

5-2013

# Perceptions of Probation Officers Around Class and Racial Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System

Jeffrey A. Hilliard  
*St. Catherine University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Hilliard, Jeffrey A.. (2013). Perceptions of Probation Officers Around Class and Racial Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System. Retrieved from Sophia, the St. Catherine University repository website: [https://sophia.stkate.edu/msw\\_papers/188](https://sophia.stkate.edu/msw_papers/188)

This Clinical research paper is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Work at SOPHIA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Social Work Clinical Research Papers by an authorized administrator of SOPHIA. For more information, please contact [amshaw@stkate.edu](mailto:amshaw@stkate.edu).

Running head: CLASS AND RACIAL DISPARITIES

Perceptions of Probation Officers Around Class and Racial  
Disparities In the Juvenile Justice System

Jeffrey A. Hilliard, B. A.  
Saint Catherine University and University of Saint Thomas

MSW Clinical Research Paper

Presented to the Faculty of the  
School of Social Work  
Saint Catherine University and the University of Saint Thomas  
Saint Paul, Minnesota  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Social Work

Committee Members  
Valandra, Ph. D., MBA, MSW, LISW, (Chair)  
Nancy Heitzig, Ph. D.  
Jennifer Miller, MSW, LICSW

The Clinical Research Project is a graduation requirement for MSW students at St. Catherine University/University of St. Thomas School of Social Work in St. Paul, Minnesota and is conducted within a nine-month time frame to demonstrate facility with basic social research methods. Students must independently conceptualize a research problem, formulate a research design that is approved by a research committee and the university Institutional Review Board, implement the project, and publicly present the findings of the study. This project is neither a Master's thesis nor a dissertation.

May 20, 2013

### **Abstract**

The pervasiveness of disparities related to race and class is an important topic in the juvenile justice systems. The current research examines perceptions of juvenile probation officers around disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. A number of theoretical and methodological approaches are discussed in the literature review. A conceptual framework of intersectionality is used as an analytic technique to examine the simultaneous interplay of race and class and its impact on disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. The sample of juvenile probation officers has been drawn from a department of corrections for a county employer located in an urban community with the Midwestern United States. A total of 17 juvenile probation officers responded to the 24-item survey. Descriptive and inferential statistics were generated for the collected data. Chi-square analyses were generated to examine the associations between the levels of agreeableness for variables. The findings yielded minimal contributions to the current research due to the low amount of participants. However, despite the low amount of participants, there were two significant associations between variables. The findings had implications for practice, policies, and research in the fields of social work and corrections. The limitations to this current research encourage new research designs capturing greater participation rates while the strengths provide groundwork for future research capturing data regarding disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system.

### **Acknowledgements**

The past two years of graduate school have been some of the challenging times of my life, but I was fortunate to have several supportive individuals to help me overcome these challenging times. Firstly, I want to thank my supervisor from my first internship working in corrections. He taught me the value of professional use of self in a professional relationship with clients and colleagues. He also steered me in the direction to pursue a master's degree in social work. I thank him for opening new opportunities to grow as a scholar, professional, and person.

Secondly, I want to thank my supervisor from my clinical internship. I met her for the first time when my supervisor from my first internship set up an opportunity for me to network with my supervisor from my clinical internship. She discussed how a master's degree in social work provides several opportunities for professionals to strive for social justice. During my clinical internship, my supervisor helped me discover my own vulnerabilities as a professional and how I can build upon my vulnerabilities to become a more effective professional in the fields of social work and corrections. I also want to thank my coworkers in the unit from my clinical internship, providing excellent consultation and unconditional support. I also want to thank my colleagues at my place of employment for providing unconditional support as I pursued my master's degree in social work. They provided a healthy working environment where employees deliver meaningful services to their clients and families.

Fourthly, I want to thank my clinical chair member who has guided me since my first days in the master of social work program. She fosters supportive learning environments for students and challenges students to think critically and reflectively of

their work and how it impacts the field of social work. I also want to thank my committee members for their excellent consultation and unconditional support.

Fifthly, I want to thank my friends for their unconditional love and support as I pursued a master's degree in social work. Although I was busy balancing my education, internships, and job, my friends stood alongside me, encouraging me to pursue my dreams. Finally, I want to thank my family members for their unconditional love and support during the cheerful and stressful times for the past two years. They taught me how the values of hard work and dedication direct individuals to successful paths. I am fortunate to have family members who have guided me along a meaningful path.

Lastly, I want to thank everyone who I have forgotten to mention in this section. Several individuals have positively impacted my experiences as a student, professional, and as a person while I have been attending graduate school. As I mentioned earlier in this selection, graduate school has accompanied some challenging times, but these challenging times provide individuals with the opportunities to think critically and reflectively about their experiences and how these experiences will assist them as they forge as professionals in the field of social work.

**Table of Contents**

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| i.   | Introduction                                | 1  |
|      | a. Social Problem                           |    |
|      | b. Terminology                              |    |
|      | c. Scope and Prevalence                     |    |
|      | d. Significance and Impact                  |    |
|      | e. Relevance to Social Work                 |    |
| ii.  | Literature Review                           | 17 |
|      | a. Theoretical Approaches                   |    |
|      | b. Methodological Approaches                |    |
|      | c. Class and Racial Disparities             |    |
|      | d. Perceptions                              |    |
| iii. | Conceptual Framework                        | 29 |
|      | a. Theoretical Lens                         |    |
|      | b. Professional Lens                        |    |
|      | c. Personal Lens                            |    |
| iv.  | Methods                                     | 36 |
|      | a. Research Design                          |    |
|      | b. Sample                                   |    |
|      | c. Protection of Human Subjects             |    |
|      | i. Recruitment                              |    |
|      | ii. Confidentiality                         |    |
|      | iii. Informed Consent                       |    |
|      | d. Data Collection Instrument and Process   |    |
|      | e. Data Analysis Plan                       |    |
| v.   | Findings                                    | 41 |
|      | a. Descriptive Statistics                   |    |
|      | b. Inferential Statistics                   |    |
| vi.  | Discussion                                  | 66 |
|      | a. Interpretation of Descriptive Statistics |    |
|      | b. Interpretation of Inferential Statistics |    |

|       |  |     |
|-------|--|-----|
|       | c. Interpretation of Missing Data  |     |
|       | d. Implications for Practice   |     |
|       | e. Implications for Policy   |     |
|       | f. Implications for Research   |     |
|       | g. Strengths and Limitations   |     |
| vii.  | References   | 81  |
| viii. | Tables   |     |
|       | a. Table 1. DMC in the Adult Criminal Justice System                             | 7   |
|       | b. Table 2. DMC in the Juvenile Justice System                                   | 9   |
|       | c. Table 3. Variables  | 42  |
|       | d. Table 4. Years in Corrections   | 99  |
|       | e. Table 5. Gender Distribution  | 100 |
|       | f. Table 6. Highest Education Degree   | 101 |
|       | g. Table 7. Major of Highest Education Degree                                    | 102 |
|       | h. Table 8. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>My CDC</i>                 | 103 |
|       | i. Table 9. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i> |     |
|       | j. Table 10. Cross-Tabulation for <i>CF CDR</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                | 105 |
|       | k. Table 11. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My DR</i> and <i>My DC</i>                  | 56  |
|       | l. Table 12. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DC</i>  | 106 |
|       | m. Table 13. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDR</i>        | 107 |
|       | n. Table 14. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>CF CDR</i>                | 108 |
|       | o. Table 15. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i>        | 109 |
|       | p. Table 16. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                | 110 |
|       | q. Table 17. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DR</i>          | 111 |
|       | r. Table 18. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>My DR</i>                 | 65  |
| ix.   | Appendices   |     |
|       | a. Appendix A. Interview Questions   | 93  |
|       | b. Appendix B. Consent Form  | 99  |
|       | c. Appendix C. Survey Items  | 101 |
|       | d. Appendix D. Years in Corrections  | 99  |
|       | e. Appendix E. Gender Distribution   | 100 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| f. Appendix F. Highest Education Degree   | 101 |
| g. Appendix G. Major of Highest Education Degree                                    | 102 |
| h. Appendix H. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>My CDC</i>                 | 103 |
| i. Appendix I. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i> |     |
| j. Appendix J. Cross-Tabulation for <i>CF CDR</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                 | 105 |
| k. Appendix K. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DC</i>   |     |
| l. Appendix L. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDR</i>         | 107 |
| m. Appendix M. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>CF CDR</i>                 | 108 |
| n. Appendix N. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i>         | 109 |
| o. Appendix O. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                 | 110 |
| p. Appendix P. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DR</i>           | 111 |



**List of Tables**

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| i.     | Table 1. DMC in the Adult Criminal Justice System                             | 7   |
| ii.    | Table 2. DMC in the Juvenile Justice System                                   | 9   |
| iii.   | Table 3. Variables  | 42  |
| iv.    | Table 4. Years in Corrections   | 99  |
| v.     | Table 5. Gender Distribution  | 100 |
| vi.    | Table 6. Highest Education Degree   | 101 |
| vii.   | Table 7. Major of Highest Education Degree                                    | 102 |
| viii.  | Table 8. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>My CDC</i>                 | 103 |
| ix.    | Table 9. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i> | 104 |
| x.     | Table 10. Cross-Tabulation for <i>CF CDR</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                | 105 |
| xi.    | Table 11. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My DR</i> and <i>My DC</i>                  | 56  |
| xii.   | Table 12. Cross-Tabulation for <i>Colleagues DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DC</i>  | 106 |
| xiii.  | Table 13. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>Colleagues CDR</i>        | 107 |
| xiv.   | Table 14. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>CF CDR</i>                | 108 |
| xv.    | Table 15. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>Colleagues CDC</i>        | 109 |
| xvi.   | Table 16. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDC</i> and <i>CF CDC</i>                | 110 |
| xvii.  | Table 17. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My DR</i> and <i>Colleagues DR</i>          | 111 |
| xviii. | Table 18. Cross-Tabulation for <i>My CDR</i> and <i>My DR</i>                 | 65  |

**Social Problem**

The pervasiveness of disparities in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems has arguably been an issue in the United States since the beginning of American criminology (von Hentig, 1940; Lyon, 1915; Washington, 1912). In the criminal justice systems, disparities refer to the great differences amongst decisions impacting the welfare of clients. Since the U. S. has been considered the “melting pot” of the world, containing several people of different races and ethnicities as well as from different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, clients have been subject to the implied impartialness of criminal justice systems. The history of the criminal justice systems has been evident of class and racial disparities. Class disparities refer to the great differences in the way clients from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are processed compared to clients from higher socioeconomic backgrounds whereas racial disparities refer to the great differences in the way clients of color are processed compared to White clients.

**Terminology**

The following section will provide details on the terminology used throughout the clinical researcher proposal. For the purposes of this research, the juvenile justice system will refer to the system handling juvenile clients between the ages of 10 and 18 years of age and the adult criminal justice system will refer to the system handling adults over 18 years of age. When both the juvenile justice system and the adult criminal justice system are referred to together, they will be known as the criminal justice systems. In regards to the information provided by the U. S. Census Bureau (2010) and Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010), clients will be identified by their racial

demographics, including the races of White or European American, Black or African American, Asian American, Hmong American, or Southeastern Asian American, Native American, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic American. Although some statistics break down the Hispanic population from their identified race, the Hispanic population will be reported in this selection as well as the other races with different cultures. Whereas the Census Bureau (2010) distinguished Hispanic as an identifier of ethnicity rather than an identifier of race, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010) considered Hispanic as an identifier of ethnicity as well as race.

When these populations are represented in the criminal justice systems, they will be referred to as clients in this selection. In other words, individuals in the criminal justice systems will be referred to as clients no matter where they might be located throughout the entire criminal justice systems. For example, when individuals are apprehended by law enforcement agencies, they are known as arrestees; when individuals are processed into the detention centers, they are known as detainees or inmates; and when individuals are processed into prison, they are known as prisoners or residents. As evident at different points in the criminal justice systems, these individuals can be referred to as several different names. These individuals may accidentally fall under the universal identity of offender. However, individuals can only be given the identities of offenders only when they have been convicted of committing an offense. In this selection, these individuals involved in the criminal justice systems will be referred to as clients. The only exception in this selection where individuals are not referred to as clients is when the researcher differentiates probationers, parolees, and prisoners.

When discussions on disparities and discrimination appear in the selection, disparities will refer to the great differences in the covert processing of clients in the criminal justice systems whereas discrimination will refer to the overt, unjust, and prejudicial of people on the grounds of race or class. For the purposes of this research, racism and classism will be examined as the prejudice against or in favor of certain people. Racism is the prejudice against or in favor of certain races whereas classism is the prejudice against or in favor of certain people from socioeconomic classes (Holley and Van Vleet, 2006). The differences between the judicial terms of determine and indeterminate sentencing guidelines will be discussed later under the literature review.

### **Scope and Prevalence**

*Census.* By the end of 2009, an approximate total of 307 million people lived in the United States (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010). According to the U. S. Census Bureau (2010), approximately 80 % of the total population identified as White, 13 % as Black, five percent as Asian, and one percent as Native American while 16 % of the total population identified as Hispanic. An approximate total of 42 million people, which is approximately 14 % of the total population, fell between the ages of 10 and 19 years old; approximately 76 % of the total population between these ages identified as White, 16 % as Black, four percent as Asian, and one percent as Native American while approximately 19 % of the total population between these ages identified as Hispanic. Black and Hispanic juvenile clients were three times as likely to live in poverty than White juvenile clients (OJJDP, 2010). As the populations of juvenile and adult clients are compared to the census of the U. S. during the year of 2009, the following evidence supports the existence disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in the criminal justice

systems, subsequently connecting to the topic of disparities related to class and race and its significance and impact on the clients.

***Disproportionate Minority Contact.*** The following section is a discussion about the potential effects of disparities related to race and class in the criminal justice systems. Although information has not been compiled for disparities related to class for adult clients by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010), scholars should be aware how the socioeconomic status of clients impacts the processing through the criminal justice systems. The Bureau of Justice Statistics should strongly consider collecting data on the socioeconomic backgrounds of clients. The major effects of disparities are seen in the disproportionate amount of clients of color compared to White European Americans as well as in the disproportionate amount of clients of lower socioeconomic statuses compared to clients of higher socioeconomic statuses. In Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (P. L. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241, 1964), governing institutions are responsible for addressing the structural dimensions of race as well as the way in which government decisions perpetuate racial inequality. In Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (P. L. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241, 1964), governing institutions are responsible for remedying actions producing a disproportionate impact on racial minority groups. These provisions address the issue of disproportionate minority contact, which is a result of disparities in the criminal justice systems. The remainder of this section provides statistics on disproportionate minority contact (DMC), including juvenile and adult clients as probationers, parolees, and inmates in U. S. jurisdictions.

***Adult Criminal Justice System.*** In 2009, the U. S. had an approximate total of 4.9 million adults under community supervision, which includes clients on parole or

probation; the U. S. had an approximate total of 840,000 adults under parole and an approximate total of four million adults under probation (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010). Parole refers to the court's decision to release inmates early from prisons to serve time in the community under the supervision of parole officers. Probation refers to the court's decision to have clients serve time in the community under the supervision of probation officers in lieu of custody, including confinement at law enforcement centers, correctional facilities, or prisons. Approximately 55 % of the probationers were White, 30 % were Black, and 13 % were Hispanic or Latino, while the remaining two percent comprised Native Americans; approximately 42 % of parolees were White, 39 % were Black, and 18 % were Hispanic or Latino, while the remaining two percent comprised Native Americans (U. S. Department of Justice, 2010). Statistics were not compiled for the Asian American, Southeast Asian American, Hmong Asian American, Native American, or Pacific Islander adult clients due to their small populations in the adult criminal justice system. These statistics included parolees and probationers from county, state, and federal jurisdictions.

In 2009, the U. S. had an approximate total of 1.6 million adult prisoners under the jurisdiction of state and federal correctional authorities (Bureau of Statistics, 2010). According to the statistics provided by the U. S. Department of Justice (2010), approximately 31 % of the adult prisoners under the jurisdiction of state and federal correctional authorities were White, 36 % were Black, and 21 % were Hispanic or Latino. Statistics were not compiled for the Asian American, Southeast Asian American, Hmong Asian American, Native American, or Pacific Islander adult clients due to their small populations in the adult criminal justice system. These statistics

included adult clients under the custody of county, state, or federal jurisdictions. Table 1 presents evidence of DMC in the adult criminal justice system.

**Table 1*****Disproportionate Minority Contact In the Adult Criminal Justice System in 2009***

| Race <sup>a</sup>     | Population % <sup>b</sup> | Probationer % <sup>c</sup> | Parolee % <sup>d</sup> | Prisoner % <sup>e</sup> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| White <sup>f</sup>    | 80 %                      | 55 %                       | 42 %                   | 31 %                    |
| Black <sup>g</sup>    | 13 %                      | 30 %                       | 39 %                   | 36 %                    |
| Asian <sup>h</sup>    | 5 %                       | N/R                        | N/R                    | N/R                     |
| Native <sup>i</sup>   | 1 %                       | 2 %                        | 2 %                    | N/R                     |
| Hispanic <sup>j</sup> | 16 %                      | 13 %                       | 18 %                   | 21 %                    |

**Note.** The table presents the disproportionate minority contact in the adult criminal justice system with regards to the percentages of probationers of color, parolees of color, and prisoners of color. The total population of the U. S. includes individuals from all ages. N/R = not reported.

<sup>a</sup> The table presents the racial demographic of individuals (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010).

<sup>b</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. population by the racial demographic. An approximate total of 307 million people lived in the U. S. (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010). The population of adults over the age of 18 was not reported in the 2010 U. S. Census.

<sup>c</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. probationer population by racial demographics. An approximate total of 4 million adults were probationers (U. S. Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>d</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. parolee population by racial demographics. An approximate total of 840,000 adults were parolees (U. S. Census Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>e</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. prisoner population by racial demographics. An approximate total of 1.6 million adults were prisoners (U. S. Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>f</sup> White is equivalent to White European American.

<sup>g</sup> Black is equivalent to African American.

<sup>h</sup> Asian also refers to Asian American, Southeast Asian American, or Hmong Asian American.

<sup>i</sup> Native American also refer to Alaskan Native American or Pacific Islander American.

<sup>j</sup> Hispanic persons also refer to Latino persons. For the purposes of this research, Hispanic persons are referred under a classification of racial demographics instead of ethnic demographics, so Hispanic persons may comprise individuals of different races.



*Juvenile Justice System.* In 2009, the U. S. had an approximate total of 71 thousand juvenile clients in residential placements (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency (OJJDP), 2010). According to the statistics provided by the OJJDP (2010), approximately 32 % of the juvenile clients in residential placements were White, 41 % were Black, and 22 % were Hispanic. Out of the approximate 1.5 million delinquency cases handled by juvenile courts in 2009, 64 % of the juvenile clients were White and 34 % were Black. Out of the approximate 1.02 million delinquency cases receiving a juvenile court sanction in 2009, 53 % resulted in probation. Out of the approximate 53 % resulting in probation, 64 % of the juvenile clients were White and 32 % were Black. Contrary to the lack of information from Bureau of Statistics (2010) on Asian, Southeast Asian, Hmong Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander adult clients in the adult criminal justice system, the OJJDP found approximately between two and four percent of the juvenile clients in the juvenile justice system comprised Asian Americans, Southeast Asian Americans, and Hmong Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Pacific Islanders, which are very small percentages compared to the rest of the racial identities in the juvenile justice system. Table 2 presents evidence of DMC in the juvenile justice system.

**Table 2*****Disproportionate Minority Contact In the Juvenile Justice System in 2009***

| Race <sup>a</sup>     | Population % <sup>b</sup> | Delinquent % <sup>c</sup> | Probationer % <sup>d</sup> | Resident % <sup>e</sup> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| White <sup>f</sup>    | 76 %                      | 64 %                      | 64 %                       | 32 %                    |
| Black <sup>g</sup>    | 16 %                      | 34 %                      | 32 %                       | 41 %                    |
| Asian <sup>h</sup>    | 4 %                       | N/R                       | N/R                        | N/R                     |
| Native <sup>i</sup>   | 1 %                       | N/R                       | N/R                        | N/R                     |
| Hispanic <sup>j</sup> | 19 %                      | N/A                       | N/R                        | 22 %                    |

**Note.** The table presents the disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system with regards to the percentages of delinquent cases involving youth of color, probationers of color, and residents of color. The total population of persons between the ages of 10 and 19 years in the United States is 42 million, which is 14 % of the total population. Residential placements may require juvenile clients to be certain ages. N/R = not reported.

<sup>a</sup> The table presents the racial demographic of individuals (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010).

<sup>b</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. population between the ages of 10 and 19 years of age by the racial demographic. An approximate total of 42 million people between the ages of 10 and 19 lived in the U. S. (U. S. Census Bureau, 2010).

<sup>c</sup> The table presents the percentages of delinquent cases involving youth between the ages of 10 and 19 years by racial demographics. An approximate total of 1.5 million delinquent cases involving youth were handled in the juvenile justice system (U. S. Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>d</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. probationer population by racial demographics. An approximate total of 541 thousand juveniles between the ages of 10 and 19 years of age were probationers in the juvenile justice system (U. S. Census Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>e</sup> The table presents the percentages of the U. S. resident population by racial demographics. An approximate total of 71 thousand juvenile clients between the ages of 10 and 19 years of age were ordered to residential placements (U. S. Bureau of Statistics, 2010).

<sup>f</sup> White is equivalent to White European American.

<sup>g</sup> Black is equivalent to African American.

<sup>h</sup> Asian also refers to Asian American, Southeast Asian American, or Hmong Asian American.

<sup>i</sup> Native American also refer to Alaskan Native American or Pacific Islander American.

<sup>j</sup> Hispanic persons also refer to Latino persons. For the purposes of this research, Hispanic persons are referred under a classification of racial demographics instead of ethnic demographics, so Hispanic persons may comprise individuals of different races.

**Significance and Impact**

*Law Enforcement.* A number of researchers have discussed the injustice of disparities in the criminal justice systems. Keen and Jacobs (2009) discussed alternative outcomes in the adult criminal justice system and positive relationships between racial minority presence and punitive outcomes. They found an inverted, U-shaped, non-linear relationship between African American presence and racial disparities in imprisonments (2009), meaning as the population of imprisoned African Americans increased, racial disparities in incarceration became more prevalent until the population of imprisoned African Americans reached a certain peak. After the population of imprisoned African Americans reached a certain peak, racial disparities in incarceration became less prevalent. Several researchers have discussed the injustice of disparities in the adult criminal justice system regarding clients' contacts with law enforcement agencies (Austin & Allen, 2000; Kupferberg, 2008; Mosher, Pickerill, Pratt, & Lovrich, 2008; Ousey & Lee, 2010; Ousey & Lee, 2008; Pickerill, Mosher, & Pratt, 2009; Smith, Visher, & Davidson, 1984; Tomaskovic-Devey, Wright, Czaja, & Miller, 2006; Warren, Tomaskovic-Devey, Smith, Zingraff, & Mason, 2006). Some researchers found little evidence of racism toward clients after controlling for legal variables (Pickerill, Mosher, & Pratt, 2009; Mosher, Pickerill, Pratt, & Lovrich, 2008; Ousey & Lee, 2012; Smith, Visher, & Davidson, 1984; Warren, Tomaskovic-Devey, Smith, Zingraff, & Mason, 2006). However, Ousey and Lee (2010) found mixed support for their hypotheses about how policies influence law enforcements' responsibility to apprehend clients and its subsequent impact on clients of color whereas Austin and Allen (2012) found more reliability for racial discrimination in one state's adult criminal justice

system. Although more researchers found little evidence of disparities in their studies, these researchers continue noting the importance of racial demographic features of the clients, so they can be aware of potential disparities and its impact on clients in the criminal justice systems.

*Processing for Drug Offenses.* Helms and Costanza (2010), Golub, Johnson, and Dunlap (2007), Beckett, Nyrop, Pfingst, and Bowen (2005), and Beckett, Nyrop, and Pfingst (2006) studied disparities regarding the processing of clients committing drug offences. Helms and Costanza (2010) found punishments for African American clients in drug-related cases varied by social and political context; if African American clients were convicted in jurisdictions with a large Black population, they received reduced punishments whereas if African American clients were convicted in jurisdictions where strong political support toward law existed, African American clients received harsher punishments. In the same regards to treatment in the adult criminal justice system, Black and Hispanic clients were more likely than White clients to be placed in detention prior to their court appearances (Golub, Johnson, and Dunlap, 2007). Beckett, Nyrop, Pfingst, & Bowen (2005) found similar results for the treatment of racial minority clients compared to White clients; they found racial disparity among drug offenses was largely due to law enforcement's focus on Black and Latino clients using crack cocaine when their findings indicated Black and Latinos were "overrepresented among those arrested for drug possession compared with variety of measures of drug use" (p. 436). A year later Beckett, Nyrop, and Pfingst (2006) confirmed their findings from their previous research, indicating race shapes perceptions regarding the way to respond to drug problems. They suggested disparities

appear to be the result of three main organizational factors: (1) the focus on crack offenders, (2) the differences between outdoor and indoor drug activity, and (3) the geographic concentration of law enforcement resources (Beckett, Nyrop, & Pfingst, 2006).

*Sentencing for Drug Offenses.* Steen, Engen, and Gainey (2005) and Hebert (1997) expanded the discussion regarding the processing of clients committing drug offenses by examining the sentencing guidelines to drug offenses. These researchers found similar findings in their studies. Steen, Engen, and Gainey (2005) wanted to explore the idea about how professionals in the field of criminal justice distinguish among felony drug clients, “referring to an array of legal and extra legal variables indicative of dangerousness and blameworthiness” (p. 460). Black clients who resembled the stereotype of a dangerous drug clients received harsher punishments than White clients (Steen, Engen, & Gainey, 2005). Additionally, Black clients who resembled the stereotype of the least dangerous drug client received less harsh punishments than Black clients who resembled the stereotype of a dangerous drug client (Steen, Engen, & Gainey, 2005). Herbert (1997) decided to examine the sentence outcomes of Hispanic and Black clients compared to White clients; after controlling for legal and socioeconomic factors, it was found that Black and Hispanic clients were sentenced more harshly than White clients (Herbert, 1997).

*Pretrial and Presentence for Offenses.* A few researchers have studied the impact of race on the decisions from pretrial and presentencing court hearings for a variety of offenses, excluding capital offenses (Demuth, 2003; Free, 2002; Freiburger, Marcum, & Pierce, 2010). Consistent with the findings from Steen, Engen, and Gainey

(2005), Demuth (2003) and Freiburger, Marcum, and Pierce (2010) suggested Hispanic and Black clients were viewed as more dangerous and blameworthy than White clients, respectively. Demuth (2003) and Freiburger, Marcum, and Pierce (2010) found race had a significant impact on the decision to release clients under their own recognizance, meaning the decision to release clients under the condition to function safely in the community without further criminal involvement, but no significant impact on the decision of bail amount. Additionally, Black clients were less likely to receive release status (Freiburger, Marcum, & Pierce, 2010). Whereas Freiburger, Marcum, and Price (2010) suggested Black clients viewed as more dangerous and blameworthy, Demuth (2010) found Hispanic clients subjected to harsher punishments than Black and White clients. Despite reported shortcomings of his research, Free (2002) suggested researchers continue examining effects of race on the processing of clients because they may result in disparities.

*Sentencing Clients.* Whereas the previously mentioned researchers studied the impact of race on the decision from pretrial and presentencing court hearings for a variety of offenses, Bushway and Piehl (2001), Johnson (2003), Kautt and Delone (2006), McCoy (1997), Mustard (2001), Schlesinger (2011), and Spohn (1990) extend the research studying the impact of race on the decision from sentencing court hearings for a variety of offenses. Congruent with the Steen, Engen, Gainey (2005), Demuth (2003) and Freiburger, Marcum, and Pierce (2010), Johnson (2003) suggested racial minority clients were viewed as more dangerous and blameworthy than White clients. Johnson (2003) found differences in the effects of both legal and extralegal variables, including race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class, across modes of conviction, including plea

bargains where clients and their defense attorneys negotiate a deal with the prosecuting attorneys, and trials where clients face twelve of their peers who determine the verdict or make the decision whether the clients are guilty or innocent of their alleged offenses. Although Kautt and Delone (2006) found mixed support for their hypothesis regarding extralegal factors, including race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class, having effect on sentencing outcomes, they recognize how disparities may be presented in the sentencing guidelines of court jurisdictions, thus suggesting the existence of disparities within the structure of criminal justice policies, which is congruent with the suggestions from Schlesinger (2011) regarding the impact of policies and practices on the outcome of racial minority clients. After controlling for legal and extralegal factors, Bushway and Piehl (2001) and Mustard (2001) found similar results for African American clients who received longer sentences than White clients for the same offenses, thus suggesting disparities in the sentencing court hearings. Mustard (2001) and McCoy (1997) further reported differences in the sentences between clients from higher and lower socioeconomic backgrounds, purporting clients from lower socioeconomic backgrounds received longer sentences, hinting the cumulative impact of racial and socioeconomic demographics on the outcome of racial minority clients.

As evident from the preceding information on the impact of race regarding clients' contact with law enforcement and courts, disparities related to race and class appear to have a major impact and significance on the welfare of clients in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. These disparities, related to class and race, are problems in the field of social work because they reveal the injustice against clients of color and clients from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. The criminal justice

systems in the U. S. promote equitable and impartial justice, but clients, especially those of color and those from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, have been treated less equally than others.

### **Relevance to Social Work**

The following section is a discussion on the relevance of class and racial disparities as a problem in the field of corrections and social work. Professionals in the field of corrections and social work need to address disparities because its pervasiveness creates injustice for clients, especially those of color and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Depending on their socioeconomic status, clients may not have access to alternatives, minimizing the degree of supervision in county, state, and federal jurisdictions. Professionals need to be aware about the ethical implications of disparities on the welfare of clients. The *Code of Ethics* (National Association of Social Workers (NASW), 2008) will be referenced in the discussion on the relevance of disparities as a problem to the field of social work.

The *Code of Ethics* (NASW, 2008) aspires social workers to follow the broad ethical principles of service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence. In regards to the ethical principle of service, professional in the field of corrections and social work address social problems by utilizing their professional skills without the expectation of personal gain. In other words, professionals need to provide fair and equitable services to their clients traversing the criminal justice systems. In regards to the ethical principle of social justice, professionals challenge injustice on behalf of the vulnerable and oppressed populations, including clients of color and those from lower socioeconomic



backgrounds. As professionals work with clients, they treat their clients with the upmost respect while being mindful of their clients' cultural and ethnic diversity. Professionals understand the importance of their relational skills as a vehicle for social justice. Their ability to strengthen relationships between clients and stakeholders in the criminal justice systems will have major impact on the way in which disparities will be addressed and on the way in which clients of color and those from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds will be treated fairly and equitably. Professionals behave in a manner where integrity is preserved in their work with clients, meaning professionals act in a manner consistent with honesty and trustworthiness. Lastly, professionals display competence on the problem of disparities in the criminal justice systems. In accordance to *Code of Ethics* (NASW, 2008), the purpose of the following selection is to further examine disparities related to class and race in the juvenile justice system.

### **Literature Review**

For the purposes of this selection, the review of the literature will exclude examinations of specific offenses and specific decision points relating to disparities in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. In other words, this discussion will exclude a review of the literature on specific offenses related to disparities as well as a review of the literature on specific decision points where professionals, including those from law enforcement, corrections, attorney's office, and court, impact the welfare of clients based on racism and classism. The following section will be a review of the theories explaining the phenomenon of disparities, methodologies gathering information to explain the phenomenon of disparities, and literature on disparities related to class and race as well as the perceptions regarding disparities in the criminal justice systems. Firstly, the following section will be a review of the theories explaining the phenomenon of disparities. Some of the theoretical approaches are punishment theory, stratification theories, power threat theory, normative theories, and structural-processual theories. Secondly, the following section will be a review of the methodological approaches, which previous researchers have used in their studies to gather information, explaining the phenomenon of disparities. Some of the methodological approaches are methodologies where researchers utilize the positions of law enforcement officers, prosecuting attorneys, and policy-makers as participants. Some more methodologies are methodologies where researchers utilize collected data from law enforcement agencies and corrections departments, results of decisions made at certain points in the criminal justice systems, and perceptions of clients and personnel in the criminal justice systems. Lastly, the following section will be a review of the literature on disparities related to

class and race as well as the perceptions regarding disparities in the criminal justice systems. These three reviews provide groundwork for the conceptual framework and methods of the current research.

### **Theoretical Approaches**

***Punishment Theory.*** The following section reviews theories explaining the phenomenon of disparities. Tonry (2005) proposes the need for the development of new development frameworks speaking to the contemporary issues of disparities rather than issues of disparities dating back to the 1970s. Since the 1970s, policy makers responsible for the direction of corrections have been complacent with punishment theory, which is the idea of “determinate sentencing, promoting equality, consistency, evenhandedness, procedural fairness, and moral autonomy” (2005, p. 1241), rather than indeterminate sentencing, which is the idea of retribution. A determinate sentence refers to the strict adherence of guidelines established by the court to impose upon clients who have been convicted of a crime. An indeterminate sentence refers to the loose adherence of guidelines established by the court to impose upon clients who have been convicted of a crime. Given the heightened awareness of disparities in the criminal justice system, stakeholders decided to address disparities by creating uniform sentencing guidelines, promoting fair and equitable justice for all clients awaiting convictions and dispositions.

***Stratification Theories.*** Hindelang (1978), Kleck (1981), Peterson and Hagan (1984) utilize stratification theories, describing punishment as an “institutional mechanism used by dominant social classes to control and regulate population” (Bridges & Crutchfield, 1988, p. 700) threatening political or economic supremacy and attributing disparities in imprisonment to “differences in the legal system’s treatment of

white and minority defendants” (1988, p. 700). According to stratification theories, dominant social classes impose controls limiting access to economic and political prosperity to the disadvantaged social classes. Racial minority populations, especially Blacks, experience racial biases in the legal process, leading to minimal opportunities to alternatives granting greater freedom or leading to minimal opportunities limiting their times under the custody of the criminal justice systems. A popular version of stratification theory will be discussed next in the literature review of theories explaining the phenomenon of disparities.

***Power Threat Theory.*** Hubert Blalock’s (1967) power threat theory provided context to explain subtle attempts to effect social control over racial minority groups via disparate treatment, manifesting longer prison sentences. The power threat theory is a macro-level theory proposing majority population imposing punitive sanctions on its racial minority citizens when it believes “the minority has evolved into a threat to the existing social order” (Bodapati, Anderson, & Brinson, 2008, p. 115). The power threat theory is considered one of theories pertaining to conflict between people from different social classes (Barth & Noel, 1972; Blalock, 1957, 1967; Brown & Fuguitt, 1972; Frisbie & Neidert, 1976), focusing on the degree of racial minority threat to the political supremacy of whites as a primary cause of racial discrimination in the legal process.

***Normative Theories.*** In contrast to stratification theories, Hindelang (1978), Kleck (1981), and Peterson and Hagan (1984) utilize normative theories, attributing variation in disparity to the differences in criminal involvement between Blacks and whites, reasoning punishments are imposed “only in reaction to criminal acts” (Bridges & Crutchfield, 1988, p. 700) and high racial minority imprisonment rates are “due to

disproportionate minority involvement” (1988, p. 700) in serious and violent crime. According to normative theories, racial disparities in imprisonment occur due to the frequency of racial minority males, particularly Black males, committing more serious crimes than members of other racial groups (Blumstein, 1982; Hindelang, 1978; Langan, 1985). In other words, normative theories help explain the prevalence of racial minority populations, especially Blacks, involved in committing serious and violent offenses.

*Structural-Processual Theories.* One of the approaches to the problem of racial disparities in the criminal justice systems contends disparity is linked to the structure of the decision-making process (Engen, Steen, & Bridges, 2002). The use of structural-processual theories assist in the conception of criminal justice systems as comprising a series of decision points, beginning with apprehension by law enforcement and ending with decisions made by the courts to commitments at institutions. Several authors understand disparities as a cumulative effect of bias operating at multiple point in the legal process (Hill, Harris, & Miller, 1985; Liska & Tausig, 1979; McCarthy & Smith, 1986). Another argument resonating with structural theories is the effect of status characteristics varying across states of the legal process, suggesting two views on the degree of discrimination. Some researchers argue the likelihood of discrimination increases as clients move further into the system (McCarthy & Smith, 1986) whereas others contend the likelihood of discrimination decreases (Hill, Harris, & Miller, 1985).

The preceding section provides a discussion on the theoretical approaches explaining the phenomenon of disparities in the criminal justice systems. Some of the themes resonating in the discussion include the differential treatment of clients from

socioeconomic and racial backgrounds other than white middle class in the legal process, the ways in which clients are punished for their crimes depending legal and extra-legal factors, the frequency of serious and violent offenses committed by certain populations, and the approaches in which to understand the power of the policies impacting the welfare of clients in the criminal justice systems. The next session will provide a discussion on the ways in which information is gathered and analyzed by researchers to explain the phenomenon of disparities in the criminal justice systems.

### **Methodological Approaches**

For the purposes of this selection, more emphasis will be placed on methodologies requiring data from human participants rather than methodologies strictly reviewing the context and nature of disparities related to class and race in the criminal justice systems. Before the discussion on methodologies requiring data from human participants, methodological approaches attempting to review the context and nature regarding disparities will be reviewed.

*Law Enforcement.* Coker (2003) addressed the nature of criminal law enforcement by describing some evidence demonstrating unjust and unequal treatment in the adult criminal justice system of racial minority populations, describing the Supreme Court's response to "claims of selective prosecution" (p. 829), claiming prosecutors requested tougher punishments for minorities due to their race, discussing rationale for race disparities in federal drug enforcement arrests and incarceration, and examining the "potential for change in the racial operation of the criminal justice system" (p. 830).

***Prosecutors.*** Whereas Coker (2003) addressed the nature of criminal law enforcement, Davis (2007) discussed developing efforts to involve prosecutors in the elimination of racial disparities in the criminal justice systems by discussing how prosecutors “unintentionally contribute to disparities through the arbitrary, unsystematic exercise of discretion” (p. 205), recognizing the unawareness of discretion contributing to disparities, arguing the U. S. Supreme Court fails to provide an “effective legal remedy for victims of race-based selective prosecution” (p. 205), and endorsing the use of “racial impact studies and task forces” (p. 205) as well as discussing a model reform effort. Coker (2003) and Davis (2007) recognized the roles of law enforcement and prosecutors and their potential impacts on disparities related to race and class.

***Policy Makers.*** Policy makers may influence the decisions made by law enforcement officers and prosecutors. Depending on the time in history, certain theories may explain the ways in which policies influenced decisions impacting the welfare of clients in the criminal justice systems. Tonry (2005) introduced an analytical framework for thinking about changes in punishment norms and policies, suggesting refinement with penal theories and philosophies, explaining the way in which policies influenced decisions impacting the welfare of clients.

***Decision Points.*** Given the impact of the decisions from law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and policy makers contributing to disparities related to class and race, which was previously discussed earlier in this section, scholars recognized the impact of decisions from other professionals involved in the welfare of clients in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. Crutchfield, Fernandes, and Martinez (2010) examined the contemporary practices in the juvenile and adult criminal justice

systems, contributing to the disparities related to race and class at various decision points in the legal process, including police contacts, arrests, referrals, intake decisions, pretrial detention, petitions and waivers, adjudication and disposition in the juvenile justice system as well as traffic stops, arrests, pretrial processing, trial and pleas, and sentencing decisions in the adult criminal justice system.

Several scholars have discussed the ramifications of disparities at multiple decision points, including the disproportionate amount of racial minority clients in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. Johnson (2007) examined a method to address the practices exacerbating racial injustice, which known as the disproportionate minority contact (DMC) standard pursuant to the Title VI and Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Johnson (2007) suggests these approaches addressing disparities manifest new civil rights movements. As evident in this section, scholars utilized multiple methods, reviewing the context and nature of disparities, including the way in which important stakeholders impact the welfare of clients at various decision points in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. Stakeholders and decision points have been discussed in research requiring data from human participants. The remainder of the section discusses methodological approaches requiring data from human participants.

***Data Sets.*** Several researchers utilized different samples as well as different analytical approaches to examine disparities for their studies. A number of researchers utilized data sets collected by state corrections departments and law enforcement agencies to examine the racial and socioeconomic demographics of clients, statistics on apprehension, characteristics of laws, and the administration of justice. Whereas



Bridges and Crutchfield (1988) and Warren and Tomaskovic-Devey (2009) utilize multiple regression techniques to investigate data related to class and racial disparities, Steffensmeier, Feldmeyer, Harris, and Ulmer (2011) utilize a time series technique to analyze the racial demographic variables of arrestees.

*Cases.* Several researchers utilized logistic regression models and multivariate linear regression analyses to study racial and socioeconomic demographics of juvenile and adult clients (Bodapati, Anderson, & Brinson, 2008; Kurtz, 2008; Leiber & Jamieson, 1995; MacDonald, 2003). Mitchell (2005) utilized a meta-analysis to synthesize the narrative reviews of cases with outcomes from sentence hearings in court. These scholars investigated the extra-legal factors relating to disparities in the criminal justice system.

*Perceptions.* A number of researchers utilized multivariate analyses, multi-level logistic regression models, and multi-level modeling techniques to examine the perceptions of the public on disparities in the criminal justice systems (Johnson, Stewart, Pickett, & Gertz, 2011; Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, & Simons, 2009; Weitzer, 2000). A few researchers utilized multi-level logistic regression models and analyses of interviews to explore the perceptions of juvenile clients and court personal in the juvenile justice system (Leiber, Woodrick, & Roudebush, 1995; Holley & Van Vleet, 2006). The exploration of perceptions via these methodologies afforded opportunities for these researchers to capture contextual information regarding disparities.

### **Class and Racial Disparities**

The remainder of the section reviews the findings and discussions from the literature on class and racial disparities as well as perceptions regarding disparities in

the criminal justice systems. Bridges and Crutchfield (1988) found four important findings in their research on disparity:

- (1) There existed substantial variation across states in racial disparity in imprisonment;
- (2) state laws and legal policies had no differential influence on Black and white imprisonment rates and little direct influence on imprisonment disparity;
- (3) social characteristics of states contributed significantly to racial disparity in imprisonment; and
- (4) disparities were directly associated with the degree of urban concentration of Blacks and to a lesser extent, Black/white economic inequality.

Bridges and Crutchfield (1988) suggested their findings “underscore the importance of social standing in understanding disparities in imprisonment” (p. 718). In other words, Black clients were more likely than White clients to be imprisoned in states where the Black population is a small percentage of the total population and predominately urban.

Contrary to the claim indicating state laws and legal policies having no differential influence on Black and White imprisonment rates and little direct influence on imprisonment disparity (Bridges & Crutchfield, 1988), Mitchell (2005) suggested policy-makers to reevaluate the racial neutrality of sentencing practices. Laws and legal policies place emphasis on the control of people to act civilly in the community and professionals to act ethically at their jobs as clients traverse the criminal justice systems. Warren and Tomaskovic-Devey (2009) suggested social and political environment can significantly influence officer and organizational practices.

Depending on the laws and legal policies issued by the federal and state governments, law enforcement agencies have to be mindful of their powers as they process individuals into the criminal justice systems. As changes happened in the social and political environments during the period between 1980 and 2008, Steffensmeier, Feldmeyer, Harris, and Ulmer (2011) found “considerable fluctuation in racial disparities in violent crime” (p. 233) with little overall change in the race-violence relationship, contradicting the strong claim of worsening disproportionate amounts of minorities in prisons relative to their arrest levels during the past 20 to 30 years.

Over the years, changes in the social and political environments potentially welcome new ideas regarding the practices in the legal system, impacting professionals working with clients and clients navigating the criminal justice systems. Whereas a number of researchers recognized the social and political environments evidencing impacts on the practices in the legal system, several researchers examined the perceptions of clients, professionals, and community members regarding the existence of disparities in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. The next section provides a discussion on the perceptions of individuals regarding disparities.

### **Perceptions**

In light of the power threat theory (Blalock, 1957, 1967), Johnson, Stewart, Pickett, and Gertz (2011) suggested rapidly changing ethnic populations reinforce individuals perceiving greater threats to the economic resources while supporting “judicial use of offender ethnicity in sentencing” (p. 429). These reflections of culture and structural relations in society perpetuate systems of social inequality in the criminal justice systems (Garland, 1990). Bonilla-Silva (2006) suggested these reflections serve

as a new form of racism where more individuals are indirect, subtle, covert, and institutional, alluding to law and legal policies perpetuating systems of inequality. The subtleties and indirectness highlighted the cumulative influence of race, the attitudes of decision makers, and structural contexts on the outcomes of court cases (Zatz, 1987).

Leiber and Jamieson (1995) postulated decision-making is “conditioned by a complex interplay between socioeconomic structure and adherence to stereotypical beliefs by juvenile court personal” (p. 381), which is partially consistent with the findings from Holley and Van Vleet (2006), suggesting the presence of bias due to the attitudes and behaviors of professionals. However, Holley and Van Vleet (2006) extendedly noted the presence of bias due to the characteristics and behaviors of colored juvenile clients rather than system policies and practices on the attitudes and behaviors of professionals, invoking the classism and racism.

In the urban neighborhoods with residents from racial minority populations, Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, and Simons (2009) as well as Weitzer (2000) found evidence of racism and classism. Weitzer (2000) postulated the socioeconomic position of communities comprising racial minority populations produce some difference in structuring perceptions of residents regarding classism and racism, lending support to Wilson’s (1978) argument, briefly indicating class inequality rather than racial discrimination as the key factor structuring the experiences of racial minority populations “with social institutions and their worldviews” (Weitzer, 2000, p. 152).

Whereas the findings from Weitzer (2000) reflected variation in neighborhood experiences with racial discrimination, the findings from Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, and Simons (2009) reflected the variation in adolescent perceptions with racial

discrimination. Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, and Simons (2009) recognized significantly higher levels of perceived police-based racial discrimination in predominately White neighborhoods experiencing Black population growth and in neighborhoods with higher levels of affluence as well as higher rates of violence. The previous sections on theoretical and methodological approaches, detailing the review on disparities in the criminal justice systems, provide the groundwork for the current research. The next sections propose a conceptual framework from the conflict perspective (Holley and Van Vleet, 2006) to examine the perceptions of probation officers.

## **Conceptual Framework**

### **Theoretical Lens**

This researcher will use the conceptual framework of intersectionality to understand the perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system. The conceptual framework of intersectionality is the analytic technique of simultaneous interplay between race, class, gender, and sexuality (Collins, 1990; Crenshaw, 1989) to understand the “dynamics of privilege, or unearned advantage, as well as discrimination and oppression” (Hutchinson, 2011, p. 44). The challenges of racism and classism threaten access to equal opportunities and social justice (Samuels & Ross-Sheriff, 2008). For the purposes of this research, this researcher will specifically focus on the simultaneous interplay of race and class to understand the perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system. An intersectional analysis is a technique where researchers attempt to understand the depth of human experiences within complex social contexts (Crenshaw, 1989). Crenshaw (1989) distinguishes structural and political intersectional analyses. Structural intersectional analysis identifies forms of oppression and domination within a society whereas political intersectional analysis focuses on policies produced by dominant groups. According to Stewart and McDermott (2004), three tenets exist for intersectionality:

- (1) No social group is homogenous;
- (2) people must be located in terms of social structures, capturing the power relations implied by those structures; and
- (3)

there are unique, non-additive effects of identifying with more than one social group.

Social workers have used principles and tenets of intersectionality to develop empowerment theories, which focus on processes, recognizing patterns of inequality and injustice, and taking action to increase power of underprivileged individuals (Hutchinson, 2011). Social workers have been influenced by feminist theories, which focuses on male domination of the major social institutions and presents “a vision of a just world based on equity” (Hutchinson, 2011, p. 44). These two theories are important to the conceptual framework of intersectionality because they implicitly highlight the importance of people’s experiences within complex social contexts (Crenshaw, 1989). As this researcher examines the perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system, he will pay close attention to the interplay of class and race as well as the complex social contexts surrounding individuals as they encounter oppression and discrimination.

### **Professional Lens**

This researcher attempts to provide context for the use of intersectionality understanding the interaction of race and class and its association with disparities in the juvenile justice system. For the last three years, this researcher has been working in the field of corrections with a county employer located in the Midwestern United States. The county employer provides services for a diverse ethnic and racial population with individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Although this researcher has had experience working with clients in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems,

his responsibilities have changed throughout his employment with the county employer. Firstly, this researcher started as an unpaid intern studying trends in the juvenile justice system for a national initiative promoting alternatives to detention. The initiative highlighted individuals' experience entering the juvenile justice system; as long as professionals in the field of corrections found alternatives to detentions, juveniles may be diverted from moving further into the juvenile justice system. In this internship, this researcher learned about the effectiveness of alternatives to detention as well as risk factors plaguing youth's involvement in criminal activity and decision-making points potentially having impact on disparities in the juvenile justice system. However, this does not mean perceptions of other professionals in the field of corrections around disparities are consistent with the literature.

This researcher accepted another unpaid internship where he worked directly with low- to medium-risk clients in adult probation. As this researcher oriented new clients into probation and monitored their conditions of probation, he noticed patterns in the demographics of clients, including their race, class, and gender, as well as their committed offenses. For the last two years, this researcher has been working as a paid employee for the same county employer, working with juvenile delinquents who have been sentenced to the county's juvenile treatment center. Additionally, this researcher worked with juvenile clients who allegedly committed offenses in the county's juvenile detention center for a brief period of time. As part of his education program, this researcher has been interning in a mental health unit at the adult correctional facility for the same county employer. So far his experience as a mental health intern has taught him to be attuned to the life experiences of individuals; common themes arising from



individual and group sessions include clients grieving over losses or experiencing differential levels of trauma. Through his conversations with several colleagues over the years as a professional in the field of corrections, his colleagues encouraged him to look beyond the disproportion of minorities in the criminal justice systems; they encouraged him to be aware of the socioeconomic conditions contributing to clients' involvement in the criminal justice system. Overall, this researcher's professional experience has afforded him opportunities to work with colleagues who have positively impacted his professional development. This researcher's colleagues and instructors have sparked his interest in examining disparities in the juvenile justice system.

### **Personal Lens**

In this section, this researcher will discuss his identity as a young White European American adult male graduate student, coming from a middle-class family and residing in a suburban town with low ethnic and racial diversity located in the Midwestern United States. Based on the researcher's socioeconomic status and racial identity, it is important to understand the significance of this researcher's decision to use intersectionality as a way to explain the phenomenon of disparities related to class and race in the juvenile justice system. These two demographic variables, socioeconomic status and racial identity, were considerably noticeable variables as this researcher has worked with clients in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems, prompting this researcher to use the conceptual framework of intersectionality, mainly examining the intersection of class and race. This researcher will also discuss his experiences as he conducted research on perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system. His identification has partially

shaped the way he perceives his life experiences. As this researcher transitioned from high school to college, he encountered more people from diverse cultural backgrounds as well as from socioeconomic backgrounds although he never experienced working in racially diverse environments, including with colleagues and clients from different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds, until he entered the field of corrections. In his graduate program, his instructors encourage students to reflect upon their self-awareness, including areas where perceptions influence the way we deliver social work services to our clients as well as the way our clients perceive social workers as we deliver social work services. Although many people have told him that he would not be able to understand the experiences of clients in the criminal justice systems due to his identity as a White middle-class male, he says he is willing to listen to their experiences, so he can empower individuals as they face challenges by the criminal justice system.

As this researcher was conducting his current research, he sought advice from his colleagues, committee chair, and committee members. In one of his graduate courses addressing policy and practice, his instructor invited a guest speaker from a sociology department from a college located within an urban city of the Midwestern United States to discuss the topic of mass incarceration of minorities in the United States as well as disparities pervading the criminal justice systems. After the guest's presentation, this researcher approached his instructor who is now his clinical chair to see whether he could contact the guest speaker to discuss potential topics around disparities in the criminal justice systems for the clinical research project. When he connected with the guest speaker who is now one of my committee members, she

provided him with several resources, including an invitation to attend a conference addressing mass incarceration of minorities in the United States as well as disparities in the criminal justice systems. When this researcher attended the conference, he was able to network with several professionals who were passionate about addressing these issues pervading the criminal justice systems. This researcher's committee chair and committee members have provided invaluable feedback toward the development of his proposal. Their guidance and passion provided the researcher with a platform to critically examine disparities related to class and race in the juvenile justice system.

During the research process, this researcher encountered some challenges with the research design, requiring multiple protocol changes submitted to the Institutional Review Board. The most significant protocol change for the research was when the researcher had to shift from a qualitative to a quantitative research design.

After this researcher received initial approval to start conducting the research with the participants, this researcher sent emails to the supervisors, requesting their supervisees, juvenile probation officers, to participate in the research examining the perceptions of juvenile probation officers around disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. The supervisors were prompted to forward the email correspondence to their juvenile probation officers, further prompting their juvenile probation officers to contact this researcher if they were interested in participating in the study. The research design was originally qualitative, involving face-to-face, semi-standardized interviews, taking approximately one hour for participants to answer 20 questions (See Appendix A) in a private work setting chosen by the probation officers.

After waiting a long period of time, receiving no responses for participation, this researcher consulted his committee chair to discuss alternatives for research designs. During this period of consultation, this researcher received an email from one of the supervisors, suggesting this researcher utilize surveys instead of interviews, potentially increasing his chances for greater participation rates. The supervisor explained to this reporter about the difficulties for their juvenile probation officers to allocate one hour of their day to interview with this reporter due to the mass amount of changes and initiatives present in their division of the department at the time.

This researcher discussed this suggestion with his committee chair and she recommended for this researcher to use a quantitative research design to conduct research while converting the original interview questions to survey items, allowing juvenile probation officers to participate in a shorter period of time. Overall, the decision to convert the research into a quantitative research design involved a number of email correspondences with the supervisors and consultations with the committee chair, converting the original interview questions to survey items and preserving the variables, which this researcher still wanted to examine in his current research. This researcher approached this study with an exploratory disposition while never generating hypotheses or expectations, hoping to develop greater understanding of disparities.

## Methods

### Research Design

The researcher used a quantitative research design using Qualtrics, survey software on the web, to examine the perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system. The survey took approximately between five and ten minutes to complete. A purposive sampling strategy (Berg & Lune, 2012) was used to locate participants despite its limitation to generalize.

### Sample

Juvenile probation officers from a corrections department for a county employer in the Midwestern United States were invited to participate in the current research. The county corrections department was located within an urban city. Only 17 juvenile probation officers participated in the research. The researcher did not provide statistics on the socioeconomic status or racial identity of the participants due to the sensitivity of the subject area and its potential hindering ability to discourage participation.

### Protection of Human Subjects

*Recruitment.* All of the supervisors in the juvenile division of the corrections department were contacted via email to see whether they approved the current research to be conducted with their supervisees, juvenile probation officers. The supervisors were provided with an overview of the current research in the Institutional Review Board's consent form (See Appendix B) as an attachment to the email, the link to access the survey in the body of the email, and the researcher's contact information. If the supervisors approved the research to be conducted with their supervisees, juvenile probation officers, the supervisors forwarded the email with the aforementioned

information to their juvenile probation officers, prompting their juvenile probation officers to access the link if they were interested in participating in the research. The researcher sent a follow-up reminder two weeks after the original email correspondence.

***Confidentiality.*** The researcher protected the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants by prompting supervisors to forward the email correspondence, providing directions to access the link to complete the survey, thus preventing the researcher from knowing the identity of the participants in the study. The researcher only had access to the original data, which remained on password-protected survey software located on the web.

***Informed Consent.*** The juvenile probation officers were provided with the Institutional Review Board's consent form (See Appendix B) as an attachment in the forwarded email correspondence from their supervisor with the link to access the survey in the body of the email. The consent form explained the voluntary nature of the current research as well as the conditions of anonymity and confidentiality. By proceeding with the survey and submitting their final responses, the probation officers gave their permission for their answers to be used for research purposes. The only way probation officers withdrew from the research was by not submitting their answers to the survey. The participants were not provided incentives to participate in the current research as well as no benefits for their participation. Due to the sensitivity of the survey items around class and race, participants may have been hesitant to participate in the current research. In this case, the participants were reminded about their right to decline answering any question on the survey.

### **Data Collection Instrument and Process**

The participants were asked to complete a 24-item survey (See Appendix C) derived from the literature. The first survey item prompted the participants to indicate the number of years that they worked with clients in the juvenile justice system. They were provided with seven choices and with only one choice to choose from, including choices listed in increments of 5 years, “*0 to 5 years, 5 to 10 years, 10 to 15 years, 15 to 20 years, 20 to 25 years, 25 to 30 years, and over 30 years.*” The next survey item inquired the gender of the participants, “*Male or Female.*”

The next survey item inquired the highest level of education for participants. They were provided with 17 options to choose from, including “*Criminal Justice, Sociology, Urban Studies, Psychology, Anthropology, History, Social Work, Corrections, Law Enforcement, Law, Political Science, Public Policy, Public Administration, Holistic Studies, Foreign Language with a text entry for participants to place their foreign language, Two or More Majors,*” with a text entry for participants to place their multiple majors, and “*Other,*” with a text entry for participants to place a major excluded from the list of majors.

The next six survey items prompted the participants to indicate the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding their beliefs, their colleagues’ belief, and their clients as well as their clients’ families’ beliefs around the climate of differences related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. They were provided with five choices and with only one choice to choose from, including, “*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.*”

The next six survey items prompted the participants to choose the following areas where they, their colleagues, and their clients as well as their clients' families thought demographics related to race and class impact the juvenile justice system. They were provided with a total of eight choices and with an option to choose more than one choice. However, if they decided to choose "None" for the choice, "None" was considered an exclusive answer in the survey item, meaning the participants were not be able to choose any other choice listed for the survey item. The participants were provided with seven other choices for these six survey items, including, "Apprehension, Juvenile Detention Center, Court, Parole or Probation, Court-Ordered Placements, All of the Above, or Other." If they decided to choose "Other" for their choice, they were provided the option to submit text, indicating another area where they, their colleagues, or their clients as well as their clients' families believed demographics related to race or class impact the juvenile justice system.

The next two survey items prompted the participants to indicate the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding their beliefs around their employer tracking demographics related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. They were provided with five choices with only one choice to choose from, including, "Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree." Finally, the last six survey items prompted participants to indicate their degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding their beliefs, their colleagues' beliefs, and their clients' as well as their clients' families' beliefs around the existence of disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. They were provided with five choices with only one



choice to choose from, including, “*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.*”

### **Data Analysis Plan**

The results were only available to the researcher on my password-protected Qualtrics account after participants completed their survey. After the survey results were collected on the Qualtrics account, the researcher converted the variables and the results into a file where they were read in survey software known as the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). After recoding the survey items with options, including, “*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree,*” where “*Strongly Agree and Agree*” were coded together, meaning they shared the same value, “*Strongly Disagree and Disagree*” were coded together, meaning they shared the same value, and “*Neither Agree or Disagree*” were eliminated from the analysis, the researcher generated descriptive and inferential statistics, specifically utilizing chi-square statistics to analyze the associations between the variables in the survey items involving participants to indicate their level of agreeableness.

## Findings

### Variables

The following section lists the findings for the current research. Before discussing the findings, it was important to explain the names of variables and how they were abbreviated in the findings. Table 3 shows the variables and its definitions. For the survey items involving participants to select one option, “*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree,*” these items were recoded, including, “*Strongly Agree and Agree*” representing a value of “1.00,” “*Strongly Disagree and Disagree*” representing a value of “2.00,” leaving “*Neither Agree of Disagree*” eliminated from the chi-square analysis. When the abbreviations, “*APP, JDC, Court, PP, COP, AOA, NOA, and Other,*” followed the said individuals, they stood for demographics related to race and class impacting the juvenile justice system.

**Table 3***Variables*

| <i>Variables</i>  | <b>Definition</b>  | <i>Variables</i> | <b>Definition</b>         |
|-------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>My</i>         | Perception of the juvenile probation officer                                       | <i>APP</i>       | Apprehension              |
| <i>Colleagues</i> | Perception of the juvenile probation officers' colleagues                          | <i>JDC</i>       | Juvenile Detention Center |
| <i>CF</i>         | Perception of the juvenile probation officers' clients and their clients' families | <i>Court</i>     | Court                     |
| <i>CDR</i>        | Climate of differences related to race   | <i>PP</i>        | Parole or Probation       |
| <i>CDC</i>        | Climate of differences related to class  | <i>COP</i>       | Court-Ordered Placements  |
| <i>DR</i>         | Disparities related to race  | <i>AOA</i>       | All-of-the-Above          |
| <i>DC</i>         | Disparities related to class   | <i>NOA</i>       | None-of-the-Above         |
|                   |  | <i>Other</i>     | Other                     |

### **Descriptive Statistics**

The following section lists the findings of descriptive statistics, including juvenile probation officers' experience in the field of corrections, gender, highest education degree, major of highest education degree, and perceptions of demographics related to race and class impacting stages of the juvenile justice system.

**Experience.** The ordinal variable, "*Years in Corrections*," measured the amount of years respondents have worked with clients in the juvenile justice system. This variable was operational as the item, "*Years in Corrections*." The response options were "0 to 5 years, 5 to 10 years, 10 to 15 years, 15 to 20 years, 20 to 25 years, and Over 30 years" for respondents working with clients in the juvenile justice system (Item 1). The research question for the study was "*How many years have you worked with clients in the juvenile justice system*," followed by the prompt for respondents to "Choose one of the answers," which were listed previously. The findings of this study in Table 4 (See Appendix D) showed one respondent worked with clients in juvenile justice system between zero and five years, two respondents between five and 10 years, one respondent between 10 and 15 years, three respondents between 15 and 20 years, zero respondents between 20 and 25 years, three respondents between 25 to 30 years, and one respondent over 30 years worked with clients in the juvenile justice system, totaling 11 valid responses and six missing responses, thus totaling 17 participants in the research.

**Gender.** The nominal variable, "*Gender*," measured the respondents' gender. This variable was operational as the item, "*Gender*." The response options were male and female (Item 2). The research prompt for the study was "*Indicate your gender*." The

findings of this study in Table 5 (See Appendix E) showed five respondents were male and six respondents were female, totaling 11 valid responses and six missing responses, thus totaling 17 participants in the research.

**Education.** The ordinal variable, “*Highest Education Degree*,” measured the respondents’ highest education degree. This variable was operational as the item, “*Highest Education Degree*.” The response options were “*High School Diploma, Associate’s Degree, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, and Doctoral Degree*” (Item 3). The research prompt for the study was “*Indicate your high degree of education.*” The findings of this study in Table 6 (See Appendix F) showed one respondent with a high school diploma, six respondents with a bachelor’s degree, three respondents with a master’s degree, and one respondent with a doctoral degree, totaling 11 valid responses and six missing responses, thus totaling 17 participants in the research.

**Major.** The nominal variable, “*Major of Highest Education Degree*,” measured the respondents’ major of their highest education degree. This variable was operational as the item, “*Major of Highest Education Degree*.” The response options were “*Criminal Justice, Sociology, Urban Studies, Psychology, Anthropology, History, Social Work, Corrections, Law Enforcement, Law, Political Science, Public Policy, Public Administration, Holistic Studies, Foreign Language with a text entry for participants to place their foreign language, Two or More Majors*,” with a text entry for participants to place their multiple majors, and “*Other*,” with a text entry for participants to place a major excluded from the list of majors (Item 4). The research prompt for the study was “*Indicate the major of your highest degree of education*,” followed by three conditions, “*If your major is a foreign language, select ‘Foreign Language’ and indicate the foreign*

language in the text entry under ‘*Foreign Language,*’” “If you have two or more majors, select ‘*Two or More Majors*’ and indicate the majors in the text entry under ‘*Two or More Majors,*’” and “If none of your majors are listed, select ‘*Other*’ and place your major in the text entry under ‘*Other.*’” The findings of this study in Table 7 (See Appendix G) showed three respondents majored in “*Sociology,*” one respondent majored in “*Psychology,*” three respondents majored in “*Social Work,*” one respondent majored in “*Corrections,*” one respondent majored in “*Law,*” and two respondents indicated “*Other,*” including one majoring in “*Criminal Justice Leadership*” and one majoring in “*Corrections/Human Resources,*” totaling 11 valid responses and six missing responses, thus totaling 17 participants in the research.

***Demographics.*** The next subsections address the findings collected from Survey Items 11 through 16, which were the survey items addressing the following nominal variables: juvenile probation officers’ perceptions of demographics related race and class (Items 11 and 12), their colleagues’ perceptions of demographics related to race and class (Items 13 and 14), and their clients’ and their families’ perceptions of demographics related to race and class (Items 15 and 16). These nominal variables were operational as the items, “*Juvenile Probation Officers’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Race, Juvenile Probation Officers’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Class, Colleagues’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Race, Colleagues’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Class, Clients’ and Their Families’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Race, and Clients’ and Their Families’ Perceptions of Demographics Related to Class.*” The response options were “*Apprehension, Juvenile Detention Center, Court, Parole or Probation, Court-Ordered*

*Placements, All-of-the-Above, None-of-the-Above, and Other.*” It is important to note the juvenile probation officers could have selected multiple options for these aforementioned items; however, they could have selected the exclusive option, “*None-of-the-Above,*” preventing them from choosing other options; and they could have selected the option, “*All-of-the-Above,*” capturing all of the options listed in the item while providing them with the opportunity to select the option, and “*Other,*” if they thought another stage of the juvenile justice system was impacted by demographics related to race or class although they were still allowed to select other options except “*None-of-the-Above.*” The descriptive statistics of the demographics related to race and class impacting the juvenile justice system relevant to the three perceptions are addressed in the following subsection, starting with the perceptions of juvenile probation officers, perceptions of their colleagues, and ending with the perceptions of their clients and families.

***Participants.*** The findings of this study show five respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted apprehension, two respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted juvenile detention centers, two respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted courts, one respondent perceived demographics related to race impacted parole or probation, two respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted court-ordered placements, three respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted all-of-the-above options, four respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted none-of-the-above options, and zero respondents perceived demographics related to race impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system, which were not listed in the item. The findings of

this study show four respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted apprehension, one respondent perceived demographics related to class impacted juvenile detention centers, three respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted courts, two respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted parole or probation, four respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted court-ordered placements, three respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted all-of-the-above options, three respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted none-of-the-above options, and zero respondents perceived demographics related to class impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system, which were not listed in the item.

*Colleagues.* The findings of this study show two respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted apprehension, zero respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted juvenile detention centers, one respondent believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted courts, zero respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted parole or probation, one respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted court-ordered placements, four respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted all-of-the-above options, three respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted none-of-the-above options, and one respondent believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to race impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system, specifically providing this answer, “*not sure.*”



The findings of this study show three respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted apprehension, one respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted juvenile detention centers, two respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted courts, one respondent believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted parole or probation, four respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted court-ordered placements, three respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted all-of-the-above options, two respondents believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted none-of-the-above options, and one respondent believed their colleagues perceived demographics related to class impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system, specifically providing this answer, “*not sure.*”

**Clients.** The findings of this study show one respondent believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted apprehension, one respondent believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted juvenile detention centers, one respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted courts, one respondent believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted parole or probation, zero respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted court-ordered placements, eight respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted all-of-the-above options, two respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics

related to race impacted none-of-the-above options, and zero respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to race impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system.

The findings of this study show two respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted apprehension, one respondent believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted juvenile detention centers, one respondent believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted courts, zero respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted parole or probation, zero respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted court-ordered placements, seven respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted all-of-the-above options, two respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted none-of-the-above options, and zero respondents believed their clients and families perceived demographics related to class impacted other stages of the juvenile justice system.

### **Inferential Statistics**

The following section lists the findings from the chi-square analysis for the items prompting juvenile probation officers to select options from “*Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree or Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree,*” thus making these selections exclusive options, meaning they were allowed to select only one option. Items 5 through 10 and 17 through 24 are listed in the chi-square analysis, including the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding the juvenile probation officers’

beliefs, their colleagues' beliefs, and their clients as well as their clients' families' beliefs around the climate of differences related to race and class in the juvenile justice system, the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding the juvenile probation officers' beliefs around their employer tracking demographics related to race and class in the juvenile justice system, and the juvenile probation officers' degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding their beliefs, their colleagues' beliefs, and their clients' as well as their clients' families' beliefs around the existence of disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. It is important to note chi-square analyses were not able to be generated for the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding the juvenile probation officers' beliefs around their employer tracking demographics related to race and class in the juvenile justice system, the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding their clients' and their clients' families' beliefs around disparities related to race and class, the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding juvenile probation officers' beliefs and their colleagues' beliefs around disparities related to class, and the degree of agreeableness to each statement regarding juvenile probation officers' beliefs around the climate of differences related to class and their beliefs around disparities related to class due to the invalid answers.

*My CDR and My CDC.* The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around the climate of difference related to race and their beliefs around the climate of difference related to class. *My CDR* was operational as the item, "*I believe a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *My CDC* was operational as the

item, “*I believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*” Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: “Is there an association between *My CDR* and *My CDC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My CDR* and *My CDC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My CDR* and *My CDC*.”

Table 8 (See Appendix H) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDR* and *My CDC*, is 0.088. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***Colleagues CDR and Colleagues CDC.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers’ colleagues’ beliefs around climate of difference related to race and their colleagues’ beliefs around the climate of difference related to class. *Colleagues CDR* was operational as the item, “*My colleagues believe a climate of difference related*

to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.” *Colleagues CDC* was operational as the item, “My colleagues believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.” Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: “Is there an association between *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC*.

Table 9 (See Appendix I) shows out of the respondents who believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who believed their colleagues strongly disagree or disagreed climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC*, is 0.659. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

*CF CDR and CF CDC.* The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' clients' beliefs around climate of difference related to race and their clients' beliefs around the climate of difference related to class. *CF CDR* was operational as the item, "*My clients and their families believe a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *CF CDC* was operational as the item, "*My clients and their families believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *CF CDR* and *CF CDC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *CF CDR* and *CF CDC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *CF CDR* and *CF CDC*.

Table 10 (See Appendix J) shows out of the respondents who believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, six respondents believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who believed their clients and their families strongly disagree or disagreed climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, zero respondents believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile

justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *CF CDR* and *CF CDC*, is 0.064. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My DR and My DC.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around disparities related to race and their beliefs around disparities related to class. *My DR* was operational as the item, "*I believe disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *My DC* was operational as the item, "*I believe disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *My DR* and *My DC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My DR* and *My DC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My DR* and *My DC*.

Table 11 shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, six respondents strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, zero respondents strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while

one respondent strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My DR* and *My DC*, is 0.008. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis.



**Table 11**

*Cross-Tabulation for My DR and My DC*

| <b>My DR * My DC Crosstabulation</b> |                |                |        |        |        |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|                                      |                |                | My DC  |        | Total  |
|                                      |                |                | 1.00   | 2.00   |        |
| My DR                                | 1.00           | Count          | 6      | 0      | 6      |
|                                      |                | Expected Count | 5.1    | .9     | 6.0    |
|                                      |                | % within My DR | 100.0% | .0%    | 100.0% |
|                                      |                | % within My DC | 100.0% | .0%    | 85.7%  |
|                                      |                | % of Total     | 85.7%  | .0%    | 85.7%  |
|                                      | 2.00           | Count          | 0      | 1      | 1      |
|                                      |                | Expected Count | .9     | .1     | 1.0    |
|                                      |                | % within My DR | .0%    | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|                                      |                | % within My DC | .0%    | 100.0% | 14.3%  |
|                                      |                | % of Total     | .0%    | 14.3%  | 14.3%  |
| Total                                | Count          | 6              | 1      | 7      |        |
|                                      | Expected Count | 6.0            | 1.0    | 7.0    |        |
|                                      | % within My DR | 85.7%          | 14.3%  | 100.0% |        |
|                                      | % within My DC | 100.0%         | 100.0% | 100.0% |        |
|                                      | % of Total     | 85.7%          | 14.3%  | 100.0% |        |

*Colleagues DR and Colleagues DC.* The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' colleagues' beliefs around disparities related to race and their colleagues' beliefs around disparities related to class. *Colleagues DR* was operational as the item, "My colleagues believe disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement." *Colleagues DC* was operational as the item, "My colleagues believe disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement." Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC*.

Table 12 (See Appendix K) shows out of the respondents who believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, four respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while two respondents believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who believed their colleagues strongly disagree or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to class

exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC*, is 0.495. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My CDR and Colleagues CDR.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around a climate of differences related to race and the degree of agreeableness of their colleagues' beliefs around a climate of differences related to race. *My CDR* was operational as the item, "*I believe a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *Colleagues CDR* was operational as the item, "*My colleagues believe a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR*.

Table 13 (See Appendix L) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system,

one respondent believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR*, is 0.088. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My CDR and CF CDR.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around a climate of differences related to race and the degree of agreeableness of their clients' beliefs around a climate of differences related to race. *My CDR* was operational as the item, "*I believe a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *CF CDR* was operational as the item, "*My clients and their families believe a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *My CDR* and *CF CDR*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My CDR* and *CF CDR*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My CDR* and *CF CDR*."

Table 14 (See Appendix M) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, four respondents believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while one

respondent believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, three respondents believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDR* and *CF CDR*, is 0.408. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My CDC and Colleagues CDC.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around a climate of differences related to class and the degree of agreeableness of their colleagues' beliefs around a climate of differences related to class. *My CDC* was operational as the item, "*I believe a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *Colleagues CDC* was operational as the item, "*My colleagues believe a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC*."

Table 15 (See Appendix N) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC*, is 0.659. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My CDC and CF CDC.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around a climate of differences related to class and the degree of agreeableness of their clients' beliefs around a climate of differences related to class. *My CDC* was operational as the item, "*I believe a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *CF CDC* was operational as the item, "*My clients and their families believe a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: "Is there an association between *My CDC* and *CF CDC*. Here is the

hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My CDC* and *CF CDC*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My CDC* and *CF CDC*.

Table 16 (See Appendix O) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, four respondents believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while two respondent believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDC* and *CF CDC*, is 0.495. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My DR and Colleagues DR.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers' beliefs around disparities related to race and the degree of agreeableness of their colleagues' beliefs around disparities related to race. *My DR* was operational as the item, "*I believe disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*" *Colleagues DR* was operational as the

item, “*My colleagues believe disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.*” Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: “Is there an association between *My DR* and *Colleagues DR*. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between *My DR* and *Colleagues DR*. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between *My DR* and *Colleagues DR*.”

Table 17 (See Appendix P) shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, zero respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while one respondent believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My DR* and *Colleagues DR*, is 0.088. Since the p-value is greater than 0.05, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

***My CDR and My DR.*** The ordinal variables in this chi-square analysis measures the association between the degree of agreeableness of juvenile probation officers’ beliefs around a climate of differences related to race and the degree of agreeableness of their colleagues’ beliefs around disparities related to race. *My CDR* was operational as the item, “*I believe a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice*



*system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.” My DR was operational as the item, “I believe disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement.” Here is the research question for this chi-square analysis: “Is there an association between My CDR and My DR. Here is the hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is an association between My CDR and My DR. Here is the null hypothesis for this chi-square analysis: There is no association between My CDR and My DR.*

Table 18 shows out of the respondents who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, five respondents believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while zero respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Out of the respondents who strongly disagree or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, one respondent strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system while two respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. The p-value for the chi-square analysis of the variables, *My CDR* and *My DR*, is 0.035. Since the p-value is less than 0.05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

**Table 18**

*Cross-Tabulation for My CDR and My DR*

|        |                 |                 | My DR  |        | Total  |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|        |                 |                 | 1.00   | 2.00   |        |
| My CDR | 1.00            | Count           | 5      | 0      | 5      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 3.8    | 1.3    | 5.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 100.0% | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within My DR  | 83.3%  | .0%    | 62.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 62.5%  | .0%    | 62.5%  |
|        | 2.00            | Count           | 1      | 2      | 3      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 2.3    | .8     | 3.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 33.3%  | 66.7%  | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within My DR  | 16.7%  | 100.0% | 37.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 12.5%  | 25.0%  | 37.5%  |
| Total  | Count           | 6               | 2      | 8      |        |
|        | Expected Count  | 6.0             | 2.0    | 8.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDR | 75.0%           | 25.0%  | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within My DR  | 100.0%          | 100.0% | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total      | 75.0%           | 25.0%  | 100.0% |        |

## Discussion

The current research was exploratory and participatory as the supervisors from the corrections department, where the researcher decided to request individuals to participate in the study, suggested a quantitative research design rather than a qualitative research design, which initially yielded no participants. The current research used a quantitative research design and surveys to examine associations of perceptions between juvenile probation officers, their colleagues, and their clients and families. In addition to the data collected for chi-square analyses, the researcher collected data on the participants' gender, highest education degree, major of highest education degree, and their perceptions where they believed demographics related to race and class impacted the stages in the juvenile justice system. Overall, the researcher used the theoretical approach of intersectionality to examine the perceptions of juvenile probation officers' around disparities related to race and class and their impact in the juvenile justice system. The following subsections discuss the interpretations from the descriptive and inferential statistics in the findings section, implications, and strengths and limitations to the current research.

### Interpretation of Descriptive Statistics

*Experience.* Although only six out of the 17 answers were missing from the descriptive statistics, the participants demonstrated a wide range of experiences in the field of corrections. The only option omitted from the descriptive statistics was *20 to 25 years* because no participants selected the answer. Respondents with more years of experience may have greater knowledge about how policies influence decisions in the juvenile justice system (Crutchfield, Fernandes, & Martinez, 2010; Tonry, 2005). Their

perceptions may have shifted during their careers as they may have been exposed to cases or training sessions recognizing climate of differences related to race and class or disparities related to race and class. Mitchell's (2005) methodological approach of narrative reviews for these participants with more experience may provide rich context to the extension of this literature related to race and class disparities.

***Gender.*** Although only 11 answers were valid for the item identifying the gender of respondents, a fairly equal turnout between male and female respondents was present in the data collection. However, the research may have benefited from more participants responding to each item while preserving the equal turnout between male and female respondents in the data collection, capturing a wide pool of participants. The research may have also benefited from chi-square analyses for gender and other nominal and ordinal variables, possibly capturing associations between variables.

***Education.*** Although only six answers were invalid for the item identifying the highest education degree of respondents, they demonstrated a fairly wide range of education levels, ranging from high school diploma to doctoral degrees. These different level of educations may have afforded some respondents opportunities to be exposed to theoretical approaches or training sessions explaining phenomenon like climate of differences related to race and class as well as disparities related to race and class. Their varying levels of education may be different from individual to whom they deliver their services. The dynamics of socioeconomic classes may explain the phenomenon of disparities in the juvenile justice system (Hindelang, 1978; Kleck, 1981; Peterson & Hagan, 1984) as subscribed to the stratification theories. Respondents may be aware of their educations and how their educational background impact the ways they perceive

phenomenon of disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. Their positions as authority figures may perpetuate the Bridges and Crutchfield's (1988) idea about how socioeconomic status impact the control and regulation of their clients.

**Major.** Although only 11 answers were valid for the item identifying the major of the highest education degree, respondents displayed a wide range of educational backgrounds, mostly majors from social sciences, including sociology and social work, which are two subject areas, focusing on society and its impact on individuals, sustaining fair and equitable justice. Depending on the major of their highest education degree, some respondents may have been exposed to different experiences and theories, explaining the phenomenon of disparities related to race and class. Respondents having educational backgrounds in sociology may have been exposed to theoretical approaches, including punishment theory (Tonry, 2005) and normative theories (Hindelang, 1978; Kleck, 1981; Peterson & Hagan, 1984), explaining the reasons for determinate sentencing and disproportionate minority involvement in serious and violent crimes, whereas respondents having educational backgrounds in social work may have been exposed to different theoretical approaches, including stratification theories (Bridges & Crutchfield, 1988; Hindelang, 1978; Kleck, 1981; Peterson & Hagan, 1984) and power threat theory (Blalock, 1967), explaining reasons for dominant groups to control minority groups from reaching economic and political prosperity.

**Demographics.** Overall, the respondents with valid answers to the items, requesting their perceptions of demographics related to race and class impacting the stages of the juvenile justice system, provided a wide range of answers. The data extends the literature of structural-processual theories (Crutchfield, Fernandes, &

Martinez, 2010; Engen, Steen, & Bridges, 2002), explaining the decision-making process and how decisions impact individuals at various points in the juvenile justice system, thus possibly contributing to disparities related to race and class. The data also extends the literature examining the perceptions around disparities related to race and class (Johnson, Stewart, Pickett, & Gertz, 2011; Stewart, Baumer, Brunson, & Simons, 2009; Weitzer, 2000). Future research may benefit from extending participation to other professionals beside juvenile probation officers, including personnel from courts, law enforcement, and attorney's offices, thus extending literature to Coker (2003), Davis (2007), Leiber, Woodrick, & Roudebush (1995), and Holley & Van Vleet (2006) who have examined perceptions of clients and professionals around disparities related to race and class in the adult criminal and juvenile justice systems.

### **Interpretation of Inferential Statistics**

*My CDR and My CDC.* The cross-tabulation in Table 8 (See Appendix H) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to strongly agree or agree a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were less likely to strongly disagree or disagree a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDR* and *My CDC*.

*Colleagues CDR and Colleagues CDC.* The cross-tabulation in Table 9 (See Appendix I) demonstrates in the sample, those who believed their colleagues strongly

agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were less likely than those who believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their colleagues strongly agree or agree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were more likely to believe their colleagues strongly disagree or disagree a climate of difference exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC*.

***CF CDR and CF CDC.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 10 (See Appendix J) demonstrates in the sample, those who believed their clients and their families strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who believed their clients and their families strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their clients and their families strongly agree or agree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but less likely to believe their clients and their families strongly disagree or disagree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *CF CDR* and *CF CDC*.

***My DR and My DC.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 11 demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed

disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to strongly agree or agree disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were less likely to strongly disagree or disagree disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher succeeded to reject the null hypothesis, the data does support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My DR* and *My DC*. This interpretation partially supports the notion from Wilson's (1978) argument, postulating class inequality rather than racial discrimination as the key factor structuring the experiences of clients in the juvenile justice system.

***Colleagues DR and Colleagues DC.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 12 (See Appendix K) demonstrates in the sample, those who believed their colleagues strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were less likely than those who believed their colleagues strongly disagreed or disagree disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their colleagues strongly agree or agree disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were more likely to believe their colleagues strongly disagree or disagree disparities related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC*.

***My CDR and Colleagues CDR.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 13 (See Appendix L) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their colleagues strongly agree or agree a



climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, but less likely to believe their colleagues strongly disagree or disagree a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR*.

***My CDR and CF CDR.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 14 (See Appendix M) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were less likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their clients and their families strongly agree or agree a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, but were more likely to believe their clients and their families strongly disagree or disagree a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDR* and *CF CDR*.

***My CDC and Colleagues CDC.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 15 (See Appendix N) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system were less likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their colleagues strongly agree or agree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were more likely to believe their colleagues strongly disagree or disagree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher

failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC*.

***My CDC and CF CDC.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 16 (See Appendix O) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system were more less likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their clients and their families strongly agree or agree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system, but were more likely to believe their clients and their families strongly disagree or disagree a climate of differences related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDC* and *CF CDC*.

***My DR and Colleagues DR.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 17 (See Appendix P) demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who strongly disagreed disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to believe their colleagues strongly agree or agree disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, but less likely to believe their colleagues strongly disagree or disagree disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, the data does not support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My DR* and *Colleagues DR*.

***My CDR and My DR.*** The cross-tabulation in Table 18 demonstrates in the sample, those who strongly agreed or agreed a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system were more likely than those who strongly disagreed or disagreed a climate of differences related to race exists in the juvenile justice system to strongly agree or agree disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system, but less likely to strongly disagree or disagree disparities related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Since the researcher succeeded to reject the null hypothesis, the data does support the research hypothesis that there is a significant association between *My CDR* and *My DR*.

***Significant Associations.*** Due to the low amount of respondents in the research, it was difficult to interpret findings. Future research may benefit from extending the participation to more county, state, or federal departments responsible for the welfare of clients in the adult criminal and juvenile justice systems. However, a total of two chi-square analyses yielded significant association between variables in the survey, mainly the significant association between the juvenile probation officers' level of agreeableness for disparities related to race and their level of agreeableness for disparities related to class existing in the juvenile justice system, and juvenile probation officers' level of agreeableness for a climate of differences related to race and their level of agreeableness for disparities related to class.

***Generalization.*** Although the other similar variables did not yield significant associations, they still communicate information about the potential reasons for their insignificance, including too many invalid answers to the items measured in chi-square analyses and low participation rate. Despite limitations to generalize the findings from

the sample, the current research still extends the literature of disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system.

***Policy.*** One of the forgotten variables, which may have been important to examine with chi-square analyses, was respondents' perception toward the impact of policies on disparities related to race and class existing in the juvenile justice system. Future research may benefit from adding this variable, extending the scope of impact beyond the aforementioned decision points or stages of the juvenile justice system, including decision points or stages of apprehension, juvenile detention centers, court, parole or probation, and court-ordered placements, which are discussed in research articles (Hill, Harris, and Miller; Liska & Tausig, 1979; McCarthy & Smith, 1986).

***Subtleties and Indirectness.*** Contrary to the literature discussing biases in the juvenile justice system (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), the current research does not yield findings addressing indirect, subtle, covert, and institutional forces impacting the decision-making processes, possibly contributing to the phenomenon of disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. Zatz's (1987) research, highlighting subtleties and indirectness of biases in the juvenile justice system, may have been pertinent to the experiences from respondents in the current research.

Zatz's (1987) research provided insight to the cumulative influence of race and class on decisions in the juvenile justice system, the attitudes of policy makers, and structural contexts on the outcomes of court cases, which may be examined through the conceptual frameworks of political intersectional analysis, focusing on the impact of policies, and structural intersectional analysis, identifying forms of oppression and domination, respectively. These additional theoretical approaches provide researchers

with extra tools to analyze data related to the perceptions of individuals around racial and class disparities in the juvenile justice system. Unfortunately, the current chi-square analyses do not allow for extensive notification on subtleties and indirectness.

### **Interpretation of Missing Data**

The findings reported six missing answers for almost every item on the survey. These missing answers had an impact on the interpretation of findings. Participants may have been hesitant to answer items on the survey due to their level of discomfort with the subject area of disparities related to race and class as it was mentioned in the method's section of this research. They may have also accidentally submitted their survey while leaving several items on the survey with no responses. The researcher may have not accounted for all the commands in the survey software on the web, which may have generated inaccurate completion. Future research needs to pay attention to the commands reading participants' answers in the survey software on the web, thus providing participants with clearer instructions to properly answer survey items for data analysis and providing researchers with greater opportunities to extend the literature.

### **Implications**

*Practice.* The current research has implications for social work practice. For the purposes of this research, the following section will specifically discuss implications for social work practice in the field of correction. Juvenile probation officers need to be aware of their presence as authority figures in the community because they play an important role in their clients' experiences within the social context (Crenshaw, 1989). They also need to be aware of their educational, personal, and professional experiences and these experiences play a role in the professional relationship with their coworkers

and clients. This awareness fits with the practice of counter-transference, which is important to development of social workers delivering effective services to their clients. They also need to be aware of their presence alongside other professionals in the field of corrections because they have to collaborate with these professionals to ensure their clients are treated fairly and equitably in the juvenile justice system. Professionals in the fields of social work and corrections may have awareness of disparities related to class and race in the juvenile justice system, but their level of willingness or selectiveness to discuss the topics may impact the methods to address these concerns.

***Policy.*** Although the current research does not yield findings to address implications for policy, this is an opportunity to discuss potential implications if similar research addresses the impact of policies on disparities related to race and class in the future. Juvenile probation officers need to be aware about how the policies within their agency impact their decisions as authority figures responsible for the welfare of their clients. In addition to their adherence to the policies under which they have to follow, it may be important for juvenile probation officers to be aware about how other professional and their policies impact their ability to make decisions about their practices. Juvenile probation officers may be limited to the options pursuant to the policies under which they have to follow or policies under which other professional with whom they collaborate have to follow. Another entity having possible significant impact on the perpetuation of disparities is school. Their policies dealing with violent, disruptive, and unsafe behaviors may perpetuate the disparities in the juvenile justice system. These school referrals for these behaviors force juveniles into the justice system. Alexander (2012) comments about the disproportionate amount of black men in

state prisons compared to the amount of black men in state universities, supporting her postulation of mass incarceration of colored people due to macro-systems' new caste system, helping to explain the phenomenon of mass incarceration of colored people.

**Research.** The current research has implication for further research on disparities related to race and class. In the preceding section regarding additional variables, providing more contextual information, possibly capturing the experiences of clients and professionals, including their perceptions, especially around policies may yield fruitful discussions on the impact of racial and class disparities in the juvenile justice system. Given the quantitative research design to this study, it affords opportunities for researchers to capture more data, thus providing further opportunities to possible generalize data, assuming researchers draw from large samples. Although this current research yielded a small of respondents, it provides groundwork for future research to be conducted with a quantitative research design, possibly using a survey items to capture data. Due to the sensitivity of the subject, researchers have to be aware of the possible hesitance from individuals from participating in these studies. This current research may open new ideas for researchers to analyze variables listed in the survey, whether through the use of correlation tests, analyzing the relationship between interval and ratio intervals, or through the use of t-tests, analyzing an interval or ratio variable through the comparison of two nominal or ordinal variables. These different inferential statistics foster ways to analyze data related to racial and class disparities in the adult criminal and juvenile justice systems, thus extending the literature to the topic, which has major implications to the field of social work.

### **Strengths and Limitations**

*Strengths.* The survey questions were related to the purpose of the research, which is examining the perceptions of probation officers around class and race-based disparities. Participants were provided the protection of anonymity and confidentiality given the quantitative research design and the use of an online survey. The current study attempted to further the research around disparities in the criminal justice systems as recommended from previous scholars. The current quantitative research design allowed for quicker response rates compared to the initial qualitative research design, allowing the researcher to collect data from participants in a shorter period of time. Compared to the amount of time needed for the interviews, which would have been approximately 1 hour, the survey took shorter amount of time for participants, which was approximately 5 minutes. However, the current research faced some limitations in the process as the research underwent multiple protocol changes pursuant to the instructions from the Institutional Review Board and pursuant to the suggestions from supervisors in the field of corrections, specially the suggest to change the qualitative research design into a quantitative research design, promoting greater participation rates from juvenile probation officers due to their busy schedules and adherence to new initiatives.

*Limitations.* Although juvenile probation officers have major decision-making roles regarding the welfare of their clients, other professionals, including those from law enforcement agencies, public attorney's offices, and judicial courts, also have major decision-making roles in the juvenile justice system. Law enforcement demonstrates power to apprehend individuals allegedly committing offenses, requiring these individuals to be admitted into juvenile detention centers. This current research lacks



the perspectives of other professionals as well as the perspectives of their clients and their families around disparities in the juvenile justice system. Additionally, the sample from the current research is drawn from only one county employer in the Midwestern United States. Future research should include more than one county employer with a corrections department for its sample. The sample was also relatively small compared to the recommended amount for a quantitative research design as stated in the methods for this current research. Due to the content of the interviewing questions, it potentially elicits adverse responses from participants around class and race. Due to the small response rate, the findings do not particularly extend the research on disparities related to race and class in the juvenile justice system. However, given more time to collect data from more participants may yield different expectations with participation rate. The researcher neglected to incorporate demographics of clients, including their socioeconomic status and race, capturing intersection of race and class in the juvenile division of the department where the researcher recruited juvenile probation officers. Future research should gather data from the U. S. Census Bureau and information for the research design regarding the percentages of juveniles represented by public defenders, capturing data for disparities related to class. In regards to the interpretation of the missing data, future research may benefit from utilizing a frequency distribution of the participants leaving unanswered survey items. Due to the sensitivity of reporting racial identity in relation to the subject of this research, future research may benefit from organizing a frequency distribution of participants leaving unanswered items by the amount of years of experience in the field of social work or corrections.

### References

- Alexander, Michelle. *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Austin, R. L., & Allen, M. D. (2000). Racial disparity in arrest rate as an explanation of racial disparity in commitment to Pennsylvania prisons. *Journal of Research In Crime and Delinquency*, 37(2), 200-220.
- Barth, E. A. T., & Noel, D. L. (1972). Conceptual frameworks for the analysis of race relations. *Social Forces*, 50, 333-348.
- Beckett, K., Nyrop, K., & Pfingst, L. (2006). Race, drugs, and policing: Understanding disparities in drug delivery arrests. *Criminology*, 44(1), 105-137.
- Beckett, K., Nyrop, K., Pfingst, L., & Bowen, M. (2005). Drug use, drug possession arrests, and the question of race: Lessons from Seattle. *Social Problems*, 52(3), 419-441.
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Blalock, H. (1957). Percent non-white and racial discrimination in the south. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 677-682.
- Blalock, H. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority group relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Blumstein, A. (1982). On the racial disproportionality of United States' prison populations. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 73, 1259-1268.

Bodapati, M., Anderson, J. F., & Brinson, T. E. (2008). Revisiting Hubert Blalock's power threat theory to determine its effect on court workgroup behavior as it concerns structured sentencing. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 21(2), 109-134.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Oxford, United Kingdom: Rowman and Littlefield.

Bridges, G. S., & Crutchfield, R. D. (1988). Law, social standing, and racial disparities in imprisonment. *Social Forces*, 66(3), 699-724.

Brown, D. L., & Fuguitt, G. V. (1972). Percent nonwhite and racial disparity in non-metropolitan cities in the south. *Social Science Quarterly*, 53, 573-582.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2010). *Prisoners in 2010*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2010). *Probation and parole in the United States*. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Justice.

Bushway, S. D., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Judging judicial discretion: Legal factors and racial discrimination in sentencing. *Law & Society Review*, 35(4), 733-764.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352, 78 Stat. 241. (1964).

Coker, D. (2003). Supreme court review foreword: Addressing the real world of racial injustice in the criminal justice system. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 93(4), 827-879.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

- Crenshaw, K. (1989). *Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics* (pp. 139-167). Chicago: University of Chicago Legal Forum.
- Crutchfield, R. D., Fernandes, A., & Martinez, J. (2010). Racial and ethnic disparity and criminal justice: How much is too much? *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *100*(3), 903-932.
- Davis, A. J. (2007). Racial fairness in the criminal justice system: the role of the prosecutor. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*, *39*, 202-232.
- Demuth, S. (2003). Racial and ethnic difference in pretrial release decisions and outcomes: A comparison of Hispanic, black, and white felony arrestees. *Criminology*, *41*(3), 873-907.
- Engen, R. L., Steen, S., & Bridges, G. S. (2002). Racial disparities in the punishment of youth: A theoretical and empirical assessment of the literature. *Social Problems*, *49*(2), 194-220.
- Free, M. D. Jr. (2002). Race and presentencing decisions in the United States: A summary and critique of the research. *Criminal Justice Review*, *27*(2), 203-231.
- Freiburger, T. L., Marcum, C. D., & Pierce, M. (2010). The impact of race on the pretrial decision. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *35*, 76-86.
- Frisbie, W. P., & Neidert, L. (1976). Inequality and the relative size of minority populations: A comparative analysis. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*, 1007-1030.

- Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Golub, A., Johnson, B. D., & Dunlap, E. (2007). The race/ethnicity disparity in misdemeanor marijuana arrests in New York City. *Criminal Public Policy*, 6(1), 131-164.
- Helms, R., & Costanza, S. E. (2010). Modeling the politics of punishment: A contextual analysis of racial disparity in drug sentencing. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35(4), 472-291.
- Hill, G. D., Harris, A. R., & Miller, J. L. (1985). The etiology of bias: Social heuristics and rational decision making in deviance processing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 135-162.
- Hindelang, M. J. (1978). Race and involvement in common law personal crimes. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 993-1009.
- Holley, L. C., & Van Vleet, R. K. (2006). Racism and classism in the youth justice system: Perspectives of youth and staff. *Journal of Poverty*, 10(1), 45-67.
- Hutchinson, E. D. (2011). *Dimensions of human behavior: Person and environment* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Leiber, M. J., & Jamieson, K. M. (1995). Race and decision making within juvenile justice: The importance of context. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 11(4), 363-388.
- Johnson, B. D. (2003). Racial and ethnic disparities in sentencing departures across modes of conviction. *Criminology*, 41(2), 449-489.

Johnson, B. D., Stewart, E. A., Pickett, J., & Gertz, M. (2011). Ethnic threat and social control: Examining public support for judicial use of ethnicity in punishment. *American Society of Criminology, 49*(2), 401-441.

Johnson, O. C. A. (2007). Disparity rules. *Columbia Law Review, 107*, 374-425.

Kautt, P. M., & Delone, M. A. (2006). Sentencing outcomes under competing but coexisting sentencing interventions: Untying the Gordian knot. *Criminal Justice Review, 31*(2), 105-131.

Keen, B., & Jacobs, D. (2009). Racial threat, partisan politics, and racial disparities in prison admissions: A Panel analysis. *Criminology, 47*(1), 209-237.

Kleck, G. (1981). Racial discrimination in criminal sentencing: A critical evaluation of the evidence with additional evidence on the death penalty. *American Sociological Review, 46*, 783-805.

Kupferberg, N. (2008). Transparency: A new role for police consent decrees. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems, 42*(129), 129-163.

Kurtz, D. L. (2008). Investigating racial disparity at the detention decision: The role of respectability. *Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice, 5*(2), 140-157.

Langan, P. (1985) Racism on trial: New evidence to explain the racial composition of prisons in the United States. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 76*, 666-683.

Leiber, M. J., Woodrick, A. C., & Roudebush, E. M. (1995). Religion, discriminatory attitudes and the orientations of juvenile justice personnel: A research note. *Criminology, 33*(3), 431-449.

- Liska, A. E., & Tausig, M. (1979). Theoretical interpretations of social class and racial differentials in legal decision-making for juveniles. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 20, 197-207.
- Lyon, F. E. (1915). Race betterment and the crime doctors. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 5(887).
- MacDonald, J. M. (2003). The effect of ethnicity on juvenile court decision making in Hawaii. *Youth Society*, 35, 243-263.
- McCarthy, B. R., & Smith, B. L. (1986). The conceptualization of discrimination in the juvenile justice process: The impact of administrative factors and screening decisions on juvenile court dispositions. *Criminology*, 24(1), 41-64.
- McCoy, C. (1997). Sentencing and the Underclass. *Law & Society Review*, 31(3), 589-612.
- Mitchell, O. (2005). A meta-analysis of race and sentencing research: Explaining the inconsistencies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21(4), 439-466.
- Mosher, C., Pickerill, J. M., Pratt, T., & Lovrich, N. (2008). The importance of context in understanding biased policing: State patrol traffic citations in Washington state. *Police Practice and Research*, 9(1), 43-57.
- Mustard, D. B. (2001). Racial, ethnic, and gender disparities in sentencing: Evidence from the U. S. federal courts. *Journal of law and Economics*, 44, 285-314.
- National Association of Social Workers. (2008). *Code of ethics*. Washington, D. C.: NASW.

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2010). *Statistical briefing book*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Ousey, G. C., & Lee, M. R. (2010). Whose civic community? Testing alternative hypotheses of the relationship between civic community and racial inequality in arrest rates. *Sociological Spectrum, 30*, 550-579.
- Ousey, G. C., & Lee, M. R. (2008). Racial disparity in formal social control: An investigation of alternative explanations of arrest rate inequality. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 45*(3), 322-355.
- Peterson, R. D., & Hagan, J. (1984). Changing conceptions of race: Towards an account of anomalous findings of sentencing research. *American Sociological Review, 49*, 56-70.
- Pickerill, J. M., Mosher, C., & Pratt, T. (2009). Search and seizure, racial profiling, and traffic stops: A disparate impact framework. *Law and Policy, 31*(1), 1-30.
- Samuels, G. M., & Ross-Sheriff, F. (2008). Identity, oppression, and power: Feminisms and intersectional theory. *Journal of Women and Social Work, 23* (1), 5-9.
- Schlesinger, T. (2011). The failure of race neutral policies: How mandatory terms and sentencing enhancements contribute to mass racialized incarceration. *Crime and Delinquency, 57*(1), 56-81.
- Smith, D. A., Visher, C. A., & Davidson, L. A. (1984). Equity and discretionary justice: The influence of race on police arrest decisions. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 75*(1), 234-249.
- Spohn, C. (1990). The sentencing decisions of black and white judges: Expected and unexpected similarities. *Law & Society Review, 24*(5), 1197-1216.



- Steffensmeier, D., Feldmeyer, B., Harris, C. T., Ulmer, J. T. (2011). Reassessing trends in black violent crime, 1980-2008: Sorting out the “Hispanic effect” in uniform crime reports, arrests, national crime victimization survey, offender estimates, and U. S. prisoner counts. *American Society of Criminology*, 49(1), 197-251.
- Stewart, A. J., & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 519-544.
- Stewart, E. A., Baumer, E. P., Brunson, R. K., & Simons, R. L. (2009). Neighborhood racial context and perceptions of police-based racial discrimination among black youth. *American Society of Criminology*, 47(3), 847-887.
- Tomaskovic, D., Wright, C. P., Czaja, R., & Miller, K. (2006). Self-reports of police speeding stops by race: Results from the North Carolina reverse record check survey. *J Quant Criminology*, 22, 279-297.
- Tonry, M. (2005). Obsolescence and immanence in penal theory and policy. *Columbia Law Review*, 105, pp. 1232-1275.
- Von Hentig, H. (1940). Criminality of the negro. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 30(662).
- Warren, P., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., Smith, W., Zingraff, M., & Mason, M. (2006). Driving while black: Bias processes and racial disparity in police stops. *American Society of Criminology*, 44(3), 709-738.
- Warren, P. Y., & Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (2009). Racial profiling and searches: Did the politics of racial profiling change police behavior? *Criminology and Public Policy*, 8(2), 343-369.

Washington, B. T. (1912). Negro crime and strong drink. *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 3(384).

Weitzer, R. (2000). Racialized policing: Residents' perceptions in three neighborhoods. *Law & Society Review*, 34(1), 129-155.

Wilson, W. J. (1978). *The Declining Significance of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zatz, M. (1987). The changing forms of racial/ethnic biases in sentencing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 24, 69-92.

**Appendix A. Interview Questions**

1. How many years have you worked in the field of corrections?
2. With what race do you identify?
3. With what socioeconomic class do you identify?
4. What are the racial demographics of your colleagues?
5. What are the socioeconomic class demographics of your colleagues?
6. What are the racial demographics of your clients and their families?
7. What are the socioeconomic class demographics of your clients and their families?
8. What is your assessment of racial and socioeconomic class demographics in the juvenile justice system?
9. What are your colleagues' assessments of racial and socioeconomic class demographics in the juvenile justice system?
10. What are your clients' and their families' assessments of racial and socioeconomic class demographics in the juvenile justice system?
11. At what stages, if any, do you think racial and socioeconomic demographics impact the juvenile justice system?
12. Does your department collect data on racial and socioeconomic demographics of your clients and their families?
13. If your department collects data on racial and socioeconomic demographics of your clients and their families, how does it collect and utilize the data? If not, how would you collect and utilize the data?
14. Do you believe disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system?
15. If you think disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system,

what do you think contributes to these disparities?

16. If you think disparities related to race or class exists in juvenile justice system, what do you think should be done?

17. Do your colleagues believe disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system?

18. If your colleagues think disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system, what do they think contributes to these disparities?

19. If your colleagues think disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system, what do they think should be done?

18. Do your clients and their families believe disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system?

19. If your clients and their families believe disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system, what do they think contributes to these disparities?

20. If your clients and their families believe disparities related to race or class exists in the juvenile justice system, what do they think should be done?

## **Appendix B. Institutional Review Board**

### **Perceptions of Probations Officers Around Class and Racial Disparities In the Juvenile Justice System INFORMATION AND CONSENT FORM**

#### **Introduction:**

You are invited to participate in a research study investigating perceptions of juvenile probation officers around class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system. This research is being conducted by Jeffrey A. Hilliard from the St. Catherine University and University of Saint Thomas Graduate Social Work Program under the supervision of Valandra, MBA, MSW, LISW, Ph. D., a faculty member in the School of Social Work at Saint Catherine University and University of Saint Thomas. You were selected as a possible participant in this research because you are a juvenile probation officer who works with clients from various cultural backgrounds. Please read this form and ask questions before you agree to be in the study.

#### **Background Information:**

The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of juvenile probation officers regarding class and race-based disparities in the juvenile justice system through the conceptual framework of intersectionality. Approximately forty to fifty people are expected to participate in this research.

#### **Procedures:**

If you agree to participate in this research, you will be asked to respond to survey questions about disparities related to class and race via a link in an email correspondence forwarded from your supervisors. The survey takes approximately five minutes to complete. The researcher will send a follow-up reminder via email to you and your supervisor. The only way probation officers can withdraw from the research is not submitting their answers to the survey.

#### **Risks and Benefits of being in the study:**

Due to the sensitivity of the survey items on class and race, you may feel some discomfort when completing the survey. The only way probation officers can withdraw from the research is by not submitting their answers to the survey. The current research will lend implications to the literature on disparities in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems and ultimately to the field of Social Work and its mission to address social justice. It will also raise awareness of disparities pervading the criminal justice systems. One of the main competencies emphasized by the field of Social Work is the competency of self-awareness. The competency of self-awareness prompts professionals in the field of Social Work to critically reflect on their and their clients' experiences as they work together in their professional relationship. Although you may be hesitant to participate in the current research due to the sensitivity of the survey items pertaining to class and race, the potential benefits outweigh the minimal identified risks. The current research extends the literature of disparities in the criminal justice

systems by utilizing a quantitative research design without harming vulnerable populations.

**Confidentiality:**

Any information obtained in connection with this research will be kept anonymous and confidential. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only group data will be presented. The researcher will protect your confidentiality and anonymity by storing your original data on password-protected survey software program. The researcher will only have access to the original data, which will remain on password-protected survey software program until it is deleted on May 31, 2013. The researcher will protect the identity of your employer by replacing any identifying information of your employer with generic names and terms.

**Voluntary nature of the study:**

Participation in this research study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with University of Saint Thomas or St. Catherine University in any way. The only way probation officers can withdraw from the research is by not submitting their answers to the survey.

**Contacts and questions:**

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, Jeffrey A. Hilliard, at 651-492-2027. You may ask questions now, or if you have any additional questions later, my faculty advisor, Valandra, MBA, MSW, LISW, Ph. D., will be happy to answer them; her contact number at Saint Catherine University is 651-690-6709. If you have other questions or concerns regarding the study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher or his faculty advisor, you may also contact Dr. John Schmitt, Chair of the St. Catherine University Institutional Review Board, at (651) 690-7739. You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

**Statement of Consent:**

By proceeding with the survey and submitting your final responses, you are giving your permission for this information to be used for research purposes.

### Appendix C. Survey

1. How many years have you worked with clients in the juvenile justice system? Choose one of the following answers:

- 0 to 5 years
- 5 to 10 years
- 10 to 15 years
- 15 to 20 years
- 20 to 25 years
- 25 to 30 years
- Over 30 years

2. Indicate your gender.

- Female
- Male

3. Indicate your high degree of education.

- High School Diploma
- Associate's Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree

4. Indicate the major of your highest degree of education. If your major is a foreign language, select "Foreign Language" and indicate the foreign language in the text entry under "Foreign Language." If you have two or more majors, select "Two or More Majors" and indicate the majors in the text entry under "Two or More Majors." If none of your majors are listed, select "Other" and place your major in the text entry under "Other."

- Criminal Justice
- Sociology
- Urban Studies
- Psychology
- Anthropology
- History
- Social Work
- Corrections
- Law Enforcement
- Law
- Political Science
- Public Policy
- Public Administration
- Holistic Studies
- Foreign Language (Place a choice in the text entry)
- Two or More Majors (Place choices in the text entry)

- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

5. I believe a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

6. I believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

7. My colleagues believe a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

8. My colleagues believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

9. My clients and their families believe a climate of difference related to race exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

10. My clients and their families believe a climate of difference related to class exists in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree



- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

11. At what stages, if any, do you think demographics related to race impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation
- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

12. At what stages, if any, do you think demographics related to class impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation
- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

13. At what stages, if any, do your colleagues think demographics related to race impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation
- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

14. At what stages, if any, do your colleagues think demographics related to class impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation

- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

15. At what stages, if any, do your clients and their families think demographics related to race impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation
- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

16. At what stages, if any, do your clients and their families think demographics related to race impact the juvenile justice system? Choose one or more of the following choices:

- Apprehension
- Juvenile Detention Center
- Court
- Parole or Probation
- Court-Ordered Placement
- All of the Above
- None of the Above (Exclusive Answer)
- Other (Place choices in the text entry)

17. My employer collects data on demographics related to race of my clients and their families in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

18. My employer collects data on demographics related to class of my clients and their families in the juvenile justice system. Indicate the degree of agreeableness to this statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree

- Strongly Disagree

19. I believe disparities related to race exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

20. I believe disparities related to class exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

21. My colleagues believe disparities related to race exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

22. My colleagues believe disparities related to class exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

23. My clients and their families believe disparities related to race exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

24. My clients and their families believe disparities related to race exist in the juvenile justice system.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree or Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree



### Appendix D. Years in Corrections

**Table 4**

*Years in Corrections*

|         |                | Years in Corrections |         |               |                    |
|---------|----------------|----------------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|         |                | Frequency            | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | 0 to 5 years   | 1                    | 5.9     | 9.1           | 9.1                |
|         | 5 to 10 years  | 2                    | 11.8    | 18.2          | 27.3               |
|         | 10 to 15 years | 1                    | 5.9     | 9.1           | 36.4               |
|         | 15 to 20 years | 3                    | 17.6    | 27.3          | 63.6               |
|         | 25 to 30 years | 3                    | 17.6    | 27.3          | 90.9               |
|         | Over 30 years  | 1                    | 5.9     | 9.1           | 100.0              |
|         | Total          | 11                   | 64.7    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System         | 6                    | 35.3    |               |                    |
| Total   |                | 17                   | 100.0   |               |                    |

### Appendix E. Gender Distribution

**Table 5**

*Gender Distribution*

|         |        | Gender    |         |               |                    |
|---------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|         |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | Male   | 5         | 29.4    | 45.5          | 45.5               |
|         | Female | 6         | 35.3    | 54.5          | 100.0              |
|         | Total  | 11        | 64.7    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System | 6         | 35.3    |               |                    |
| Total   |        | 17        | 100.0   |               |                    |

**Appendix F. Highest Education****Table 6***Highest Education Degree*

|         |                     | <b>Highest Education Degree</b> |         |               |                    |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|         |                     | Frequency                       | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | High School Diploma | 1                               | 5.9     | 9.1           | 9.1                |
|         | Bachelor's Degree   | 6                               | 35.3    | 54.5          | 63.6               |
|         | Master's Degree     | 3                               | 17.6    | 27.3          | 90.9               |
|         | Doctoral Degree     | 1                               | 5.9     | 9.1           | 100.0              |
|         | Total               | 11                              | 64.7    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System              | 6                               | 35.3    |               |                    |
| Total   |                     | 17                              | 100.0   |               |                    |

### Appendix G. Major of Highest Education Degree

**Table 7**

*Major of Highest Education Degree*

|         |             | Major of Highest Education Degree |         |               |                    |
|---------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|         |             | Frequency                         | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid   | Sociology   | 3                                 | 17.6    | 27.3          | 27.3               |
|         | Psychology  | 1                                 | 5.9     | 9.1           | 36.4               |
|         | Social Work | 3                                 | 17.6    | 27.3          | 63.6               |
|         | Corrections | 1                                 | 5.9     | 9.1           | 72.7               |
|         | Law         | 1                                 | 5.9     | 9.1           | 81.8               |
|         | Other       | 2                                 | 11.8    | 18.2          | 100.0              |
|         | Total       | 11                                | 64.7    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing | System      | 6                                 | 35.3    |               |                    |
| Total   |             | 17                                | 100.0   |               |                    |



**Appendix H. Cross-Tabulation for My CDR and My CDC**

**Table 8**

*Cross-Tabulation for My CDR and My CDC*

|        |                 |                 | My CDC * My CDC Crosstabulation |        |        |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------|--------|
|        |                 |                 | My CDC                          |        | Total  |
|        |                 |                 | 1.00                            | 2.00   |        |
| My CDR | 1.00            | Count           | 5                               | 0      | 5      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 4.3                             | .7     | 5.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 100.0%                          | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within My CDC | 83.3%                           | .0%    | 71.4%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 71.4%                           | .0%    | 71.4%  |
|        | 2.00            | Count           | 1                               | 1      | 2      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 1.7                             | .3     | 2.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 50.0%                           | 50.0%  | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within My CDC | 16.7%                           | 100.0% | 28.6%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 14.3%                           | 14.3%  | 28.6%  |
| Total  | Count           | 6               | 1                               | 7      |        |
|        | Expected Count  | 6.0             | 1.0                             | 7.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDR | 85.7%           | 14.3%                           | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within My CDC | 100.0%          | 100.0%                          | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total      | 85.7%           | 14.3%                           | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix I. Cross-Tabulation for *Colleagues CDR* and *Colleagues CDC***

**Table 9**

*Cross-Tabulation for Colleagues CDR and Colleagues CDC*

**Colleagues CDR \* Colleagues CDC Crosstabulation**

|                |                         |                         | Colleagues CDC |        | Total  |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|
|                |                         |                         | 1.00           | 2.00   |        |
| Colleagues CDR | 1.00                    | Count                   | 5              | 1      | 6      |
|                |                         | Expected Count          | 5.1            | .9     | 6.0    |
|                |                         | % within Colleagues CDR | 83.3%          | 16.7%  | 100.0% |
|                |                         | % within Colleagues CDC | 83.3%          | 100.0% | 85.7%  |
|                |                         | % of Total              | 71.4%          | 14.3%  | 85.7%  |
|                | 2.00                    | Count                   | 1              | 0      | 1      |
|                |                         | Expected Count          | .9             | .1     | 1.0    |
|                |                         | % within Colleagues CDR | 100.0%         | .0%    | 100.0% |
|                |                         | % within Colleagues CDC | 16.7%          | .0%    | 14.3%  |
|                |                         | % of Total              | 14.3%          | .0%    | 14.3%  |
| Total          | Count                   | 6                       | 1              | 7      |        |
|                | Expected Count          | 6.0                     | 1.0            | 7.0    |        |
|                | % within Colleagues CDR | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |
|                | % within Colleagues CDC | 100.0%                  | 100.0%         | 100.0% |        |
|                | % of Total              | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix J. Cross-Tabulation for *CF CDR* and *CF CDC***

**Table 10**

*Cross-Tabulation for CF CDR and CF CDC*

|        |                 |                 | CF CDC * CF CDC Crosstabulation |        |        |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------|--------|
|        |                 |                 | CF CDC                          |        | Total  |
|        |                 |                 | 1.00                            | 2.00   |        |
| CF CDR | 1.00            | Count           | 6                               | 1      | 7      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 5.3                             | 1.8    | 7.0    |
|        |                 | % within CF CDR | 85.7%                           | 14.3%  | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDC | 100.0%                          | 50.0%  | 87.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 75.0%                           | 12.5%  | 87.5%  |
|        | 2.00            | Count           | 0                               | 1      | 1      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | .8                              | .3     | 1.0    |
|        |                 | % within CF CDR | .0%                             | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDC | .0%                             | 50.0%  | 12.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | .0%                             | 12.5%  | 12.5%  |
| Total  | Count           | 6               | 2                               | 8      |        |
|        | Expected Count  | 6.0             | 2.0                             | 8.0    |        |
|        | % within CF CDR | 75.0%           | 25.0%                           | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within CF CDC | 100.0%          | 100.0%                          | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total      | 75.0%           | 25.0%                           | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix K. Cross-Tabulation for *Colleagues DR* and *Colleagues DC***

**Table 12**

***Cross-Tabulation for Colleagues DR and Colleagues DC***

|               |                        |                        | Colleagues DC |        | Total  |
|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|--------|--------|
|               |                        |                        | 1.00          | 2.00   |        |
| Colleagues DR | 1.00                   | Count                  | 4             | 2      | 6      |
|               |                        | Expected Count         | 4.3           | 1.7    | 6.0    |
|               |                        | % within Colleagues DR | 66.7%         | 33.3%  | 100.0% |
|               |                        | % within Colleagues DC | 80.0%         | 100.0% | 85.7%  |
|               |                        | % of Total             | 57.1%         | 28.6%  | 85.7%  |
|               | 2.00                   | Count                  | 1             | 0      | 1      |
|               |                        | Expected Count         | .7            | .3     | 1.0    |
|               |                        | % within Colleagues DR | 100.0%        | .0%    | 100.0% |
|               |                        | % within Colleagues DC | 20.0%         | .0%    | 14.3%  |
|               |                        | % of Total             | 14.3%         | .0%    | 14.3%  |
| Total         | Count                  | 5                      | 2             | 7      |        |
|               | Expected Count         | 5.0                    | 2.0           | 7.0    |        |
|               | % within Colleagues DR | 71.4%                  | 28.6%         | 100.0% |        |
|               | % within Colleagues DC | 100.0%                 | 100.0%        | 100.0% |        |
|               | % of Total             | 71.4%                  | 28.6%         | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix L. Cross-Tabulation for *My CDR* and *Colleagues CDR***

**Table 13**

***Cross-Tabulation for My CDR and Colleagues CDR***

|        |                         |                         | Colleagues CDR |        | Total  |
|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|
|        |                         |                         | 1.00           | 2.00   |        |
| My CDR | 1.00                    | Count                   | 5              | 0      | 5      |
|        |                         | Expected Count          | 4.3            | .7     | 5.0    |
|        |                         | % within My CDR         | 100.0%         | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                         | % within Colleagues CDR | 83.3%          | .0%    | 71.4%  |
|        |                         | % of Total              | 71.4%          | .0%    | 71.4%  |
|        | 2.00                    | Count                   | 1              | 1      | 2      |
|        |                         | Expected Count          | 1.7            | .3     | 2.0    |
|        |                         | % within My CDR         | 50.0%          | 50.0%  | 100.0% |
|        |                         | % within Colleagues CDR | 16.7%          | 100.0% | 28.6%  |
|        |                         | % of Total              | 14.3%          | 14.3%  | 28.6%  |
| Total  | Count                   | 6                       | 1              | 7      |        |
|        | Expected Count          | 6.0                     | 1.0            | 7.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDR         | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within Colleagues CDR | 100.0%                  | 100.0%         | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total              | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix M. Cross-Tabulation for *My CDR* and *CF CDR***

**Table 14**

***Cross-Tabulation for My CDR and CF CDR***

|        |                 |                 | CF CDR |        | Total  |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|        |                 |                 | 1.00   | 2.00   |        |
| My CDR | 1.00            | Count           | 4      | 1      | 5      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 4.4    | .6     | 5.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 80.0%  | 20.0%  | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDR | 57.1%  | 100.0% | 62.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 50.0%  | 12.5%  | 62.5%  |
|        | 2.00            | Count           | 3      | 0      | 3      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 2.6    | .4     | 3.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDR | 100.0% | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDR | 42.9%  | .0%    | 37.5%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 37.5%  | .0%    | 37.5%  |
| Total  | Count           | 7               | 1      | 8      |        |
|        | Expected Count  | 7.0             | 1.0    | 8.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDR | 87.5%           | 12.5%  | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within CF CDR | 100.0%          | 100.0% | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total      | 87.5%           | 12.5%  | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix N. Cross-Tabulation for *My CDC* and *Colleagues CDC***

**Table 15**

***Cross-Tabulation for My CDC and Colleagues CDC***

|        |                         |                         | Colleagues CDC |        | Total  |
|--------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|
|        |                         |                         | 1.00           | 2.00   |        |
| My CDC | 1.00                    | Count                   | 5              | 1      | 6      |
|        |                         | Expected Count          | 5.1            | .9     | 6.0    |
|        |                         | % within My CDC         | 83.3%          | 16.7%  | 100.0% |
|        |                         | % within Colleagues CDC | 83.3%          | 100.0% | 85.7%  |
|        |                         | % of Total              | 71.4%          | 14.3%  | 85.7%  |
|        | 2.00                    | Count                   | 1              | 0      | 1      |
|        |                         | Expected Count          | .9             | .1     | 1.0    |
|        |                         | % within My CDC         | 100.0%         | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                         | % within Colleagues CDC | 16.7%          | .0%    | 14.3%  |
|        |                         | % of Total              | 14.3%          | .0%    | 14.3%  |
| Total  | Count                   | 6                       | 1              | 7      |        |
|        | Expected Count          | 6.0                     | 1.0            | 7.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDC         | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within Colleagues CDC | 100.0%                  | 100.0%         | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total              | 85.7%                   | 14.3%          | 100.0% |        |

**Appendix O. Cross-Tabulation for *My CDC* and *CF CDC***

**Table 16*****Cross-Tabulation for My CDC and CF CDC***

**My CDC \* CF CDC Crosstabulation**

|        |                 |                 | CF CDC |        | Total  |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|
|        |                 |                 | 1.00   | 2.00   |        |
| My CDC | 1.00            | Count           | 4      | 2      | 6      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | 4.3    | 1.7    | 6.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDC | 66.7%  | 33.3%  | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDC | 80.0%  | 100.0% | 85.7%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 57.1%  | 28.6%  | 85.7%  |
|        | 2.00            | Count           | 1      | 0      | 1      |
|        |                 | Expected Count  | .7     | .3     | 1.0    |
|        |                 | % within My CDC | 100.0% | .0%    | 100.0% |
|        |                 | % within CF CDC | 20.0%  | .0%    | 14.3%  |
|        |                 | % of Total      | 14.3%  | .0%    | 14.3%  |
| Total  | Count           | 5               | 2      | 7      |        |
|        | Expected Count  | 5.0             | 2.0    | 7.0    |        |
|        | % within My CDC | 71.4%           | 28.6%  | 100.0% |        |
|        | % within CF CDC | 100.0%          | 100.0% | 100.0% |        |
|        | % of Total      | 71.4%           | 28.6%  | 100.0% |        |



**Appendix P. Cross-Tabulation for *My DR* and *Colleagues DR***

**Table 17**

***Cross-Tabulation for My DR and Colleagues DR***

|       |      |                        | Colleagues DR |        | Total  |
|-------|------|------------------------|---------------|--------|--------|
|       |      |                        | 1.00          | 2.00   |        |
| My DR | 1.00 | Count                  | 5             | 1      | 6      |
|       |      | Expected Count         | 4.3           | 1.7    | 6.0    |
|       |      | % within My DR         | 83.3%         | 16.7%  | 100.0% |
|       |      | % within Colleagues DR | 100.0%        | 50.0%  | 85.7%  |
|       |      | % of Total             | 71.4%         | 14.3%  | 85.7%  |
|       | 2.00 | Count                  | 0             | 1      | 1      |
|       |      | Expected Count         | .7            | .3     | 1.0    |
|       |      | % within My DR         | .0%           | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|       |      | % within Colleagues DR | .0%           | 50.0%  | 14.3%  |
|       |      | % of Total             | .0%           | 14.3%  | 14.3%  |
| Total |      | Count                  | 5             | 2      | 7      |
|       |      | Expected Count         | 5.0           | 2.0    | 7.0    |
|       |      | % within My DR         | 71.4%         | 28.6%  | 100.0% |
|       |      | % within Colleagues DR | 100.0%        | 100.0% | 100.0% |
|       |      | % of Total             | 71.4%         | 28.6%  | 100.0% |