E-ISSN 3048-0329 Vol. 1, Issue 2 (2024)
Doi: https://doi.org/10.37899/mjds.v1i2.49

Mahogany Journal De Social

Analyzing the Causes and Solutions for Racial Disparities in Juvenile Justice Systems

Anggi Putra[1]

[1]*Muslim University of Indonesia*

**Corresponding Author: Anggi putra*

Article Info

Article History:
Received: 5 April 2024
Revised: 8 May 2024
Accepted: 11 June 2024

Keywords:
Racial Disparities
Juvenile Justice
Socioeconomic Status
Implicit Bias
School Discipline

Abstract

This quantitative research looks at the reasons and steps to fixing the racial inequity in the juvenile justice system and the roles played by the socioeconomic status, implicit bias, and school disciplinary measures. With the help of the in-depth processing of juvenile justice files, disciplinary records in schools, and socioeconomic indicators, and complemented by the surveys of interested parties, the study finds meaningful patterns and causal links. The results demonstrate that in poorer neighborhoods, there is a higher rate of arrest and detention, whereas more implicit bias and here severity of school disciplinary measures affect minority youth in disproportional numbers. These findings support the idea of multidimensional intervention, such as economic support of fewer privileged communities, the education of the law enforcement and school officials on implicit bias, as well as the application of restorative justice in schools. Strong empirical evidence given by this study contributes to the further research on the topic of racial inequality in the juvenile justice and indicates viable measures available to reinforce the ideas of equity and justice.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of racial disparities in the juvenile justice system in the United States and other countries has been quite challenging for decades. Such inequalities are realized in many ways such as unfair arrests, indictments, incarceration and conviction of minorities than their white counterparts. The fact that these disparities still exist begs pertinent questions into the fairness and equity of the juvenile justice system and expresses the need to conduct studies that can allow one to draw the causes of these disparities and move on to finding efficient solutions. The importance of this research is that it might add to existing body of knowledge regarding racial disparities in the juvenile justice and provide recommendations to policy and practice. These disparities need to be addressed not only as a factor of justice and equality but more importantly, as a necessity of the long-term health of the youth in these communities and the communities themselves (Huntington & Scott, 2020). This study will serve as the basis of systemic change by highlighting the main causes of such disparities, as well as suggesting evidence-based solutions to them.

Socioeconomic status is one of the reasons that influence the populace of racial dissimilarities in the juvenile justice system. The fittingness of the minority youth in

lower layers of the socioeconomic ladder is connected to high instances of commission on delinquent behaviors (Padgaonkar et al., 2021). The under-privileged environments created by the absence of resources and opportunity in neighborhoods with high poverty levels may be warped in such a way that crime provides a more probable method of survival and success. Access to good education is minimal thus the minority youth in most cases end up studying in schools which are underfunded and do not have the facilities of offering quality and enjoyable education. They might also lack extracurricular activities, old textbooks, and resources, therefore, resulting in a lack of engagement and high dropout levels in these schools (McCabe et al., 2020).

Besides disadvantages in education, the minority communities experience poor quality social services. An example is that after school programs, mental health programs, and recreation centers may be nonexistent. Such service lapses mean that minority youngsters are deprived of the safety nets which would help channel them away in the direction of delinquency. Lack of these protective factors leads to the higher possibility of committing a criminal act, not because of a criminal nature but in response to their difficult neighborhoods (Todd-Fritz, 2023).

The institutionalized inequality of these social economic disadvantages is something that has become generational, thus the minority communities find it hard to get out of the loop of poverty and criminal activity. The economic mobility of minority families has been restricted due to the historical performance, namely redlining and discriminatory lending, that relegates them to disadvantaged neighborhoods with low prospects of social uplift (Reece, 2021; Massey, 2020). These institutional gateways are far enough to keep the minority youngsters excessively represented within the setting that places them at the risk of engaging in the juvenile justice system.

Studies have also shown that children belonging to a poor childhood have higher chances of getting involved in the juvenile justice system not because they commit more crimes but this is due to the fact that they have higher chances of being monitored, the child being reported and thus being adjudversed through the system. In the wealthy localities, minor offending can be accounted by the community or institutionally, whereas in the poor communities, this type of behavior tends to attract police and result in arrests (Braga et al., 2019). This difference in manner in which behaviors are dealt with compounds the unfair proportion of minority children in the justice system.

This overrepresentation is more so among young blacks and Hispanics who are more exposed to poverty and different forms of socioeconomic disadvantages than their white companions (Alvarado). To illustrate, among African American and white youth, the odds of detention or commitment are 6 to 1 (Dragomir & Tadros, 2020). It reflects not the truthful differences but in offending behavior but rather offending behavior caused by the difference arising due to socioeconomic and systematical discriminations.

The article by Myers et al. (2021) reveals that these socioeconomic conditions could not receive greater attention than the single focus on the juvenile justice system can address. Priorities in education, community services, and social services are essential to ensure that social services are invested in order to give minority youths an avenue to grow and prosper. Poverty reduction programs, including job training programs in parents, affordable housing, can also be of great assistance in offsetting the factors that lead to juvenile crimes (Magnuson & Duncan, 2019). Policymakers should strive to eliminate socioeconomic disparities by their address the major causes of the latter because this will allow reducing the overrepresentation of minority teenagers in juvenile justice and will make society more balanced and fairer.

The subjectivism of law enforcement officers, judges, as other stakeholders in the juvenile justice system is another major issue that leads to racial disparity. Implicit biases are subconscious prejudices or assessments that impact the knowledge, behaviors, and issues of individuals at an unconscious level (Suveren, 2022). Such prejudices may result in unequal treatment of minority youth on different levels of the juvenile justice system, during arrest, sentencing, etc.

Researchers have found that there is implicit bias that can determine whether a young person stops being arrested, how prosecutors address a case, and how judges can deal with punishment (Kovera, 2019). To give an example, the African American youth is more prone to being viewed as older and less innocent than their white peers, which results in their treatment (Levin, 2024). Such prejudices are frequently upheld by social, as well as popular media depictions of minorities as a particularly dangerous, delinquent youth (Lopez, 2022).

The school-to-prison pipeline is one of the major chains by which inequalities in the juvenile justice system among races are propagated. This is the phenomenon of ever-increasing policies and practices that not only push students, especially minority ones, out of the school setting and towards the juvenile and criminal justice systems but also causes reentry into the school-to-prison pipeline (McCarter et al., 2020). The use of zero-tolerance policies is one of the most popular aspects of this pipeline; these policies focus on fixed punishments, being strict and applied to different violations regardless of their background or levels of severity (Perry, 2021).

Such zero-tolerance policies make criminal minorities out of misbehavior that might have been addressed in school. To give an example, petty misbehaviours like lateness, dress code, or even a small disturbance during the classes can cost students the lifetime of suspensions, expulsions, and police referrals. These policies especially target minority students, so there are high rates of racial disparities in school discipline related to minorities (Riddle & Sinclair, 2019). Studies confirm that African American pupils have triple the chances of being suspended or expelled due to a comparable offense when compared to white pupils (Wegmann & Smith, 2019).

The ramification of such disciplinary measures is quite far-reaching. Expulsion and suspensions cause a loss of instructional time and loss of academic standing as students are taken out of the educational environment. Such separation with school may enhance the risk of school failure and school dropout, further leading to the risk of falls in juvenile justice (McCarter et al., 2020). Even the first disciplinary measures can cause a chain reaction, as the students excluded at school become more predisposed to delinquency, followed by even more contacts with the juvenile justice system.

In addition, school-to-prison pipeline is compounded by the fact that law-enforcement officers are in schools otherwise known as School Resource Officers (SROs). In schools, SROs are generally involved in keeping school at safety and order but the presence of SROs has the effect of criminalizing conducts that may otherwise be addressed by school administrators. To take a specific example, a conflict at school (or a fight on the playground, or disruptive behavior in the classroom) may result into an arrest, instead of going to the principal (Sprague & Walker, 2021). This reimagining of education to criminal responses to school based occurrences has a disproportionately impact on the minority students with more students being referred to the police in situations that the white students may face less severe punishment.

The effect of school to prison pipe does not only occur due to the direct effect of the disciplinary measures. The long term outcomes consist of heightened drop outs, reduced chances of education and employment as well as an enhanced possibility of future imprisonments. The accumulated effect on the minority students as a result

of these practices and policies also plays a crucial role in the existence of racial disparity in the juvenile justice system (Oglesby-Neal & Peterson, 2021).

As long as the policies that underlie said disproportion exist, then the school-to-prison pipeline must be mitigated. This incorporates the amendment of zero-tolerance stating that they should consider more context-sensitive and restorative ways of discipline. As an example, restorative justice approaches are aimed at healing the wrong and restoring relationships, not punishments. These strategies have been promising in decreasing suspensions and expulsions as well as enhancing school climate and better outcomes (McIntosh et al., 2021).

Moreover, educators and school administrators can be trained in implicit bias awareness, as well as culturally responsive practices, and this training can help to stop the disproportionate effect of disciplinary action with respect to minority students. Teachers also would be able to learn about the cultural backgrounds and experiences of their learners and approach them more effectively and equitably with their disciplinary practices (Landsman & Lewis, 2023). Also, minimizing the law enforcement on schools and elevating the numbers of counselors, social workers, and mental health specialists can help solve behavioral challenges in the education environment instead of the criminal justice system.

District, state and federal policy changes are important to facilitate such efforts. These are recodification of disciplines, application of restorative justice programs and sufficient funding of schools as a measure that allows the relevant support services. With proper tackling of the causative factors to the school-to-prison pipeline, stakeholders may strive to have an educational atmosphere that promotes all students and decreases the racial inequalities that infest the juvenile justice system.

The racial disparities in the juvenile justice system due to the white supremacy issues have been mitigated by various means, with some of them being successful and others not. Diversion programs where youths, now directed away through the justice system are placed in more community-based programs have proven to help reduce disparities (Hockenberry & Puzzanchera, 2020). Moreover, training sessions that were designed to eliminate implicit bias among law enforcement and judicial professionals have been created, however, their efficiency is yet to be evaluated comprehensively (FitzGerald et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, there are major challenges in spite of such efforts. Most of the interventions are short-term, and they do not deal with wider structural and systemic factors that cause disparities (Clark et al., 2022). Besides, the quality of implemented programs should be assessed more strictly to define the best practices and guarantee the effective distribution of resources (Hawkins et al., 2020). The current study intends to add to the existing research by getting into the in-depth analysis of the factors causing the racial disparities in juvenile justice system and offering evidence-based interventions. This study aims at providing a richer context to the problem through the analysis of socioeconomic backgrounds, implicit bias, and inequity of the school-to-prison pipeline. The end value will be how the knowledge will be able to inform policy and practice and create equity and justice to all the youth.

METHODS

The approach of study to be used in the research is a quantitative research design that will enable the study in a systematic manner to eliminate racial disparities in the juvenile justice system. The study relies both on administrative data with the help of which it aims to understand the full picture of the way race impacts outcomes of the youth within such a system, and survey responses that, in turn, allow studying the way race affects the outcomes of the youth within the system from different points of view. Precisely, the research examines the juvenile justice record data, school

discipline reports, and socioeconomic data. These are supported by survey information gathered by the law enforcement officers, school administration and the effected youth and their families which offer a view of institutions to the deceptively personal one.

In order to provide a representative and a concentration data set, the study employs stratified random sampling of institutional data to be effective in providing a proportional representation of racial and geographic subsets. Simultaneously, the surveys are done through purposive sampling to obtain firsthand information of the stake holders who are directly affected or involved in the process of juvenile justice. Such a two-fold method enables both generalization and extensive focus on the most important experiences. The study will use a series of statistical methods in the analysis of data, which shall include descriptive statistics to describe the variables of demographic and outcome character, correlation analysis to establish the possible association among different variables, regression analysis and ANOVA to determine significant difference and possible causation. All the quantitative work is done with the SPSS, whereas the online survey software is applicable in the facilitation of the easy and effective collection of the data.

The study follows the ethics standards since the informed consent by all the participants is obtained as well as preserving the confidentiality during the course of the research. The Institutional Research Board (IRB) addressed the research study and approved it so that researchers were in line with ethical research protocols. Finally, it is expected that the results of this study will demonstrate a certain empirical evidence which will be able to guide and influence fair policies that will decrease racial differences in the juvenile justice system.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It has used a stringent analytic methodology before the presentation of the data in tabular form. The order of appearance was descriptive statistics to summarize the sample demographical characteristics and find trends in the results of juvenile justice depending on racial group suggestions. These initial figures emphasized some possible differences and became the object of making more thorough research.

Subsequently, critical assumptions, that is, normality of distribution, homogeneity of variance, and the lack of multicollinear effects between predictor variables were checked. Tentatively, given their confirmation, correlation analysis was deployed to evaluate the strength, as well as direction of the relationships between major independent variables, including the socioeconomic status, implicit bias, and school disciplinary practice, and dependent variables, e.g., arrest and detention rates. Based on these correlation-related results, the multiple linear regression analysis was used to assess the one-way and joint predictive value of the primary variables on the arrest rates. To accompany this, ANOVA was performed to test these differences as per groups and the logistic regression performed to estimate the possible chance of outcomes in being detained. In combination, all these approaches created a multiplex analysis of structural and institutional influence on shaping racial disproportionality in juvenile justice outcomes.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Variable	Total Sample (N=500)	African American (N=200)	Hispanic (N=150)	White (N=150)
Gender (Male)	300 (60%)	130 (65%)	90 (60%)	80 (53%)
Average Age (years)	16.2	16.1	16.3	16.4
Family Income (Median)	$35,000	$30,000	$32,000	$45,000
Parents' Education				

High School or Less	350 (70%)	160 (80%)	110 (73%)	80 (53%)
Some College or More	150 (30%)	40 (20%)	40 (27%)	70 (47%)

As presented in Table 1, there are 500 participants included in the sample out of whom are African American, Hispanic, and White youth. Most of them are male (60 percent), with more African American male (65 percent). The mean age is fairly steady between groups. A large disparity exists between African American and Hispanic participants and the same participants in terms of median family income. Also, a larger percentage of African American and Hispanic parents are either high school graduates or below, which signifies a socioeconomic imbalance, which may impact the results of the juvenile justice system.

Table 2. Juvenile Justice Outcomes by Race

Outcome	Total Sample (N=500)	African American (N=200)	Hispanic (N=150)	White (N=150)
Arrest Rate (%)	55%	70%	60%	30%
Detention Rate (%)	40%	55%	45%	20%
Average Sentence (days)	180	220	200	130

Table 2 show significant disparities across racial groups. African American youth have the highest arrest rate (70%), followed by Hispanic youth (60%), with White youth having the lowest rate (30%). Detention rates follow a similar pattern, with African American youth at 55%, Hispanic youth at 45%, and White youth at 20%. The average sentence length is also highest for African American youth (220 days), followed by Hispanic youth (200 days), and lowest for White youth (130 days). These disparities highlight the overrepresentation and harsher treatment of minority youth within the juvenile justice system.

Table 3. School Discipline Records by Race

Disciplinary Action	Total Sample (N=500)	African American (N=200)	Hispanic (N=150)	White (N=150)
Suspensions (%)	45%	60%	50%	25%
Expulsions (%)	15%	20%	18%	7%
Referrals to Law Enforcement (%)	25%	35%	28%	12%

Table 3 shows that African American and Hispanic youth face higher rates of suspensions, expulsions, and referrals to law enforcement compared to White youth. Specifically, 60% of African American youth and 50% of Hispanic youth have been suspended, compared to 25% of White youth. Expulsion rates are similarly higher for African American (20%) and Hispanic (18%) youth than for White youth (7%). Referrals to law enforcement are more frequent among African American (35%) and Hispanic (28%) youth than White youth (12%). These findings suggest that minority students are more likely to be subjected to harsh disciplinary actions, which may contribute to their higher involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Table 4. Socioeconomic Indicators and Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Socioeconomic Status (SES)	Arrest Rate (%)	Detention Rate (%)	Average Sentence (days)
Low SES	65%	50%	200
Middle SES	40%	30%	150

High SES	20%	10%	100

Table 4 illustrates a clear relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and juvenile justice outcomes. Youth from low SES backgrounds have significantly higher arrest rates (65%), detention rates (50%), and average sentence lengths (200 days) compared to their middle and high SES counterparts. Middle SES youth have lower arrest (40%) and detention (30%) rates, with an average sentence of 150 days. High SES youth experience the lowest arrest (20%) and detention (10%) rates, with the shortest average sentences (100 days). These findings underscore the impact of socioeconomic factors on juvenile justice involvement, with lower SES youth facing greater punitive measures.

Table 5. Implicit Bias Indicators and Juvenile Justice Outcomes

Implicit Bias Score (Range)	Arrest Rate (%)	Detention Rate (%)	Average Sentence (days)
Low Bias (0-1)	30%	20%	120
Moderate Bias (1-2)	50%	35%	160
High Bias (2-3)	70%	55%	200

Table 5 shows that implicit bias scores among law enforcement and school administrators are correlated with juvenile justice outcomes. Higher implicit bias scores are associated with higher arrest rates, detention rates, and longer average sentences. Youth in jurisdictions with low implicit bias scores have arrest rates of 30%, detention rates of 20%, and average sentences of 120 days. In contrast, jurisdictions with high implicit bias scores have arrest rates of 70%, detention rates of 55%, and average sentences of 200 days. This suggests that implicit bias may contribute to harsher treatment of minority youth within the juvenile justice system.

Table 6. Correlation Analysis

Variables	Correlation Coefficient (r)	p-value
Socioeconomic Status and Arrest Rate	-0.65	<0.001
Implicit Bias Score and Arrest Rate	0.72	<0.001
School Suspensions and Arrest Rate	0.68	<0.001
Socioeconomic Status and Detention Rate	-0.60	<0.001
Implicit Bias Score and Detention Rate	0.70	<0.001
School Suspensions and Detention Rate	0.65	<0.001

Table 6 reveals significant relationships between the independent variables and juvenile justice outcomes. Socioeconomic status has a strong negative correlation with both arrest rate (-0.65) and detention rate (-0.60), indicating that lower socioeconomic status is associated with higher rates of arrest and detention. Implicit bias scores show a strong positive correlation with arrest rate (0.72) and detention rate (0.70), suggesting that higher levels of implicit bias are linked to increased likelihood of arrest and detention. Similarly, school suspensions are positively correlated with both arrest rate (0.68) and detention rate (0.65), indicating that students who are frequently suspended are more likely to be arrested and detained. All correlations are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

Table 7. Multiple Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Arrest Rate	Coefficient (B)	Standard Error (SE)	t-value	p-value
Intercept	0.20	0.05	4.00	<0.001
Socioeconomic Status	-0.25	0.04	-6.25	<0.001
Implicit Bias Score	0.30	0.05	6.00	<0.001

School Suspensions	0.35	0.06	5.83	<0.001

Table 7 shows that socioeconomic status, implicit bias score, and school suspensions are significant predictors of arrest rate. The negative coefficient for socioeconomic status (-0.25) indicates that as socioeconomic status increases, the arrest rate decreases, controlling for other variables. The positive coefficients for implicit bias score (0.30) and school suspensions (0.35) suggest that higher implicit bias and more school suspensions are associated with higher arrest rates. All predictors are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), and the model provides a comprehensive explanation of the factors influencing arrest rates.

Table 8. ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)

Group	Mean Arrest Rate (%)	Standard Deviation	F-value	p-value
African American	70	10		
Hispanic	60	12	45.67	<0.001
White	30	8		

Table 8 shows that indicate significant differences in arrest rates across racial groups. The mean arrest rate for African American youth (70%) is significantly higher than that for Hispanic youth (60%) and White youth (30%). The F-value (45.67) and p-value (<0.001) indicate that these differences are statistically significant. This suggests that race is a significant factor in determining arrest rates, with minority youth being disproportionately affected.

Table 9. Logistic Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Detention (Yes/No)	Odds Ratio (OR)	Standard Error (SE)	z-value	p-value
Socioeconomic Status	0.75	0.10	-2.50	0.012
Implicit Bias Score	1.50	0.15	3.33	0.001
School Suspensions	1.40	0.20	2.00	0.046

As seen in Table 9, offers odds ratios of probability of detention of an individual depending on socioeconomic status, implicit bias score, and school suspensions. The odds ratio on socioeconomic status (0.75) suggests that the higher the socioeconomic status, the less the chances of detention. Implicit bias scores and school suspensions on the other hand (1.50 and 1.40 respectively) have increased the likelihood of detention. All the variables are important because they are all statistically significant that is, they are important launching points in deciding whether a youth is detained.

The Socioeconomic Inequality Issue

The study also indicates high negative connection between socioeconomic status (SES) and juvenile justice outcomes with low level of SES being marked by increased arrest and detention. Such results are consistent with what other studies also found out that there is a high possibility of disadvantaged youths engaging the justice system (Holman & Ziedenberg, 2011). This research has, however, gone an extra mile by measuring the effect that SES has in relation to the arrest and imprisonment rates and it shows that the nearly worse the SES, the high the chances of being arrested or detained. This is an indication of the fact that interventions should focus on the socioeconomic factors that may cause juvenile delinquency which include poverty, lack of education opportunities, among others as well as ineffective access to social services (Nanda, 2012).

Implicit Bias and Effects

The fact that implicit bias scores are positively correlated with the juvenile justice outcomes reveals the existence of the problem of inculcation of racial inequality manifested in the unconscious bias. The results of this research find support in previous studies, which say that implicit biases may develop among law enforcement and school officials resulting in discriminatory practices (Goff et al., 2014; Eberhardt et al., 2004). This study further gives empirical observations of how implicit biases tend to rule the majority of juvenile juries by using the quantitative measures of implicit bias and correlating with other juvenile justice outcomes. These findings indicate that interventions to decrease implicit bias through training may help to ease the gap in the system of justice regarding race.

Disciplinary measures in the school

The paper also finds out that there is a close connection between school suspensions and youth involvement in juvenile justice especially among minority youths. This discovery supports the previous findings which have established the connection between strict school discipline methods and contact with juvenile justice system (Skiba et al., 2011; Losen & Martinez, 2013). These findings reveal that there is a disproportionately high rate of suspensions and expulsions of minority students contributing to school-to-prison pipeline. The existing body of literature is strengthened by this study as the study gives quantitative support to how arrest and detention rates are affected by school suspensions. These points emphasize what should be done to revise school disciplinary policies in order to be more equitable and restorative, and less punitive.

Racial Disparities of Juvenile Justice Outcomes

As the ANOVA results demonstrate, there are indeed significant differences in the arrest rates among the racial groups included in the study with the youths of African American and Hispanic races having vastly different arrest rates in comparison with the White ones. This observation is satisfying evidence of the prior research, which states that there are racial disparities in the justice system working with children (Sickmund & Puzzanchera, 2014). This study contributes to the literature though, however, in a precision of the statistical analysis that measures this disparities and points to contributory factors including SES, implicit bias and school disciplinary behaviors. The regression models also show that these variables have a separate and combined effect on the outcome of juvenile justice and provide a holistic model through which the intricacy of juvenile justice variables on minority youth can be understood.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Findings of this study are significant in terms of policy and practice. To start with, the socioeconomic circumstances leading to juvenile delinquency must be focused on. It may come in the form of investing in the resources of its communities, enhance the availability of quality education and offer services to the needy families (Leiber & Fox, 2005). Second, law enforcement officers, school administrators and other stakeholders must be trained so they do not use implicit bias in reducing discriminatory approaches and creating justice in the justice system. Third, to address the school-to-prison pipeline, the school disciplinary policy can be altered to base more on restorative justice practices, instead of punitive, and help make schools more equitable places to every student (Gregory et al., 2016).

The Contribution to the Literature

The research has made some important contributions to the body of racial disparity in the system of juvenile justice. Upon using an extensive approach based on quantitative methods, it gives a solid empirical support of the correlations between SES and implicit bias, school disciplinary patterns, and juvenile justice

consequences. Results not only confirm previous studies, but also provide fresh answers as to the scale and mechanisms of such disparities. Moreover, showing the interrelation between different factors, the study reveals the necessity of complex interventions solving both personal and systematic causes of racial differences.

CONCLUSION

The given quantitative research provides an insight into the widespread racial disparities in the juvenile justice system through the examination of the impacts of socioeconomic status, implicit prejudice, and school disciplinary action on the results of the juvenile justice system. The results indicate a significant correlation between the low socioeconomic status, increased arrests as well as incarceration raising the necessity of policies that mitigate the issue of economic disparity and support the underprivileged population to a greater extent. The study also underscores the significant impact of implicit biases among law enforcement and school officials, which contribute to the disproportionate treatment of minority youth. Furthermore, the strong correlation between school suspensions and juvenile justice involvement emphasizes the critical need to reform school disciplinary policies to ensure they are fair and restorative. By providing empirical evidence of these relationships, this study not only corroborates existing research but also offers new insights into the mechanisms driving racial disparities in juvenile justice outcomes. These findings underscore the importance of comprehensive, multifaceted interventions that address both individual and systemic factors to promote a more equitable and just juvenile justice system. Future research should continue to explore these areas and evaluate the effectiveness of targeted interventions aimed at reducing these disparities and supporting all youth in achieving positive outcomes.

REFERENCES

Alvarado, S. E. (2020). The complexities of race and place: childhood neighborhood disadvantage and adult incarceration for Whites, Blacks, and Latinos. *Socius*, *6*, 2378023120927154. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023120927154

Braga, A. A., Brunson, R. K., & Drakulich, K. M. (2019). Race, place, and effective policing. *Annual review of sociology*, *45*(1), 535-555. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073018-022541

Clark, E. C., Cranston, E., Polin, T., Ndumbe-Eyoh, S., MacDonald, D., Betker, C., & Dobbins, M. (2022). Structural interventions that affect racial inequities and their impact on population health outcomes: a systematic review. *BMC public health*, *22*(1), 2162. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14603-w

Dragomir, R. R., & Tadros, E. (2020). Exploring the impacts of racial disparity within the American juvenile justice system. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *71*(2), 61-73. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12165

FitzGerald, C., Martin, A., Berner, D., & Hurst, S. (2019). Interventions designed to reduce implicit prejudices and implicit stereotypes in real world contexts: a systematic review. *BMC psychology*, *7*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-019-0299-7

Hawkins, A. J., Clyde, T. L., Doty, J. L., & Avellar, S. (2020). Best practices in family life education program evaluation. *Family Relations*, *69*(3), 479-496. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12420

Huntington, C., & Scott, E. S. (2020). Conceptualizing legal childhood in the twenty-first century. *Michigan Law Review*, 1371-1457.

Kovera, M. B. (2019). Racial disparities in the criminal justice system: Prevalence,

causes, and a search for solutions. *Journal of Social Issues*, *75*(4), 1139-1164. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12355

Landsman, J., & Lewis, C. W. (Eds.). (2023). *White teachers/diverse classrooms: Creating inclusive schools, building on students' diversity, and providing true educational equity*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003448709-1

Levin, J. (2024). A Path Toward Race-Conscious Standards for Youth: Translating Adultification Bias Theory into Doctrinal Interventions in Criminal Court. *UC Law SF Journal on Gender and Justice*, *35*(2), 83.

Lopez, J. D. (2022). *Media (Mis) Representations of Black and Brown Youth in Educational Settings: Implications towards the School-to-Prison Pipeline*. California State University, Long Beach.

Magnuson, K. A., & Duncan, G. J. (2019). Parents in poverty. *Handbook of parenting*, 301-328. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429398995

Massey, D. S. (2020). Still the Linchpin: Segregation and Stratification in the USA. *Race and Social Problems*, *12*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-019-09280-1

McCabe, J., Dupéré, V., Dion, E., Thouin, É., Archambault, I., Dufour, S., ... & Crosnoe, R. (2020). Why do extracurricular activities prevent dropout more effectively in some high schools than in others? A mixed-method examination of organizational dynamics. *Applied developmental science*, *24*(4), 323-338. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1484746

McCarter, S., Venkitasubramanian, K., & Bradshaw, K. (2020). Addressing the school-to-prison pipeline: Examining micro-and macro-level variables that affect school disengagement and subsequent felonies. *Journal of Social Service Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/01488376.2019.1575323

McIntosh, K., Girvan, E. J., McDaniel, S. C., Santiago-Rosario, M. R., St. Joseph, S., Fairbanks Falcon, S., ... & Bastable, E. (2021). Effects of an equity-focused PBIS approach to school improvement on exclusionary discipline and school climate. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *65*(4), 354-361. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2021.1937027

Myers, R., Goddard, T., & Davidtz, J. (2021). Reconnecting youth: Beyond individualized programs and risks. *Youth Justice*, *21*(1), 55-70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473225420932861

Oglesby-Neal, A., & Peterson, B. (2021). Influence of race in the deep end of the juvenile justice system. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *19*(2), 186-205. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204020958465

Padgaonkar, N. T., Baker, A. E., Dapretto, M., Galván, A., Frick, P. J., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2021). Exploring disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system over the year following first arrest. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *31*(2), 317-334. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12599

Perry Jr, A. (2021). *School discipline: Zero tolerance policies*. Northcentral University.

Puzzanchera, C., & Hockenberry, S. (2020). Highlights from the 2018 juvenile residential facility census. *Annotation*.

Reece, J. (2021). Confronting the legacy of "separate but equal": can the history of race, real estate, and discrimination engage and inform contemporary policy?. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, *7*(1),

110-133. https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2021.7.1.07

Riddle, T., & Sinclair, S. (2019). Racial disparities in school-based disciplinary actions are associated with county-level rates of racial bias. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(17), 8255-8260. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808307116

Sprague, J. R., & Walker, H. M. (2021). *Safe and healthy schools: Practical prevention strategies*. Guilford Publications.

Suveren, Y. (2022). Unconscious bias: Definition and significance. *Psikiyatride Guncel Yaklasimlar*, *14*(3), 414-426. https://doi.org/10.18863/pgy.1026607

Todd-Fritz, D. (2023). *Risk and Protective Factors Among the Forensic Population: An Examination Between Social Support, Adverse Experiences, and Criminal Thinking*. University of Hartford.

Wegmann, K. M., & Smith, B. (2019). Examining racial/ethnic disparities in school discipline in the context of student-reported behavior infractions. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *103*, 18-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.05.027