

Prairie View A&M University

Digital Commons @PVAMU

All Dissertations

Dissertations

8-2023

**An Analysis Of The Consequences Of Running Away Among Black
And Hispanic Female Juvenile Offenders With An Emphasis On
Future Orientation**

Kruthi Jagadish Kumar

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pvamu.edu/pvamu-dissertations>

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF RUNNING AWAY AMONG BLACK
AND HISPANIC FEMALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON
FUTURE ORIENTATION

A Dissertation

By

KRUTHI JAGADISH KUMAR

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Prairie View A&M University
In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2023

Major Subject: Juvenile Justice

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF RUNNING AWAY AMONG BLACK
AND HISPANIC FEMALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH AN EMPHASIS ON
FUTURE ORIENTATION

A Dissertation
By
KRUTHI JAGADISH KUMAR

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Prairie View A&M University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Myrna Cintron
Chair of Committee

Dr. Nabil Ouassini
Co-Chair

Dr. Shantae Motley
Member

Dr. Douglas Hermond
Member

Dr. Myrna Cintron
Head of the Department

Dr. Camille Gibson
Interim-Dean of College

Dr. Tyrone Tanner
Dean of Graduate Studies

August 2023

Major Subject: Juvenile Justice

ABSTRACT

An Analysis of the Consequences of Running Away Among Black and Hispanic Female
Juvenile Offenders with an Emphasis on Future Orientation

(August 2023)

Kruthi Jagadish Kumar, B.A., Bangalore

University; M.Sc., University of Madras

Chair of Dissertation Committee: Dr. Myrna Cintron

Girls are prominent in the etiology of runaways due to having higher runaway rates than boys. While empirical studies of runaways have extensively focused on the causes of girls' runaways, few studies shed light on the runaway consequences. Those studies that analyzed the consequences of a girl's runaway have majorly stressed the delinquent outcomes. However, studies of runaway consequences have minimally paid attention to youth future orientation since future orientation is a vital factor in youth offending behavior. Furthermore, contextual background, such as runaway, influences the same future orientation. Therefore, this research explored the understudied relationship between the girl's runaway consequences, future orientation, and offending behavior among female Black and Hispanic offenders. This quantitative research utilized a secondary dataset, Research on Pathways to Desistance [Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia County, PA]: Subject Measures, 2000-2010 from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). This research examined three research questions. The first research question measured whether runaway girls

significantly differed in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than non-runaway girls. The second research question attempted to understand if there are any significant differences between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. The third research question examined the interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation's influence on runaway girls' offending behavior.

This research employed one-way ANOVA and Multiple Regression analysis to analyze the research questions. The research findings from one-way ANOVA identified no significant differences between runaway and non-runaway girls and Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. The results from Multiple Regression analysis found a statistically significant influence of the interaction of exposure to violence and future orientation, and procedural justice and future orientation on runaway girls' offending behavior.

Keywords: runaway girls, future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, certainty of sanctions perceptions, self-reported offending behavior

DEDICATION

In the loving memory of my grandmother Mrs. (Smt.) L. Saraswathi who always showed us to never give up. My dearest grandmother's last words to me were to finish what I had started, and today with her blessings, I hope she is beaming with pride.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Despite the fact that this work has an individual author, its completion owes many people for their help and support. My heartfelt gratitude to each one of them.

To my parents, Mr. (Sri) N. Jagadish Kumar and Mrs. (Smt.) T. G. Poornima. Thank you, Amma and Appa, for raising me to be the person I am today and teaching me the values that I will forever cherish. Also, my brother Mr. Kaushik J. Kumar, BBA LLB., for his encouragement and support at challenging times and for standing by me in my every decision. My grandfather, Mr. (Sri) T. S. Gururajaro for his advice and inspiration. Thank you to all my relatives and friends who encouraged me.

My humble gratitude to dear Dr. Myrna Cintron for taking me under her wings as a research assistant and teaching me all the values and providing me with abundant opportunities to grow. I am forever indebted to you. Dr. Cintron very generously agreed to be my dissertation chair, and without her guidance and encouragement, this achievement would not have been possible. Dr. Cintron has been a role model to me and many other students who are enlightened by her. My heartfelt thanks and highest regards to Dr. Cintron. I would also like to thank my committee co-chair Dr. Nabil Ouassini and the committee members, Dr. Shantae Motley and Dr. Douglas Hermond for their timely advice and reviews that resulted in my successful completion.

My special thanks to Dr. Camille Gibson, who introduced me to the Ph.D. program and encouraged me to take on this journey. Dr. Gibson, thank you for all the motivation and support throughout the program. My regards to all the faculty members in the department and Dr. Kimberly Chism and Dr. Abdullah Cihan, for the wonderful

advice and opportunities you provided to prove myself. Mrs. Sandy Siegmund, thank you for all your acts of kindness.

My final and special address to my dearest friend Praveenrao Bolli for being my anchor throughout this journey. Praveen, you have encouraged me and supported me in my hardest times and motivated me to overcome every obstacle I stumbled upon. Your values and principles have always taught me to work harder with perseverance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Importance of Future Orientation.....	5
Problem Statement and Significance.....	7
Background of Study.....	11
Exposure To Violence, Future Orientation and Offending Behavior.....	11
Procedural Justice, Future Orientation, and Offending Behavior.....	12
Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions, Future Orientation, and Offending Behavior.....	14
Summary.....	16
II__ LITERATURE REVIEW.....	18
Historical View of Runaway Youth.....	19
Runaway Black and Hispanic Girls.....	21
Future Orientation as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior.....	27
Exposure to Violence as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior.....	32
Procedural Justice Views as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior.....	33
Runaways Procedural Justice Views Towards Police.....	34
Runaways Procedural Justice Views Towards Courts.....	37
Perceptions of Certainty/Deterrence as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior.....	40
Offending Behavior as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior.....	44
Interaction Between Future Orientation and Other Consequences of Running Away	45
Theoretical Framework.....	48
General Strain Theory.....	48
Procedural Justice Theory.....	50
Deterrence Theory.....	53
Summary.....	54
III__ METHOD.....	57

The Current Study.....	57
Research Questions.....	57
Population and Data.....	60
Sample Design.....	61
Measures.....	62
Runaway.....	63
Future Orientation.....	63
Procedural Justice.....	64
Exposure to Violence.....	64
Perceptions of Certainty of Sanctions.....	64
Self-Reported Offending.....	65
Data Cleaning and Indexing.....	67
Interaction Variables.....	69
Summary.....	69
IV RESULTS.....	70
Statistical Test Assumptions.....	73
One-Way ANOVA.....	73
Multiple Regression.....	75
Demographic Statistics.....	76
Research Question 1.....	78
Runaway Background and Future Orientation.....	78
Runaway Background and Exposure to Violence.....	79
Runaway Background and Procedural Justice Views.....	79
Runaway Background and Certainty of Sanction Perceptions.....	80
Research Question 2.....	82
Racial/Ethnic Background and Future Orientation.....	82
Racial/Ethnic Background and Exposure to Violence.....	83
Racial/Ethnic Background and Procedural Justice Views.....	83
Racial/Ethnic Background and Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions.....	84
Research Question 3.....	86
Exposure to Violence, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior.....	86
Procedural Justice, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior	87
Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior.....	87
Summary.....	91
V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	93
Summary of Study Results.....	95
Research Question 1.....	95
Research Question 2.....	98

Research Question 3	101
Limitations	104
Conclusion and Policy Implication.....	105
REFERENCES	108
APPENDIX.....	157
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	158

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Self-Reported Offending.....	66
2. Demographic Measures	77
3. Difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions	81
4. Differences between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions	85
5. Interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation influence on runaway girls' offending behavior ..	90

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Status offenses (running away from home, truancy, not obeying parents, curfew violations, and underage drinking by minors) comprised most of the arrests for which girls are processed in the juvenile justice system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014). Of the various kinds of status offenses, runaway has the highest number of girls involvement (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2021). Studies conducted by Chesney-Lind and Okamoto (2001), Hockenberry and Puzzanchera (2020), Hockenberry and Puzzanchera (2021), and Snyder and Sickmund (1999) have analyzed that while girls outnumber boys in the category of runaway, boys hold the major share in other status offenses.

In 2019, 56% of boys were referred to juvenile court for a status offense violation. For the same year, 55% of girls were referred for runaway violations and boys for 45% (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). In other categories of status offenses such as truancy, ungovernability, liquor law violation, and curfew, boys hold a higher referral rate than girls (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020).

This dissertation follows the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 7th Edition*.

The greater number of girls running away than boys have been considered a problem since 1970 (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2013). Since that time, girl runaways have become the subject of empirical studies, particularly those exploring the causes and consequences of runaway behavior. However, most studies have focused on the causes of runaway (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997), while only a few studies have explored the consequence of runaway behavior (Stinton, 2007).

In the context of runaway consequences, studies have extensively examined the correlation between youth runaway and offending behavior (Baron & Hartnagel, 1998; Chesney-Lind, 2006; Chesney-Lind & Okamoto, 2001; Datesman & Aickin, 1984; Donovan et al., 1988; Farrington et al., 1988; Hagan et al., 1997; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Howell, 2003; Igra & Irwin, 1996; Johansson & Kempf-Leonard, 2009; Kaufman & Widom, 1999; Kim et al., 2009; Moore & Gullone, 1996; Sheldon et al., 1989; Stinton, 2007; Thomas, 1976; Tracy & Kempf-Lenord, 1996; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder et al., 2003). The consensus among the empirical analysis point to a positive relationship between running away and offending. The literature has also identified several reasons for delinquency involvement including survival strategies (Hagan et al., 1997; Kim et al., 2009; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder et al., 2003), long-term homelessness (Baron & Hartnagel, 1998; Hagan et al., 1997; Kim et al., 2009), experiences of victimization (Hagan et al., 1997; Kim et al., 2009; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993), contact and differential treatment of the justice system (Howell, 2003; Johansson & Kempf-Leonard, 2009), deterrence (Lee et al., 2018; Lochner, 2007; Matsueda et al., 2006), and exposure to delinquent peers (Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder et al., 2003).

Although the delinquency rates of girls are not as high as their status offense rates, in 2019, 28% girls were identified as delinquents compared to 72% boys. That is, boys were 2.5 times more likely to be referred to as delinquents than girls (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). When comparison is made using 2019 runaway and delinquency data among girls and boys (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020), the conclusion can be drawn that girls' involvement in runaway needs to be examined, particularly the consequences of the behavior.

Observing the empirical analysis of runaway and delinquency, data reveal some important patterns for race and ethnicity. The runaways' race and ethnicity in 2005 showed that, Whites had nine percent runaway cases, Blacks had 22% runaway cases, and Hispanics had 12% runaway cases (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). By 2019, Whites had six percent runaway cases, Blacks had 19% runaway cases, and Hispanics had eight percent cases (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). Despite the overall decline of runaway rates among all racial/ethnic youth groups, it can be identified that the runaway rates are still higher among Black and Hispanic youth than White youth (Courtney & Zinn, 2009; Dworsky et al., 2018; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020; Lin, 2012; Wulczyn, 2020).

Observing the delinquency data for race and ethnicity shows that in 2005, Blacks had 33% delinquency rate, which increased to 35% in 2019, Hispanics had 16% and an increase of 19% in 2019. With regards to the delinquency rates of Whites, in 2005 it was at 48% and had declined to 43% by 2019 (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). As it can be observed that among both Blacks and Hispanics, delinquency rates increased from 2005 to 2019 whereas for Whites, the rates declined (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera,

2020). With reference to the runaway and delinquency rates among the Whites, Blacks, and Hispanic youth, it can be observed that minorities have higher representation in both runaway and delinquency rates. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the consequences of Black and Hispanic girls' runaway behavior.

According to Donovan et al. (1988), delinquency is a consequence of running away, although there are other unknown underlying factors that may influence runaway youth offending behavior. These underlying factors as identified by other researchers are exposure to violence (Becker & Kerig, 2011; Copeland et al., 2007; Cohen & Felson, 1979; Kim et al., 2009; Peterson et al., 2004), procedural justice views (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Levi et al., 2009; Penner et al., 2014; Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006b; Walters, 2018), and certainty of sanctions perceptions (Lochner, 2007; Loughran et al., 2012; Matsueda et al., 2006; Schulz, 2014) which may act as underlying factors for runaway youth offending behavior.

Several studies have ignored the role of future orientation between runaway and offending behavior. The need to study future orientation in this study is that, although runaway behavior is found in both girls and boys (Stinton, 2007), the juvenile delinquency trend varies among boys and girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004), and studies have found a strong correlation between runaway and offending behavior among boys and girls (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Kim et al., 2009; Stinton, 2007). According to Jensen and Rojek (1998), this phenomenon could be due to differences in offending motivation among boys and girls. Therefore, this study analyzed the role of future orientation in the runaway and offending behavior among a sample of Black and

Hispanic girl delinquents. The next section reviews the reasons why future orientation is necessary when examining consequences of runaway for youth.

Importance of Future Orientation

Future orientation refers to an individual's concern for their future and consists of guiding factors like maintaining goals, executing plans, exploring choices, and making commitments (Arnett, 2000; Johnson et al., 2014; Nurmi, 1991, 2005; Seginer & Noyman, 2005; Steinberg et al., 2009). Therefore, one's future orientation plays a significant role in shaping behavior (Nurmi, 1991; Seginer et al., 2004) and provides the ability to cope with the difficulties (Testa et al., 2021). For example, adolescence is the age when the young adults make life-changing decisions regarding occupation, education, marital status, peer group selection, and mostly develop pro-social or antisocial in behaviors in terms of forming their identity (Nurmi, 1991, 2005; Testa et al., 2021). According to Cedeno et al. (2010), Shetgiri et al. (2016), and Stoddard et al. (2011), the positive functioning of greater future orientation is found to be a protective factor among Black youth against offending behavior.

Numerous studies have extensively examined the association between future orientation and juvenile offending behavior (Alm & Laftman, 2016; Anderson et al., 2020; Borowsky et al., 2009; Brezina et al., 2009; Jaynes et al., 2021; Piquero, 2014). For example, juveniles with greater future orientation are more likely to avoid opportunities of delinquency (Alm & Laftman, 2016; Johnson et al., 2013; Nurmi, 1989; Rowan et al., 2019; Stoddard et al., 2011; Seginer, 2008; Shetgiri et al., 2016; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). It has been found that because of the greater future orientation, individuals tend to care about their future goals and may not adapt anti-social behavior, by which they

increase their tendency to achieve goals (Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Johnson et al., 2013; Robbins & Bryan, 2004; Stoddard et al., 2011; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000) which indicates that juveniles with higher future orientation are less likely to participate in risk taking behavior. Lower future orientation may cause decisions that result in delinquency, such as aggressive behavior, panhandling, prostitution, selling drugs, and using weapons, to achieve immediate gratification by disregarding the future consequences (Bentham, 1970; Bolland et al., 2001; Chen & Vazsonyi, 2011; Stoddard et al., 2011; Shetgiri et al., 2016; Rowan et al., 2019).

While future orientation might be a significant variable in adolescents' offending behavior, the extent to which the contextual factors shape future orientation is less studied (Monahan et al., 2015). For example, future orientation and offending as a consequence of runaway behavior and the interaction between runaway girls and their future orientation impact on offending, are less examined. Though developmental transitions vary among the runaway and non-runaway youth, since runaway youth are at high risk, their future orientation is subjected to change and cause offending behavior. For example, if a runaway youth fails to mature out of a status offense like runaway it may change their future orientation and offending behavior leading to criminal behavior involvement in adulthood. With the same probability, negative consequences of runaway are also more likely to impact youth's future orientation and offending behavior than that of non-runaway youth.

Similarly, studies suggest that youth with violent surroundings (such as runaway youth exposed to violent surroundings, negative perceptions and the experiences with procedural justice and certainty of sanctions views) have poor future orientation (Shetgiri

et al., 2016; Stoddard et al., 2011;). Simultaneously, poor future orientation leads to offending behavior (Cauffman & Stienberg, 2000; Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Jessor et al., 2003; Monahan et al., 2013; Nurmi, 1991; Shetgiri et al., 2016; Stoddard et al., 2011;). Therefore, studies indicate a consistent connection between youth runaway behavior, future orientation, and offending behavior.

However, the connection between runaway behavior, future orientation, and offending behavior have been less studied among girls, particularly among Black and Hispanic girls whose runaway and delinquency rates are higher than White girls. Therefore, studying future orientation relationship with offending behavior among Black and Hispanic runaway girls is necessary and comparing Black and Hispanic runaway girls with non-runaways will strengthen the validity of the predicted relationships among Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Examining the interplay between these variables may provide significant findings regarding the runaway consequences among minority girls. The next section introduces the problem statement, and more information is provided describing this research.

Problem Statement and Significance

The runaway behavior literature mostly highlights youth offending behavior and underlying factors. For example, studies have extensively discussed the offending behavior and runaway survival strategies (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Tyler et al., 2004), association with delinquent peers (Simons & Whitbeck, 1991; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder et al., 2003), substance use (Windle, 1989), exposure to violence (Agnew 2002; Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Jennings et al. 2010; Martin et al., 1995; Maxfield & Widom, 1999; McCormack et al., 1986; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Smith & Thornberry,

1995; The National Child Traumatic Stress Network, 2016; Widom, 1989; Whitbeck et al., 1997), contact with justice system (Ayres, 1988; Flowers, 1995; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Herman, 1988; Hoyt et al., 1999; Jones, 1988; Kipke et al., 1997; Maxfield & Widom, 1999; Rotherham-Borus et al., 1991; Smart & Adlaf, 1991; Windle, 1989), procedural justice views (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Levi et al., 2009; Penner et al., 2014; Tyler, 2006b; Walters, 2017), certainty of sanctions perceptions (Loughran et al., 2012; Lochner, 2007; Matsueda et al., 2006; Schulz 2014), long-term homelessness (Hagan & McCarthy, 1994; McCarthy & Hagan, 1992), and lack of social service support (Smart & Adlaf, 1991).

However, as mentioned earlier it can be understood that the earlier studies emphasized the relationship of runaway's underlying factors such as survival strategies, exposure to violence, substance abuse, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions on offending behavior (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Loughran et al., 2012; The National Child Traumatic Stress Network 2016; Tyler et al., 2004; Windle, 1989), ignoring to identify that these underlying factors are actual consequences of runaway behavior. For example, earlier studies examined relationships like runaway's exposure to violence impact on offending behavior or runaways delinquent peer association impact on offending behavior. Whereas this study emphasized that alike offending behavior, these underlying factors are also consequences that are brought by runaway behavior into the youth's life. For example, exposure to violence with a greater probability vary as a consequence for runaways than non-runaways, and such consequence can potentially moderate the offending behavior among runaway and non-

runaway youth. Therefore, it increases the explanatory power of the relationship between the variables, which is the first identified significance for this study.

Although all the consequences of runaway are likely to yield offending behavior, more emphasis is seen in analyzing offending behavior as a prime consequence of runaway. Failing to primarily identify the underlying factors as a consequence of runaway may derail the understanding of runaway youth. Even if there are several consequences of runaway, in the context of Black and Hispanic runaway girls, it is important to study future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions as consequences. Because runaway girls are more likely to have prior violence exposure, and increased probability of contact with the justice system, it is likely that these will potentially mediate their procedural justice and certainty of sanctions views and offending behavior. Future orientation is a distinct factor among the runaway consequence because runaway itself solely impacts one's future orientation. However, with the addition of every new runaway consequence experience, future orientation tends to change its impact direction towards offending behavior. Therefore, offending behavior among runaway girls has heterogeneous causes. In the context of runaway girls, the heterogeneous causes of offending behavior tend to be the direct consequences of runaway behavior.

The second identified significance of this study is the lack of studies examining Black and Hispanic runaway girls' offending behavior from the lens of their future orientation. One's future orientation is a product of internal control (Carver & Scheier, 2001; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995), and ambitions and expectations of success (Kerpelman et al., 2008; Seginer & Shoyer, 2012; Seginer et al., 2004). Studies argue that adolescents

tend to develop future orientation attitudes at an early age (Nurmi, 1991), and through life experiences and social interactions, future orientation is subjected to change (Destin & Oyserman, 2009; Lynch, 1965).

Future orientation is subjected to change, and the factors that interact with or moderate future orientation and influence offending behavior are referred to as hooks for change (Skardhamar & Savolainen, 2014), referring to the influential factors having hook potential to transform one's future orientation. For example, while runaway alters one's future orientation (Thornberry & Krohn, 2005), it may increase violence exposure (Allwood et al., 2012; Stoddard et al., 2015) or delinquent friends (Albert et al., 2013; Gallupe et al., 2019; Gardner & Steinberg, 2005; Robbins & Bryan, 2004) or expose to other bad events. In total, the gained disrupted hopes may lay one's effort on instant gratifications leading to offending behavior (Fischhoff et al., 1978; Hinton et al., 2021).

This research highlighted the importance of understanding Black and Hispanic runaway girls' behavioral consequences from the lens of future orientation. Doing so will broaden the scope of analysis by exploring the causal relation between Black and Hispanic runaway girls and future orientation views and how Black and Hispanic runaway girls with violence exposure, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions interact with future orientation and impact their offending behavior. Understanding Black and Hispanic runaway girls from a future orientation perspective is significant because only a few studies examined the moderator relationship of future orientation (Chen & Vazsonyi, 2011; Clinkinbeard, 2014; Mahler et al., 2017; Robbins & Bryan, 2004). In addition, future orientation as a variable in the context of runaway youth

play role of a confounding variable, indicating that the failure to identify the confounding variable role in the analysis may affect the study finding's validity.

Background of Study

Exposure to Violence, Future Orientation and Offending Behavior

Exposure to violence may sabotage the future orientation among youth (Allwood et al., 2012; Borowsky et al., 2009; Boxer et al., 2003; Craig, 2019; Daigle & Hoffman, 2018; Hinton et al., 2021; Iselin et al., 2012; Monahan et al., 2015; Piquero, 2014). For example, exposure to violence triggers low future orientation, impacting youth's academic and job efforts (Macmillan & Hagan, 2004). In addition, several studies established a logical connection between exposure to violence, future orientation, and offending behavior (Agnew, 2002; Brooks et al., 2018; Pinchevsky et al., 2014) and future offending behavior (Agnew et al., 2002; Hinton et al., 2021), such as substance use (Agnew 2002; Pinchevsky et al., 2014).

Studies state that exposure to violence is more significant among youth (Becker & Kerig, 2011; Copeland et al., 2007), especially among runaways and girls. Running away indicates a risky lifestyle and it significantly increases the probability of exposure to violence (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Kim et al., 2009; Peterson et al., 2004). Since adolescents do not have access to legitimate resources to survive outside the home, they are exploited by adults and can participate in several offending activities (Hagan et al., 1997; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993).

General Strain Theory assumptions support the relationship between exposure to violence, individual orientation, and offending behavior. According to Agnew's (1992) general strain theory explanation, one's exposure to violence as strain advances offending

behavior because individuals exposed may experience strain and negative orientation, which increases their likelihood of offending behavior (Agnew, 1992; Agnew & White, 1992). While much of the research emphasized exposure to violence's impact on offending behavior, only a few studies examined how youth exposure to violence declines youth future orientation views and leads to offending behavior (Abramson et al., 1989; Borowsky et al., 2009; So et al., 2018; Stoddard et al., 2011; Rose & Abramson, 1992). Analyzing the interaction between future orientation and exposure to violence may explore significant findings regarding Black and Hispanic runaway girls' offending behavior.

The likelihood of exposure to violence is based on gender, as runaway girls can be more exposed with much greater chances than those with non-runaway backgrounds. However, the effect of violence exposure can be based on race and ethnic background. For example, violence exposure among Black females is strongly correlated with poor future orientation (Monahan et al., 2015).

Procedural Justice, Future Orientation, and Offending Behavior

Procedural Justice is the perception of an individual regarding their fair treatment during their encounter with law enforcement and the judiciary (Birkhead, 2009; Hough et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2019; Numri, 1991, 2005; Testa et al., 2021; Walters, 2017). When considered unfair by adolescents (DeVylder et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2020; McFarland et al., 2019), justice system encounters cause stress which weakens the future orientation (Craig, 2019; Nurmi, 1991, 2005). Such perceptions of police legitimacy hinder the development of future orientation (Brunson & Weitzer, 2009). Future orientation and its relationship with contact with the justice system are

influenced by age, race and ethnicity, and gender of adolescents (Geller, 2018; Johnson et al., 2014; Testa et al., 2021; Warner & Swisher, 2015; Zimmerman et al., 2016).

Girls generally have a complex and multifaceted attitude toward police (Hurst et al., 2005). In many cases, girls with runaways or other status offense backgrounds are more likely to get arrested. It is because the justice system may focus more on girls than boys, allowing girls higher contact with the system (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004; Tanner et al., 1999). Studies identified that runaway girls are more likely to hold procedural justice beliefs related to their offending behavior (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Levi et al., 2009; Penner et al., 2014; Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006b; Walters, 2017).

Concerning race, minority females experiences with the justice system are different from those of Whites females and males (Augustyn, 2013). Race and ethnicity have been found to be significant predictors of injustice, specifically about police (Augustyn, 2013). Hispanics and Blacks, both boys and girls, are more likely to have negative perceptions of police (Weitzer & Tuch, 2004). Minority girls often experience excessive surveillance, restrictions, harassment, and degradation from police. For example, Hurst et al. (2005) found that only 30% of Black girls indicated having a positive attitude, satisfaction, and trust in the police.

Several criminological studies addressing the racial context have found that directly or indirectly police contact is experienced by a high percent of Black youth (Jackson et al., 2021), which might result in lower future orientation (Herrera, 2009; Nyborg & Curry, 2003). Also, unlike Whites, Blacks and Hispanics youth have negative perceptions of procedural justice and are believed to have a lower future orientation (Borowsky et al., 2009; Davis & Niebes-Davis, 2010; Jamieson & Romer, 2008).

Donovan (2022) stated that future orientation and procedural justice views were vital in understanding juvenile offending behavior. Several studies analyzed whether adolescent contact with the justice system contributed to changes in their future commitment and have found strong correlation (Jäggi et al., 2020; Kirk & Sampson, 2013; Sharlein, 2018; Steinberg et al., 2004; Testa et al., 2021). Since adolescence is a malleable age, experiences with the justice system could shape adolescents' future orientation (Johnson et al., 2011; Steinberg & Morris, 2001; Testa et al., 2021) and their offending behavior (Doherty et al., 2016; Lopes et al., 2012; Novak, 2019; Schmidt et al., 2015; Wiesner et al., 2010; Wiley, 2015). However, the exact relationship has not been studied among runaway Black and Hispanic girls (Laub, 2014; Laub & Sampson, 2019). Due to the experiences of runaways with police and courts, their self-concept is lower than non-runaways (Burke & Burkhead, 1989). Therefore, understanding the relationships between runaways' procedural justice views, future orientation, and offending behavior is vital.

Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions, Future Orientation, and Offending Behavior

Deterrence Theory assumes that those involved in criminal behavior weigh the risk of crime commission (Lee et al., 2018). While those with greater deterrence avoid crime commission, it is possible that individuals might consider the sanction as a threat, which refers to the sanction's level of certainty and severity (Lee et al., 2018). However, although deterrence exists, it may not act similarly upon the individuals. Instead, the impact of deterrence may vary due to the individual's developmental and environmental factors (Lee et al., 2018), which is a significant point to consider. However, there may be several reasons for the variation of deterrence (Loughran et al., 2012; Pogarsky et al.,


2005) and individual heterogeneity (Loughran et al., 2012; Nagin & Paternoster, 1993; Parker & Grasmick, 1979; Pogarsky, 2002; Zimring & Hawkins, 1968), but future orientation could be a significant, influential factor that allows individuals to assess the threats, risks and costs (Lee et al., 2018). Therefore, having future orientation may change the perceptual deterrence of certainty of sanctions and make individuals more deterrable.

This study examined the relationship between certainty of sanctions perceptions, future orientation, and offending behavior among Black and Hispanic runaway girls. The reason for using the certainty of sanctions aspect of deterrence is because, according to Schulz (2014), Loughran et al. (2012), Lochner (2007), and Matsueda et al. (2006), the certainty of sanctions aspect of deterrence enhances greater deterrence among high risk individuals, such as youth with runaway behavior. Similarly, empirical studies of deterrence stated the effectiveness of certainty of sanctions in deterring individuals (Fader, 2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Loughran et al., 2012; Nagin, 1998; Nagin, 2013; Paternoster, 1987; Pogarsky, 2002; Pratt et al., 2006; Wikström, 2007). However, studies are based mainly on samples of relatively nonserious offenders (that is, high school, college, and adult samples) (Grasmick & Bursik, 1990; Nagin, 1998; Paternoster, 1987; Nagin & Paternoster, 1993; Nagin & Pogarsky, 2001, 2003; Piquero & Tibbetts, 1996; Pratt et al., 2006; Wikström, 2007). This study used an offender sample which can provide more evidence.

Previous studies have found greater future orientation correlation among those with higher risks, higher cost of punishment, and fewer rewards of crime (Lee et al., 2018). Other studies found that greater perceptions of certainty of sanctions were

associated with low offending (Loughran et al., 2012). At the same time, studies emphasized that the deterrence perspective helps understand offending among runaway youth (Stinton, 2007). Similarly, LeBlanc and Biron (1980) stated that the deterrence aspect of status offenders is vital in avoiding delinquent behavior. Several identified influential factors that impact delinquent risks and deterrence perceptions include delinquent peers (Loughran et al., 2011; Matthews & Agnew, 2008), individual characteristics such as sex, self-control, moral consciousness, and impulse (Pauwels et al., 2011; Pogarsky, 2002; Schulz, 2014), and future orientation, especially during adolescence (Steinberg et al., 2008; Steinberg et al., 2009). Therefore, studying perceptions of certainty of sanctions, future orientation, and offending behavior may advance understanding of Black and Hispanic runaway girls.

Summary

In conclusion, this research examined the nature and strength of the consequential relationship that exists between the Black and Hispanic runaway girls and their consequences, such as future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and self-reported offending. In doing so, this research compared Black and Hispanic girls with runaway and non-runaway backgrounds.  analyze the spurious relationships that exist between Black and Hispanic runaway girls' experiences of violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions when interacted with their future orientation and influencing their offending behavior, an interaction analysis was conducted. Finally, to increase the validity of the analysis, research introduced non-runaway background Black and Hispanic girls into the study models to make comparisons of the relationships.

This research utilized offender samples with both runaway and non-runaway backgrounds. Since offense commission is the last resort for runaways, studying samples with no offending background may not provide a clear picture of the runaway offending behavior and runaway consequences, such as their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. It is because offending as a last resort enhances an individual's experience of various runaway consequences before the offending behavior. Also, as stated by Gibbs (1986), self-reported offenses are found to be more effective than official crime rates while measuring deterrence effect. For example, as soon as a girl becomes a runaway, the first and next step of theirs may not be the offending behavior. Instead, initially, they may experience any or the combination of the consequences such as a change in their future orientation, getting exposed to violence, alteration in perceptions of certainty of sanctions, and procedural justice before they adopt offending characteristics.

Previous studies of runaway consequences examining future orientation and delinquency relied on official arrest data rather than self-report data and measured future orientation using a single question item (Lindstrom Johnson et al., 2015; Nurmi, 1991; Seginer, 2003). This research used self-reported offending data and had a multi-dimensional measure of future orientation, enhancing more valid measurements of the variable.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Around 1 to 1.7 million teenagers run away from home every year (Chen et al., 2012; Fernandes-Alcantara, 2013; Hammar et al., 2002; Sanchez et al., 2006). Also, studies show that about 10% of girls and seven percent of boys run away from home each year (Benoit-Bryan, 2011; Chen et al., 2012; Sanchez et al., 2006). These numbers indicate that even in the current times, runaway children are essential in criminological research. Although both girls and boys runaway, it can be understood that there is a difference in the path these adolescents choose after running away from home. Therefore, it is vital to understand the consequences of running away that are specific to gender.

This research analyzed the nature and the strength of the association between runaway Black and Hispanic girls and the consequences of runaway behavior. The purpose of emphasizing girls while discussing running away behavior is vital due to their higher representation in the running away data rather than other offenses (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). Therefore, greater representation of girls in the running away needs significant emphasis. Although girls and boys have an equal share in the running away data, the motivation for girls differs from boys (Stinton, 2007).

The literature on runaway behavior is lacks the analysis of the impact of runaway behavior on delinquent careers (Stinton, 2007) and the consequences it has on the path leading to offending behavior among Black and Hispanic girls. To understand the consequences of running away behavior among Black and Hispanic female offenders, this chapter reviews the literature including historical transformation of the running away as a concept and the consequences of running away, including future orientation,

exposure to violence, procedural justice, perceptions of certainty of sanctions, and offending behavior.

Historical View of Runaway Youth

Historically, in the Code of Hammurabi, during 2270 B.C., runaway children were those who disobeyed their parents (Lawrence & Hemmons, 2008). During the 17th and 18th centuries, runaway Scottish, Dutch, Irish, Portuguese, and British children were seen as the earliest immigrants to the United States of America for a better life and employment and to overcome the oppressive conditions, frustrations, and despair in their homes (Libertoff, 1980). During the 18th century, running away behavior was recognized as when adolescent employees ran away from their enslavers (Libertoff, 1980). Around the 1880s, most runaway youths were vagrant and homeless children of immigrant parents who were considered inferior humans as they were incapable of adapting to the American culture and being employed (Platt, 1977) and chose delinquency as a way of life. The running away behavior of adolescents was attributed to the failure of parents to guide and provide for these juveniles in the 19th century (Libertoff, 1980).

With the changing definition of runaway behavior among children/adolescents and the increase in homelessness and delinquency, an idea to reform children during the late 19th century emphasized interventions to control juvenile behaviors (Krisber, 2005), leading to the establishment of Juvenile Courts in 1899. This new court addressed juvenile problems, including serious offenders, status offenders, and dependent and neglected children (Ferdinand, 1991). In this process of understanding the causes of runaway behavior, several transitions can be identified as the causes of runaway behavior, for example in 1909 the predominant cause was considered as mental disorder

(Libertoff, 1980), until the 1930s, it was free will, biological defects, and Intelligence Quotient (I.Q.) (Kidd & Taub, 2004), and until 1940s the causes were family conflict and unbearable situations at home (Brockington, 1946; Knight, 1942; Lowrey, 1941; Riemer, 1940).

In the 1950s and 1960s, runaway adolescents were labeled delinquents (Herrera-Rojas et al., 2009). Until the 1970s, girls were highly incarcerated for running away, incorrigibility, sexual offenses, probation violations, and truancy (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). Disproportionate treatment in the justice system was observed in treating girls more harshly than boys by enforcing sexual double standards (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). The 1980s explained runaway behavior due to sexual and physical abuse at home (Herrera-Rojas et al., 2009). Due to the increased attention towards the causes of runaway behavior and its consequences, along with the disproportionate treatment of girls, there was concern among reformers about the criminalization of status offenses by the juvenile courts (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001).

As a result, the Runaway Youth Act of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (JJDP) was amended to decriminalize running away (Libertoff, 1980), which transitioned the understanding of runaway behavior from psychological causes to a sociocultural perspective. In addition, the leading cause for runaway behavior was identified and emphasized as family and its related problems (neglectful, abusive, and abnormal family environments), further widening the understanding of the problem (Kidd & Taub, 2004).



Due to the increased concern over runaway girls and status offenders, the JJDP Act 1974 was amended by Congress in 1980 with an addition of the Valid Court Order (VCO) exception. The VCO allowed the courts to imprison status offenders for violating the conditions of a court order in the facilities (Godsoe, 2014), including halfway houses and foster care (MacDonald & Chesney-Lind, 2001). The conditions of the VCA include obeying parents, obeying curfews, attending school, and not running away (N.Y. Comp. Codes R. & Regs. tit. 22 § 205.66, 2013). Nevertheless, judges from 1995 to 2010 more likely incarcerated girls for status offenses, of which runaway (58%) is the primary offense (Puzzanchera & Hockenberry, 2013). Although the JJDP Act decriminalized status offenses, including running away, the VCO incarcerated girls by defining running away and status offenses as an escape or any other form of crime that violated the state laws. Such practices were overlooked by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Due to such conflict in implementing the laws, runaway and status offenders experienced procedural justice, particularly girls of minority groups (Godsoe, 2014). As such, the justice system can be assumed to alter the runaway girls' perceptions towards their future, the certainty of sanctions, and offending behavior.

Runaway Black and Hispanic Girls

Girls, unlike boys, are at a heightened risk of being victimized before and mainly after running away from home (Kempf-Leonard & Johansson, 2007). However, females have been persistently invisible in the historical explanations provided for runaway behavior (Janus et al., 1987). The earlier literature's emphasis on girls has been very narrow (Johnson et al., 2006) or it mainly discussed middle- and upper-class boys who runaway from home seeking a new adventure or escaping from despair and abusive

parents. Female representation in the literature was extensively found in the studies post-1990s due to the alarming surge in female delinquency (Kempf-Leonard & Johansson, 2007). As discussed in the earlier section, historically, girls and boys have been equally involved in status offenses, including running away from home. However, the justice system has disproportionately arrested girls, to control female sexuality and gendered roles (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998).

Traditionally girls have been considered and described as less violent than boys, and until the 1970s, the academic and empirical literature ignored female-specific offending (Adler, 1975; Chesney-Lind & Okamoto, 2001). Before this time, if female juvenile delinquency was acknowledged, it was considered rare, insignificant, or both. However, historically, there were instances where girls were vilified and referred to courts as they were assumed to be morally depraved (Tappan, 1947). Girls have been thought to commit gender-specific offenses, such as prostitution (Adler, 1975; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014), shoplifting/larceny-theft (Adler, 1975; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Kim et al., 2003; Mangleburg et al., 2004), and status offenses (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Steinhart, 1996). Status offenses, for example, (running away from home, truancy, not obeying parents, curfew violations, and underage drinking by minors, comprised most of the arrests for which girls were processed in the juvenile justice system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014).

Since status offense comprised most of the arrests for which girls were processed in the juvenile justice system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2021), the juvenile justice system has historically dealt with these girls from a paternalistic ideology regulating the gender-specific behavior of girls in court

(Alexander, 1999; Humphrey, 2004). The paternalistic ideology refers to the preconstructed gender roles expected for girls. This paternalistic treatment of girls leads to harsh punishments for status offenses because they have violated their gender roles (Guevara & Spohn, 2006). Hence, runaway girls have been a serious concern in the discipline (Thompson et al., 2004).

Often runaway girls have a history of being unwanted and have been victimized (Feitel et al., 1992; Kempf-Leonardo & Johansson, 2007; Stiffman, 1989; Whitbeck et al., 1999; Zahn et al., 2010), rejected, and neglected by their parents, peers and teachers. Also, they experience specific psychological challenges, including low self-esteem, depression, impulsiveness, and failed suicide attempts, leading to inconsistent behavioral tendencies (Schaffer & Caton, 1984; Yoder et al., 1998). Once these girls runaway and resort to delinquency for survival (drug use and risky sexual activities) (Chen et al., 2004) they are arrested and labeled delinquent. Theoretically, once they are labeled, they alter their self-concept and eventually achieve the master status of a runaway girl (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Crain, 1996; Swaim & Bracken, 1997). It is also understood that the age of delinquency onset, negative peer association, and mental illness are associated with running away behavior and delinquency (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Hammer et al., 2002; Tyler & Bersani, 2008; Windle, 1988).

Therefore, it is crucial to understand the multiple factors that are associated with runaway juveniles and specifically minority girls because, once the juveniles runaway, they are exposed to a wide range of delinquency-prone factors, including (relationships with antisocial peers, unmonitored time to involve in deviant acts, drug dealing, theft, and prostitution, resulting in entering the juvenile justice system (Beniot-Bryan, 2011; Jeanis

et al., 2019; Whitbeck et al., 2001). Although girls and boys runaway (Chesney-Lind, 1973; Kemp-Leonard, 1998) during the period 1995-2009, a 25% decrease in girls' runaway cases was seen. However, despite the decrease, girls accounted for 58% of all runaway cases (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2013). In addition, of the 140,000 status offense cases in 2009, girls accounted for 50% of cases, and in the same year, girls accounted for 28% of delinquency cases (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2013). The above explanation indicates the differential treatment provided by the justice system for runaway girls than runaway boys due to the system's belief that these runaway girls had violated the social expectations of the female sex roles (Mann, 1979). In contrast, boys were charged with criminal misconduct rather than status offenses (Feld, 2009).

The total number of status offense cases petitioned in U.S. court during 2019 was 90,500, while this count was 192,600 in 2005. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (2019), the juvenile court case volume provides similar information to arrest trends among the juvenile population. There was a 53% decline in status offense cases from 2005-2019. In the context of runaways, the total number of cases in 2005 was 22,600, and the count in 2018 was 8,200. This indicates a decline of 64% between 2005, the equivalent of six cases per 1,000 juveniles, and 2019, the equivalent of (2.8 per 1,000 juveniles) (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2020). A similar count of decline was identified between 2005-2019 among males (52%) and females (53%) in status offense cases. In the context of runaway classification, the petitioned cases count between 2005-2019 for males and females found a decline of 58% and 67%, respectively (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2020). Regarding gender differences, it is identified that females above 13 years have higher runaway rates than males. In contrast, in all other status offenses,

females of ages 10-17 were found to be lower than males (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2020).

The racial difference among the runaway adolescents is also significant because the highest decline seen in status offenses between 2005-2019 was among White adolescents (68%) compared to Black (61%) and Hispanics (50%), signifying the less rate of decline among Black and Hispanic youth (Hockenberry & Puzanchera, 2020). These rates indicated that minority girls were more likely to runaway than Whites (Courtney & Zinn, 2009; Dworsky et al., 2018; Lin, 2012; Wulczyn, 2020) and were overrepresented in the system, and received harsher punishments than White girls (Guevara et al., 2006; Moore & Padavic, 2010; Schaffner, 2006).

The recent data suggest that there is disproportionality between runaway and delinquency rates of girls, which may imply that there could be a decline in either runaway girls' future delinquency behavior or, despite the decline in girls' runaway delinquency, the present delinquent girls may have disproportionate runaway background (Donovan et al., 1988). Either way, girls' propensity to get involved in delinquent behavior is influenced by one's future orientation (Alm & Laftman, 2016; Anderson et al., 2020; Borowsky et al., 2009; Brezina et al., 2009; Jaynes et al., 2021; Piquero, 2014). Since various studies elevated the role of one's future orientation impact on their delinquent behavior, it can be logical to assume that future orientation may have something to do with runaway girls and their delinquent behavior.

Recently, status offenses and, particularly, runaway behavior have widely attracted the researchers' attention for the similarity in the runaway patterns for boys and girls. For this reason, this area was highly studied, exploring the causes and consequences

of running away. For the most part, the causes identified were being unwanted and victimized (Feitel et al., 1992; Kempf-Leonardo & Johansson, 2007; Stiffman, 1989; Whitbeck et al., 1999; Zahn et al., 2010), rejected and neglected by peers and teachers, low self-esteem, depression, impulsiveness, and attempting suicide, leading to inconsistent behavioral tendencies (Schaffer & Caton, 1984; Yoder et al., 1998), school dropout, unemployed, being in debt, conflict in marriage, psychological concerns (Olson et al., 1980), broken homes (de Man et al., 1993; Meltzer et al., 2012; Sanchez et al., 2006; Thompson & Pollio, 2006), weak bonds with parents (Kim et al., 2009; Meltzer et al., 2012; Terrell, 1997; Thompson & Pollio, 2006), neglectful parents (Terrell, 1997; Tyler & Bersani, 2008), parents who were not supportive (Tucker et al., 2011), and exposure to violence at home (Jeanis et al., 2019). In contrast, the consequences of runaway have highlighted more exposure to violence and substance abuse (Clatts et al., 2005; Halco'n & Lifson, 2004; Haley et al., 2004; Solorio et al., 2006; Tyler et al., 2007; Tyler et al., 2004), and delinquency, which are commonly identified factors connected to one another (Donovan & Jessor, 1985; Willoughby et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2002).

However, earlier studies identified contradictory results regarding delinquency as a consequence of runaways, especially among girls (Stinton, 2007). Runaway girls are heterogeneous regarding their experiences and risk factors occurring before and after they runaway (Jeanis et al., 2019). For example, some studies found that girls involved more in runaway behavior (Datesman & Aickin, 1984; Farrington et al., 1988; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Kim et al., 2009; Stinton, 2007) were less likely to adopt delinquent behavior in the future (Tracy & Kempf-Lenord, 1996), while others suggested that runaway girls commit delinquency (Kaufman & Widom, 1999; Thomas, 1976). Overall,

it is unclear whether delinquent behavior is a consequence of girls' runaway behavior (Stinton, 2007). Therefore, it is essential to understand whether the interaction between gender and race creates distinct consequences for individuals. Janus et al. (1987) suggested that if running away and delinquency were combined, then delinquent behavior was a survival strategy that may be associated with the experiences of victimization among runaways. For example, girls of minority racial backgrounds are more likely to be considered delinquents by the justice system (Nanda, 2012).

Future Orientation as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior

Several researchers have provided explanations of factors that include an individual's future orientation. The future orientation process can be identified through different stages, such as exploring the availability of options for education or work, imagining self in the future, planning to follow the future, and finally, committing oneself to the future. Through these stages of planning and commitment, one's future orientation plays a significant role in shaping one's present behavior (Nurmi, 1991; Seginer et al., 2004).

As Trommsdorff (1986) described, future orientation includes identifying the required motivation to attain personal and mental needs according to expectations. To expand Trommsdorff's explanation, Nurmi (1991, 1989, 1987) added that future orientation was a three-stage development, including motivation, planning, and evaluation. Motivation is essential for setting goals and knowledge to build future expectations. Planning, along with setting goals, includes the path one chooses to reach their goals and finally achieve those goals. The final evaluation process includes examining the feasibility of the goals and plans (Nurmi, 1991, 1989, 1987). Consensus

among the researchers indicate that the zeal towards planning and achieving goals is more likely to refrain adolescents from delinquent behavior. For example, studies analyzed that youth with poor orientation were found to have aggressive behaviors (Stoddard et al., 2011) and weapons usage (Bolland et al., 2001; Rowan et al., 2019).

The influence of future orientation among adolescents depends on the environmental, psychosocial, and culture-related factors (Parker, 1997). The level of future orientation in an adolescent also impacts their motivation, decision-making abilities, and self-control (Parker, 1997). Similarly, witnessing violence can negatively impact adolescents' future (Andrews, 1984; DuRant et al., 1994; Hopkins & King, 1994).

As adolescents develop multiple skills that impact their future (Nurmi & Pulliainen, 1991), failure to establish motivation towards their future can impede them from achieving those skills (Trad, 1993). Mello and Worrell (2015) suggested that future orientation was part of the significant developmental phase across an individual's life span. For example, cognitive development aids in understanding situations that would facilitate the adolescents to envision their outcomes (Neimark, 1975; Piaget, 1952, 1954), and if not developed, the future orientation of the adolescent was implicated.

Another factor influencing adolescents' future orientation is their environment (Pulkkinen, 1990). For example, adolescents who are constantly exposed to violence have a decreased orientation toward their future compared to adolescents who are not exposed to violence (Parker, 1997). Another influential factor impacting adolescents' future orientation is their ability to assess the impact of their risky behavior leading to a positive or negative influence on their future consequences (Furby & Beyth-Marom, 1992).

Therefore, adolescents who disregard the consequences of their actions impacting their future are more likely to involve in delinquent behaviors (Parker, 1997). Similarly, Wood (1997) identified that runaway adolescents were less likely to think about their future than non-runaway adolescents.

As mentioned before, Parker (1997) found that runaway adolescents wanting to get off of the streets indicated they planned to find employment (32%), shelter (10%), return to school (five percent), return home (four percent), and reorganize their life (four percent). Whereas 82% of the sample witnessed someone physically being attacked, 57% experienced the violence of people chasing them intending to harm. Youth who had experienced or witnessed violence were more likely to stay/desired to stay on the streets rather than get off the streets. This indicated that if these adolescents lived in adverse environments, they were more likely to adapt to that culture and make decisions that were influenced by these circumstances, impacting their future orientation and decisions made. Adolescents who want to get off the streets show higher future orientation, unlike those who do not want to get off the streets (Parker, 1997).

Runaway and Non-Runaways and Future Orientation

In their study, Mello et al. (2018) identified that compared to runaways, future orientation was higher among non-runaways, similar to findings reached by Mello et al. (2017). Mello et al. (2009) also indicated that runaways who thought about their future reported higher hope and self-esteem. In addition, Steinberg et al.'s (2009) study results indicated that the orientation toward the future also increased among adolescents aged 10 and above. For example, future orientation was high among adolescents who graduated from high school compared to dropouts (Worrell & Hale, 2001).

In the study conducted by Dumain (2010), the researcher interviewed four runaway participants, two of whom were Hispanic females. These females exhibited low future orientation and impulsive decision-making abilities with little regard for the consequences of their actions. Adolescents in situations that cause challenges and impulsive behavior disregard the implications for their immediate gains while making decisions and engage in risky behaviors after running away (Dumain, 2010).

Since runaway adolescents have a low future orientation, they do not understand the consequences of their actions while on the streets (Posner, 1993). As stated by Able-Peterson (1989), adolescents do not foresee their future and therefore, do not understand the consequences of their actions since they are not sure of their life the next day. The author concluded that due to such difficulty surviving on the streets, adolescents were less likely to consider the impact of their actions on their future.

While studies widely agreed on the connection between poor future orientation and delinquent behavior among youth (Bolland et al., 2001; Dumain, 2010; Parker, 1997; Posner, 1993; Rowan et al., 2019; Stoddard et al., 2011), studying the future orientation and delinquency relationship among runaway girls may advance the literature on the runaway girls' behavior. Johnson et al. (2006) suggested gender-specific aspects were associated with runaway adolescents impacting their future orientation. Since these adolescents are escaping from abusive environments at home, they are ideal for studying the factors that could further victimize them on the streets and impact their future orientation, exposing them to violence, and understanding their perceptions towards procedural justice and certainty of sanctions.

Adolescents are often labeled as risk-takers due to their involvement in risky behaviors that could impact their future (Trad, 1993). Adolescents skilled in predicting their future outcomes will be more likely to estimate the outcomes of their risky behavior in the future (Trad, 1993). Also, risk-takers lookout for benefits from their behaviors, whereas the risk-avoiders focus on the probable loss due to their behaviors (Lopes, 1987). For example, young girls who envisioned that teenage pregnancy could hinder their educational opportunities were less likely to consider being a teenage mother (Trad, 1993).

Experience of strain in adolescence may impact decision-making abilities (Trad, 1993). As identified by Furby and Beyth-Marom (1992), the decision-making abilities of an adolescent can be categorized into five steps: identification of the available opportunities, understanding the consequences of each opportunity, examining the benefits of the available opportunities, estimating the probability of the consequences, and finally articulating all the previous steps before making the final decision. As seen in earlier study findings, for example, by Masten et al., (1988), the probability of engaging in offending behavior could be associated with the adolescent's level of intelligence and decision-making abilities. Adolescents fail to make better decisions for their future due to their lack of understanding of the consequences of their actions or their perception of less of a likelihood that negative consequences would occur (Trad, 1993).

Future orientation is a significant predictor of attitudes/behavior since a positive future orientation enhances commitment towards the behavior (Hinton et al., 2021), so it is vital to know what shapes youth orientation, especially among youth with runaway and offending history. Therefore, the current study vitally focused on the youth's future

orientation, assuming that future orientation is a significant consequence of delinquency among runaway youth. To conclude, from the previous explanations, it can be understood that the higher proportion of girls involved in future delinquent behavior indicates the importance of one's future orientation concerning delinquency commission decisions. There is also the indication that while runaway influences one's future orientation, it may also impact offending behavior, suggesting a strong relationship between future orientation and delinquency.

Exposure to Violence as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior

Exposure to violence is a generic phrase broadly used to categorize the experience of different forms of violence, such as physical assault, rape, homicide, and gun violence (Parker, 1997). Since this study focused on exposure to violence as a consequence of runaway behavior among Black and Hispanic girls, the study extensively focused on the exposure to violence both witnessed and experienced. Witnessing violence includes watching an act of violence committed against another person, such as assault or the outcome of such violence commission including injuries (Parker, 1997).

Earlier studies show that exposure to violence, both witnessed and experienced, specifically among adolescents, leads to emotional and developmental disorders (Mitchell, 1992), impacting their future orientation. Similarly, concerning witnessed violence, adolescents may feel devastated and strained, leading them to acting out and involvement in delinquent behaviors such as substance abuse, life-threatening acts, and promiscuity (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Pynoos & Eth, 1984).

One factor that functions as an element in the pattern leading to delinquency among girls is exposure to violence. A study in Hawaii showed that more than 58% of

girls experienced violence (Pasko, 2006). Often abuse and exposure to violence result in girls running away from home (Acoca & Dedel, 1998; McCormack et al., 1986; Tyler et al., 2001). Girls experiencing abuse and violence at home runaway at an early age spend sufficient time on the streets and adapt to deviant strategies to survive (Chen et al., 2004). Jeanis et al. (2019) indicated that both runaway boys and girls, 70.8 and 29.2%, respectively, were exposed to violence at home; 93% were physically abused, 48% were sexually abused, and 89% were neglected, and half of the sample was emotionally neglected.

Exposure to violence is mainly explained as a cause of running away from home. At the same time, limited studies have explained the exposure to violence as a consequence of running away and being homeless (AMA, 1993; Masten, 1992; Rafferty & Shinn, 1991; Schweitzer et al., 1994; Smart, 1991). One of the studies identifying the violence against runaways shows that around 42% of runaways experienced assault, 18% were robbed, and 12.5% were sexually assaulted within a year of running away from home (Robertson, 1989). However, extensive emphasis has not been given to the impact of witnessing violence on the offending behavior of the runaway girls. Therefore, examining the consequences of violence exposure to the offending behavior of runaway girls is essential.

Procedural Justice Views as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior

Procedural Justice has a significant role in preventing youth from committing delinquent acts. Pursuant to the theory of procedural justice, several adolescents restrict themselves from engaging in delinquent behavior due to their belief in the fairness of the decision-makers (Birckhead, 2009). According to the theory of Procedural Justice, people

will more likely obey the law if they positively perceive the system. The theory functions as a guide in accomplishing legal procedures that the youth will perceive as legitimate and that the system is fair towards them irrespective of the results, enhancing law-abiding behavior among juveniles (Birckhead, 2009; Liu et al., 2019). The central assumption of Procedural Justice Theory is the need for justice institutions to follow a fair and respectful process which can translate into fair and respectable treatment, rather than focusing on the outcomes of arrest and conviction as one of the fundamental approaches to establishing citizens' trust in the justice system (Hough et al., 2013).

Runaways Procedural Justice Views Towards Police

Most studies analyzing procedural justice views have failed to report gender differences (Papachristos et al., 2012) or exclusively studied the views of males (Casper et al., 1988). It is assumed that the procedural justice views of males and females are different, and these differences in the perceptions could result from procedural justice being situation-oriented (Brandl et al., 1994). That is, several factors can influence the perceptions of procedural justice.

Specifically, for girls, the factors that influence their procedural justice perceptions are their offending behavior (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Levi et al., 2009; Penner et al., 2014; Tyler, 2003), the inclination towards delinquency among adolescents who are transitioning into adulthood (Walters, 2018), and the willingness to cooperate with the police (Murphy & Gaylor, 2010). Although unlike adults, the procedural justice beliefs of juveniles might be unstable due to their changing experiences (Paternoster et al., 1997; Walters, 2018).

Girls generally have a complex and multifaceted attitude toward police (Hurst et al., 2005). Although earlier studies such as those conducted by Birckhead (2009), Hough et al. (2013), Liu et al. (2019), Tyler and Huo (2002), Weitzer (2017), Weitzer and Tuch (2006), and Wu et al. (2009) did provide eminent information on the offender's perceptions, there is a gap in understanding how female offenders' perceptions vary (Tatar et al., 2012). Studies examining the justice system involving individuals and their perceptions of procedural justice are a recently emerging topic. For example, Papachristos and colleagues (2012) in their study found that positive procedural justice views toward police officers were reliant on the perceived legitimacy of those officers. However, these results do not explain the female offender's perceptions.

Female arrest rates increased by 33.58% from 28.37% from 2010 to 2019 (FBI, 2015). The explanation for this growth is also partly due to the difference in the types of crimes committed by females, who are disproportionately involved in drug offenses and prostitution, and females who are mostly escaping negative situations, and, as a result, involved in offending behavior (Chesney-Lind & Rodriguez, 1983; Hubbard & Pratt, 2002; McCartan & Gunnison, 2010; Salisbury & Van Voorhis, 2009).

While the encounters with the police officers impact the juvenile's future orientation, the association between police contact and future orientation is formed due to the factors that lead to police contact (Testa et al., 2021). The reason for the negative impact of police contact on future orientation can be connected to the detrimental experiences with the police (Jackson et al., 2019; Jackson et al., 2021a; Nordberg et al., 2016, 2018;), alterations in the self-perceptions (Merrill et al., 2016), and the future orientation (Corrigan et al., 2009; DeVlyder et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2019).

Minority girls often experience excessive surveillance, restrictions, harassment, and degradation from police. Hurst et al. (2005) found that only 30% of Black girls indicated a positive attitude, satisfaction, and trust in the police. Similarly, Augustyn and Ray (2016) stated that involuntary contact with the police and the courts impacted procedural justice and legitimacy beliefs. Recall that procedural justice is the perception of individuals regarding their fair treatment during their encounters with law enforcement and the judiciary (Birkhead, 2009; Hough et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2019; Walters, 2018).

Gender, race and ethnicity, and age significantly impact the construction of one's normal and criminal behaviors (Burgess-Proctor, 2006). Regarding race, minority females and their experiences with the justice system differ from Whites and males. Race has been identified as a significant predictor of injustice, specifically by police (Augustyn, 2013). Both boys and girls, Hispanics and African Americans are more likely to have unfavorable perceptions of police (Weitzer & Tuch, 2004). Unlike adults, research findings indicate juveniles are indifferent towards police across genders and races/ethnicities.

The relationship between procedural justice and delinquency among girls is not a direct relationship. It is influenced by and differs according to gender, race and ethnicity, and other individual characteristics (Hegtvedt, 2006; Ritter et al., 2005; Scheuerman, 2019; Zapolski et al., 2018). So, minority girls may have increased contact with the justice system compared to non-minority girls (Horowitz & Pottieger, 1991; Visher, 1983). Also, police officers often are more attentive toward female runaways (Posner, 1993). As explained by Powers et al. (1990), the situation of runaway youths has become very critical in recent times, unlike the 18th and 19th centuries when finding employment

and a legitimate survival means was not impossible. Adolescents experience higher difficulties finding a legitimate means of survival given the economic structure. As a result of their underachieved adulthood, their roles differ in society and increase their chances of survival through illegitimate means, increasing their contact with the police. Therefore, the justice system's contact with the high-risk Black and Hispanic runaway girls is an essential factor for consideration since they are more likely to negatively perceive perceptions of procedural justice and the certainty of sanctions.

Runaways Procedural Justice Views Towards Courts

Studies examining procedural justice views have excessively analyzed the perceptions towards police and very limitedly, the courts (Baker et al., 2015; Mazerolle et al., 2013; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). The purpose of including the procedural justice views towards court is significant because, as Garland (1990) mentioned, courtrooms are where justice is served and the whole society participates. Therefore, examining the perceptions towards courts is also essential. The differed attitude towards the courts could be due to the differential treatment girls receive owing to their racial identification. For example, in the status offense cases, Black and Hispanic girls are more likely to be adjudicated than other racial and ethnic backgrounds girls (Freiburger & Burke, 2011).

In addition, Black girls are more likely to receive sanctions than Hispanic girls, while Hispanic girls receive harsher punishment than White girls (Moore & Padavic, 2010). Accordingly, there is the possibility of biased outcomes for female minority youth and the role of race, ethnicity, and gender were found to be significant factors in the decisions of court officials since girls of minority racial backgrounds are more likely to be considered delinquents by the justice system (Nanda, 2012). Most studies based their

results on the perceptions of the individuals based on the way the police treated them. In contrast, Casper et al.'s (1988) study suggested that the perception of the justice system involving individuals and the court system was formed based on the way the police treated them.

It is also suggested that the perceptions towards police and the courts are relatively different. For example, as explained by Roberts and Hough (2005), people had more positive perceptions of the police than courts. The perceptions towards police officers are based on interaction, representation, consistency, impartiality, accuracy, correctability, and ethicality (Leventhal, 1980; Luescher, 2004). In comparison, the perceptions towards courts are influenced by various factors, such as the type of attorneys and plea-bargaining negotiations (Baker et al., 2015).

Baker et al. (2014) in their study on female inmates in Florida, found that ethnicity and gender influenced the perceptions towards the courts but not the police officers' procedural justice. Similar to Casper et al. (1988), the Baker et al. study also showed that perceptions of procedural justice towards police were a precursor to the perceived procedural justice of the courts. This could be because existing studies have extensively discussed runaway as a social problem (Tucker et al., 2011; Tyler & Bersani, 2008) and the role of the juvenile justice system in addressing runaway behavior among adolescents (Acoca, 1998; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998) from a paternalistic ideology.

Due to this paternalistic and conservative ideology, the courts have treated runaway girls differently than boys. Runaway girls have been subjected to physical examinations by the courts to verify their involvement in sexual behavior, unlike runaway boys. Around 60% to 70% of girls in Chicago juvenile court were on probation

for engaging in behaviors against the preconstructed gender roles (Pasko, 2010). Such differential treatment by the courts and police causes disbelief in procedural justice. Such perceptions are believed to impact the future orientation of these runaway minority girls.

Similarly, the encounters with the police officers also impact the runaway girls' future orientation. To add, the association between police contact and court and future orientation are formed due to the factors that lead to police contact and contact with the court (Testa et al., 2021). The reason for the negative impact of justice system contacts on future orientation can be connected to the detrimental experiences with the system (Jackson et al., 2019; Jackson et al., 2021a; Nordberg et al., 2016, 2018;), alterations in the self-perceptions (Merrill et al., 2016), and finally, the stigmatization experienced by adolescents that can impact the future orientation (Corrigan et al., 2009; DeVlyder et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2019).

However, though the earlier studies stated that there was a difference in the perceptions of different genders and the various racial/ethnic groups regarding their perceptions of procedural justice, empirical support to prove the same is limited. Generally, gender and race are only limited to the statistical models as a control variable on procedural justice and legitimacy, or the studies were limited to samples of the same sex (Augustyn, 2013; Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Kaasa et al., 2008; Piquero et al., 2005; Sprott & Greene, 2010; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tatar et al., 2011). Therefore, it is essential to examine how the procedural justice attitudes as a consequence of runaway behavior among Hispanics and African American girls influence their offending behavior.

Perceptions of Certainty/Deterrence as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior

Deterrence Theory proposes that offenders weigh the benefits and costs of crime (Nagin, 2013). The philosophy of this theory is crime prevention (Beccaria, 1986). The three key ingredients of this theory are swiftness, severity, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. Among the three, certainty and severity serve as the foundation for contemporary deterrence theories. One of the restrains of crime is not necessarily the cruel nature of punishments, but their impeccability (Beccaria, 1986). Therefore, the certainty of sanctions has a higher impact on deterring individuals from committing offenses.

Certainty of sanctions refers to an individual's evaluation of the probability of being caught and punishment for engagement in a restricted act. The stronger the perceptions of certainty in sanctions, the higher the likelihood for the individuals to believe in deterrence effectiveness (Loughran et al., 2012). According to the Deterrence Theory, swift, certain, and severe punishments deter future criminal behavior (Beccaria, 1764; Robinson & Darley, 2004; Tittle, 1975; Walters, 2018; Zimring & Hawkins, 1972).

Of all the three concepts of Deterrence Theory mentioned above criminological research suggests that certainty of sanctions produces a reliable deterrence effect (Loughran et al., 2015; Nagin, 2013; Wright, 2010) and has been widely studied (Fader, 2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Nagin, 2013). Furthermore, it is identified that although individuals are unresponsive to the severity of the punishment, they are more likely to be deterred due to the certainty of sanctions (Fader, 2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Nagin, 2013; Schulz, 2014), specifically at-risk individuals (Kuin et al., 2015). Due to the latter

explanation, the certainty of sanctions has been chosen as a consequence of runaway behavior among Black and Hispanic girls.

Perceptions of certainty are based on an individual's assessment of the probability of being caught and punished for a delinquent act. The greater the belief in the certainty of sanctions, the more significant the impact of the deterrence effect (Loughran et al., 2012; Pickett et al., 2018). Walters (2018) suggested that there could be an association between adolescents and their perception of the certainty of sanction in deterring them from future offending behavior. Walters' study results indicated that as the certainty of sanctions perception increased, there was a decrease in offending frequency among adolescents. However, it does not explain the gender differences in the certainty of sanctions perceptions, even with 184 female samples.

Pursuant to the National Research Council (2013), the perceptions of adolescents and adults differ in three different ways. Firstly, compared to adults, adolescents had difficulty regulating their behavior in emotional situations. Secondly, adolescents sought more immediate gratifications than adults. Finally, adolescents were less considerate of the future consequences of their actions compared to adults. Therefore, it could be understood that adolescents are less likely to consider the certainty of sanctions when there are increased criminal opportunities (Lee et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2008; Woolard et al., 2001).

The purpose of analyzing the certainty of sanctions is due to the previous researchers support of this aspect of the theory related to the consistency and reliable effect of deterrence (Fader, 2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Loughran et al., 2015; Nagin, 2013; Wright, 2010) as well as its effect related to running away on girls offending

behavior. Also, as suggested by Pratt et al. (2006), future research on deterrence theory must examine the circumstances under which the certainty of sanctions is likely to deter an individual's offending behavior. For this purpose, it is essential to understand the certainty of sanctions from the perspective of consequences for running away behavior among girls and leading to offending behavior. Because of running away from home, it is most likely that these adolescents turned away from the moral values of society (Tyler et al., 2004), which could be detrimental to their future as well as their perceptions of the certainty of sanctions and procedural justice perceptions eventually impacting their future.

Leverso et al. (2015) indicated low future orientation as one of the several factors, including peer influence, distorted perceptions of risks, and impulsivity, that could lead to offending behavior among adolescents. The purpose of future orientation significantly impacts adolescents with limited experience, which may restrain these adolescents from looking far into the future (Gardner, 1993). For instance, an eight-year jail imprisonment of a 16-year-old would mean half of his/her life and could be too far in the future for them to completely comprehend (Leverso et al., 2015). It could be implied from the research findings of Nagin and Paternoster (1993, 1994) and Nagin and Pogarsky (2001, 2003) that sanctions highly deter individuals with more significant stakes in conformity. Similarly, runaway girls, since they are away from family and most of them are classified as school dropouts, do not have anything at stake that they fear, and this could be one of the reasons for these runaway girls to engage in delinquent behavior.

Although earlier studies have very strongly emphasized that perceptions of certainty of sanctions have a very strong deterrence effect on offending behavior (Fader,

2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Loughran et al., 2015; Nagin, 2013; Wright, 2010), recent studies have raised concerns over the impact of certainty of sanctions perceptions on all offending behavior rather than a few (Gallupe & Baron, 2010; Piquero et al., 2011; Pogarsky, 2007; Pratt et al., 2006; Nagin & Paternoster, 1993; Piquero et al., 2011; Wikström, 2007;). It is suggested by researchers Gallupe and Baron (2010), Piquero et al. (2011), Pogarsky (2007), Pratt et al. (2006), and Wikström (2007), that to improve the understanding of how the deterrence effect might vary for different individuals and different offenses, it is necessary to examine the latter to enhance the theoretical understanding of the effect and develop strategies to prevent these offenses with reference to runaway behavior among Black and Hispanic girls and its consequence on their offending behavior.

As Wikstrom (2006) stated, for individuals who do not view offending behavior as an alternative action or commit a crime out of habit, the certainty of sanctions might not influence their actions. Only when they see offending behavior as an alternative action do they fear the consequences of such actions, which may eventually impact their decision. Similarly, it could be implied that runaway girls, since they commit offenses as a means of survival, might not view offending behavior to be deterred by the certainty of sanctions perceptions, unlike non-runaway girls who do not have to resort to offending for survival.

Limited studies have explained the differential consequences of running away for boys and girls (Johnson et al., 2006). Several earlier studies examined the certainty of sanctions factors with relevance to peer groups (Jacobs, 2010; Nagin & Pogarksy, 2003; Tittle & Paternoster, 2000), low-socio-economic individuals (Foglia, 1997; Loughran et

al., 2009; Matsueda et al., 2006; Maxson et al., 2011; Piliavin et al., 1986), and street youths (Baron, 2009a, 2009b). However, these findings are male-centric and limitedly discuss the impact of certainty of sanctions on girls and their offending behavior.

Therefore, it is essential to address this gap in the existing literature to understand the gender and racial and ethnic differences in the perceptions of certainty of sanctions.

Offending Behavior as a Consequence of Runaway Behavior

As Chesney-Lind et al. (2008) stated, female delinquency is an area of study that is used to develop a holistic national profile by emphasizing the circumstances that they experience leading to their contact with the system (Acoca & Dedel, 1998; Holsinger et al., 1999; Lederman et al., 2004; Pasko, 2006; Tyler et al., 2001). It was identified by Snyder and Sickmund (1999) that compared to 10% of boys, three percent of girls committed significantly fewer violent offenses by the age of 18. The question being unaddressed here is whether girls have fewer needs than boys. A better perspective shows an array of interconnected situations that impact and lead to delinquent behavior among girls (Chesney-Lind et al., 2008).

Several researchers have suggested a relationship between running away and offending behavior (Baron & Hartnagel, 1997; Chen et al., 2007; Greenblatt & Robertson, 1993; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Haynie et al., 2009; S. Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999). Deviant behavior among runaways is influenced by several factors, such as family conflict, delinquent peer association, and street adversity (Baron, 1999; Baron & Hartnagel, 1997; Baron et al., 2001; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Lee & Schreck, 2005; Whitbeck et al., 1999; Whitbeck et al., 2001). For example, it was identified by Hagan

and McCarthy (1997) that street adversities were situational based, including insufficient food and money and lack of shelter, which positively impacts delinquency.

Runaway homeless youth are found to engage in risky behaviors that are strongly connected to their engagement in other risky behaviors (Bailey et al., 1998; Kipke et al., 1995), such as substance abuse and sexually risky behavior (Clatts et al., 2005; Halco'n & Lifson, 2004; Haleyet al., 2004; Solorio et al., 2006; Tyler et al., 2007; Tyler et al., 2004), and delinquency, which is the commonly identified factors that are connected to one another (Donovan & Jessor, 1985; Willoughby et al., 2004; Zhang et al., 2002).

Similarly, delinquent acts, including drug dealings, stealing, and committing assaults (Crawford et al., 2009; Stein et al., 2009; Whitbeck et al., 1997), are mainly likely identified as deviant survival strategies (Baron & Hartnagel, 1997; Greenblatt & Robertson, 1993; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Whitbeck et al., 1999; Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999) and not as consequences of running away. It is necessary to analyze these survival strategies as consequences since they result from runaway behavior and eventually impact runaways' future. Limited studies have analyzed the interaction between these runaway consequences, future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, the certainty of sanctions perceptions. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing literature by analyzing the impact of runaway consequences on the offending behavior among Black and Hispanic female offenders.

Interaction Between Future Orientation and Other Consequences of Running Away

As no studies were located that examined the interaction effect between future orientation and other runaway consequences such as exposure to violence, procedural justice, the certainty of sanctions, and delinquency's impact on girls' future orientation,

this section provides expected results at the end of this research. Leverso et al. (2015) indicated low future orientation as one of the several factors, including peer influence, distorted perceptions of risks, and impulsivity, that could lead to offending behavior among adolescents. The purpose of future orientation has a significant impact on adolescents who have limited experience, which may restrain these adolescents from looking far into the future (Gardner, 1993). For instance, an eight-year jail imprisonment of a 16-year-old would mean half of their life and could be too far in the future for them to completely comprehend (Leverso et al., 2015).

Specifically, few studies have suggested that runaway behavior is commonly found among Black and Hispanic adolescents, unlike Whites (Benoit-Bryan, 2011; Greene et al., 1997) and specifically among girls (Baker et al., 2003; Benoit-Bryan, 2011). Moreover, their consequences vary from boys to girls due to female sexuality and gendered roles (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998). For these runaway girls, as suggested by Janus et al. (1987), if running away and delinquency are combined, then despite delinquent behavior being a survival strategy, it may be associated with the experiences of victimization among runaways. This could be due to the difference in the girls' sensitivity towards the trauma they experience away from home, unlike boys (Zahn et al., 2010). The experiences of girls while away from home do have an impact on their future orientation.

Low future orientation could be attributed to their failure to identify the positive or negative consequences of their risky behavior on their future (Furby & Beyth-Marom, 1992). Hence, adolescents who fail to understand the consequences of their actions are more likely to involve in delinquent behavior (Parker, 1997). The same has been

identified with runaway adolescents. Non-runaways might have higher future orientation since their experiences may differ from that of runaway girls (Mello et al., 2018; Wood, 1997).

Future orientation is also believed to be influenced by exposure to violence. Witnessing and experiencing violence leads to impaired emotional and cognitive development, which impacts the adolescents ability to identify the consequences of their actions on their future (Mitchell, 1992). Unlike non-runaway adolescents, runaways are more likely to experience violence (Chen et al., 2007; Hoyt et al., 1999; Kim et al., 2009; Terrell, 1997; Thrane et al., 2006; Whitbeck et al., 1997, 2007). Exposure to violence has been extensively studied as a cause of running away, but it is critical to measure its impact as a consequence and on future orientation. Apart from their exposure to violence, these runaway girls also experience differential treatment from police and in courts. For example, Acoca (1998) stated that in his study, girls often experienced abusive attitudes from the correctional system personnel, such as inappropriate language, inappropriate physical touch, and being hit by the staff. Therefore, due to their association with delinquent behaviors, these runaways will be identified as delinquents and not as victims (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1997; Smith & Thornberry, 1995; Stinton, 2007).

Deterrence Theory suggests that individuals refrain from crime commission due to the perceived fear of getting caught, certainty, and the consequences followed by getting caught, associated with severity (Gibbs, 1975; Wikström, 2007). Studies have examined the interaction between deterrence and self-control (Gallupe & Baron, 2010; Wright et al., 2004) but are very limited regarding deterrence and future orientation. With

regards to the certainty of sanctions, there is a need to identify how runaway girls differ from non-runaway girls in their perceptions of certainty of sanctions since a considerable part of the existing literature emphasizes the male perceptions and very little related to girls' perceptions. The purpose of using exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions, along with the interaction of future orientation, is to analyze the spurious relationship between Black and Hispanic runaway and non-runaway girls' experiences impacting their offending behavior using self-reported data.

Theoretical Framework

General Strain Theory

The theory postulates that strain is an outcome when an individual fails to achieve positively valued goals, loses positively valued stimuli, or experiences a negative stimulus (Agnew, 1992). Agnew (1992) argued that General Strain Theory (GST) is central to explaining delinquency. This theory focuses on the individualistic level, their immediate social surroundings, and the factors that influence these adolescents in their choices of delinquent versus non-delinquent adaptations (Agnew, 1992).

General Strain Theory is distinct from other sociological theories for two reasons. First, it analyses an individual's social relations, how they lead to delinquency, and, secondly, the motivation for delinquency (Agnew, 1992). Regarding social relationships, the theory explicitly focuses on negative relationships with others, meaning relationships where individuals are not treated as expected.

With regards to motivation for delinquency, Agnew emphasized that adolescents were forced into delinquency by the negative affective state, for example, anger, becoming flustered or nervous, fear, disgust, bitterness, jealousy, shame, embarrassment,

disappointment, regret, and depression (Morgan & Heise, 1988) which is a resultant of the negative relationships. Such negative effects may pressure adolescents to use illegitimate ways to achieve their goals, fight or flight from the source of their hardship, and overcome their negative affective state by using illicit drugs (Agnew, 1992).

The recent versions of the General Strain Theory argued primarily regarding the concerns of adolescents not only limited to their future goals of monetary success but also regarding the achievement of immediate gratifications, including good grades and popularity among peers (Agnew, 1984; Elliott & Voss, 1974; Elliott et al., 1985; Empey, 1982; Greenberg, 1977). However, Agnew (1985a) argued that strain was not only caused by the inability to achieve positively valued goals but may also result from the failure to escape from distressing situations.

The latter is true for runaway girls as these runaway girls have limited legitimate opportunities leading them to engage in unlawful activities impacting their future orientation making it more difficult to avoid their pathway to delinquency and get off the streets (Nihart et al., 2005). As a result, strain leads to acting out such as delinquent behavior (Agnew, 1992; Agnew, 2001; Kort-Butler, 2010; Peterson, 2014) which is conditioned by the availability of legitimate and illegitimate opportunities.

According to the GST propositions, increased strain reduces the individual's perceptions of the costs/consequences of their actions, leading to their disposition to engage in delinquent behavior due to negative emotions (Kort-Butler, 2010). For example, adolescents feeling negative emotions, especially anger, may desire to take corrective steps, and delinquency is one possible response (Agnew, 1992).

Similarly, Agnew (2002) also argued that exposure to violence, both witnessed and experienced, were the forms of strain leading to delinquent responses, and in an attempt to overcome the negative emotions, adolescents may use delinquency as a way of protection (Acoca, 1998; Kort-Butler, 2010). The latter is true for runaway girls, as they are more prone to be exposed to violence and, subsequently, delinquency (McIntyre & Widom, 2011). Some forms of delinquency girls adopt as coping mechanisms are prostitution and substance use. Such coping mechanisms resulting from running away could impact the girls' future orientation.

Although exposure to violence has been debated robustly, the direct and indirect effects of violence exposure on delinquent outcomes are limited (Richmond et al., 2009). Studies that ignore considering both experienced and witnessed exposure to violence might fail to understand its detrimental effects on girls' delinquency outcomes (Peterson, 2014).

Procedural Justice Theory

Criminal justice encounters follow the perception of procedural justice. The primary element in the perception progression is the interaction with the police, followed by the court proceedings. However, these interactions are influenced by several mediating variables, such as race, ethnicity, gender, and education. These mediating variables may influence the citizens' perceptions of police and courts individually and collectively (Baker et al., 2014).

The Procedural Justice Theory is extended from the works of Thibaut and Walker (1975), Leventhal (1980), and Lind and Tyler (1988). Researchers theorized that individuals who have a role in the process and the decisions made by justice system

authorities are likely to perceive the process as fair irrespective of the outcome of those encounters (Thibaut & Walker, 1975). For this process to be considered fair, the procedures should be accurate, consistent, unbiased, correctible if there are errors, ethical, and representative of all the parties involved in the decision-making process (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Procedural Justice Theory proposes that perceptions towards police officers during encounters are dependent upon the perceived fairness of the officer which the public views as morally appropriate behavior (Tyler, 2006c; Tyler & Blader, 2005). For example, when officers engage in racial profiling, the public views it as unfair and not in accordance with morally appropriate behavior. Specifically, Skogan (2006) suggested that negative encounters with the police can have nine times higher effect on the perceptions of procedural justice than positive encounters.

Individuals have a positive attitude toward police when treated fairly and impartially (Skogan, 2005), which enhances respect for the law and legal authorities. Similarly, with courts, when females are allowed to tell their stories in court, they perceive their treatment as fair and have an overall positive perception towards procedural justice (Baker et al., 2014). Although it is suggested that the perceptions of procedural justice are formed when there is quality treatment and quality in the officers' decision-making ability, Tyler (2006a) suggested that the public's perception of procedural justice varied based on the situation and different measurement criteria. Also, those perceptions varied based on individual characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender (Fossati & Meeker, 1997). For example, regarding the situational differences in procedural justice views, Thibaut and Walker (1975) identified that individuals in

adversarial trials had more positive views toward the courts than those in inquisitorial trials.

Similarly, the views of procedural justice were measured by citizens based on the treatment's quality rather than the treatment's outcome. This is also the same for racial minority groups (Tyler, 2001). Race is identified as a prominent factor influencing procedural justice fairness experiences (Engel, 2005; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). Sunshine and Tyler (2003), in their study, identified that education and the performance of police significantly predicted the positive procedural justice views among Whites but not for Blacks and Hispanics. Also, as explained by Ekins (2016) and Fingerhut (2017), minority racial groups were more likely to withdraw their support for police fairness by revealing "neutral feelings." For this reason, it is vital to study only Black and Hispanic adolescents since their views of procedural justice significantly differ from Whites.

Procedural justice studies have majorly measured the perceptions of adults and the factors influencing their views. However, limited studies have examined the impact of procedural justice on adolescents and their future orientation. As suggested by Testa et al. (2022), encounters with the justice system and specifically with the police can have a significant effect on one's future orientation, and this is also influenced by race and gender. Due to this gap in the existing literature, this study proposed to examine the difference in procedural justice views among Black and Hispanic runaway girls, if it is a consequence of girls' runaway behavior, and if procedural justice views influence runaway girls offending behavior when interacting with future orientation.

Deterrence Theory

The Deterrence Theory proposes that individuals weigh the benefits and costs of crime and subsequently decide how to behave (Chalfin & McCrary, 2017; Nagin, 2013). Similarly, individuals refrain from engaging in restricted acts due to the perceived risk of getting caught and its following consequences (Andenaes, 1974; Gibbs, 1975; Wikström, 2007). Although Deterrence Theory presides on the three essential concepts such as swiftness, certainty, and severity, a large body of research suggests that certainty of sanctions perceptions are strongly correlated with the other two concepts (Nagin, 1998; Paternoster, 1987, 2010; Pratt et al., 2006).

Deterrence Theory is preceded by the belief that certainty of sanctions discourages future delinquent acts by establishing an understanding of the consequences of one's actions (Wilson & Herrnstein, 1985; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). For example, runaway girls with high certainty of sanctions perceptions are more likely to understand the consequences of their actions on their future and deter themselves from engaging in delinquent behavior. The latter indicates that certainty of sanctions perceptions do impact one's future orientation and offending behavior which means that any form of legal intervention can deter future delinquent behaviors (Nagin, 2013).

Svensson (2015) suggested that in instances where the certainty of sanctions perceptions is weak, it could be assumed that certainty of sanctions deterrence effect is effective for some individuals but not for others (Gallupe & Baron, 2010; Pogarsky, 2007; Pratt et al., 2006; Wikström, 2007). Piquero et al. (2011) suggested that it was crucial to identify how the certainty of sanctions perceptions' deterrence effectiveness varied among individuals. The researchers suggest that identifying this relationship and

its interaction with other variables will serve the purpose of developing preventive strategies.

This could be true for runaway Black and Hispanic girls and runaway and non-runaway girls since there could be a difference among these girls and their probability of engaging in specific offenses. Therefore, understanding how these girls vary in their perceptions of certainty of sanctions and their offending behavior might provide insights into filling the existing gap.

Summary

Since the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act of 1974 was first passed, runaway youth have been a very prominent concern throughout the nation (Morton et al., 2017). In their generalized survey results, Morton et al. (2017) identified that in the United States, around 700,000 adolescents from 13 to 17 years were likely to experience homelessness due to running away from home. Furthermore, this concern increases when the age group is between 18 to 25 years. That is, 1 in 10 young adults of 18 to 25 years are more likely to experience homelessness due to running away every year (Morton et al., 2017; Morton et al., 2018).

According to the Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress, from 2007 to 2016, the number of homeless people decreased from 1,221,044 to 374,718. Pursuant to this data, female representation increased from 34% in 2007 to 42% in 2016. Regarding race and ethnicity, homelessness among Hispanics due to running away was 14.2% in 2016, whereas for African Americans, it was 33.9% in 2016 (United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2017).

With such a higher representation of girls in runaway data, it is necessary to understand the impact of age, race, commitment to future orientation, parental violence, family structure, and procedural justice-related belief and strain on girls' delinquent behavior. In addition, the importance of studying only females is vital since girls have lower offending rates than boys. It is more rational to study females offending in areas where both boys and girls have equal representation, such as status offenses (Stinton, 2007). Therefore, studying girls independently to understand their offending behavior advances the area of girls' runaway literature.

Some of the identified consequences of running away include exposure to violence impacting the future of these adolescents (Benoit-Bryan, 2011; Edinburgh et al., 2013; Kingree et al., 2001; Whitbeck et al., 2000; Yoder et al., 1998). Compared to non-runaway adolescents, runaways have higher risks of being school dropouts (Aratani & Cooper, 2015), are more likely to engage in substance use (Edinburgh et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2004), and undertake self-harming behavior and suicidal tendencies (Benoit-Bryan, 2011; Kingree et al., 2001; Whitbeck et al., 2000; Yoder et al., 1998). Since the experiences of runaway boys and girls vary, such as runaway girls are more likely to experience sexual assault whereas boys are more likely to experience physical assault, such differed experiences may shape differential future offending pathways for both boys and girls (Jeanis et al., 2020; Whitbeck et al., 1999).

Thrane et al. (2006) found that 75% of runaway youth experience violence while on the streets. As a result, runaway adolescents have more probability of delinquent behavior leading to contact with the criminal justice system compared to non-runaways (Windle, 1988). The same pattern is also witnessed in adulthood (Benoit-Bryan, 2011).

Despite the general idea that running away among American adolescents leads to grave and deleterious effects, limited studies have emphasized the consequences of running away among adolescents (Jeanis et al., 2020). Also, there are few theoretical explanations available to understand how these identified consequences significantly affect adolescent girls and their future orientation, offending behavior, and how they differ according race and ethnicity. Therefore, this research is of importance to understand the consequences of running away and how these consequences differ by race.

As this study extensively focused on Black and Hispanic girls, however, research on White runaway girls and diverse background runaway girls is sternly needed and proves valuable. Black and Hispanic backgrounds yield a particular status in the society that is correlated with runaway background than White girls. Therefore, this study emphasized only Black and Hispanic girls' runaway behavior.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The Current Study

Runaway children, without any plans for their futures, are lost in society and are more likely to become victims (Janus et al., 1987). Black and Hispanic girls are more likely to runaway compared to White girls (Baker et al., 2003; Benoit-Bryan, 2011; Greene et al., 1997). As a result, runaway girls are more likely to be involved in delinquent behavior and criminal behavior in later adulthood (Benoit-Bryan, 2011). The earlier studies on runaway behavior have extensively discussed the causes (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Tyler et al., 2004) but there is limited literature that explains whether the survival strategies of runaway girls are the consequences of running away from home. As such, it is necessary to understand adolescent girls' runaway behavioral consequences on their future orientation and offending behavior.

While young girls do not immediately commit an offense when they run away from home, there is a spill-over effect of running away on their means of survival and the experiences they encounter that eventually impact their future orientation and often leads to offending behavior. Because of this pathway, it becomes important to understand the effect of these identified consequences on Black and Hispanic runaway girls' future orientation and offending behavior, which is the primary focus of this study.

Research Questions

Several youth runaway studies focused on examining runaway's exposure to violence or runaway's procedural justice views, or runaway's certainty perceptions emphasized on finding the delinquency relationship. However, studies utilized runaway's

experience as mediating variables for delinquency by ignoring that these runaway experiences are the preliminary consequences for runaway youth. To demonstrate if any such difference exists, this research developed the following question to examine if the variables future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions associate with the runaway or non-runaway girls. In doing so, this research clarified if variables future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions were consequences with respect to or irrespective of girls runaway background.

The study proposed the following research questions:

RQ1: Do runaway girls significantly differ in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than non-runaway girls?

H_{A1}: There is a significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their future orientation.

H_{A2}: There is a significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their exposure to violence.

H_{A3}: There is a significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their procedural justice views.

H_{A4}: There is a significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their certainty of sanctions perceptions.

The attempt to study of which racial group among Black and Hispanic runaway girls had the increased probability of experiencing the runaway consequences is less studied. Therefore, this study used research question two to examine if runaway

consequences such as exposure to violence, future orientation, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions significantly differed for Black and Hispanic runaway girls. This allowed the research to identify the pattern of runaway consequences association with girls' racial background.

RQ2: Are there any significant differences between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions?

H_{A5}: There is a significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their future orientation.

H_{A6}: There is a significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their exposure to violence.

H_{A7}: There is a significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their procedural justice views.

H_{A8}: There is a significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their certainty of sanctions perceptions.

Many studies suggested the greater effect of runaway on youth future orientation apart from other runaway consequences such as exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. However, Black and Hispanic runaway girls offending as a result of interaction effect between future orientation and exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions are not often studied. To address this aspect of Black and Hispanic runaway girls this research utilized the following research question.

RQ3: Does the interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation, influence runaway girls' offending behavior?

H_A9: The interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation does influence runaway girls offending behavior.

H_A10: The interaction between procedural justice views and future orientation does influence runaway girls offending behavior.

H_A11: The interaction between certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation does influence runaway girls offending behavior.

Population and Data

This study used a quantitative research approach by using the secondary dataset Research on Pathways to Desistance [Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia County, PA]: Subject Measures, 2000-2010 from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). This longitudinal dataset included 1,354 adjudicated serious juvenile offenders 14 to 18 years old at the time of recruitment for the study (Mulvey, 2016). It assessed their transition into early adulthood from November 2000 through March 2010 from juvenile and adult courts in Maricopa County, Phoenix, Arizona (N = 654) and Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania (N = 700) (Mulvey, 2016).

The Pathways to Desistance Study was developed during the MacArthur Research Network about Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice (Mulvey, 2016). The study broadly focused on providing empirical evidence to juvenile justice professionals on the issues concerning juveniles. The study mainly focused on concerns regarding the

treatment of juvenile serious offenders including their transfers to adult courts, impact of juvenile justice system, and deterring juvenile delinquency (Mulvey, 2016).

Since there is limited data on juvenile serious offenders measuring their patterns and outcomes of antisocial behavior, developmental changes, and the impact of sanctions of the juveniles' antisocial behavior, the pathways study attempted to measure the psychological, behavioral, social, and mental health experiences while in the juvenile justice system (Mulvey, 2016).

Over a period of seven years, interviews were conducted with these juveniles and their family members to investigate the decrease in the juvenile serious offenders' antisocial activity, the impact of social and developmental aspects in the transformation, and the impact of sanctions in the positive changes of these juvenile offenders (Mulvey, 2016).

The data collection for the study was through the enrollment of juveniles into the study which was conducted for over 26 months from November 2000 to January 2003. After the enrollment, the data was collected from the participants through self-reports (Mulvey, 2016). The study participants were interviewed which ranged from baseline interviews (November 2000 to March 2003), follow-up interviews (May 2001 to March 2010 at 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 48, 60, 72, and 84 months since the baseline), and release interviews (during the stay in residential facility before 30 of release) (Mulvey, 2016).

Sample Design

The Pathways dataset was collected through computer-assisted interviews. The study relied mostly on self-reports from serious juvenile offenders from a baseline interview and follow-up interviews. The first baseline interviews were conducted in

November 2000 and the last interview was in March 2003 (Mulvey, 2016). After the baseline interviews were completed, the Pathways study conducted six-month, three-year follow-up interviews from May 2001 to March 2010. The baseline and follow-up period were calculated for equal measurement periods necessary to statistically analyze the developmental, environmental, and relational changes in the behaviors of the juveniles (Mulvey, 2016). At the baseline data collection, the juveniles were White (20%), Black (41%), Hispanic (34%), and other racial/ethnic groups (5%). This dataset had a predominantly male population (86%).

These interviews were conducted at the juvenile's residence, library or at the facilities with the assistance of laptop computers. Trained interviewers would read the questions out loud for the juveniles to mark their responses on a keypad to maintain privacy. The self-reported responses were validated through collateral reporters interviews and official records of arrest. For this research, baseline interviews are utilized (Mulvey, 2016).

Measures

As this study aimed to identify the association between future orientation over the other runaway consequences, variables that are the consequences such as exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty perceptions, and self-reported offending behavior of both runaway and non-runaway Black and Hispanic girls were considered for this study from the Pathways to Desistance study dataset. In the current study, for RQ 1, the independent variable was runaway and non-runaway girls, and the dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty perceptions.

For RQ 2, the independent variable was runaway girls' race/ethnicity (that is, Black and Hispanics), and the dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty perceptions. The third research question had the independent variables using interaction effect such as interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation, interaction between procedural justice views and future orientation, and interaction between certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation. The dependent variable was runaway girls self-reported offending behavior.

Runaway. The variable runaway measured whether the juvenile ever ran away from where they were living. The respondents were asked, "Ever run away from where you were living?" This variable is a categorical variable with 0=No and 1=Yes. Since the variable is dichotomous, Yes (56) and No (66) responses were retained and -9=Don't know and -8=Refused, were treated as missing data. Without considering the gender of these runaways, the number of runaways were 449 and non-runaways were 881 juveniles.

Future Orientation. The variable is constructed from the Future Outlook Inventory developed by Cauffman and Woolard (1999), using items from the Life Orientation Task (Scheier & Carver, 1985), the Zimbardo Time Perspective Scale (Zimbardo, 1980), and the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (Strathman et al., 1994). This 15-item measure asked the participants if they agree with each statement reflecting how they are such as "I will keep working at difficult, boring tasks if I know they will help me get ahead later." The measure used a 4-point Likert Scale with 1=Never true, 2=Rarely True, 3=Often true, and 4=Always true. The Likert scale responses were retained and -300=Too few answers for computation and -200=Data missing were treated as missing data.

Procedural Justice. The inventory measured the perceptions of the juveniles of fairness and equity related with arrest and court processing. This measure was developed to address multiple aspects of fair treatment including correctability, ethicality, representativeness, and consistency (see Tyler & Huo, 2002). An index was formed by two items measuring Procedural Justice experiences with Judges/Court (mean of 14 items) and Direct Procedural Justice Experiences with Police (mean of 14 items). These two items were on a 5-point scale with 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree.

Exposure to Violence. This measure was adapted from the Exposure to Violence Inventory (Selner-Ohagan et al., 1998) and was modified to measure the types of violence the adolescent had either witnessed or experienced. The exposure to violence both witnessed and experienced variable was combined in the dataset to measure the greater exposure to violence and its impact on the juvenile offenders. The category of witnessed exposure measured if the juvenile had seen or witnessed someone else being victimized. Whereas the experienced violence category measured if the juvenile themselves experienced victimization. The items categorized under witnessed violence included seven items such as "Have you ever seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack?" The items categorized under the violence experienced were inclusive of six items asking the respondents "Have you ever been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt?" Collectively, under the 13 items, higher scores suggested greater exposure to violence.

Perceptions of Certainty of Sanctions. The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards was utilized to measure the juvenile's perceptions of probability of

detection and punishment for offenses (Nagin & Paternoster, 1994). This 78-item measure included direct and indirect experiences of certainty of punishment, social costs of punishment, personal costs of punishment, social rewards of crime, and personal rewards of crime. For the purpose of this study, direct/individual perceptions of certainty of sanctions were utilized with seven items where respondents were asked “Ever do crazy dangerous things for fun,” “Like to speed or take chances when you drive,” and “Ever been stopped/chased by police for speeding/reckless driving.” This item was measured on a 10-point scale with 0=No chance and 10=Absolute certain to be caught.

Self-Reported Offending. This study focused on the Self-Report of offending (SRO) of female juveniles as the dependent variable. The SRO (Huizinga et al., 1991) measured the adolescent’s participation in antisocial and illegal acts. The 24 items measured the juvenile’s offending behavior among the several types of crimes was a dichotomous variable with 0=No and 1= Yes. For the current study, among these 24 items, only 19 items were used to index into one dependent variable.

The items utilized for indexing can be seen in Table 1. They are destroyed/damaged property, set fire, broke in to steal, bought/received/sold stolen property, used check/credit card illegally, stole car or motorcycle, sold marijuana, sold other drugs, carjacked, drove drunk or high, paid for sex, shot someone bullet hit, shot at someone no hit, took by force w/ weapon, took by force no weapon, beat up someone serious injury, in a fight, beat someone as part of gang, and carried a gun.

Table 1*Self-Reported Offending*

Items	Description
Destroyed/ damaged property	“If the subject engaged in [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] in their lifetime”
Set fire	“If the subject engaged in [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] in their lifetime”
Broke in to steal	“If the subject engaged in, [entered or broken into a building (home or business) to steal something] in their lifetime”
Bought/ received/ sold stolen property	“If the subject engaged in [bought, received, sold something you knew was stolen] in their lifetime”
Used check/credit card illegally	“If the subject engaged in [used checks or credit cards illegally] in their lifetime”
Stole car or motorcycle	“If the subject engaged in [stolen a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] in their lifetime”
Sold marijuana	“If the subject engaged in [sold marijuana] in their lifetime”
Sold other drugs	“If the subject engaged in [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] in their lifetime”
Carjacked	“If the subject engaged in [carjacked someone] in their lifetime”

Drove drunk or high	“If the subject engaged in [driven while you were drunk or high] in their lifetime”
Paid for sex	“If the subject paid by someone for having sexual relations with them in their lifetime”
Shot someone bullet hit	“if the subject [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] in their lifetime”
Shot at someone no hit	“If the subject [shot at someone (where you pulled the trigger)] in lifetime”
Took by force w/ weapon	“If the subject had [taken something from another person by force, using a weapon] in their lifetime”
Took by force no weapon	“If the subject had [taken something from another person by force, without a weapon] in their lifetime”
Beat up someone serious injury	“If the subject had [beaten up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] in their lifetime”
In a fight	“If the subject had been in a fight] in their lifetime”
Beat someone as part of gang	“If the subject had [beaten up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] in their lifetime”
Carried a gun	“If the subject had [carried a gun] in their lifetime”

Note. All the items above are dichotomous with yes or no response and will be used to create an index measuring the self-reported offending behavior among runaway and non-runaway Black and Hispanic girls.

Data Cleaning and Indexing

Following Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, data cleaning was initiated.

As the current study is female specific (184 which is, 13.6%), 1,170 (86.4%) male

samples were deleted. With regards to race/ethnicity, the study specifically measured Blacks and Hispanics for the analysis. Therefore, White and Others were removed from the sample. In the items of the variables such as runaway, future orientation, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, exposure to violence, and self-reported offending behavior, missing values were deleted through the case-wise deletion method.

The variables procedural justice and self-reported delinquency were developed by indexing the items, therefore reliability and factor analysis was conducted. For the variable procedural justice, two items reliability and factor analysis were conducted. From the reliability analysis, Cronbach's alpha value is identified as .68. Results of the factor analysis developed one component matrix which included all items with a value greater than .8. The factor analysis model is significant in Bartlett's test with a value less than .001 and with a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value greater than .5, suggesting that all items loaded well. Therefore, the variable procedural justice, was developed using the compute strategy and mean technique. The Cronbach's alpha value from reliability analysis for variable self-reported delinquency is .85. Factor analysis was not conducted for this variable since all items were categorical (dichotomous). Therefore, the variable self-reported delinquency, was formed using the compute strategy and sum technique.

Interaction Variables

This research developed three interaction variables for the purpose of research question three. Initially, using the select cases technique, only the sample of runaway girls were selected. Later, by using the compute strategy and multiplication technique, three interaction variables were developed. The first interaction variable was developed by multiplying the variables exposure to violence and future orientation. The second interaction variable was developed by multiplying the variables procedural justice and future orientation. The third interaction variable was developed by multiplying the variables certainty of sanctions and future orientation.

Summary

This study used secondary data from ICPSR, aimed to test the differences between runaway and non-runaway girls as well as runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation and other runaway consequences like exposure to violence, perceptions of certainty of sanctions, procedural justice perceptions, and self-reported offending behavior. The study also attempted to identify the interaction effect between future orientation and the runaway consequences among Black and Hispanic runaway girls in predicting their self-reported offending behavior.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Chapter IV comprises the findings of this study. The results of this study's research questions are detailed in the following sections. This chapter concludes with a summary of the findings. This research signified the importance of understanding Black and Hispanic girls' runaway consequences, such as future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions and these consequences' relationship with girls offending behavior.

This study hypothesized a significant difference between runaway and non-runaway and Black and Hispanic runaway girls' future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. This research also hypothesized that the interaction between future orientation and exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions influenced runaway girls offending behavior. This study relied on statistical techniques such as One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Multiple Regression analysis.

One-way ANOVA is an inferential technique used to test hypotheses in research situations to evaluate differences between two or more means from two or more groups (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). One-way ANOVA results explain whether a group's difference is significant or non-significant (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). One-way ANOVA does this for its ability to compare two variance estimates, such as between group and with-in-group variability (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). In the one-way ANOVA test, if the variability between groups is approximately the same as within groups, variability indicates an insignificant difference between group means (Gravetter

& Wallnau, 2014). Overall, one-way ANOVA results allow the researcher to determine if the group differences are due to random error or a systematic effect of the group condition or background (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014).

Interaction among variables refers to any change in one variable that is related to the change in another variable (Walker & Maddan, 2013). In this study's point of view (research question three), using interacted variables as predictors is a strategy adopted to understand the combined effect of two or more predictor variables on the outcome variable. According to Walker and Maddan (2013), interaction can describe more significant variation in the outcome variable than the effect of an individual predictor variable. Examining interaction variables' (predictor) impact on outcome variables is possible with multiple regression procedures (Walker & Maddan, 2013). Therefore, this study utilized multiple regression to test some of the study hypotheses.

Multiple regression is a statistical procedure that can estimate or predict one variable from the knowledge of the other (Mertler & Reinhart, 2017). The primary objective of multiple regressions is to develop a linear combination of predictor variables that will associate as highly as possible with the outcome variable (Walker & Maddan, 2013). Multiple regression explains the linear relational impact of a predictor variable on an outcome variable (Walker & Maddan, 2013). Therefore, the multiple regression analysis results allow the researcher to explain the causal relationship between predictor and outcome variables (Mertler & Reinhart, 2017).

Research question one explored if runaway girls significantly differ in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than non-runaway girls? The independent variable in research question one

was runaway behavior, and the dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions. This study utilized the one-way ANOVA technique to examine research question one. This statistical technique is suitable for finding the group differences when the study has one categorical independent variable and one quantitative dependent variable.

Research question two asked if there were any significant differences between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions? The independent variable in research question two was race/ethnicity, and the dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions. This study utilized the one-way ANOVA technique to examine research question two. This statistical technique is suitable for finding the group differences when the study has one categorical independent variable and one quantitative dependent variable. Before conducting the analysis using the select cases technique, only runaway cases were selected for the analysis purpose.

The third research question explored the interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, the certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation influence on runaway girls' offending behavior. The independent variables in research question three were the interaction of future orientation and exposure to violence, the interaction of future orientation and procedural justice, and the interaction of future orientation and certainty of sanctions. The dependent variable was runaway girls self-reported offending behavior. Therefore, this study employed the Multiple Regression Analysis technique. The multiple regression model technique creates a linear

combination that best predicts the dependent variable. Before conducting the analysis using the select cases technique, only runaway cases were selected for the analysis purpose.

Statistical Test Assumptions

One-Way ANOVA

An assumption of a statistical test shows the possible bias sources and functions as a condition in the method of demonstrating the works of statistical tests or does what it is meant to do (Field, 2013). The one-way ANOVA assumptions include the test of independence, normality, and homogeneity of variance. According to the assumptions of independence, the errors must be independent of one another and not related (Field, 2013; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). This means that the independence in the particular statistical test, the responses or mean of scores of one group, was not dependent on another group (Field, 2013; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). In instances of violating the assumption of independence, the test of significance and confidence intervals will become invalid (Field, 2013).

The second assumption of one-way ANOVA is the assumption of normality and it focuses on the normal distribution of dependent variables (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Finally, the homogeneity of variance is the assumption that the distribution of scores will be similar. In other words, there is an assumption that the distribution of the range of scores within each group of runaway and non-runaway girls and Black and Hispanic runaway girls for each of the variables of future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions will be roughly the same.

Ensuring that the discussed assumption conforms that the statistical analysis is functioning as designed (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014).

One-Way ANOVA Assumptions. The three assumptions related to one-way ANOVA were met in the current study. The dependent variables were measured on a scale ranging from 1-4 (future orientation), 0-1 (exposure to violence), 0-10 (certainty of sanctions perceptions), and 1-5 (procedural justice views). The independent variables were categorical independent groups, including runaway and non-runaways and Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Pursuant to the assumptions of independence, among the independent variables selected for the current study, independence of observation can be observed, meaning there is no relationship between the groups. Each study participant in the dataset completed the survey considering their own perspective of their position. The outliers were removed using the case-wise deletion technique.

One of the appropriate tests for normality is Shapiro-Wilk (Mertler & Reinhart, 2017) and it was conducted for each dependent variable. Normality is observed when the significance value is greater than .05. For research question one and two, the dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. They each had Shapiro-Wilk significance value greater than .05, indicating that these variables were normally distributed. Homogeneity of variances was observed using Levene's test with significant levels greater than .05. One-Way ANOVA results indicated homogeneity of variance significance value as greater than .05 for each One-Way ANOVA test conducted to answer research questions one and two.

Multiple Regression

Multiple regression analysis is the most appropriate statistical technique for data with multiple variables. The study had four key variables: the dependent variable was self-reported offending behavior, and the independent variables were the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation, the interaction between procedural justice views and future orientation, and the interaction between the certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation. The study aimed to examine the existing relationship between the variables and predict the possible outcomes.

It was observed that multiple regression is used to understand three types of relationships between the predictor and outcome variables. This threefold relationship is primarily, employed to understand the strength of the relationship between variables. Second, to predict the effects of the variables, and finally, to forecast the possible trends (Abdullah & Rahim, 2016). Specifically, to analyze the relationship of the variables, multiple regression analysis can be directed toward the degree of impact the predictor variable has on the outcome variable. In the current study, this was the degree of the relationship connecting the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation on the runaway Black and Hispanic girls self-reported offending behavior.

The second purpose of utilizing multiple regression is the prediction of the effects of the variables. This enables the researcher to compute how much change appears in the dependent variable when an alteration is made to the independent variable. In the current study, this was determined when the self-reported offending changes when the exposure to violence interacts with the future orientation. The third reason for utilizing the regression technique is to foresee the trends by projecting the estimates using

hypothetical manipulation of the variables. The projection in the current study would be that runaway girls' self-reported offending behavior decreased when their procedural justice views and future orientation were high.

Multiple Regression Assumptions. For the multiple regression analysis results to be considered meaningful, several assumptions must be addressed, such as normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. To check normality assumptions, skewness and Kurtosis values were calculated for the dependent variable, self-reported offending. Results from descriptive statistics found that the skewness and kurtosis values were between positive one and negative one, indicating the normal distribution for the dependent variable.

To check for multivariate outliers, the Mahalanobis distance test was conducted. Using the scatterplots, the assumptions of homoskedasticity and linearity were tested. The residual scatterplots used to test linearity showed approximately an even distribution along the straight lines and no disparity in the patterns, such as clusters of points.

Bivariate scatterplots were used to test homoskedasticity, and no heteroskedasticity was identified. Other tests were conducted to check multicollinearity among the independent variables, such as zero-order correlations, variance inflation factors (VIF), and tolerance coefficients. The results from the bivariate correlation showed that the correlation values between the variables were less than .7. VIF statistics values for the variables were less than 10, and tolerance coefficients were greater than .1 showing no multicollinearity issue.

Demographic Statistics

The current research included 122 participants from specific gender and race/ethnicity. Since the study focused only on girls, all the 122 participants were

females. Race/ethnicity specific to Black and Hispanic, were: 54.9% (67) Blacks and 45.1% (55) Hispanics. Runaway variable shows that 45.9% (56) girls had runaway background and 54.1% (66) did not have any runaway background.

As seen in Table 2, the average future orientation of the participants was $M = 2.37$; the average exposure to violence of the participants was $M = 4.48$; the participants average procedural justice views was $M = 3.03$, the average certainty of sanctions perceptions of the participants was $M = 6.22$, with regards to self-reported offending, $M = 4.42$.

Table 2

Demographic Statistics

Measures	Frequency	Percentage
Race/Ethnicity		
Black	67	54.9
Hispanic	55	45.1
Gender		
Female	122	100
Runaway		
Yes	56	45.9
No	66	54.1
	Mean	S. D
Future Orientation	2.37	.55
Exposure to Violence	4.48	2.83

Procedural Justice Views	3.03	.46
Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions	6.22	2.90
Self-Reported Offending	4.42	3.63
<hr/>		
<i>N</i>	122	

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 assessed if runaway girls significantly differed in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than non-runaway girls. To answer this question, one-way ANOVA was conducted. The independent variable for this research question was runaway girls, a dichotomous variable with a yes or no type of response. The dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. Since one-way ANOVA is conducted with one independent and dependent variable, four one-way ANOVA tests were conducted for four dependent variables, and the independent variable remained the same for every test conducted.

Runaway Background and Future Orientation

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 120) = .99, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 3) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 120) = .04, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both runaway and non-runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their future orientation, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis one.

Previous studies have shown that the concern towards one's future reduces delinquent behavior among adolescents (Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Johnson et al., 2013; Robbins & Bryan, 2004; Stoddard et al., 2011; Wigfeild & Eccles, 2000). Some of the factors that impacts one's future orientation is at-risk behavior such as running away. However, runaway girls did not differ from non-runaway girls in their future orientation.

Runaway Background and Exposure to Violence

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 120) = .77, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 3) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 120) = 2.80, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both runaway and non-runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their exposure to violence, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis two.

Earlier studies have noted that since running away is a risky behavior, it increases the exposure to violence among runaway girls (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Kim et al., 2009; Peterson et al., 2004) than non-runaway girls. Specifically, girls are more likely to be victims of violence and are more vulnerable after running away unlike non-runaway girls due to the differed experiences on the streets. However, runaway and non-runaway girls did not statistically differ in the current study.

Runaway Background and Procedural Justice Views

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 120) = 1.01, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 3) indicated

a non-significant effect [$F(1, 120) = 1.04, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both runaway and non-runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their procedural justice views, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis three.

Procedural justice views are suggested to vary among runaway and non-runaway girls as runaway girls have increased contact with the justice system, their perceptions are more unpleasant, and this differs for non-runaway girls. However, the current study did not see any statistical difference between runaway and non-runaway girls' procedural justice views.

Runaway Background and Certainty of Sanction Perceptions

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 120) = .60, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 3) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 120) = 1.94, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both runaway and non-runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their certainty of sanction perceptions, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis four. As suggested by Loughran et al. (2012), unlike at-risk individuals, those with higher belief in the deterrence effectiveness are more likely to have stronger certainty of sanctions perceptions and this was not found in the current study between runaway and non-runaway girls.

Table 3

Difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions

Measure	Runaway Girls		Non-Runway Girls		F
	M	SD	M	SD	
Future Orientation	2.39	.58	2.36	.53	.04
Exposure to Violence	4.95	3.02	4.09	2.61	2.80
Procedural Justice Views	3.08	.46	2.9	.46	1.04
Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions	5.83	2.99	6.56	2.81	1.94
N	122				

*Note. *p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 assessed if runaway Black girls significantly differed in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than runaway Hispanic girls. Girls with runaway backgrounds were selected for the analysis using the select technique. To answer this question, one-way ANOVA was conducted. The independent variable for this research question was the race/ethnicity of the runaway girls, which was inclusive of Black and Hispanic. The dependent variables were future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. Since a one-way ANOVA is conducted with one independent and dependent variable, four one-way ANOVA tests were conducted for four dependent variables, and the independent variable remained the same for every test conducted.

Racial/Ethnic Background and Future Orientation

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 54) = .26, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 4) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 54) = .11, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their future orientation, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis five.

As mentioned earlier, many existing studies have not considered the race/ethnicity of runaway girls and how that influences their future orientation, although race/ethnicity has been seen in the runaway studies (Mello et al., 2018; Wood, 1997). Although this

study results did not find any significant differences between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their future orientation, it could be due to the small sample size.

Racial/Ethnic Background and Exposure to Violence

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 54) = 4.73, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 4) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 54) = .05, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their exposure to violence, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis six.

As seen in the previous studies, runaway girls have higher exposure to violence particularly those from minority racial backgrounds. As identified by Monahan et al. (2015), Black runaway girls are more likely to be exposed to violence than Hispanic runaway girls which was not identified in the current study.

Racial/Ethnic Background and Procedural Justice Views

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 54) = .53, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 4) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 54) = .70, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their procedural justice views, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis seven.

Since Black girls are observed to have excessive contact with the justice system, they are more likely to be institutionalized than other racial background runaway girls (Brunson & Miller, 2006). Therefore, it was suggested by several researchers such as (Chesney-Lind and MacDonald (2001) and Chesney-Lind and Sheldon (2004), that procedural justice views differ among various racial and ethnic background runaway girls. However, the current study results showed no significant differences between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their procedural justice views.

Racial/Ethnic Background and Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted with an alpha level of .05. The test met the homogeneity of variance assumption with a non-significant value [Levene $F(1, 54) = .16, p > .05$]. Furthermore, results of the one-way ANOVA test (see Table 4) indicated a non-significant effect [$F(1, 54) = 1.24, p > .05$], suggesting the same amount of errors for both Black and Hispanic runaway girls. Since there was no significant difference between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their certainty of sanctions perceptions, the study results failed to reject null hypothesis eight.

Earlier researchers have observed that certainty of sanctions perceptions enhances the effectiveness of deterrence among high-risk individuals from minority racial backgrounds. But very limited studies have emphasized on how Black and Hispanic runaway girls differ in their certainty of sanctions perceptions. Therefore, this study aimed to measure the differences but found no significant difference among Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their certainty of sanctions perceptions.

Table 4

Differences between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions

Measure	Runaway Black Girls		Runaway Hispanic Girls		F
	M	SD	M	SD	
Future Orientation	2.35	.60	2.40	.60	.11
Exposure to Violence	4.90	2.44	5.03	3.50	.05
Procedural Justice Views	3.02	.44	3.12	.47	.70
Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions	6.32	2.80	5.43	3.15	1.24
N	56				

*Note. *p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Research Question 3

Research Question 3 assessed if the interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation influenced runaway girls' offending behavior. Girls with runaway backgrounds were selected for the analysis using the select technique. To answer this question, multiple regression analysis was conducted. The independent variables for this research question were the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation, procedural justice and future orientation, and certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation. The dependent variable was self-reported offending behavior. The test results indicated that the independent variables cumulatively explained 22% of the variance in runaway girls offending behavior, $R^2=.22$, $F(3, 52) = 6.29$, $p < .001$.

Exposure to Violence, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior

The predictor variable (interaction of exposure to violence and future orientation) was a significant positive predictor of runaway girls offending behavior, $\beta=.42$, $t(55) = 3.57$, $p < .001$ (see Table 5). The results from Table 6 indicate that the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation significantly influenced runaway girls offending behavior, which means that the increase in exposure to violence and future orientation led to an increased offending behavior among runaway Black and Hispanic girls. Therefore, the study results rejected null hypothesis nine.

Violence exposure is identified to have a negative impact on future orientation by lowering future orientation leading to offending behavior (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000; Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Jessor et al., 2003; Monahan et al., 2013; Nurmi, 1991; Shetgiri et al., 2016; Stoddard et al., 2011). Limited studies have emphasized on the

interaction of violence exposure and future orientation and therefore, this research aimed to see its impact on runaway girls offending behavior. The study results showed that the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation increased offending behavior.

Procedural Justice, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior

The predictor variable (interaction of procedural justice and future orientation) was a significant negative predictor of runaway girls offending behavior, $\beta = -.30$, $t(55) = -2.26$, $p < .05$ (see Table 5). The results from Table 6 indicate that the interaction between procedural justice and future orientation significantly influenced runaway girls offending behavior, which means that the increase in procedural justice and future orientation led to decreased offending behavior among runaway Black and Hispanic girls. Therefore, the study results rejected the null hypothesis 10.

Studies have stated that contact with the justice system has an impact on one's future orientation as a result of strain (Craig, 2019; DeVlyder et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2020; McFarland et al., 2019; Nurmi, 1991, 2005). The current results showed that positive procedural justice views had a positive influence on future orientation reducing the probability of engaging in offending behavior.

Certainty of Sanctions Perceptions, Future Orientation, and Self-Reported Offending Behavior

The predictor variable (interaction of certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation) was not a significant predictor of runaway girls offending behavior, $\beta = -.08$, $t(55) = -.61$, $p > .05$ (see Table 5). The results from Table 5 indicate that the interaction between certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation did not significantly

influence runaway Black and Hispanic girls offending behavior. Therefore, the study results failed to reject the null hypothesis eleven.

Certainty of sanctions perceptions emphasizes that individuals evaluate the consequences of their actions but as adolescents have underdeveloped emotion regulation, they are less likely to consider the consequences of their actions. Therefore, they are likely to have lower certainty of sanctions perceptions. The study results indicated that although not significant, the interaction effect did reduce offending behavior.

The multiple regression analysis allowed to understanding of the interaction effect between the consequences of runaway on the self-reported offending behavior. The model was created to determine whether the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation, interaction between procedural justice views and future orientation, and interaction between certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation statistically predicted a significant influence on the runaway Black and Hispanic girls self-reported offending behavior.

Table 5 shows that the model fitness analyzed referring to the adjusted r-square value of the regression model. The coefficients of determination or the r-square suggests whether the model was a good fit for the used data. The interpretation of r-square is 1-the ratio of residual variability. An adjusted r-square value close to 1.0 indicates that most of the independent variables' variability contributed to change in the dependent variable in the study model. Therefore, it is ideal to have the highest possible adjusted r-square value. Pursuant to Table 5, the adjusted r-square value was .22, indicating that the 22% change in dependent variable was caused by the study's predictor variables.

To understand each variables' relative importance in multiple regression analysis, the beta coefficients were analyzed. The values of beta coefficient verify the type of relationship among the specific independent and dependent variable. However, in the current study, two out of three independent variables were significant in the model showing that the two significant independent variables had linear relationship with the outcome variable.

Table 5

Interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation influence on runaway girls' offending behavior

Variables	Self-reported offending behavior			
	B	Std. Error	β	t
Exposure to violence* future orientation	.23***	.06	.42	3.57
Procedural justice views* future orientation	-.54*	.24	-.30	-2.26
Certainty of sanctions perceptions* future orientation	-.04	.06	-.08	-.61
Adjusted R ²	.22			
N	56			

*Note. F (3, 52)=6.29, *p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Summary

The purpose of the current study was to examine the group differences between runaway and non-runaway girls, and Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, certainty of sanctions perceptions and self-reported. Finally, the study aimed to measure the interaction effect between exposure to violence, procedural justice views, the certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation impacting runaway girls' self-reported offending behavior.

The data indicated that runaway girls did not significantly differ in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions than non-runaway girls. Regarding the impact of race on runaway girls' consequences, the study results indicated that Black and Hispanic girls did not significantly differ in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. The interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice, the certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation influence on runaway girls' offending behavior results showed that the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation led to runaway girls offending behavior. In contrast, the interaction between procedural justice and future orientation showed that it decreased offending behavior among Black and Hispanic runaway girls. While the certainty of sanctions perceptions and its interaction with future orientation was not statistically significant, it can be seen that the interaction effect between the certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation decreased offending behavior among runaway girls.

Study results contradicted earlier research particularly for research questions one and two. Earlier studies have shown that runaway girls and non-runaway girls differed as well as a difference existed between Black and Hispanic runaway girls. However, there were no significant difference between these groups in this study. One explanation could be the dataset used had participants that were in the facility already and therefore, their exposure to violence, procedural justice views, certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation may not have varied. Studies using non-offender samples might provide better explanation to the research questions.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although identifying the number of children running away from home is complicated due to contradictory definitions and challenges in sampling, Sedlak and Bruce (2019) suggested that pursuant to the NISMART-3 (National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children), 5.3 per 1000 children were estimated to have runaway. Previous studies indicate that among these runaway cases, girls hold higher representation, and it has been a serious concern (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 2013; Stinton, 2007). Due to this concern, several studies have been conducted to understand girl's runaway phenomenon.

Youth runaway studies can be categorized into two general categories, such as causes of runaways and consequences of runaways. Causes of runaway studies have primarily focused on providing insights into possible explanations of why adolescents runaway from home (Foster, 1962; Hildebrand, 1968; Justice & Duncan, 1976; Kidd & Taub, 2004; Libertoff, 1980; Orten & Soli, 1980; Ostensen, 1981; Stierlin, 1973; Stinton, 2007;). Studies focusing on the consequences of runaways explain that the conditions that runaways experience may increase their risk of further offending.

In the context of runaway consequences, studies have extensively examined the relationship between youth runaway and various offense categories (Chesney-Lind, 2006; Kim et al., 2009; Stinton, 2007; Yoder et al., 2003) such as deviant acts, drug dealing, theft, and prostitution (Beniot-Bryan, 2011; Jeanis et al., 2019; Whitbeck et al., 2001).

Also, studies regarding the relationship between runaway and offending behavior identified mediating variables as youth's survival strategies (Tyler et al., 2004),

delinquent peer association (Yoder et al., 2003), substance use (Windle, 1989), exposure to violence (Jennings et al., 2010), contact with the justice system (Maxfield & Widom, 1999), procedural justice views (Walters, 2017), the certainty of sanctions perceptions (Schulz, 2014), long-term homelessness (Hagan & McCarthy, 1994), and lack of social service support (Smart & Adlaf, 1991).

It can be noted that most runaway studies have emphasized the offending behavior as the most likely and primary consequence of runaway behavior. Not considering these mediating factors as consequences may not thoroughly explain runaway behavior. Also, many studies that did measure these mediating factors did not consider the impact running away had on these mediating factors and the impact these mediating factors could have on the offending behavior of runaway girls.

Therefore, this study contributes to the literature by exploring the understudied areas of runaway girls and their consequences. One of the main reasons for this study was to understand the relationship between runaway girls and different types of consequences such as future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions and how these consequences may vary among runaway and non-runaway girls, the varied impact of these consequences on Black and Hispanic runaway girls, and finally when these consequences interact with future orientation, its influence on runaway girls self-reported offending behavior.

This last chapter summarizes the study findings and draws conclusions derived from the study findings, as well as its contribution to the existing literature about runaways, consequences of running away, Black and Hispanic girls, and delinquency. Finally, this chapter concludes with study limitations and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Study Results

Previous studies indicate that running away has seen higher female rates than other status offenses (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020; Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2021; Jensen & Rojeck, 1998). Therefore, this study's first objective was to examine the differences between runaway and non-runaway girls in their consequences, such as future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. The second objective of this study was to examine the differences between Black and Hispanic runaway girls in their consequences, such as future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions. The third objective of this study was to examine the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation, the interaction between procedural justice and future orientation, and the interaction between the certainty of sanctions and future orientation influence on runaway girls offending behavior.

Research Question 1

Research question one aimed to understand if runaway and non-runaway girls significantly differed in their future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice, and certainty of sanctions perceptions. The statistical technique used to address this question was one-way ANOVA. The runaway variable was dichotomous with a yes or no response, and the dependent variables were quantitative. The one-way ANOVA results indicated that runaway girls did not significantly differ in their future orientation from non-runaway girls. Similarly, runaway and non-runaway girls had no significant difference in their exposure to violence. Runaway and non-runaway girls did not show

any significant difference in their procedural justice views and certainty of sanctions perceptions in the study, as shown in Table 3.

Earlier studies indicated that there was a significant relationship between future orientation and offending behavior (Alm & Laftman, 2016; Anderson et al., 2020; Borowsky et al., 2009; Brezina et al., 2009; Jaynes et al., 2021; Piquero, 2014).-It has been noted that individuals with higher future orientation are more concerned about their future goals and, therefore, may avoid delinquent adaptations, increasing their likelihood of achieving their goals (Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Johnson et al., 2013; Robbins & Bryan, 2004; Stoddard et al., 2011; Wigfeild & Eccles, 2000). In contrast, studies on the impact of contextual factors such as runaway behavior on future orientation are less studied. Hence, the assumption was made that runaway girls are at high risk than non-runaway girls. Therefore, it was hypothesized that there might be a significant difference in runaway and non-runaway girls' future orientation. However, this study's results showed that runaway and non-runaway girls did not significantly differ in their future orientation.

Exposure to violence has been observed to have a higher impact on adolescents (Becker & Kerig, 2011; Copeland et al., 2007) and, more specifically, among runaways and girls. As noted by Cohen and Felson (1979), Kim et al. (2009), and Peterson et al. (2004), runaway behavior is identified as a risky lifestyle heightening the runaways' probability of exposure to violence. One of the explanations for this is the unavailability of legitimate resources for these runaways to survive outside of the home. Furthermore, research suggest they are more likely to be exploited by adults to engage in illegitimate activities, increasing their vulnerability (Hagan et al., 1997; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993).

Specifically, for girls, the latter is true as they are more prone to be victims of violence due to their gender and are more likely to have a greater propensity to experience or witness violence than non-runaway girls. With this emphasis seen in the earlier literature, the variable exposure to violence was added to the research question one to see whether runaway girls differed in their exposure to violence from non-runaway girls. However, unlike earlier findings, this study did not find any significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls' exposure to violence, which contradicts previous studies.

The third hypotheses in research question one was runaway and non-runaway's procedural justice views. Procedural Justice Theory propositions suggest that due to the fairness in the justice system and its decision-makers, adolescents avoid delinquent behavior (Birckhead, 2009). As Hough et al. (2013) suggested, the fundamental approach to establishing positive citizen perceptions towards the justice system is by being fair and respectful in the justice system process and treatment rather than emphasizing the outcomes of the encounters, such as arrest and conviction. As shown in earlier studies, running away is identified as an at-risk behavior, and it increases their contact with the justice system, which runaway girls consider unfair. Such experiences differ for non-runaway girls. However, the current study showed no significant difference between runaway and non-runaway girls in their procedural justice views.

Deterrence Theory says that offenders evaluate the costs and benefits of the crime involvement (Nagin, 2013) which functions as a crime prevention mechanism (Beccaria, 1986). The certainty of sanctions perception, which is highly studied, has a higher impact on deterring individuals from engaging in criminal behavior. It was suggested by

Loughran et al. (2012) that the stronger the certainty of sanctions perceptions, the higher the individual believed in the effectiveness of deterrence, and this was true for at-risk individuals like runaways. The same was not seen in the current study irrespective of the girls' runaway and non-runaway background. Therefore, the certainty of sanctions perceptions was not statistically significant.

Research Question 2

Wulczyn's (2020) study compared race and runaway rates and found that Black (11.5%) and Hispanics (13.8%) more than Whites (7.8%) had higher runaway rates, suggesting that Black and Hispanic youth are more likely to runaway than White youth. As rightly said by Wulczyn (2020), there is limited attention given to understanding Black and Hispanic runaways' consequences such as their risk of victimization, including trafficking, lack of food, and substance abuse (Morewitz, 2016), increasing their probability of engaging in delinquent behavior. Although there are several consequences for runaway girls, as discussed earlier, these consequences may vary for Black and Hispanic runaway girls, which is narrowly studied, especially from the future orientation perspective. Therefore, this study used Black and Hispanic runaway girls' sample to analyze whether they differed in their runaway consequences, such as future orientation, violence exposure, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions in the research question two.

Runaways and future orientation have received limited attention (Mello et al., 2018). This study results were statistically not significant in explaining the racial and ethnic background impact of runaway girls on their future orientation, which is a similar phenomenon observed in the previous studies. For example, Wood's (1997) study

compared the differences between runaways and non-runaways, where runaways had lower future orientation than non-runaways. At the same time, race and ethnicity were not observed as influential factors on youth future orientation in the study conducted by Wood (1997). Also, Mello et al.'s (2018) study results showed that runaways had negative attitudes toward their future orientation. Although Mello et al. used runaways and their future orientation along with race and ethnicity, this study's results did not explain how future orientation differed for African American and Hispanic runaway girls.

As discussed earlier, exposure to violence has a higher negative impact on runaway girls, and it can also intensify the effect based on the race and ethnicity of these girls, particularly for those with minority racial and ethnic backgrounds. For instance, Monahan et al. (2015) noted that Black runaway girls had exposure to violence. However, this study's results indicated that exposure to violence was insignificant for both Black and Hispanic runaway girls. One possible explanation for this could be that, irrespective of race and ethnic background, the association of these runaway girls with other delinquent peers or gangs that might protect them from violence exposure, for which girls might not believe that they are exposed to violence (Voisin et al., 2011).

Although limited studies have extensively examined the relationship between race and runaway behavior, Brunson and Miller (2006) suggested that Black girls were observed to have more contact with the justice system and were more likely to experience formal processing in the justice system and also to be excessively institutionalized than other racial and ethnic groups. Therefore, race and ethnicity may contribute to the differential experiences among girls (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004). It can also be noted from Nanda's (2012) study that the justice system

personnel, including police and courts, were more likely to consider the stereotypes towards African Americans and Latinas that might influence their interaction with these young runaway girls. For example, the common stereotype for Blacks is that they are independent, aggressive, loud, and crime-prone. In comparison, the stereotypes for Latinas are family-oriented, dependent, domestic, and submissive (Nanda, 2012). With such stereotypes, the interaction these young girls had can be interpreted as different from one another.

Such differences observed specifically among minority girls show they are more likely to have negative experiences with the justice system that yields negative perceptions, especially for African American and Hispanic girls (Augustyn, 2013; Weitzer & Tuch, 2004). Also, looking at the adjudication rates in courts, Black and Hispanic girls have higher representation than other racial and ethnic backgrounds girls (Freiburger & Burke, 2011; Moore & Padavic, 2010). Therefore, whether runaway Black and Hispanic girls differ in procedural justice views was hypothesized in this study. The study results indicated that, although Black and Hispanic girls had runaway backgrounds and contact with the justice system, they did not differ significantly in their procedural justice views. As Tyler and Huo (2002) suggested, the Procedural Justice Theory is generalizable and operates similarly across race and gender and is consistent in the current study results that Black and Hispanic girls do not significantly differ in their procedural justice views.

Loughran et al.'s (2012) study results stated that as the certainty of sanctions perception increases, the offending behavior reduces among adolescents. Previous studies have also shown that certainty of sanctions perceptions increases deterrence effectiveness

among high-risk individuals, particularly runaway girls of color (Schulz, 2014; Loughran et al., 2012; Lochner, 2007; Matsueda et al., 2006). Since there is a gap in the runaway literature about Black and Hispanic girls' certainty of sanctions perceptions, it is essential to see the differences between these two race and ethnicity. The current investigation results indicated that certainty of sanctions perceptions was not statistically different for runaway Black and Hispanic girls.

Research Question 3

Studies rarely examined how the relationship between interaction of runaway girls' future orientation with exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions affected their self-reported offending behavior. Therefore, this study's third research question aimed to answer "Does the interaction between exposure to violence, procedural justice views, the certainty of sanctions perceptions, and future orientation influence runaway girls' offending behavior?" Three interaction effects were created between exposure to violence and future orientation, procedural justice views and future orientation, and certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation.

Previous research regarding future orientation shows that when it interacts with violence, it has a negative impact, which means that adolescents exposed to violence or in violent surroundings have a weaker or low future orientation which leads to engaging in offending behavior (Caffman & Steinberg, 2000; Jackman & MacPhee, 2017; Jessor et al., 2003; Monahan et al., 2013; Nurmi, 1991; Shetgiri et al., 2016; Stoddard et al., 2011). Therefore, it would be right to identify that studies have observed a consistent association between runaway youth future orientation, exposure to violence and offending behavior.

General Strain Theory proposes that there is a relationship between exposure to violence, individual orientation, and offending behavior. Agnew (1992) in his theory, explained that strain as a result of exposure to violence increased offending behavior due to negative orientation. Most studies have explained the relationship between exposure to violence and offending behavior. Only a few studies have analyzed that exposure to violence lowers adolescents' future orientation and results in offending behavior (Abramson et al., 1989; Borowsky et al., 2009; Rose & Abramson, 1992; So et al., 2018; Stoddard et al., 2011). However, limited emphasis is given to the impact of exposure to violence and its interaction with future orientation leading to offending behavior.

Therefore, this study aimed to examine the interaction effect between exposure to violence and future orientation in predicting offending behavior. However, the study results indicated that the interaction between exposure to violence and future orientation increased offending behavior. As the interaction effect between these variables has not been conducted in the previous studies, it could be assumed that due to the low sample size and these girls already being in the facility for delinquent behavior, it might have had an impact on the study results.

This study results for procedural justice views interaction with future orientation indicated that there was a significant negative influence on runaway girls offending behavior. Therefore, the interaction effect between procedural justice views and future orientation inversely influenced runaway Black and Hispanic girls offending behavior. As procedural justice views increase and future orientation also increases, there is a decline in offending behavior. It is seen in previous studies that unfair contact with the justice system results in stress and leads to weaker future orientation (Craig, 2019;

DeVylder et al., 2020; Jackson et al., 2020; McFarland et al., 2019; Nurmi, 1991, 2005). Regarding the interaction effect, it can be understood that, as proposed by the Procedural Justice Theory, positive experiences with the justice system strengthen future orientation and decrease the probability of engaging in delinquent behavior, as seen in the current study results.

Deterrence Theory's three main propositions are swiftness, severity, and certainty of sanctions perceptions, and among these three propositions, the certainty of sanctions perceptions is suggested to create more deterrence effect (Loughran et al., 2015; Nagin, 2013; Wright, 2010). The reason for the certainty of sanctions perceptions to have received more attention from criminological researchers is due to its reliable effect as well as its ability to create a deterrence effect on at-risk individuals (Fader, 2016; Freiburger et al., 2017; Kuin et al., 2015; Nagin, 2013; Schulz, 2014).

Certainty of sanctions perceptions refers to an individual's assessment of the likelihood of being caught and punished for engaging in a constrained act. However, adolescents are known to have issues related to emotion regulation and seek immediate gratification. As a result, considering criminal opportunities available by disregarding the consequences of these acts on their future indicates that adolescents are less likely to have certainty of sanctions perceptions (Lee et al., 2018; Watkins et al., 2008; Woolard et al., 2001).

Therefore, the current study aimed to understand, as suggested by Pratt et al. (2006), the factors and circumstances that influence the certainty of sanctions perceptions in deterring an individual's offending behavior. Hence, this study used certainty of sanctions perceptions and created an interaction with future orientation to see its

deterrence effect on runaway girls offending behavior. The study results indicated that the interaction effect of certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation did not significantly influence runaway girls offending behavior. However, although not statistically significant, Table 5 showed that certainty of sanctions perceptions and future orientation did reduce offending behavior among runaway girls, suggesting that using a larger sample might provide statistically significant results with better explanatory results for this third research question.

Limitations

This study's results should be carefully interpreted, and generalization of these results may not be appropriate due to the study's small sample size and cross-sectional nature of the data. Therefore, this study can be observed as a preliminary examination of the previously mentioned relationships. Future researchers may apply this research framework to a larger female runaway sample to see if it yields different results than the current study. Future studies are also suggested to conduct a longitudinal study to see how these variables influence runaway girls offending behavior. Besides, these limitations, this study results are undoubtedly a contribution to the runaway girls consequence literature in understanding the phenomena among the variables, since there are very few previous studies that combined future orientation, exposure to violence, procedural justice views, and certainty of sanctions perceptions in a single study and examined its relationship with runaway and non-runaway girls, as well as the differential relationship with Black and Hispanic girls..

Conclusion and Policy Implications

Although tracking the runaway girls is challenging, identifying these runaways and providing them with access to legitimate resources is important. One of the main reasons mentioned by several previous studies is the inability to access legitimate resources. Hence, these runaway girls engage in offending behavior. Identifying these runaway girls and providing them access to legitimate resources such as food, shelter, and legal employment reduces their further risk of engaging in survival strategies such as association with delinquent peers (Simons & Whitbeck, 1991; Whitbeck & Simons, 1993; Yoder et al., 2003), substance use (Windle, 1989), exposure to violence (Agnew 2002; Herrera & McCloskey, 2001; Jennings et al. 2010; Martin et al., 1995; Maxfield & Widom, 1999; McCormack et al., 1986; Siegel & Williams, 2003; Smith & Thornberry, 1995; The National Child Traumatic Stress Network 2016; Whitbeck et al., 1997; Widom, 1989), increases their contact with the justice system (Ayres, 1988; Flowers, 1995; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997; Herman, 1988; Hoyt et al., 1999; Jones, 1988; Kipke et al., 1997; Maxfield & Widom, 1999; Rotherham-Borus et al., 1991; Smart & Adlaf, 1991; Windle, 1989), leading to negative/altered procedural justice views (Fagan & Piquero, 2007; Levi et al., 2009; Penner et al., 2014; Tyler, 2006b; Walters, 2017) and certainty of sanctions perceptions (Lochner, 2007; Loughran et al., 2012; Matsueda et al., 2006; Schulz 2014). Therefore, identifying girls at risk of running away assists in creating prevention programs that would reduce their probability of engaging in delinquency and eventually leading them to adult criminality.

Also, the response provided by the juvenile justice system including police and courts, similar to the application of male-centric criminological theories to explain female

delinquency, must be altered to address the female-specific problems and concerns that need a different and gender-specific approach. Although the causes of running away might be similar for boys and girls (DeCoster, 2003; Stinton, 2007), they significantly differ in their consequences due to the gender roles in the society (Stinton, 2007). Also, since the police and courts responses towards these runaway girls are harsh and less lenient, owing to paternalistic ideology, and particularly for girls of color (Chesney-Lind & MacDonald, 2001; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998) such contact with the justice system both formal and informal have an increased negative effect on girls (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 2004) particularly after running away more than non-runaway girls.

Even though runaway behavior is commonly identified among all race and ethnicity girls, it is still high among Black and Hispanic girls. Therefore, policies created to address runaway behavior must be tailored to meet gender-specific consequences. Also, regarding race/ethnicity, it is essential to cater to the needs of minority racial and ethnic girls by accommodating their needs in the prevention and correctional programs. Although the current study results did not find any difference between runaway Black and Hispanic girls in the runaway consequences, previous studies have noted that differences do exist between Black and Hispanic runaway girls.

Understanding the consequences of running away is essential because it identifies other female status offenses and mechanisms to prevent future female offending behavior. As discussed earlier, future orientation is a key component in adolescents' offending behavior yet has received limited attention. It is known that higher future orientation functions as a protective factor for adolescents from offending behavior. Providing education to at-risk girls about the consequences of one's immediate

gratification on one's future orientation could prevent their delinquent behavior.

Similarly, having higher future orientation also increases certainty of sanctions perceptions and may minimize their offending behavior.

Emphasizing one of the crucial and constant perspectives regarding girls and their offending is that their route to offending is unique, and the pathway is inclusive of victimization (Acoca, 1998; Belknap & Holsinger, 1998; Belknap & Holsinger, 2006; Gaarder & Belknap, 2002). Such victimization can be seen as both cause and outcome of running away. In addition, unlike causes, a common set of factors cannot explain the consequences of running away (Stinton, 2007). For example, studies attempting to understand runaway girls' future orientation impacts their offending behavior without identifying that future orientation can be influenced by runaway behavior fails to explain the consequences of runaway behavior thoroughly.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, L., & Rahim, A. F. (2016). A step-wise multiple linear regression analysis for identifying predictors of employees' intention to undertake further study. *Journal of Current Research in Science*, 4(2), 21-26.
- Able-Peterson, T. (1989). Excerpts from address. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 10(3S), 8-9.
- Abramson, L. Y., Metalsky, G. I., & Alloy, L. B. (1989). Hopelessness depression: A theory-based subtype of depression. *Psychological Review*, 96, 358-372.
- Acoca, L. (1998). Outside/inside: The violation of American females at home, on the streets, and in the juvenile justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44, 561-589.
- Acoca, L., & Dedel, K. (1998). *No place to hide: Understanding and meeting the needs of girls in the juvenile justice system*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Agnew, R. (1984). Goal achievement and delinquency. *Sociology and Social Research*, 68, 435-451.
- Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, 64, 151-167.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology*, 30, 47-88.
- Agnew, R. (2001). Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, 38(4), 319-361.

- Agnew, R. (2002). Experienced, vicarious, and anticipated strain: An exploratory study on physical victimization and delinquency. *Justice Quarterly, 19*, 603–32.
- Agnew, R., Brezina, T., Wright, J. P., & Cullen, F. T. (2002). Strain, personality traits, and delinquency: Extending general strain theory. *Criminology, 40*, 43–72.
- Agnew, R., & White, H. R. (1992). An empirical test of general strain theory. *Criminology, 30*, 475–500.
- Albert, D., Chein, J., & Steinberg, L. (2013). The teenage brain: Peer influences on adolescent decision making. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*, 114–120.
- Allwood, M. A., Baetz, C., DeMarco, S., & Bell, D. J. (2012). Depressive symptoms, including lack of future orientation, as mediators in the relationship between adverse life events and delinquent behaviors. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma, 5*, 114–128.
- Alm, S., & Låftman, S. B. (2016). Future orientation climate in the school class: Relations to adolescent delinquency, heavy alcohol use, and internalizing problems. *Children and Youth Services Review, 70*, 324–331.
- American Medical Association. (1993). Adolescents as victims of family violence: Council on scientific affairs, American Medical Association. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 270*(15), 1850-1856.
- American Medical Association. (1989). Health care needs of homeless and runaway youths: Council on scientific affairs, American medical association. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 262*(10), 1358-1361.

- Andenaes, J. (1974). *Punishment and deterrence*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Anderson, A. Y., Weiss, D. B., & Oselin, S. S. (2020). When I grow up: Exploring the link between future expectations and criminal trajectories. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 6, 43–66.
- Augustyn, M. B. (2013). *Examining the meaning of procedural justice among serious adolescent offenders* [doctoral Thesis, University of Maryland].
- Augustyn, M. B., & Ray, J. V. (2016). Psychopathy and perceptions of procedural justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 46, 170-183.
- Aratani, Y., & Cooper, J. (2015). The effects of runaway-homeless episodes on high school dropout. *Youth & Society*, 47(2), 173–198.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American psychologist*, 55(5), 469.
- Ayres, M. (1988). AIDS and juveniles: Policy issues and problems. *National Sheriff*, 40(4), 53-54.
- Bailey, S., Camlin, C., & Ennett, S. (1998). Substance use and risky sexual behavior among homeless and runaway youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 23(6), 378-388.
- Baker, A. J., McKay, M. M., Lynn, C. J., Schlange, H., & Auville, A. (2003). Recidivism at a shelter for adolescents: First-time versus repeat runaways. *Social Work Research*, 27(2), 84–93.
- Baker, T., Pelfrey Jr, W. V., Bedard, L. E., Dhungana, K., Gertz, M., & Golden, K. (2014). Female inmates' procedural justice perceptions of the police and courts: Is

there a spill-over of police effects? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(2), 144-162.

Baker, T., Pickett, J. T., Amin, D. M., Golden, K., Dhungana, K., Gertz, M., & Bedard, L. (2015). Shared race/ethnicity, court procedural justice, and self-regulating beliefs: A study of female offenders. *Law & Society Review*, 49, 433-466.

Baker, T., Pelfrey Jr, W. V., Bedard, L. E., Dhungana, K., Gertz, M., & Golden, K. (2014). Female inmates' procedural justice perceptions of the police and courts: Is there a spill-over of police effects? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(2), 144-162.

Baron, S.W., & Hartnagel, F. (1998). Street youth and criminal violence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 35, 166-192.

Baron, S. W. (2009a). Differential coercion, street youth, and violent crime. *Criminology*, 47, 239-268.

Baron, S. W. (2009b). Street youths' violent responses to violent personal, vicarious, and anticipated strain. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 119-136.

Beccaria, C. (1986). *On crimes and punishments*. Translated by Henry Paolucci. New York: Macmillan.

Becker, S. P., & Kerig, P. K. (2011). Posttraumatic stress symptoms are associated with the frequency and severity of delinquency among detained boys. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 40(5), 765-771.

Belknap, J. & Holsinger, K. (1998). An overview of delinquent girls: How theory and practice failed and the need for innovative changes. In R.T. Zaplin (Ed.), *Female*

offenders: Critical perspectives and effective interventions (pp. 37-69).

Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers.

Belknap, J., & Holsinger, K. (2006). The gendered nature of risk factors for delinquency.

Feminist Criminology, 1(1), 48-71.

Bell, C. C., & Jenkins, E. J. (1993). Community violence and children on Chicago's

southside. *Psychiatry*, 56, 46-54.

Benoit-Bryan, J. (2011). *The runaway youth longitudinal study*. Chicago: National

Runaway Switchboard.

Bentham, J. (1970). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. London,

England: Athlone Press.

Birckhead, T. R. (2009). Toward a theory of procedural justice for juveniles. *Buff. L.*

Rev., 57, 1447.

Bolland, J. M., McCallum, D. M., Lian, B., Bailey, C. J. & Rowan, P. (2001).

Hopelessness and violence among inner-city youths. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 5(4), 237-244.

Borowsky, I.W., Ireland, M., & Resnick, M. D. (2009). Health status and behavioral

outcomes for youth who anticipate a high likelihood of early death. *Pediatrics*, 124(1), 81-88.

Brandl, S. G., Frank, J., Worden, R. E., & Bynum, T. S. (1994). Global and specific

attitudes toward the police: Disentangling the relationship. *Justice quarterly*, 11(1), 119-134.

Brockington, C. F. (1946). Homelessness in children: Causes and prevention. *Lancet*,

250, 933-936.

- Brooks, M. J., Abebe, K., Miller, E., Mulvey, E. P. (2018). The observed longitudinal relationship between future orientation and substance use among a cohort of youth with serious criminal offenses. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 53(12), 1925-1936.
- Brunson, R. K., & Miller, J. (2006). Gender, race and urban policing: The experience of African American youths. *Gender & Society*, 20(4), 531-552.
- Brunson, R. K., & Weitzer, R. (2009). Police relations with Black and White youths in different urban neighborhoods. *Urban Affairs Review*, 44(6), 858–885.
- Burgess-Proctor, A. (2006). Intersections of race, class, gender and crime: Future directions in feminist criminology. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 27-41.
- Burke, W. H. & Burkhead, E. J. (1989). Runaway children in America: A review of the literature. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 12(1), 73-81.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2001). Optimism, pessimism, and self regulation. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism & pessimism: Implications for theory, research and practice* (pp. 31–51). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Casper, J. D., Tyler, T., & Fisher, B. (1988). Procedural justice in felony cases. *Law & Society Rev*, 22, 483-508.
- Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)maturity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 18, 741-760.
- Cedeno, L. A., Elias, M. J., Kelly, S., & Chu, B. C. (2010). School violence, adjustment, and the influence of hope on low-income, African American youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80, 213-226.

- Chalfin, A., & McCrary, J. (2017). Criminal deterrence: A review of the literature. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 55(1), 5-48.
- Chen, X., Thrane, L., & Adams, M. (2012). Precursors of running away during adolescence: Do peers matter? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22, 487–497.
- Chen, X., Thrane, L., Whitbeck, L. B., Johnson, K. D., & Hoyt, D. R. (2007). Onset of conduct disorder, use of delinquent subsistence strategies, and street victimization among homeless and runaway adolescents in the Midwest. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(9), 1156–1183.
- Chen, X., Tyler, K.A., Whitbeck, L.B., & Hoyt, D.R. (2004). Early sex abuse, street adversity, and drug use among female homeless and runaway adolescents in the Midwest. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 34, 1–21.
- Chen, P., & Vazsonyi, A., (2011). Future orientation, impulsivity, and problem behaviors: A longitudinal moderation model. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(6) 1633-1644.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1973). Judicial enforcement of female sex role. *Issues in Criminology*, 8, 51-70.
- Chesney-Lind, M (2001). Out of sight, out of mind: Girls in the justice system. In C.M. Renzetti & L. Goodstein, (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: Contemporary perspectives*. (pp. 27-43). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 6-26.

- Chesney-Lind, M., & MacDonald, J.M. (2001). Gender bias and juvenile justice revisited: A multiyear analysis. *Criminology*, 47(2), 173-195.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Okamoto, S. K. (2001). Gender matters: Patterns in girls' delinquency and gender responsive programming. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 1(3), 241-266.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Rodriguez, N. (1983). Women under lock and key: A view from the inside. *The Prison Journal*, 63, 47-65.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. G. (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: West/Wadsworth.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (2004). *Girls, delinquency and juvenile justice*, (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. (2014). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Clatts, M. C., Goldsamt, L., Yi, H., & Gwadz, M. V. (2005). Homelessness and drug abuse among young men who have sex with men in New York City: A preliminary epidemiological trajectory. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28, 201-214.
- Clinkinbeard, S. S. (2014). What lies ahead: An exploration of future orientation, self-control, and delinquency. *Criminal Justice Review*, 39, 19-36.
- Coalition for Juvenile Justice. (2013). *Girls, status offenses and the need for a less punitive and more empowering approach*. Emerging Issues Policy Series. SOS Project - Girls, Status Offenses and the Need for a Less Punitive and More Empowering Approach.pdf (juvjustice.org)

- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, *44*, 588–608.
- Copeland, W. E., Keeler, G., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2007). Traumatic events and posttraumatic stress in childhood. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *64*(5), 577–584.
- Corrigan, P. W., Larson, J. E., & Ruesch, N. (2009). Self-stigma and the “why try” effect: Impact on life goals and evidence-based practices. *World psychiatry*, *8*(2), 75.
- Courtney, M. E., & Zinn, A. (2009). Predictors of running away from out-of-home care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *31*(12), 1298–1306.
- Craig, J. (2019). The potential mediating impact of future orientation on the ACE-Crime relationship. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *17*(2), 111-128.
- Datesman, S., & Aickin, M. (1984). Offense specialization and escalation among status offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *75*, 1246-1275.
- Davis, M. J., & Niebes-Davis, A. J. (2010). Ethnic differences and influence of perceived future certainty on adolescent and young adult sexual knowledge and attitudes. *Health, Risk & Society*, *12*(2), 149–167.
- De Coster, S. (2003). A gendered role-taking and social learning perspective on delinquency and depression. *Social learning theory and the explanation of crime: A guide for the new century*, *11*, 129-51.
- Destin, M., & Oyserman, D. (2009). From assets to school outcomes: How finances shape children’s perceived possibilities and intentions. *Psychological Science*, *20*:414–18.

- DeVylder, J., Fedina, L., & Link, B. (2020). Impact of police violence on mental health: A theoretical framework. *American Journal of Public Health, 110*(11), 1704–1710.
- Donovan, K. M. (2022). *The role of violence exposure, future orientation and perceptions of procedural justice in predicting gun carrying and violence in Black male juvenile offenders* [Masters Thesis, College of Bowling Green, State University].
- Donovan, J. E., & Jessor, R. (1985). Structure of problem behavior in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 890–904.
- Donovan, J. E., Jessor, R., & Costa, F. M. (1988). Syndrome of problem behavior in adolescence: A replication. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*(5), 762-765.
- Dumain, K. (2010). *Optimism, hope, problem solving, and runaway behavior in adolescents in the dependency system* (Order No. 3412439). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (734722401).
<https://login.pvamu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/optimism-hope-problem-solving-runaway-behavior/docview/734722401/se-2>
- DuRant, R. H., Cadenhead, C., Pendergrast, R. A., Slavens G., Linder, C. W. (1994). Factors associated with the use of violence among urban Black adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health, 84*(4), 612-617.
- Dworsky, A., Wulczyn, F., & Huang, L. (2018). Predictors of running away from out-of-home care: Does county context matter? *Cityscape, 20*(3), 101–116.

- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 215–225.
- Edinburgh, L. D., Harpin, S. B., Garcia, C. M., & Saewyc, E. M. (2013). Differences in abuse and related risk and protective factors by runaway status for adolescents seen at a US child advocacy center. *International Journal of Child and Adolescent Resilience, 1*(1), 4–16.
- Ekins, E. (2016). *Policing in America: Understanding public attitudes toward the police*. Results from a national survey. Retrieved from <https://www.cato.org/survey-reports/policing-america>.
- Elliott, D., & Voss, H. (1974). *Delinquency and dropout*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Elliott, D., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Empey, L. (1982). *American delinquency: Its meaning and construction*. Homewood, 111.: Dorsey.
- Engel, R. S. (2005). Citizens' perceptions of distributive and procedural injustice during traffic stops with police. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 42*, 445-481.
- Fader, J. L. (2016). Selling smarter, not harder: Life course effects on drug sellers' risk perceptions and management. *International Journal of Drug Policy, 36*, 120-129.

- Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. (2007). Rational choice and developmental influences on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 4(4), 715-748.
- Farrington, D., Snyder, H., & Finnegan, T., (1988). Specialization in juvenile court careers. *Criminology*, 26(3), 461-487.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2019). *Crime in the United States, 2019*. FBI — Crime in the U.S. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2015). *Crime in the United States, 2014*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Feitel, B., Margetson, N., Chamas, J., & Lipman, C. (1992). Psychosocial background and behavioral and emotional disorders of homeless and runaway youth. *Psychiatric Services*, 43(2), 155-159.
- Feld, B. C. (2009). "Girls in the juvenile justice system." In M. A. Zahn (Ed.). *The delinquent girl*, (pp. 225-64). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferdinand, T. N. (1991). History overtakes the juvenile justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 37(2), 204–224.
- Fernandes-Alcantara, A. L. (2013). *Runaway and homeless youth: Demographics and programs* (Congressional Research Service RL33785).
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. sage.
- Fingerhut, H. (2017). *Deep racial, partisan divisions in Americans' views of police officers*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/15/deeracial-partisan-divisions-in-americans-views-of-police-officers/>.

- Fischhoff, B., P. Slovic, S. Lichtenstein, S. Read, and B. Combs. (1978). How safe is safe enough? A psychometric study of attitudes towards technological risks and benefits. *Policy Sciences*, 9, 127–52.
- Fossati, T. E., & Meeker, J. W. (1997). Evaluations of institutional legitimacy and court system fairness: A study of gender differences. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 141-154.
- Foster, R. (1962). Intrapsychic and environmental factors in running away from home. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 32, 486-491.
- Freiburger, T. L., & Burke, A. S. (2011). Status offenders in the juvenile court: The effects of gender, race, and ethnicity on the adjudication decision. *Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice*, 9(4), 352-365.
- Freiburger, T. L., Romain, D. M., Randol, B. M., & Marcum, C. D. (2017). Cheating behaviors among undergraduate college students: Results from a factorial survey. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 28, 222-247.
- Furby, L, Beyth-Marom, R. (1992). Risk-taking in adolescence: A decision-making perspective. *Developmental Review*, 12, 1-44.
- Gaarder, E., & Belknap, J. (2002). Tenuous borders: Girls transferred to adult court. *Criminology*, 40(3), 481-492.
- Gallupe, O., & Baron, S. W. (2010). *Morality, self-control, deterrence, and drug use: Street youths and Situational Action Theory*. Crime & Delinquency. Advance online publication.

- Gallupe, O., McLevey, J., & Brown, S. (2019). Selection and influence: A meta-analysis of the association between peer and personal offending. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 35*, 313–335.
- Gardner, M., & Steinberg, L. (2005). Peer influence on risk taking, risk preference, and risky decision making in adolescence and adulthood: An experimental study. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 625–635.
- Gardner, W. (1993). A life-span rational-choice theory of risk taking. In N. J. Bell (Ed.), *Adolescent risk taking* (pp. 66e83). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Geller, A. (2018). Policing America's children: Police contact and consequences among teens in fragile families. *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*, 1–46.
- Gibbs, J. P. (1975). *Crime, punishment, and deterrence*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Gibbs, J. P. (1986). Punishment and deterrence: Theory, research, and penal policy. *Law and the Social Sciences, 319-368*.
- Godsoe, C. (2014). Contempt, status, and the criminalization of non-conforming girls. *Cardozo Law Review, 35(3)*, 1091-1116.
- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences* (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Greenberg, D. F. (1977). Delinquency and the age structure of society. *Contemporary Crises, 1*, 189-223.

- Greenblatt, M., & Robertson, M. J. (1993). Life-styles, adaptive strategies, and sexual behaviors of homeless adolescents. *Psychiatric Services, 44*(12), 1177-1180.
- Greene, J. M., Ennett, S. T., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1997). Substance use among runaway and homeless youth in three national samples. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*(2), 229–235.
- Guevara, L., Herz, D., & Spohn, C. (2006). Gender and juvenile justice decision making: What role does race play? *Feminist Criminology, 1*(4), 258–282.
- Hagan, J., & McCarthy, B. (1994). Double jeopardy: The abuse and punishment of homeless youth. In G.S. Bridges & M. A. Myers (Eds.). *Inequality, crime and social control*. (pp. 195-211). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hagan, J., & McCarthy, B. (1997). *Mean streets: Youth crime and homelessness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hagan, J., McCarthy, B., Parker, P., & Climenhage, J. (1997). *Mean streets: Youth crime and homelessness* [Cambridge criminology' series]. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Haley, N., Roy, E., Leclerc, P., Boudreau, J. F., & Boivin, J. F. (2004). HIV risk profile of male street youth involved in survival sex. *Sexually Transmitted Infections, 80*, 526–530.
- Hammar, H., Finkelhor, D., & Sedlak, A. J. (2002). *Runaway/ throwaway children: National estimates and characteristics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Haynie, D. L., Petts, R. J., Maimon, D., & Piquero, A. R. (2009). Exposure to violence in adolescence and precocious role exits. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 38*, 269-286.
- Hegtvædt, K. A. (2006). Justice frameworks. In P. J. Burke (Ed.). *Contemporary social psychological theories*. (pp. 46–69) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Herman, R. (1988). Center provides approach to major social ill: Homeless urban runaways and throwaways. *JAMA, 260*(3), 311-13.
- Herrera, D. E. (2009). *Perceived racial/ethnic discrimination, hope, and social connectedness: Examining the predictors of future orientation among emerging adults* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Texas.
- Herrera, V., & McCloskey, L. (2001). Gender differences in the risk for delinquency among youth exposed to family violence. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 25*, 1037-1051.
- Herrera-Rojas, M., Sun, M., & Tran, A. (2009). *Shaping the future of New York with Professor Blot. runaways - History* (cuny.edu)
- Hildebrand, J. (1968). Reasons for runaways. *Crime and Delinquency, 14*(1), 42-49.
- Hinton, E. M., Tillyer, M. S., & Tillyer, R. (2021). Victimization, offending, and expectations for future success among high-risk youth. *Deviant Behavior, 42*(6), 777-791.
- Hockenberry, S., & Puzanchera, C. (2020). *Juvenile court statistics 2018*. National Center for Juvenile Justice Juvenile.
- Hockenberry, S., & Puzanchera, C. (2021). *Juvenile court statistics 2019*. National Center for Juvenile Justice Juvenile.

- Holsinger, K., Belknap, J., & Sutherland, J. L. (1999). Assessing the gender specific program and service needs for adolescent females in the juvenile justice system.
- Hopkins, O., King, N. (1994). Posttraumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents. *Behaviour Change, 11*(2): 110-120.
- Horowitz, R., & Pottieger, A. E. (1991). Gender bias in juvenile justice handling of seriously crime-involved youths. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28*, 75-100.
- Hough, M., Jackson, J. and Bradford, B. (2013). Legitimacy, trust and compliance: An empirical test of procedural justice theory using the European social survey. In J. Tankebe, and A. Liebling, (Eds.). *Legitimacy and criminal justice: An international exploration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Howell, J. C. (2003). *Preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency: A comprehensive framework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hoyt, D., Ryan, K., & Cauce, A. (1999). Personal victimization in a high-risk environment: Homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 36*(4), 371-392.
- Hoyt, S., & Scherer, D. G. (1998). Female juvenile delinquency: Misunderstood by the juvenile justice system, neglected by social science. *Law and Human Behavior, 22*(1), 81-107.
- Hubbard, D. J., & Pratt, T. (2002). A meta-analysis of the predictors of delinquency among girls. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 34*, 1-13.
- Hurst, Y., McDermott, M. J., & Thomas, D. (2005). The attitudes of girls toward police officers: Differences by race. *Policing, 28* (4), 578-593.

- Igra, V. & Irwin, C. E. Jr. (1996). Theories of adolescent risk-taking behavior. In R. J. DiClemente, W. B. Hansen, & L. E. Ponton (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Health Risk Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Iselin, A. M., Mulvey, E. P., Loughran, T. A., Chung, H. L., & Schubert, C. A. (2012). A longitudinal examination of serious adolescent offenders' perceptions of chances for success and engagement in behaviors accomplishing goals. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *40*, 237–249.
- Jackman, D. M., & Macphee, D. (2017). Self-esteem and future orientation predict adolescents' risk engagement. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *37*(3), 339-336.
- Jackson, D. B., Fahmy, C., Vaughn, M. G., & Testa, A. (2019). Police stops among at-risk youth: Repercussions for mental health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *65*(5), 627-632.
- Jackson, D. B., Testa, A., Fix, R. L., & Mendelson, T. (2021). Adolescent police stops, self-harm, and attempted suicide: Findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study, 2012–2019. *American journal of public health*, *111*(10), 1885-1893.
- Jackson, D. B., Testa, A., & Vaughn, M. G. (2020). Low self-control and the adolescent police stop: Intrusiveness, emotional response, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *66*, 101635.
- Jackson, D. B., Del Toro, J., Semenza, D. C., Testa, A., & Vaughn, M. G. (2021). Unpacking racial/ethnic disparities in emotional distress among adolescents during witnessed police stops. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *69*(2), 248–254.
- Jacobs, B. A. (2010). Deterrence and deterrability. *Criminology*, *48*, 417-442.

- Jäggi, L., & Kliewer, W. (2020). Reentry of incarcerated juveniles: Correctional education as a turning point across juvenile and adult facilities. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 47*(11), 1348–1370.
- Jamieson, P. E., & Romer, D. (2008). Unrealistic fatalism in US youth ages 14 to 22: Prevalence and characteristics. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*(2), 154–160.
- Janus, M., McCormack, A., Burgess, A. W., & Hartman, C. (1987). *Adolescent runaways: Causes and consequences*. Lexington Books.
- Jaynes, C. M., Moule, R., Hubbel, J. T., Santos, M. R. (2021). Impulsivity or discounting? Evaluating the influence of individual differences in temporal orientation on offending. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 38*(4), 831-859.
- Jeanis, M. N., Fox, B. H., Jennings, W. G., Perkins, R., & Liberto, A. (2020). Oooh she's a little runaway: Examining invariance in runaway youth trajectories by developmental and life-course risk factors and gender. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, 6*, 398–423.
- Jeanis, M. N., Fox, B. H., & Muniz, C. N. (2019). Revitalizing profiles of runaways: A latent class analysis of delinquent runaway youth. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 36*, 171-187.
- Jensen, G. F., & Rojek, D. (1998). *Delinquency and youth crime*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Johansson, P., & Kempf-Leonard, K. (2009). A gender-specific pathway to serious, violent, and chronic offending? Exploring Howell's risk factors for serious delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency, 55*(2), 216–240.

- Johnson, M. K., Crosnoe, R., & Elder Jr, G. H. (2011). Insights on adolescence from a life course perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 21*(1), 273–280.
- Johnson, R. J., Rew, L., & Kouzekanani, K. (2006). Gender differences in victimized homeless adolescents. *Adolescence, 41*(161), 40–53.
- Johnson, L.M., Simons, R. L., & Conger, R. D. (2004). Criminal justice system involvement and continuity of youth crime: A longitudinal analysis. *Youth & Society, 36*(1), 3–29.
- Johnson, S. R. L., Blum, R.W., & Cheng, T. L. (2014). Future orientation: A construct with implications for adolescent health and wellbeing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 26*(4), 459–468.
- Johnson S.R., Blum R.W., & Cheng T.L. (2013). Future orientation: A construct with implications for adolescent health and wellbeing. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 26*(4), 459-468.
- Justice, B., & Duncan, D. (1976). Running away: An epidemic problem of adolescence. *Adolescence, 77*, 365-371.
- Kaasa, S. O., Malloy, L. C., & Cauffman, E. (2008). *Procedural justice and the adolescent offender*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology – Law Society, Hyatt Regency Jacksonville Riverfront, Jacksonville, FL.
- Kaufman, J., & Widom, C. S. (1999). Childhood victimization, running away and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 36*(4), 347-370.

- Kempf-Leonard, K., & Johansson, P. (2007). Gender and runaways: Risk factors, delinquency, and juvenile justice experiences. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 5*(3), 308-327.
- Kerpelman, J. L., Eryigit, S., & Stephens, C. J. (2008). African American adolescents' future education orientation: Associations with self efficacy, ethnic identity, and perceived parental support. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*, 997-1008.
- Kidd, S. A., & Taub, B. (2004). A history of psychological research into the runaway phenomenon: From delinquent to street kid. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 13*(3-4), 327-343.
- Kim, M. J., Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., & Huang, B. (2009). Early child maltreatment, runaway youths, and risk of delinquency and victimization in adolescence: A meditational model. *Social Work Research, 33*, 19-28.
- Kingree, J. B., Braithwaite, R., & Woodring, T. (2001). Psychosocial and behavioral problems in relation to recent experience as a runaway among adolescent detainees. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*(2), 190-205.
- Kipke, M., Montgomery, S. B., Simon, T.R., & Iverson, E.F. (1997). Substance abuse disorders among runaway and homeless youth. *Substance Use and Misuse, 32*(7-8), 969-986.
- Kirk, D. S., & Sampson, R. J. (2013). Juvenile arrest and collateral educational damage in the transition to adulthood. *Sociology of Education, 86*(1), 36-62.
- Knight, E. M. (1942). Homeless and financially dependent adolescents as clients of a family agency. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 13*, 40-73.

- Kort-Butler, L. A. (2010). Experienced and vicarious victimization: Do social support and self-esteem prevent delinquent responses? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 496-505.
- Kuin, N., Masthoff, E., Kramer, M., & Scherder, E. (2015). The role of risky decision making in aggression: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 25, 159-172.
- Krisberg, B. (2005). The historical legacy of juvenile justice. In *Juvenile justice: Redeeming our children*. United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.
- Laub, J. H. (2014). *Understanding inequality and the justice system response: Charting a new way forward*. William T. Grant Foundation.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2019). Life-course and developmental criminology: Looking back, moving forward. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 6, 158–171.
- Lawrence, R., & Hemmons, C. (2008). History and development of the juvenile court and justice process. *Juvenile Justice: A Text Reader*, 19-38.
- LeBlanc, M., & Biron, L. (1980). Status offenses: A legal term without meaning. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 114-118.
- Lederman, C. S., Dakof, G. A., Larrea, M. A., & Li, H. (2004). Characteristics of adolescent females in juvenile detention. *International journal of law and psychiatry*, 27(4), 321-337.
- Lee, H., Sullivan, C. J., Barnes, J. C. (2018). Maturity of judgment and perceptual deterrence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 45(11), 1762-1781.

- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Leverso, J., Bielby, W., Hoelter, L.F. (2015). Back on the streets: Maturation and risk factors for recidivism among serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of Adolescence*, *41*, 67-75.
- Levi, M., Sacks, A., & Tyler, T. (2009). Conceptualizing legitimacy, measuring legitimating beliefs. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *53*(3), 354–375.
- Libertoff, K. (1980). The runaway child in America: A social history. *Journal of Family Issues*. *1*, 151-164.
- Lin, C. H. (2012). Children who run away from foster care: Who are the children and what are the risk factors? *Children and Youth Services Review*, *34*(4), 807–813.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Lindstrom Johnson, S., Jones, V., & Cheng, T. L. (2015). Promoting “healthy futures” to reduce risk behaviors in urban youth: A randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *56*, 36–45.
- Liu, X., He, P., Chen, W., & Gao, J. (2019). Multi-task deep neural networks for natural language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11504*.
- Lochner, L. (2007). Individual perceptions of the criminal justice system. *American Economic Review*, *97*, 444-460.

- Lopes, L. L. (1987). Between hope and fear. The psychology of risk. In L Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 255-295). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Lopes, G., Krohn, M. D., Lizotte, A. J., Schmidt, N. M., Vasquez, B. E., & Bernburg, J. G. (2012). Labeling and cumulative disadvantage: The impact of formal police intervention on life chances and crime during emerging adulthood. *Crime & Delinquency, 58*(3), 456–488.
- Lopez, V., & Nuno, L. (2016). Latina and African-American girls in the juvenile justice system: Needs, problems, and solutions. *Sociology Compass, 10*(1), 24.
- Loughran, T. A., Brame, R., Fagan, J., Piquero, A. R., Mulvey, E. P., & Schubert, C. A. (2015). *Studying deterrence among high-risk adolescents*. In Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Loughran, T. A., Paternoster, R., Piquero, A. R., & Pogarsky, G. (2011). On ambiguity in perceptions of risk: Implications for criminal decision making and deterrence. *Criminology, 49*, 1029-1061.
- Loughran, T. A., Piquero, A. R., Fagan, J., & Mulvey, E. P. (2012). Differential deterrence: Studying heterogeneity and changes in perceptual deterrence among serious youthful offenders. *Crime & Delinquency, 58*(1) 3–27.
- Loughran, T. A., Piquero, A. R., Fagan, J., & Mulvey, E. P. (2009). Differential deterrence: Studying heterogeneity and changes in perceptual deterrence among serious youthful offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*. Advance online publication.

- Loughran, T. A., Pogarsky, G., Piquero, A. R., & Paternoster, R. (2012). Re-examining the functional form of the certainty effect in deterrence theory. *Justice Quarterly*, *29*, 712–741.
- Lowrey, L. G. (1941). Runaways and nomads. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *11*, 775-783.
- Luescher, J. L. (2004). *Adolescent perspectives on family conflict resolution: Exploring the relationships among procedural justice, identity orientation, and deviant behavior*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Lynch, W. F. (1965). *Images of hope: Imagination as healer of hopeless*. Baltimore: Helica Press.
- MacDonald, J. M., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2001). Gender bias and juvenile justice revisited: A multiyear analysis. *Crime and Delinquency*, *47*(2), 173-195.
- Macmillan, R. & Hagan, J. (2004). Violence in the transition to adulthood: Adolescent victimization, education, and socioeconomic attainment in later life. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *14*, 127-58.
- Mahler, A., Simmons, C., Frick, P. J., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2017). Aspirations, expectations, and delinquency: The moderating effect of impulse control. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *47*, 1503–1514.
- Mann, C. R. (1979). The differential treatment between runaway boys and girls in juvenile court. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, *30*, 37-48.

- Martin, S., Gordon, T., & Kupersmidt, J. (1995). Survey of exposure to violence among the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers. *Public Health Reports, 110*, 268-76.
- Masten, A. S. (1992). Homeless children in the United States: Mark of a nation at risk. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(2):41-44.
- Masten, A. S., Garmezy, N., Tellegen, A., Pellegrini, D. S., Larkin, K., & Larsen, A. (1988). Competence and stress in school children: The moderating effects of individual and family qualities. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 29*(6), 745-764.
- Matthews, S. K., & Agnew, R. (2008). Extending deterrence theory: Do delinquent peers condition the relationship between perceptions of getting caught and offending? *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 45*, 91-118.
- Matsueda, R. L., Kreager, D. A., & Huizinga, D. (2006). Deterring delinquents: A rational choice model of theft and violence. *American Sociological Review, 71*, 95-122.
- Maxson, C. L., Matsuda, K. N., & Hennigan, K. (2011). Deterrability among gang and nongang juvenile offenders. Are gang members more (or less) deterrable than other juvenile offenders? *Crime & Delinquency, 57*, 516-543.
- Maxfield, M., & Widom, C. S. (1999). The cycles of violence: Revisited six years later. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 150*, 390-395.
- Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S., & Tyler, T. R. (2013). Shaping citizen perceptions of police legitimacy: A randomized field trial of procedural justice. *Criminology, 51*(1), 33-63.

- McCartan, L. M., & Gunnison, E. (2010). Individual and relationship factors that differentiate female offenders with and without a sexual abuse history. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 1449-1469.
- McCarthy, B., & Hagan, J. (1992). Surviving on the street: The experience of homeless youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*(4), 412-430.
- McCormack, A., Burgess, A., & Gaccione, P. (1986a). Influence of family structure and financial stability on physical and sexual abuse among a runaway population. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 16*(2), 251-262.
- McCormack, A., Janus, M.-D., & Burgess, A.W. (1986b). Runaway youths and sexual victimization: Gender differences in an adolescent runaway population. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 10*, 387-395.
- McFarland, M. J., Geller, A., & McFarland, C. (2019). Police contact and health among urban adolescents: The role of perceived injustice. *Social Science & Medicine, 238*, 112487.
- McIntyre, J. K., & Spatz Widom, C. (2011). Childhood victimization and crime victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(4), 640-663.
- Mello, Z. R., Walker, E. B., Finan, L. J., Stiasny, A. M., Wiggers, I. C. S., McBroom, K. A., & Worrell, F. C. (2018). Time perspective, psychological outcomes, and risky behavior among runaway adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science, 22*(3), 233-243.
- Mello, Z. R., Oladipo, S. E., Paoloni, V. C., & Worrell, F. C. (2017). *Time perspective in Nigeria and the United States*. Manuscript under review for publication.

- Mello, Z. R., & Worrell, F. C. (2015). The past, the present, and the future: A conceptual model of time perspective in adolescence. In M. Stolarski, N. Fieulaine, W. van Beek (Eds.), *Time perspective theory; Review, research and application: Essays in honor of Philip G. Zimbardo* (pp. 115–129). Cham, Switzerland: Springer
- Mello, Z. R., Worrell, F. C., & Andretta, J. R. (2009). *Variation in how frequently adolescents think about the past, the present, and the future in relation to academic achievement*. *Diskur Kindheits- und Jugendforschung [Research on Child and Adolescent Development]*, 2, 173–183.
- Meltzer, H., Ford, T., Bebbington, P., & Vostanis, P. (2012). Children who run away from home: Risks for suicidal behavior and substance misuse. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 51, 415-421.
- Mertler, C. A., & Reinhart, R. V. (2017). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Mitchell, M. A. (1992). Overview of children as witnesses to violence, in Schwarz DF (ed): *Children and Violence, Report of the Twenty-third Ross Roundtable on Critical Approaches to Common Pediatric Problems*. Columbus, Ohio: Ross Laboratories, pp. 77-86.
- Monahan, K. C., King, K. M., Shulman, E. P., Cauffman, E., & Chassin, L. (2015). The effects of violence exposure on the development of impulse control and future orientation across adolescence and early adulthood: Time-specific and generalized effects in a sample of juvenile offenders. *Development and Psychopathology*, 27, 1267-1283.

- Monahan, K., Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., & Mulvey, E. (2013). Psychosocial (im)maturity from adolescence to early adulthood: distinguishing between adolescence-limited and persisting antisocial behavior. *Development and Psychopathology, 25*, 1093-1105.
- Moore, S. & Gullone, E. (1996). Predicting adolescent risk behavior using a personalized cost-benefit analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 25* (3), 343-359.
- Moore, L. D., & Padavic, I. (2010). Racial and ethnic disparities in girls' sentencing in the juvenile justice system. *Feminist Criminology, 5*(3), 263–285.
- Morgan, R. L., & Heise, D. (1988). Structure of emotions. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 51*(1), 19–31.
- Morton, M. H., Dworsky, A., & Samuels, G. M. (2017). *Missed opportunities: Youth homelessness in America. National estimates*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.
- Morton, M. H, Dworsky, A., Matjasko, J. L., Curry, S. R., Schlueter, D., Chávez, R., Farrell, A. F. (2018). Prevalence and correlates of youth homelessness in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 62*(1), 14-21.
- Mulvey, E. P. (2016). Research on pathways to desistance [Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia County, PA]: Subject measures, 2000-2010. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].
<https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29961.v2>
- Murphy, K., & Gaylor, A. (2010). *Policing youth: Can procedural justice nurture youth cooperation with police?* (Vol. 6). Australia: Alfred Deakin Research Institute, Deakin University.

- Nanda, J. (2012). Blind discretion: Girls of color & delinquency in the juvenile justice system. *UCLA Law Review*, *59*(6), 1502-1539.
- Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2003). An experimental investigation of deterrence: Cheating, self-serving bias, and impulsivity. *Criminology*, *41*, 167-192.
- Nagin, D. S. (2013). Deterrence in the twenty-first century. *Crime and Justice*, *42*, 199-263.
- Nagin, D. S. (1998). Criminal deterrence research at the outset of the twenty-first century. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 23, pp. 1-42). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Nagin, D. S., & Paternoster, R. (1994). Personal capital and social control: The deterrence implications of individual differences in criminal offending. *Criminology*, *32*, 581-606.
- Nagin, D. S., & Paternoster, R. (1993). Enduring individual differences and rational choice theories of crime. *Law and Society Review*, *27*, 467-496.
- Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2001). Integrating celerity, impulsivity, and extralegal sanction threats into a model of general deterrence: Theory and evidence. *Criminology*, *39*, 865-892.
- Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2003). An experimental investigation of deterrence: Cheating, self-serving bias, and impulsivity. *Criminology*, *41*, 167-191.
- National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming juvenile justice: A developmental approach*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

- Nihart, T., Michelle Lersch, K., Sellers, C. S., & Mieczkowski, T. (2005). Kids, cops, parents and teachers: Exploring juvenile attitudes toward authority figures. *Western Criminology Review*, 6(1).
- Novak, A. (2019). Is a minimum age necessary? An examination of the association between justice system contact in childhood and negative outcomes in adolescence. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 5(4), 536–553.
- Neimark E. Intellectual development during adolescence. In D. Horowitz (ed.), *Review of child developmental research*, 4, 541-594. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1975.
- New York State Senate. (2021). *Family court act (FCT) Chapter 686, Article 7, Part 1*. Legislation | N.Y. State Senate (nysenate.gov)
- Nordberg, A., Twis, M. K., Stevens, M. A., & Hatcher, S. S. (2018). Precarity and structural racism in Black youth encounters with police. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 35, 511-518.
- Nordberg, A., Crawford, M. R., Praetorius, R. T., & Hatcher, S. S. (2016). Exploring minority youths' police encounters: A qualitative interpretive meta-synthesis. *Child and adolescent social work journal*, 33, 137-149.
- Nurmi, J. (1989). Development of orientation to the future during early adolescence: A four-year longitudinal study and two cross sectional comparisons. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24, 195-214.
- Nurmi J. E (1989). Planning, motivation, and evaluation in orientation to the future: A latent structure analysis. *Scandanavian Journal of Psychology*, 30(1):64-71.

- Nurmi, J. (1991). How do adolescence see their future? A review of the development of future orientation and planning. *Developmental Review, 11*, 1-59.
- Nurmi J. E (1987). Age, sex, social class, and quality of family interaction as determinants of adolescents' future orientation: A developmental task interpretation. *Adolescence, 22*(88), 977-991.
- Nurmi, J. E. (2005). Thinking about and acting upon the future: Development of future orientation across the life span. In A. Strathman & J. Joireman (Eds.), *Understanding behavior in the context of time: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 31–57). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Nurmi J. E., & Pulliainen, H. (1991). The changing parent-child relationship, self-esteem, and intelligence as determinant of orientation to the future during early adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence, 14*(1):35-51.
- Nyborg, V. M., & Curry, J. F. (2003). The impact of perceived racism: Psychological symptoms among African American boys. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32*(2), 258–266.
- Olson, L., Liebow, E., Mannino, F. V., & Shore, M. F. (1980). Runaway children twelve years later: A follow-up. *Journal of Family Issues, 1*(2), 165-188.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, (1997). In the wake of childhood maltreatment. Retrieved January 20, 2003, from <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs>.
- Orten, J., & Soli, S. K. (1980). Runaway children and their families. *Journal of Family Issues, 1*, 249-261.
- Ostensen, K. (1981). The runaway crisis: Is family therapy the answer? *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 9*, 3-12.

- Papachristos, A. V., Meares, T. L., & Fagan, J. (2012). Why do criminals obey the law? The influence of legitimacy and social networks on active gun offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *102*, 397-440.
- Parker, V. C. (1997). *The influence of future orientation on the relationship between condom use and violence among homeless/runaway youth: Implications for the prevention of HIV and violence* (Order No. 9733119). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304369457).
- Pasko, L.J. (2006). *The female juvenile offender in Hawaii understanding gender differences in arrests, adjudications, and social characteristics of juvenile offenders*. Honolulu, HI: Department of the Attorney General.
- Paternoster, R. (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, *4*, 173-217.
- Pauwels, L., Weerman, F., Bruinsma, G., & Bernasco, W. (2011). Perceived sanction risk, individual propensity and adolescent offending: Assessing key findings from the deterrence literature in a Dutch sample. *European Journal of Criminology*, *8*, 386-400.
- Penner, E. K., Viljoen, J. L., Douglas, K. S., & Roesch, R. (2014). Procedural justice versus risk factors for offending: Predicting recidivism in youth. *Law and Human Behavior*, *38*(3), 225–237.
- Peterson, J. (2014). *Examining victimization types and frequencies among a delinquent female population*. University of Nebraska at Omaha.
- Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Esbensen, F. A. (2004). Gang membership and violent victimization. *Justice Quarterly*, *21*, 793–815.

- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origin of intelligence in children*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Pickett, J. T., Roche, S. P., & Pogarsky, G. (2018). Toward a bifurcated theory of emotional deterrence. *Criminology: An interdisciplinary Journal*, *56*, 27–58.
- Piliavin, I., Thornton, C., Gartner, R., & Matsueda, R. L. (1986). Crime, deterrence, and rational choice. *American Sociological Review*, *51*, 101-119.
- Pinchevsky, G. M., A. A. Fagan, and E. M. Wright. (2014). Victimization experiences and adolescent substance use: Does the type and degree of victimization matter? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*, 299-319.
- Piquero, A. R. (2014). Take my license n’ all that jive, I can’t see...35”: Little hope for the future encourages offending over time. *Justice Quarterly*, *33*(1), 73–99.
- Piquero, A. R., Paternoster, R., Pogarsky, G., & Loughran, T. (2011). Elaborating the individual difference component in deterrence theory. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences*, *7*, 335-360.
- Piquero, A. R., & Tibbetts, S. (1996). Specifying the direct and indirect effects of low self-control and situational factors in offenders’ decision making: Toward a more complete model of rational offending. *Justice Quarterly*, *13*, 481-510.
- Platt, A. M. (1977). *The child savers: The invention of delinquency*. University of Chicago Press.
- Pogarsky, G. (2002). Identifying “deterable” offenders: Implications for research on deterrence. *Justice Quarterly*, *19*, 431-452.

- Pogarsky, G., Kim, K., & Paternoster, R. (2005). Perceptual change in the national youth survey: Lessons for deterrence theory and offender decision-making. *Justice Quarterly*, 22, 1-29.
- Pogarsky, G. (2007). Deterrence and individual differences among convicted offenders. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 23, 59-74.
- Posner, M. (1993). *Nowhere to Run: HIV prevention for runaway and homeless youth*. ERIC - ED389707 - Nowhere to run: HIV Prevention for Runaway and Homeless Youth., 1993-Jun
- Powers, J. L., Eckenrode, J., & Jaklitsch, B. (1990). Maltreatment among runaway and homeless youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 14(1), 87-98.
- Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Blevins, K. R., Daigle, L. E., & Madensen, T. D. (2006). The empirical status of deterrence theory: A meta-analysis. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (Advances in criminological theory Vol. 15, pp. 367-395). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.
- Pulkkinen L. (1990). Home atmosphere and adolescent future orientation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 5(1), 33-43.
- Puzzanchera, C., & Hockenberry, S. (2013). *Juvenile court statistics 2010*. National Center for Juvenile Justice. <http://www.ncjj.org/pdf/jcsreports/jcs2010.pdf>
- Pynoos RS, Eth S. (1984). The child as a witness to homicide. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40, 87.
- Rafferty Y, Shinn M. (1991). The impact of homelessness on children. *American Psychologist*, 46(11), 1170-1179.

- Robbins, R. N., Bryan, A. (2004). Relationships between future orientation, impulsive Sensation seeking, and risk behavior among adjudicated adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*(4), 428-445.
- Roberts, J. V., & Hough, M. (2005). *Understanding public attitudes to criminal justice*. New York, NY: Open University Press
- Robertson, M. (1989). *Homeless youth in Hollywood: Pattern of alcohol use: A report to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism*. Berkeley: Alcohol Research Group.
- Richmond, J. M., Elliott, A. N., Pierce, T. W., Aspelmeier, J. E., & Alexander, A. A. (2009). Poly victimization, childhood victimization, and psychological distress in college women. *Child Maltreatment, 14*(2), 127-147.
- Riemer, M.D. (1940). Runaway children. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 10*, 522-527.
- Ritter, B. A., Fischbein, R. L., & Lord, R. G. (2005). Implicit and explicit expectations of justice as a function of manager and subordinate race. *Human Relations, 58*(12), 1501-1521.
- Rose, D. T., & Abramson, L. (1992). Developmental predictors of depressive cognitive style: Research and theory. In D. Cicchetti & S. Toth (Eds.), Rochester symposium of developmental psychopathology (Vol. IV, pp. 323-349). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Rotherham-Borus, M. J., Koopman, C., Haignere, C., & Daviews, M., (1991). Reducing HIV sexual risk behaviors among runaway adolescents. *JAMA, 266*(9), 1257-1242.

- Rowan, Z., Schubert, C., Loughran, T., Mulvey, E., & Pardini, D. (2019). Proximal predictors of gun violence among adolescent males involved in crime. *Law and Human Behavior, 43*(3), 250-262.
- Salisbury, E. J., & Van Voorhis, P. (2009). Gendered pathways: A quantitative investigation of women probationers' paths to incarceration. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 541-566.
- Sanchez, R. P., Waller, M. W., & Greene, J. M. (2006). Who runs? A demographic profile of runaway youth in the United States. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*, 778–781. doi:10.1016/j. Jadohealth.2006.04.018.
- Schaffner, L. (2006). *Girls in trouble with the law*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Schaffer, D., & Caton, C. L. M. (1984). Runaway and homeless youth in New York City: A report to the Ittleson Foundation. *New York: Division of Child Psychiatry, New York State Psychiatric Institute and Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons*.
- Scheuerman, H. L. (2019). Intersectionality and crime: An exploratory look at how gender and race influence responses to injustice associated with strain. *Deviant Behavior, 40*(11), 1349–1371.
- Schmidt, N.M., Lopes, G., Krohn, M. D., & Lizotte, A. J. (2015). Getting caught and getting hitched: An assessment of the relationship between police intervention, life chances, and romantic unions. *Justice Quarterly, 32*(6), 976–1005.

- Schulz, S. (2014). Individual differences in the deterrence process: Which individuals learn (most) from their offending experiences? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 30*, 215-236.
- Schweitzer, R. D., Hier, S. J., Terry, D. J. (1994). Parental bonding, family systems, and environmental predictors of adolescent homelessness. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 2*(1):39-45.
- Sedlak, A., & Bruce, C. (2019). *Youth's characteristics and backgrounds: Findings from the survey of youth in residential placement*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Seginer, R. (2003). Adolescent future orientation: An integrated cultural and ecological perspective. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 6*(1), 1–12.
- Seginer, R. (2008). Future orientation in times of threat and challenge: How resilient adolescents construct their future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*(4), 272-282.
- Seginer, R., & Noyman, M. S. (2005). Future orientation, identity and intimacy: Their relations in emerging adulthood. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2*(1), 17-37.
- Seginer, R., & Shoyer, S. (2012). How mothers affect adolescents' future orientation: A two-source analysis. *Japanese Psychological Research, 54*, 310–320.
- Seginer, R., Vermulst, A., & Shoyer, S. (2004). The indirect link between perceived parenting and adolescent future orientation: A multi-step model. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*, 365–378.

- Sharlein, J. (2018). Beyond recidivism: Investigating comparative educational and employment outcomes for adolescents in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(1), 26–52.
- Shelden, R. G., Horvath, J. A., & Tracy, S. (1989). Do status offenders get worse? Some classifications on the question of escalation. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35(2), 202-216.
- Shetgiri, R., Boots, D. P., Lin, H., & Cheng, T. L. (2016). Predictors of weapon-related behaviors among African American, Latino, and White youth. *The Journal of pediatrics*, 171, 277–282.
- Siegel, J., & Williams, L. (2003). The relationship between child sexual abuse and female delinquency and crime: A prospective study. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 40(1), 71-94.
- Simons, R. & Whitbeck, L. (1991). Sexual abuse as a precursor to prostitution and victimization among adolescent and adult homeless women. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12, 361-79.
- Skardhamar, T., & Savolainen, J. (2014). Changes in criminal offending around the time of job entry: A study of employment and desistance. *Criminology*, 52, 263–291.
- Skogan, W. G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing & Society*, 16(02), 99-126.
- Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police quarterly*, 8(3), 298-321.
- Smart, R.G., & Adlaf, E.M. (1991). Substance use and problems among Toronto street youth. *British Journal of Addiction*, 86, 999-1010.

- Smart, A. D. H. (1991). Homeless youth in Seattle. Planning and policy-making at the local government level. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 12*(7), 519-527.
- Smith, C., & Thornberry, T. (1995). The relationship between childhood maltreatment and adolescent involvement in delinquency. *Criminology, 33*, 451-481.
- Snyder, H., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report*. Washington DC: OJJDP.
- So, S., Gaylord-Harden, N., Voisin, D. & Scott, D. (2018). Future orientation as a protective factor for African American adolescents exposed to community violence. *Youth and Society, 1-24*.
- Solorio, M. R., Milburn, N. G., Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Higgins, C., & Gelberg, L. (2006). Predictors of sexually transmitted infection testing among sexually active homeless youth. *AIDS Behavior, 10*, 179–84.
- Steinberg, L., Chung, H. L., & Little, M. (2004). Reentry of young offenders from the justice system: A developmental perspective. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 2*(1), 21–38.
- Steinberg, L., Graham, S., O'Brien, L., Woolard, J., Cauffman, E., & Banich, M. (2009). Age differences in future orientation and delay discounting. *Child Development, 1*, 28–44.
- Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 83–110.
- Steinberg, L., Albert, D., Cauffman, E., Banich, M., Graham, S., & Woolard, J. (2008). Age differences in sensation seeking and impulsivity as indexed by behavior and

- self-report: Evidence for a dual systems model. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 1764-1778.
- Steinberg, L., Graham, S., O'Brien, L., Woolard, J., Cauffman, E., & Banich, M. (2009). Age differences in future orientation and delay discounting. *Child Development*, *80*, 28-44.
- Stierlin, H. (1973). A family perspective on adolescent runaways. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *29*, 56-62.
- Stiffman, A. R. (1989). Physical and sexual abuse in runaway youths. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *13*(3), 417-426.
- Stinton, A. (2007). *The causes and consequences of running away: What difference does gender make?* [Doctoral Dissertation, Vanderbilt University]. Retrieved from <https://etd.library.vanderbilt.edu/etd-01192007-121755>.
- Stoddard, S., Zimmerman, M., & Bauermeister, J. (2011). Thinking about the future as a way to succeed in the present: a longitudinal study of future orientation and violent behaviors among African American youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *48*, 238-246.
- Stoddard, S. A., Heinze, J. E., Choe, D. E., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2015). Predicting violent behavior: The role of violence exposure and future educational aspirations during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *44*, 191-203.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, *37*, 513-547.
- Svensson, R. (2015). An examination of the interaction between morality and deterrence in offending: A research note. *Crime and Delinquency*, *61*(1), 3-18.

- Tanner, J., Davies, S., & O'Grady, B. (1999). Whatever happened to yesterday's rebels? Longitudinal effects of youth delinquency on education and employment. *Social Problems, 46*(2), 250-274.
- Tappan, P. W. (1947). *Delinquent girls in court: A study of the wayward minor court of New York*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tatar, J. R., II, Kaasa, S. O., & Cauffman, E. (2012). Perceptions of procedural justice among female offenders: Time does not heal all wounds. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 18*, 268-296.
- Terrell, N. E. (1997). Street life: Aggravated and sexual assaults among homeless and runaway adolescents. *Youth & Society, 28*, 267–290.
- Testa, A., Turney, K., Jackson, D. B., Jaynes, C. M. (2021). Police contact and future orientation from adolescence to young adulthood: Findings from the Pathways to Desistance Study. *Criminology, 60*, 263–290.
- The National Child Traumatic Stress Network. (2016). *Victimization and juvenile offending*. Accessed from http://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/assets/pdfs/victimization_juvenile_offending.pdf
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thomas, C. W. (1976). Are status offenders really so different? A comparative and longitudinal assessment. *Crime & Delinquency, 22*(4), 438-455.
- Thompson, S. J., & Pollio, D. E. (2006). Adolescent runaway episodes: Application of an estrangement model of recidivism. *Social Work Research, 30*, 245–251.

- Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2005). Applying interactional theory to the explanation of continuity and change in antisocial behavior. In *Integrated developmental and life-course theories of offending* (pp. 183–210). Transaction Publishers.
- Thrane, L. E., Hoyt, D. R., Whitbeck, L. B., & Yoder, K. A. (2006). Impact of family abuse on running away, deviance, and street victimization among homeless rural and urban youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 30*(10), 1117–1128.
- Tittle, C. R., & Paternoster, R. (2000). *Social deviance and crime*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Tracy, P., & Kempf-Leonard, K., (1996). *Continuity and discontinuity in criminal careers*. New York, NY: Plenum Publishing.
- Trad, P. V., (1993). The ability of adolescents to predict future outcome part 1: Assessing predictive abilities. *Adolescence, 28*(111)533-555.
- Frommsdorff, G. (1986). Future time orientation and its relevance for development in action. In R.K. Silbereisen, K. Eyferth, & G. Rudinger (Eds.) *Development as action in context: Problem behavior in normal youth development*, pp 121-136. BerlinerSpringer-Verlag.
- Tucker, J. S., Edelen, M. O., Ellickson, P. L., & Klein, D. J. (2011). Running away from home: A longitudinal study of adolescent risk factors and young adult outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 40*, 507–518.
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice--A review of research* (vol 30; pp. 431-505). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Tyler, T. R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal institutions? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *19*, 215-235.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006a). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006b). *Why people obey the law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006c). Restorative justice and procedural justice: Dealing with rule breaking. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*(2), 307-326.
- Tyler, K. A., & Bersani, B. E. (2008). A longitudinal study of early adolescent precursors to running away. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *28*, 230–251.
- Tyler, T. R., and Blader, S.L. (2005). Can businesses effectively regulate employee conduct? The antecedents of rule following in work settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*, 1143– 1158.
- Tyler, T. R. & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tyler, K.A., Hoyt, D.R., Whitbeck, L.B., & Cauce, A.M. (2001). The impact of childhood sexual abuse on later sexual victimization among runaway youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *11*, 151–176.
- Tyler, K. A., Whitbeck, L. B., Chen, X., & Johnson, K. (2007). Sexual health of homeless youth: Prevalence and correlates of sexually transmissible infections. *Sexual Health*, *4*, 57–61.
- Tyler, K. A., Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & Cauce, A. M. (2004). Risk factors for sexual victimization among male and female homeless and runaway youth. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*, 503–520.

- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2017). *Homelessness in the United States: The 2016 annual homeless assessment report to Congress: Part 2: Estimates of homelessness in the United States*. Available at: [https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/2016- AHAR-Part-1.pdf](https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/2016-AHAR-Part-1.pdf).
- Visher, C. A. (1983). Gender, police arrest decisions, and notions of chivalry. *Criminology*, 215-28.
- Voisin, D. R., Bird, J. D., Hardesty, M., & Shiu, C. S. (2011). African American adolescents living and coping with community violence on Chicago's southside. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(12), 2483-2498.
- Walker, J. T., & Maddan, S. (2013). *Statistics in criminology and criminal justice: Analysis and interpretation* (4th ed.). Jones and Bartlett Learning.
- Walters, G. D. (2018). Procedural justice, legitimacy beliefs, and moral disengagement in emerging adulthood: Explaining continuity and desistance in the moral model of criminal lifestyle development. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(1), 37-49.
- Walters, G. D. (2018). Change in the perceived certainty of punishment as an inhibitor of post-juvenile offending in serious delinquents: Deterrence at the adult transition. *Crime & Delinquency*, 64(10), 1306-1325.
- Warner, T. D., & Swisher, R. R. (2015). Adolescent survival expectations: Variations by race, ethnicity, and nativity. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 56(4), 478-494.
- Watkins, A. M., Huebner, B. M., & Decker, S. H. (2008). Patterns of gun acquisition, carrying, and use among juvenile and adult arrestees: Evidence from a high-crime city. *Justice Quarterly*, 25, 674-700.

- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and perceptions of police misconduct. *Social Problems, 51*(3), 305-325.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. (2006). *Race and policing in America: Conflict and reform*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Weitzer, R. (2017). Theorizing racial discord over policing before and after Ferguson. *Justice quarterly, 34*(7), 1129-1153.
- Whitbeck, L. B., & Simons, R. L. (1993). A comparison of adaptive strategies and patterns of victimization among homeless adolescents and adults. *Violence & Victims, 8*, 135-152.
- Whitbeck, L.B., Hoyt, D.R., & Ackley, K.A. (1997). Families of homeless and runaway adolescents: A comparison of parent/caretaker and adolescent perspectives on parenting, family violence and adolescent conduct. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 21*(6), 517-28.
- Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & Yoder, K. A. (1999). A risk-amplification model of victimization and depressive symptoms among runaway and homeless adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(2), 273-296.
- Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., & Bao, W. (2000). Depressive symptoms and co-occurring depressive symptoms, substance abuse, and conduct problems among runaway and homeless adolescents. *Child Development, 71*(3), 721–732.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00181>.
- Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D., Yoder, K., Cauce, A., & Paradise, M. (2001). Deviant behavior and victimization among homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 1175-1204.

- Whitbeck, L. B., Hoyt, D. R., Johnson, K. D., & Chen, X. (2007). Victimization and posttraumatic stress disorder among runaway and homeless adolescents. *Violence and Victims, 22*(6), 721–734.
- Whitbeck, L. B., & Simons, R. L. (1993). A comparison of adaptive strategies and patterns of victimization among homeless adolescents and adults. *Violence & Victims, 8*, 135-152.
- Widom, C. S. (1989). Child abuse, neglect and violent criminal behavior. *Criminology, 27*, 251-271.
- Wiesner, M., Capaldi, D. M., & Kim, H. K. (2010). Arrests, recent life circumstances, and recurrent job loss for at-risk young men: An event-history analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 76*(2), 344–354.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 68–81.
- Wikström, P. O. H. (2006). Individuals, settings, and acts of crime: Situational mechanisms and the explanation of crime. *The explanation of crime: Context, mechanisms and development*, 61-107.
- Wikström, P. O. H. (2007). Deterrence and deterrence experiences: Preventing crime through the threat of punishment. In S. G. Shoham, O. Beck & M. Kett (Eds.), *International handbook of penology and criminal justice* (pp. 345-378). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Wiley, S.A. (2015). Arrested development: does the grade level at which juveniles experience arrest matter? *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, 1*(4), 411–433.

- Willoughby, T., Chalmers, H., & Busseri, M. A. (2004). Where is the syndrome? Examining co-occurrence among multiple problem behaviors in adolescence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*, 1022–1037.
- Wilson, J. Q. & Herrnstein, W. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Windle, M. (1989). Substance use and abuse among adolescent runaways: A four-year follow-up study. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 18*(4), 331–45.
- Woolard, J., Fondacaro, M. R., & Slobogin, C. (2001). Informing juvenile justice policy: Directions for behavioral science research. *Law and Human Behavior, 25*, 13–24.
- Worrell, F. C., & Hale, R. L. (2001). The relationship of hope in the future and perceived school climate to school completion. *School Psychology Quarterly, 16*, 370–388.
- Wood, K. M. (1997). The relationship of impulsivity and extension of future time perspective in adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 58*(5B), 2707.
- Wright, V. (2010). *Deterrence in criminal justice: Evaluating certainty vs. severity of punishment*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Wright, B. R. E., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Paternoster, R. (2004). Does the perceived risk of punishment deter criminally-prone individuals? Rational choice, self-control, and crime. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 41*, 180–213.
- Wu, Y., Sun, I., & Triplett, R. (2009). Race, class or neighborhood context: Which matters more in measuring satisfaction with police? *Justice Quarterly, 26*, 125–156.

- Wulczyn, F. (2020). Race/ethnicity and running away from foster care. *Children And Youth Services Review, 119*, 105504.
- Yoder, K., Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D.R. (2003). Gang involvement and membership among homeless and runaway youth. *Youth & Society, 34*(4), 441-467.
- Yoder, K. A., Hoyt, D. R., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1998). Suicidal behavior among homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 27*(6), 753–771.
- Zapolski, T.C.B., Banks, D.E., Lau, K.S.L., Aalsma, M. C. (2018). Perceived police injustice, moral disengagement, and aggression among juvenile offenders: Utilizing the general strain theory model. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 49*, 290–297.
- Zahn, M. A., Agnew, R., Fishbein, D., Miller, S., Winn, D., Dakoff, G., Kruttschnitt, C., Giordano, P., Gottfredson, D. C., Payne, A. A., Feld, B. C., Chesney-Lind, M. (2010). *Girls study group: Understanding and responding to girls' delinquency*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Zhang, L., Welte, J. W., & Wieczorek, W. F. (2002). Underlying common factors of adolescent problem behaviors. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 29*, 161–182.
- Zimmerman, G. M., Rees, C., & Farrell, C. (2016). Contextual determinants of adolescent perceived early fatality. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 45*(8), 1546–1559.
- Zimring, F. E., & Hawkins, G. (1968). Deterrence and marginal groups. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 5*, 100-114.
- Zimring, F., & Hawkins, G. (1973). *Deterrence: The legal threat to crime control*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX



PRAIRIE VIEW A&M UNIVERSITY

A Member of the Texas A&M University System

To: **Myrna Cintron, Ph.D.**, Principal Investigator
Kruthi Jagadish Kumar, Co-Investigator

From: Marco L. Robinson, M.A.Ed.
Director, Research Compliance
Office of Research Compliance

Date: May 3, 2023

Re: IRB Protocol #2023-030
An Analysis of the Consequences of Running Away Among Black and Hispanic Female Juvenile Offenders with an Emphasis on Future Orientation

After review of your application, it has been determined the proposed activities described do not meet the definition of research with human subjects according to federal regulations and IRB approval is not needed.

Thank you for the time and effort put into preparing and submitting your application. If you have any further questions, please call the Office of Research Compliance at (936) 261-1589.

Marco Robinson

Marco L. Robinson, M.A.Ed.
Director, Research Compliance
Office of Research Compliance
Email: mlrobinson@pvamu.edu

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kruthi Jagadish Kumar

kjagadishkumar@pvamu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Juvenile Justice, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX, 2023

M.Sc. Criminology and Criminal Justice Science, University of Madras, Chennai, India, 2018

Postgraduate course in Victimology, Victim Assistance, and Criminal Justice, Inter-University Centre, Dubrovnik, Croatia, Europe, 2017

B.A. Journalism, Psychology and Women's Studies, N.M.K.R.V. College for Women, Bangalore University, Bangalore, India, 2016

ACADEMIC & WORK EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX, 2020-2023

Graduate Research Assistant, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX, 2019-2020

PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Jagadish Kumar, K.,* Bolli, P., & Cintron, M. (2021). The criminalization of low-rank castes: A historical perspective of Mahad Movement in India (1927-1937). In V. Vegh Weis, *Criminalization of activism: Historical, present, and future perspective on the over-criminalization of dissent*. Routledge.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Society of Criminology
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

HONORS

First place- Graduate Student Presentation (completed study), Conference for Interdisciplinary Student Research, Prairie View A&M University, April 12, 2022.

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) Doctoral Summit 2022 Scholarship