to create respect, and teach adolescents and youths proper behavior. According to Hirschfield (2008), the traditional disciplinary approach in the American education system has been diminishing. The approach has shifted from discipline to punishment. School interventions were attended to approach disruptive behavior in a manner that seeks to discipline students in order to correct the learning environment. Comparably, the criminal justice system throughout history has also increased in size (Hirschfield, 2008). There are many implications that have resulted from the increase in size of the criminal justice system. One implication that has translated into the educational system is that there has been a redefinition of disruptive students. The management of students through school interventions is prone to redefinition and a change in discretionary outcomes.

As result of this shift, the educational system began seeing students through a different perspective. Traditionally, disruptive students were seen as deviant students (Hirschfield, 2008). However, students that currently are defined as disruptive and trouble making are more likely to be defined as criminal (Hirschfield, 2008). This shift in perspective can be explained through many perspectives. The main explanation is within the elements of the criminal justice system; however, the punishment that occurs has translated into the educational system. According to Hirschfield (2008), students that are defined as criminals are more likely to be treated as such through policies and practices. Students that are defined as criminals are more likely to be subjected to policies that define the students

as a criminal or are referenced to law enforcement based on their disciplinary infraction. As a result, many disruptive students in the educational system are increasingly becoming more criminalized (Hirschfield, 2008).

The criminalization of students through school interventions has many explanations. The main explanation is that legal reforms of student code of conduct policies have impacted the educational system. For example, most legislative responses through school interventions do not define new crimes nor increase penalties for disruptive behavior (Hirschfield, 2008). Substantially, legal reforms of school interventions require that certain disruptive behaviors or illegal offenses be referred to police when the incident occurs on school property (Hirschfield, 2008). The referral to law enforcement for disruptive behavior or illegal offenses expedites student's contact with the criminal justice system, and further reinforces the idea that the education system is shifting to a crime control approach. Additionally, schools have recently begun implementing school interventions such as school suspensions, detention, suspensions, secondary school, armed police presence, police dogs, and/or metal detectors (Hirschfield, 2008). The criminalization of school interventions has not only continued to increase in similarities with the criminal justice system, but has also affected the students that are referred to school interventions.

As a result, students are not the only entity of the educational system that has been affected in this shift of the education paradigm. School employees and officials have been affected by the legal reforms. According to Hirschfield (2008), the criminalization of school interventions has affected the decision making that policy makers, school officials, and employees use when addressing a disciplinary infraction. As criminalization increases in the educational system implications from this phenomena have affected the mandatory discretion that employees and school officials possesses. There have been many policies implemented that are mandatory minimum disciplinary interventions to certain disciplinary infractions. The criminalization of disciplinary infractions limits the discretion that school employees and school officials have, and ultimately increases disruptive students contact with the criminal justice system.

In a study conducted by Paul Hirschfield (2008), he analyzed the educational system, and the management of disciplining students through a crime control model. He concluded that the educational system is becoming similar to the criminal justice system in the context of the management of disruptive

students (Hirschfield, 2008). He presents three dimensions that have become increasingly common within the educational system. The first dimension is that school punishment has become formal and procedural (Hirschfield, 2008). Additionally, school punishment has become focused on the nature of the offense rather than the factors that are contributing to the disciplinary infraction. This shift takes the discretionary decisions away from school officials and employees and shifts the discretion to referral agencies. The shift in the referrals to formal policies has continued to reinforce the shift in policies that resemble the criminal justice system. For example, zero tolerance policies were introduced as a formal response to disciplinary infractions. According to Simon (2006), zero tolerance policies were intended for alcohol, tobacco, drugs and violence. Comparably, policies such as zero tolerance policies in the educational system resemble similar policies in the criminal justice system. For example, in the criminal justice system there are mandatory minimum sentences for a variety of offenses. Therefore, if an individual has committed an offense within the mandatory minimum sentencing, they can be subject to predetermined punishment.

As a result, the second dimension presented concludes that there is an increase in school discipline such as suspensions and expulsions in the educational system (Hirschfield, 2008). An explanation to this increase in referrals such as suspensions and expulsions can be contributed to the continued criminalization of the educational system. Many schools that continue to increase their use of policies such as suspensions and expulsions do so with the intended responses such as deterrence and incapacitation. Schools use policies such as expulsions and suspensions to deter other students from committing similar discipline infractions. Additionally, schools use policies such as these in order to incapacitate students who display behavior that is disruptive or that is deemed as a disciplinary infraction.

The third dimension present is that criminalization in the educational system implements criminal justice technology, methodology, and personnel for disciplinary and security purposes (Hirschfield, 2008). The educational system has started using technology that is used in the criminal justice system. For example, gates, walls, fencing, and metal detectors are just some of many technological advances that are shared between the educational system and the criminal justice system. According to Hirschfield (2008), preventive measures such as metal detectors and personal searchers of students represent a transparent shift to criminalization since schools are implementing measures that define students as

criminals. These preventive measures can be argued as proactive in order to prevent any potential disciplinary infraction. However, the implementations of preventive measures that are comparable to the criminal justice system represent a shift in the criminalization of school interventions.

In addition, the methodology behind the process of referring a student to a school intervention has been affected by the shift in criminalization of disciplinary infractions. Traditional school interventions handled disruptive students within the school and educational system. Contrastingly, the current school discipline methodology integrates the juvenile justice system and criminal justice system. According to Hirschfield (2008), there has been an increase in the collaboration between educational system and the juvenile justice system. This collaborative approach to disciplinary infractions further reinforces that there is a substantial shift in the criminalization of the methodology of school interventions. As a result, of the zero tolerance policies that have been put in place within the student code of conduct many of the offenses that are referred to the juvenile justice system are considered minor.

In conclusion, Hirschfield (2008) presented two dimensions of school interventions that highlight variables that contribute to the criminalization of school interventions. First, the use of technology that is similar to prisons in the criminal justice center will contribute to an environment that can be transparent to a prison or jail. Additionally, there are requirements within the educational system where police presence is required at schools. Second, many schools have a School Resource Officer, which are police officers that have completed training that is specific to the educational setting (Hirschfield, 2008). The collaborative approach between schools and criminal justice agencies has been key components in the shift of criminalizing school interventions. As this partnership continues to increase there will be similarities between the criminal justice system and educational system which contain variables that are identifiable within both systems. The use of zero tolerance policies also reinforces the shift of criminalization with the educational settings.

Zero Tolerance & School Interventions in the Educational System

In the beginning, zero tolerance policies were created to discourage students from using drugs. During the 1990s, school administrators became increasingly concerned about drug use and gang activity among students (Curtis, 2014). Dramatic events, such as the school shooting at Columbine High School, further solidified concern about school safety (Curtis, 2014). As a result, many states and schools started

implementing zero tolerance policies. According to Curtis (2014), zero tolerance policies “mandate predetermined consequences or punishments for specific offenses.” Additionally, zero tolerance policies are based on the assumption that removing students from the school environment when they behave deviant or disruptively will protect the learning environments and deter others from engaging in similar patterns of conduct (Curtis, 2014). Many school officials believe that zero tolerance policies may also deter bad behavior through representation of punishment that will communicate to students that deviant behavior is unacceptable and that disciplinary infractions will be punished adequately (Curtis, 2014).

The ideology of getting tough on crime approach has been translated to the educational system. Additionally, a crime control approach has been used when addressing a disciplinary infraction. The absolute punishment for disciplinary infractions has a response that equates to zero tolerance ideology. Zero tolerance intentions are to stop deviant behavior from occurring because of the deterrence that is created from the punishment. However, the severity of punishment doesn't always equate to deterrence from committing a crime. For example, in 1994 the U.S. federal government issued the Gun-Free School act of 1994, which required any school that is receiving title 1 funding to “expel from school for a period of not less than 1 year a student who is determined to have brought a firearm to a school ” (Curtis, pg. 1254, 2014). Additionally, this act required that school administration officials refer the student to the juvenile justice system (Curtis, 2014). A zero tolerance policy such as this expedites the process in which students can come into contact with the criminal justice system. As a result of the Gun-Free School act of 1994, many school districts across the nation began implementing other types of zero tolerance policies for other disciplinary infractions (Curtis, 2014). In Texas, an act was introduced by the Texas Education Code, Chapter 37, Discipline; Law and Order (Appleseed, 2007). This chapter of the Texas Education code requires that students who commit serious offenses or disciplinary infractions be removed to alternative campuses in order to preserve a safe school (Appleseed, 2007). Additionally, this gives school administrators wide discretion to remove students for various violations that are defined by their student code of conduct (Appleseed, 2007). As a result, Chapter 37 removes students, based off of zero tolerance policies, for offenses such as profanity, disrupting class, and repeat violations of a student code of conduct policy.

As a result, this research will question if school interventions can lead to contact with the criminal justice system. Disciplinary interventions in schools currently operate under a model of zero tolerance (Monahan, et al, 2014). Zero tolerance policies in the education system were first introduced in 1989 (Monahan, et al, 2014). Additionally, these policies were intended to deter youths and adolescents from violence, drug use, or any behavior or action that is not permitted on school property (Monahan, et al, 2014). For example, in 1994, federal legislation required states to expel any student who brought a firearm to school for one year, or lose all federal funding (Morin, 2014). Implementations such as the Morin example are mandated for schools to implement or schools can risk reduced funding. As a result, many schools have adopted zero tolerance policies to include all type of disciplinable behavior such as, weapons, incidents of bullying, and drugs and alcohol possessions (Morin, 2014). These behaviors that are mandated by regulation are also dependent on the discretion of administration officials and employees of the school. At the onset of implementation, these policies made it mandatory to suspend or expelled students that were suspected to be involved in violence, drug use or gang related activity (Skiba and Knesting 2001). Zero tolerance policies were created so that students would deter from committing offenses that are classified by the school. However, zero tolerance policies remain rather controversial and many educators and parents question the effectiveness of such policies (Morin, 2014).

Furthermore, a justification of zero tolerance policies in the educational system is that they create uniformity throughout the punishment policies. For example, if a student is truant from school, and any other student that commits the same disciplinary infraction he or she must be subject to the same punishment. These punishments predetermine the penalties without considering any other factors. However, school administrators believe that if students are not “subject to predetermined punishments for misbehavior, they will learn that there are no consequences for inappropriate and sometimes illegal behavior, as long as it occurs within the property of the school” (Curtis, 2014).

The current educational system has disciplinary interventions to correct behavior that threatens or disrupts the learning environment. Zero tolerance policies are implemented to require punishment of any infraction against a school’s code of conduct, state school code of conduct, and federal code of conduct. This policy is implemented into the educational system for a variety of reasons. First, this policy is created to address any behavior; such as status offenses, drug and alcohol violations, and violent or disruptive

behavior. As a result, any type of disruptive behavior or repeat violations of school conduct can lead to a referral to zero tolerance policies. Second, zero tolerance policies were implemented to cease the onset of deviant or disruptive behavior with such severity that it deters the possibility of any future behavior. Third, zero tolerance policies enable school officials and authorities absolute discretion over the range of punishment that can be referred. For example, if a student is late for class the teacher has the option to punish the student at the regulation of a zero tolerance policy with the intentions to correct the behavior, which can lead to a referral. However, this also allows school officials, employees, and authority to punish students for minor infractions. Zero tolerance policies are created to take a get tough on crime approach to ensure that the learning environment is not disrupted, and to correct any behavior that is deemed deviant.

The severity of a response to a disciplinary infraction is at the evaluation of the employee of the school, and under the guidelines of the Student Code of Conduct. However, over time zero tolerance policies have evolved as response to other offenses. Zero tolerance policies have been applied to other offenses such as cigarette smoking, cheating, swearing, and disruptive behavior (Monahan, et al, 2014). For example, in Texas there is a requirement for alternative educational referrals for students that are expelled, and/or the student serving out the suspensions or expulsion by staying simply staying at home (Fabelo, 2011). This led to an increase in the amount of students that were being suspended, expelled, and sentenced other type of intervention.

As a result, zero tolerance policies have been pipe-lining students that are disciplined through school interventions into the criminal justice system (Barrett, 2011). Additionally, in 2008, the American Psychological Association published a report that concluded, zero tolerance has not been shown to improve school climate or school safety (Morin, 2014). According to Morin (2014), researchers who conducted the study concluded concern that zero tolerance policies were unnecessarily preventing children from getting a public education and causing many children to face legal charges for relatively minor offenses. In particular, zero tolerance policies have expedited student contact into the juvenile justice system. According to Monahan, et al, (2014), school disciplinary interventions place students and youths at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system, and place less risky youths as well. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics (2013), policies such as zero tolerance are detrimental to students

because students who are referred to suspensions and expulsions are 10 times more likely to drop out of high school. The disciplinary system that the schools have been using has marginalized the difference in discretion between serious offenses and minor offense. For example, if a student commits an offense such as fighting he or she faces similar discipline as an offense such as class room disruption. The variety of offenses that schools are disciplining with zero tolerance policies has increased for serious offenders, and also less serious offenders contact, with criminal justice system.

Furthermore, once students are integrated into the juvenile justice system, they hold an increased chance to be integrated into the adult criminal justice system. Mulvey (2011), found an increase in the percentage of adolescents that continued criminal activity into young adulthood. His research study examined 1,354 high risk juvenile offenders ages 14-18 over a time period of seven years and revealed that approximately half of those classified as high risk offenders continued to commit offenses and maintain delinquent behavior into adulthood and into the adult criminal justice system. In this research, delinquent behavior that is corrected through suspensions, expulsion, and other disciplinary actions can lead to further delinquent behavior into adulthood.

In the study *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, et al, 2010), researchers studied millions of school and juvenile records in Texas. This study focused on the impact that suspensions and expulsion have on students (Fabelo, et al, 2010). They highlighted four significant findings and issues with discipline within the educational system. First, nearly six out of ten public school students were suspended or expelled at least once between their seventh and twelfth grade school years (Fabelo, et al, 2010). Additionally, the researchers concluded that 54 percent received in school suspensions, and 31 percent of students received an out of school suspension (Fabelo, et al, 2010). This statistic represents the prevalence that disciplinary interventions are used in the educational system. Second, they concluded that African-American students, and students with educational disabilities, were disproportionately likely to be subject to disciplinary action (Fabelo, et al, 2010). A significant statistic that was presented was that African-American students had a 31 percent increase of being sentenced to some type of school discretion action (Fabelo, et al, 2010). This statistic is comparable to the overrepresentation of African Americans in the criminal justice system.

Third, students who were suspended and/or expelled were more likely to be held back a grade or to drop out than were students not involved in the disciplinary system (Fabelo, et al, 2010). This finding represents that the students who received a suspension or expulsion were more likely to not finish their education or be held back. When a student does not complete their education it creates a risk factor that has the potential to lead to future delinquency. Fourth, when a student is suspended and/or expelled, his or hers likelihood of being involved in the juvenile justice system the upcoming year dramatically increases (Fabelo, et al, 2010). This finding is a significant issue within the educational system. By disciplining students through the means of suspension or expulsions can increase the risk of contact with the criminal justice system.

According to Routine Activities theory (Monahan, et al, 2014), suspension or expulsion from the school would increase the manifestation of criminal behavior because of the absence of a capable guardian. Additionally, the absences from school hold the potential to increase the amount of time available to engage in delinquent behavior, and increase the chance of arrest (Monahan, et al, 2014). Suspensions and expulsions rates among schools varied significantly when compared with student compositions and campus characteristics (Monahan, et al, 2014). A contributing issue is the prevalence of all the different variables that can contribute to the correlation between school discipline intervention and the criminal justice system.

Zero Tolerance Policies and Criminality

In particular, interventions such as zero tolerance policies can have detrimental effects on students, which increase their chances of contact with the criminal justice system. Zero tolerance policies consist of; disciplinary referrals; in school suspensions; out of school suspensions; and, secondary schools (Appleseed, 2007). Additionally, the more serious disciplinary infractions were sent to more intensive Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program or Texas Youth Commission (Appleseed, 2007). However, zero tolerance policies focus on students who violate school rules and are punished by this type of discipline. This discipline consists of suspensions or expulsions from the educational system which will place students at an increases risk of coming into contact with the criminal justice system (Monahan, et al, 2014). According to Texas A&M University's Public Policy Research Institute (2007), the single most significant risk factor that is associated with future involvement in the criminal justice system

is a history of disciplinary referrals in the educational system. Given that the student is a juvenile, most juvenile delinquency cases start with a school referral (Curtis, 2014). School administrators hold the discretion to refer students to the juvenile justice system for a variety of offenses. According to Curtis (2014), many schools frequently respond to disruptive behavior or disciplinary infractions by referring students to law enforcement. Furthermore, referrals such as these can result in juvenile or criminal charges, and placements into different types of detention facilities (Curtis, 2014). The referral of students to the criminal justice system dramatically expedites the school to prison pipeline. Additionally, many referrals are not consider crimes by adults or are defined as disruptive behavior. According to Curtis (2014), many students enter the criminal justice system by means of school referrals for status offenses; noncriminal misbehaviors such as truancy and alcohol use that are only illegal for minors or young students. Additionally, status offenses and truancy are rapidly increasing referrals from schools into the criminal justice system (Curtis, 2014). One of the most common types of discipline used by the educational system is suspensions from school. This type of discipline is widely used in responses to fighting and physical aggression (Monahan, et al, 2014). However, zero tolerance policies are widely used more often with offenses that are less serious such as disobedience, disrespect, attendance problems, and general class room disruptions (Dupper and Bosch 1996; Skiba and Knesting 2001).

The use of zero tolerance policies creates a response from students that can contribute to the likelihood of future criminality. According to Curtis (2014), harsh discipline pushes students out of school. Student's behavioral responses to zero tolerance policies are paramount in effecting future criminality. Zero tolerance policies that have strict disciplinary policies make schools uncomfortable for students that are committing an infraction against the school's disciplinary code (Curtis, 2014). When students are punished harshly it forces them out of the educational system and into the juvenile and criminal justice system (Curtis, 2014). For example, when a student is punished by a disciplinary infraction he or she would feel that they are alienated from the norm of educational environment. The punishment separates the student from the general student population, which creates a different classification of students. By removing students from the school or educational setting it holds the potential to lead to further misbehaving and criminal behavior. Zero tolerance policies can prolong criminality and continue to disrupt behavior into adulthood. As a result, suspensions and expulsions from school are correlated with higher

rates of antisocial and illegal behavior which includes drug use; increases in potential suspensions or expulsions; and, contact with the criminal justice system.

In addition, zero tolerance policies create stigmatizations that effect students. Stigmatizations from zero tolerance policies also label students as deviant or disruptive. This label can be detrimental to the development of the student and can prolong delinquent behavior into adulthood. According to Tannenbaum (1938), deviant behavior amongst adolescents is normal. However, once that behavior is labeled as delinquent the person will further become deviant, because the individual becomes the label that is described (Tannenbaum, 1938).

According to Restio and Lanier (2013), labeling theory predicts that punishment stigmatizes an offender in a manner that frequently will have unintended consequences of developing future delinquent behavior. Additionally, the labeling of offenders contradicts the philosophy that punishment will decrease additional delinquent acts because additional delinquent acts are likely to occur once the label is internalized by the individual (Restio and Lanier, 2013). In the educational system, many disciplinary infractions are comparable to delinquent acts and are punished with the same intent that severe punishment will suppress any future disciplinary infractions.

As a result, adolescent students especially are subject to certain types of labels. Social labels are defined as an identity of an individual that is formed from self-concept, blocked opportunities, and a deviant subculture (Restio and Lanier, 2013; Tannenbaum, 1938; Schwartz and Skolnick, 1962). The first variable of social identity which is self-concept, affects the perspective that a labeled individual sees one self. Schwartz and Skolnick (1962) concluded that the criminal justice system processes in a manner that will negatively affect an individual's self-concept and this is prevalent amongst adolescents. Comparably, the educational disciplinary system can also negatively affect a student's self-concept. According to Jensen (1972), adolescents that are labeled have a more delinquent perspective and self-identity than adolescents who have never received a label. As a result, many adolescents and students have an increased risk to view their own identity as delinquent or disruptive, which can lead to future delinquent and disciplinary infractions. According to Matsueda (1992), labeling separates individuals from obtaining success. Additionally, labeled stereotypes that are correlated with a delinquent or disruptive classification define individuals that have received some type of formal or informal intervention (Restio and Lanier,

2013). As a result, many family members, friends, and teachers view the individual labeled with the perspective that they are delinquent or disruptive (Restio and Lanier, 2013). The stigmatization that occurs from a delinquent or disruptive label can not only block current or future opportunities, but continue to develop criminality into adulthood.

Second, blocked opportunities are a consequence of labeling which can lead to further disruptive, delinquent, and criminal behavior. Bernbug and Krohn (2003), concluded that disciplinary interventions decrease graduation rates, and are correlated with an increase in criminality participation into adulthood. Additionally, labeling that occurs during school disciplinary policies not only affect a student's self-concept but also the additional outside variables that can become blocked (Bernbug and Krohn, 2003). In the educational system, many blocked opportunities can consist of removing a student from a learning environment that all other students are granted. Once removed, the learning environment becomes marginalized and adjusted to the student that is displaying disruptive behavior. In many instances, students that are being disruptive or delinquent are removed from the current learning environment and placed into an isolated learning environment. Isolated learning environments can consist of removal from the class room, suspension from school, removal to a disciplinary alternative education program, expulsion, and placement into a juvenile justice alternative education program (School Crime and Discipline Handbook, 2013). According to Bernbug and Krohn (2003), the marginalization that occurs from labeled students, including students that are involved in a type of disciplinary infractions will result in an increase in participating in more crime and delinquency into adulthood. Criminal or delinquent perceptions that are created from labeling can be detrimental to the student. In addition, the stigmatizations that influence perceptions of delinquent offenders will result in blocked opportunities and negative perceptions of the student that will influence future success for delinquent students (Restio and Lanier, 2013).

Third, a consequence of labeling students through zero tolerance policies is combining the students into a deviant sub culture (Restio and Lanier, 2013). A deviant sub culture is a group of individuals that identify with each other through a label of delinquent or disruptive. This identification is correlated with being punished accordingly through a school intervention. In the criminal justice system, especially in prisons and jails, offenders are isolated from society, and gathered into an environment that

is labeled as deviant. Similarly, in the educational system students that are disruptive or delinquent are gathered into an environment that separates them from the general student population. In both the criminal justice system and educational system deviant offenders and disruptive students are given labels that identify each subculture. Many students assign themselves labels that are dependent on the subculture of their associated peers. According to Restio and Lanier (2013), delinquent peer associations can be correlated with interventions based off future delinquency. Many students once labeled as disruptive or delinquent will seek out other students that share similar labels. In addition, the stigmatizations that are correlated with deviant labels can promote identification with deviant subcultures, which can lead to the exclusion from relationships with the general student population (Restio and Lanier, 2013). This can occur for a variety of reasons. Students that are disciplined through zero tolerance policies can embrace the label of disruptive or delinquent and identify with other labeled students. One explanation to this correlation is that disruptive or delinquent labeled students will relate to each other as a means of security and acceptance (Restio and Lanier, 2013). This identification with a delinquent subculture will embrace a labeled relationship between disruptive or delinquent students, which can increase the prevalence of deviant behavior. A delinquent subculture not only reinforces deviant behavior, but will embrace a student's disruptive or delinquent labeled identity which then could lead to an increase of engaging in delinquent behavior (Restio and Lanier, 2013).

In conclusion of labeling and zero tolerance policies, labels determine many different perspectives that are formed to identify a student. These labels that can occur from zero tolerance policies and school interventions hold enormous ramifications as it pertains to future delinquent behavior. For example, if a student is disruptive and is referred to a disciplinary infraction a label is created. A delinquent or disruptive label can be correlated to a delinquent or disruptive student. Additionally, these labels are applied to deviant sub cultures. Similarly, in the criminal justice system, when an individual commits a crime they are labeled as a criminal. This label affects their own self-concept, which is the perspective that an individual views themselves. A disruptive or delinquent self-perspective by a student can be detrimental to their current livelihood, and can continue into their adulthood. Additionally, once a label is defined it holds the potential to block many future opportunities for a student. Blocked opportunities that are created from disruptive or delinquent labels not only decrease graduation rates, but

can be detrimental to future success and criminality. Lastly, a disruptive or delinquent student once labeled becomes part of deviant sub culture. This sub culture is comprised of similar students who were disruptive or delinquent and were referred to a type of school intervention. The peer association within a deviant sub culture can lead to an increase in future criminality. The same type of stigmatization occurs when a student is deemed disruptive or delinquent. This behavior exists in many different aspects of the educational system.

School Interventions and Adult Criminality

As a result, the criminalization of school discipline interventions has created a school to prison pipeline that funnels at risk youth from the class room to a retributive disciplinary policy to the juvenile justice system, and last, on to a path of contact with the adult criminal justice system (Barrett, 2011). The school interventions create an issue of stigmatizations of individuals, which can lead to addition discipline through the criminal justice. A consequential issue of the education system, is that they are pipe-lining students into the juvenile justice system, and ultimately into the adult criminal justice system. There are many factors that can contribute to this phenomena. First, the range of intervention and/or discipline is not evaluated to properly address or correct behavior. Suspensions and expulsion seek to remove the onset of a problem, which will not fix the problem once the discipline is served. Second, there are stigmatizations that occur from discipline interventions. For example, once a student is disciplined they are given a label that they display deviant behavior that needs to be corrected. The student will be given a type of discipline that is easily recognized, and can be identifiable through associations with other disciplined students. For example, when a student is referred to detention, he or she is placed in a room with other disruptive students that are easily identified by other students and school employees. Students will begin to recognize this label and self-fulfill the label given leading to further deviant behavior. Third, many students are referred to the juvenile justice system in accordance with zero tolerance policies. For example, when a student commits a disciplinary infraction there is a possibility that the student will be referred to the juvenile justice system. Once in the system the student has been exposed to an entity of the criminal justice system. This exposer not only creates familiarity with the criminal justice system, but also increases the likelihood of reoffending. Last, school administrations should properly evaluate their discretion when giving out discipline referrals. Zero tolerance policies intentions should not be to remove

the problem, but to correct behavior at the onset instead of prolonging deviant behavior. Additionally, this should be taken into consideration in disciplinary decisions.

As a result, zero tolerance policies often result in the student being referred to the juvenile justice system. Once in the juvenile justice system there are many variables that can contribute continuation of criminal behavior. A continuation of criminal behavior can be defined as recidivism. In the juvenile justice system many juveniles that recidivate share similar characteristics. According to Mulder, et al (2010), juveniles that reoffend can be attributed to risk factors such as age of first offense, a high number of previous offenses, family criminality, low academic achievement, contact with criminal peers, absence of positive coping skills, incidents within various institutions, and conduct disorders. Many of these identified risk factors can be influenced by zero tolerance policies.

The first risk factor that can be contributed to zero tolerance policies is the age in which the first offense is committed. Status offenses are offenses that adults cannot be tried, but adolescents can. For example, status offenses can consist of alcohol violations, tobacco violations, truancy, curfew violations, and referrals from the educational system. Similarly, many juveniles enter the juvenile justice system through school referrals, status offenses, and noncriminal misbehaviors (Curtis, 2014). The age at which a juvenile is arrested can include referrals from school, status offenses, and noncriminal misbehaviors, which can be a result of zero tolerance policies in the educational system.

The second risk factor that can influence zero tolerance policies in the education system is low academic achievement. Zero tolerance policies can have detrimental effects on academic achievement. According to Bernbug and Krohn (2003), different disciplinary interventions, such as zero tolerance policies, can decrease academic success. Academic achievement in the educational system provides social labels for students and also the quality of education that is provided. For example, when a student becomes disruptive, he or she can be removed from the education environment and can be placed in an environment that is not as beneficial. Low academic success can also be correlated to the continuation of criminality into adulthood (Bernbug and Krohn, 2003).

The third risk factor that can be contributed to zero tolerance policies, and further criminality is contact with disruptive or criminal peers. Zero tolerance policies separate the student that is being disruptive from the student population. Similar to the criminal justice system, individuals that are being

deviant are separated from the society and placed into an environment with other deviant individuals. Comparably, in the education system students that are disruptive are referred to environments that are composed of other disruptive students. For example, a student is placed in a secondary school because of a disciplinary infraction. Once the student is attending the secondary school there is an increase in the contact with criminal or disruptive peers. Peer association is paramount to further criminality. According to Boisvert, et al (2013), students select themselves into disruptive or deviant peer groups based on similar characteristics they retain to the point in which their own behaviors and actions of their peers influence their own behavior. The identification with disruptive or delinquent peers can prolong disruptive or delinquent behavior.

However, contact with criminal peers can also affect students because they are exhibiting behavior that requires discipline. Students exhibiting behavior such as this are regularly punished by adults. Many disruptive or delinquent adolescents experience a transitional period in their teenage years where they display behavior similar to adults, but society has not given them the adult social status (Moffitt, 1993). Behavior can consist of smoking, drinking, risky sexual behavior, fighting, stealing, and disruptive behavior (Moffitt, 1993). The display of this behavior not only makes contact with disruptive or delinquent peers more favorable, but peers that display this behavior share many similar characteristics. Behavior characteristics and risk factors make up the structure of the group and contribute to the behavior of the individuals. For example, a student that is referred to school interventions such as a secondary school is subject to a peer association with disruptive or delinquent peers. Contact with disruptive or delinquent peers not only creates contact with other disruptive students, but increases the likelihood of further disruptive behavior. By placing students that display disruptive or delinquent behavior with other students, it not only increases the likelihood of future potential delinquent behavior, but can continue to manifest into adulthood.

The last risk factor that is associated with zero tolerance policies in the educational system and further criminality is conduct disorders among adolescents. Conduct disorders can be correlated to disruptive behavior and future delinquent or criminal behavior. According to Cohen-salmon, et al (2005), conduct disorders in children and adolescents may be displayed in the form of various behaviors. Additionally, these behaviors include frequent and intense temper tantrums, persistent disobedience,

disruptions, and delinquent serious acts such as aggression, theft, and violence (Cohen-salmon, et al, 2005). These behaviors are preceded as disruptive in the educational setting but have the potential to be more detrimental further into adulthood. However, according to the DSM-IV (Cohen-salmon, et al, 2005), conduct disorder includes aggression, violent behavior, the destruction of property, theft, deceitfulness, and serious violations of the rules. In the medical field, conduct disorders are defined to a set of morbid conditions characterized by the impairment of an individual's behavior, interpersonal and psychological functioning defined by the norms of their expected age (Cohen-salmon, et al, 2005). One criticism of the definition of conduct disorder is that it covers a broad range of definitions for such behavior, which makes it discretionary and hard to identify. In many instances disruptive students will exhibit multiple disruptive behaviors. For example, a student could be disrespectful to teachers, which would represent disobedience. Additionally, the same student could get in fight with another student, which would represent violent tendencies. Both of the disruptive behaviors that the student displays can be classified as a conduct disorder, however specifically classifying the appropriate disorder can be troublesome.

According to Cohen-salmon, et al (2005), conduct disorders are defined by the repetitive and persistent behavior patterns, which reinforce set social classes and perspectives of individuals. Since conduct disorders are difficult to define, many students are viewed through perspectives that don't adequately define the actual conduct disorder presented. The inability to correctly diagnose a conduct disorder can lead to the inappropriate use of zero tolerance policies, which can lead to further disruptive behavior or delinquency. For example, a disruptive student is referred to a secondary school for violent behavior in order to protect students and ensure a positive learning environment. This student displays disruptive behavior that represents violent tendencies which students and employees view as the conduct disorder. However, this student has misguided diagnosed perspective. For example, the student could suffer from a substance abuse, which is making him display violent tendencies. The disruptive behavior is then addressed through zero tolerance policies, which seek to separate the disruptive student from the student population. The disruptive behavior displayed from the student is under the assumption that it will resolve itself from the isolation from the student population.

As a result, conduct disorders can start to develop at many different points in an individual's life. The age of onset of conduct disorders is correlated with the identification of this behavior in order to

properly address this behavior. For example, a young student can show conduct that is deceitful and disrespectful. This behavior, at first, is disciplined with referrals to the office, detention, and isolation from other students. This student could not only be misdiagnosed as being disruptive or delinquent, but have other underlying disorders that are not being properly addressed. According to Cohen-salmon, et al (2005), during childhood conduct disorders manifest within school and family environments. Additionally, these disorders will affect the child's basic functioning and can also be related with academic disorders (Cohen-salmon, et al 2005). Many of these problematic conduct disorders can manifest the behavior further into adolescences. Once this behavior continues many other problematic factors can start occurring. Once this behavioral disorder is prolonged or evolved, it encircles the adolescent whole social environment which can lead to high risk behavior such as unprotected sex, premature pregnancy, substance abuse, disruptive behavior, and even further disruptive or delinquent behavior (Cohen-salmon, et al 2005). Once this behavior has reached this point of the growth and development, the conduct disorders can continue to develop. For example, an adolescent that has had reoccurring problematic behavior throughout their youth and adolescents can go unaddressed for many years and be detrimental further into adulthood. Therefore, emphasis should be placed on referring students to certain school interventions while taking consideration of underlying behavior disorders.

Chapter 3

Methodology

School interventions are responses to disruptive or delinquent behavior within the educationally setting. However, school interventions have been criticized and evaluated with many conflicting findings. Even though there are multiple opinions on school interventions the State of Texas still uses and continues to implement school interventions and zero tolerance policies in the educational system. Actual studies of school interventions in the educational system show that there is some correlation between the school interventions and future criminality. Nevertheless, the State of Texas still implements legislative and school policies that are written as discretionary and mandatory guidelines to responses of disruptive or delinquent behavior. Such guidelines and policies lead to a variety of responses and sanctions from school officials, which can consist of suspension and expulsions that can contribute to future criminality.

The purpose of this study is to determine correlations between adult criminality and/or juvenile criminality with school interventions such as removal from the class room, in-school suspension from school, removal to a disciplinary alternative education program, expulsion, and placement into juvenile justice alternative education program. This research will examine how these factors can influence and predict the potential for offending and recidivism among adult offenders. When a student is disciplined through a school discipline policy they are referred to a type of intervention as a response to their behavior. This intervention is at the discretion of the school employee, and under the guidelines of the School Crime and Discipline Handbook written by the Texas Attorney General (2013). During the intervention process there are multiple variables that correlate together. These variables can consist of the students, the parents of the student, multiple employees of the school, and/or law enforcement. Each disciplinary infraction is situational that can require different combination of variables and decisions. For example, in the event of an intervention the police are not always used during the intervention process. In particular this study will examine the type of intervention used, the race of the participant, gender, highest education level, juvenile history, and adult criminal history.

Research Questions

As the variables are presented to be defined and operationalized to predict future criminality five research questions are presented. The dependent variable will be criminality, which is defined by the sentencing to probation. The independent variable will be school interventions. The research questions are as follows; 1) do school interventions and zero tolerance policies in the educational system effect future adult criminality? School interventions will be defined evaluated by the School Crime and Discipline Handbook (2013). 2.) Do school interventions correlate to juvenile criminality? 3.) Are there any differences in gender, and the use of school interventions or zero tolerance policies? 4.) Are there correlating differences in criminality based on race and school interventions? 5.) Can the highest level of education be correlated with school interventions and zero tolerance policies in the education system?

Hypothesis

All of the research questions presented will be evaluated through five hypotheses that will examine the dependent variables of race, ethnicity, gender, adult criminal history, current offense, juvenile criminal history, highest level of completed education, types of school intervention, and location of school attended. Virtually, the five hypotheses are presented as follows:

H1= School interventions or zero tolerance policies in the educational system increase adult criminality.

H2= School interventions or zero tolerance policies in the education system increase students contact with the juvenile justice system.

H3= Males are more likely to be referred to school interventions.

H4= Nonwhites are at an increased risk of being referred to school interventions.

H5= School interventions can decrease graduations rates.

Study Design

The methodology of this study will be both descriptive and inferential statistics (eg, multi nominal regression). Additionally, if necessary the researcher will conduct a multi nominal regression of the statistics. The quantitative data will be collect from a self-report survey and the respondent's answers to the questions. Self-report surveys will be conducted from January 1st 2015-February 28th 2015 in Weatherford, Parker County, Texas. A total of 150 respondents are expected. Additionally, a letter of supporting approval from the Director of the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections

department will be provided. Also the research has been approved by a prospectus defense and also The Institution Review Board.

Furthermore, the sample population will consist of 150 probationers of the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department that are sentenced to probation during that time period in which the data collection is conducted. The data collection is completed through surveys that will be administered when the probationer comes to the department after his or hers sentencing to probation, and their intake into the probation department. The survey will be given out at the intake process of probation, and will be strictly voluntary. The intake process of probation is the first face to face meeting that an individual will have with the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department regarding their current offense and sentencing to probation. An IRB approved cover letter of the survey will provide documentation for contact information, the purpose of the study, duration, number of participants, procedures, possible benefits, possible risk, compensation, alternative procedures, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and contact information. The survey will be conducted in person to clarify any questions about the survey. The cover letter will also explain to the respondent how anonymity and confidentiality will be measured throughout the data collection and three years after completion of thesis. The surveys themselves will be kept in the locked file room at the University of Texas at Arlington, and the data computed will be kept in a password encrypted file at the University of Texas at Arlington. Additionally, any identification variables, such as name, will be excluded from the calculated results.

Human Subjects

A Human Subjects form was submitted to The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects to notify the institution that the study was being conducted. The data that is analyzed in this study are not public records and therefore this study does require IRBPHS approval, which was approved.

Data Sources and Validity

The State of Texas mandates that the confidentiality of each individual on probation is kept, unless other law enforcement agencies request information. Any information that pertains to the individuals cases must be kept only to the access of law enforcement. Therefore, it was required to get

approval and consent from the director of the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department.

There are two limitations in this research. The research will first present the internal threat. The first internal threat is memory issue or error. This is a threat because individuals would have a hard time recalling the exact or exact types of school interventions they were subject to, while in the educational system. This threat creates a memory issue of recalling the intervention received. The second threat is external. This external threat is selection basis. The research is examining individuals that are already offenders, and this predicts that all the respondents will have some type of referral offense.

Chapter 4

Results and Findings

Descriptive Results

The sample that was originally collected consisted of 105 participants. These participants were collected at the Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department. The participants of the study were collected by their sentencing to probation. The sentencing consisted of four different courts that represent the state. These courts consisted of County Court of Law One, County Court of Law Two, District Court 43rd, and District 415th. Both of the county courts consist of strictly misdemeanors offense. The district courts consist of strictly felony offenses. The different variety of courts provides the population of the sample with a variety of different types of offenses. The participants in the study were collected from January 1st, 2015 to February 28, 2015. After the data was collected the participants that didn't attend school in the State of Texas were excluded from the population sample. The sample population then consisted of 92 participants. The 13 participants were excluded because of the definition of school interventions outside the State of Texas. In the current study school interventions are defined by the Texas Attorney General; School and Discipline Handbook (2013).

Therefore, other states may have other policies or code of conducts that define school interventions that could be different from the variables in this study. The emphasis was placed on participants that went to school in Texas, because of the school interventions that are used specifically mandated by the Texas Attorney General. The research didn't include other states school interventions because the lack of transparency amongst the different states in regards to school interventions.

Table 1: Juvenile Criminality and Adult Criminality

	Juvenile Criminality				Adult Criminality			
	n	%	t	F	n	%	t	F
Gender	13	14.1	1.441	20.89	51	55.4		
Female	3	23.1			19	37.3		
Male	10	76.9			32	87.7		
Race	13	100	0.137	0.077	51	100		
Non-White	1	7.7			8	8.7		
White	12	92.3			84	91.3		
Level of Education	13	100	-0.971	2.08	51	100	0.349	1.8
Less than H/S or GED	3	23.1			12	23.5		
H/S or GED	7	53.8			19	37.3		
College of above	3	25.1			20	39.2		
School Interventions								
Referrals	8	61.5	2.84	2.89	18	35.3		
Detention	9	69.2	3.17	0.358	20	39.2		
In School Suspension	7	53.8	2.98	8.7	14	27.5		
Secondary School	7	53.8	4.94	31.8	9	17.6		
Expelled	2	15.4	0.918	3.01	6	11.8		
Other	0	0	-1.75	2.17	3	3.3		

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics		
Variables	n	%
Gender	92	100
Female	38	41.3
Male	54	58.7
Race	92	100
Non-White	8	8.7
White	84	91.3
Level of Education	92	100
Less than H/S or GED	18	19.6
H/S or GED	39	42.6
College or above	35	38
School Interventions	92	100
Referrals (1=Yes)	27	65
Detention (1=Yes)	30	32.6
In School Suspension (1=Yes)	21	22.8
Secondary School (1=Yes)	13	14.1
Expelled (1=Yes)	8	8.7
Other (1=Yes)	3	3.3
Juvenile History (1=Yes)	13	14.1
Adult History (1=Yes)	51	59.3

Table 3: Logistical Regression: Adult Criminality

Logistical Regression: Adult Criminality						
	B	S.E	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender	0.389	0.479	0.657	1	0.417	1.475
Race	1.005	0.809	1.545	1	0.214	2.733
Education	-0.121	0.317	0.147	1	0.702	0.886
Referrals	0.346	0.697	0.247	1	0.619	1.414
Detention	0.615	0.62	0.985	1	0.321	1.85
In school suspension	-0.251	0.842	0.089	1	0.765	0.778
Secondary School	0.144	0.811	0.032	1	0.859	1.1155
Expelled	0.625	0.963	0.421	1	0.516	1.868
Other	21.309	23088.2	0	1	0.999	#####

Table 4: Logistical Regression: Juvenile Criminality

Logistical Regression: Juvenile Criminality						
	B	S.E	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender	1.583	0.978	2.619	1	0.106	4.869
Race	0.249	1.255	0.039	1	0.843	1.282
Education	-0.585	0.561	1.088	1	0.297	0.557
Referrals	-0.068	1.128	0.004	1	0.952	0.934
Detention	1.294	0.921	1.973	1	0.16	3.648
In school suspension	-0.611	1.297	0.221	1	0.638	0.543
Secondary School	3.197	1.104	8.382	1	0.004	24.463
Expelled	-1.722	1.335	1.664	1	0.197	0.179
Other	-18.319	22346	0	1	0.999	0

Table 5: Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Gender	1										
Race	-0.181	1									
Education	0.121	-0.027	1								
Referrals	0.201	-0.055	-0.097	1							
Detention	0.16	-0.114	-0.112	.570*	1						
In School Suspension	.244*	-0.108	-.242*	.673*	.616*	1					
Secondary School	0.023	0.014	-0.144	.492*	.383*	.523*	1				
Expelled	0.024	-0.042	-.235*	.309*	.279*	.384*	.429*	1			
Other	0.03	0.057	0.12	-0.118	-0.128	-0.1	-0.074	-0.057	1		
Juvenile History	0.15	0.014	-0.102	.287*	.317*	.300*	.463*	0.096	-0.074	1	
Adult History	0.092	0.111	-0.042	0.146	0.157	0.123	0.113	0.121	0.165	0.175	1

1: Gender, 2: Race, 3: Education, 4: Referrals, 5: Detention, 6: In school suspensions, 7: Secondary School, 8: Expelled, 9: Other, 10: Juvenile History, 11: Adult History.

Sample Characteristics

Gender

According to the results the 92 participants consisted of 54 males and 38 females. Furthermore, males consisted of 58.7% the sample population. The females consisted of 41.3% of the sample population. In the population sample there was adequate representation of each gender.

Race

There was a significant amount of overrepresentation of racial disparities within the population sample. In the population sample, the 92 participant's race consisted of 84 whites or 91.3% of the sample population, and 8 nonwhites or 8.7% of the sample population. Once the data was collected the researcher observed that the racial demographics of Parker County, Texas were overrepresented with the racial identification of white. Many explanations can be contributed to the overrepresentation of whites, and the under representation of nonwhites. The geographical location of Parker County, Texas, is mostly a rural area consisting of many different small rural cities. Given that the nearest significant city of Fort Worth, Texas is 30 miles away contributes to the demographics of the city. Given that the city is smaller, has less jobs, less housing, and limited resources that are available for the population. The two factors of demographic variables and geographic locations can contribute to a disparity in the racial composition of the population sample. Given the racial disparity, the data had to be recoded and separated the additional racial identifications of African American, White, American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander, and any other race. This was done in because the percentage of all nonwhites only contributed to 8.7% of the total population.

Education

In the sample population education is observed as a dependent variable that is included in the study. Once the data was collected education was defined in variables of dropped out or no GED, high school diploma, GED, some college, associated degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctoral degree. However, once the data was analyzed it was recoded into dropped out and/or no GED, high school diploma or a GED, and some college or college degree. The results represented that 18

individuals or 19.6% of the sample size of the participants have either dropped out of high school or never received a GED. Participants that received a High School Diploma or a GED totaled 39 participants or 42.4% of the sample size in the sample population. Additionally, participants that completed some college or a college degree made up 35 participants or 38% of the sample size of the sample population

Juvenile Criminal History

The population sample included the variable of Juvenile History within the study. The variable of juvenile history was included to represent any arrest for a juvenile offense that was committed. Additionally, this variable represented any juvenile offense that the participant was found guilty of. The results concluded that 79 or 85.9% of the sample population were not arrested or found guilty for a juvenile offense. Additionally, 13 or 14.1% of the sample population were arrested or found guilty for a juvenile offense.

Adult Criminal History

The population sample included the dependent variable of adult probation history within the study. The variable that was included in the findings represents any history of prior criminality. This variable is calculated by any other prior sentencing to probation. The results concluded that 51 participants or 55.4% of the sample population were sentenced to adult probation more than one time in their life. Additionally, the results found those 42 participants or 44.6% of the sample population were a sentenced to adult probation for the first time. The findings of adult probation history showed an adequate representation between participants that have prior received sentencing to probation and the participants that were sentenced to the first time.

School Interventions

In the population sample, the variable of school intervention were included to represent the different types of school interventions and also to calculate the number of participants that have received one or many combinations of different school interventions. The findings concluded that there are a significant number of participants that didn't receive a type of school intervention. However, many participants received a referral. Referrals are defined as any written reprimand from a teacher or employee of the school as a response. Many of these referrals refer students to the principle or assistant principle. Once the student reaches the principle office there are many options of school interventions that

can be referred. This decision depends on the incident, disruptive behavior, situational circumstances, and the discretion of the school employee. The school interventions were separated out into separate variables that equal 100%, because many participants received more than one intervention. There are six school interventions that were observed in this study. First, students that received a referral consisted of 65% of the total population sample. Second, the school intervention of detention was received by 32.6% of the total sample population. Detention can consist of isolation from other students to staying after school hours as a punishment to a disciplinary infraction. Third, the school intervention of in-school suspension or suspension consisted of 22.8% of the total population sample. This intervention consists of isolating the student for long periods of time that are greater than the amount of time that detention requires. In many occasions the student will spend entire an entire school day in the isolation from the traditional learning environment and also from other students.

Fourth, the school intervention that is presented is defined as secondary school. Participants that were referred to secondary schools comprised 14.1% of the total sample population. Secondary schools are an educational environment that is different from the traditional educational setting that combines many other disruptive students into on setting. As a result, schools readily used this school intervention. Fifth, the school intervention of expulsion from the educational system is observed. Being expelled from a school represents that the student is no longer allowed to attend that specific schools or many other schools based of the disciplinary infraction or a combination of disciplinary infractions. Expulsion from school consisted of 8.7% of the total sample population. Lastly, the school intervention which is defined as other is observed. This school intervention has a multiple definitions. This school intervention can include a wide variety of punishment from verbal reprimands to being asked to leave the classroom. This variable comprised 3.3% of the total sample population. This variable that is include in the population sample is unique because it can be any type of punishment that was not included in the other five school interventions, but the participant felt that the received a punishment or school intervention.

School Interventions and Adult Criminality

The first hypothesis presented is that school interventions or zero tolerance policies in the educational system can increase adult criminality. Within the hypothesis the research is putting emphasis on the dependent variable of adult criminality and the independent variable of school interventions and

zero tolerance policies. The data produced that 51 (male and female) participants have been sentenced to probation more than one time. This variable was produced from the survey which asked the participants "Is this your first sentencing to probation?" The 51 participants were chosen based on the prevalence of criminality. The prevalence of criminality was based on the participant's response, which can be interpreted as that they have committed more acts of crime or been found guilty for additional offenses. However, the total sample of this study consisted of 92 participants, only 51 participants (male and female) have been on probation more than one time. The sentencing to adult probation more than once was defined as adult criminality within this hypothesis. The zero tolerance policies and/or school interventions were represented as separate independent variables. The separate independent variables of school interventions consisted of referrals, detention, in school suspensions, secondary school, expulsion or expelled and any other type of intervention. Additionally, an individual can be subjected to a school intervention between kindergarten and high school.

The first independent variable is the school intervention of referrals. As seen in Table 1, of the 51 participants, (18 or 35.3%) of the participants were subject to school intervention such as a referral. According to Monahan, et al (2014), school interventions and zero tolerance policies have increased the amount of students that are disciplined through school interventions, and puts students at risk for future criminality. However, according to a bivariate analysis in Table 5, there was a significance level of ($r = .166$). Since the significance was ($<.05$), there is no significant positive correlation between referrals and adult criminality. Since referrals are the beginning phase of many school disciplinary infractions the researcher can formulate that referrals can be the final outcome of a school intervention or preliminary response to a disciplinary infraction, which could be subjected to suspension, expulsion, in school suspension, detention, and secondary school.

The second independent variable is the school intervention of detention. As presented in Table 1, of the 51 (male and female) participants, (20 or 39.2%) were subjected to detention. Detention consists of isolating the student from other students for a predetermined length of time. Detention can also occur before, during, and after school hours which is determined by school officials or employees. According to a correlation matrix from Table 5, the significance level between adult criminality and detention is ($r = .135$). Disciplinary removal such as detention, from the educational setting can increase students

contact with the criminal justice system (Monahan, et al 2014). Contrastingly, the significance level concluded between detention and adult criminality represents no ($>.05$) significant positive correlation for future criminality. Therefore, there is no relationship within this study that shows a correlation that detention can affect future adult criminality.

The third independent variable is the school intervention of in-school suspension or suspension. As presented in Table 1, of the 51 (male and female) participants, (14 or 27.5%) of the participants were referred to in-school suspension or suspension. According to Monahan, et al (2014), school interventions such as suspensions are amongst the most widely used disciplinary response to many different infractions. Additionally, suspensions or in-school suspensions are predictors of problematic behaviors in youths because of their correlation with juvenile and adult criminality (Forsyth, et al, 2014). Many researchers have predicted that suspensions can lead to further criminality (Monahan, et al, 2014; Forsyth et al, 2014). According to Table 5, the significance level between suspensions or in-school suspensions and adult criminality is ($r = .243$). Additionally, the significance level between suspensions or in-school suspensions and adult criminality is ($>.05$). This represents that there is no correlation between suspensions or in-school suspensions and adult criminality. However, the findings from Monahan, et al (2014), Forsyth, et al, (2014), Skiba, (2014), contradict the findings in this study.

The fourth independent variable is the school intervention of secondary school. Secondary schools are a type educational setting where many disruptive students are referred to until behavior is corrected or a designated length of time is fulfilled. According to Table 1, of the 51 participants (male and female), (9 or 17.6%) of participants were referred to a secondary school. Secondary schools combine students together that have a similar characteristic. The similar characteristic that is shared with students in secondary schools is disruptive, and/or criminal behavior. According to Restivo and Lanie (2013), interventions lead to an increase in deviant peer associations. Additionally, in research conducted by Restivo and Lanie (2013), they concluded that nearly half of the correlation of interventions contributes to future delinquency. As seen in Table 5, the significance level between secondary schools and adult criminality is ($r = .285$). Furthermore, the significance level is ($<.05$), which shows that there is no correlation between secondary schools and adult criminality. This finding contradicts that the relationship

between label theory, deviant subcultures, and deviant peers associations that can contribute to adult criminality (Restivo and Lanie, 2013; Liberman, Kirk, and Kim, 2014).

The fifth independent variable is the school intervention of expulsions. Expulsions are also defined as the student being expelled from a school or educational system. According to Table 1, 51 participants (male and female), (6 or 11.8%) of the participants have be referred to an expulsion. Expulsions or being expelled is considered one of the punitive zero tolerance policies. This school intervention is considered a "Get tough" policy (Monahan, et al, pg.1111, 2014). Additionally, policies such as these refer students from the educational system and into the criminal justice system. The results from this research concluded that the significance between expulsions and adult criminality is ($r = .249$). By expelling students from the educational system or from a school it could increase the chance and/or opportunity for criminality. According to (Monahan, et al, 2014) when students are expelled from school, they are being place at home with no capable guardian, which can lead to an increase in contact with the juvenile justice system and criminal justice system. This research found that the significance level between expulsions and adult criminality is ($>.05$). Therefore, there is not a correlation between expulsion and adult criminality. Additionally, the findings of this research contradict the findings of Monahan, et al, (2014).

The last independent variable is the school intervention that is defined as other. This school intervention is unique from the other school interventions because it is not as easily defined or identified. This variable is a possible answer choice if a participant felt that they received an intervention that was not available between the answer choices of referrals, detention, in-school suspension or suspension, secondary school, and expulsion. According to the Table 1, of the 51 participants (male and female), (3 or 3.3%) of the participants have be referred to a school intervention that is defined as other. Additionally, from Table 2, the significance level for the school intervention of other and adult criminality is ($r = .117$). The research interprets that there this is no correlation between school interventions such as other and adult criminality, because the significant level is ($<.05$).

School Interventions and Juvenile Criminality

The second hypothesis presented in this research, is that school interventions in the educational system increases students contact with the juvenile justice system. Within this hypothesis, the research puts an emphasis on the dependent variable of juvenile criminality and the independent variable of school interventions within the educational system. From the Table 2, original 92 participants (male and female) only (13 or 14.1%) of the participants have a juvenile history. This variable was collected from the survey, which asked defendants if they have ever been arrested for a juvenile offense. This variable represents that either juvenile criminality was present or that they have a juvenile criminal history. This variable was chosen for this hypothesis as the dependent variable; because it represents that there was criminality during adolescence. The independent variable for this hypothesis is school interventions. Similar to first hypothesis, all interventions are defined as referrals, detention, in-school suspension or suspension, secondary school, expelled, and other. Every school intervention will be counted separately. Additionally school interventions can occur between kindergarten to high school.

The first independent variable within this hypothesis is the school intervention of referrals. Referrals similar to the first hypothesis are the response to disruptive behavior or disciplinary infraction, which requires the school employee or official to refer the student to school official or law enforcement. This school intervention can be used for many different situations. According to Table 1, of the 13 participants, (8 or 61.5%) of the participants have received the school interventions such as a referral. Additionally, schools have been implementing strict zero tolerance policies that turn kids into criminals for acts that rarely constitute a crime when committed by an adult (Advancement, 2005). Referrals during the discipline process are the beginning or final outcome of to a response to a disciplinary infraction. According to the Texas A&M University (Bush School of Government and Public Service, 2009), "the single greatest predictor of future involvement in the juvenile system is a history of disciplinary referrals at school". According to the research, the significant level for the correlation between juvenile history and referrals is (sig = .006). As seen in Table 5, the correlation matrix has a positive correlation value of ($r = .287$). In the study *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, A, pg. XII 2011), the research concluded that more than one in seven students were in contact with the juvenile justice system at least once during high school. Additionally, half of those students who were disciplined 11 or more times through school

interventions or zero tolerance policies were in contact with the juvenile justice system. Given that there is a significant level ($\text{sig} < .05$) within the study, the researcher correlates that there is weak positive correlation between juvenile criminality and referrals. However, this supports the conclusions of research by Appleseed (2007); Advancement, (2005); and Fabelo, (2011).

The second independent variable within this hypothesis is the school intervention of detention. Detention, similar to the first hypothesis, is isolating the student from the student population for a predetermined length of time that is determined by a school employee or school officials. According to Table 1, of the 13 participants, (9 or 69.2%) of the participants have been referred to a school intervention such as a detention. From the results, the significance level between juvenile criminality and detention is ($\text{sig} = .002$). Detention is used as a response to a disciplinary infraction. Detention has the intentions to isolate a disruptive student in order to correct behavior, but as the results show there is a correlation between juvenile criminality and detention. As seen in the Table 5, there is a positive correlation of ($r = .317$). Therefore, there is a correlation between juvenile criminality and detention, but there is weak correlation between the variables.

The third independent variable within this hypothesis is suspensions or in- school suspensions. Suspensions consist of in-school suspensions and out of school suspensions (Fabelo, 2011). According to the Table 1, of the 13 participants, (7 or 53.8%) of the participants were referred to a suspensions. These suspensions consist of isolating the student within the school with complete separations from other students for long periods of time. According to Appleseed (2007), recently the in the state of Texas there has been an increase in the use of zero tolerance policies as sanctions to disruptive class room behavior. Additionally, research conducted by Appleseed (2007), concluded that the use of zero tolerance policies such as suspensions do not decrease crime within the school. As a result, in 2007 there were 3.3 million students that were being suspended from school (Fabelo, 2011). Additionally, zero tolerance policies in the educational system are considered a common response to a disciplinary infraction. In the study Breaking School Rules the researchers concluded that from 929,940 students from the state of Texas, 59.6% of students experienced some form of suspension between in middle school or high school (Fabelo, 2011). Furthermore, many of the students that received a suspension were involved in four or more disciplinary infraction (Fabelo, 2011). According to the results, the level of significance for the

correlation between juvenile criminality and suspensions is ($\text{sig} = .004$). As seen in table 5, there a positive correlation ($r = .300$) between juvenile criminality and suspensions. Given the prevalence of suspensions within schools in the state of Texas, Fabelo (2011), the research concluded that there is a positive correlation between juvenile criminality and suspensions in the educational system. The findings of this research support the conclusions of *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011).

The fourth independent variable within the hypothesis is the school intervention of secondary schools. Secondary schools are used when a student is removed from the traditional educational setting for a time that is longer than three days (Fabelo, 2011). In the state of Texas, there are two types of secondary schools that students can be referred too. The first secondary school is Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (Fabelo, 2011). Once a student is placed in this secondary school any additional disciplinary infractions can lead to the student being permanently expelled. According to *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), of 143, 707 student there were (17.1%) of students that were referred to a DAEP. The second secondary school in the state of Texas is the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (Fabelo, 2011). Additionally, this program is utilized when the student is expelled. A secondary school such as this is a juvenile justice system operated school. In the research *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), the researcher concluded that of 77, 399 students, (8.3%) of students were referred to a JJAEP. In the current study, according to the Table 1, of the 13 participants, (7 or 53.8%) of the participants have received a referral to a secondary school. Additionally, many students that were referred to a secondary school were more likely to be involved in the juvenile justice system (Fabelo, 2011). The level of significance between juvenile criminality and secondary schools was ($\text{sig} = .000$). During the research logistical regression was conduct on the data set. According to Table 4, participants that have a juvenile history are sentenced to secondary school (24.463) times more often. According to the logistical regression, participants with a juvenile history have an increased chance of being referred to a school intervention such as a secondary school. There was a significant positive correlation between juvenile criminality and secondary school, which is ($r = .463$). The findings from this research support the findings that are represented by (Fabelo, 2011; Appleseed, 2007)

The fifth independent variable presented in this hypothesis is the school intervention of expulsion or commonly referred as expelling the student. This intervention, similar to the first hypothesis is

permanently removing the student from the educational system. This school intervention is strictly dependent on the direction of the school employees and officials. Additionally, expulsions are mandatory responses for certain disciplinary infractions (Fabelo, 2011). Similar to referrals, most students in the educational system (59.6%) experienced some form of expulsions (Fabelo, 2011). Similar to the independent variable of referrals, most students that have experienced a school intervention of expulsion have also experienced other disciplinary infractions (Fabelo, 2011). Expulsions are also correlated with higher rates of antisocial and illegal behavior (Monahan, et al 2014). According to Table 1, of the 13 participants, (2 or 15.4%) of the participants were referral to a school interventions such as expulsions. According to the results, the level of significance for the correlation between expulsions and juvenile criminality is (sig= .361). Therefore, there is no correlation between juvenile criminality and expulsions. Additionally, the findings from the research support that conclusions of (Fabelo, 2011; Monahan, et al 2014).

The last independent variable that is presented in this hypothesis is the school intervention of other. There are many similarities between this independent variable and the school intervention of other in the first hypothesis. The school intervention of other is unique from all of the other independent variables. This independent variable is defined as any intervention that not is included in the independent variable. According to Table 1, of the 13 participants, (0 or 0%) of the participants were referred to a school interventions such as other. Additionally, the significance level between juvenile criminality and the school intervention of other is (sig=.480). Therefore, there is no correlation between juvenile criminality and the school intervention of other.

The third hypothesis presented in this study is that males are more likely to be referred to school interventions or zero tolerance policies. According Table 2, of the 92 participants there were only (54 or 58.7%) males. According to the study *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), (59%) of male in the state of Texas were disciplined through in school suspensions. Comparably, (41%) of females were sentencing to in-school suspensions (Fabelo, 2011). From this statistic, males are disciplined to a school intervention at a higher rate than females. Additionally, males were sentenced to out of school a suspension at (63.5%) which is a higher rate than women at (36.5%) (Fabelo, 2011). The results from this study concluded that males and in-school suspensions were correlated at a significance of (sig =.018), and at a

positive correlation ($r = .246$). This finding represents that there is a correlation between males and suspensions.

The fourth hypothesis is that nonwhites are at an increased risk of being referred to school interventions. According to the results, there are no correlations between school interventions and race. However, of the 92 participants there are only (8 or 8.7%) of the participants that are nonwhite. This statistic represents that there is an over representation of whites within the participants and Parker County Community Supervision and Corrections Department.

The last hypothesis presented in this study is that school interventions can decrease graduations rates. According to the study Texas School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007), more than (80%) of the Texas prison inmates are dropouts from the educational system. Additionally, more than a third of the Texas public school students dropped out between 2005 and 2006 (Appleseed, 2007). The research conducted by Appleseed (2007), reinforces the hypothesis that school interventions are correlated to graduations rates. Furthermore, students that are sent to secondary schools have five times more dropout rates than the normal educational schools (Appleseed, 2007). The state of Texas is one of the top fifteen states that have produced the highest number of dropouts (Appleseed, 2007). In the current research, the school interventions of in-school suspensions and expulsions are significantly correlation with graduation rates. Additionally, of the 92 participants in this research (21 or 22.8%) were disciplined through suspensions or in school suspensions. According to the research, there is a significance level of ($\text{sig} = .020$) between graduation rates and suspensions or in school suspensions, and a negative correlation ($r = -.242$). According to the results, there is a negative correlation between graduations and suspension.

The second school intervention that is correlated to graduation rates is expulsions. According to the study Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011), students who were referred to suspensions or expulsions were more likely to be held back or drop out of school than students who were not involved in the school disciplinary procedures. The results from this study, as seen in Table 2, concluded that of the 92 participants, (8 or 8.7%) were referred to expulsions or are expelled from the school. Additionally, the results from this study showed that there is a significance level between graduation rates and expulsions of ($\text{sig} = .024$), and a negative correlation of ($r = -.235$). In conclusions of this hypothesis, there is a

significant negative correlation between graduations rates and school interventions. The findings from this research support the conclusions of (Appleseed, 2007; Fabelo, 2011).

In conclusions of the results, school interventions have no significant associations with adult criminality. Contrastingly, schools interventions have significant associations with juvenile criminality. Additionally, juvenile criminality is positively correlated with school interventions such as referrals, detention, in-school suspensions or suspensions, and expulsions. Specifically, a key variable that is highly associated with juvenile criminality is the school intervention of secondary school. Furthermore there are additional variables that resulted in a correlation. First, males are more likely to be referred to school interventions such as a referral than females. Lastly, graduation rates are negatively affected by school interventions. In summary, of the results, juvenile criminality is associated with school interventions; and variables such as education and gender can be associated with graduation rates and referrals to school interventions.

Chapter 5

Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to observe any correlations between school interventions or zero tolerance policies and criminality. In regards to the first research question, do school interventions and zero tolerance policies in the educational system affect future adult criminality, the results show that there is not a relationship between school interventions and/or zero tolerance policies in the educational system and adult criminality. However, for future research a larger sample may produce different findings. Additionally, replicating the research in a different demographic area and at longer length of data collection could potentially produce different findings. One explanation to this findings, is that the research could not expand further based on the population size and sampling time frame. For future reference, a longer data collection period would increase the sample size and benefit the validity of the result from the sample population.

In regards to the second research question, do school interventions correlate with juvenile criminality; the results show that there is a relationship between school interventions and juvenile criminality. Specifically, the research concluded that juvenile criminality is correlated with referrals, detention, in-school suspensions or suspensions, and secondary school. In particular, secondary schools showed the most significance to a predictor of juvenile criminality. It can be concluded that secondary schools have an effect on juvenile criminality. For future research, researchers may want to look at the types of disciplinary infractions that are referred to secondary schools, and the educational curriculum that is used within secondary schools. Additionally, future research should examine the types of juvenile offenses that are committed to see if there is a correlation between school interventions and violent or nonviolent offenses.

In response to the third research question, are there any differences in gender and the use of school interventions or zero tolerance policies, the research can concluded that males are referred to in-school suspensions or suspensions more than females. Future research could examine the discretionary decisions regarding the referrals to in-school suspensions or suspensions, as it compares to males and females. An examination of the school officials or employees and their discretionary decisions can yield to an explanation to this finding. Additionally, a larger sample could potentially result in more correlations

between gender and school interventions. For future direction, the examination of males and school interventions could explain the results from the research and any other potential conclusions.

In regards to the fourth research question, are there correlating differences in criminality based on race and school an intervention, the research concludes that race is not correlated with school interventions. According to the research, nonwhites are not correlated with school interventions and/or any type of juvenile or adult criminality. However, the research may not have been able to obtain a correlation due to the racial disparity throughout the research. According to the current research, there is an overrepresentation of whites within the sample population. For future research, a population sample that has an equal distribution of racial classification could develop a more racially equally sample. By using a more diverse sample population, researchers could potentially develop other correlations. The results from this finding show no correlation with nonwhites. However, additional research concludes that there is a correlation between nonwhites and school interventions (Appleseed, 2007; Fabelo, 2011). In conclusion, because of the population sample and the overrepresentation of whites, the research could not obtain a correlation between racial classification and school interventions.

In response to the last research question, can the highest level of education be correlated with school interventions and zero tolerance policies in the education system, the research can concluded that in-school suspensions or suspensions and expulsions can affect the highest level of education that is completed. Additionally, in-school suspensions or suspension and expulsions can affect graduation rates. The research concludes students that are suspended or referred to in-school suspensions are increasingly less likely to graduate or pursue additional education. Additionally, education is a variable that is considered to be a predictor to future criminality (Fabelo, 2011). According to the study Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011) and School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007), suspensions and expulsion can be detrimental to the students and affect the ability to graduate from the Texas educational system. In future studies, researchers should evaluate what types of behavior leads to suspensions or explosions. If future researchers are able to identify certain disruptive behaviors that are causing referrals to suspensions or expulsions, then policy makers should evaluate policies to address this finding.

Chapter 6

Limitations

Like most studies, this research was met with many limitations. The first limitation is the population size of Parker County, Texas. Demographically, the area of Parker County is mostly rural that consist of small towns such as Weatherford, Aledo, Springtown, Azle, Willow Park, Hudson Oaks, Millsap, Brock, and Reno. According to the United States Census Bureau (2015), The City of Weatherford consist of 27,02 residents, The City of Aledo consisted of 2,896 residents, the City of Springtown consist of 2,722 residents, The City of Azle consist of 11,334 residents, The City of Willow Park consist of 4,470 residents, The City of Hudson Oaks consist of 1,865 residents, The City of Hudson Oaks consist of 1,865, the City of Millsap consist of 414 residents, the City of Brock consist of 26,871 residents, and the City of Reno consist of 3,243 residents. Additionally, many residents that do not live within the city limits, but many of these residents still live within the county. The total population of Parker County is 121,418 residents (United States Census Bureau, 2015). Comparably, the population size for Tarrant County is 1.912 million residents (United States Census Bureau, 2015). The counties of Parker and Tarrant are neighboring counties that differ tremendously by population size. Tarrant County is over ten times the size of Parker County. An assumption can be made that if research was conducted within Tarrant County the sample size of participants would increases dramatically, which holds the possibility of further correlations between school interventions and criminality. Even though the population size of Parker County is dramatically smaller in size than many other counties in the state of Texas, the research still consist of a sample size of 105 participants. Additionally, if a county was used as a population size such as Tarrant county the research would increase dramatically by sample size, and would increase the validity of the results. The research conducted in Parker County is limited based on the population size. If the research was replicated in a county such as Tarrant County, the population size would hold a better representation of a sample of the individuals that are on probation within the county.

The second limitation within this research was the racial disparity. According to the results from this study, (91.2%) of the population of the participants were white. Additionally, only (8.7%) of the population of the participants were nonwhite. Given that there is unequal representation among the population, once a bivariate analysis was conducted there was not an adequate representation. The

overrepresentation of the racial classification of white in this research limited the ability to correlate the variable of race with any other factors. This limitation affected the hypothesis and research questions that were intended to observe any correlation between race and school interventions. According to the United States Census Bureau (2015), the racial composition of Parker County, Texas, was (94.7%) white. This statistic from the United States Census Bureau can be an explanation to the over representation of whites within this study. However, this statistic has limited the results that were conducted from the research.

Given that this research could be replicated in another demographic area, there are many options that could provide better representation. For example, in Dallas county, the racial classification of white composes (68.3%) of the total population for Dallas county (United States Census Bureau, 2015). Additionally, Dallas County has a total population of 2,480,331 (United States Census Bureau, 2015). In Tarrant County, the racial classification of white composes (86.8%) of the total population (United States Census Bureau, 2015). If replicated, the researcher would expect an increase in racial diversity and ensure the validity as it pertains to race and school interventions.

The third limitation within in this study was the classification of offense. From the data collected criminality was defined as the sentencing to probation, and juvenile criminal history. The data from this finding did not classify specifically the offense committed. Additionally, there could not be any bivariate analysis performed in regards to offense commit to form any correlation with types of offenses and school interventions. If the offense was classified then the severity of the offense could be collected. By obtaining the type of offense, the research would be able to make correlations between violent and non-violent crimes as the correlate to school interventions. Furthermore, the classification of a juvenile offense is not included within the research. A limitation of not including juvenile offenses within the research is that status offenses are classified as criminality. For example, if a juvenile is arrested for truancy this arrest could be included within the study as juvenile criminality. Additionally, by not including the type of juvenile offense the research cannot identify violent and nonviolent juvenile offenses. By not being able to classify the juvenile offense the research cannot make correlations between the types of juvenile crimes and school interventions. In conclusion, since the research doesn't include juvenile offenses, this limits any correlations between types of juvenile offenses, severity of juvenile offenses, and school interventions.

The fourth limitation within this study is that the research doesn't include all demographic variables, peer associations, and individual characteristics. The research conducted examines variables such as gender, race, age, level of offense, education level, if attended school in Texas, and school interventions. However, the research doesn't include individual demographic level characteristics that can be identified throughout the research. Given that there are some demographic variables presented, the research doesn't include employment, income, family, parent's criminal history, and other demographic variables. The lack of demographic variables limits the research, because other correlations could be made between the results and the missing demographic variables. For example, employment could be dependent on school interventions and education. However, within this research, variables such as these aren't include, which limits any other potential correlations. The variable of peer associations wasn't included within this research. According to Restio and Lanier (2013) delinquent peer associations are predictors of juvenile criminality and future criminality. Therefore, not including peer associations limits any correlations that can be made from the relationship between peer associations and juvenile criminality. In conclusion, the research doesn't include variables that could be pertinent such as individual level characteristics, peer associations, and demographic information. Withholding these types of variables limits the correlations that can be concluded from the research.

Chapter 7

Implications

From the research, the sample of the Parker County Community Supervisions and Corrections Department was a microcosm study when compared to the studies of Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011) and Texas School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007). In the study of Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011), the researcher examined over 1,200 school districts in the state of Texas, and over 3,900 campus in which students from the state of Texas attended. Additionally, this study examined 928, 940 students within the state of Texas (Fabelo, 2011). In the study of Texas School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007), the research examined 1,221-1,229 school districts in the state of Texas over a time period of 4 years. Additionally, the research examined the number students that were sentenced to suspensions, secondary schools, and expulsions (Appleseed, pg 106. 2007). Within the current study and the study conducted by Appleseed, (2007), there are many policy recommendations that are transparent.

These studies when compared to the current study have a greater validity of results because of the sample size of the data collected. Comparably, the current study examines similar characteristics that are transparent to the study of Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011). In the current study, the pertinent variables that are examined are school interventions, adult criminality, juvenile criminality, education, race, and gender. In the study of Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011), the variables examined are school interventions, education, juvenile criminality, race, and gender. These variables are comparable to the pertinent variables that included in the current study. From the results, in both studies there is a significant correlation between school interventions a juvenile criminality, education, race, and gender. There are many policy implications within the study of Breaking School Rules (Fabelo, 2011) and Texas School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007) that can be analyzed within the current study. The implications presented are implemented at the state level and at the school level.

State Level Implications

The first policy implication presented in this research is that school interventions are not meeting the desired results by disciplining through school interventions. As a result, policy makers should be questioning whether the school disciplinary system and its current functioning is achieving its desired objective. Additionally, policy makers should create other disciplinary options for students that have

already been referred to a school intervention in order to decrease juvenile criminality. From the results, there are statistical correlations that contribute to a phenomenon between school interventions and juvenile criminality. In particular, policy makers should focus on school interventions, such as suspensions, and the unintended results. According to (Fabelo, 2011), policy makers should consider students that have been suspended multiple times. Additionally, policy makers should consider students that were suspended between middle school and high school (Fabelo, 2011). Policy maker's roles are essential in the creation and evaluation of school interventions. Therefore, policy makers need to examine the detrimental effects of school interventions as they correlate with juvenile criminality. In conclusion of the first implication, policy makers need to be educated of the unintended consequences of school interventions.

The second implication at the state level is that researchers should replicate this study within other states of the United States. According to the results, school interventions have an associated relationship with juvenile criminality, and this relationship could be replicated in other states. According to the study *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), the findings can be replicated in other states across the United States. Additionally, Texas is not alone in observing groups of students that are removed from the educational system, and are at an increased risk of coming into contact with the juvenile justice system (Fabelo, 2011). There can be replications from the current study and *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), that would have potential similar results in other states throughout the United States.

The third implication is that schools should operate independently and should not wait for policy makers to implement policy. Currently, schools within the educational system created their own student code of conduct within the guidelines of policies created by the state of Texas. Additionally, schools have copious amounts of discretionary decisions when addressing a school intervention. According to *Breaking School Rules* (Fabelo, 2011), schools in the educational system should not wait on policy makers for alternatives responses to disruptive behaviors. Schools officials and employees have a lot of guidance and recommendations when creating a student code of conduct. School officials and employees should also take into consideration their discretionary role when making decisions on a disciplinary infraction. Additionally, schools should adjust discretionary decisions in regards to students that are displaying disruptive or deviant behavior. If a school official or employee recognizes a disciplinary infraction and

choose other options besides the school intervention, this not only decreases the chance of criminality, but also corrects the problem at the onset. In conclusion, school officials should take into consideration the detrimental effects of school interventions prior to subjecting them to a type of disciplinary referral.

As result, the fourth policy implication at the state level is that the state of Texas should provide strict supervision over secondary schools. According to (Appleseed, 2007), the state of Texas should provide oversight to the operations of secondary schools. Additionally, the state of Texas should be mandated to monitor and improve the educational curriculum, in order to ensure disruptive students are getting intensive quality education. According to the current study, juvenile criminality is significantly correlated with secondary schools. Therefore, it is imperative that policy recommendations take into consideration the detrimental effects of secondary school and adjust responses to disciplinary infractions. Given the significance of secondary schools on juvenile criminality, this policy recommendation is that schools improve academic standards and the courses that are offered (Appleseed, 2007).

The last policy implication at the state level is that the state of Texas should have alternatives to school interventions and limitations to how long students can be suspended or expelled from school. Removal of the student from the educational environment, does not correct disruptive behavior it just removes the student from the educational environment. Additionally, the Texas educational system should implement a limit on the length of time a student is suspended during the academic year (Appleseed, 2007). From the results of the current study, suspensions from school are directly correlated with the level of education completed and other school interventions. Therefore, policy implications should take into consideration the detrimental effects of removing the student from the educational system, and the potential consequences of decreasing the highest level of completed education, and prolonging disruptive behavior. As a result, there are many policy implications that are suggested to the officials of state of Texas, in regards to their capacity to implement implications within the educational system. However, the educational system is unique, because schools independently also have the ability to implement their own policy. As a result from the studies of Texas School to Prison Pipeline (Appleseed, 2007), and Discipline: Effective School Practices (Bear, 2010), there are many policy implications that can be directly implemented at the school level.

School Level Implications

As a result, there are multiple school leveled policy implications presented from the study. First, schools should refer students to school interventions off the direction and analysis of evidenced based research. According to (Appleseed, 2007), schools should develop research based discipline strategies as responses to disciplinary infractions. This policy implication concludes that schools should implement research base strategies into policy and procedures. Additionally, schools should develop, implement, and routinely evaluate disciplinary plans (Appleseed, 2007). The second implication at the school level is that schools should develop consistent policies that require every school in the state of Texas to properly evaluate and consider situational and discretionary variables before making a decision on a disciplinary infraction. According to Appleseed (2007), schools should develop consistent uniformity for plans to monitor at risk youths. This policy is implicated in order to monitor at risk students to prevent further disruptive behavior, support success in-school, and prevent future delinquency or contact with the criminal justice system. The third implication at the school level, similar to the state level, is that schools should improve the educational guidance of secondary schools and in-school suspensions. As previously stated, removing the student from the educational environment doesn't correct disruptive behavior, it only removes the student. As a result from the findings, there is an association between suspensions and education. It is imperative to have policy implications as a response. According to Appleseed (2007), improvement to in-school suspension's academic curriculum will improve student's education level, and decrease contact with the criminal justice system.

Furthermore, in the study *Discipline: Effective School Practices* (Bear, 2010), there are four policy implications that can be interpreted at the school level as responses to a disciplinary infraction. First, schools in the educational system should have alternatives to school interventions. Similar at the state level, alternatives to school interventions should be used throughout. According to Bear (2010), school officials and or employees should avoid using punishment techniques and use techniques that involve self-discipline and preventing misbehavior. Furthermore, if school officials or employees use improved decision making, the variable of school interventions could be avoided entirely. As a result, school officials or employees should use techniques such as "physical proximity, taking away privileges, and

verbal reprimands” (Bear, pg. 3, 2010). Techniques such as these when used properly, in the context as supportive and nurturing, should effectively result in developing the desired behavior (Bear, 2010).

The second policy implication at the school level in response to a disciplinary infraction is that schools need to identify different responses to students that are disciplined more frequently. Furthermore, a collaborative approach with mental health workers, counselors, school officials or employees, students, and the student’s family would be beneficial in analyzing a disciplinary infraction, and deciding upon a proper response. Additionally, disruptive students need to be evaluated through techniques that target risk factors, and protective factors (Bear, 2010). This policy implication is intended to identify factors within disruptive students that can be underlying factors to disciplinary infractions. Within this implication, schools should implement a system that uses mental health specialist, school employees, and other community resources that will collaborate with students and their families in addressing a disciplinary infraction (Bear, 2010). This collaborative partnership with different resources and the student enables a deductive approach to a disciplinary infraction, which takes into consideration many different aspects of disruptive behavior. Last, the policy implication at the school level in response to a disciplinary infraction, is that there should be early interventions for students that display disruptive behavior. According to Bear, (2010), schools should be cognitive of the importance of early intervention as well of the interventions provided when disruptive behavior first begins to occur. This implication analyzes the early onset of disruptive behavior, and the responses that can be used to correct this behavior. If operationalized and evaluated properly, the recognition of disruptive behavior with proper responses through evaluated interventions, should be able to properly identify and decrease future disruptive behavior.

In conclusion of the implications, there are many different levels of the educational system that can be affected by policy recommendations. The first level of policy recommendation is at the state level in regards to policy makers. This can consist of the state of Texas, the Texas Attorney General, and the Texas Education Agency (Appleseed, 2007; Fabelo, 2011). Policy makers such as these evaluate and mandate responses to disciplinary infractions. For example in the state of Texas, the Texas Attorney General produces a School Crime and Discipline Hand book each year that gives guidance for the response to disruptive behavior (School crime and discipline handbook, 2013). Additionally, the Texas Education Agency monitors and enforces the policies mandate by the state of Texas (Fabelo, 2011). By

presenting policy implementation to these state agencies, it would change the way the state of Texas educational system responds to disruptive behavior.

However, this process can be lengthy and must be approved by multiple policy makers in order to be implemented. The second level of policy implication is at the schools within the educational environment. At this level schools can operate independently and produce their own discretionary responses to disruptive behavior. For example, every public school in the state of Texas has a student code of conduct that is given to every student, which defines the rules and regulations of the school the student is attending. The schools can implement their own discretionary responses to disruptive behavior within the guidelines of the state. However, if both the state agencies and independent public schools work collaboratively through policy recommendations, it can increase uniformity throughout the Texas educational system, and decrease students contact with the juvenile justice system.

Despite the limitations of this research, it is still able to demonstrate a correlation with school interventions and criminality. As presented in this study there are many factors that can contribute to school interventions and criminality. Additionally, it can be concluded that adult and juvenile criminality is not a singular issue. There are many variables that contribute to criminality at either the juvenile level or the adult level (Appleseed, 2007; Fabelo, 2011). On the contrary though, the research concludes that adult criminality is not correlated and school interventions are more complexly related to juvenile criminality. Comparably to criminal offenses, disciplinary infractions are complex and derive from many different disruptive behaviors. These disruptive behaviors are defined through the student code of conduct, but many disciplinary infractions are situational and discretionary. The multivariate essence of disciplinary infractions makes it very difficult to identify and address. Many disciplinary educational policies focus on the singular disciplinary acts and do not take into consideration any situational or additional variables. Responses to disciplinary infractions have become uniformity and mandatory. Disciplinary infractions require a response from the educational system, just as crime requires a response from the criminal justice system. However, disciplinary interventions are multidimensional, and require responses through a collaborative approach from mental health specialist, school employees, and other community resources (Bear, 2010). While it is not a simple issue to address; the beginning initiative is to identify that disciplinary infractions have multiple variables and the importance of addressing the

underlying characteristics to a disciplinary infraction, rather than referring to mandatory responses that prolong disruptive behavior, and has the potential evolve into criminality.

References

- Advancement, P. (2005). Education on lockdown: The schoolhouse to jailhouse track.
- Appleseed. (2007). Texas' school-to-prison pipeline: Dropout to incarceration: The impact of school discipline and zero tolerance. Austin, TX: Texas Appleseed.
- Barrett, K. L. (2011). The school-to-prison pipeline: structuring legal reform. *Journal Of Criminal Justice Education*, 22(4), 593-596
- Bear, G. (2010). *Discipline: Effective School Practices* (Vol. 301, pp. 657-0270). Bethesda, Maryland: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Bernburg, J. G., & Krohn, M. D. (2003). Labeling, Life Chances, and Adult Crime: The Direct and Indirect Effects of Official Intervention in Adolescence on Crime in Early Adulthood. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1287-1318
- Boisvert, D., Boutwell, B. B., Vaske, j., & Newsome, j. (2014). Genetic and Environmental Overlap Between Delinquent Peer Association and Delinquency in Adolescence. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 41(1), 58-74
- Bush School of Government and Public Service. 2009. *The ABCDs of Texas Education: Assessing the Benefits and Costs of Reducing the Dropout Rate*. Texas A&M University: 26.
- Casella, R. (2003). Zero tolerance policy in schools: Rationale, consequences, and alternatives. *Teachers College Review*, 105, 872–892
- Curtis, A. (2014). Tracing the School-to-Prison Pipeline from Zero-Tolerance Policies to Juvenile Justice Dispositions. *The Georgetown Law Journal*, 102(1251), 1251-1277.
- Dupper, D. R., & Bosch, L. A. (1996). Reasons for school suspensions: An examination of data from one school district and recommendations for reducing suspensions. *Journal of Just and Caring Education*, 2, 140–159.
- Fabelo, A (2011). *Breaking schools' rules: a statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. New York: Justice Center, Council of State Governments

- Forsyth, C. J., Asmus, G., Howat, H., Pei, L. K., Forsyth, Y. A., & Stokes, B. R. (2014). Examining the relationship between school suspensions/expulsions and felonies. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 27(2), 149-158
- Hirschfield, P. (2008). Preparing For Prison? The Criminalization of School Discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology*, 79-101.
- Cohen-salmon, C., Côté, S., Gasquet, I., Guedeney, A., Hamon, M., Lamboy, B., Wohl, M. (2005). Conduct disorder in children and adolescents. *Inserm*. 1-46
- Matsueda, R. L. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1577-1611.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-Limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: *A developmental taxonomy*. *Psychological Review*, 4, 674–701.
- Morin, (2014). The Pros and Cons of Zero Tolerance Policies. [online] About. Available at: <http://discipline.about.com/od/solvingschoolproblems/fl/The-Pros-and-Cons-of-Zero-Tolerance-Policies.htm>.
- Monahan, K., VanDerhei, S., Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2014). From the School Yard to the Squad Car: School Discipline, Truancy, and Arrest. *Journal Of Youth & Adolescence*, 43(7), 1110-1122.
- Mulvey, E. (2011). Highlights from pathways to desistance: A longitudinal study of serious adolescents offenders. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, NCJ*.
- Mulder, E., Brand, E., Bullens, R., & Van Marle, H. (2011). Risk Factors for Overall Recidivism and Severity of Recidivism in Serious Juvenile Offenders. *International Journal Of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 55(1), 118-135.
- Restivo, E & Lanier, M (2013) Measuring the Contextual Effects and Mitigating Factors of Labeling Theory, *Justice Quarterly*, 32(1), 116-141.
- School crime and discipline handbook (2013). A practical reference guide. Austin, Tex.: Office of the Attorney General.

- Skiba, R. J., & Knesting, K. (2001). Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice. In R. J. Skiba & G. G. Noam (Eds.), *Zero tolerance: Can suspension and expulsion keep schools safe?* (pp. 17–43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skiba, R. J. (2014). The Failure of Zero Tolerance. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 22(4), 27-33.
- Schwartz, R. D., & Skolnick, J. H. (1962). Two studies of legal stigma. *Social Problems*, 10, 133-143.
- Simon, Jonathan (2006) *Governing through Crime: How the War on Crime Transformed American Democracy and Created a Culture of Fear*. NewYork: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, G. (1972). Delinquency and adolescent self-conceptions: A study of the personal relevance of infraction. *Social Problems*, 20, 84-103.
- Liberman, A. M., Kirk, D. S., & Kim, K. (2014). Labeling effects of first juvenile arrests: Secondary Deviance and Secondary Sanctioning. *Criminology*, 52(3), 345-370.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). State & county Quickfacts: Parker County, T.X, Tarrant County, T.X., Dallas County, T.X. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from <http://quickfacts.census.gov>

Biography Information

Holton Hemby has studied the fields of criminology and criminal justice for the past six years. This study is his first significant, individual project. He was awarded his Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2013, where he was a student athlete. Additionally, he was awarded his Masters of Arts degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology from the University of Texas at Arlington in 2015. His research interests include juveniles, recidivism, and the criminal mind. Holton's future plans are to continue his career in law enforcement.