

LIBERTAD FOR OUR YOUTH OF COLOR:

EARLY PREVENTION PROGRAM

A Thesis

Presented to the faculty of the Department of Sociology

California State University, Sacramento

Submitted in partial satisfaction of  
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Sociology

by

Emily Andrade

FALL  
2018

© 2018

Emily Andrade

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

LIBERTAD FOR OUR YOUTH OF COLOR:

EARLY PREVENTION PROGRAM

A Thesis

by

Emily Andrade

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_, Committee Chair  
Dr. Manuel Barajas

\_\_\_\_\_, Second Reader  
Dr. Heidy Sarabia

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Student: Emily Andrade

I certify that this student has met the requirements for format contained in the University format manual, and that this thesis is suitable for shelving in the Library and credit is to be awarded for the thesis.

\_\_\_\_\_, Graduate Coordinator \_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Jacqueline Carrigan Date

Department of Sociology

Abstract  
of  
LIBERTAD FOR OUR YOUTH OF COLOR:  
EARLY PREVENTION PROGRAM

by  
Emily Andrade

The early 1990's reports of spikes in juvenile violence brought nationwide interest in reforming the juvenile justice system to prevent youth from engaging in delinquent behavior. Diversion Programs have since then become of high importance with the goal to divert youth from engaging in deviant behavior, but also with the purpose to prevent them from "building" a criminal profile and keeping them away from the traditional justice system. In this study, I examined which Caminos Program intervention was more effective in preventing recidivism amongst a first-time youth offender. This study relied on secondary data from the Caminos Program and employed the intersectionality theory to understand the experiences of a predominately working-class Chicax youth within the intervention program. I hypothesize guided by intersectionality theory that non-colonial/-policing social interventions directed to first-time youth offenders of color will decrease recidivism. The findings from the whole sample study showed that the odds of reoffending are 3.98 times higher for female compared to males. For every additional hour of pro-social activity the odds of reoffending decrease by 2.6%. For every additional

hour of community service the odds of reoffending decreases by 4%. Interestingly, for every additional hour of counseling services the odds of reoffending increase by 1.5%. These findings will allow for researchers to continue to explore and study other diversion programs across the nation, but also find better approaches to understanding recidivism and how systems of oppressions affect these types of programs and our youth of color.

\_\_\_\_\_, Committee Chair  
Dr. Manuel Barajas

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I close this chapter of my life to commence a new chapter I would like to take this time to thank those who have supported me through this bittersweet journey of stress, anxiety, tears, tiredness, joy, happiness but most importantly of learning. The knowledge we gain allows us to make this world a better place and help those most vulnerable. This journey could not have been made possible without the support of various individuals.

Family, thank you for being patient with me. Thank you mom for always sending me away with delicious food and clean clothes. Dad, thank you for washing my car, and getting my car serviced. To my brothers for not taking over my room and letting me sleep when visiting. To my cousin Patricia Mata for helping me get through my first semester of graduate school.

To my committee members Dr. Manuel Barajas and Dr. Heidy Sarabia. Thank you for your patience, teachings, knowledge, and guidance. Never forget you are amazing individuals. Your passion to help many does not go unrecognized.

To my cohort classmates who became great friends, thank you for staying up late with me studying, reading and revising papers. You know who you are.

Thank you to my amazing colleagues Anne Cheng, Berenice Espitia, Rosana Chavez-Hernandez, Jennifer Yang, Alejandra Franco and Jose Mejia for keeping me sane. For listening, believing in me, and being my family away from home.

To the Caminos Diversion Program staff and the Watsonville Police Department for allowing me to conduct this study. To the partners who do all possible to help and

support the youth and their families. We seek to continue to serve youth in our communities and implement best practices across the nation.

Lastly, to all youth who face adversity. We are here for you and remember to dream big because you can make your dreams become reality. And believe there are people out there who want to help you succeed and achieve your dreams. “Never forget, it takes a village to make your dreams come true.” – Rosana Chavez-Hernandez.

## DEDICATION

I, Emily Andrade-Silva dedicate this thesis to my mother and father, Rocio Silva and Jorge Andrade, to my siblings Eddy Andrade and Manuel Andrade, to the rest of my family and lastly to all the immigrant families who have crossed borders to give their children a chance to live a better life and achieve a higher education to accomplish their dreams. Thank you all for your unconditional support and most importantly for all your sacrifices.

Yo, Emily Andrade-Silva dedico este tesis a mi mama y papa, Rocio Silva y Jorge Andrade, a mis hermanos Eddy Andrade y Manuel Andrade, para el resto de mi familia y por ultimo para todos las familias inmigrantes que han cruzado fronteras para darle a sus hijos e hijas la oportunidad para vivir una mejor vida y poder cumplir sus sueños. Gracias por todo su apoyo incondicional y mas importante por todos sus sacrificios.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgments.....	vii
Dedication.....	ix
List of Tables .....	xii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Significance of the Study.....	3
2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
Background.....	5
Risk Factors .....	6
Juvenile Justice System.....	10
Methods to Preventing Recidivism.....	11
Program Outcomes.....	12
Theoretical Perspectives .....	13
3. METHODOLOGY .....	17
Secondary Data.....	20
Measures .....	20
Independent Variables .....	20
Dependent Variable .....	21

Method of Analysis.....	21
4. FINDINGS.....	22
Descriptive Statistics .....	22
Bivariate Findings.....	26
Logistic Regressions.....	27
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	31
Limitations.....	33
Conclusion and Future Recommendations .....	33
Appendix A. Types of Offenses.....	36
References.....	38

## LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics.....	24
2. Crosstabs .....	25
3. Summary Correlations Table.....	26
4. Logistic Regressions Model.....	28

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The United States of America is to some the land of “freedom, liberty, and justice for all,” but to many others the nation represents a history of conquest, unequal and denied freedom, exploitation and continued marginalization. The United States is infamous for its history of creating systems and/or institutions for social control in society, such as the prison system. In 1971, Richard Nixon enacted the “war on drugs” which disproportionately targeted and marginalized people of color (Rios 2011; Alexander 2010). Former president Ronald Reagan followed along with the “tough on crime” campaign, with the purpose of getting rid of rehabilitative programs and mandating longer sentences, consequently leading to the rise of incarceration rates (Rios 2011). The United States has the highest mass incarceration rates compared to other advanced countries. In 2016, Ann Carson, a statistician with the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) reported approximately 1,505,400 million incarcerated adults in federal and state prisons and county jails across the United States (Prisoners in 2016). BJS also reported that at year-end approximately 7% of non-Hispanic white males in federal and state prison were ages 18 to 24, compared to 13% of non-Hispanic black males and 12% Hispanic males. Evidently, people of color disproportionately fall victims to the criminal injustice system, through constant marginalization and criminalization.

Interestingly, in the early 1990s there was a perceived spike of “juvenile violence”, which brought nationwide concern (Greenwood 2008; Blumstein 2002). As a result, public officials pushed for a more “reformed juvenile justice system.” The juvenile

court was established with the purpose of separating the court system of justice for young people, focusing on prevention and remediation of delinquent behavior (Quinn and Dyke 2004). The reasoning was that, when youth are labeled, stigmatized, and marginalized by such institutions, they end up in the prison system. As a result, diversion programs were implemented with the interests to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and to keep them away from building an adult criminal career, thus preventing recidivism. The National Institute of Justice defines recidivism “as a person’s relapse into criminal behavior, often after the person receives sanctions or undergoes intervention for a previous crimes.”<sup>1</sup> Again, the goal of diversion programs is to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and prevent them from engaging in deviant behavior.

In Watsonville, California, the Caminos Program is a diversion program for youth who commit a first time offense (misdemeanor). This study evaluates the Caminos Program established in the Santa Cruz County that has exemplified support for youth. Juvenile delinquency has been an on-going concern in the Santa Cruz County. In 2012, a youth violence task force was created in order to address juvenile crime. Its mission is to establish an equitable, united, and safe county where all youth are engaged in family, school and community, have a sense of safety and well-being, feel they have a voice and are empowered to use it, and are able to access opportunities for successful transition into adulthood (Santa Cruz County’s Youth Violence Prevention Task Force 2012).

Applied Geographic Solution (2018) reports that the current Watsonville population stands at 54, 384 people. Interestingly, out of that whole population, 8,445

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: Recidivism of Prisons Released in 30 States in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010 (pdf, 31 pages) Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, April 2014, NCJ 244205

(15.53%) are youth between ages 10 – 19. Ethnic breakdown report shows that 45,199 (83.11%) of the Watsonville population are Hispanic, while 6,499 (11.95%) are white and 270 (0.50%) are Black.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study examines whether or not the Caminos Program reduces recidivism, by asking, which Caminos Program intervention is more effective in preventing recidivism amongst a first-time youth offender? The partners include Pajaro Valley Prevention & Student Assistance, Inc. (PVPSA); Pajaro Valley Unified School District (PVUSD); Santa Cruz County Office of Education – Teen Peer Court; Santa Cruz County Probation Department; Watsonville Police Activities League; and Watsonville Police Neighborhood Services Division – Neighborhood Accountability Board. This study focuses solely on PVPSA, Teen Peer Court, and Neighborhood Accountability Board.

The Santa Cruz County Community Assessment Project reported a total of 1,326 juvenile misdemeanor arrests in 2008 (2015:127). Local data from Santa Cruz County shows that 9.4 juveniles are repeat offenders within a 3-month period (Watsonville Police Department, 2015). A World Youth report defines delinquency as such,

“to criminologist, juvenile delinquency encompasses all public wrongs committed by young people between the ages of 12 and 20.... Included under the umbrella of juvenile delinquency are status offenses, so called because they are closely connected with the age status of an offender; a particular action or behavior is considered a violation of the law only if it is committed by a juvenile (examples include truancy and running away)” (2003, 190-191).

This study focuses on first-time juvenile offenders in the Santa Cruz County. Quinn and Dyke (2004) define first-time juvenile offenders as “youths who have entered the juvenile justice system, with the explicit meaning being that they have fallen into society’s net for the first time with a claim that a societal proscription has been violated” (179). Quinn and Dyke (2004) also report that most common crimes committed by first-time juvenile offenders are truancy, shoplifting, trespassing, and drug and alcohol abuse (179). The Santa Cruz County has implemented several community-based and restorative justice programs to address youth behavior such as Caminos Hacia el Éxito Program (Pathways to Success) in partnership with Teen Peer Court (TPC), Pajaro Valley Prevention and Student Assistance Inc. (PVPSA), Azteca Program, Valor, BASTA, Adelante, and Neighborhood Accountability Board (NAB).

These programs aim to serve the parents, youth who are first-time juvenile offenders, and youth who are also categorized as “at-risk”. The programs seek to divert youth from the juvenile justice system by offering them counseling services, pro-social activities, parenting and child workshops, and community service opportunities. Interestingly, Rios (2011) argues that programs and schools that work with criminal justice systems that already suppress youth continue to do so by the fact that they are in collaboration with each other. This study also explores this claim through the case study of the Caminos Program, as well as examines what intervention has the most success in preventing youth recidivism. Thus, I examine whether or not the Caminos Program and its partnerships made significant differences in the prevention of recidivism among first-time youth offenders.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Background

For many years, those in power have used systems and institutions of social control disproportionately against people of color. The powerful create systems and laws to keep ‘order’ and control of society; in which laws and institutional apparatus label, criminalize, and suppress people of color. Youth of color are constantly made aware that they are under surveillance. For example, one way we see this is through cameras and warning signs placed everywhere in schools, parks, and other public spaces (Wehr and Aseltine 2013). This form of social control is “supposed” to deter individuals from committing an act deemed wrong by the rest of society, thus exerting control over the daily decisions that individuals choose to make. When individuals do not follow these rules, they risk facing some type of sanction or even incarceration. To an extent I believe it’s fair to say that we all contribute and engage to some amount of social control and that it’s somewhat needed. However, it is important to highlight that social control in the hands of the powerful elites (the affluent, white men) can be detrimental to our society. For example, President Trump exemplifies this fixation with social control, policing, and securing the hegemonic status and interests of white nationalist, corporate and patriarchal elites. Throughout his presidency, Trump’s decisions have fueled hatred across America hurting particularly people of color, women, undocumented immigrants, and LGBTQ communities. Rios (2011) calls it “punitive social control” and argues, “it has been imposed on communities that have been racialized, thus affecting the everyday behavior

of youth considered deviant, criminal, and risky by adults in various social institutions” (XIV).

Individuals might ask why youth get involved in deviant behavior, and they might assume that youth, who engage in deviant behavior, do not listen, lack supervision, seek attention, or do not care about school. The Office of Juvenile Justice of Delinquency Preventions (OJJDP) reported that in 2014 more than 60% of adjudicated delinquency cases involving Hispanics youth were placed on probation, and Hispanic youth were more likely to than white or black youth to be adjudicated<sup>2</sup> delinquent in 2014. Saavedra (2010) found that at least 18,000 Latino youth are incarcerated annually, most often for nonviolent offenses (1). The Coalition for Juvenile Justice reported that nationwide Latino youth are 1.5 times more likely to be incarcerated than youth of European descent (Coalition for Juvenile Justice 2010 as cited by Seroczynski and Jobst 2016: 424). OJJDP also reports that “child delinquents are two to three times more likely to become serious, violent, and chronic offenders, than adolescents whose delinquent behavior begins in their teens” (2003:1). A review of literature identifies various factors that have been theorized to contribute to juvenile delinquency.

### **Risk Factors**

Research shows that there are various risk factors that contribute to juvenile delinquency. Risk factors contributing to juvenile delinquency include the following: low-socio economic status, peer affiliation, lack of parental supervision, and lack of

---

<sup>2</sup> Adjudication – at the adjudicatory hearing, a juvenile may be adjudicated (judged) a delinquent or status offender; the case would then proceed to a disposition hearing.

parental/child involvement, child abuse, substance abuse, and neighborhood demographics (such as low-risk or high-risk neighborhoods), (Ryan, Williams, Courtney 2013; Ryan, Abrams, and Huang 2014; Williams and Smalls 2015). In relation to juvenile delinquency, Heilbrun and associates (2005) define risk factors as “external or internal influences or conditions that are associated with or predictive of a negative outcome (such as delinquency or antisocial behavior)” (20). In this section, we focused primarily on peer affiliation, parental involvement, low-socio economic status and neighborhood demographics.

Firstly, youth peer affiliation with deviant peers is one of the strongest predictors of delinquent behavior (Deutsch et al. 2012). In a separate experience, I came across a group of youth who were caught ditching class and charged with possession of vandalism tools. During the individual youth/parent intake, one of the youth reported that they decided to join the group unaware that their peers were in possession of vandalism tools. Consequently, due to the deviant peer affiliation they all received the same disposition. Fergusson and associates (2002) argue that there is two plausible explanations that attempt to explain how peer affiliation and deviant acts come about. First they suggest that “processes that enlist the young person into deviant practices including crime and substance abuse ” (419), and secondly “...involvement in deviant peer groups is a selective process in which children from disadvantage, dysfunctional, or disturbed backgrounds are more likely to affiliate with delinquent peers” (420). Interestingly, Zhu and associates (2016) who gravitate from various sources (Fergusson & Horwood 1999; Fergusson, Wanner, Vitaro, Horwood and Swain-Campbell 2003; Keijsers et al., 2012)

define deviant peer affiliation as “the selective affiliation of adolescents who show serious problem behaviors (e.g., cheating, substance abuse and aggressive behavior)” (40). Research on peer affiliation offer complex findings and other research points to peer affiliation being interconnected with parental involvement, which has resulted in some mixed results.

Secondly, lack of parental supervision and lack of parental involvement were highlighted as other factors that contribute to juvenile delinquency. Hirschi’s argues that, “children’s attachment to parents deters antisocial behavior, because children who are close to their parents imagine their parents’ reactions to misconduct when temptation arises” (Hirsch 1969 as cited by Deutsch et al 2012:1079). More recently, Deutsch and associates (2012) study find that supportive parents have behavioral control over youth through their strong bonds, which deters youth from being influenced by other peers (1080). Interestingly, also in Deutsch and associates’ study ethnicity was examined as a potential factor that can influence the parental styles and how it may affect the behavior of the child. For example, some scholars found that “African-American parents are more restrictive and authoritarian, on average, than European American parents”, which at the end authoritarian parenting practices appeared to be more beneficial for African – American youth as compared to European American youth (Deutsch et al. 2012:1079; credit to Dornbusch et al. 1987). Therefore, ethnicity and parenting practices are highlighted as having either positive or negative effects on child behavior.

Youth seek freedom and autonomy, as they transition from adolescence to young adulthood. Harris-McKoy and Cui (2013) explained that, “higher levels of autonomy

could increase the opportunities for risky behavior such as delinquency ” (836). Some researchers suggest that too much parental control could prevent adolescents from exploring themselves and establishing autonomy (Nye 1958), whereas others believe that parental control is crucial for adolescents (Smetana et al. 2005). McKoy and Cui (2013) suggest that too much parental control could prevent adolescents from exploring themselves and establishing autonomy (Nye 1958), whereas others believe that parental control is crucial for adolescents (Smetana et al. 2005; 836). During this transition, youth want to participate and engage within the activities of their peers, which can cause tensions at home with variant parenting practices that may clash against such youth behaviors.

Thirdly, youth who come from a low-socio economic status and high crime area neighborhoods are two other interconnected factors that have been explored to make meaning of youth engaging in deviant behavior. Various researchers suggest that youth who reside in low-income high crime neighborhoods are more likely to engage in behavior deemed delinquent (Kowaleski-Jones and Dunifon 2006; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000 as cited in Deutsch et al. 2012). Interestingly, Heilburn and associates (2005) suggested that, “...adolescents who are raised in a low socioeconomic neighborhood may have less access to structured activities and healthy school environments, which have been found to reduce the risk of delinquent behavior among juveniles.” (30).

As reviewed, there is quite an amount of risk factors that contribute to juvenile delinquency; some youth may be exposed to all the factors while others may only be exposed to one factor. Generally, research finds that the more risk factors a youth is

exposed to the higher the likelihood of them engaging in delinquent behavior (Loeber et al. 1998; Hanna 2001; Hawkins et al., 2000 as cited in Heilburn et al. 2005). Although acknowledging these risk factors, it is important to note how institutions such as schools, the traditional justice system (i.e. probation), and diversion/restorative programs, law enforcement, etc. shape recidivism outcomes amongst youth. Furthermore, many studies have focused on risk factors common to low-income communities, which disproportionately affect communities of color who have historically been targets of social control, particularly male youth of color who are seen as greater threats to the hegemonic order.

### **Juvenile Justice System**

Juvenile delinquency can be prevented at an early age. To this end, prevention programs and diversion programs attempt to prevent recidivism within the juvenile justice system and to divert the juveniles from the court system. Research has found that probation does not prevent recidivism. Quinn and Dyke (2014) found that “in a meta-analysis of 200 intervention studies ...probation had a weak or no effect in reducing recidivism of serious offenders” (180). The juvenile justice system has been ineffective in reducing the rates of recidivism amongst juveniles. For example, Ryan and associates (2014) explain that in the context of, “...juvenile corrections system, youth actually get worse while confined because of poor conditions, absence of rehabilitation programs, and the contamination or contagion effect of being in close confinement with other delinquents” (8). Therefore, if a first-time juvenile offender, who is “low-risk or at-risk,” and is placed in the juvenile justice system he/she is more likely to reoffend, as compared

to a first-time juvenile offender involved in a diversion program where they have the opportunity of their case being closed, by agreeing to activities such as: volunteering, getting involved in pro-social activities, and getting good grades. In return, this intervention – outside of the juvenile justice system – offers a promising alternative in diverting juveniles from negative stimuli at their homes, or even within their peers.

### **Methods to Preventing Recidivism**

Diversion programs have played a big role on preventing recidivism among youth who have been labeled as “at-risk” and/or committed a first-time offense. Diversion programs also attempt to keep youth out of the adult system. Bynum and Thompson (1996) defined juvenile diversion as “an attempt to divert, or channel out youthful offenders from the juvenile justice system” (430). Greenwood (2008) notes that, “it costs states billions of dollars a year to arrest, prosecute, incarcerate, and treat juvenile offenders” (185). Nevertheless, most importantly it keeps youth from becoming adult criminals. Greenwood (2008: 185) discussed that “community-based programs that can divert first-time offenders from further encounters with the justice system. The most successful community programs emphasize family interactions and provide skills to the adults who supervise and train the child.” Greenwood (2008:186) found strong evidence that some programs work and some do not. In his study, he found that 12 prevention programs were effective, but 23 others had weak evidence of effectiveness.

Arrigo and associates (2015) also examined four well-known programs that seek to prevent youth from engaging in delinquent behavior. These four programs were Scared Straight Program, D.A.R.E, boot camps, and juvenile correctional facilities. Although

popular, these programs have been found to be ineffective in preventing youth from engaging in criminal behavior. Arrigo and associates (2015) report that participation in the Scared Straight Programs has been proved to be ineffective, and most of those participants tend to continue to reoffend after participating. However, the media, who finds them entertaining and popular among the public, only shares the successful outcomes and gives a false sense of effectiveness to the viewers of these types of programs.

Through D.A.R.E, youth will still engage in drug behavior event after learning about the negative impacts on doing drugs. Through boots camps they found them to also be ineffective because of the type of physical and emotional process they go through which might trigger memories of what is going on at home. Lastly, the juvenile correctional facilities have been found to be ineffective because they do not have enough rehabilitative support services to help the youth during their time, allowing them to be around environments that are still harmful. A brief discussion of these programs follows because they have been created to help youth but have proven the contrary. Thus, the main objective of this study is to focus on whether or not diversion programs are effective in preventing youth from reoffending; and from this knowledge, we can further inform the implementation of more helpful interventions for youth.

### **Program Outcomes**

Wilson and associates (2017) examine various studies that compare participants in a diversion program to participants in the traditional justice system. They found that there was a small decrease in future delinquent behavior for those processed in the traditional

justice system (Wilson et al. 2017). However, Wilson and associates showed that “in 60 of 73 programs, the recidivism rate of diverted youth was lower than that of youth processed by the traditional justice system (504). In a separate study, Wilson and Hodge (2013) found that diversion is more effective in reducing recidivism than the traditional justice system (497). Interestingly, Wilson and Hodge point out that there is a need for stronger research designs when examining diversion programs (513). Similarly, Mears and associate explain that, “one of the central problems in studies of diversion is that the concept is unclear, which in turn creates challenges in evaluating its impacts” (Klein 1979; McCord, Widom, and Crowell 2001; Mears 2012; Pabon 1978; Petrosino et al. 2010; Sanborn and Salerno 2005). It is important to understand what makes restorative or community justice programs different from the traditional justice system. Restorative or community justice programs are meant to repair harm and to bring the victims and offenders together (Kurki 2000), essentially creating peace and forgiveness.

### **Theoretical Perspectives**

The extant research identifies factors that lead to juvenile delinquency, but two main theories predominate in explaining juvenile delinquency and in guiding these intervention programs: differential association theory and labeling theory. Theorist Edward Sutherland developed a theory that tries to explain how people engage in deviant behavior (Berger and Gregory 2009). Sutherland’s differential association theory is broken down into nine principles (Rohall et al. 2014). Accordingly, differential association theory generally suggests, “that deviance is learned through interaction with others. Individuals who associate with deviant people are more likely to learn deviant

behavior than those who do not spend time with deviant others” (2014: 207). Ryan and associates (2014: 9) explain that, “strong attachments to individuals oriented toward deviance are likely to be detrimental, a finding consistent with differential association theory”. Subsequently, peer affiliation is a strong risk factor that can lead to deviant behavior amongst youth.

Social institutions such as schools have a major influence on juvenile delinquency. Researchers identify this particular link as the school to prison pipeline. The labeling theory offers some illumination of this connection of schools and prison. Akiva and associates (2014) explain that, “labeling theory generally predicts that an official response to delinquency promotes future delinquency (e.g. Lemert 1951)” (4). The labeling theory has two parts: primary deviance and secondary deviance. Primary deviance is the initial act that causes others (i.e. institutions) to label an individual a deviant; and secondary deviance occurs after an individual accepts the deviant label and continues to commit deviant acts (Rohall et al. 2014: 192). Youth who live in high crime rate and violent neighborhoods tend to be marginalized by their schools and law-enforcement.

Without discarding the differential association theory and labeling theory, other theoretical frameworks may offer some understanding of the realities faced by youth entangled with the juvenile system. Nonetheless, these popular theories differential association and labeling do not fully capture the reality and voices of what youth are going through on a day-to-day basis with systems of inequality and marginalization along race, gender, and class.

Overall, according to the existing literature juvenile delinquency results from the following factors: peer affiliation, lack of parental involvement/ supervision, ineffective program practices, neighborhood demographics, and low-socio economic status. But why are predominately brown and black youth affected disproportionately by the pipeline of schools to prison? For the purpose of this study we choose to look at this through a framework that looks at the intersectionality of systems of oppression that have historically marginalized communities of color, particularly those who were victims of colonization (brown and black). Therefore, I theorize – guided by intersectionality – that partnership with institutions (i.e. prisons, juvenile halls, militaristic programs) originating from colonial histories – institutional policies of removal, extermination, enslavement, segregation, and devaluation of their humanity – cannot liberate or emancipate youth of color. The solutions of rehabilitating these youth can only come from programs that affirm the value of their lives and their right to exist with dignity and equity as youth and communities of color. Thus, the following hypotheses are guided by intersectionality theory that non-colonial/-policing social interventions directed to first-time youth offenders of color will decrease recidivism:

H1: First-time youth offenders with higher number of hours in pro-social activities are less likely to reoffend.

H2: First-time youth offenders referred to community service are less likely to reoffend.

H3: First-time youth offenders referred to counseling are less likely to reoffend.

H4: First-time youth offenders referred to case management are less likely to reoffend.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

Diversion programs were implemented with the goal to divert youth from engaging in delinquent behavior and keeping them away from the traditional justice system. Insignificantly, some communities, schools, and the criminal justice system often marginalize the youth that engage in ‘delinquent behavior’ and push them towards the traditional justice system. As explained by the labeling theory, once the youth is labeled (primary deviance), if they accept the label they become part of a secondary deviance and continue a ‘criminal’ path. However, from an intersectional perspective, whether or not the youth accepts the label matters little, as a system has been set in place to assert social control of those deviating from the hegemonic norm – white, rich (or middle class), men, and heterosexual. As previously discussed various studies have indicated that the placement of juveniles in probation are not effective methods to preventing recidivism, which includes boot camps, and scare tactic programs among others, thus different approaches have sought better effective practices.

In the Santa Cruz County, specifically in Watsonville community members and non-profits have partnered to implement more effective methods to addressing youth delinquency and keeping youth in the right path. For example, the Caminos Hacia el Éxito Program (Pathways to Success) is a program administered by the Watsonville Police Department. The program reports using evidence-based approaches to hold youth accountable for their actions in a timely and appropriate manner. Caminos is funded through the community approved safety tax, Measure G and the California Board of State

and Community Corrections (BSCC) through Title II. According to the City of Watsonville, Measure G is a public-safety sales tax that secures local revenue to the City of Watsonville as well as provides additional police and fire personnel, updates public safety equipment, and enhances youth-violence prevention programs such as the Caminos Program. Title II is a delinquency prevention and intervention grant that was awarded to the Watsonville Police Department in 2013 to help continue administer the Caminos Program.

Caminos works in partnership with Pajaro Valley Prevention & Student Assistance, Inc. (PVPSA), Pajaro Valley Unified School District (PVUSD), Santa Cruz County Office of Education – Teen Peer Court, Santa Cruz County Probation Department, Watsonville Police Activities League, and Watsonville Police Neighborhood Services Division – Neighborhood Accountability Board. Again, this study focuses solely on three main partners: PVPSA, Teen Peer Court, and Neighborhood Accountability Board services.

PVPSA is a nonprofit organization that aims at providing education, training, counseling, and prevention services to students, families, and staff in the Pajaro Valley Unified District. They solely focus on attempting to prevent criminal behavior, gang involvement, truancy, and drug, alcohol and tobacco use. The Teen Peer Court Program is a program run by peers for peers and their main objective is to interrupt a development pattern of criminal behavior. Peers act as prosecutors, defense attorneys, bailiff, clerk, and jury and with one adult volunteer judge. The youth is asked to get involved in community service hours, counseling, and drug and alcohol assistance as needed.

Neighborhood Accountability Board solely focuses on connecting the youth with the community in which the crime was committed and finds community members to mentor them and help youth understand how their actions may affect their community.

The Caminos Program is offered to youth between the ages of 10-17 that have been arrested/or cited with a misdemeanor for the first time. The youth who agree to participate in the Caminos Program must complete several requirements in order to prevent their case from being referred to the Santa Cruz Probation Department. These requirements include the following: community service hours, counseling/cognitive behavioral therapy, case management, involvement in pro-social activities and mentorship through the Watsonville Police Activities League, and the involvement of parents attending either the Guiding Good Choices (GGC) or Strengthening Families Program (SFP) for parents and youth workshops. Youth are referred to these partners based on the presenting risk factors they share during their initial intake process, with a three month completion time.

It is important to note that before the implementation of the Caminos Program, PVPSA provided evidence-based services to youth since April 2012. During that time PVPSA gave the youth 6 months to complete their program. From April 2012 to December 2017, a total of 492 youth were referred to PVPSA and the Caminos Program, from those, 409 youth accepted the program. Out of this total (409) 345 have successfully completed the program. The program has a completion rate of 84% for a five-year period.

## **Secondary Data**

For the purposes of this study, in order to determine objectively which Caminos Program intervention was more effective in preventing recidivism amongst a first-time youth offender required the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. SPSS allows running statistical analysis, which allows examining the impact of various independent variables – i.e. ethnicity, age, and gender. This study analyzed quantitative secondary data that was collected and provided by the Caminos Program, a two-year time span from 2015 - 2017. The sample included a total of 180 cases of youth aged 11 to 17, 160 were Hispanic (88.9%), 10 were White (5.6%), 6 were Black (3.3%) and 4 were other (2.2%). In terms of gender the sample included 104 males (57.8%) and 76 females (42.2%).

## **Measures**

### *Independent Variable*

This study considered the following independent variables: ethnicity, gender, and age. Other corresponding independent variables were the types of interventions on recidivism. The interventions included the following: (1) # of community service hours completed, (2) # of hours involved in pro-social activities, (3) # of hours spent in counseling and (4) # of hours spent in case management. These continuous variables were reported in number of hours and ranged from 0 – 100. Also, included was the program the youths were referred to, based on their risk potential.

The variables were coded as follows: *Age* was coded in number of years 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. I measured *race/ethnicity* as dichotomous variables coded as (1)

Hispanic and (0) non-Hispanic. Because the rest of the sample size had underrepresented categories I grouped black, white, and others race/ethnicity categories together. *Gender* was coded as (1) male and (0) female. *Program referred to* was coded as (1) PVPSA, (2) NAB, (3) TPC and (4) Probation. *Successfully completed the Caminos program* was coded as (1) no and (2) yes. *Types of offense* were also coded (see Appendix A for list). *Re-offense time* was coded as (1) while in the program, (2) within 6 months of completion, (3) after 6 months of completion, (4) after 12 months of completion, (5) at 18 months of completion, (6) at two years of completion and (7) not applicable.

#### *Dependent Variable*

In order to analyze if the Caminos Program is an effective diversion program we must be able to measure its success rate. Thus, our dependent variable measures recidivism. Reoffended was coded as (0) yes and (1) no. To examine the findings of the Caminos Program, intersectionality theory is used to understand why youth engage in “deviant” behavior.

#### **Method of Analysis**

In this study I ran a descriptive statistics to describe the sample and then ran a correlations matrix to examine the bivariate relationships among the variables. This then allowed for me to run a logistic regressions model which includes various independent variables (categorical and continuous variables) to predict the outcome of my dependent variable (dichotomous variable).

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

This chapter reviews the findings based on the data provided by the Caminos Program and analyzed with the statistical program using SPSS. The findings are presented as follows: first, I present the descriptive statistics which provide a view of general trends among the youth population, and report the means and range of scores for the outcomes of various interventions and control variables (Creswell 2009). Then, I employ logistic regressions to identify statistically significant relationships between type of intervention and rates of recidivism. Various regression models measure the impact of various interventions on the dependent variable, i.e., recidivism.

#### **Descriptive Statistics**

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for all the variables used in my analysis.

From 2015-2017, a total of 240 youth were referred to the Caminos Program. Out of those (240) youth, a total of 180 accepted to participate in the program. As mentioned earlier Watsonville's population is predominately Hispanic/Latino. In this study 160 youth identified as Hispanic (88.9%) while 20 youth identified as non-Hispanic (11.1%). The youths' average age was 15 years old and the minimum age was 11. Out of those (180), 100 youth (55.6%) were referred to PVPSA, while 27 (15%) were referred to NAB, 13 (7.2%) were referred to TPC, and 40 (22.2%) were referred to probation due to reoffending or not following through with the Caminos program. Although each of these programs is unique, they all direct youth to similar types of interventions, including pro-social activities, counseling requirements, case management, and community service

hours (see Table 2.). A total of 140 (77.8%) youth successfully completed the program, while 40 (22.2%) did not. Out of those youth who successfully completed the program, 139 (77.2%) did not reoffend after completion of the program, while 41 (22.8%) did. When looking at re-offense time the average re-offense time was at 12 months of completing the program.

The youth arrested and/or cited accounted for the following top eight offenses: petty theft (23.3%), resisting arrest (7.8%), vandalism (7.2%), battery (7.2%), possession of vandalism tools (5.6%), minor in possession of alcohol (5%) and minor in possession of marijuana (5%). The common offense for being arrested and/or cited was for giving false information to an officer. The average amount of community service hours completed by youth was 37.85 hours. The average amount of counseling hours youth received was 3.08 hours. On average the amount of case management hours received by youth were 15.31 hours. And on average youth were involved in 10 hours of pro-social activities.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics

Variables	M or %	SD
<i>Dependent Variable</i>		
Reoffended while in the program	1.77	.421
	M or %	SD
<i>Independent Variables</i>		
Female participants	42.2%	
Male participants	57.8%	
Age	15.14	1.383
Ethnicity	1.19	.596
Type of Offense	12.67	12.874
Partner Referred To	1.96	1.524
PVPSA	55.5%	
NAB	15%	
TPC	7.2%	
Probation	22.2%	
Successfully Completed the Program	77.8%	
# of Community service hours	37.850	17.61
# of Counseling hours	3.083	5.8
# of Case Management hours	15.3083	12.27
# of Pro-Social Activities	10.739	4.13
Re-Offense Time		
While in the Program	21.7%	
Within 6 months of completion	10.6%	
After 6 months of completion	1.1%	
At 12 months of completion	1.7%	
At 18 months of completion	6.7%	
At 2 years of completion	.6%	
Not applicable (no re-offense since completion)	57.8%	

*N=180*

<b>Table 2. Crosstabs</b>		<b>Types of Interventions (2015 – 2017)</b>			
<b># of Community Service Hours</b>		<b>PVPSA</b>	<b>NAB</b>	<b>TPC</b>	<b>Probation</b>
	0 hours	0	0	7	15
	1 – 15 hours	3	11	6	1
	16 – 30 hours	51	12	0	11
	31 – 45 hours	38	4	0	13
	46 – 60 hours	8	0	0	0
	61+ hours	0	0	0	0
	<b>N Total=</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>
<b># of Counseling Hours</b>	0 hours	44	24	12	29
	1 – 15 hours	49	3	1	11
	16 – 30 hours	6	0	0	0
	31 – 45 hours	1	0	0	0
	46 – 60 hours	0	0	0	0
	61+ hours	0	0	0	0
	<b>N Total=</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>
	<b># of Case Management Hours</b>	0 hours	0	0	0
1-15 hours		51	13	12	22
16 – 30 hours		37	13	1	4
31 – 45 hours		7	1	0	3
46 – 60 hours		2	0	0	0
61+ hours		3	0	0	0
<b>N Total=</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>
<b># of Pro-Social Activities</b>		0 hours	0	0	2
	1 – 15 hours	91	22	10	31
	16 – 30 hours	9	5	1	4
	31 – 45 hours	0	0	0	0
	46 – 60 hours	0	0	0	0
	61+ hours	0	0	0	0
	<b>N Total=</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>
	<b>N=180</b>				
<b>*Note: Once a youth is referred to probation information is no longer tracked by the Caminos Program.</b>					

### Bivariate Findings

Table 2 presents the bivariate relationships between variables. The correlations show that participants age and # of case management hours assigned had a moderate negative relationship ( $r = -.258, p < .01$ ), meaning that younger participants had less number of case management hours. On the other hand, number of community service hours assigned and those of counseling hours assigned has a moderate positive relationship ( $r = .257, p < .01$ ). When looking at number of community service hours and those of case management hours they had a moderate positive relationship ( $r = .353^{**}, p < .01$ ). Observing the number of community service hours and those of pro-social activities had a moderate positive relationship ( $r = .219^{**}, p < .01$ ). Lastly, when looking at the number of counseling hours and those of case management hours also had a moderate positive relationship ( $r = .246^{**}, p < .01$ ). In general, the various interventions are positively correlated with each other.

<b>Table 3. Summary Correlations Table</b>	
<i>Pair</i>	<i>Pearson r</i>
1) age : # of case management hours	-.258**
2) # of community service hours : # of counseling hours	.257**
3) # of community service hours : # of case management hours	.353**
4) # of community service hours : # of pro-social activities	.219**
5) # of counseling hours : # of case management hours	.246**

### Logistic Regressions

A logistic regression model helped us understand how the various interventions and other factors affect recidivism, as measured by a dichotomous dependent variable re-offended: yes or no (see Table 4.). In this model, gender is the only categorical independent variable that is statistically significant at  $P > .002$ , meaning that the odds of not re-offending are 3.98 times higher for males compared to females (95% CI 1.685-9.424,  $P > .002$ ). For every additional year of age, the odds of not re-offending increase by 2.2% (95 CI .780 – 1.340,  $P < .875$ ). Although ethnicity is not statistically significant, it is important to note that the odds of not re-offending are 1.11 times lower for non-Hispanic youth compared to Hispanic youth (95% CI .249 – 3.238,  $P < .870$ ). When looking at the number of pro-social activities although not statistically significant, for every additional hour of pro-social activity the odds of not re-offending increases by 2.7%. (95% CI .935 – 1.128,  $P < .582$ ). Case management did not have a statistical significant effect on recidivism ( $\text{Exp}(B) = 1.000$ ). Interestingly, for every additional hour of counseling services the odds of re-offending increase by 1.5% (95% CI .925 – 1.049),  $P < .642$ ). In terms of community service, for every additional hour of community service the odds of not re-offending increase by .4% (95% CI .981 – 1.027,  $P < .749$ ).

The Nagelkerke  $R^2$  (.105) indicates that this model accounts for 10% of the variability observed in youth re-offending after receiving various interventions. The Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients table indicates a Sig. (p)<sup>3</sup> value of .076. Because this is greater than .05  $\alpha$  level, this model is statistically insignificant, meaning that none

---

<sup>3</sup> Sig. (p) – statistically significant at p-value of .05  
Alpha ( $\alpha$ )

of the predictors strongly predict the outcome variable re-offended; thus we fail to reject our null hypothesis. Ultimately, this model concludes that for this study these predictors with the exception of gender which is statistically significant cannot predict the outcome variable.

**Table 4.** Logistic Regressions Model

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP (B)	
						Lower	Upper
Ethnicity (1)	-.107	.654	.027	.870	.899	.249	3.238
Age	.022	.138	.025	.875	1.022	.780	1.340
Gender (1)*	1.3282	.439	9.908	.002	3.985	1.685	9.424
Community Service	.004	.012	.102	.749	1.004	.981	1.027
Counseling	.015	.032	.217	.642	.985	.925	1.049
Case Management	.000	.017	.000	.995	1.000	.966	1.035
Pro-Social Activities	.026	.048	.303	.582	1.027	.935	1.128
Constant	.073	2.191	.001	.973	1.076		

P-value  $\leq$  .05 \*  
Nagelkerke R Square .105  
Omnibus Test Sig. .076

The higher the number of hours a first-time youth offender involved in pro-social activities reduces recidivism. Even though this predictor was not statically significant, as mentioned earlier the model indicates a small difference in the chances of a first-time youth not re-offending increases, thus supporting my first hypothesis. Involvement in

Pro-social activities is an essential intervention for youth because it focuses on the social aspects. In this study, youth are given the opportunity to go on fieldtrips out of their community that may be related to personal hobbies which may give the youth some sense of autonomy and a gateway to stay away from negative environments.

First-time youth offenders referred to community service are less likely to reoffend. Although not statistically significant, the model suggests that for every additional hour engaged in community service youth chances of not re-offending also increases, thus this support my second hypothesis. This finding might suggest that engagement with the community can potentially keep the youth involved in other activities that they might potentially enjoy.

I hypothesized that first-time youth offenders referred to counseling are less likely to reoffend. Interestingly, for every additional hour of counseling the chances of re-offending increases, thus this finding did not support my third hypothesis. This finding shows that potentially counseling can trigger something, especially if the youth is not ready to receive that type of intervention.

First-time youth offenders referred to case management are less likely to reoffend. In this study case management does not have an impact on whether or not a first-time youth offender will reoffend, thus not supporting my fourth hypothesis making it inconclusive.

While it is difficult to test each individual program (PVPSA, NAB, and TPC) because each of these programs rely heavier on specific types of interventions such as the ones discussed above it's important to look at how their partnerships with each other and

referrals to specific types of interventions can affect if a first-time youth offender will reoffend. Overall, the findings in these model were not statistically significant but again it does not mean the types of interventions are not working at all. It's important to note that these are not fully representative of the whole population and this study only addresses a very small sample of the whole population.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the interventions offered to first-time youth offenders referred to the Caminos Program and to assess if they had a positive impact on youth and made a difference in preventing recidivism. Theoretically, various research points out that recidivism has been attributed to various factors such as neighborhood demographics, socioeconomic status, family dynamics, and peer affiliation. Again, my hypotheses were guided by intersectionality theory that non-colonial/-policing social interventions directed to first-time youth offenders of color would decrease recidivism. Although, this study was not statistically significant small achievements have been made. Once again, guided by intersectionality theory partnerships with institutions (prisons, juvenile hall, militaristic programs) cannot emancipate youth.

Previous research has found that the traditional justice system (i.e. probation) is not effective at preventing recidivism as compared to non-traditional juvenile delinquency programs that are community based. Its important to be aware that diversion programs might be effective for some youth, but it may not work for all youth. In this study intersectionality theory helps explain this phenomena. To give you a better understanding of intersectionality theory, the Oxford Dictionaries define intersectionality as “the interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage.” Sociologist Patricia Hill Collins defines intersectionality “as the critical insight that race, class, gender, sexuality,

ethnicity, nation, ability and age operate as a reciprocally constructing phenomena that in turn shape complex social inequalities” (2015, pg.2) .

In this study, we look at the intersection of youth of color who come from working-class families and a predominately Hispanic community both male and female. Simply, these intersecting systems of marginalization rooted to a history of colonialism create the reoffending patterns observed in this study. Youth of color from working class background are generally profiled as delinquents; in spite of the diversion efforts—which remain integrated with a criminal justice system—youth of color, and particularly girls, face a structure that has historically devalued their lives based on race, gender, and class. For example, Chicana girls were almost 4 times the odds of reoffending than boys. Apparently, the interventions are less effective in serving and helping girls, who are unfairly treated by patriarchal, racist, and classist norms that deny them equal freedom and opportunities, and those that transgress these unfair societal norms, borders, or laws and are subject to dehumanizing stigmas.

In this study, while all youth participate in pro-social activities through the Watsonville P.A.L program in terms of the other interventions: counseling, case management, and community service hours are different for all youth. This is due to the fact that youth are referred to different partners (PVPSA, NAB, TPC) based on their potential presenting risk factors. Then these partners to an extent determine how much involvement in each area of intervention youth will have to get involved. These partners each rely heavily more on specific types of interventions as mentioned earlier. PVPSA partners focus more on supporting family and individual needs. NAB partners focus more

on community integration and service. And TPC focuses more on the restorative side by having peer to peer run trials that ultimately models the criminal justice system by its setting. Unfortunately, these programs are also affected by systems of oppression that don't offer them the funding support. They are working with less staff and with higher case loads affecting the support they can provide to youth and their families.

### **Limitations**

First, this thesis was limited by the fact that it took a quantitative approach. Meaning that it doesn't fully capture the voices and experiences of the youth and families who participate in the Caminos Program. Future studies should consider capturing the voices and experiences of the staff who work with such programs. Secondly, this thesis was limited by the fact that ethnically the sample was not fully representative of all youth of color due to the demographics of the location of the sample; thus leaving out other ethnic groups that would be important to consider in such studies. Thirdly, this thesis is limited because it doesn't fully capture what happens to the youth when they reoffended while participating in the Caminos program or for not following through during their three month completion period. Future studies should consider capturing the experiences that youth face when they are referred to probation.

### **Conclusion and Future Recommendations**

There is more to this, the problems are within the systems and institutions, which socially, politically, and economically shape our lives and particularly youth of color from working-class backgrounds. Mass incarceration is a problem that has been normalized in the United States, though its known that prisons are not effective in

preventing crime. As suggested in other studies youth who are referred to traditional juvenile delinquency centers will be more likely to recidivate; whereas those referred to non-traditional juvenile delinquency programs that are community based and non-profit are less likely to reoffend thus having a more positive effect. Ultimately keeping youth away from a system that has historically been designed to keep them unfree, caged, and dehumanized.

It is important to understand why so many youth, especially youth of color, continue to be incarcerated instead rather than directed to higher education. By understanding the relationships between diversion programs and institutions (schools, probation, law enforcement, case managers, social workers) and how they affect recidivism outcomes, can lead to better methods of serving youth. Moreover, if we consider the research that suggests that diversion programs are effective, how can we incorporate more of those that are working to prevent the criminalizing of our youth of color.

Intersectionality theory highlights systems of continued oppression reproducing the same patterns as we have seen throughout our history. The findings in this study point out to the importance of continuing to improve services. Future research might want to qualitatively explore the standpoint view of these young Chicanxs. Also, future studies should consider looking at the partners individually and perhaps considering a comparison study between Santa Cruz County and Monterey County to see how youth interventions are handled at both the traditional and non-traditional processes in both counties and see if there are any differences.

Even though the study was statistically insignificant, overall youth who participated in the Caminos Program had a 77.8% successful completion rate from 2015 – 2017 a two year span, while only 22.2% of youth did not successfully complete the program. And 57.8% of those youth who successfully completed the program have not reoffended since their completion of the Caminos Program, while only 10.6% reoffended within 6 months of completing the program. These small achievements are important to consider because it shows that to an extent the interventions are being effective for some youth, perhaps not a larger scale but knowing this can help expand or improve services that already exists and implement them across the programs, the county, other neighboring counties and eventually across various states. Most importantly, these findings suggest that the program is being effective for some youth.

Ultimately, the community advocates, educators, social workers, etc. must challenge the systems that work against these youth. These youth deal with so much in their lives – poverty, housing insecurity, no health coverage – and deserve more just systems that affirm their human worth, dignity, and dreams. Colonial continuities must be identified and uprooted and replaced by more democratic and social justice values, policies, and practices. With these structural changes, democratic bottom-up governance, and broad-based coalitions we can help keep youth away from the criminal justice system and reduce social inequalities.

## Appendix A

### Type of Offenses

SPSS Coded	Penal Code*	Penal Code Description
1	484(a) pc	PETTY THEFT
2	25662(a) pc	MINOR IN POSSESSION OF ALCOHOL
3	594(a)(1) pc	VANDALISM
4	594.1(e)(1) pc	POSSESSION OF PAINT SPRAY
5	594.2(a) pc	POSSESSION OF VANDALISM TOOLS
6	148(a) pc	RESISTING ARREST
7	241(b) pc	ASSAULTING A POLICE OFFICER
8	459.5 pc	SHOPLIFTING
9	12500(a) pc	DRIVING WITHOUT A LICENSE
10	23103 pc	RECKLESS DRIVING
11	647(f) pc	DRUNK IN PUBLIC
12	148.9 pc	FALSE INFORMATION TO AN OFFICER
13	242 pc	BATTERY
14	417(a) pc	EXHIBIT DEADLY WEAPON
15	626.10(a) pc	POSSESSION OF WEAPON ON SCHOOL
16	16028(a)	FAIL TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
17	308(b) pc	MINOR IN POSSESSION OF CIGARETTES
18	11377(a) pc	POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE ON SCHOOL GROUNDS
19	594 (b)(2)(a) pc	COHABITANT VANDALISM
20	21310 pc	CARRYING A CONCEALED DIRK OR DAGGER
21	415.5(a)	FIGHT/CHALLENGING TO FIGHT ON SCHOOL GROUNDS
22	25608 pc	POSSESSION OF LIQUOR ON SCHOOL PROPERTY
23	602(k) pc	TRESPASSING/INJURE PROPERTY
24	182(a)(1) pc	CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CRIME
25	11357(e) pc	MINOR IN POSSESSION OF MARIJUANA
26	186.22(a) pc	PARTICIPATE IN A STREET GANG
27	20002(a) pc	HIT AND RUN
28	23152(a) pc	DUI
29	23152(b) pc	DUI WITH BAC OF .08 OR HIGHER
30	243.2(a) pc	FIGHT ON CAMPUS
31	243(e) pc	BATTERY ON SPOUSE/PARTNER
32	496(a) pc	RECEIVING KNOWN STOLEN PROPERTY

33	2800 pc	FAILING TO OBEY AN OFFICER
34	23109(b) pc	ILLEGAL EXHIBITION OF SPEED
35	626.8(a)(3) pc	ANY PERSON DISRUPTING SCHOOL PROPERTY
36	626.7(a) pc	FAILURE TO LEAVE/RETURN TO CAMPUS
37	308(b) pc	MINOR PURCHASING, RECEIVING TOBACCO OR CIGARETTE PAPERS
38	245(a)(1)	ADW OR GBI FORCE -NOT FIREARM
39	29650 pc	MINOR IN POSSESSION LIVE AMMUNITION
40	21456(b) pc	FAILURE TO OBEY PEDESTRIAN DON'T WALK/WAIT SYMBOL
41	243.2 (a) pc	BATTERY ON A PERSON ON SCHOOL, PARK, OR HOSPITAL PUBLIC OR PRIVATE PROPERTY
42	647(f) pc	DISORDERLY CONDUCT
43	422 pc	CRIMINAL THREATS WITH INTENT TO TERRORIZE
44	10851(a) pc	POSSESSION OF STOLEN VEHICLE

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, Michelle. 2010. *The New Jim Crow*. New York: The New Press.
- Applied Geographic Solutions. 2018. Available from:  
<https://www.cityofwatsonville.org/1441/Demographics> Retrieved on October 22, 2018.
- Blumstein, Alfred. 2002. Youth, Guns, and Violent Crime. *The Future of Children*, 12(2): 39-53.
- Board of State and Community Corrections. 2014. Available from:  
[http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s\\_cppttleiidelinquencyprevention.php](http://www.bscc.ca.gov/s_cppttleiidelinquencyprevention.php) Retrieved on 10/24/18
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Jail Inmates at Midyear 2014*. Available from:  
<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/jim14.pdf> . Retrieved on July 29, 2018.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. *Prisoners in 2016*. Available from:  
<http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p16.pdf> . Retrieved on July 29, 2018.
- Collins, Patricia H. 2015. "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 41:1-20.
- Creswell, John. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Davis, Angela. 2003. *Are Prisons Obsolete?* Boston: Seven Stories Press.
- Deutsch, Arielle R., Lisa J. Crockett, Jennifer M. Wolff, and Stephen T. Russell. 2012. "Parent and Peer Pathways to Adolescent Delinquency: Variations by Ethnicity and Neighborhood Context". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(8): 1078-1094.
- Greenwood, Peter. 2008. "Prevention and Intervention Programs for Juvenile Offenders" *The Future of Children*, 18(2):185-210
- Grunwald, Heidi E., Brian Lockwood, Philip W. Harris, and Jeremy Mennis. 2010. Influences of Neighborhood Context, Individual History and Parenting Behavior on Recidivism Among Juvenile Offenders. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 39(9), 1067-1079.
- Rios, Victor M. 2011. *Punished Policing The Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York: New York University Press.

- Ryan, Joseph P., Abigail B. Williams and Mark E. Courtney. 2013. "Adolescent Neglect, Juvenile Delinquency and the Risk of Recidivism." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(3): 454-65.
- Ryan, Joseph P., Laura S. Abrams, and Hui Huang. 2014. "First-time violent juvenile offenders: Probation, Placement, and Recidivism." *National Association of Social Workers*.
- Harris-McKoy, DeAnna and Ming Cui. 2013. "Parental Control, Adolescent Delinquency, and Young Adult Criminal Behavior." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 22(6):836-843.
- Heilburn, Kirk, Naomi E. Sevin Goldstein, and Richard E. Redding. 2005. *Juvenile Delinquency: Prevention, Assessment, and Intervention*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Hockenberry, Sarah and Charles Puzzanchera. 2016. "Delinquency Cases Involving Hispanic Youth, 2013." *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved July 29, 2018 (<https://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/249915.pdf>).
- Hyland, Nina. 2018. "Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Court, 2014." *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved July 29, 2018 (<https://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/251107.pdf>).
- Liberman, Akiva, David Kirk and Kideuk Kim. 2014. "Labeling Effects of First Juvenile Arrests: Secondary Deviance and Secondary Sanctioning." *Criminology*, 52(3): 345-370.
- Loeber, Rolf, David Farrington, and David Petechuk. 2003. "Child Delinquency: Early Intervention and Prevention." 1- 19. Retrieved on July 29, 2018 (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/186162.pdf>).
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. "National Juvenile Court Data Archive: Juvenile Court Case Records 2005–2014." Retrieved on July 29, 2018
- Saavedra, Jose. (2010). *Just the facts: A snapshot of incarcerated Hispanic youth*. Retrieved on April 13, 2017. (www.nclr.org)
- Seroczynski, Alesha D., & Jobst, Amy D. 2016. Latino Youth and the School-to-Prison Pipeline: Addressing Issued and Achieving Solutions. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 38(4): 423-445.

- Wehr, Kevin, and Elyshia Aseltine. 2013. *Beyond the Prison Industrial Complex: Crime and Incarceration in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wikstrom, Per-Olof, Rolf Loeber. 2000. "Do Disadvantaged Neighborhoods Cause Well-Adjusted Children To Become Adolescent Delinquents? A Study Of Male Juvenile Serious Offending, Individual Risk And Protective Factors, And Neighborhood Context\*." *Criminology*, 38(4): 1109-1142.
- Williams, Ruthie G., and Elsie W. Smalls. 2015. "Exploring a Relationship between Parental Supervision and Recidivism among Juvenile Offenders at a Juvenile Detention Facility". *International Social Science Review*, 90(2): 1-22.
- Zhu, Jianjun, Chengfu, Yu, Wei, Zhangz, Bao, Zhenzho, Bao, Yanping, Jiang, Chen, Yuanyuan Chen, and Shuangju Zhen. 2016. "Peer Victimization, Deviant Peer Affiliation and Impulsivity: Predicting Adolescent Problem Behaviors." *Child Abuse & Neglect*, (58): 39-50.