



University of  
New Haven

University of New Haven  
**Digital Commons @ New Haven**

---

Criminal Justice Faculty Publications

Criminal Justice

---

2010

# Practitioner Perceptions of Juvenile Transfer in Pennsylvania

David Myers

*University of New Haven, [dmyers@newhaven.edu](mailto:dmyers@newhaven.edu)*

Daniel Lee

*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

Dennis Giever

*Indiana University of Pennsylvania*

Jay Gilliam

*University of Illinois at Springfield*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.newhaven.edu/criminaljustice-facpubs>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

## Publisher Citation

Myers, D. L., Lee, D., Giever, D., & Gilliam, J. (2010). Practitioner perceptions of juvenile transfer in Pennsylvania. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 9(3):1541204010391216.

## Comments

This is the authors' accepted version of the article published in *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. The final version is available at Sage Publications: <http://dx.doi.org/0.1177/1541204010391216>

Running Head: PRACTITIONER PERCEPTIONS OF JUVENILE TRANSFER

Practitioner Perceptions of Juvenile Transfer in Pennsylvania\*

David L. Myers, Daniel Lee, and Dennis Giever  
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Jay Gilliam  
University of Illinois Springfield

\* A previous version of this paper was presented at the 2010 Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Annual Meeting in San Diego, CA. This research was supported by the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (2004-DS-19-16255). We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, which improved the quality of the manuscript. Correspondence should be addressed to Dr. David L. Myers, Department of Criminology, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA 15705. Electronic mail may be sent to [david.myers@iup.edu](mailto:david.myers@iup.edu).

### Abstract

Consistent with virtually all other states in the nation, in the mid-1990s legislation was enacted in Pennsylvania to address increasing concerns about serious and violent juvenile offending. This legislation included provisions for facilitating the transfer of violent juvenile offenders to adult criminal court. The current study examines contemporary practitioner perceptions of juvenile transfer to adult court, with regard to the number of juveniles transferred, the effectiveness of this practice, and the appropriate minimum age for transfer to occur. Utilizing statewide survey data, comparisons are made between juvenile court judges, probation officers, prosecutors, and public defenders, and other predictors are assessed. The findings indicate modest overall support for transferring juveniles to adult court, with various significant differences across practitioner groups. Policy implications are discussed.

Keywords: juvenile transfer, juvenile waiver, juvenile justice, youth violence

### Practitioner Perceptions of Juvenile Transfer in Pennsylvania

Throughout much of the 1990s, both during and following years of rising juvenile violent crime arrest rates, policy-makers and practitioners moved rapidly to strengthen the procedures and sanctions available for handling serious and violent adolescent offenders (Howell, 1997; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999, 2006). Growing concerns about a nationwide youth violence epidemic and the perceived emergence of juvenile “super-predators” (DiIulio, 1995, 1996) fueled the passage of laws that sought to deemphasize traditional juvenile court philosophy and confidentiality, while increasing information sharing, sentencing options, public safety, and offender accountability to victims and the community. The most popular and politically touted reform effort emerged in laws that were enacted to ease the process of transferring (also known as waiving, certifying, or remanding) adolescents to adult criminal court (Bishop, 2000; Fagan & Zimring, 2000; Jordan, 2006; Kupchik, 2006; Myers, 2001, 2005; Snyder, Sickmund, & Poe-Yamagata, 2000). By the turn of the century, virtually all states had adopted or modified laws that were intended to facilitate the transfer of juveniles to the adult criminal justice system (Adams & Addie, 2009; Griffin, 2003, 2008; Griffin, Torbet, & Szymanski, 1998; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999, 2006).

This transfer movement appeared to be fueled by strong public support (Feiler & Sheley, 1999; Meddis, 1993; Schwartz, Guo, & Kerbs, 1993; Sprott, 1998; Triplett, 1996). In general, many citizens seemed to believe that youthful offenders were “getting off easy” in juvenile court, and that lenient treatment was contributing greatly to increasing levels of violent juvenile crime (Greenwood, 1995). In the adult system, it was thought that serious and violent adolescent offenders would be held more accountable and would receive harsher punishment. This, in turn,

would have a beneficial impact on juvenile crime, by producing greater retribution, stronger deterrence, and lengthier incapacitation.

Although supportive of transferring serious and violent offenders to adult court, it is noteworthy that the general public did not actually favor giving juveniles the same sentences as adults or placing them in adult correctional facilities (Schwartz et al., 1993; Sprott, 1998, Triplett, 1996). In addition, considerable support was shown for juvenile rehabilitation and intervention efforts, particularly for younger offenders (Cullen et al., 1998; Mears, Hay, Gertz, & Mancini, 2007; Moon, Sundt, Cullen, & Wright, 2000; Nagin, Piquero, Scott, & Steinberg, 2006). It is also essential to recognize that expanded juvenile transfer laws generally were not guided by systematic research and empirical support (Farrington, Ohlin, & Wilson, 1986; Howell, 1996, 1997; Myers, 2001, 2005; Redding, 2003, 2008). In fact, contemporary research has greatly questioned the efficacy of this practice. In spite of conditional public support and an overall lack of confirmatory scientific evidence, modern waiver laws and revisions remain in place, and both the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems (along with youthful offenders) are impacted by their presence.

The sheer volume and variety of contemporary policies and practices in American juvenile justice is difficult to overstate, and whether many of them are effective remains largely unknown (Howell, 2003; Krisberg, 2005; Mears, Shollenberger, Willison, Owens, & Butts, 2008). The practice of transferring juveniles to adult court, though, has been subjected to a great deal of research, including examinations of the characteristics of waived youth, case outcomes in adult court, the recidivism of transferred offenders, and the impact of expanded waiver laws on aggregate adolescent crime rates (Bishop, 2000; Fagan & Zimring, 2000; Jordan, 2006; Kupchik, 2006; Myers, 2001, 2005; Redding, 2003, 2008). While relatively few research findings have

been supportive, one notable void in the literature pertains to practitioner views about the use and effectiveness of this practice (Mears et al., 2008). The current study represents an effort to fill this identified void.

More specifically, we seek to contribute to further discussions about juvenile transfer policies by analyzing data from a statewide survey of juvenile court practitioners in Pennsylvania. Legislative actions in Pennsylvania during the mid-1990s illustrate the way many states enacted laws pertaining to a variety of juvenile justice issues, including the criminal prosecution of adolescent offenders (Jordan, 2006; Myers, 2001, 2005; Snyder et al., 2000). Amid much political fanfare, and in response to statewide increases in youth violence, legislators in Pennsylvania modified the juvenile code through the passage of Act 33 of 1995 (Griffin, 2006; Sampson, 1995a, 1995b; Stanley, 1996). In doing so, certain serious and violent juvenile offenders were statutorily excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction and were charged automatically as adults. This was done with the expectation that the number of juveniles processed in adult criminal court would increase substantially, thereby enhancing public safety and offender accountability.

As part of a larger juvenile justice evaluation project, survey data were collected from juvenile court judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers from across Pennsylvania. Our current analyses focus on practitioner views about: a) whether greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred to the adult criminal justice system; b) whether statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction is an effective way to handle this type of juvenile offending; c) whether Pennsylvania's Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime; and d) at what age individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. We begin by describing the context of our study, and

then present the data, methods, and findings. We also discuss the resulting implications for juvenile justice policy and research.

### Context of the Study and Prior Research

All states currently allow certain juveniles to be tried in adult court or otherwise face adult sanctions, but great variation exists with regard to the specific waiver methods employed (Adams & Addie, 2009; Griffin, 2008; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Three primary mechanisms exist: 1) judicial waiver, whereby a juvenile court judge makes the decision to transfer an eligible youth; 2) prosecutorial waiver (also known as concurrent jurisdiction or direct file), which provides prosecutors with the discretion and authority to file eligible charges in either juvenile or adult court; and 3) legislative waiver (or statutory exclusion), which exists through state statutes that exclude certain juvenile offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction and originate eligible cases in adult criminal court (for detailed discussion of these methods, see Bishop, 2000; Fagan & Zimring, 2000; Griffin, 2003, 2008; Jordan, 2006; Kupchik, 2006; Myers, 2001, 2005; and Snyder et al., 2000). Most states employ more than one of these methods simultaneously, and many add additional provisions for such things as “reverse waiver” or “decertification” from adult to juvenile court, “once an adult, always an adult” case processing requirements, and blended sentencing that allows youthful offenders to serve correctional sanctions in both the juvenile and adult systems and facilities (Griffin, 2008; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006).

All but a few states have judicial waiver provisions, but judicially waived cases likely represent less than 10% of all juveniles who are processed in the adult criminal system (Bishop, 2000; Howell, 1997; Myers, 2001, 2005). The total number of cases judicially waived to criminal court peaked in 1994 at 13,000; subsequently, this number declined by 47% to 6,900 cases in 2005 (Adams & Addie, 2009). Only 15 states allow for prosecutorial waiver, but available data

suggest that the number of prosecutorial waivers nationwide might be double or triple that of judicial waivers (Bishop, 2000; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999, 2006). Finally, 29 states employ legislative waiver or statutory exclusion (Griffin, 2008; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). Although difficult to estimate, this latter method undoubtedly accounts for the largest number of transferred juveniles. Overall, based on available police arrest and referral data, along with juvenile and adult court data, it appears likely that roughly 200,000 or more youths under the age of 18 are prosecuted annually in adult criminal courts under the various laws, methods, and procedures available today (Bishop, 2000; Myers, 2005).

### *Prior Research*

During the past several decades, policies and procedures surrounding juvenile transfer to adult court have been subjected to a great deal of research. Various authors have provided excellent presentations of the historical development of the waiver process, and numerous investigators have examined such topics as the offense and offender characteristics of transferred youth, case outcomes in adult court, the recidivism of transferred offenders, and the impact of expanded waiver laws on aggregate adolescent crime rates (for thorough reviews of this literature, see Bishop, 2000; Fagan & Zimring, 2000; Jordan, 2006; Kupchik, 2006; Myers, 2001, 2005; and Redding, 2003, 2008). Although this research has sometimes been of uneven quality and scientific rigor, many findings and conclusions have indicated limited support at best for expanded transfer laws.

Research generally indicates, for example, that modern waiver laws have increased the number of younger offenders who are sent to adult court, but many of these youth subsequently are directed back to juvenile court through reverse waiver or decertification proceedings (Jordan, 2006; Jordan & Myers, 2007; Snyder et al., 2000). In addition, offense seriousness and prior



record are consistent predictors of juvenile transfer, but some studies have found high dismissal and decertification rates even for serious and violent offenders in adult court (Jordan, 2006; Jordan & Myers, 2007, 2008; Singer, 1996; Snyder et al., 2000). Although violent youth in adult court tend to experience higher conviction and incarceration rates than youthful property offenders, case processing time is much longer in adult court than in juvenile court, and many transferred offenders are released back into the community on bail or after serving relatively short sentences of incarceration as teenagers (Jordan, 2006; Jordan & Myers, 2008; Bishop, 2000; Fagan, 1995; Myers, 2001, 2005; Podkopacz & Feld, 1996; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006).

Various studies in different jurisdictions also have investigated the impact of expanded waiver laws on aggregate juvenile crime rates. Singer and McDowall (1988), Jensen and Metsger (1994), Risler, Sweatman, and Nackerud (1998), and Steiner and Wright (2006) all found virtually no evidence that expanded waiver laws had a beneficial impact on overall juvenile offending. In fact, some of their findings revealed increases in aggregate juvenile crime following the enactment of expanded waiver laws. Levitt (1998), in contrast, did uncover overall decreases in youth crime as adolescents reach the age of criminal responsibility. This was particularly true in those states where juvenile and adult sanctions differ significantly in their severity, suggesting that more punitive punishments imposed by adult courts may deter youth from offending once they reach the legal age of adulthood. Lee and McCrary (2005), however, found that adolescent offending rates in Florida were not lowered as youth turned age 18, indicating that the prospect of adult criminal sanctions was not a general deterrent. Overall, then, the bulk of empirical evidence suggests that transfer laws have little or no general deterrent effect on overall juvenile crime, although it is possible that sufficiently publicizing transfer laws

and educating delinquent youth about the legal consequences of serious and violent offending could provide some deterrence (Redding, 2008).

With regard to specific deterrence, contemporary research findings appear even more clear and consistent. Studies comparing youth who were prosecuted as adults with similar offenders who were handled in the juvenile system have found repeated evidence that transferred youth exhibit higher levels of recidivism, recidivate sooner, and engage in more serious forms of recidivism (Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner, 1996; Fagan, 1995, 1996; Lanza-Kaduce, Lane, Bishop, & Frazier, 2005; Myers, 2001, 2003, 2005; Podkopacz & Feld, 1996; Redding, 2008; Winner, Lanza-Kaduce, Bishop, & Frazier, 1997). In particular, this research has established substantially higher recidivism rates for violent offenders prosecuted as adults, while the findings are more moderate and somewhat mixed for property and drug offenders in adult court. As summarized by Redding (2008, p. 6), “the extant research provides sound evidence that transferring juvenile offenders to the criminal court does not engender community protection by reducing recidivism. On the contrary, transfer substantially increases recidivism.”

One notable gap in the transfer literature pertains to practitioner views about this response to serious and violent youthful offending and the effectiveness of this practice. Overall, relatively few studies have investigated practitioner opinions about juvenile justice policies and procedures, or how to improve the juvenile justice system (Mears et al., 2008). Mears and his colleagues did recently report on a national survey they conducted to measure how juvenile justice professionals view modern changes in juvenile justice policy and practice. Their survey targeted experienced juvenile court judges, prosecutors, public defenders, court administrators, and chief probation officers from each of the nation’s 300 most populated counties. Based on a

response rate of 52%, the final sample included 534 juvenile justice professionals who completed a self-administered questionnaire.

Overall, Mears et al. (2008) found a consensus that the most effective policies and practices are those focused on specialized or individualized treatment and rehabilitation, graduated sanctions, and risk and needs assessment, while such approaches as reduced confidentiality of court records, transfer to adult criminal court, juvenile curfew laws, and parental accountability generally were not reported to be effective. Prosecutors and public defenders differed substantially in their views; prosecutors tended to favor more “get tough” measures, while public defenders held more favorable opinions of rehabilitative programming. Finally, when asked about ways to improve juvenile justice, practitioners identified expansion of system resources, greater collaboration within the juvenile justice system and between juvenile justice and families and communities, reliance on a broader range of sanctions, more prevention and early intervention, and a greater reliance on evidence-based practices and practitioners’ knowledge.

The current study adds to the transfer literature and builds on the findings of Mears and his colleagues by examining the views of juvenile court practitioners regarding the waiver of juveniles to adult criminal court in Pennsylvania. Specifically, we sought to answer the following research questions through a survey of Pennsylvania juvenile court judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers:

1. Should greater numbers of juvenile offenders be transferred to the adult criminal justice system?
2. Is statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction an effective way to handle this type of juvenile offending?

3. Has Pennsylvania's Act 33 had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime?
4. At what age should individuals be held criminally responsible for violent crime?

### Methodology

During the mid 1990s, at about the same time Act 33 was being implemented, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) began funding Juvenile Prosecution and Defense Capacity Building Projects (JPDCBP) in counties throughout the state (Myers, Giever, Lee, & Gilliam, 2008). From 1996 through 2006, nearly \$6.5 million in JPDCBP grant and matching funds were directed to 45 projects in 28 participating counties. Juvenile prosecutors and/or public defenders were hired in approximately 75% of all funded projects, and over 90% of the total budgeted expenditures were for juvenile justice practitioner salary and benefits. Grant funds were provided in an effort to improve juvenile case processing capabilities, strengthen the coordination of juvenile court operations, and enhance the quality of juvenile advocacy and case preparation. Data for the current study were collected as part of a larger evaluation project focusing on the implementation and impact of JPDCBP throughout Pennsylvania.

### *Sample and Procedure*

In November 2006, a self-administered questionnaire<sup>1</sup> was mailed to four key respondent groups throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: juvenile court judges, prosecutors, public defenders, and probation officers. The survey was sent to all 213 President Judges, Juvenile Court Judges, and Juvenile Court Masters in each of the 67 counties in Pennsylvania, as listed in the *2006 Juvenile Court Directory* (Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission, 2006). Three copies of the survey also were mailed to the District Attorney, Public Defender, and Chief Juvenile Probation Officer in each of the 67 counties. In a cover letter, these individuals

were asked to distribute the survey to the three prosecutors, public defenders, and juvenile probation officers having the most experience handling juvenile cases in their offices.<sup>2</sup> A total of 816 questionnaires were mailed to the four key respondent groups, along with addressed and stamped envelopes for purposes of returning the survey.

A total of 384 completed surveys were returned. Based on the 816 questionnaires that were mailed, this would amount to a 47% response rate.<sup>3</sup> However, approximately 15 President Judges replied in letters, email messages, or phone calls that they were not handling juvenile cases and therefore would not be returning the survey. In addition, in many rural Pennsylvania counties, the offices of the District Attorney, Public Defender, and Juvenile Probation would not have three staff members experienced with handling cases in juvenile court. In these county offices, fewer than three surveys would have been distributed to staff members (the extra surveys were to be discarded, as instructed in the cover letter mailed with the questionnaire). Taking these factors into account, the actual response rate for the survey was likely well over 50%.

Survey covers were color-coded to identify subjects from the counties that received JPDCBP funds. A red cover was used for surveys that were sent to the 28 JPDCBP counties, and a blue cover was used for surveys sent to the 39 non-JPDCBP counties. This color-coding was done to allow for aggregate statistical comparisons to be made between JPDCBP and non-JPDCBP counties. The cover of each survey also was labeled in order to identify whether the survey respondent was a judge, prosecutor, public defender, or probation officer. This again was done for purposes of making statistical comparisons between the four groups of juvenile court professionals.

### *Measures*

Survey items were designed to generate quantitative data for the overall evaluation of JPDCBP. In addition to soliciting demographic information and other personal characteristics, the questionnaire contained numerous items in the form of visual analog or rating scales (DeVellis, 2003). Through using this technique, respondents were presented with a series of statements regarding various juvenile justice policies, practices, and procedures. For each statement, participants were asked to mark their responses on a 10-centimeter line. Most of these lines were anchored by “Strongly Disagree” and “Strongly Agree,” which enabled respondents to estimate their level of disagreement or agreement with each statement. Other response continuums were anchored by “Not Productive At All” and “Extremely Productive;” “Not At All a Problem” and “Very Serious Problem;” and “Never Happens” and “Always Happens.” Scores for each item were measured, by hand, with rulers. As noted by DeVellis (2003), continuous visual analog scales provide the benefits of differentiation and sensitivity in scores, and it is difficult for respondents to encode (either intentionally or unintentionally) their past responses with much precision.

Following data coding and entry, frequency distributions and descriptive statistics were computed and assessed. Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics for the variables employed in the current study. As discussed below, means for the dummy variables (coded 0 and 1) that appear in Table 1 should be interpreted as the proportion of cases coded as 1 for that particular variable.

*Independent variables.* Dummy variables (coded 0 and 1) were used to indicate the type of profession for each respondent. Surveys were returned by 161 juvenile probation officers (*Probation*; 42% of the sample), 100 juvenile court judges (*Judge*; 26%), 75 juvenile prosecutors (*Prosecutor*; 20%), and 48 juvenile public defenders (*Defender*; 12%). The average age of

respondents was nearly 45 years old (*Age*); 69% were male (*Male* = 1), 31% were female (*Male* = 0), and 79% were married (*Married*; 0 = No; 1 = Yes).<sup>4</sup> Participants reported working an average of 10 years in their current position (*Worked Position*) and almost 14 years in the field of juvenile justice (*Worked Field*), with about 55% of their current workload being devoted to juvenile cases (*Percent Juvenile*). A total of 192 surveys (exactly 50%) were returned from counties that received JPDCBP awards, with the other half coming from unfunded counties (*JPDCBP*; 0 = no funding, 1 = received funding). About 16% of the respondents reported being from an urban county (*Urban* = 1), and 84% were from rural or suburban counties (*Urban* = 0).

The remaining independent variables utilized for our current analyses were measured through visual analog scales, with response lines primarily anchored by “Strongly Disagree” and “Strongly Agree.” Scores for *Prosecutor Lead* were in response to the statement “Juvenile prosecutors have taken the lead in developing graduated sanctions (i.e., intermediate punishments of increasing severity) for serious and repeat juvenile offenders.” The mean score of 3.22 for this variable was based on respondent marks on the corresponding 10-centimeter line, generally indicating overall disagreement with the statement. Responses for *JJ System* were in reaction to “A separate and distinct juvenile justice system should remain in place to process juvenile offenders.” Here, the mean of 8.34 indicates moderate to strong agreement with the statement. *Crime Problem* was based on “Adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago.” The mean of 6.74 indicates at least modest overall agreement. Scores for *Insufficient GS* were in response to the item “Insufficient graduated sanctions (i.e., intermediate punishments of increasing severity) for serious and repeat offenders,” for which the corresponding 10-centimeter line was anchored by “Not At All a Problem” and “Very Serious

Problem.” The mean of 3.89 suggests that survey participants did not view this as a serious problem in their county’s juvenile system.

The next three variables listed in Table 1 measured respondents’ self-reported knowledge of Pennsylvania juvenile justice principals, provisions, and procedures. To begin, during the mid 1990s (at the same time Act 33 was implemented and JPDCBP began to be funded), Pennsylvania embraced the philosophy and principals of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) as an operating framework for its juvenile justice system (Griffin, 2006; Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission, n.d.; Seyko, 2001). In general, under BARJ, “balanced attention” is to be given to ensuring the protection and safety of the community, holding offenders accountable to their victims and the community, and developing offender competencies. Scores for *Know BARJ* were based on the statement “I am knowledgeable of the principals of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) in Pennsylvania.” The mean of 7.98 indicates at least moderate overall agreement with the statement. Similarly, responses for *Know Act 33* were based on “I am knowledgeable of the provisions of Pennsylvania’s Act 33 (Special Session No. 1 of 1995,” with the mean of 7.43 suggesting moderate agreement. The third knowledge variable, *Know Rules*, was based on the statement “I am knowledgeable of the Pennsylvania Rules of Juvenile Court Procedure (effective October 1, 2005).” The mean of 7.97 again indicates at least moderate overall agreement.

Finally, two additional variables measured practitioner views on contemporary juvenile justice in Pennsylvania. Scores for *Balanced System* were based on the statement “The juvenile justice system gives balanced attention to the victim, the offender, and the community.” The mean of 6.91 once again suggests moderate overall agreement. The mean for *BARJ Effective* was



nearly identical, at 6.82, and was based on responses to the statement “Balanced and restorative justice is an effective approach to dealing with juvenile delinquency.”

*Dependent variables.* Four dependent variables were employed for the current study. *Greater Transfer* was based on the statement “Greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred to the adult criminal justice system.” The mean of 4.34 suggests modest overall disagreement with the statement. Scores for *Statutory Exclusion* were in response to “Statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders from juvenile court (i.e., directing accused youth to stand trial in adult criminal court based on the charged offense) is an effective way to handle this type of juvenile offending.” Here, the mean of 5.65 indicates modest overall agreement. For *Act 33*, responses were provided to “Pennsylvania’s Act 33 (Special Session No. 1 of 1995) has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime.” Moderate agreement was revealed, with a mean of 6.06. Finally, for *Transfer Age*, survey participants were asked at what age they thought individuals should be held criminally responsible (i.e., treated as an adult) for violent crimes.<sup>5</sup> The mean age reported was 15.62 years.

## Results

Prior to conducting multivariate analyses, we assessed differences in means for the four dependent variables across the four groups of juvenile justice practitioners. These findings appear in Table 2. We also estimated zero-order correlations for all variables, in order to consider bivariate associations among the independent variables and between the independent and dependent variables.<sup>6</sup> Bivariate correlations among the independent variables suggested that multicollinearity was not a problem. Only three of the correlations were greater than  $|.60|$ , and all were less than  $|.65|$ . The possibility of multicollinearity was further assessed when ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models were estimated, through the use of tolerance statistics and

variance inflation factors. These tests confirmed that multicollinearity did not pose a threat, as all tolerances were greater than .25 and all variance inflation factors were less than 4.0 (Lewis-Beck, 1980; Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989).

### *Comparisons by Profession*

As shown in Table 2, a number of statistically significant differences in means for the dependent variables existed across the four groups of juvenile justice professionals. Juvenile public defenders (Group “a”) indicated the strongest disagreement with the statements that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred (mean of 1.74); statutorily excluding serious and violent juvenile offenders is effective (mean of 1.89); and Pennsylvania’s Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime (mean of 4.43). They also reported the highest average age (nearly 17 years old) at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. In contrast, juvenile prosecutors (Group “b”) reported the highest levels of agreement with the statements that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred (mean of 5.98); statutorily excluding serious and violent juvenile offenders is effective (mean of 7.30); and Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime (mean of 6.13). They also indicated the lowest average age (14 years old) at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. For all four dependent variables, mean scores were significantly different between public defenders and prosecutors.

The mean scores for juvenile probations officers (Group “c”) tended to be most similar to those of juvenile prosecutors, and significantly different in all four cases from the means of juvenile public defenders. The one exception was for *Transfer Age*, where the mean for probation officers (15.78 years) was significantly higher than that reported by prosecutors (14.09 years). Finally, the mean scores of juvenile court judges (Group “d”) tended to be more like

those of juvenile public defenders. As compared to public defenders, however, judges did indicate significantly more agreement with the statements that statutorily excluding serious and violent juvenile offenders is effective (mean of 4.47) and that Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime (mean of 6.17). As compared to prosecutors and probation officers, judges indicated significantly less agreement with the statements that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred (mean of 2.91) and that statutorily excluding serious and violent juvenile offenders is effective. Moreover, as compared to prosecutors, judges reported a significantly higher age at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime (mean of 15.95 years).

#### *Multivariate Results*

The four dependent variables were measured continuously; skew and kurtosis statistics indicated acceptable normality for each variable. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression subsequently was utilized to examine possible relationships between the independent and dependent variables, while controlling for other influences (Lewis-Beck, 1980; Neter et al., 1989). For each dependent variable, three models were estimated.<sup>7</sup> Model 1 contained only the independent variables measuring demographics or personal characteristics. Model 2 included all of the variables in Model 1 plus the additional independent variables that measured juvenile justice perceptions through the use of visual analog scales. Due to the rather large number of independent variables (20) included in the full models, and the fact that a number of them were statistically insignificant, Model 3 was estimated using stepwise regression with forward insertion. This allowed for the statistical consideration of all independent variables, but produced a more parsimonious model that identified the independent variables having the greatest explanatory power for each dependent variable.<sup>8</sup>

Table 3 presents the multiple regression results for the dependent variable *Greater Transfer*. Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>s from Models 2 and 3 indicate that the independent variables account for 40% of the variation in the dependent variable. *Defender* was used as the omitted reference group in the regression models. In all three models contained in Table 3, *Prosecutor*, *Probation*, and *Judge* were positive and highly significant, indicating that practitioners from these three groups (as compared to public defenders) reported significantly stronger agreement with the statement that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred to the adult criminal justice system. In Models 2 and 3, the slope coefficients for *Prosecutor* and *Probation* were virtually identical and nearly twice as large as the coefficient for *Judge* (with similar standard errors). In addition, married respondents (*Married*) revealed significantly more agreement with the dependent variable statement than did non-married respondents, and those participants who reported a higher percentage of their workload as being devoted to juvenile cases (*Percent Juvenile*) also reported significantly higher agreement.

Concerning the perceptual variables, respondents who believed juvenile prosecutors have taken the lead in developing graduated sanctions for serious and repeat juvenile offenders (*Prosecutor Lead*) indicated significantly stronger agreement with the statement that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred. Furthermore, significantly more agreement was reported by survey participants who thought adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago (*Crime Problem*), while those who thought the juvenile system gives balanced attention to the victim, the offender, and the community (*Balanced System*) were significantly less agreeable to transferring greater numbers of juvenile offenders. Finally, in Model 3, *Know Rules* was positive and significant, suggesting that respondents who reported being more knowledgeable of the Pennsylvania Rules of Juvenile Court Procedure also were

more agreeable to transferring greater numbers of juvenile offenders to the adult criminal justice system.

Table 4 provides regression results for the dependent variable *Statutory Exclusion*. Adjusted R<sup>2</sup>s from Models 2 and 3 again indicate that the independent variables account for close to 40% of the variation in the dependent variable. As in Table 3, the slope coefficients for *Prosecutor*, *Probation*, and *Judge* were positive and highly significant across all three models. This indicates that when controlling for the other variables, juvenile prosecutors, probation officers, and judges were significantly more likely than public defenders to agree with the statement that statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction is an effective way to handle this type of offending. In addition, the slopes for *Prosecutor* and *Probation* were about twice as large as the coefficient for *Judge*. *Married* respondents again were significantly more agreeable with the dependent variable statement than were non-married respondents, and males were significantly more agreeable than females (*Male*).

With regard to the perceptual variables, only two were statistically significant. Respondents who believed adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago (*Crime Problem*) were significantly more agreeable with the statement that statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders is effective. *Know Rules* also was positive and significant, indicating that survey participants who reported being more knowledgeable of the Pennsylvanian Rules of Juvenile Court Procedure also were more supportive of the effectiveness of statutory exclusion.

The OLS regression estimates for the dependent variable *Act 33* are shown in Table 5. Here, the adjusted R<sup>2</sup>s from Models 2 and 3 reveal that the independent variables account for about 33% of the variation in the dependent variable. Notably, while controlling for the other

independent variables (Models 2 and 3), *Prosecutor*, *Probation*, and *Judge* all became statistically insignificant. In combination with the bivariate comparisons, this suggests that when taking the other variables into account, the four groups of juvenile justice professionals expressed similar agreement with the statement that Pennsylvania's Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime. Moreover, none of the other variables measuring demographics or personal characteristics were found to be significant.

Four of the perceptual variables were statistically significant in Models 2 and 3. Respondents who believed juvenile prosecutors have taken the lead in developing graduated sanctions for serious and repeat juvenile offenders (*Prosecutor Lead*) indicated significantly stronger agreement with the statement that Pennsylvania's Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime. Again, significantly more agreement was reported by survey participants who thought adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago (*Crime Problem*), while those who reported being more knowledgeable of the Pennsylvanian Rules of Juvenile Court Procedure also were more supportive of Act 33. Finally, *BARJ Effective* had by far the most highly significant relationship with the dependent variable. This indicates that respondents who believed Balanced and Restorative Justice is an effective approach to dealing with juvenile crime also expressed significantly more support for Pennsylvania's Act 33.

Finally, Table 6 presents the regression results for the dependent variable *Transfer Age*. In contrast to previous tables, the adjusted  $R^2$ s indicate that the independent variables explain less than 20% of the variation in the dependent variable. In the current models, *Prosecutor*, *Probation*, and *Judge* were consistently negative and significant, meaning practitioners from those groups (as compared to public defenders) reported significantly lower ages at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. In Models 2 and 3, the slope

coefficients for *Prosecutor* were nearly twice as large as the coefficients for *Probation* and *Judge* (again, with similar standard errors). In addition, *Worked Field* was positive and significant in Models 1 and 3, suggesting that working a longer time in the field of juvenile justice was associated with higher reported ages at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime.

Concerning the perceptual variables, *JJ System* was positive and significant, indicating that respondents who agreed that a separate and distinct juvenile justice system should remain in place to process juvenile offenders also tended to report higher ages at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. Lastly, significantly lower ages for holding individuals criminally responsible for violent crime were reported by survey participants who thought adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago (*Crime Problem*).

#### Discussion and Conclusions

As noted by Mears and his colleagues (2008), few past studies have investigated practitioner views about juvenile justice policies and their effectiveness. Practitioners may have unique insights about whether certain policies are needed and if they are effective, and in combination with other evaluation research, findings from studies of practitioner perceptions can be used to generate better understanding of important topics and inform policy debates. Although the topic of juvenile transfer to adult court has been subjected to a great deal of research during the past two decades, the current study adds to this body of literature by drawing on the views of knowledgeable “insiders” who are familiar with juvenile transfer policies and procedures in Pennsylvania.

Although violent juvenile crime arrest rates and violent juvenile victimization rates have fallen steadily since the mid 1990s, to levels similar to those of the mid 1980s (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006), prior research does not suggest that new or expanded juvenile transfer laws are the reason. As compared to prior findings, our results indicate modest support, at best, for waiving juveniles to adult court. On average, survey respondents did not agree that greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred to the adult criminal justice system. Moderate overall support was expressed for statutorily excluding serious and violent offenders from juvenile court, and for Pennsylvania's Act 33 having had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime. In addition, the average age expressed for when individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crimes was 15.6 years, which is slightly higher than the minimum age of 15 specified in Pennsylvania's statutory exclusion law (i.e., Act 33).

When comparisons of the dependent variables were made across professions, it was revealed that, consistent with Mears and his colleagues (2008), juvenile prosecutors and public defenders differed dramatically in their views. Prosecutors expressed much more agreement that: a) greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred; b) statutory exclusion is effective for serious and violent juvenile offenders; and c) Pennsylvania's Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime. They also reported the lowest average age (14 years) at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. With the exception of the minimum age at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime, probation officer perceptions were similar to those of prosecutors, while the views of juvenile court judges were more like those of public defenders. In sum, support for transferring juveniles to adult court was expressed to the greatest extent by prosecutors (although even their mean



scores for the first three dependent variables were not overly high), with probation officers providing additional support.

Multivariate regression analyses further confirmed differences across practitioner groups, except in the case of the *Statutory Exclusion* dependent variable. When other independent variables were entered into the models, no significant practitioner group differences were revealed for the statement “Pennsylvania’s Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime.” For this dependent variable, *BARJ Effective* was a highly significant predictor, suggesting that those who perceived Act 33 as having a beneficial impact on juvenile crime also believed that Balanced and Restorative Justice is an effective approach to dealing with juvenile delinquency. In other words, the effectiveness of Act 33 was associated strongly with the perceived effectiveness of BARJ in the juvenile system, while taking into account practitioner type and the other independent variables.

Another variable that was a consistent predictor of all four dependent variables was *Crime Problem*. Respondents who believed that adolescent crime is more of a problem today than it was 10 or 15 years ago also expressed significantly more agreement that: a) greater numbers of juvenile offenders should be transferred; b) statutory exclusion is effective for serious and violent juvenile offenders; and c) Pennsylvania’s Act 33 has had a beneficial impact on juvenile crime. They also reported significantly lower ages at which individuals should be held criminally responsible for violent crime. The consistent influence of *Crime Problem* on practitioner perceptions about juvenile transfer is important to consider, because “10 or 15 years ago” represents the early to mid 1990s, when juvenile violent crime arrest rates peaked and nationwide concerns were expressed about a growing body of “super-predators” throughout America. Considering that serious and violent juvenile crime arrest rates have been much lower

in recent years than in the early to mid 1990s (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006), it appears that practitioner support for juvenile transfer in Pennsylvania may be influenced, at least in part, by misperceptions about current and former trends in adolescent offending.

#### *Policy Implications and Future Research*

As long as there is a separate system of justice in place for dealing with juvenile offenders, which very likely will be the case for the foreseeable future, there also will be a perceived need and desire to treat some of these adolescents as adults. Few would argue that there are not certain older, chronic, and violent juvenile offenders who, for the sake of public safety, should be removed from society for long periods of time. Prior research and the results of the current study suggest, however, that extending the transfer of juveniles beyond those who are deemed the “most deserving” is not good public policy. The real issue, assuming juvenile transfer will not be totally eliminated, is which adolescent offenders should be waived to adult court and how they should be processed and sanctioned once they get there.

Various sources suggest that 75% or more of all transferred youth are age 16 or older (Bishop, 2000; Bishop & Frazier, 2000; Myers, 2001, 2005). Aside from prosecutors, survey respondents in the current study also expressed an average age of about 16 years as being appropriate for holding individuals criminally responsible for violent crime. Other research indicates an older age at offense is consistently associated with a greater likelihood of transfer (Bishop, 2000; Myers, 2005), and a younger age has been associated with a greater likelihood of decertification (Jordan, 2006; Jordan & Myers, 2007; Snyder et al., 2000). Overall, these findings suggest that a minimum age of 16 may be appropriate as a standard to consider for juvenile transfer, at least for all crimes other than murder.

Next, regardless of which waiver method is employed, transferring greater numbers of juvenile offenders is not supported by past studies or the current research. Rather, a greater focus on violent recidivists and offenders who use firearms during the commission of their crimes seems justified. Research shows that violent juvenile gun users typically receive more immediate attention and severe sanctions in adult court, as do adolescents with more serious and extensive offending backgrounds (Myers, 2001, 2005). In sum, older youths who both employ a firearm during the commission of a crime and display a notable delinquent background would appear most appropriate as the focus of juvenile transfer policies, if the key goal is to advance public safety. This mainly would be achieved through the lengthier incarceration, incapacitation, and treatment that potentially can be provided to dangerous offenders through the adult correctional system.

Finally, there are several areas where additional research is needed on the topic of juvenile transfer. First, further survey and qualitative research should be done with practitioners from both the juvenile and adult court and correctional systems. Findings from this line of study would be useful in helping to shape or modify juvenile transfer policies and explaining previous research results, such as the consistent finding of greater recidivism among waived offenders. Second, more survey and qualitative research also should be done with serious and violent youthful offenders in both the juvenile and adult systems, to better understand how these adolescents view and interpret juvenile transfer policies, and to consider the experiences of these youths in court and correctional facilities. These types of research would add to the substantial body of transfer literature that currently exists.

## References

- Adams, B., & Addie, S. (2009). *Delinquency cases waived to criminal court, 2005*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Bishop, D. M. (2000). Juvenile offenders in the adult criminal justice system. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 27, pp. 81-167). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bishop, D. M., & Frazier, C. E., (2000). Consequences of transfer. In J. Fagan & F. Zimring (Eds.), *The changing borders of juvenile justice: Transfer of adolescents to the criminal court* (pp. 227-276). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bishop, D. M., Frazier, C. E., Lanza-Kaduce, L., & Winner, L. (1996). The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Does it make a difference? *Crime & Delinquency*, 42(2), 171-191.
- Cullen, F. T., Wright, J. P., Brown, S., Moon, M. M., Blankenship, M. B., & Applegate, B. K. (1998). Public support for early intervention programs: Implications for a progressive policy agenda. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44(2), 187-204.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DiIulio, J. J. (1995). The coming of the super-predators. *Weekly Standard*, 1, 23-28.
- DiIulio, J. J. (1996). They're coming: Florida's youth crime bomb. *Impact*, 25-27.
- Fagan, J. (1995). Separating the men from the boys: The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, & J. J. Wilson (Eds.), *A sourcebook: Serious, violent, & chronic juvenile offenders* (pp. 238-260). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fagan, J. (1996). The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on

- recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Law and Policy*, 18(1-2), 77-114.
- Fagan, J., & Zimring, F. E. (2000). *The changing borders of juvenile justice: Transfer of adolescents to the criminal court*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Farrington, D. P., Ohlin, L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1986). *Understanding and controlling crime: Toward a new research strategy*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Feiler, S. M., & Sheley, J. F. (1999). Legal and racial elements of public willingness to transfer juvenile offenders to adult court. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 55-64.
- Greenwood, P. W. (1995). Juvenile crime and juvenile justice. In J. Q. Wilson, & J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Crime* (pp. 91-117). San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Griffin, P. (2003). *Trying and sentencing juveniles as adults: An analysis of state transfer and blended sentencing laws*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Griffin, P. (2006). *Ten years of Balanced and Restorative Justice in Pennsylvania*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Griffin, P. (2008). *Different from adults: An updated analysis of juvenile transfer and blended sentencing laws, with recommendations for reform*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Griffin, P., Torbet, P., & Szymanski, L. (1998). *Trying juveniles as adults in criminal court: An analysis of state transfer provisions*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Howell, J. C. (1996). Juvenile transfers to the criminal justice system: State of the art. *Law & Policy*, 18(1 & 2), 17-60.
- Howell, J. C. (1997). *Juvenile justice and youth violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J. C. (2003). *Preventing & reducing juvenile delinquency: A comprehensive framework*.

- Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jensen, E. J., & Metsger, L. K. (1994). A test of the deterrent effect of legislative waiver on violent juvenile crime. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(1), 96-104.
- Jordan, K. L. (2006). *Violent youth in adult court: The decertification of transferred offenders*. New York: LFB Scholarly.
- Jordan, K. L., & Myers, D. L., (2007). The decertification of transferred youth: Examining the determinants of reverse waiver. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 5(2), 188-206.
- Jordan, K. L., & Myers, D. L., (2008). Juvenile transfer and deterrence: Reexamining the effectiveness of a “get-tough” policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, Pre-published July 11, 2008, DOI: 10.1177/0011128708319111.
- Krisberg, B. A. (2005). *Juvenile justice: Redeeming our children*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kupchik, A. (2006). *Judging juveniles: Prosecuting adolescents in adult and juvenile courts*. New York: New York University Press.
- Lanza-Kaduce, L., Lane, J., Bishop, D. M., & Frazier, C. E., (2005). Juvenile offenders and adult felony recidivism: The impact of transfer. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 28(1), 59-77.
- Lee, D. S., & McCrary, J. (2005). *Crime, punishment, and myopia*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Levitt, S. D. (1998). Juvenile crime and punishment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(6), 1156-1185.
- Lewis-Beck, M. S. (1980). *Applied regression: An introduction* (Sage University Paper Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 07-022). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mears, D. P., Hay, C., Gertz, M., & Mancini, C. (2007). Public opinion and the foundation of the juvenile court. *Criminology*, 45(1), 223-257.

- Mears, D. P., Shollenberger, T. L., Willison, J. B., Owens, C. E., & Butts, J. A. (2008). Practitioner views of priorities, policies, and practices in juvenile justice. *Crime & Delinquency*, Pre-published November 11, 2008, DOI: 10.1177/00111287083246664.
- Meddis, S. V. (1993, October 29). Poll: Treat juveniles the same as adult offenders. *USA Today*, pp. A1, A11.
- Moon, M. M., Sundt, J. L., Cullen, F. T., & Wright, J. P. (2000). Is child saving dead? Public support for juvenile rehabilitation. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1), 38-60.
- Myers, D. L. (2001). *Excluding violent youths from juvenile court: The effectiveness of legislative waiver*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Myers, D. L. (2003). The recidivism of violent youths in juvenile and adult court: A consideration of selection bias. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 1(1), 79-101.
- Myers, D. L. (2005). *Boys among men: Trying and sentencing juveniles as adults*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Myers, D. L., Giever, D., Lee, D., & Gilliam, J. (2008). *An evaluation of Pennsylvania's juvenile prosecution and defense capacity building projects*. Available from [http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/juvenile\\_justice/7627](http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/juvenile_justice/7627)
- Nagin, D. S., Piquero, A. R., Scott, E. S., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Public preferences for rehabilitation versus incarceration of juvenile offenders: Evidence from a contingent valuation survey. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5(4), 627-651.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1989). *Applied linear regression models* (2nd ed.). Burr Ridge, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.
- Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (n.d.). *Juvenile justice in Pennsylvania: Mission-driven, performance-based, outcome-focused*. Harrisburg, PA: Juvenile Court

Judges' Commission.

Pennsylvania Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (2006). *2006 Juvenile Court Directory*.

Harrisburg, PA: Juvenile Court Judges' Commission.

Podkopacz, M. R., & Feld, B. C. (1996). The end of the line: An empirical study of judicial waiver. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *86*(2), 449-492.

Redding, R. E. (2003). The effects of adjudicating and sentencing juveniles as adults. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *1*(2), 128-155.

Redding, R. E. (2008). *Juvenile transfer laws: An effective deterrent to delinquency?*

Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Risler, E. A., Sweatman, T., & Nackerud, L. (1998). Evaluating the Georgia legislative waiver's effectiveness in deterring juvenile crime. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *8*, 657-667.

Sampson, P. (1995a, April 2). Bill would expose crimes to media, public. *The Sunday Patriot News*, p. A6.

Sampson, P. (1995b, October 26). Senate addresses youth crimes: Serious offenses could bring automatic transfer to adult court. *The Patriot*, p. B5.

Schwartz, I. M., Guo, S., & Kerbs, J. J. (1993). The impact of demographic variables on public opinion regarding juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. *Crime & Delinquency*, *39*(1), 5-28.

Seyko, R. J. (2001). Balanced approach and restorative justice efforts in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. *The Prison Journal*, *81*(2), 187-205.

Singer, S. I. (1996). *Recriminalizing delinquency: Violent juvenile crime and juvenile justice reform*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Singer, S. I., & McDowall, D. (1988). Criminalizing delinquency: The deterrent effects of the



- New York juvenile offender law. *Law and Society Review*, 22(3), 521-535.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 National Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 National Report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Snyder, H. N., Sickmund, M., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (2000). *Juvenile transfers to criminal court in the 1990s: Lessons learned from four studies*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sprott, J. B. (1998). Understanding public opposition to a separate youth justice system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 44(3), 399-411.
- Stanley, B. (1996, November 17). States strengthen laws to crack down on juvenile crime: Now it's easier to try youths as adults across nation; impact unclear. *The Sunday Patriot News*, p. A4.
- Steiner, B., & Wright, E. (2006). Assessing the relative effects of state direct file waiver laws on violent juvenile crime: Deterrence or irrelevance? *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 96(4), 1451-1477.
- Triplett, R. (1996). The growing threat: Gangs and juvenile offenders. In T. J. Flanagan & D. R. Longmire (Eds.), *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Winner, L., Lanza-Kaduce, L., Bishop, D. M., & Frazier, C. E. (1997). The transfer of juveniles to criminal court: Reexamining recidivism over the long term. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43(4), 548-563.

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the full survey can be obtained from the authors. Development of the survey was guided by an 11-member advisory board consisting of juvenile justice experts convened to assist with the statewide evaluation of JPDCBP.

<sup>2</sup> We targeted the most experienced juvenile justice professionals in each county in order to draw on the insights and views of knowledgeable “insiders” who were familiar with a wide range of juvenile justice policies, programs, practices, and issues (Mears et al., 2008).

<sup>3</sup> Our response rate is consistent with that of other research based on surveys of practitioners (Mears et al., 2008).

<sup>4</sup> Race was not used as a demographic variable in the current study, because 96% of the respondents reported being white.

<sup>5</sup> The survey also asked respondents at what age individuals should be held criminally responsible (i.e., treated as an adult) for crime in general. Because Pennsylvania’s statutory exclusion law focuses on violent crimes, for the current study we correspondingly focused on the appropriate age of transfer for violent crimes.

<sup>6</sup> In order to conserve space, we do not present our correlation matrix here. Estimated zero-order correlations can be obtained from the authors.

<sup>7</sup> Mean replacement was used to account for the small amount of missing data. In addition, residual analyses were conducted for each model and indicated the OLS regression assumptions were met (Lewis-Beck, 1980; Neter et al., 1989).

<sup>8</sup> For the stepwise regression models, a p-value of .20 was utilized for independent variable insertion, and a p-value of .30 was used for independent variable removal.

Table 1

## Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>N</i>
<u>Independent:</u>					
Defender	0.12	0.33	0.00	1.00	384
Prosecutor	0.20	0.40	0.00	1.00	384
Probation	0.42	0.49	0.00	1.00	384
Judge	0.26	0.44	0.00	1.00	384
Male	0.69	0.46	0.00	1.00	380
Married	0.79	0.42	0.00	1.00	378
Urban	0.16	0.37	0.00	1.00	365
JPDCBP	0.50	0.50	0.00	1.00	384
Age	44.86	11.09	22.00	80.00	374
Worked Position	10.06	7.67	0.50	36.00	372
Worked Field	13.84	9.45	0.50	40.00	371
Percent Juvenile	54.88	38.83	0.00	100.00	374
Prosecutor Lead	3.22	2.34	0.00	9.90	378
JJ System	8.34	1.87	0.00	10.00	383
Crime Problem	6.74	2.58	0.00	10.00	377
Insufficient GS	3.89	2.51	0.00	10.00	381
Know BARJ	7.98	1.99	0.10	10.00	381
Know Act 33	7.43	2.25	0.10	10.00	377
Know Rules	7.97	1.58	2.20	10.00	382
Balanced System	6.91	2.34	0.00	10.00	381
BARJ Effective	6.82	2.32	0.00	10.00	376
<u>Dependent:</u>					
Greater Transfer	4.34	2.96	0.00	10.00	383
Statutory Exclusion	5.65	3.12	0.00	10.00	382
Act 33	6.06	2.31	0.00	10.00	368
Transfer Age	15.62	2.17	8.00	23.00	353

Table 2

## Dependent Variable Mean Comparisons by Profession

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Defender (a)</i>					
Greater Transfer	1.74 <sup>bc</sup>	2.35	0.00	10.00	48
Statutory Exclusion	1.89 <sup>bcd</sup>	2.20	0.00	7.90	47
Act 33	4.43 <sup>bcd</sup>	2.20	0.00	8.50	44
Transfer Age	16.93 <sup>bc</sup>	2.03	10.00	18.00	42
<i>Prosecutor (b)</i>					
Greater Transfer	5.98 <sup>ad</sup>	2.68	0.00	10.00	75
Statutory Exclusion	7.30 <sup>ad</sup>	2.38	1.00	10.00	75
Act 33	6.13 <sup>a</sup>	2.15	1.10	10.00	71
Transfer Age	14.09 <sup>acd</sup>	2.19	8.00	18.00	70
<i>Probation (c)</i>					
Greater Transfer	5.24 <sup>ad</sup>	2.80	0.00	10.00	161
Statutory Exclusion	6.71 <sup>ad</sup>	2.59	0.00	10.00	161
Act 33	6.41 <sup>a</sup>	2.30	0.00	10.00	159
Transfer Age	15.78 <sup>ab</sup>	1.79	8.00	23.00	154
<i>Judge (d)</i>					
Greater Transfer	2.91 <sup>bc</sup>	2.15	0.00	8.60	99
Statutory Exclusion	4.47 <sup>abc</sup>	2.85	0.00	9.90	99
Act 33	6.17 <sup>a</sup>	2.19	0.00	10.00	94
Transfer Age	15.95 <sup>b</sup>	2.19	8.00	21.00	87

Note: Superscripts a, b, c, and d indicate statistically significant differences in means;  $p < .05$

Table 3

OLS Regression Estimates for Greater Numbers of Juvenile Offenders Should Be Transferred to the Adult Criminal Justice System (N=384)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
Intercept	2.855 (.787)***	1.148 (1.158)	1.189 (1.065)
Prosecutor	4.020 (.460)***	3.372 (.480)***	3.295 (.468)***
Probation	3.247 (.453)***	3.314 (.488)***	3.204 (.451)***
Judge	1.746 (.466)***	1.725 (.501)***	1.699 (.480)***
Male	.201 (.288)	.381 (.274)	.360 (.271)
Married	.703 (.327)*	.765 (.311)*	.761 (.306)*
Urban	.105 (.377)	.170 (.359)	---
Funded	.232 (.262)	.224 (.250)	---
Age	-.041 (.019)*	-.034 (.018)	-.033 (.017)
Worked Position	-.011 (.022)	-.010 (.021)	---
Worked Field	-.036 (.020)	-.018 (.019)	-.023 (.018)
Percent Juvenile	.009 (.004)*	.008 (.004)*	.010 (.004)**
Prosecutor Lead	---	.193 (.059)***	.193 (.057)***
JJ System	---	-.133 (.069)	-.131 (.067)
Crime Problem	---	.228 (.049)***	.226 (.048)***
Insufficient GS	---	.011 (.052)	---
Know BARJ	---	.045 (.088)	---
Know Act 33	---	-.005 (.075)	---
Know Rules	---	.173 (.096)	.198 (.081)*
Balanced System	---	-.200 (.068)**	-.217 (.062)***
BARJ Effective	---	-.045 (.065)	---
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.312	.393	.400
F-test	16.815***	13.385***	20.664***

2-tailed significance: \* p < .05; \*\* p < .01; \*\*\* p < .001

Note: Unstandardized coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses) are presented

Table 4

OLS Regression Estimates for Statutorily Excluding Serious and Violent Offenders from Juvenile Court Jurisdiction is an Effective Way to Handle This Type of Juvenile Offending (N=384)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
Intercept	2.794 (.817)***	-.005 (1.224)	-.247 (1.066)
Prosecutor	5.154 (.477)***	4.463 (.507)***	4.486 (.466)***
Probation	4.635 (.470)***	4.071 (.516)***	4.028 (.411)***
Judge	2.734 (.484)***	2.119 (.530)***	2.151 (.462)***
Male	.664 (.299)*	.864 (.290)**	.828 (.283)**
Married	.598 (.339)	.675 (.328)*	.662 (.321)*
Urban	-.008 (.392)	-.044 (.379)	---
Funded	.198 (.273)	.189 (.264)	---
Age	-.036 (.020)	-.036 (.019)	---
Worked Position	.004 (.023)	.006 (.022)	---
Worked Field	-.018 (.021)	-.014 (.020)	---
Percent Juvenile	.000 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	---
Prosecutor Lead	---	-.019 (.063)	---
JJ System	---	-.100 (.073)	-.095 (.069)
Crime Problem	---	.264 (.052)***	.260 (.050)***
Insufficient GS	---	-.062 (.055)	---
Know BARJ	---	.032 (.093)	---
Know Act 33	---	.015 (.079)	---
Know Rules	---	.304 (.102)**	.312 (.080)***
Balanced System	---	-.079 (.072)	---
BARJ Effective	---	-.039 (.068)	---
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.326	.384	.396
F-test	17.861***	12.930***	28.881***

2-tailed significance: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Note: Unstandardized coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses) are presented

Table 5: OLS Regression Estimates for Pennsylvania's Act 33 has had a Beneficial Impact on Juvenile Crime (N=384)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
Intercept	4.082 (.705)***	1.776 (.927)	1.670 (.622)
Prosecutor	1.476 (.412)***	.017 (.385)	---
Probation	1.748 (.405)***	.072 (.391)	---
Judge	1.508 (.417)***	-.350 (.401)	---
Male	.189 (.257)	.201 (.219)	---
Married	.398 (.293)	.282 (.249)	---
Urban	.105 (.338)	.199 (.287)	---
Funded	-.081 (.235)	-.192 (.200)	-.264 (.191)
Age	.003 (.017)	.001 (.015)	---
Worked Position	.016 (.020)	.020 (.017)	---
Worked Field	-.019 (.018)	-.020 (.015)	---
Percent Juvenile	.002 (.004)	-.002 (.003)	---
Prosecutor Lead	---	.110 (.048)*	.128 (.042)**
JJ System	---	-.083 (.056)	-.085 (.053)
Crime Problem	---	.086 (.039)*	.079 (.038)*
Insufficient GS	---	-.028 (.042)	---
Know BARJ	---	-.054 (.070)	---
Know Act 33	---	.148 (.060)*	.107 (.045)*
Know Rules	---	-.038 (.077)	---
Balanced System	---	.027 (.054)	---
BARJ Effective	---	.509 (.052)***	.511 (.044)***
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.050	.329	.339
F-test	2.841***	10.400***	33.689***

2-tailed significance: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Note: Unstandardized coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses) are presented

Table 6

OLS Regression Estimates for At What Age Do You Think Individuals should be Held  
Criminally Responsible for Violent Crime (N=384)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>
Intercept	15.702 (.611)***	15.301 (.941)***	15.231 (.651)***
Prosecutor	-2.503 (.357)***	-2.141 (.390)***	-2.224 (.354)***
Probation	-1.315 (.351)***	-1.199 (.397)**	-1.109 (.325)***
Judge	-1.081 (.361)**	-.964 (.407)*	-1.046 (.344)**
Male	-.209 (.223)	-.228 (.223)	---
Married	.207 (.253)	.159 (.253)	---
Urban	.140 (.293)	.041 (.291)	---
Funded	.103 (.204)	.067 (.203)	---
Age	.006 (.015)	.001 (.015)	---
Worked Position	.010 (.017)	.010 (.017)	---
Worked Field	.037 (.016)*	-.026 (.016)	.030 (.011)**
Percent Juvenile	.005 (.003)	.004 (.003)	---
Prosecutor Lead	---	-.048 (.048)	---
JJ System	---	.130 (.056)*	.149 (.053)**
Crime Problem	---	-.103 (.040)**	-.100 (.039)**
Insufficient GS	---	.019 (.042)	---
Know BARJ	---	-.078 (.071)	---
Know Act 33	---	.095 (.061)	.078 (.047)
Know Rules	---	-.008 (.078)	---
Balanced System	---	.012 (.055)	---
BARJ Effective	---	.049 (.053)	---
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.159	.184	.199
F-test	7.566***	5.331***	14.630***

2-tailed significance: \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Note: Unstandardized coefficients (with standard errors in parentheses) are presented