

CHAPTER 12 GENDER ISSUES

12.1 Introduction

The number of girls in juvenile justice facilities has increased significantly in the past few years. Because boys have dominated the juvenile justice system, juvenile justice programming has developed around male needs (Scahill, 2000). As female participation in criminal activity rises, it is essential to examine the unique treatment and education needs and characteristics of girls (Morash, 1998). Girls are victims of abuse, particularly sexual abuse, at rates higher than those of their male counterparts (Widom, 2000). Female juvenile delinquents are also more likely to engage in substance abuse (Scahill, 2000). According to the 1995 Uniform Crime Report Data, one in four arrests for females were for shoplifting. In addition, roughly half of all female arrests are accounted for by larceny and running away. It is also interesting to note that running away accounts for 21.1% of female arrests. With regard to violent offenses, there were 90,687 male arrests for violent offenses as compared to 15,503 female arrests for violent offenses (UCR, 1995).

It is quite clear that girls' emotional needs differ from those of boys in significant ways (Obeidallah, 1999). Historically, the small proportion of girls in juvenile justice facilities has resulted in lack of funding, resources, knowledge, and interest in developing gender-specific programming for female juvenile delinquents. As female participation in criminal activity rises, it is essential to examine the unique treatment and education needs and characteristics of girls. Scrutiny of female participation in delinquency will enhance criminological understanding of these behaviors and allow the development of effective, replicable best practices in educating and treating female delinquents.

This chapter focuses on the significance of gender-specific programming and services to incarcerated females. The chapter is comprised of three subsequent sections. Section 12.2 identifies most promising practices in female programming. Section 12.3 presents JJEEP data and findings. Section 12.4 provides a summary discussion of the need for gender-specific programming and introduces a longitudinal research proposal as it relates to incarcerated females.

12.2 Identification of Most Promising Practices

Despite increasing participation of females in juvenile delinquency, girls account for a relatively small proportion of crime. The sheer volume of male criminal activity has demanded substantial attention and efforts from the academic and research community. As social, political, and economic conditions have shifted throughout the last half of the 20th century, greater interest has focused on females and girl delinquency in particular. This

academic work remains preliminary rather than definitive or comprehensive in nature. There are two tasks at hand in addressing the research questions posed by female participation in juvenile delinquency. First, the problem must be described and understood.

Previous descriptive and analytic approaches have long suffered from an overwhelming male-oriented and paternalistic approach. For example, Broidy and Agnew (1997) pose the question, “How can we explain the higher rate of crime among males?” rather than contextualizing the issue as a female problem by asking, “How can we explain the lower rate of crime among females?” A recent trend has developed, however, from a variety of disciplines that embarks on appropriate description of sex and gender differences between men and women, girls and boys. Heimer (1996); and LaGrange (1999) found that self-control explains much of the “gap” between male and female crime in adults and suggest that more intense social constraints experienced by women also play a key role in sex differences. Similarly, exposure to delinquent peers and the strength of relationships with peers and family explains some of the sex differences (Mears, Ploeger, & Mark, 1998; Agnew & Brezina, 1997; Anderson 1999, Koita & Triplett, 1998). The field of psychology has also examined sex differences, examining delinquency as a problem of adolescence and anti-social behavior (Baldwin, Harris, Shanette, & Chambliss, 1997; Casper, Belanoff, & Offer 1996; Pajer, 1998; and Silver, 1996). Although this previous research touches on various aspects of gender and sex differences, the phenomenon is a complicated and intricate combination of social, biological, and psychological factors. Given the extended complexities of the problem of describing gender and sex differences, it is clear that much work remains to be done in this area.

Secondly, best practices for the treatment and education of females must be identified. This task, which is so clearly of paramount social importance for all criminal offenders, is fraught with difficulties even before introducing the problem of sex and gender differences. In the extant academic literature, however, three primary themes emerge: education, treatment for abuse, and drug and alcohol treatment (Acoca, 1998; Chesney-Lind, 2001; Corrado, Odgers, & Cohen, 2000; Maughan, Pickles, Hagell, Rutter, & Yule, 1996; Pepi, 1997; Schaffner, Shick, & Stein, 1997). Chesney-Lind (2001) also suggests an all-female environment that explicitly addresses sex and gender issues throughout the educational and treatment services. This suggests that facilities that attempt to serve both males and females may be less successful in meeting the needs of girls than those facilities that are segregated by sex. Although there are a variety of suggestions for best practices in the academic literature, few of these concepts have been empirically evaluated and further research is clearly called for.

Many juvenile justice facilities in Florida, those serving females only, as well as those serving combined populations, offer a variety of gender-specific programming options. These program offerings are not universal, however, and vary substantially from one program to another. Table 12.2-1 summarizes findings from a 1999 Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) report (using 1999 restrictiveness level designations) that indicates the gender-specific programming offered in Florida at that time.

Table 12.2-1: Overview of Gender-Specific Services by Levels (DJJ 1999)

Gender-Specific Programming Categories	Percentage of Programs Providing Services			
	Level 2	Level 4	Level 6	Level 8
Pregnancy/sexuality/parenting instruction	17%	82%	82%	80%
Health and hygiene services	5%	71%	71%	100%
Relationship building	5%	53%	24%	20%
Sexual/physical abuse counseling	2%	53%	41%	80%
Self-image development and body awareness	2%	47%	29%	40%
Promotion of self-esteem	2%	29%	53%	60%
Communication and anger management counseling	5%	24%	47%	60%
Female mentoring models	10%	12%	18%	0%
Cultural activities	10%	12%	6%	20%
Domestic violence counseling	5%	6%	29%	0%

Because current JJEEP education QA standards do not address gender-specific programming, QA scores reflect general program performance rather than the volume, content, or quality of sex-based offerings.

Practical Academic Cultural Education (PACE)

PACE day treatment prevention programs provide comprehensive, gender-specific services that center on a strong educational and social service delivery model for girls aged 12 to 18. A pilot program for girls aged 8 to 11 began this year in Broward County. Programs also provide transition services that provide aftercare services to students and their families. According to DJJ Prevention Outcome Evaluation Reports, PACE was identified as the only prevention program in Florida that statistically showed a relationship between successful completion of their program and avoidance of subsequent delinquent activity for two consecutive years (1998 & 1999).

By implementing gender-based programming in a sex-segregated environment, PACE programs employ the promising best practices identified in the literature. These programs consistently receive high QA review scores, indicating a positive correlation between the identified promising practices and QA scores. In fact, of the 19 PACE centers operating in 2001, two of the facilities had special deemed status which required no program review in 2001 and deemed program reviews for the next two years, eight of the facilities had deemed status which required an abbreviated QA review, while nine facilities received a full QA review. The high proportion of deemed and special deemed PACE programs (53%) indicates not only that the PACE program provides especially high quality educational programs, but that the PACE model is replicable and can be implemented with consistently high performance across PACE programs. Table 12.2-2 summarizes the mean QA scores by standard and overall mean of the nine PACE facilities that received a full QA review.

Table 12.2-2: PACE Mean Scores of Standards and Overall Mean QA Score*

Program Type	Number of Programs	Standard One: Transition	Standard Two: Service Delivery	Standard Three: Administration	Standard Four: Contract Management	Overall Mean QA Score
PACE female-only day treatment	9	6.44	6.49	6.22	5.67	6.33

*Does not include deemed programs. Contract Management is not included in the Overall Mean QA score.

Although the PACE programs are exemplary, they cannot be generally compared to other juvenile justice programs in Florida for several reasons. First, PACE is selective in deciding which students to accept into their programs. Most of them are not committed and, as such, DJJ treats and evaluates this program as a prevention program. Second, PACE programs are nonprofit and receive high levels of funding from outside sources; therefore, they can provide inclusive program offerings more readily than other juvenile justice programs. Nevertheless, the PACE gender-specific model and key elements of its programming could be successful in other juvenile justice programs for females.

12.3 JJEEP Data and Findings

Girls received services in 97 juvenile justice facilities in 2001. The majority of the facilities in Florida serve males only. Because fewer facilities serve girls, girls may have to travel greater distances from home to programs than boys. Table 12.3-1 shows the number of DJJ facilities (including deemed) that serve females only, males only, and that serve both (combined).

Table 12.3-1: Number of Facilities by Gender

Facility Type	Number of Programs
Female Only	41
Male Only	106
Combined	56
Total	203

Most programs that serve females, whether in combination with males or not, are prevention or day treatment programs. Table 12.3-2 indicates the number of programs (including deemed) in each facility type and security level according to the gender of the student population.

Table 12.3-2: Number of Facilities by Security Level and Gender

Security Level	Female Only	Male Only	Combined	Total
Prevention	16	2	4	22
Intensive Probation/ Conditional Release	2	3	5	10
Day Treatment*	0	0	19	19
Low Risk	3	15	1	19
Moderate Risk - Environmentally Secure	0	19	1	20
Moderate Risk - Hardware Secure	6	16	2	24
Moderate Risk - Staff Secure	9	26	0	35
Mixed Moderate and High Risk	0	6	0	0
High Risk	3	15	0	18
Mixed High and Maximum Risk	1	1	0	2
Maximum Risk	1	3	0	4
Detention (Secure)	0	0	24	2
Total	41	106	56	203

*This category includes some programs that are combined with intensive probation, conditional release, or group treatment home.

During the 2001 QA review cycle, 21% of the youths served in juvenile justice facilities were female. Of the female students, a little more than one third were in PACE programs. For those programs that received a full review in 2001, JJEEP is able to compare QA scores for programs that serve females only, males only, or have combined populations. Table 12.3-3 shows the comparison of female-only programs with male-only programs.

Table 12.3-3: Comparison of Female-Only and Male-Only Programs by Mean Scores of Standards and Overall Mean QA Score*

Program Type	Number of Programs	Standard One: Transition	Standard Two: Service Delivery	Standard Three: Administration	Standard Four: Contract Management	Overall Mean QA Score
Female Only	32	5.54	5.78	5.71	5.15	5.66
Male Only	91	5.26	5.74	5.55	5.28	5.54

*Does not include deemed programs. Contract Management is not included in the Overall Mean QA score.

Although the programs that serve females have a higher overall mean QA and higher mean scores on three of the four standards, none of the differences were statistically significant. Single sex facilities were then compared to facilities that serve both males and females. The results are summarized in table 12.3-4.

Table 12.3-4: Comparison of Female-Only and Male-Only Programs with Combined Programs (Including Detention) by Mean Score of Standards and Overall Mean QA Scores*

Program Type	Number of Programs	Standard One: Transition	Standard Two: Service Delivery	Standard Three: Administration	Standard Four: Contract Management	Overall Mean QA Score
Female Only	32	5.54 ^a	5.78	5.71	5.15	5.66
Male Only	91	5.26	5.74	5.55	5.28	5.54 ^b
Combined	44	4.79 ^a	5.41	5.23	4.66	5.13 ^b

*Does not include deemed programs. Contract Management is not included in the Overall Mean QA score. Statistically significant relationships for a and b at the 0.05 level.

Table 12.3-4 indicates that single sex facilities have higher mean QA scores both for individual standards and for the overall mean QA score. Two of these relationships, the comparison of the Standard 1 mean score of female only programs to combined programs, and the overall mean QA score of male only programs to combined programs, were statistically significant. These comparisons do include detention centers, which serve both girls and boys. Because educational services provided in detention centers differ greatly from all other juvenile justice facilities due to the unique constraints and constant changes in the students served by detention centers, the same comparison was conducted with detention centers excluded. The results of this comparison are summarized in Table 12.3-5.

Table 12.3-5: Comparison of Female Only and Male Only Programs with Combined Programs (Excluding Detention) by Mean Scores of Standards and Overall Mean QA Score*

Program Type	Number of Programs	Standard One: Transition	Standard Two: Service Delivery	Standard Three: Administration	Standard Four: Contract Management	Overall Mean QA Score
Female Only	32	5.54	5.78	5.71 ^a	5.15	5.66 ^b
Male Only	91	5.26	5.74	5.55 ^c	5.28	5.54 ^d
Combined	24	4.82	5.31	4.99 ^{ac}	4.38	5.05 ^{bd}

*Does not include deemed programs. Contract Management is not included in the Overall Mean QA score. Statistically significant relationships for a, b, c, and d at the 0.05 level.

Table 12.3-5 indicates that when detention centers are excluded from the analysis, the difference in program performance between single sex programs and combined facilities increases. In particular, programs that serve both boys and girls perform lower on Standard 3 Administration as well as the overall mean QA score. In addition, it should be noted that 17 of the 24 facilities serving a combined population are Associated Marine Institute (AMI) day treatment facilities, which tend to receive lower than average QA scores.

12.4 Summary Discussion

As female involvement in the juvenile justice system increases, it is essential to address the unique education needs of girls. Because boys significantly outnumber girls in the system, girls face fewer programmatic options. Academic literature emphasizes the description of gender differences as well as the particular needs of girls. Specifically, prior research suggests the need for gender-segregated as well as gender-based programming. Although there is not a plethora of identified promising practices, realistic implementation and replication of those practices that have been identified should be initiated and encouraged. In particular, elements of the PACE program, which embodies promising practices and appears to be replicable, should be considered for inclusion in other programs to enhance the quality of juvenile justice education for girls.

