

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL INCARCERATION ON CHILDREN: AN
EXAMINATION OF DELINQUENCY AND CRIMINALITY, SCHOOL
PERFORMANCE AND ALCOHOL AND DRUG USAGE

by

DIONNE ANNA PENISTON

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 IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

May 2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My chief debt is to Dr. Ahmad, Dr. Bing, and Dr. Paris who guided me through this rigorous process. I should also like to thank Mary Rowe for her help and assistance with my statistical needs. Last but not least, I will like to thank for family and friends for their support and love throughout this process.

April 17, 2006

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTAL INCARCERATION ON CHILDREN: AN EXAMINATION OF DELINQUENCY AND CRIMINALITY, SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, AND ALCOHOL AND DRUG USAGE

Publication No. _____

Dionne Anna Peniston, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2006

Supervising Professor: Janice Ahmad, Ph.D.

This study investigates the effects of parental incarceration on children and youth. The main objectives of this study are to validate previous research on delinquency and criminality, and poor school performance of youth whose parents have been under correctional supervision (jail or/and probation). In addition, this study aims to examine the prevalence of drug and alcohol use in this population.

This study utilizes the data set from the Children at Risk Program. This program was a drug and delinquency prevention program that was implemented in 1992 to 1996.

The electronic data set was obtained from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data.

Findings from this study reveal no differences between delinquency and criminality, poor school performance, and alcohol and drug use among youth whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 12 months or in jail during the past 12 months. However, findings revealed that youth at Time 2 whose caregiver had been on probation during the past two years or in jail once, twice, or several times in the past two years shows a higher frequency of delinquency and criminality, poor school performance, and alcohol and drug use than their counterparts whose caregiver had not been under correctional supervision.

The conclusions in this study support the literature that identifies delinquency and criminality, poor school performance, and alcohol and drug use among youth with parents under correctional supervision. Although very little differences were found in youth whose caregiver had been under correctional supervision during the past 12 months, this study does show that parental criminality may have an effect on youth. Therefore, caregivers, educators, counselors, and community advocates need to be educated on this negative effect on youth and steps taken to support children and youth during this stressful time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Purpose of the study.....	2
1.2 Significance of the study	3
1.3 Research questions.....	3
1.4 Limitations of the research.....	4
1.5 Chapters overview.....	4
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	5
2.1 Statistics on prisoners and their children.....	6
2.2 Behavioral problems in children with imprisoned parents.....	9
2.3 Prevalence of juvenile delinquency/criminality among youth of prisoners.....	13
2.4 Poor school performance of children with imprisoned parents.....	16
2.5 Drug/alcohol usage among children with incarcerated parent.....	17
2.6 Summary of Children at Risk Program.....	19

2.6.1 CAR participants/data collection.....	20
2.6.2 Program services.....	22
2.6.3 CAR results.....	23
3. METHODOLOGY.....	25
3.1 Secondary analysis.....	26
3.2 Sample.....	27
3.3 Research design.....	28
3.4 Independent and dependent variables.....	28
3.5 Measurement of variables.....	29
3.6 Limitations.....	33
4. RESULTS.....	35
4.1 Demographics.....	35
4.2 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers probations status during the past months.....	37
4.3 Youth school performance and caregivers probation during the past 12 month.....	38
4.4 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregivers probation during the past 12 months.....	39
4.5 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers jail status during the past 12 months.....	41
4.6 Youth school performance and caregivers jail status during the past 12 months.....	42
4.7 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregivers jail status during the past 12 months.....	43

4.8 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers probation status during the past 2 years.....	44
4.9 Youth school performance and caregivers probation status during the past 2 years.....	47
4.10 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregivers probation status during the past 2 years.....	48
4.11 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers jail status during the past 2 years.....	50
4.12 Youth school performance and caregivers jail status during the past 2 years.....	53
4.13 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregivers jail status during the past 2 years.....	55
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	58
5.1 Implications and Recommendations.....	63
5.2 Conclusions.....	63
Appendix	
A. IRB APPROVAL FORM.....	65
B. STUDY SITES.....	67
REFERENCES.....	70
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Research variable (Time 1).....	29
3.2 Research variables (Time 2).....	31
3.3 Caregiver’s criminality.....	33
4.1 Demographics.....	35
4.2 Youth delinquency/criminality 1.....	38
4.3 Youth school performance 1.....	39
4.4 Youth alcohol and drug usage 1.....	40
4.5 Youth delinquency/criminality 2.....	41
4.6 Youth school performance 2.....	42
4.7 Youth alcohol and drug usage 2.....	43
4.8 Youth delinquency/criminality 3.....	46
4.9 Youth school performance 3.....	48
4.10 Youth alcohol and drug usage 3.....	49
4.11 Youth delinquency/criminality 4.....	52
4.12 Youth school performance 4.....	54
4.13 Youth alcohol and drug usage 4.....	56

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

According to statistics from the U.S. Department of Justice, more than two million people are incarcerated in the United States. The prison population increases 6.5% annually in the United States. This rise in the rates of imprisonment is not due to violent crimes; instead the war on drugs has greatly contributed to this trend (Incarcerated America, 2003). Furthermore, factors such as three strikes laws, and the media's preoccupation with policing and arrest resulted in the national increased use of incarceration as punishment (Reed & Reed, 1997). As the prison population increases, more and more children are left without fathers and mothers because they are incarcerated. As a result of parental absence, children lives are affected. It is estimated that 7 million children under the age of 18 have a parent under some sort of correctional supervision (Lee, 2005).

Numerous children are affected by the incarceration of a mother or a father. The Bureau of Justice statistics reported that during 2003, the number of women in state and federal prison systems increased by 3.6%, compared to men at 2.0%. Although male prisoners account for the majority of the prison population, the number of mothers in prison grew at a faster rate than the number of incarcerated fathers between 1991 and 2000 (Mumola, 2000). As women (mothers) are the primary caretakers of their children, their absence result in a greater disruption in the lives of children than the absence of a

father. This is significant due to the fact that between 75% and 80% of incarcerated women have children and two-thirds of these women have children under the age of 18 (Greene, Haney, & Hurtado, 2000).

Because of the increase in children with incarcerated parents, numerous studies (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993; Sack, Seidler, & Thomas, 1976; Lipsey & Derzon, 1998; Hagen, 1999) documented the impact of imprisonment on children whose parents are incarcerated. According to Hagen (n.d.) children with incarcerated parents have a greater tendency to exhibit the following problems accompanying parental absence: low self-esteem, impaired achievement motivation, poor peer relations, anxiety, sadness, grief, social isolation, guilt, developmental regression, delinquency, drug addiction, and gang involvement. The following paragraphs discuss the current study's purpose and significance. In addition, the research questions are explored as well as the study's limitations.

1.1 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of parental incarceration on children by measuring delinquency and criminality, school performance, and alcohol and drug usage. Although the number of children affected by incarcerated parents is well documented, the full scope of the problem is rarely assessed. This study validates what previous studies have found about delinquency and criminality, and school performance of children with imprisoned parents. In addition, this study adds to the scarce body of knowledge on the prevalence of substance abuse among this population.

1.2 Significance of the study

This study will not only bring attention to the effects of incarceration on children with imprisoned parents, but it will make recommendations for policies and programs which can be employed to assist children with incarcerated parents. These recommendations are of the utmost importance since the population of children with imprisoned parents has become an epidemic in our nation.

1.3 Research questions

The following research questions will guide this study:

1. Do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months exhibit more delinquency and criminality than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision?
2. Do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional supervision?
3. Are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision?
4. Do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years exhibit more delinquency and criminality than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision?
5. Do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional supervision?

6. Are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision?

1.4 Limitations of the research

This study uses the data set employed in the Children at Risk Program. Questions that involve delinquency and criminality, school performance, and substance abuse will be statistically analyzed. The limitations of using this data set are that the caretaker in the study may not be a parent. In addition, the data set questions do not ask about length of time under correctional supervision prison.

1.5 Chapters overview

In the following chapter, a review of related literature is presented. This review includes previous research on statistics of prisoners and their children, behavioral problems inherent in children with imprisoned parents, problems relating to poor school performance, delinquency and arrest, and substance abuse. In addition, the Children at Risk program will be thoroughly discussed. Next, in Chapter Three the methodology employed in this study is discussed. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter Four. Finally, in Chapter Five a discussion of the study findings and policy recommendations to alleviate the effects of incarceration on children with imprisoned parents are presented.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of literature will focus on six main areas: statistics on prisoners and their children, behavioral problems in children with incarcerated parents, prevalence of delinquency and criminality among youth of prisoners, poor school performance of children with imprisoned parents, drug and alcohol usage among children of incarcerated parents, and a summary of the Children at Risk program. Each area of the literature review provides the reader with detailed information about the effects of incarceration on children with imprisoned parents. Section one will use statistics to fully allow the reader to comprehend the scope of the problem. Every day in the United States adults are imprisoned and more children are left without parents. Section two will expound upon the visible behavioral effects of parental incarceration on children and youth. Next, section three will discuss the prevalence of delinquency and criminality among children of prisoners. Estimates reveal that children of offenders are more likely than their peers to become criminally involved and arrested. Section four will turn to poor school performance of children with imprisoned parents. Poor grades, extensive absences, and suspensions are a few incidents reported by parents about their children's school performance. Section five follows with a discussion of drug and alcohol usage among children of prisoners. Estimates show that children who have absent parents and who experience family instability might be exposed to trauma that leads them to abuse

substances as a coping mechanism. Finally, section six will summarize the Children at Risk program (CAR). This study will use the data sets from the CAR program to collaborate previous research findings about the behavioral effects, delinquency, and poor school performance of children with imprisoned parents.

2.1. Statistics on prisoners and their children

Every day in the United States, adults are arrested or sentenced to serve time in prison or jail. At the end of 2003, the United States had 2,212,475 persons incarcerated. About 1 in every 109 men and 1 in every 1,613 women was under the jurisdiction of state or federal authorities (Harrison & Beck, 2003). If incarceration rates remain unchanged, an estimated 1 of every 20 individuals will serve time in prison during their lifetime (Bonczar & Beck, 1997). Furthermore, although relative to the U.S. population, men were almost 15 times more likely than women to be incarcerated in State or Federal prison, during 2003 the number of female prisoners rate of growth increased 3.6%, compared to men at 2.0% (Harrison & Beck, 2003).

As more adults are incarcerated, more children are left without parents. According to Johnston (1995), there is no reliable way of directly measuring the number of prisoners' children. This is due to the fact that there is no official mechanism that is used to collect information about offenders' children during arrest and adjudication. All information gained about this population is obtained from self-reports from prisoners, which may be inaccurate.

Only a few jurisdictions actually require correctional agencies to inquire about the dependent children of prisoners. However, this information does not follow offenders through adjudication and incarceration. Likewise, although some jurisdictions require

information about convicted persons families to be included in pre-sentence reports, the majority of sentences are imposed without these reports. Therefore, there are no actual counts of affected children, only estimates. These estimates are obtained by counting incarcerated women, estimating the percentage who are mothers, and multiplying by the actual number of children as found in large scale self-report data (Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, & Kennon, 1999).

Mumola (2000) report indicated that of the 721,500 parents held in state and federal prison in 1999, an estimated 1,498,800 children have absent parents. Thus, of the nation's 72 million minor children, 2.1% had a parent in state or federal prison in 1999. Lee (2005) estimated that 7 million children, or 10 percent of the children under the age of 18, have a parent under some sort of correctional supervision. Parke and Clarke-Stewart (2002) estimated that 58% of children with incarcerated parents are under the age of 10 with a median age of 8.

Gender is a major factor in parental incarceration. On an average day, there are approximately 1 million fathers behind bars. Although fathers accounted for 90% of parents in prison, between 1991 and 2000, the number of mothers in prison increased 98%, compared to fathers at 58%. According to Greenfield and Snell (1999) approximately 7 in 10 women under correctional sanction have a child who is under the age of 18. These women report an average of 3 children of this age.

In order to fully comprehend the impact of parental incarceration on children, it is important to understand the prior living arrangements of children whose parents are incarcerated. In 1999, state and federal prisons held an estimated 721,500 parents of

minor children. According to Mumola (2000), 46% of the parents reported that their children lived with them prior to their incarceration, 44% of fathers and 64% of mothers. Sixty-four percent of mothers in state prisons and 84% of mothers in federal prisons reported living with their children prior to imprisonment, while 44% of fathers in state prisons and 55% of fathers in federal prisons report living with children prior to imprisonment.

On average, parents in state prisons are expected to serve a total of 80 months. Fathers spend nearly 36 months more than mothers. In federal prisons, parents are expected to serve an average of 103 months. Furthermore, Mumola (2000) reported that over 75% of parents in state prison reported a prior conviction and 50% reported a prior incarceration. These statistics are alarming since some investigations have identified parental recidivism as the most damaging aspect of parent incarceration (Johnston, 1995; McGowan & Blumenthal, 1978).

Current statistics reveal more than 721,500 parents are incarcerated (Mumola, 2000), and it is estimated that more than 1.5 million children have a parent who is incarcerated in the United States (Bilchik, Seymour, & Kreisher, 2001). If incarceration rates continue to grow at the current rate, millions of children in the United States will be affected. With the large number of parents incarcerated, there is large group of children whose lives are disrupted and damaged from prolonged separation from their parents. In the next section, behavioral problems exhibited by children with incarcerated parents will be discussed.

2.2 Behavioral problems in children with imprisoned parents

The well being of a growing number of children is affected by the absence of a parent(s) due to incarceration. Starting in childhood, the effects of a parent's incarceration on a child are visible. As the child goes into adolescents, maladaptive coping patterns become even more apparent (Myers et al., 1999).

Several researchers have identified a number of environmental risk factors that raises the prevalence of psychopathology in childhood. These risk factors tend to be fairly long lasting. Results from a study by Cohen and Brook (1987) revealed that long-term risks tended to be associated with characteristics of the family, poverty, poor housing, family instability and family sociopathy. Children with incarcerated parents are vulnerable to all of these factors.

A study by Greene et al. (2000) asked 102 incarcerated mothers in three central California jails about the circumstances under which their children were raised. On average, the mothers had 2.5 children and 76% of mothers had legal custody of their children. Interviewers collected information about the children by focusing on the oldest child who was under 18. Questions were asked about the child's experiences of physical and sexual abuse, witnessing drugs and domestic violence at home, the number of homes their children lived in during the last five years, and about the father's presence and involvement in the child's life. Results from this study showed that 83% of the mother's children had been either sexually or physically abused or witnessed violence at home.

The initial experience of separation from a parent and subsequent disruption of attachment relationships are factors that may cause some children to exhibit behavioral problems. Johnson (1991) purports that one in five children witness their mother being

arrested and taken away by the police. Children who witness their parent(s) arrest are typically terrified (Myers et al., 1999). These children may not understand the circumstances under which their parents were arrested. Therefore, the child may perceive the situation as being threatening and hostile. In another study, Kampfner (1995) interviewed 30 children that witnessed their mother's arrest. Findings revealed that these children suffered flashbacks and nightmares about the incident.

In like manner, for some children who experience separation from their parent(s), the attachment relationship that had been previously formed between the parent and the child may be disrupted. Once this relationship is broken, the child may become susceptible to abuse, neglect, aggression and delinquency. In a study conducted by Poehlmann (2005), the representation of attachment relationships in 54 children ages 2.5 to 7.5 years whose mothers were incarcerated was assessed. Results revealed that most of the children (63%) held representations of insecure-negative relationships with their mothers. This study also revealed that the most common reaction to initial separation from the mother going to prison or jail was sadness, crying, misbehavior, sleep problems, worry, and developmental regression.

Insecure attachment has also been associated with other adverse outcomes. According to an estimate by Baunach (1985), 70% of children whose parents were incarcerated had emotional or psychological problems. Other researchers (Bloom & Steinhart, 1993; Johnston, 1995; Kampfner, 1995; Sack, Seidler, & Thomas, 1976) also attributed behaviors such as anxiety, withdrawal, hyper-vigilance, depression, shame, guilt, eating disorders, anger, aggression, and hostility towards caregivers and siblings to the separation of a parent and child.

In addition, Fritsch and Burkhead (1981) studied 91 male and female inmates, selected from a federal minimum-security prison in Lexington, Kentucky. These inmates reported a total of 194 children whose average age was 8.8 years for male inmates and 7.5 years for female inmates. Results from this study showed that the 91 inmates reported a total of 124 child-related problems. Further results also revealed that respondents who lived with their children prior to being incarcerated were more likely to report problems. Fritsch and Burkhead (1981) grouped these problems into two categories. One consisted of acting-out, which included “hostile behavior, use of drugs or alcohol, running away, school truancy, discipline problems, aggressive acts, and involvement in delinquent activities” (p.85). The other category referred to as acting-in, which included daydreaming and nightmares. Absent fathers reported more acting-out behaviors, whereas, absent mothers were more likely to report acting-in behaviors.

Another way of studying the affects of incarceration on children is to compare children with imprisoned parents to their peers. Phillips, Burns, Wagner, Kramer, and Robbins (2002) used data collected from adolescents from the Adolescent Treatment Outcome Module (ATOM) to determine if adolescents whose parents were incarcerated differed from other adolescents. These researchers examined factors such as demographic characteristics, lifetime experience of risk factors, recent exposure to stressful life events or clinical characteristics. Secondary data collected from a study of adolescents and caregivers to validate ATOM was used in this study. Participants ranged in age from 11 to 18 years. Original data was collected on 258 adolescents, and follow-up data was collected on 237 adolescents. Results from the study revealed that adolescents whose parent(s) had been incarcerated experienced a higher number of risk

factors in their lifetimes. These risks included a mother or father who abused drugs or alcohol, living in a home whose annual income was below \$10,000, and having a history of abuse or neglect. Furthermore, when exposure to stressful life events six months immediately preceding treatment was compared, adolescents whose parents had been incarcerated were more likely to have experienced life crises and to have witnessed violence. Phillips et al. (2002) found that compared to other adolescents in this study, youths whose parents had been incarcerated had significantly higher rates of conduct disorder, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, and problems with role performance. Results also revealed that adolescents whose parents had been incarcerated experienced a higher number of incidents of school expulsion/suspension, arrest, or incarceration between intake and follow-up.

Observational studies that document children's reactions to the imprisonment of their parents are indispensable to identifying the behavioral reactions that follow the incarceration of a parent. Sack (1977) presented his observations of six families whose fathers were imprisoned. His observations occurred over a three-year period at a neighborhood health center sponsored by the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. The families represented were lower income and white living in the community served by the clinic. Each of these families had a male child ages 6 to 13 and who had exhibited antisocial and/or aggressive behavior soon after his father's incarceration. Sack (1977) observed that the males aged 11 to 13 seemed to be the most vulnerable to being the most severely affected. Sack's (1977) observations also revealed that the boys' antisocial behavior was a defense mechanism devised to help the boys continue their relationship with their imprisoned fathers.

A similar study by Sack et al. (1976) sampled 31 male and female prisoners in Oregon state correctional institutions. These parents reported aggressive or disruptive behavior of the children as being the most frequent complaint. Furthermore, six children manifested some sort of antisocial behavior such as stealing or temporary truancy within three months of their parent's incarceration.

Studies have also found that boys and girls exhibit behavioral problems in different ways. Cummings, Davies, & Campbell (2000), reported that boys are more likely to externalize behavioral problems, whereas, girls are more likely to internalize problems (as cited in Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2002). It has also been found that boys are more likely than girls to demonstrate aggressive and antisocial behavior (Gabel, 1992).

Soon after a parent(s) incarceration, children begin to exhibit common behavioral problems. Numerous studies have identified these behavior problems. However, for some children, their behavior caused them to come in contact with correctional departments in their communities. The following section discusses delinquency and criminality in children whose parents are imprisoned.

2.3 Prevalence of juvenile delinquency/criminality among youth of prisoners

According to Bilchik et al. (2001), research is beginning to reveal that children of offenders are more likely to enter the criminal justice system than children of non-offenders. Estimates reveal that children of offenders are six times more likely than their peers to become criminally involved and become incarcerated.

Goldstein (1984) used data collected from the Health Examination Survey conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics to study the relationship between families with absent fathers, parental supervision, and conduct disorder in youths. This

survey, which was conducted between 1966 and 1970, studied thousands of youths between the ages of 12 and 17. Data collected were obtained from youth reports, parent reports, and school reports. Conduct problems were assessed using reported contacts with police, disciplinary actions in schools, and arrests. Findings from Goldstein's study revealed that the police had questioned boys from absent father families significantly more than boys whose fathers were present. Also, boys with absent fathers tended to have more contact with the police than girls with absent fathers. In terms of parental supervision, Goldstein found that boys, but not girls, in homes with no supervision, had a greater chance of having contact with the police. Finally, this study showed that boys with absent fathers showed a greater chance of having disciplinary problems at school than boys from father present homes.

A study by Lipsey and Derzon (1998) found that 15 to 20 percent of children with incarcerated parents who had committed serious crimes are likely to exhibit conduct behaviors during adolescents. It has also been found in a study by Hungerford (1993), that 40 percent of the boys aged 12 to 17 whose mothers were incarcerated were delinquent.

Sirpal (2002) examined the relationship between familial criminality and juvenile gang membership. Two groups of families, 79 with criminality and 79 with no reported criminality were compared. The first group of parents interviewed children participated in Gang Reduction Activities and Sports programs (GRASP). The families in GRASP had children who were either identified as gang members or were at risk for becoming a gang member. The latter group of parents' children participated in the Police Athletic League (PAL). This program was open to all families. The only condition for admission

was that the child was not delinquent or a gang member. The ages of the children ranged from 12 to 18. Parents were given a self-report survey in order to measure the effects of parental criminality on juvenile gang membership. Analysis from this study revealed that parental criminality was a significant factor related to gang membership and delinquency among juveniles.

A study by the Survey of Youth in Custody conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1988) found that more than half of all juveniles and young adults in custody reported a family member serving time in jail or prison. Furthermore, adolescent children of incarcerated parents are one-half to three times more likely than their peers to get arrested (Eddy & Heid, 2003). A study by Myers et al. (1999), reported similar findings that children of incarcerated mothers are more likely than other children to engage in lawbreaking and to be arrested.

The Oregon Youth Study (OYS) was a longitudinal study of 206 boys that began in 1983 (Eddy & Heid, 2003). The OYS participants grew up in lower to working class European American families. Participants were recruited from four grade classes in 12 public elementary schools. At the beginning of the study, 2% of the boys had parents who had been arrested as adults; 9% had a mother who had been arrested; and 22 % had a father who had been arrested. By the age of 18, 80% of participants who had had either a mother arrested or a mother and father arrested had been arrested two or three times. However, for youths whose parents were never arrested, 20% had two or more arrests. The study showed that participants with criminal parents were more likely to be arrested than those youths without criminal parents.

The research reviewed indicates that children whose parent(s) are incarcerated are more likely than their peers to engage in lawbreaking, and be arrested. Furthermore, the majority of juveniles and youth that have served time in jail had parents that were in prison. Therefore, a link is beginning to be identified that shows a causal relationship between parental incarceration and criminality in their children. The following section discusses the school performance of children whose parents are imprisoned.

2.4 Poor school performance of children with imprisoned parents

In addition to behavioral problems, children with incarcerated parents may have school related problems and problems with peer relationships. Stanton (1980) reported that 70% of 166 children of incarcerated parents studied show poor school performance and 50% exhibited classroom behavioral problems following the incarceration of their parents.

Additionally, Sack et al. (1976) conducted a study of 31 families of prisoners, 20 imprisoned fathers and 11 imprisoned mothers. Wives of male prisoners reported that their children had problems in schools following their father's incarceration. Problems included poor grades or instances of aggression. Furthermore, Sack et al. (1976) found that the children ages 6-8 years of age had developed school phobia. Four of the 20 children did not want to go to school for a four to six week period after the confinement of their parent.

Trice (1997) compared the school performance of 219 children of incarcerated mothers in a state prison in Virginia with their same-gender best friends, whose parents were not incarcerated. This data was collected using the reports of the caregiver of the target child and the mother of the peer child. The investigation revealed that children of

incarcerated mothers were more likely than their peers to experience suspension, mandated school visits by the guardian, extensive school absences, and failing classes. Furthermore, the study revealed that the drop out rate of children with incarcerated mothers was 34% compared to 10% of their best-friend peers (as cited in Myers, et al., 1999).

Henriques (1982) study of imprisoned mothers and their children included the perceptions of the guardians of the children whose mothers were incarcerated. The guardians expressed concern relating to the academic performance of these children. One guardian believed that separation from the mother affected the children's schoolwork.

In school, children with incarcerated parents experience trouble with schoolwork, their peers, and authoritative figures. For this reason, these children may do poorly in school. The next section of this review investigates drug and alcohol usage among children with incarcerated parents.

2.5 Drug/alcohol usage among children with incarcerated parent

Although numerous researchers have written about the effects of parental incarceration on children and youth, research that identifies substance abuse as a problem among this population is scarce. The following paragraphs discuss available studies that state that children with imprisoned parents are more likely to abuse drugs and alcohol. In addition, current studies that explore absent parents and family instability as factors in adolescents substance abuse are examined.

Two studies, Hagen and Dinovitzer (1999) and Bilchik et al., (2001) stated that children of imprisoned parents are at a greater risk for alcohol and drug abuse. Reed and Reed (1997) also noted that children whose parents are incarcerated might be exposed to

enduring trauma that leads them to abuse substances as a coping mechanism. In addition, Lowenstein (1986) studied 118 married Jewish criminal first time offenders. Husbands were interviewed in prison and wives at home. This study investigated the ability of the children to adjust successfully to their father's imprisonment. Drug problems and involvement were measured. Results from the study revealed that some mothers identified experiencing drug problems with their children.

According to Butters (2002), the experience of family stressors such as a family unit disruption, may affect the patterns of drug use among adolescents. Butters (2002) used the 1997 cycle of the Ontario Student Drug Use Survey conducted on students in grades 7, 9, 11, and 13 in which 3,990 students were surveyed. Results from the study revealed that youths who reported being from a disrupted family were 79% more likely to use cannabis than those who had not experienced family disruption.

Distant parent child relationships have also been shown to cause drug usage in children. A study by Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, and Fleming (2002) investigated the influence of family disruptions on the likeliness of drug use among early adolescents. The sample of 67 youth in this study was taken from a family-based intervention study entitled Focus on Families. The mean age for the sample was 11.4 years at baseline and 13.8 years at the time of the final interview. Forty-five percent of the sample was females. Results revealed that 70% of the youths had experienced parent figure transition during the study period. Overall, the study revealed that parental transitions placed females at a greater risk than males for substance abuse.

Brook, Brook, De La Rosa, Whiteman, Johnson, and Montoya (2000) also found that a distant parent-child relationship is a risk factor for adolescents' illegal drug use.

Participants in the study were adolescents and their biological mothers who lived in Columbia, South America. Adolescents in the sample were between 12 and 17 years of age and lived with their biological mothers. Results showed that maternal and paternal attachment to the child in the form of support, identification, and nonconflictual relationship, inhibited the adolescent from drug use.

Although research that identifies parental incarceration as a factor that leads to adolescent's substance abuse is limited, numerous studies have shown that family instability and absent parents are factors that increase the likelihood of drug and alcohol use in adolescents. As with delinquency, parent-child attachment has been found to insulate adolescents against substance abuse. The following section discusses the Children at Risk program. The current study will use this study's data set to validate the results of the studies above on delinquency and criminality, and poor school performance of children with incarcerated parents. In addition, the results from this study will add to the limited body of knowledge on alcohol and drug usage among children with incarcerated parents.

2.6 Summary of Children at Risk Program

The Children at Risk (CAR) program was a drug and delinquency prevention program that targeted high-risk adolescents ages 11 to 13, who lived in severely distressed neighborhoods in Austin, Texas, Bridgeport, Connecticut, Memphis, Tennessee, Savannah, Georgia, and Seattle, Washington (Harrell, Cavanagh, & Sridharan, 1999). CAR delivered integrated services to the youth as well as their families that involved collaboration with the police, schools, case managers, and other service

providers. The evaluation of this research compared randomly experimental and quasi-experimental group in four of the five cities.

The CAR program was originally implemented in 1992 to 1996. It was developed, funded, and monitored by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University. The National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and delinquency Prevention in the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs also provided financial support. Numerous private foundations such as the Ford Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts provided additional support for the program (Harrell et al., 1999).

The average CAR program when fully operating served 90 participants and 83 family members per year at a cost of \$420,000. Therefore, this amounts to \$4,700 per year for youth participants (Harrell et al., 1999). However, when family members are involved in the program the amount went down to \$2,400 per individual. Each city received funds for at least 3 years.

2.6.1 CAR participants/data collection

The sample consisted of 338 youth in the CAR treatment group, 333 youths in the control group and 203 youths in the quasi-experimental group. Youth chosen for the treatment group were randomly selected from high-risk neighborhoods in the above-mentioned cities. Youth in the control group were the remainder of youths not selected to be in the treatment group. Youths in the quasi-experimental group were high-risk youth in neighborhoods with comparable poverty rates, crime and drug problems in the same cities. The average age of the youths at entry was 12.4 years old. Fifty-two percent of the participants were male. Fifty eight percent were black, 34 percent Hispanic, and 8

percent were white or Asian. Participant's caregivers were usually mothers who had low educational levels, and depended on public support (Harrell et al., 1999).

CAR data on youths and their caregivers was conducted using in-person interviews at the participants' homes. These interviews were conducted twice, at baseline and at the end of the program period. Follow-up surveys were given to the youth one year after the end of the program. Data on the youths contact with the criminal justice system was collected each year from the police and courts in participating cities. Finally, data on school performance and attendance was collected using records from schools on grades, promotions, and percentage of days youths attended (Harrell et al., 1999).

The response rate for youths was 98 percent at baseline and 77 percent at the end of the program. The one-year follow-up response rate was 76 percent. Caregivers response rate was 97 percent at baseline, and 76 percent at the end of the program (Harrell et al., 1999).

Participants chosen to participate in the CAR programs had to meet the following criteria: youths between the ages of 11 and 13 who attended sixth or seventh grade; lived in the target neighborhood and enrolled in the neighborhood school; and exhibited risk in school, family, or personal factors (Harrell et al., 1999). School risk indicators included factors such as poor academic performance, out-of-school suspension, and disruptive behavior in school. Family risk included factors such as a family history of violence, or drug use. Finally, personal risk constituted factors such as delinquency, mental illness, past arrest, or teen pregnancy.

2.6.2 Program services

The CAR program was designed to prevent drug use and delinquency by reducing the number of risk factors in youths (Harrell et al., 1999). The program provided eight services which included case management, family services, after-school and summer activities, mentoring, education services, incentives, community policing and enhanced enforcement, and criminal and juvenile justice intervention. These services targeted family, neighborhood, peer group, and individual risk factors.

Case managers were used to assess the services needed by the participants and their families. Case managers then developed and implemented plans to meet those needs. Family services included a wide range of services to meet the family's needs such as therapeutic services, and skills training. After school and summer activities were both local programs and CAR-sponsored programs. These recreational activities included sports, crafts, games, and music. These programs were geared towards helping CAR youth interact with their peers. CAR programs in different cities implemented mentoring in different ways. For example in Austin, CAR participants were matched with individuals from Austin's Big Brother/Big Sisters. Other sites used group mentoring, in which mentors led a group of youths. CAR programs offered all participants tutoring and homework assistance. This was accomplished by utilizing some form of a computer lab, games led by college students, or individual help. CAR program allowed community police officers to participate by using their increased presence in and around schools, and working with residents on crime prevention. In addition, police officers taught the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) course, participated in recreational programs and special events, and occasionally worked with case managers to solve certain participant's

problems. Finally, when CAR youth became involved with the courts, case managers worked with the criminal and juvenile authorities. This was done in order to ensure that participant's received supervision and engage in community services that served as learning experiences (Harrell et al., 1999).

2.6.3 CAR results

Results from the study revealed that when compared with youths from the comparison groups, CAR youths had a higher number of positive activities such as community program, and religious groups (Harrell et al., 1999). Results also revealed that CAR youth used more services such as mentoring and drug treatment programs. Services averaged at 3.4 for CAR households, compared to 2.5 for the control group.

When risk factors in the individual, peer group, family, and neighborhood were evaluated, the program found reductions in CAR youths' peer risk. CAR youth associated less with delinquent youths and had more positive peer support than the youth in the control groups. For individual risk factors, no significant differences were found between CAR youths and the other groups. Finally, when family risk factors were examined, there were no indications of lower family risk in CAR youths (Harrell et al., 1999).

The main focus of CAR was to reduce drug use and delinquency in youth. Results from the study one year after the programs ended revealed five findings. First, CAR youths were less likely to use drugs in the past month than the control groups. Secondly, CAR youth were less likely to use gateway drugs in the year following the end of the study. Thirdly, CAR youth were less likely to sell drugs in the past month (Harrell et al., 1999).

When compared to the comparison group, CAR participants had almost half the number of contacts with the police, and less than half the number of contacts with the juvenile courts than the comparison groups. Also, CAR youth committed less violent crimes in the year following the end of the program than the control youth. Finally, results showed that CAR participants had a greater chance of being promoted to the next grade and they also had lower rates of chronic absenteeism (Harrell et al., 1999).

In sum, the Children at Risk program was a drug and delinquency prevention program conducted in five distressed neighborhood in the United States. The program was designed to prevent drug use and delinquency by reducing the number of risk factors in at-risk youth. In order to accomplish this, the program provided eight services to the youth and their families. Results from the evaluation of the study revealed that the program did indeed reduce risk factors in the youth lives. In addition, the evaluation of the program revealed that in the year following the study CAR youth were less likely to use drugs than the control group. In the following Chapter, the methodology employed in this research will be explained.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The current study will attempt to answer six important research questions. First, do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months exhibit more delinquency and criminality than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision? Second, do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional supervision? Third, are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision? Fourth, do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years exhibit more delinquency and criminality than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision? Fifth, do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional supervision? Finally, are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision? In order to do this, I will use secondary data obtained from the National Archive of

Criminal Justice Data. This Chapter justifies the use of secondary data, describe the sample, explain the research design, discuss the measurement of variables, and identify the independent and dependent variables in the study.

This study will utilize the data set developed by Harrell, Cavanagh, and Sridharan (1999) in the Evaluation of the Children at Risk Program in Austin, Texas, Bridgeport, Tennessee, Savannah, Georgia, and Seattle, Washington. Survey data and administrative records data were collected between January 1993 and May 1997. The data collection is contained on four data files, a user guide, codebooks, and data collection instruments in separate PDF files, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements. Before using the Children at Risk Program's data set to run statistical analysis for this study, a research protocol to The University of Texas at Arlington Institutional Review Board (IRB) was submitted. See appendix A for IRB forms and approval. After gaining consent, data analyses was performed.

3.1 Secondary analysis

According to Glass (1976) secondary analysis can serve two purposes, reanalysis of data for the purpose of answering the original research question with better statistical techniques and answering new questions with old data. Arguments for the use of secondary analysis are based on a few assumptions. First, secondary analysis may contribute to future knowledge since original analysts may fail to focus on issues that became salient after the data were collected. Second, secondary analysis is raw material that is already available, saving the researcher's time and energy in gathering new information (Sobal, 1981). Third, secondary analysis offers a less expensive process to those who do not have enough money for an adequate study (Glaser, 1962). Fourth,

secondary analysis may diminish the psychological constraints, such as motivational lapses and mental fatigue often found in original researchers (Burstein, 1978). Finally, secondary analysis allows researchers with different skills to use the same data to produce various studies with certain strengths and weaknesses. For these reasons, I will utilize secondary research in my study because I believe it can serve a special purpose in research. Therefore, in my research, use of secondary data will save me time, expense, and energy yet it will allow for exploration of expanded issues, such as alcohol and drug use by children of incarcerated parents, using data that was collected in a long-term, multi-site study.

3.2 Sample

The sample of youth in the CAR study consisted of 338 participants (the treatment group), 333 youths in the control groups, and 203 youths in a quasi-experimental comparison group. The average participant was 12.4 years old. Fifty-two percent were male. Fifty-eight percent were black, 34% were Hispanic, and the remaining 8% were white or Asian. Eighty percent of primary caregiver's in this sample were mothers. Most of the caregivers had attained a low level of education (more than half had not graduated from high school), and their family depended heavily on public support (fewer than half were employed at the beginning of the study and most received some form of public assistance).

The youth chosen for the CAR study are from five severely distressed neighborhoods. In Austin, Texas, 60% of youth participants were Hispanic and 30% black. This neighborhood was extremely poor, had a high incidence of substance abuse and drug trafficking, and most households were headed by single mothers. In Bridgeport,

Connecticut, 40% of youth participants were Hispanic, 40% black, 14% white, and the remaining were Southeast Asians. Most of these participants lived in extreme poverty. In Memphis, Tennessee, 88% of youth participants lived in poverty. In Savannah, Georgia, 66% of the participants' households were low income, and more than 70% of households with children were led by a single mother. This area led the city in juvenile delinquency, crime, and urban blight. Finally, in Seattle, Washington, the student body at the targeted school was comprised of 40% white, 25% black, 20% Asian, 4% American Indian, and 10% other.

3.3 Research design

In the current study, the effects of parental incarceration on youth's delinquency and criminality, school performance, and substance abuse is measured using the mean scores of youths whose caretaker had been incarcerated, and youths whose caretaker had never been incarcerated. Both groups are matched on dependent variables; therefore, differences in outcome between the two groups would suggest that a relationship between youths' delinquency and criminality, school performance, and substance abuse is related to the caretaker's criminal history.

This research design allows the assessment of the independent effects of caretaker's criminality on youths' delinquency and criminality, school performance, and substance abuse.

3.4 Independent and dependent variables

Caretaker criminality is treated as the independent variable in this study. Youth delinquency and criminality, poor school performance, and substance abuse are treated as dependent variables.

3.5 Measurement of variables

This study will utilize the CAR data collected from the youths and caretakers in 1993 and 1995. Data was collected using in-person interviews with youths at their homes. The first set of variables measuring delinquency and criminality, school performance, and alcohol and drug usage will be tested using questions that were obtained from the Baseline Questionnaire For Youth January 1993. All of these questions asked youths about events that took place some time during the past year, except for the alcohol and drug variable, which asked about the last 30 days. The first variable, delinquency and criminality will be tested using the four questions exhibited in Table 3.1. The answer options for each of these questions were yes (1) or no (2). The second variable, school performance, will be tested using three questions as shown Table 3.1. These were measured using a Likert-type scale never (1), 1 to 2 times (2), 3 to 5 times (3), 6 to 9 times (4) and 10 more times (5). The third variable, alcohol and drug usage, will be tested using eight questions exhibited in Table 3.1. These variables were also measured using the Likert-type scale described above.

Table 3.1 Research variable (Time 1)

Delinquency and Criminality
During the past year, have you ever...
1. Have you been stopped or picked up by the police for questioning about your activities?
2. Have you ever been arrested?
3. Have you been to court for something you were accused of doing?
4. Are you a member of a gang?
School Performance
This year, have you ever...
1. how many times have you been sent to the principal's office or to see the guidance counselor <u>this school year</u> because you were in trouble?

Table 3.1-continued

2. how many days of school did you skip during the past month, when you didn't have a reason like being sick or having to see a doctor?
3. During the past month, how many days did you go to school, but skip one or more classes?
Alcohol and Drug Usage
1. how often have you had alcohol during the last 30 days?
2. How many times the past two weeks. How many times have you had five or more drinks in a row? A "drink" is a glass of wine, a bottle of beer, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.
3. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you sniffed glue or breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any other gases or sprays in order to get high?
4. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used marijuana or hash?
5. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used psychedelics, like LSD (acid)?
6. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used crack cocaine?
7. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used cocaine in any other form?
8. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used heroin?

The second set of youth questions were taken from the Follow-Up Questionnaire For Youth January 1995. In addition to similar questions seen in the Baseline Youth Questionnaire January 1993, additional questions are added to measure delinquency and criminality, and school performance variables. It appears that the researchers added questions in the Follow-Up Questionnaire For Youth January 1995. Therefore, these questions are used since they include behaviors identified in prior research, as discussed in the review of literature section. The literature review identified numerous behaviors in youth with incarcerated parents such as anger and aggression, running away, and stealing.

All of these questions asked about events that took place some time in the past two years, except for the alcohol and drug variable, which again asked about the last 30 days. The first variable, delinquency and criminality are measured using the following nine questions exhibited in Table 3.2. School performance is measured using the

following five questions exhibited in Table 3.2. Finally, as shown in Table 3.2, alcohol and drug usage is measured using the following eight questions. The scale for each question is also listed in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Research variable (Time 2)

Delinquency and Criminality	
1. during the past two years have you been a member of a gang?	Yes or No
2. how many times in the last two years have you been arrested?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times;
3. how many times in the past two years have you been to court for something you were accused of doing?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times;
4. how many times in the past two years have you been in jail or juvenile detention?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times;
5. during the past year, was getting into trouble with the law a big problem for you, a little problem, not a problem for you?	Big 1; Little 2; Not 3;
6. how many times in the past two years have you run away from home for overnight or longer?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times; 11 or more times;
7. how many times have you taken something from a locker, house, or car worth under \$50?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times, 5 or more times
8. how many times have you taken something from a locker, house, or car worth over \$50?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times
9. how many times in the past two years have you attached someone with the idea of seriously hurting them, whether with a weapon or not?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times
School Performance	
1. how many days of school did you skip when you didn't have a reason like being sick or having to see a doctor? (past month)	Never 1; 1 to 2 days 2; 3 to 5 days 3; 6 to 9 days 4; 10 days or more 5;

Table 3.2-continued

2. how many days did you go to school, but skipped one or more classes? (past month)	Never 1; 1 to 2 days 2; 3 to 5 days 3; 6 to 9 days 4; 10 days or more 5;
3. how many times have you been sent to the principal's office or to see the guidance counselor because you were in trouble? (past year)	Never 1; 1 to 2 days 2; 3 to 5 days 3; 6 to 9 days 4; 10 days or more 5;
4. during the past year, was getting into trouble at school a big problem for you, a little problem, or not a problem for you?	Big 1; Little 2; Not 5;
5. how many times in the past two years have you gotten into a serious fight in school?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-4 times; 5 or more times;
Alcohol and Drug Usage	
1. how often have you had alcohol during the last 30 days?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
2. think back over the past two weeks. How many times have you had five or more drinks in a row? A "drink" is a glass of wine, a bottle of beer, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.	Never; 1 day; 2 days; 3-5 days; 6-9 days; 10 or more days;
3. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you sniffed glue or breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any other gasses or sprays in order to get high?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
4. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used marijuana or hash?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
5. during the last 30 days, how many times have you used psychedelics like LSD, mescaline, peyote, psiloybin, or PCP?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
6. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used crack cocaine?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
7. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used cocaine in any other form?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;
8. during the last 30 days, how many times, if any, have you used heroin?	Never; 1-2 times; 3-5 times; 6-9 times; 10-19 times; 20-39 times; 40 or more times;

The dependent variable, caretaker's criminality is measured by using questions found in the Baseline Questionnaire For Caregivers January 1993 and the Follow-Up

Questionnaire For Caregiver January 1995. The first set of questions asked about events that occurred in the last 12 months (Time 1), whereas, the second set of questions asked about events that occurred in the last two years (Time 2). These questions are exhibited in the Table 3.3. The scale for each question is also listed in the table.

Table 3.3 Caregiver’s criminality

Caregiver’s Criminality Time 1 (January 1993)	
1. were you on probation at any time during the past 12 months?	Yes 1; No 2
2. were you in jail at any time during the past 12 months?	Yes 1; No 2
Caregiver’s Criminality Time 2 (January 1995)	
1. during the past two years, have you been on probation?	Yes or No
2. during the past two years, have you been in jail?	Several times; once or twice; not at all;

3.6 Limitations

The data set employed in this study has three limitations. First, in using secondary analysis, I depended on questions specifically geared for assessing the Children at Risk Program. For this reason, although the Children at Risk Program’s data set has hundreds of questions, only a few questions fit the needs of this study. Secondly, the population of participants in the Children at Risk Program was from severely distressed neighborhoods marked by poverty and crime. Therefore, the results in this study may not be able to be generalized to other populations. Finally, the questions asked at different sites have caused the number of respondents to vary for each set of questions.

This study measures the effects of parental incarceration on youth’s delinquency and criminality, school performance, and substance abuse by comparing the mean scores of youth whose parents had been incarcerated and those whose parents had not been

incarcerated. In order to accomplish this, the current study utilizes secondary data obtained from the Children at Risk Program study. In the following chapter, the results of the analyses will be discussed in an effort to answer the six research questions previously introduced.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The results of the analyses of the data are presented in this chapter. It will begin with the demographics of the studied population, followed by the results of the cross-tabulation analyses.

4.1 Demographics

Eight hundred and seventy four youths participated in the Children at Risk program. At Time 1, the youth ages ranged from 10 to 14 years old, in which the majority were 13 (44.5%) or 12 (43.7%). Over half (57.7%) were comprised of African American youth, with the next largest group Hispanic (34%). These were followed respectively by whites (5.7%), and Asian (1.7%). Of the 874 youths in the sample, 51.1% were males, and 48.4% were females. The relationship of caregiver to youth revealed that mother's represent the majority of caregivers (79.9%), while fathers' (7.6%) and grandmothers' (6.4%) comprised the next largest type of caregiver. In examining parental presence in the homes, the majority (87.4%) of mothers were present compared to 31.2% of the fathers. Table 1 shows the demographic composition of the sample.

Table 4.1 Demographics

Youth Age At Intake		Number	Percent
	10	3	.3
	11	88	10.1
	12	382	43.7
	13	389	44.5

Table 4.1-continued

	14	12	1.4
Ethnicity	White	50	5.7
Ethnicity cont.	Asian	Number	Percent
	Hispanic	297	34
	African American	504	57.7
	Asian	15	1.7
	Misc. Other	3	.3
	Not Ascertained	5	.6
Gender	Male	423	48.4
	Female	450	51.5
Caregiver	Mother	698	79.9
	Father	66	7.6
	Grandmother	56	6.4
	Aunt	15	1.7
	Other	39	4.4
Mother Present			
	Yes	764	87.4
	No	110	12.6
Father Present			
	Yes	273	31.3
	No	601	68.8

Cross-tabulations were conducted to determine if differences exist between youths whose caregiver were on probation or went to jail during the last 12 months and those whose caregiver was not. Another set of cross-tabulation were conducted to determine if differences exist between youths whose caregivers were on probation or went to jail during the past two years and those whose caregiver was not. The case numbers used in the study differ from those in the demographics section. See Appendix B for explanation. This study utilizes cross-tabulation, as they are an excellent way of

displaying the joint distribution of one or more variables. Further tests for significance were not utilized in this study because many cells lacked 5 or more cases. Findings of this study are presented in the following sections.

4.2 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers probation during the past 12 months

Cross-tabulations were used to determine if differences exist between youths whose caregiver had been on probation and jail during the last 12 months. The results of cross-tabulation that were used to determine if differences exist in delinquency and criminality of youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 12 months and those whose caregiver had not been on probation during the last 12 months are shown in Table 4.2 to 4.4. In the following paragraph, youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 12 months will be referred to as group 1 and youths whose caregiver had not been on probation in the last 12 months will be referred to as group 2. Table 4.2 shows that 5.4% of youths in group 2 reported being a member of a gang compared to no youths in group 1. The next question asked had the youth been stopped or picked up by the police. Results show that the majority of youths had not been stopped or picked up by the police. However, of the youths that answered yes to this question, almost 15% percent of both groups of youths reported being stopped or picked up by the police. The third question asked had the youths been arrested, and again, the majority of youth answered no. A larger percentage (17.4%) of youths in group 2 answered yes, compared to 15.4% of youths in group 1. Finally, when asked if they had been to court during the past year, the majority of youths reported that they had not been. Results show that of the youths who had been to court, 15.4% of youths in group 1 had been to court compared to only 5.8% of youths in group 2.

Table 4.2 Youth delinquency/criminality 1

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF GANGS:NO	14	35		49
YES	14	37		51
	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%
BEEN STOPPED, PICKED UP BY POLICE:YES	4	11	0	15
	15.4%	15.9%	.0%	15.6%
BEEN STOPPED, PICKED UP BY POLICE:NO	22	58	1	81
	84.6%	84.1%	100%	84.4%
TOTAL	26	69	1	96
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BEEN ARRESTED:YES	4	12	0	16
	15.4%	17.4%	.0%	16.7%
BEEN ARRESTED:NO	22	57	1	80
	84.6%	82.6%	100.0%	83.3%
TOTAL	26	69	1	96
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
BEEN TO COURT:YES	4	4	0	8
	15.4%	5.8%	.0%	8.3%
BEEN TO COURT: NO	22	65	1	88
	84.6%	94.2%	100.0%	91.7%
TOTAL	26	69	1	96
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4.3 Youth school performance and caregiver probation status during the past 12 months

Cross-tabulations were used to measure if differences exist between the school performance of youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 12 months (group 1) and those whose caretaker had not been on probation during the last 12 months (group 2). The majority of youths reported that they had never been sent to the principal or guidance counselor's office for misbehavior. Seventy-six percent of the youths in group 1 reported going to the principal or guidance counselor's office 1 or 2 times, compared to 61.7% of youths in group 2. The second question asked youths about the number of days they had skipped school during the past month. As illustrated in Table 4.3, the majority of youths had never skipped class. Equal percentages (19%) of both youth's groups reported skipping classes at least once.

Table 4.3 Youth school performance 1

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PROBATION DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS			
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
SENT TO PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR OFFICE:NEVER	6 24.0%	26 38.2%	1 100.0%	33 35.1%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR OFFICE:1 OR 2 MORE TIMES	19 76%	42 61.7%	0 .0%	61 64.9%
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
TOTAL	25 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	94 100.0%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:NEVER	21 80.8%	55 80.9%	1 100.0%	77 81.1%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:1 OR 2 TIMES	1 3.8%	4 5.9%	0 .0%	5 5.3%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:3 OR MORE TIMES	4 15.3%	9 13.2%	0 .0%	13 13.7%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

4.4 Youth alcohol/drug usage and caregiver probation during the past 12 months

Cross-tabulation was used again to determine if differences exist in the alcohol and drug usage of youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 12 months (group 1), and youths whose caregiver had not been on probation during the past 12 months (group 2). As shown in Table 4.4, for each of the eight alcohol and drug questions, the majority of youths answered no or never. When asked if they had used alcohol during the past 30 days, 57.7% of youth in group 1, and 20.3% of youths in group 2 reported alcohol usage. Question two asked youths how many days they consumed five or more drinks during the last 30 days. About 15% of the youth in group 1 reported doing so, compared to only 8.6% of youths in group 2. When asked if during the last 30 days the youth had sniffed glue or breathed the contents of aerosol spray cans or inhaled any other gases or sprays to get high, 5.7% of the youths in group 2 answered yes compared to none of the youths in group 1. Question four asked youths if they used marijuana or hash during the past 30 days. As illustrated in Table 4.4, 7.6% of youths in

group 1 reported using this substance, compared to 2.9% of youths in group 2. The last four questions asked the youths how many times they had used psychedelics, crack cocaine, cocaine in any other form and heroin during the last 30 days. Results show that all youths in the sample answered never to these questions.

Table 4.4 Alcohol and drug usage 1

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PROBATION DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS			
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	TOTAL
EVER HAD ALCOHOL:YES	15 57.7%	14 20.3%	1 100.0%	30 31.3%
EVER HAD ALCOHOL:NO	11 42.3%	55 79.7%	0 .0%	66 68.8%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS:NEVER	22 84.6%	63 91.3%	1 100.0%	86 89.6%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS:1 OR MORE DAYS	4 15.4%	6 8.6%	0 .0%	10 10.4%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES SNIFFED GLUE:NEVER	26 100.0%	65 94.2%	1 100.0%	92 95.8%
HOW MANY TIMES SNIFFED GLUE:1 OR MORE DAYS	0 .0%	4 5.7%	0 .0%	4 4.1%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED MARIJUANA OR HASH:NEVER	24 92.3%	67 97.1%	1 100.0%	92 95.8%
HOW MANY TIMES USED MARIJUANA OR HASH:1 OR MORE DAYS	2 7.6%	2 2.9%	0 .0%	4 4.1%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED PSYCHEDELICS:NEVER	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED CRACK COCAINE:NEVER	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED CRACK COCAINE IN OTHER FORM:NEVER	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	68 100.0%	1 100.0%	95 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED HEROIN:NEVER	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%
TOTAL	26 100.0%	69 100.0%	1 100.0%	96 100.0%

4.5 Youths delinquency/criminality and caregiver jail status during the past 12 months

Tables 4.5-4.7 illustrate the results of cross-tabulation of the same questions regarding delinquent behavior with the independent variable being caregiver’s jail status during the past 12 months. In the following paragraph, group 1 refers to youths whose caregiver had been in jail during the past 12 months, and group 2 refers to youths whose caregiver had not been in jail during the past 12 months. As shown in Table 4.5, most youths answered that they had not been involved in activities associated with delinquency and criminality. For question one, the only youths who admitted to gang involvement, were youths in group 2 (5%). Youth were then asked if they been stopped or picked up by the police. Both groups, responded almost equally to being stopped or picked up by the police (20% and 21.1% respectively). When the youths were asked if they had been arrested, 12% of youth in group 1 reported yes compared to 15.3% of youths in group 2. Finally, youth were asked had they been to court in the past 12 months. Again both groups reported almost equally that they had been to court (12%).

Table 4.5 Delinquency/criminality 2

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER JAIL DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
ARE YOU A MEMBER OF GANGS:YES	0 .0%	4 5.0%	4 4.5%
ARE YOU A MEMBER OF GANGS:NO	9 100.0%	76 95.0%	85 95.5%
TOTAL	9 100.0%	80 100.0%	89 100.0%
BEEN STOPPED, PICKED UP BY POLICE:YES	5 20.0%	26 21.1%	31 20.9%
BEEN STOPPED, PICKED UP BY POLICE:NO	20 80.0%	97 78.9%	117 79.1%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	123 100.0%	148 100.0%
BEEN ARRESTED:YES	3 12.0%	19 15.3%	22 14.8%
BEEN ARRESTED:NO	22 88.0%	105 84.7%	127 85.2%

Table 4.5-continued

TOTAL	25 100.0%	124 100.0%	149 100.0%
BEEN TO COURT: YES	3 12.0%	15 12.1%	18 12.1%
BEEN TO COURT: NO	22 88.0%	109 87.9%	131 87.9%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	124 100.0%	149 100.0%

4.6 Youths school performance and caregiver jail status during the past 12 months

Table 4.6 illustrates the results of cross-tabulations that were used to determine if differences exist between the school performance of youth whose caregiver had been in jail during the past 12 months (group 1) and those whose caregiver had not been in jail during the past 12 months (group 2). Question one ask youths how many times this year had they been sent to the principal’s or guidance counselor’s office because they had gotten into trouble. As shown in Table 4.6, 24% of youths in group 1 answered never, and 76% answered 1 or 2 times, compared to almost 35% of the youths in group 2 who answered never and 65.3% who answered 1 or 2 times. The second question asked youths how many times during the past month had they gone to school, but skipped one or more classes. Results reveal that the vast majority of youths had not engaged in this act. However, 24% in group 1, and 16.1% in group 2 answered 1 or 2 times.

Table 4.6 School performance 2

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER JAIL DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
SENT TO PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR OFFICE: NEVER	6 24.0%	43 34.7%	49 32.9%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL/COUNSELOR OFFICE: 1 OR MORE TIMES	19 76%	81 65.3%	100 67.1%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	124 100.0%	149 100.0%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES: NEVER	19 76.0%	104 83.9%	123 82.6%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES: 1 OR MORE TIMES	6 24.0%	20 16.1%	26 17.4%

Table 4.6-continued

TOTAL	25 100.0%	124 100.0%	149 100.0%
-------	--------------	---------------	---------------

4.7 Youths drug/alcohol usage and caregivers jail status during the past 12 months

Table 4.7 shows the results of cross-tabulations that were used to determine if differences exist in alcohol and drug use of youths whose caregiver had been in jail during the past 12 months (group 1) and those whose caregiver had not been in jail during the past 12 months (group 2). The first question asks youths had they had consumed alcohol during the last 30 days. As shown in Table 4.7, 40.0% of youths in group 1 used alcohol compared to 35.2% of youth in group 2. Results from the next three questions about alcohol and drug usage reveal that the vast majority of youths had never engaged consuming 5 or more drinks, sniffed glue or used marijuana. Twelve percent of each group of youths reported having 5 or more drinks during the last 30 days. Almost 6% of the youths in group 2 reported sniffing glue, or breathing the contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaling other gasses or sprays to get high, whereas, none of the youths in group 1 reported such usage. As shown in Table 4.7, youths in group 1 (8.3%) were almost twice as likely to smoke marijuana than youths in group 2 (4.8%). The last three questions asked youth how many times had they used crack cocaine, cocaine in any other form, or heroin in the last 30 days. For these three questions all youths responded that they had not used these drugs.

Table 4.7 Alcohol and drug usage 2

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER JAIL DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
EVER HAD ALCOHOL:YES	10 40.0%	44 35.2%	54 36.0%
EVER HAD ALCOHOL:NO	15 60.0%	81 64.8%	96 64.0%

Table 4.7-continued

TOTAL	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS:NEVER	22 88.0%	110 88.0%	132 88.0%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS:1 OR MORE DAYS	3 12.0%	15 12.0%	18 12.0%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES SNIFFED GLUE:NEVER	24 100.0%	118 94.4%	142 95.3%
HOW MANY TIMES SNIFFED GLUE:1 OR MORE DAYS	0 .0%	7 5.6%	7 4.8%
TOTAL	24 100.0%	125 100.0%	149 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED MARIJUANA OR	22 YES	119 NO	141 TOTAL
HASH:NEVER	91.7%	95.2%	94.6%
HOW MANY TIMES USED MARIJUANA OR HASH:1 OR MORE DAYS	2 8.3%	6 4.8%	8 5.4%
TOTAL	24 100.0%	125 100.0%	149 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED PSYCHEDELICS:NEVER	25 100.0%	123 99.2%	148 99.3%
HOW MANY TIMES USED PSYCHEDELICS:1-2 TIMES	0 .0%	1 .8%	1 .7%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	124 100.0%	149 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED CRACK COCAINE:NEVER	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED CRACK COCAINE IN OTHER FORM:NEVER	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES USED HEROIN:NEVER	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%
TOTAL	25 100.0%	125 100.0%	150 100.0%

4.8 Youth delinquency/criminality and caregivers past two years on probation

Cross-tabulation was used to determine if differences exist between youth whose caregiver had been on probation during the past two years and those whose caregiver was not. Tables 4.8-4.10 show these results. In the following paragraph, group 1 will refer to youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past 2 years, and group 2 will refer to youths whose caregiver had not been on probation during the past two years. In

order to measure the fourth research question about delinquency and criminality, youth were asked nine questions. Results reveal that for all nine questions, the majority of youth had not engaged in these acts. Comparing youths who reported being a member of a gang during the past two years, 15.8% of those youths in group 1, compared to 8.9% of youths in group 2. Question two asked youths had they been arrested in the last two years. Twenty-eight percent of youths in group 1 had been arrested, compared to 22.8% of youths in group 2. Similar results are also seen in question three that ask youths how many times in the past two years had they been to court for something they were accused of doing. Thirty-three percent of youths in group 1 reported going, while only 18.5% in group 2 did so. Question four asks youths had they been in jail or juvenile detention in the past two years. About 22.2% of youths in group 1 compared to 18.7% of youth in group 2 reported being in jail during the past two years. Question five asks youths if getting into the trouble with the law was a big, little, or not a problem. Five percent of youths in group 1 reported it as a big problem compared to 6% of youths in group 2. When asked about running away from home one or more times, 26.4% of the youths in group 1 reported doing so, compared to 14.2% of youths in group 2. Question seven and eight asks the youths about stealing. Youths from each group reported almost equally (15.4% and 13.4%) taking something under \$50, 1 or more times. The same is true when reporting something over \$50, 1 or more times (7.7% and 8.1%). Finally, Table 4.8 displays the results of the number of times in the past two years that youth have attacked someone with the idea of hurting them, whether with a weapon or not one or more times. Of the youths in group 1, 26.3% answered in the affirmative, compared to 10.3% of youth in group 2.

Table 4.8 Delinquency and criminology 3

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST 2 YEARS ON PROBATION		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
MEMBER OF A GANG DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS:YES	3 15.8%	56 8.9%	59 9.1%
MEMBER OF A GANG DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS:NO	16 84.2%	575 91.1%	591 90.9%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	631 100.0%	650 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN ARRESTED:NEVER	13 72.2%	483 77.3%	496 77.1%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN ARRESTED:1 OR MORE TIMES	5 27.8%	142 22.8%	147 22.8%
TOTAL	18 100.0%	625 100.0%	643 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN TO COURT:NEVER	12 66.7%	513 81.6%	525 81.1%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN TO COURT: 1 OR MORE TIMES	6 33.4%	116 18.5%	122 18.8%
TOTAL	18 100.0%	629 100.0%	647 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN IN JAIL OR JUVENILE DETENTION:NEVER	14 77.8%	510 81.3%	524 81.2%
HOW MANY TIMES IN PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN IN JAIL OR JUVENILE DETENTION:1 OR MORE TIMES	4 22.2%	117 18.7%	121 18.8%
TOTAL	18 100.0%	627 100.0%	645 100.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW A BIG PROBLEM FOR YOU?	1 5.3%	38 6.0%	39 6.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW A LITTLE PROBLEM FOR YOU?	6 31.6%	49 7.8%	55 8.5%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW NOT A PROBLEM FOR YOU?	12 63.2%	544 86.2%	556 85.5%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	631 100.0%	650 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU RUN AWAY FROM HOME FOR OVERNIGHT OR LONGER:NEVER	14 73.7%	541 85.9%	55 85.5%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU RUN AWAY FROM HOME FOR OVERNIGHT OR LONGER:1 OR MORES TIMES	5 26.4%	89 14.2%	94 14.5%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	630 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH UNDER \$50?:NEVER	11 84.6%	399 86.6%	410 86.5%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH UNDER \$50?:1 OR MORE TIMES	2 15.4%	62 13.5%	64 13.5%
TOTAL	13 100.0%	461 100.0%	474 100.0%

Table 4.8-continued

HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH OVER \$50:NEVER	12 92.3%	423 92.0%	435 92.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH OVER \$50:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 7.7%	37 8.1%	38 8%
TOTAL	13 100.0%	460 100.0%	473 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU ATTACHED SOMEONE WITH THE IDEA OF SERIOUSLY HURTING THEM, WHETHER WITH A WEAPON OR NOT?:NEVER	14 73.7%	566 89.7%	580 89.2%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU ATTACHED SOMEONE WITH THE IDEA OF SERIOUSLY HURTING THEM, WHETHER WITH A WEAPON OR NOT?:1 OR MORE TIMES	5 26.3%	65 10.3%	70 10.7%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	631 100.0%	650 100.0%

4.9 Youth school performance and caregiver probation status for the past two years

Cross-tabulations were used to determine if differences exist in school performance between youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past two years (group 1) and those whose caregiver had not been on probation during the past two years (group 2). Table 4.9 shows the results of the five questions on school performance. When youths were asked how many times they had skipped school or class, the majority of youths reported never engaging in this behavior. However, 28.5% of youths in group 1 reported such behavior, compared to 32.3% of youths in group 2. Furthermore, 50.0% of youths in group 1 reported skipping 1 or more days of class, compared to 27.1% of youths in group 2. Interestingly, 100% of youths in group 1 reported being sent to the principal or guidance counselor office for misbehavior. Whereas, only 63% of the youths from the other group reported this action. Question four asks youths if during the past year, was getting into trouble at school a big, little or not a problem. Although almost equal percent of each group reported that getting into trouble was a big problem for them

(10.5% and 10.8%), over half (52.6%) of the youths in group 1 reported that getting into trouble was a little problem. This can be compared to the 31.4% of the other group who reported the same answer. Finally, Table 4.9 shows that 63.1% of youths in group 1 reported getting into a serious fight at school, compared to only 40.4% of the other group.

Table 4.9 School performance 3

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST TWO YEARS ON PROBATION		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
DAYS SKIPPED SCHOOL IN PAST MONTH:NEVER	10 71.4%	417 67.7%	427 67.8%
DAYS SKIPPED SCHOOL IN PAST MONTH:1 OR MORE DAYS	4 28.5%	199 32.3%	203 32.2%
TOTAL	14 100.0%	14 100.0%	14 100.0%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:NEVER	7 50.0%	449 72.9%	456 72.4%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:1 OR MORE TIMES	7 YES	167 NO	174 TOTAL
TOTAL	50.0%	27.1%	27.6%
TOTAL	14 100.0%	616 100.0%	630 100.0%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL OR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN PAST YEAR:NEVER	0 .0%	228 37%	228 36.2%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL OR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN PAST YEAR:1 OR MORE TIMES	14 100.0%	388 63%	402 63.8
TOTAL	14 100.0%	616 100.0%	630 100.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE A BIG PROBLEM FOR YOU?	2 10.5%	68 10.8%	70 10.8%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE A LITTLE PROBLEM FOR YOU?	10 52.6%	198 31.4%	208 32.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE NOT A PROBLEM FOR YOU?	7 36.8%	364 57.8%	371 57.2%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	630 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR HAVE YOU GOTTEN INTO A SERIOUS FIGHT AT SCHOOL:NEVER	7 36.8%	377 59.7%	384 59.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR HAVE YOU GOTTEN INTO A SERIOUS FIGHT AT SCHOOL:1 OR MORE TIMES	12 63.1%	255 40.4%	267 41%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	632 100.0%	651 100.0%

4.10 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregiver probation status during the past 2 years

Cross-tabulations were used to determine if differences exist between the alcohol and drug usage of youths whose caretaker had been on probation during the past two

years (group 1), and those whose caregiver had not been on probation during the past two years (group 2). Table 4.10 shows that the majority of youths reported never having alcohol during the last 30 days. Of the youths who had consumed alcohol, almost an equal percentage of each group reported using 1 or more times (26.4% and 22.6% respectively). Twenty-one percent of youth in group 1 reported having five or more drinks in a row over the past two weeks, compared to 12.5% of youths in group 2. The next two questions asks the youths if had they had sniffed glue or breathed contents of aerosol spray cans, or inhaled any other gases to get high, and had they used marijuana or hash in the last 30 days. Almost 16% of youths in group 1 and 7% of youths in group 2 reported the former and 26% of youths in group 1 and 18% of youths in group 2 reported using the latter. Question five asked youths how many times had they used psychedelics in the last 30 days. Five percent of youths in group 1 compared to 1% of youths in group 2 reported using psychedelics. Finally, as illustrated in Table 4.10, all youths responded that they had never used heroin during the last 30 days.

Table 4.10 Alcohol and drug usage 3

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST 2 YEARS ON PROBATION		
	YES	NO	TOTAL
HAD ALCOHOL DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	14 73.7%	489 77.4%	503 77.3%
HAD ALCOHOL DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	5 26.4%	143 22.6%	148 22.8%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	632 100.0%	651 100.0%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS (OVER PAST TWO WEEKS):NEVER	15 78.9%	553 87.5%	568 87.3%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS (OVER PAST TWO WEEKS):1 OR MORE TIMES	4 21.1%	79 12.5%	83 12.7%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	632 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS HAVE YOU SNIFFED GLUE OR BREATHED AEROSOL SPRAY CANS, OR INHALED ANY OTHER GASES OR SPRAYS IN ORDER TO GET HIGH?:YES	3 15.8%	42 6.7%	45 6.9%

Table 4.10-continued

HOW MANY TIMES DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS HAVE YOU SNIFFED GLUE OR BREATHED AEROSOL SPRAY CANS, OR INHALED ANY OTHER GASES OR SPRAYS IN ORDER TO GET HIGH?:NO	16 84.2%	588 93.3%	604 93.1%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	630 100.0%	668 100.0%
HAVE YOU USED MARIJUANA OR HASH IN THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	14 73.7%	520 82.3%	534 82.0%
HAVE YOU USED MARIJUANA OR HASH IN THE LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	5 26.3%	112 17.7%	117 18.0%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	632 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED PSYCHEDELICS IN LAST 30 DAYS:NEVER	18 94.7%	623 98.9%	641 98.8%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED PSYCHEDELICS IN LAST 30 DAYS:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 5.3%	7 1.1%	8 1.3%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	630 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED CRACK COCAINE DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:NEVER	18 94.7%	629 99.8%	647 99.7%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED CRACK COCAINE DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 5.3%	1 .2%	2 .4%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	630 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED COCAINE IN ANY OTHER FORM DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:NEVER	18 94.7%	630 99.7%	648 99.5%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED COCAINE IN ANY OTHER FORM DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 5.3%	2 .3%	3 .5%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	632 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED HEROIN DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:NEVER	19 100.0%	631 100.0%	650 100.0%
TOTAL	19 100.0%	631 100.0%	650 100.0%

4.11 Youth delinquency and criminality and caregiver jail status during the past 2 years

The final variable studied related to caregivers who had been in jail during the past two years. Again, cross-tabulations were used to determine if differences existed between youths whose caregiver had been in jail during the past two years, and those whose caregiver had not been to jail during the past two years. In the following paragraph, group 1 refers to youths whose caregiver had been in jail several times in the

past two years, group 2 refers to youth whose caregiver had been in jail once or twice in the past two years, and group 3 refers to youth whose caregiver had not been in jail in the past two years. For each of the questions, the majority of youths answered that they had never engaged in the following behaviors. When youths were asked if they had been a member of a gang, youths in group 2 were almost twice as likely (16.7%) to report that they had than youths in group 3 (8.8%). The next three questions asked youths had they been arrested, been to court, or been to jail in past two years. Thirty-three percent of youths in group 1 had been arrested, had been to court, and had been to jail or detention. Whereas, youths in group 2 reported 41.6%, 29.2%, and 37.5% respectively. Almost an equal number of youths in group 3 reported being arrested (20.6%), going to court (18.2%) and jail or detention (17.8%). Question five asks youths if during the past year was getting into trouble with the law a big problem, a little problem, or not a problem. As shown on Table 4.11, an equal percentage of youths in group 1 reported trouble with the law as a little problem (50%) and not a problem (50%). Eight percent of youths in group 2 reported getting into trouble a big problem, 54.2% a little problem, and 37.5% of youth not a problem. Whereas, youths in group 3 reported 11% getting into trouble as being a big problem, 31% a little problem, and 57.8% not a problem. Youths were asked how many times in the past two years had they run away from home. About 33% of youths in group 2 reported running away compared to 14% of youths in group 3. Youth were then asked about their stealing habits. As illustrated in Table 4.11, youths in group 2 reported stealing twice as many times (26%) as youth (13%) in group 3. Furthermore, almost three times as many youths (21%) in group 2 reported stealing something worth \$50 or more compared to 7.5% of youths in group 3. Finally, youths were asked how

many times in the past two years had they attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them. A large amount of youths (66.7%) in group 1 reported that they had, compared to 16.6% of those in group 2, and 15.8% of youths in group 3.

Table 4.11 Delinquency/criminology 4

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST 2 YEARS IN JAIL			
	Several times	Once or twice	Not at all	TOTAL
MEMBER OF A GANG DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS:YES	0 .0%	4 16.7%	55 8.8%	59 9.1%
MEMBER OF A GANG DURING THE PAST TWO YEARS:NO	3 100.0%	20 83.3%	568 91.2%	591 90.0%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	623 100.0%	650 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN ARRESTED:NEVER	2 66.7%	14 58.3%	481 78.1%	497 77.3%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN ARRESTED:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	10 41.6%	135 20.6%	146 22.7%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	616 100.0%	643 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN TO COURT:NEVER	2 66.7%	17 70.8%	507 81.8%	526 81.3%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN TO COURT:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	7 29.2%	113 18.2%	121 18.7%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	620 100.0%	647 100.0%
	Several times	Once or twice	Not at all	TOTAL
HOW MANY TIMES IN PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN IN JAIL OR JUVENILE DETENTION:NEVER	2 66.7%	15 62.5%	508 82.2%	525 81.4%
HOW MANY TIMES IN PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN IN JAIL OR JUVENILE DETENTION:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	9 37.5%	110 17.8%	120 18.6%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	618 100.0%	645 100.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW A BIG PROBLEM FOR YOU?	0 .0%	2 8.3%	69 11.1%	71 10.9%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW A LITTLE PROBLEM FOR YOU?	1 50.0%	13 54.2%	194 31.1%	208 32.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE WITH THE LAW NOT A PROBLEM FOR YOU?	1 50.0%	9 37.5%	360 57.8%	370 57.0%
TOTAL	2 100.0%	24 100.0%	623 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU RUN AWAY FROM HOME FOR OVERNIGHT OR LONGER:NEVER	3 100.0%	16 66.7%	536 86.2%	555 85.5%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU RUN AWAY FROM HOME FOR OVERNIGHT OR LONGER:1 OR MORES TIMES	0 .0%	8 33.4%	86 13.9%	94 14.5%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	622 100.0%	649 100.0%

Table 4.11-continued

HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH UNDER \$50?:NEVER	2 100.0%	14 73.7%	394 87%	410 86.5%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH UNDER \$50?:1 OR MORE TIMES	0 .0%	5 26.3%	59 13%	64 13.5%
TOTAL	2 100.0%	19 100.0%	453 100.0%	474 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH OVER \$50:NEVER	2 100.0%	15 78.9%	418 92.5%	435 92.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU TAKEN SOMETHING FROM A LOCKER, HOUSE, OR CAR WORTH OVER \$50:1 OR MORE TIMES	0 .0%	4 21.1%	34 7.5%	38 8%
TOTAL	2 100.0%	19 100.0%	452 100.0%	473 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU ATTACHED SOMEONE WITH THE IDEA OF SERIOUSLY HURTING THEM, WHETHER WITH A WEAPON OR NOT?:NEVER	1 33.3%	20 83.3%	558 89.6%	579 89.1%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST TWO YEARS HAVE YOU ATTACHED SOMEONE WITH THE IDEA OF SERIOUSLY HURTING THEM, WHETHER WITH A WEAPON OR NOT?:1 OR MORE TIMES	2 66.7%	4 16.6%	65 15.8%	71 10.9%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0	623 100.0%	650 100.0%

4.12 Youth school performance and caregiver jail status during the past 2 years

Differences between the school performance of youths whose caregiver had been in jail in the past two years and youths whose caregiver had not been in jail in the past two years were determined by using cross-tabulation. In the following paragraph, group 1 refers to youths whose caregiver had been in jail several times in the past two years, group 2 refers to youths whose caregiver had been in jail once or twice in the past two years, and group 3 will refer to youths whose caregiver had not been in jail in the past two years. Results reveal that almost an equal amount of youths in group 2 (36%) and youths in group 3 (32%) reported skipping school. Likewise, 33.3% of youths in group 1, 40.8% of youths in group 2, and 27.1% in group 3 reporting skipping classes in the last month. Youths were then asked how many times had they been sent to the principal or

guidance counselor’s office for misbehavior. All youths in group 1 reported that they had, compared to 81.8% of youths in group 2, and 63% of youths in group 3. As illustrated in Table 4.12, over half of respondents did not have a problem getting into trouble at school during the past year. However, almost 9% of youths in group 2 reported getting into trouble as being a big problem, compared to 11% of youth in group 3. Furthermore, youths who reported getting into trouble as a little problem include 50% of youths in group 1, 54.2% of group 2, and 31% of group 3. Finally, youths were asked had they gotten into a serious fight at school. All of the youths in group 1 reported that they had, compared to 58.3% of youths in group 2, and 40% of youths in group 3.

Table 4.12 School performance 4

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST TWO YEARS IN JAIL			
	Several times	Once or twice	Not at all	TOTAL
DAYS SKIPPED SCHOOL IN PAST MONTH:NEVER	3 100.0%	14 63.6%	409 67.6%	426 67.6%
DAYS SKIPPED SCHOOL IN PAST MONTH:1 OR MORE DAYS	0 .0%	8 36.4%	196 32.4%	204 32.4%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	22 100.0%	605 100.0%	630 100.0%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:NEVER	2 66.7%	13 59.1%	441 72.9%	456 72.4%
DAYS SKIPPED CLASSES:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	9 40.8%	164 27.1%	174 27.6%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	22 100.0%	605 100.0%	630 100.0%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL OR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN PAST YEAR:NEVER	0 .0%	4 18.2%	224 37.0%	228 36.2%
SENT TO PRINCIPAL OR GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN PAST YEAR:1 OR MORE TIMES	3 100.0%	18 81.8%	381 63%	402 63.8%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	22 100.0%	605 100.0%	630 100.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE A BIG PROBLEM FOR YOU?	0 .0%	2 8.3%	69 11.1%	71 10.9%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE A LITTLE PROBLEM FOR YOU?	1 50.0%	13 54.2%	194 31.1%	208 32.0%
DURING THE PAST YEAR, WAS GETTING INTO TROUBLE NOT A PROBLEM FOR YOU?	1 50.0%	9 37.5%	360 57.8%	370 57.0%
TOTAL	2 100.0%	24 100.0%	623 100.0%	649 100.0%

Table 4.12-continued

HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR HAVE YOU GOTTEN INTO A SERIOUS FIGHT AT SCHOOL:NEVER	0 .0%	10 41.7%	373 59.8%	383 58.8%
HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR HAVE YOU GOTTEN INTO A SERIOUS FIGHT AT SCHOOL:1 OR MORE TIMES	3 100.0%	14 58.3%	251 40.2%	268 41.2%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	624 100.0%	651 100.0%

4.13 Youth alcohol and drug usage and caregiver jail status during the past 2 years

In order to determine the differences in alcohol and drug usage between youths whose caretaker had been in jail in the past two years and those whose caregiver had not been in jail in the past two years cross-tabulations were used. In the following paragraph, group 1 refers to youths whose caregiver had been to jail several times in the past two years, group 2 refers to youths whose caregiver had been to jail once or twice in the past two years, and group 3 refers to youths whose caregiver had not been to jail in the past two years. Youths were asked had they used alcohol in the last 30 days. Thirty-three percent of youths in group 1 reported using alcohol, compared to 38% of youths in group 2, and 22% of youths in group 3. Also, youths were asked if they had five or more drinks in a row over the past 30 days. Youths in group 1 (33%) and in group 2 (25%) reported using this substance at a greater rate than youths in group 3 (12%). As illustrated in Table 4.13, a small percentage of youths reported sniffing glue, breathing aerosol sprays cans or inhaling other gases to get high. Only 8.3% of youths in group 2 and 7.1% of youths in group 3 reported doing so. Youths were also asked had they used marijuana or hash during the last 30 days. Results show that an equal amount of youths (33.3%) in group 1 and group 2 reported using these substances, compared to 17.5% in group 3. The vast majority of youths reported never using psychedelics, cocaine and cocaine in any

other form. However, the 4% of youths in group 2 reported consistently using these substances. Finally, all youths reported never using heroin in the last 30 days.

Table 4.13 Alcohol and drug usage 4

VARIABLE	CAREGIVER PAST 2 YEARS IN JAIL			
	Several times	Once or twice	Not at all	TOTAL
HAD ALCOHOL DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	2 66.7%	15 62.5%	485 77.7%	502 77.1%
HAD ALCOHOL DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	9 37.5%	139 22.3%	149 22.9%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	624 100.0%	651 100.0%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS (OVER LAST 30 DAYS):NEVER	2 66%	18 75.0%	547 87.7%	567 87.1%
DAYS OF FIVE OR MORE DRINKS (OVER LAST 30 DAYS):1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	6 25.0%	77 12.3%	84 12.9%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	624 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS HAVE YOU SNIFFED GLUE OR BREATHED AEROSOL SPRAY CANS, OR INHALED ANY OTHER GASES OR SPRAYS IN ORDER TO GET HIGH?:NO	3 100.0%	22 91.7%	578 92.9%	603 92.9%
HOW MANY TIMES DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS HAVE YOU SNIFFED GLUE OR BREATHED AEROSOL SPRAY CANS, OR INHALED ANY OTHER GASES OR SPRAYS IN ORDER TO GET HIGH?:YES	0 .0%	2 8.3%	44 7.1%	46 7.1%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	622 100.0%	649 100.0%
HAVE YOU USED MARIJUANA OR HASH IN THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	2 66.7%	16 66.7%	515 82.5%	533 81.9%
HAVE YOU USED MARIJUANA OR HASH IN THE LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	1 33.3%	8 33.3%	109 17.5%	118 18.1%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	624 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED PSYCHEDELICS IN LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	3 100.0%	23 95.8%	615 98.9%	641 98.8%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED PSYCHEDELICS IN LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	0 100.0%	1 4.2%	7 1.1%	8 1.2%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	622 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED CRACK COCAINE DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	3 100.0%	23 95.8%	621 99.8%	647 99.7%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED CRACK COCAINE DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:1 OR MORE TIMES	0 .0%	1 4.2%	1 .2%	2 .3%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	622 100.0%	649 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED COCAINE IN ANY OTHER FORM DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS?:NEVER	3 100.0%	23 95.8%	622 99.7%	648 99.5%

Table 4.13-continued

HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED COCAINE IN ANY OTHER FORM DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:1 OR MORE TIMES	0 .0%	1 4.2%	2 .3%	3 .5%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	624 100.0%	651 100.0%
HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU USED HEROIN DURING THE LAST 30 DAYS:NEVER	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	623 100.0%	650 100.0%
TOTAL	3 100.0%	24 100.0%	623 100.0%	650 100.0%

In the following chapter, results of these finding are discussed and six research questions for this study are answered. In addition, recommendations and implications are discussed.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the results of the study, and also answers the six research questions. In addition, the current study's implications and recommendations are presented.

Research question one asks do children whose parents were under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months exhibit more delinquency and criminality than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision. The findings indicate that youths whose caregivers had been on probation during the past 12 months were more likely to have been to court (15%, 9%). Results show that youths whose caregiver had been to jail in the past 12 months were almost as likely as their peers whose caregiver had not been to jail to be picked up by the police (20%, 21%) and been to court (12.0%, 12.1%). Therefore, of the eight variables that were used to answer research question one, only one variable showed some difference albeit slightly.

Research question two asks do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional supervision. The findings indicate that youths whose caregivers had been on probation during the past 12 months were more likely to have been sent to the principal's or

counselor's office than their peers (76%, 62%). Also, youths whose caregiver had been to jail during the past 12 months shows that youths were more likely to have been sent to the principal or counselor's office (76%, 65.3%). Therefore, for research question two, of the five variables that were used to measure school performance, only two variables showed some difference. These results are consistent with the findings from a study by Trice (1997), which found that children whose mothers were incarcerated were more likely than their peers to experience suspension, and extensive school absences (as cited in Myers, et al., 1999).

Research question three asks are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past 12 months were more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision. The findings indicate that youths whose caregivers had been on probation consumed alcohol (58%, 20%), had five or more drinks of alcohol (15%, 9%), and used marijuana or hash (8%, 3%) at a higher rate than those youths whose caregiver were not under correctional supervision. Youths whose caregivers had been to jail in the past 12 months were more likely to have used alcohol (40%, 35%) and marijuana or hash (8%, 5%) during the past 30 days than their peers whose caregivers had not been to jail. Therefore, in answering question three, of the sixteen variables that were used to measure alcohol and drug usage, only four variables showed some difference between groups.

Research question four asks do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years exhibit more delinquent and criminal behaviors than those whose parents were not under correctional supervision. Findings indicate that youths whose caregiver had been on probation during

the past two years were more likely to be a member of a gang (16%, 9%), been arrested (28%,23%), been to court (33%,19%), and been in jail or juvenile detention (22%, 19%). They also reported running away from home (26%, 14%), stealing (15%, 14%), and attacking someone with the intention of hurting them more frequently than their counterparts (26%, 10%).

Further findings reveal that youths whose caregiver had been to jail once or twice over the past two years were more likely than their peers to be a member of a gang (17%,9%). Furthermore, youths whose caregiver had been to jail once, twice, or several times over the past two years were more likely than their peers to have been arrested (33%,42%,21%), been to court, and been in jail or juvenile detention. Also, youths whose caretaker had been in jail once or twice over the past two years reported more frequently than their counterparts to running away from home (33%, 14%) and stealing (under \$50 26%, 13%; over \$50 21%, 8%). Finally, youths whose caretaker had been in jail several times over the past two years reported having attacked someone with the idea of hurting them more than youths whose caregiver had been to jail once or twice or not at all over the past two years (67%,17%,16%). Therefore, for research question four, of the eighteen variables that were used to measure delinquency and criminality, all of the variables showed some difference. These findings are consistent to results found by Sirpal (2002), which revealed that parental criminality was a significant factor relating to gang membership and delinquency among juveniles.

Research question five asks do children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years perform poorly in school when compared to their peers whose parents have not been under correctional

supervision. Results show that youths whose caregiver had been on probation during the past two years were more likely than their counterparts to have skipped classes (50%, 27%), to have been sent to the principal or counselor's office (100%,63%), and to report getting into serious fights at school (63%,40%).

Findings indicate that youths whose caregiver had been to jail once or twice over the past two years were more likely to have skipped school (0%, 36%), and those youths whose caregiver had been to jail once, twice, or several times over the past two years were more likely to have skipped class than their peers (33%, 41%, 27%). Results also show that youths whose caregivers had been to jail once, twice, or several times in the past two years were sent to the principal or counselor's office more times than their classmates (100%, 82%, 63%). Also, youths whose caregiver had been to jail once, twice, or several times reported that they had gotten into fights at a greater rate than their peers (100, 58%, 40%). Therefore, while measuring school performance, of the ten variables all showed some difference. These findings are consistent with a study done by Henriques (1982), which found that children with incarcerated parents experiences trouble with their peers and authoritative figures at school.

Research question six asks are children whose parents have been under correctional supervision (probation or jail) during the past two years are more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs than children whose parents were not under correctional supervision. Results show that youths whose caregivers had been on probation during the past two years reported using alcohol (26%,23%), sniffing glue (19%, 7%), using marijuana or hash (26%,18%), psychedelics (5%,1%), crack cocaine (5%, .2%), and

cocaine in other forms (5%, .3%) at a greater rate than youths whose caregivers had not been on probation during the past two years.

Furthermore, results reveal that youths whose caregivers had been to jail once, twice, or several times were more likely to have used alcohol (38%,33%, 22%), and had five or more drinks of alcohol (25%, 33%, 12%). Youths whose caregivers had been to jail once or twice during the past two years reported at a greater rate than their counterparts, having used glue or breathing aerosol spray, or inhaling other gases (8%,7%) to get high. Also, youths whose caregivers had been to jail once, twice, or several times reported having used marijuana or hash (33%,33%, 18%) and those whose caregiver had been to jail once or twice reported having used psychedelics (4%, 1%) at a greater rate than their counterparts. Finally, youths whose caregivers had been to jail once or twice during the past two years reported having used crack cocaine (4%, .2%), and cocaine in other forms (4%, .3%) at a greater rate than youths whose caretakers had not been to jail in the past two years. Therefore, for research question six, of the sixteen variables, fourteen variables showed some difference. These results are consistent with a study by Reed and Reed (1997), which found that children whose parents are incarcerated might be exposed to enduring trauma that leads them to abuse substances.

It can be concluded from these results that youth ages 13 to 15 whose caregivers spent some time under correctional supervision (probation or/and jail) in the past two years, were more likely to have displayed problems associated with juvenile delinquency and criminality, misbehavior in school, and alcohol and drug usage. In the case of probation, the likeliness of a caregiver being sent to jail may weigh upon the youth and

cause them to display adverse behaviors. When jail is considered, it appears that youth may act out as the absence of a caregiver becomes more profound.

5.1 Implications and Recommendations

The current study has several implications and recommendations for treatment. This study shows that youth are affected when a caregiver is under correctional supervision. In a study conducted by Stanton (1980), 70% of participants showed poor school performance and 50% exhibited classroom behavioral problems following the incarceration of a parent. Therefore, these findings point to the need for intervention by teachers, counselors, and principals. These persons are chosen to intervene due to the time the children spend in their care and expertise. When a youth's caregiver is placed under correctional supervision, the youth's teachers, principal, and counselor should be notified. Youth should be enrolled in individual and small group counseling sessions to provide for their specific needs. These sessions should concentrate on coping mechanisms and anger management. Furthermore, principals, teachers, and counselors need to work together to provide mentors for youths. This will provide the steady adult role model so needed for the youth's success. Last but not least, schools must also work with community resources to provide intervention and prevention programs to help youth cope with issues such as drug and alcohol usage and gang membership.

5.2 Conclusions

This study, in agreement with many other studies (Myers, Smarsh, Amlund-Hagen, & Kennon, 1999; Sack, 1977; Henriques, 1982), found that caregiver's criminality adversely affects the behavior of children. Unlike other studies, however, this study found that within a sample of youths whose caregivers had been under correctional

supervision during the last 12 months the likeliness of engaging in delinquency and criminality, misbehavior at school, and alcohol and drug usage is lower compared to youths whose caregiver had not been under correctional supervision during the past 12 months. This study also found that youths whose caregivers have been under correctional supervision during the past two years have a greater likelihood of engaging in delinquency and criminality, misbehavior at school, and alcohol and drug usage than youths whose caregiver had not been under correctional supervision during the past two years. Therefore, it can be concluded that caregiver's time spent under correctional supervision directly affects their child's likelihood of engaging in delinquency and criminality, performance at school, and alcohol and drug usage.

Identification of the effects of a caregiver's criminality on youths allow individuals who are directly involved with these youths to intervene. A recommendation based on this study is that youths' school make the necessary provisions to help these youths adapt to their changing situation. Principals, counselors, and teachers must work with the children to place them in counseling, mentoring programs, and community programs. It is of the uttermost importance that schools assume this role as youths spend most of their waking hours at school. Therefore, this study's findings and recommendations are important since the population of youths with caregivers under correctional supervision is growing substantially in our nation. As the population of adults grows who are under correctional supervision, the number of affected youths also grows. It is necessary for those who are close to these youths to provide the necessary guidance to help them cope with the problems that may result from having a caregiver under correctional supervision.

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL FORM

TITLE: *Effects of Incarceration on Children with Imprisoned Parents* IRB No.: 06.152e

The UTA Institutional Review Board (UTA IRB) Chair (or designee) has reviewed the above-referenced study and found that it qualified as exempt from coverage under the federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects as referenced at Title 45--Part 46.101 (b)(4). You are therefore authorized to begin the research as of February 10, 2006.

Please be advised that as the principal investigator, you are required to report local adverse (unanticipated) events to this office within 24 hours. In addition, pursuant to Title 45 CFR 46.103(b)(4)(iii), investigators are required to, " promptly report to the I RB any proposed changes in the research activity, and to ensure that such changes in approved research, during the period for which IRB approval has already been given, are not initiated without IRB review and approval except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject."

All investigators and key personnel identified in the protocol must have documented *GIT! Training* on file with this office. The UTA Office of Research Integrity and Compliance appreciates your continuing commitment to the protection of human research subjects. Should you have questions or require further assistance, please contact this office by calling (817) 272-2775 or (817) 272-3723.

Patricia Myrick
Director
UTA IRB
Designee

APPENDIX B
STUDY SITES

The total number of caregivers involved in the study was 874. According to the questions asked, certain answers were not ascertained. I observed that certain questions had 96 respondents, and others had 681. It appears as though some questions were not asked at each study site. Therefore, since no identifiers are found in this study, I was unable determine which site did not ask these questions. See tables below.

PROBATION DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	26	3.0	27.1	27.1
	No	69	7.9	71.9	99.0
	Don't Know	1	.1	1.0	100.0
	Total	96	11.0	100.0	
Missing	Not ascertained	769	88.0		
	System	9	1.0		
	Total	778	89.0		
Total		874	100.0		

IN JAIL DURING THE PAST 12 MONTHS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	25	2.9	16.7	16.7
	No	125	14.3	83.3	100.0
	Total	150	17.2	100.0	
Missing	Not ascertained	715	81.8		
	System	9	1.0		
	Total	724	82.8		
Total		874	100.0		

PAST 2 YRS ON PROBATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	2.3	2.9	2.9
	No	661	75.6	97.1	100.0
	Total	681	77.9	100.0	
Missing	Not ascertained	184	21.1		
	System	9	1.0		
	Total	193	22.1		
Total		874	100.0		

PAST 2 YRS IN JAIL

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Several times	3	.3	.4	.4
	Once or twice	27	3.1	4.0	4.4
	Not at all	651	74.5	95.6	100.0
	Total	681	77.9	100.0	
Missing	Not ascertained	184	21.1		
	System	9	1.0		
	Total	193	22.1		
Total		874	100.0		

REFERENCES

- Baunach, P. (1985). *Mothers in prison*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Beck, A., Gilliard, D., Greenfeld, L., Harlow, C., Hester, T., Jankowski, L., et al. (1993). Survey of state prison inmates 1991. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Beck, A. & Harrison, P. (2004). *Prisoners in 2003*. Washington D.C: Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin.
- Bilchik, S., Seymour, C., & Kreisher, K. (2001). Parents in prison. *Corrections Today*, 63(7), 108-112.
- Bloom, B., & Steinhart, D. (1993). Why punish the children? A reappraisal of the children of incarcerated mothers in America. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Bonczar, T., & Beck, A. (1997). Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Lifetime likelihood of going to state or federal prison. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Brook, J., Brook, D., De La Rosa, M., Whiteman, M., Johnson, E., & Montoya, I. (2001). Adolescent illegal drug use: The impact of personality, family, and environmental factors. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 24(2), 183-203.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1988). Survey of youth in custody, 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Burstein, L. (1978). Secondary analysis: An important resource for educational research and evaluation. *Educational Research, 17*(5), 9-12.
- Butters, J. (2002). Family stressors and adolescents cannabis use: A pathway to problem use. *Journal of Adolescence, 25*, 645-654.
- Cohen, P., & Brook, J. (1987). Family factors and persistence of psychopathology. *Psychiatry, 50*, 332-345.
- Eddy, J., & Heid, J. (2003). *Prisoners once removed: The adolescent children of incarcerated parents a developmental perspective*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Fritsch, T. A., & Burkhead, J. D. (1982). Behavioral reactions of children to parental absence due to imprisonment. *Family Relations, 30*, 83-88.
- Gabel, S. (1992). Children of incarcerated and criminal parents: Adjustment, behavior and prognosis. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry Law, 20*, 33-45.
- Gainsborough, J., & Mauer, M. (2000). *Diminishing returns: Crime and incarceration in the 1990s*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Glaser, B. (1962). Secondary analysis: A strategy for the use of knowledge from research elsewhere. *Social Problems, 10*(1), 70-74.
- Glass, G. V. (1976). Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. *Educational Researcher, 5*(10), 3-8.
- Goldstein, H. S. (1984). Parental composition, supervision, and conduct problems in youths 12 to 17 years old. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychology, 23*, 679-784.

- Greene, S., Haney C., & Hurtado, A. (2000). Cycles of pain: Risk factors in the lives of incarcerated mothers and their children. *The Prison Journal*, 80(1), 3-23.
- Greenfeld, L., & Snell, T. (1999). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Women Offenders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hagen, J. (n.d.). The next generation: Children of prisoners. Retrieved from <http://www.doc.state.ok.us/DOCS/OCJRC/Ocjrc96/Ocjrc19.htm>.
- Hagen, J., & Dinovitzer, R. (1999). Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, communities, and prisoners. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 121-162.
- Harrell, Cavanagh, & Sridharan. (1999). *Evaluation of the children at risk program: Results 1 year after the end of the program*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Henriques, Z. (1982). *Imprisoned mothers and their children*. New York: University Press of America.
- Hungerford, G. P. (1993). The children of inmate mothers: An explanatory study of children, caretakers, and inmate mothers in Ohio. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Incarcerated America. (2003). New York: NJ: Human Rights Watch.
- Johnson, D. (1991). *Jailed mothers*. Pasadena, CA: Pacific Oaks Center for Children of Incarcerated Parents.
- Johnston, D. (1995). Effects of parental incarceration. In K. Gabel & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Children of incarcerated parents* (pp. 59-88). New York: Lexington Books.

- Kampfner, C. J. (1995). Post-traumatic stress reactions in children of imprisoned mothers. In K. Gabel & D. Johnson (Eds.), *Children of incarcerated parents* (pp.89-100). New York: Lexington Books.
- Keller, T., Catalano, R., Haggerty, K., & Fleming, C. (2002). Parent figure transitions and delinquency and drug use among early adolescent children of substance abusers. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 28(3), 399-427.
- Lee, A. (2005). Children of inmates: What happens to these unintended victims? *Corrections Today*, 67(3), 84-86.
- Les, S. (1994). Two are stronger than one. *Alberta Report*, 21(20), 38-40.
- Lipsey, M., & Derzon, J. (1998). Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood: A synthesis of longitudinal research. In R. Loeber and D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions* (pp. 86-105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lowenstein, A. (1986). Temporary single parenthood—The Case of prisoners' families. *Family Relations*, 35(1), 79-85.
- McArdle, P., Wiegersma, A., Gilvarry, E., Kolte, B., McCarthy, S., Fitzgerald, M., et al. (year). European adolescent substance use: The roles of family structure, function and gender. *Addiction*, 97, 329-336.
- McGowan, B., & Blumenthal, K. (1978). *Why punish the children? A study of children of women prisoners*. Hachensack, NJ: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

- Mumola, C. (2000). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Incarcerated parents and their children*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Myers, B. J., Smarsh, T. M., & Amlund-Hagen, Kennon. (1999). Children of incarcerated mothers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 8, 11-25.
- Parke, R., & Clarke-Stewart, A. (2002, January). *Effects of parental incarceration on young children*. Paper prepared for the "From Prison to Home" Conference. Retrieved from www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410627_ParentalIncarceration.pdf.
- Phillips, S., Burns, B., Wagner, K., Kramer, T., & Robbins, J. (2002). Parental incarceration among adolescents receiving mental health services. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 11(4), 385-399.
- Poehlmann, J. (2005). Representations of attachment relationships in children of incarcerated mothers. *Child Development*, 76(3), 679-696.
- Quensel, S., McArdle, P., Brinkley, A., & Wieggersma, A. (2002). Broken home or drug suing peers: 'significant relations'? *Journal of Drug Issues*, 32(2), 467-491.
- Reed, D., & Reed, E. (1997). Children of incarcerated parents. *Social Justice*, 24(3), 152-170.
- Sack, W. H. (1977). Children of imprisoned fathers. *Psychiatry*, 40, 163-174.
- Sack, W., & Seidler, J. (1978). Should children visit their parents in prison? *Law and Human Behavior*, 2(3), 261-266.
- Sack, W. H., Seidler, T., & Thomas, S. (1976). The children of imprisoned parents: A psychosocial exploration. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 46(4), 618-628.
- Seymour, C. (1998). Children with parents in prison: Child welfare policy, program, and practice issues. *Child Welfare*, 77(5), 469-493.

- Simmons, C. (2000). Children of incarcerated parents. *California Research Bureau*, 7(2), 1-11.
- Sirpal, S. (2002). Familial criminality, familial drug use, and gang membership: Youth criminality, drug use, and gang membership-What are the connections? *Journal of Gang Research*, 9(2), 11-21.
- Sobal, J. (1981). Teaching with secondary data. *Teaching Sociology*, 8(2), 149-170.
- Stanton, A. (1980). *When mothers go to jail*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Steward, G. (1992). Behavioral problems in sons of incarcerated or otherwise absent fathers: The issue of separation. *Family Process*, 31, 303-314.
- Travis, J., & Waul, M. (2003). *Prisoners once removed: The children and families of prisoners*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Wright, J., & Cullen, F. (2001). Parental efficacy and delinquent behavior: Do control and support matter? *Criminology*, 39(3), 677-706.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Dionne Peniston was born in Boston, Massachusetts in 1981. She attended Baylor University and majored in Latin with minors of concentration in Political Science and Criminal Justice. As an undergraduate, the study of Criminal Justice intrigued her the most. For this reason, after a B.A., she attended the University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) to further explore this discipline. After completing of her Masters of Science Degree at UTA, she plan to pursue higher education in this field.