

**Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Iowa:
An Analysis of the Influences of Race on Case Processing
in Three Counties**

Technical Report

by

**Michael J. Leiber, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology/Anthropology
University of Northern Iowa**

Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Iowa:
An Analysis of the Influence of Race on Case Processing
in Three Counties

Technical Report

January, 1992

by

Michael J. Leiber, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology/Anthropology
University of Northern Iowa

Prepared for

The State Juvenile Justice Advisory Council of Iowa
& The Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning

Funds for this study were provided by the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning under grant number 715-90-RP-01. Points of view or opinions in this document are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position of The State Juvenile Justice Advisory Council of Iowa or The Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Agency in Iowa.

The research design employed represents a first step in the study of the influence of race and other nonlegal factors on juvenile justice decision making. There are two areas that need to be expanded. The first, concerns the need to do further analysis of race and juvenile justice decision making in additional counties. The inclusion of more counties would allow for greater inquiry into the case processing of not only blacks but Hispanics. The second justification for further study is the need for a qualitative component. Juvenile Court Officers, probation officers, judges, and other individuals involved with juvenile justice decision making need to be interviewed and asked questions concerning the findings reported in the two reports. The results from this type of research could possibly help contextualize and/or support or negate the explanations given to account for the observed race and sex disparity in case processing.

Acknowledgements

This project would have not been possible if it were not for the support I received from a number of agencies and individuals over the last 18 months. I would first like to thank the Juvenile Justice Advisory Council of Iowa and the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning of Iowa. The Chief Juvenile Court Officers and staff at each of the counties included in the study also need to be thanked for their cooperation, patience, and support.

There are many people who worked on the research that I would also like to thank. They are: Sean Anderson, Holly Graves, Kathleen Kauth, Tadd Cline, Karen Mead, Tony Foy, Margaret Cejas, Marla Watson, Jodi Silberman, Susan Lancaster, Teresa McCormick, Claudette Carr, Jason Nelson, Christina Schaul, Donna Shuer, Mark Sturgevant, Debborah Erickson, Brent Lindberg, Jill Hermsen, Lesile Lawson, Donna Lowry, Vanessa Nassif, Howard LeFlore, Michelle Lilla, Sandy Bell, Laure Muehlstedt, and Kathleen Markway. Special thanks go out to Tina Van Houweding, Herb Kueny, and Everette Laning.

I would like to also thank Carl E. Pope, William Feyerherm, Margaret Farnworth, Keith Crew, Tina Mawhorr, Anne Woodrick, Mary Howard, Tom Hill, Virgil Nowack, and the secretarial staff and computing services at the University of Northern Iowa.

Last, Molly Cargin, Jayne Arneil, Jeff Spears, Laticia Valdes, and Carrie Barritt all deserve acknowledgement and a special thank you for their hard work and effort.



January 19, 1992

From: Michael J. Leiber, Project Director
RE: Introduction of the report

The Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention recently issued a mandate to every state that receives federal funds for juvenile processing. It is stipulated that it be determined whether minority youth are disproportionately represented in secure facilities. If such disproportionate representation is present, the Office of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention requires the state to examine the reasons for the occurrence.

The disproportionate representation of black youths in Iowa secure facilities has been identified; the most notable overrepresentation is in the state training school. The Division of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning with the cooperation of the Iowa Juvenile Justice Advisory Council contracted with Professor Michael J. Leiber, from the University of Northern Iowa, to study the reasons for the disproportionate representation. Findings from the research are available in the summary and technical reports entitled, "Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Iowa: An Analysis of the Influence of Race on Case Processing in Three Counties."

The study examined referrals to three juvenile courts for the years 1980 thru 1989. Information was recorded on the referral offense(s), prior offender history, family, school, and case outcomes for both the current and past involvement. Statistical procedures were employed to determine whether there was disparity in case processing and outcome for black, American Native Indian, and white youths with similar backgrounds and legal charges.

The findings suggest that each of the three counties differ in case processing and in what factors influence juvenile justice decision making. Common characteristics, however, are the presence of race and gender disparities in case outcomes. Although there are a few exceptions, black youth are treated more harshly than white and, when applicable, than American Native Indian youth. Females receive both harshness and leniency. The race and gender effects are conditioned by the county and stage examined. In addition, other factors impact with race and gender to affect the decision making process.



PREFACE

Perhaps the most important issue facing the juvenile justice system today is the large number of minority youth being held in both short and long term secure facilities. Moreover, recent Children in Custody data indicate that minority youth are more likely to be housed in secure public facilities compared to non-minority youth who are more likely to be placed in more treatment oriented private facilities. As indicated in this report, there is a large and growing body of research which suggests that decision making within juvenile justice systems may not be racially neutral. That is, depending upon jurisdiction, minority youth are often more likely to be held at intake, placed in secure detention facilities, adjudicated delinquent and sent to state operated juvenile institutions compared to their non-minority counterparts. Given these findings, it is crucially important that the impact of race in juvenile processing be investigated and steps taken to ensure that decision making is racially neutral.

In this report, "Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Iowa", Dr. Michael Leiber has taken a major step in this direction by examining the impact of race in three Iowa counties. As indicated in this report, depending upon decision point and county, disparities do exist with minority youth often receiving the more severe outcomes. This well-thought out and documented report will add to the growing body of literature dealing with this critical issue and hopefully be a catalyst for a re-examination of the nature of juvenile justice decision making. I commend Dr. Leiber for his efforts as well as the State of Iowa which, along with a number of other states, is taking a major lead in dealing with this issue.

Carl E. Pope, Ph.D.
Professor of Criminal Justice
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

Table of Contents

	Page No.
Acknowledgements.....	i
Introduction of the Report.....	ii
Preface.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	v
Chapter One: Statement of the Problem.....	1
Past Studies.....	1
Federal Initiatives.....	5
Implications.....	7
Objective of the Current Study.....	8
Chapter Two: Research Design.....	9
Sites.....	9
Sample Selection.....	13
Variables.....	15
Analysis.....	19

	Page No.
Notes.....	22
Chapter	
Three: Comparison of County Samples.....	25
Characteristics of County Samples.....	25
Summary.....	29
Chapter	
Four: Results: County A.....	30
Movement Through the System.....	30
Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors.....	34
Multivariate Analyses.....	37
Summary.....	40
Chapter	
Five: Results: County B.....	42
Movement Through the System.....	42
Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors.....	47
Multivariate Analyses.....	52

	Page No.
Summary.....	59
Chapter Six: Results: County C.....	62
Movement Through the System.....	62
Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors.....	67
Multivariate Analyses.....	71
Summary.....	75
Chapter	
Seven: Summary and Discussion.....	78
Summary.....	78
Discussion.....	84
Implications.....	87
Conclusion.....	90
Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County A.....	91
Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County B.....	111
Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.....	161
Bibliography.....	212

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
2.1	Summary of Research Design	10
3.1	Distributions of Variables by County	26
4.1	Case Processing by Race (County A)	31
4.2	Zero Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Youths Referred to Intake, Petitioned to Court, Received a Consent Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquent (County A)	35
4.3	Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (County A)	38
5.1	Case Processing by Race (County B)	43
5.2	Zero Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Youths Referred to Intake, Petitioned to Court, Received a Consent Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquent (County B)	48
5.3	Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (County B)	53
5.4	Explanations of Interaction Effects at Stage of Intake	57
5.5	Youth Receiving a Judicial Disposition of Change of Placement/Transfer to Adult Court, Differentiated by Race and Gender	60
6.1	Case Processing by Race (County C)	63
6.2	Zero Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Youths Referred to Intake, Petitioned to Court, Received a Consent Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquent (County C)	68
6.3	Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (County C)	72
7.1	The Effects of Legal and Nonlegal Variables on Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Three Counties in Iowa (Summary of Results)	80

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This chapter focuses on why race and juvenile justice decision making is a major issue of concern for many across the nation. The discussion centers first on the role of the federal government in stimulating study into this area, followed by a brief introduction into the weaknesses of past studies of race and its influence on case processing outcomes. The next section of the chapter outlines the ramifications each has for the study of race and decision making in Iowa.

Past Studies

The importance of "equal justice" for juveniles, regardless of their race and ethnicity, has generated a substantial body of empirical study. The discussion that follows provides a cursory overview of the literature. The reader should refer to Pope and Feyerherm (1990a) and Liska and Tausig (1979) for a more extensive review of past studies on race and juvenile justice decision making.

Some researchers have found little or no evidence for racial selection bias (Frazier and Bishop, 1985; Cohen and Kluegel, 1979; 1978; Bailey and Peterson, 1981) while others have provided moderate to strong empirical support (Pope and Feyerherm, 1990b; Thornberry and Christenson, 1984; Thornberry, 1979; Feyerherm, 1981; Zatz, 1982; Bortner and Reed, 1985; Bortner et al., 1985).

In their comprehensive review of past research on this topic, Pope and Feyerherm (1990b:35) indicate that twenty-six of the forty-six studies they examined found some evidence of a selection bias.

Further research has found race disparity in some situations but not in others (McCarthy and Smith, 1986; Fagan et al., 1987). The findings of McCarthy and Smith (1986), for example, indicate that intake decisions were not discriminatory, but there was evidence to suggest an amplification effect. That is, as nonwhites went further into the system, the influence of legal factors diminished while that of race increased in its importance.

Past study have also indicated that in certain instances blacks may be treated more harshly than whites but in other instances they may receive more lenient dispositions. Dannefer and Schutt (1982), for example, discovered that minorities were treated more harshly than whites by police. The pattern was reversed at the dispositional stage, however, blacks received less severe sentences than whites.

In summary, it is difficult to make any firm conclusions regarding the influence of race on juvenile justice case outcomes. Some studies find support while others do not. In part, when and where the studies occurred may account for the conflicting findings. However, differences and difficulties in conceptualization, operationalization of variables, and analysis procedures also add to the confusion (Bishop and Frazier, 1988).

Researchers most often focus on one or a few decision making points with the most common being disposition or the severity of disposition and detention (e.g., Aday, 1986; Bortner and Reed, 1985). The failure to examine all relevant decision making points may obscure findings of selection bias (e.g., see Dannefer and Schutt, 1982; McCarthy and Smith, 1986).

In addition, race effects may be small or nonsignificant at earlier stages in the proceedings, however, the cumulative effect across many stages may be quite substantial (Bishop and Frazier, 1988; McCarthy and Smith, 1986). Single stage analysis would not provide evidence of such an effect.

Last, when research focuses on only one or two stages, the effects of race may be hidden due to associations between race and earlier decision making outcomes that are important at later stages in the proceedings. For example, Bortner and Reed (1985) found that race did not have a direct effect on judicial disposition. However, race had an indirect effect via the direct effect of detention status. That is, race had a direct effect on detention status (they were more likely than whites to be detained), and detention status was significantly associated with disposition. Thus, while detained black and white youth received similar outcomes at disposition, black youth were given a more severe outcome more often since they were more likely to have had detention. Bishop and Frazier (1988) found similar effects between race, prior disposition, and case outcomes in their study of case processing in Florida.

In short, analyses at one or two stages do not allow for the assessment of decision making at all decision making points, or for indirect or cumulative effects. The impact of race in relationship to juvenile justice decision making must be viewed as a process rather than an isolated occurrence (Marshall and Thomas, 1983).

Although more recent studies have utilized multivariate techniques, typically only additive models have been employed (Bishop and Frazier, 1988:245). Multivariate techniques involve the process of estimating the effect of a variable while simultaneously controlling for the effects of other variables. An assumption of this process is that the impact of race is constant across levels of other variables included in the analyses. For example, the finding of differential treatment of males and females would be assumed to be similar for both whites and other racial groups. Because the possibility exists that the effects of race may be conditioned by other variables this procedure may conceal biases that might be present in processing and case outcomes (Farnworth and Horan, 1980; Miethe and Moore, 1986). That is, interaction effects may be present. For example, being black and female may have an association with case processing, whereas just being black may not have such an effect.

In addition to these criticisms, much of the research in this area has failed to examine the extent to which case processing outcomes may differ for blacks in comparison to other minority youth (e.g., Frazier and Cochran, 1986; Marshall and Thomas,

1983). and county differences within a particular state (e.g., Bortner and Reed, 1985; Bishop and Frazier, 1988; Fenwick, 1982).

On the former point, Pope and Feyerherm found that only seven studies focused on Hispanics, one on American Native Indians, and one on Asians (1990b:34). This is a serious limitation of past study in this area, especially in light of findings from research on adult sentencing which suggest that differences may exist between minorities in case processing and outcomes (Farnworth, Teske, and Thurman, 1991; LaFree, 1985).

On the latter point, research in both juvenile justice and criminal justice settings have highlighted the importance of the location and culture of the court (e.g., Farnworth, Frazier, and Neuberger, 1988). Differences in case processing, for example, may be dependent upon whether the juvenile court is located in a rural or urban setting. Rural courts appear to adhere to a parens patriae approach while courts in an urban setting practice a due process orientation (Aday, 1986; Kempf, Decker, and Bing, 1990). Rural courts handle cases more informally than urban courts. Thus, disparities in outcomes may be more evident in rural courts in contrast to urban courts. This occurrence has been described by Feld (1991) as "justice by geography". Race effects, however, may be present in both types of courts (Kempf, Decker, and Bing, 1990).

Federal Initiatives

Over the last thirty years, extensive research has been conducted to identify the factors that affect decision making in

the juvenile justice system (Pope and Feyerherm, 1990a; Liska and Tausig, 1979). Interest in this general topic and race effects particularly has increased in recent years. This renewed interest is in part a response to the 1988 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act. As a result of the federal amendment to Section 223(a)(23), each state must develop in its formula grants program methods to reduce the proportion of minority youth in secure facilities if such proportion exceeds their representation in the general population (Federal Register, 1991:22969).

The federal government and individual states' concern stems from concern statistics which indicate that while blacks comprise roughly 15% of the nation's population in the age group 10-17 (i.e., the age category of greatest risk for delinquency), they make up 28.1% of juvenile arrests (Maguire and Flanagan, 1990) and 42% of youths held in custody in public facilities (Sweet, 1989). These race differentials may be the result of differential offending and/or racial bias in juvenile justice decision making (Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981; Pope, 1984; McNeely, and Pope, 1981). One objective of the federal initiative is to examine the disproportionate representation of minority youth in secure facilities and develop strategies to deal with the source of the problem.

Bishop and Frazier (1990) and Kempf, Decker, and Bing (1990), for example, assessed the influence of race on juvenile court proceedings in Florida and Missouri, respectively to meet this requirement. Race was found in both studies to be a significant

factor in influencing juvenile justice decision making. In each case, black youth received more severe dispositions than white youth. In light of these findings, several other states are in the process of assessing the disproportionate representation of minority youth in their juvenile justice system to meet the federal mandate (e.g., Arizona, Ohio).

Implications

A review of both past research and the federal mandate which calls for the assessment of the disproportionate representation of minority youth in secure facilities, suggest a need for further study concerning the influence of race on case processing and outcomes. Feyerherm and Pope (1989:4) propose, on the basis of findings suggestive of racial disparity, that:

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that processing decisions in many state and local juvenile justice systems may not be racially neutral. Race effects may occur at various decision points, they may be direct or indirect and they may accumulate as youths are processed through the system. At the very least ... jurisdictions should examine their juvenile justice systems to determine if, and at what points, racial differences do occur.

The need for research of this type is evident in the state of Iowa, which is a participant in the formula grants program. Minorities comprise roughly 3% of the state's population overall,

and up to 10% or more in some cities. As of 1990, however, black youth alone constituted 21% of the admissions at the state training school in Iowa. No study to date has been conducted to examine why minority youth are disproportionately represented in the state's juvenile justice system, especially in the state training facility.

Objective of the Current Study

As part of the federal mandate for research in this area, the present study was undertaken to assess the influence of race on juvenile justice decision making in the state of Iowa. The study did not examine why youth commit crime or police decision making as it pertains to juveniles. Rather, the focus of inquiry was on juvenile court referrals involving delinquent offenses in three counties. Incorporating and building upon past research designs, the research traced case referrals from the stage of intake to disposition for whites, blacks, American Native Indians, Hispanics, and Asians. Multivariate analyses which control for legal and nonlegal factors and tests for interactive effects were employed to describe patterns of decision making at each point in the proceedings and to identify racial disparities in those decisions and outcomes.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research that follows was designed to examine the extent to which race influences juvenile justice decision making in three counties in the state of Iowa. The results from the study of referrals involving delinquent offenses and case processing in each county will be reported in the next four chapters. This chapter describes the research sites, the samples for research, variables included in the analyses, and the statistical procedures employed. A summary of the research design is provided in Table 1.

Sites

Due to the relatively small number of nonwhites in the state of Iowa, the determining factor for inclusion in the study was the size of the minority youth population residing in a particular county. On the basis of this criterion and available resources, three counties were chosen. These counties will be referred to as County A, County B, and County C.

County A: This county has a total population of 123,798 with persons age 17 and younger comprising 31,402 (Bureau of the Census, 1990). Minority youth comprise 13% of those age 17 and younger, with blacks making up 11% of that figure (Bureau of the Census, 1990). The largest city in the county has a black youth population of 19% (Bureau of the Census, 1990).

Table 1. Summary of Research Design

Counties	Three, differentiated as A, B, and C
Time Period	1980 thru 1989
Sample Selection	

	<u>No. Referrals Delinquency</u>	<u>No. of Cases Included in Study</u>
<u>County A</u>		
(total)	9,011 ^a	2,030
White	8,111	1,218 ^b
Black	900	823
<u>County B</u>		
(total)	10,331	2,101
White	8,282	507
Black	475	475
American Native Indian	1,440	985
Hispanic	83	83
Asian	51	51
<u>County C</u>		
(total)	9,353 ^c	1,199
White	7,515	1,005
Black	1,632	788
American Native Indian	21	21
Hispanic	119	119
Asian	66	66

Variables

Dependent

Detention status
Intake
Petition
Consent decree
Adjudication
Judicial disposition

Table 1. continued

Variables			
<u>Independent</u>			
Social	Prior Delinquency	Legal	Current Charge(s)
Race	Severity of past disposition		No. of charges
Age	Prior record		Severity of offense
Gender	Under Court Authority		
Family Status			

Statistical Procedures

Procedure	Purpose
CROSSTABULATIONS	To examine differences in nonlegal, legal, and processing variables by county. To examine racial and ethnic composition of cohort of youth moving through proceedings or from one stage to another.
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)	To examine mean differences in variables by county.
ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS	To examine associations among two variables (bivariate comparisons).
LOGISTIC REGRESSION	To make probability estimates of the influence of race controlling for other variables in the model for each stage in the proceedings. Outcomes are categorical dependent variables.
INTERACTION TERMS	To assess the possibility that the effect of race may be conditioned by other variables. Only reported when the chi-square fit of the model is improved over the additive model.

- a. This is an estimation. Minority youth other than black may be included in this figure. The number is unknown, but it is believed to represent a small percentage in comparison to whites given the small number of other nonwhite groups (including Hispanic) in County A.
- b. A small number of files could not be located (N=77).
- c. All referrals involving delinquencies were not identified due to missing and/or destroyed records. Estimations are that 5,000 to 7,000 files were not found.

The juvenile court services in County A handles only those referrals involving delinquent offenses. The average number of referrals each year is about 700, but has ranged from 1,339 in the year 1989 to 675 in the year 1983. The average number of juvenile probation officers ranged from 15 to 18 in the 1980s. In the early 1980s, the mean caseload was in the mid to low 30s. In the late 1980s, average caseloads ranged from 38 to 42.

County B: This county has a total population of 98,276 with persons age 17 and younger making up 27.57% of that number (Bureau of the Census, 1990). Minority youth comprise 9.36% of those age 17 and younger with blacks making up 2.84% and American Native Indians 2.97% of that figure (Bureau of the Census, 1990). The percentage of Hispanic and Asian youth is 3.97% and 1.78%, respectively (Bureau of the Census, 1990). The largest city within County B has a youth population of 3.44% black, 3.53% American Native Indians, 4.72% Hispanic, and 2.01% Asian (Bureau of the Census, 1990).

The juvenile court services in this county handle referrals involving both delinquent offenses and cases pertaining to children in need of supervision. The average number of delinquent referrals has ranged from an average of 800 in the early 1980s to roughly 1,800 in the late 1980s. The average number of juvenile court probation officers ranged from 7 to 8 in the 1980s. In the early 1980s, the mean case load was in the mid to low 30s compared to the low 40s in the late 1980s.

County C: This county has a total population of 327,140 with persons age 17 and younger comprising 81,971 (Bureau of the

Census, 1990). Minority youth make up 10.25% of those age 17 and younger with blacks making up 6.08% and Asians 2.75% of the population (Bureau of the Census, 1990). The percentage of Hispanic and American Native Indian youth is 2.80% and 0.32%, respectively (Bureau of the Census, 1990). The largest city within County C has a youth population of 10.00% black, 3.62% Asian, 3.72% Hispanic, and 0.43% American Native Indians (Bureau of the Census, 1990).

The juvenile court services in this county handle referrals involving delinquent offenses, cases pertaining to children in need of supervision, and incidents where mental health is at issue (chapter 229). Juvenile court services in this county also deal with parental termination rights and situations where families and their children need assistance. In 1988, the number of referrals was 3,742 with delinquencies accounting for 72% of that figure (County C Statistical Report, Calendar year 1988). The average number per year of juvenile court probation officers has been about 30 throughout the 1980's.

Sample Selection

All cases for this study were selected from juvenile court referrals over the ten-year period from 1980 to 1989. A referral was defined as such if the situation involved a youth accused of committing a delinquent offense. In addition, a youth accused of committing more than one crime during a given incident was counted as only one referral. While some counties consider

multiple delinquencies as multiple referrals, we did not. The unit of analysis is the juvenile rather than the charge. Additional delinquencies were taken into account by the variable 'Current Number of Charges', which will be discussed later in the chapter. Thus, discrepancies may exist between the number of referrals we identified in a particular county and those reported by each of the three counties.

Each of the counties differ in their racial composition and in the number and type of referrals. Therefore, different sampling techniques were used to create racial comparison groups. The sample selection employed in each county will be discussed separately.

County A: A total of 9,011 referrals were identified for the ten-year period. Since the study focuses on racial differences, it was important to have adequate number of both whites and minorities represented in the sample. Therefore, disproportionate stratified sampling was employed to create racial comparison groups. A random sample of 1,218 referrals of delinquent cases involving white youths from a total of 8,111 was selected for the analyses. The entire population of black youths (n= 900) was targeted to provide a sufficiently large number for comparison purposes.(1) Of this number, 823 were included in the study because the files for the remaining cases were missing or had been destroyed.(2) The total analysis sample for County A therefore numbered 2,030.

County B: A total of 10,331 referrals were identified during the ten year time frame. A random sample of referrals of

delinquent cases identified as white (n= 507) were selected for the analyses. The total number of whites identified was 8,282. American Native Indians referred to juvenile court services were also selected from random pool of referrals. Due to the relatively few number of studies of juvenile case processing involving these people (Pope and Feyerherm, 1990a), oversampling was employed (n= 985 out of 1,440). All blacks (n= 475), Hispanics (n= 83), and Asians (n= 51) referred to juvenile court services during the 10 year period were included in the analyses. The total sample used for County B is 2,101.

County C: As in County B, information was collected on whites, blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Native Indians. Due to the manner in which records are kept in this particular county, 5,000 to 7,000 files could not be located. It is believed these records have been either destroyed and/or misplaced. Thus, the number of referrals in County C is actually higher than the identified 9,353 referrals involving delinquent offenses. A random sample of referrals of delinquent cases identified as white (n= 1005) were selected from 7,515 for the analyses. Disproportionate random sampling was used for blacks (n= 788 out of 1,632). All cases involving Hispanic youth (n= 119), Asian youth (n= 66), and American Native Indians (n= 21) were also recorded. The total sample used for county C is 1,199.

Variables

Six stages were identified in Iowa's juvenile justice system. Each of these stages is treated as dependent variables. Nine

Independent variables are included in the analyses. The inclusion of these nine variables are justified upon: (1) past research and (2) preliminary analyses using chi-squares and zero-order correlations which suggested each may influence case outcome(s) at various points in the proceedings. Each of the variables included in the analyses are described below.

Dependent Variables

Detention status. Shortly after a youth is taken into custody, a decision is made by law enforcement officers and juvenile officials to release or detain the person. If the decision is made to place the individual in detention, judicial review of the decision generally takes place within twenty-four hours. Referrals that resulted in detention at any point, for any given amount of time, are coded as 0; those that were not detained are coded 1.(3)

Intake. Decisions at this point in the system are made by juvenile court officers. Here, a youth may be released, receive an informal adjustment, or be recommended to go on to the stage of petition. "An informal adjustment" is a form of diversion where the youth avoids further processing by agreeing to participate in some kind of service (e.g., informal probation, restitution, community service). Under this form of intervention, a youth may be redirected into the system if he/she fails to abide by the conditions of the agreement. In some counties, admittance of guilt is a prerequisite for this outcome. Most often researchers have treated the decision to release and

the utilization of an informal adjustment as one and the same (e.g., see Bishop and Frazier, 1988; Feyerherm and Pope, 1989; Bortner and Reed, 1985). It is believed that different factors may be related to the use of this option versus a simple release or the decision to have the referral move on into the system. Thus, this stage is treated as a trichotomy with release coded 0 informal adjustment coded 1 and further processing coded 2.

Petition. The coding of the decision to seek further court processing is represented by 0 where petition equals yes. The decision not to file a petition or if the petition was withdrawn was coded 1.

Consent Decree. This stage in the analysis is included because youth have the option to agree to a consent decree or a formal adjustment rather than having to go on to the adjudicatory stage in the proceedings in Iowa. This option is equivalent to the informal adjustment, though a petition has been filed at this point. Again, if a youth fails to adhere to the stipulated conditions he/she may be subject to further juvenile court proceedings. Further court processing is coded 0, while youth receiving a consent decree is coded 1.

Adjudication. For those youth who did not agree to or have offered to them a formal adjustment, adjudicatory outcomes consist of case dismissals, decisions to withhold adjudication, adjudications of delinquency, or determinations to hold waiver hearings in anticipation of transfer to adult court. The coding of adjudicatory outcomes is as follows: adjudicated delinquent=0; case dismissed or adjudication withheld=1.

Juveniles awaiting waiver hearings were not included in the analysis at this stage and were instead grouped within the cohort at the judicial disposition stage.

Judicial disposition. Cases that resulted in either a change of placement (e.g., training school, residential facility, group home) or transfer to adult court, (next to the death penalty, the most severe sanction available in the juvenile justice system), are coded 0. Referrals that involved a sentence of probation and/or treatment within the community are coded 1.

Independent Variables

The independent variables include nonlegal or social characteristics and information pertaining to prior and current offenses and involvement with the juvenile justice system. The social characteristics are race/ethnicity (white=0, black=1, American Native Indian=2, Hispanic=3, Asian=4), age (interval), gender (male=0, female=1), and family status (two members present=0, one member present=1). The family status variable is employed as a proxy for family support/supervision. The operationalization of the race variable may vary dependent upon the county and the statistical procedure employed.

Prior record is a measure of the number of times a youth had past contact(s) with the juvenile justice system. The variable is interval.

Past research has indicated that the disposition of the previous offense may have a significant impact on the outcome of subsequent referrals (e.g., Sampson, 1986; Farrell and Swigert,

1978). Therefore, a measure was constructed as an indicator of that variable. Past disposition is defined as '0' where a youth was adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court and '1' where the individual received an outcome other than those two possibilities (e.g., release, an informal or formal adjustment).

Court Authority is a measure employed to assess whether a youth may have been under some kind of supervision when he/she was referred to the juvenile court. Under court authority=0, no court authority=1.

The number of offenses a youth was charged with at the time of the referral was also coded. This is an interval-level measure.

A measure of offense severity involves the scoring of the most serious offense with which the youth was charged. Because of the small number of cases falling into the felon categories and crimes against persons, the variable was coded as follows: simple misdemeanor (0), serious misdemeanor (1), aggravated misdemeanor (2) and felony (3). The distributions of individual felony categories and the other categories are provided in the appendices.(4)

Analysis

The first step in the analysis is to examine county differences in nonlegal, legal, and case processing variables. Next, the analyses follow the recommendations of Pope and Feyerherm (1990a,b) and the work of Bishop and Frazier (1988). The analyses begin with comparisons involving race at each of the

outcomes for each stage in the proceedings. The objective here is to describe the extent to which minorities may comprise a disproportionate number of persons moving further into the system or receiving the most severe outcome at each point in the proceedings.

Zero-order correlations (the comparison of two variables to each other) are also provided to further assess the associations between race and decision-making outcome. The possibility that other relationships may exist between variables and/or with each stage in the process can also be examined with this procedure. That is, associations between race and one or all of the legal variables can be assessed. In turn, any possible relationship(s) between legal variables and decision making at a specific stage in the proceedings can be also examined.

These preliminary procedures allow for bivariate comparisons. The procedures do not include controls for the influence of variables on decision making other than the two that may be examined. For example, correlations between race and case outcome or race and a number of legal variables can be examined. However, the associations between race, legal variables, and decision making cannot be assessed. Thus, the bivariate analyses do not explain race differences in processing. Therefore, multivariate analyses were performed controlling for additive and interactive effects.

Because each of the dependent variables is categorical (each decision making stage), logistic regression techniques within SASS were employed.(5) Logistic regression is a procedure that

allows for multivariate analyses. Recall, multivariate analyses allow for the estimation of a single effect while simultaneously controlling for the effects of other variables. In addition to estimating main effects in additive models, two-way interactions by race and each of the variables were performed for each outcome or decision making point in the proceedings.(6) The use of interaction terms allows for the evaluation of the interactive effects race may have with social, legal, and case processing variables on each outcome (see Chapter 1). However, these will not be reported if their inclusion did not improve the overall chi-square fit of the model over the estimates of the main effects.

CHAPTER 2

NOTES

1. Black and white youth are the only groups to be compared in County A. The rationale for doing this is related to when the research project began and when external funding was provided to expand the study to include other minority youth and other counties. Of the 8,111 whites identified, nonwhites may be included in that figure (including hispanic but excluding blacks). It is believed that the number of nonwhites in the 8,111 figure is small given their representation in the general population.
2. No evidence exists to suggest that the missing cases differ from those included in the analysis.
3. Detention status was defined in this manner due to the small number of youth subject to detention overall in the three counties. The construction of the variable in this manner may lead to amplification effects when multivariate analyses are employed, especially at the stage of intake. For example, youth who had been detained at adjudication would be considered as such at previous stages when the effect of that variable would be assessed (e.g., intake, petition, consent decree). Of course, this is misleading since the youth would not have been yet detained. If such an amplification effect is present, it would diminish as the analysis focuses on the latter stages in the proceedings. Therefore, the affect of detention status on

decision making at judicial disposition should not be biased by the current operationalization.

4. It is important to note when examining the distributions provided in the appendices that most of the delinquencies involved property offenses rather than acts against persons. The category of theft constituted the largest number of offenses in this dichotomy.

5. The SASS program permits logistic regression to be performed with a trichotomy dependent variable. In analyses not reported here, the stage of intake was also treated as a dichotomy with release/informal adjustment coded 0 and further processing coded 1. The results paralleled those presented in the current analysis.

6. The process of excluding youth in a systematic manner at various stages (e.g., adjudication) may create a more homogeneous population as they move from one point in the proceedings to the next. This occurrence may result in sample selection bias (Berk, 1983). While methods are available to correct for this possibility (Heckman, 1974), Stolzenberg and Relles (1990:408, 413) indicate such techniques may cause additional problems. This is especially true when theory does not strongly indicate the existence of bias or when other important variables are not available for inclusion in equations to correct for the sample selection bias. Because of the uncertainty regarding this issue and the lack of additional variables to employ further estimations, sample selection bias correction was not employed.

In addition, sample censoring is not severe at adjudication (13% or less depending on the county).

CHAPTER 3 COMPARISON OF COUNTY SAMPLES

The first step in the analysis examined the distributions of the variables included in the study differentiated by county. The objective in doing this is to provide a description of the sample to be studied and to provide a preliminary assessment of the need to control for the influence of each county in the examination of the impact of race on juvenile justice decision making. Crosstabulations for categorical variables and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for continuous variables were performed to attain these goals. The results are presented in Table 1 and discussed below.

Characteristics of County Samples

Nonlegal: In the top left corner of Table 1, it is evident that males comprise a larger portion of the samples in comparison to females. The sample is split evenly on the distribution of the family status variable, with almost 50% falling into either one of the two categories. In both situations, no large county differences are present. Looking at the bottom of the table, however, reveals that youth from County B are younger ($x = 13.66$) than those in the other 2 counties ($x = 15.31$, $x = 15.13$).

Legal: Staying with the distributions of the continuous variables near the bottom of Table 1, juveniles in the sample from County B also have a greater mean number of prior contacts with the juvenile justice system than youths from County A and

Table 1. Distributions of Variables by County (N=6130).

Variables	County A		County B		County C		Chi-Square ^a
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
NONLEGAL							
<u>Gender</u>							
Male	1583	78	1517	72	1538	77	21.34***
Female	447	22	584	28	461	23	
<u>Family Status</u>							
Two members	1007	50	968	46	922	46	6.71**
one member	1023	50	1133	54	1077	54	
LEGAL							
<u>Past Disposition</u>							
Adjudicated/ waived	265	13	94	4	52	3	201.36***
No adjudicated/ waived	1765	87	1947	97	2007	96	
<u>Under Court Authority</u>							
Yes	474	23	256	12	208	10	154.18***
No	1556	77	1845	88	1791	90	
<u>Severity of Offense</u>							
Simple misdemeanor	1097	54	1438	68	1007	50	173.69***
Serious misdemeanor	250	12	208	10	280	14	
Aggravated misdemeanor	218	11	142	7	287	14	
Felony	465	23	313	15	425	22	
STAGES							
<u>Detention Status</u>							
Yes	88	4	91	4	130	7	13.25***
No	1942	96	2010	96	1869	94	
<u>Intake</u>							
Release	259	13	448	21	1083	54	1290.14***
Informal adjustment	1026	51	1406	67	576	29	
Further processing	745	36	247	12	340	17	
<u>Petition</u>							
Yes	693	93	194	79	323	95	56.22***
No	52	7	53	21	17	5	

Table 1. continued

Variables	County A		County B		County C		Chi-Square
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
STAGES							
<u>Consent Decree</u>							
No formal adjustment	428	80	129	82	127	41	151.26***
Formal adjustment	108	20	28	18	181	59	
<u>Adjudication</u>							
Yes	373	87	126	98	122	94	14.85***
No	55	13	3	2	8	6	
<u>Judicial Disposition</u>							
Change of placement/ Transfer	316	60	88	56	70	56	1.48
Community-based treatment	207	40	68	44	56	44	
			Mean				F-value*
NONLEGAL							
Age	15.31		13.66		15.13		307.62***
LEGAL							
Prior Record	1.69		2.16		1.16		59.58***
#Current Charges	2.80		1.22		1.44		42.44***

*Tests for differences in distributions or means of variables across counties.

***p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05.

County C ($x = 2.16$ compared to 1.69 and 1.16, respectively). Moving to the top of the table where the variable representing the severity of the past disposition is located, the sample from County A appears to have a greater percent of youth who had been previously adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court for their last offense. Still, a large majority in all three counties did not evidence such a disposition. The sample in County A also exhibits a larger percentage of youth who have been referred to juvenile court services while under court authority. Most of the youth in the samples, however, were not under court authority at the time of the referral. A small percentage of youth in each county were charged with a felony offense. Most offenses fall into the simple misdemeanor classification. Here, simple misdemeanors constitute 68% in County B in contrast to 54% for County A and 50% for County C. The mean number of offenses youth are charged with is less in County B and County C than County A. These results are presented in the lower left hand portion of Table 1.

Stages: In Table 1 under stages, it can be seen that detention is seldomly practiced. County differences are evident in case processing at intake. Of the outcomes at this stage, further processing is used more often in County A in comparison to the other two counties. Conversely, Counties B and C rely more on the outcomes of release or informal adjustment. County B, however, utilizes informal adjustments more often than County C which exercises instead the option of release. Most youth who go beyond intake are likely to be petitioned and adjudicated a

delinquent. Very few consent decrees are given before youth reach the stage of adjudication. These decision making patterns exist in each county. However, there are some exceptions. County B appears to be a bit more lenient at petition in comparison to the other counties. Of the three counties, County C uses consent decrees more often. County A is more likely not to adjudicate a youth a delinquent than County B or County C. In County A, 13% of the youth in that sample who reach this stage in the proceedings are not adjudicated in contrast to only 2% for County B and 6% for County C. In all three counties at judicial disposition, a larger percentage of youth receive a change of placement/transfer to adult court rather than the more lenient outcome of community-based treatment.

Summary

Similarities and differences are evident in the samples from the three different counties. The sample for County A appears to have much greater associations with legal variables which may account for the greater tendency to refer youth further into the system at the stage of intake. In contrast, County B seems to be much more informal in its case processing, which may be related to the age of the youth and the severity of the offense. The sample from County C is much more like that of County B than County A. However, County C release youth and utilize consent decrees more often than the other two counties. Because of these differences, the analysis was conducted separately for each county. These results are reported in the next three chapters.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS: COUNTY A

This chapter reports analyses and results concerning the influence of race on juvenile justice decision making in County A. Black and white youth are compared in terms of case processing and outcomes. Results from the bivariate analyses indicating movement through the system are first discussed, followed by those from the multivariate analyses.

Movement Through the System

The movement of the cohort through the juvenile justice system from the initial referral to judicial disposition is outlined in Table 1. The results of crosstabulations involving race and each decision making point are presented in the lower portion of the table. These proportions are provided indicating the severity of the outcome(s) at each stage for white and black youths. Thus, race differences or similarities in case processing at a specific stage in the process can be examined. The proportion of the black cohort as it moves from one decision making point to another is also indicated. This is done to determine if black or white youth may be disproportionately underrepresented or overrepresented as they go through the system.

A total of 2,030 referrals make up the initial cohort. Black youth comprise 40% of the referrals. It is important to note that the 40% figure is an artifact of sampling. The figure is provided to permit comparisons of the racial composition of the

Table 1. Case Processing by Race (County A).

	White (n=400)	Black (n=400)	Not Referred (n=1000)	Referred (n=1000)	Informal Adjustments (n=1000)	No Petition Filed (n=373)	Consent Received (n=100)	Dismissed/ Adjusted Settlement (n=373)	Community Treatment (n=107)
Not Referred (n=1000)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
Referred (n=1000)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
Informal Adjustments (n=1000)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
No Petition Filed (n=373)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
Consent Received (n=100)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
Dismissed/Adjusted Settlement (n=373)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107
Community Treatment (n=107)	500	500	1000	1000	1000	373	100	373	107

1. Prosecution with a specific category of race.
 2. Prosecution of all persons.
 3. The numbers in the "Dismissed" and "Consent Received" categories do not add up to 993 (the total number of filed petitions).
 4. The numbers in the "Community Treatment" and "Change of Placement or Transferred to Adult Court" categories do not add up to 373 (the total number of adjusted delinquents). The larger 373 is due to the grouping of transferred to adult court into the latter category and 7 missing cases.

cohort of youth continuing through the system from intake to judicial disposition.

Overall, detention is seldomly practiced. Only 4% of all youths were held in detention at some point during the proceedings. Blacks comprised 50% of those detained. Thus, in the bivariate analysis, there appears to be an association between race and decision making at this stage in the process. A race differential is also present at the next stage in the proceedings. At intake, 13% of the youth were released, 50% agreed to an informal adjustment, and 37% were referred for further processing. Thus, most referrals are handled informally, with the juvenile and juvenile court personnel agreeing to some kind of action short of formal court proceedings (e.g., restitution, community service). Of the blacks, 44% received this outcome compared to 55% of the whites. Black youth represent just 35% of all persons agreeing to an informal adjustment.

These figures are in stark contrast to those representing youth referred on for further processing. Here, 42% of the blacks received this outcome, compared to 33% of the whites. The proportion black among all youth referred for further processing is 46%, representing a 6% increase in the make up of the cohort. In short, blacks are disproportionately underrepresented in the informal adjustment outcome and overrepresented in the referrals for further processing in comparison to their white counterparts.

Youth who are not involved in an informal adjustment but are instead referred on are more likely to be petitioned (93%) and

adjudicated a delinquent (87%) than released or diverted away from the adjudicatory stage of the proceedings. Following intake, only 20% of the cohort were involved in a consent decree (formal adjustment). Still, the proportion of blacks comprising the cohort from referral to adjudication grew by 9 percent.

Judicial dispositions for youths adjudicated delinquent represents the last decision making stage in the proceedings. Change of placement or transfer to adult court occurs more frequently (60%) than the use of community-based treatment as a sentencing alternative. Of the blacks, 57% received a change of placement or waiver to adult court in contrast to 64% of whites. The proportion of blacks sentenced to a change of placement/transfer is 43%.

Thus, although a disproportionate percent of blacks appeared to be treated more harshly than whites at various points in the proceedings, most notably at the stage of intake, the bias apparently is omitted or corrected at the dispositional stage. Here, blacks are treated slightly more leniently than whites. The black composition of the cohort receiving the most severe outcome is not much larger than the initial cohort of referrals (+3%). Therefore, the probability of an initial referral resulting in movement through the system to a disposition of change of placement/transfer is nearly equal for both black and white youth.

Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors

In the bivariate analyses involving race and decision making outcomes, blacks apparently are treated more harshly in some situations (detention and intake), while in others whites receive less lenient outcomes (disposition). These bivariate associations taken alone, however, do not necessarily indicate racial disparity, since past and current involvement with the juvenile justice system or age may be factors that account for the observed decision making patterns.

Table 2 presents the zero-order correlations of the variables included in the analysis. An assessment of the correlations indicates few differences between black and white youth in terms of the severity of their past dispositions, whether they have committed a crime while under court authority, or in the severity of the most serious offense leading to the referral. Black youths are younger and have more extensive delinquent pasts in comparison to whites. However, whites are charged with a greater number of offenses at the time of referral than blacks.

The bivariate correlations of the legal variables with each of the outcomes or decision-making points reveal the expected relationships. For example, persons with greater prior offenses or a more severe past disposition or severe current offense, as well as those charged with a greater number of offenses are more likely, for example, to be held in detention, or referred on for further processing (intake), or receive a change of placement/transfer to adult proceedings (Judicial disposition).

Table 2. Zero-Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Youths Referred to Intake, Petitioned to Court, Received a Consent Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquent (County A).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	x	s
(1) Race	1.00											.41	
(2) Age	-.11***	1.00										15.31	1.1
(3) Gender	.11***	-.13	1.00									.22	
(4) Family Status	.30***	-.08***	.69***	1.00								.54	
(5) Prior Record	.06***	.26***	-.20***	.05***	1.00							1.61	2.1
(6) Past Disposition	-.02	-.16***	.12***	.03	-.56***	1.00						.87	
(7) Court Authority	.01	-.15***	.13***	-.01	-.51***	.41***	1.00					.77	
(8) # Current Charges	-.03**	.10***	-.09***	.02	.15***	-.04***	-.11***	1.00				1.28	
(9) Offense Severity	.02	.05***	-.07***	-.01	.14***	-.15***	-.19***	.19***	1.00			1.03	1.2
(10) Detention Status	-.01*	-.06***	.02	-.03	-.23***	.20***	.20***	-.11***	-.18***	1.00		.95	
(11) Intake	.04**	.13***	-.10***	.03	.12***	-.27***	-.31***	.19***	.34***	-.21***	1.00	1.24	
(12) Petition	.05	-.03**	.05	.04	-.01	-.01	.04	-.10***	-.11***	.01	-.01	.07	
(13) Consent Decree	-.06	.01	.11***	-.02	-.21***	.15***	.19***	-.05	-.04	.11***		.20	
(14) Adjudicated	.01	-.09*	-.01	.04	-.06*	.13***	.17***	-.01	-.12***	.03*		.13	
(15) Disposition	.07*	-.25***	.02	.02	-.17***	.29***	.16***	-.01	-.06	.03*		.40	

* Correlation coefficients not reported for comparisons between decision making stages other than the stage of detention.

***p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05; *p less than or equal to .10.

The bivariate correlations of race with each of the three outcomes where a statistically significant association is present (detention, intake, judicial disposition) are much smaller than those involving legal variables. The strongest correlates of the decision to detain are prior record (-.23), followed by court authority (.20) and the severity of the past disposition (.20). The coefficients for race (-.04) and age (-.06) are weak. Intake outcomes are most strongly correlated with offense severity (.34) and prior record (.32) while moderate correlations are present with age (.13) and gender (-.10). The correlation of race with intake is weak (.04). Of the variables correlated with judicial disposition, prior record (-.37) and past disposition (.29) are most strong. Again, the correlation of race with this stage is weak. However, age is strongly associated with judicial disposition (-.25). Older delinquents receive a harsher sentence than younger delinquents.

In summary, black youth and white youth referred to juvenile court are very similar in their past and present legal background. However, some discrepancies do exist. Black youth are younger and evidence greater past involvement with the system while white youths are charged with a greater number of offenses. Legal variables are strongly correlated with each of the decision making points, though age does appear to have some association with judicial disposition.

The next step in the analysis employed multivariate models. There, analyses were performed that estimated the effect of each independent variable while controlling simultaneously for the

influence of other variables to assess the extent to which these associations and other social and legal factors influenced each outcome.

Multivariate Analyses

The logistic regression results for each of the six decision making points in the Juvenile Justice proceedings are presented in Table 3. Recall, additive models were estimated as were models employing interaction effects. However, no models with interaction terms improved the overall chi-square fit of the model over the estimates of the main effects. Therefore, only the additive models will be reported.

Table 3 presents results of the decision to detain or not to detain. Contrary to the bivariate analyses, legal variables and not race alone explain decision making at this point. Individuals more likely to be held in detention are: youth with a greater number of past contacts with the system, persons who were not previously adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court, persons under court authority, those charged with a greater number of offenses, and juveniles who commit more severe offenses. A gender effect is also present. Females are more likely than males to be held in detention.

The next column in Table 3 provide logistic regression results for intake outcomes. The decision to recommend further processing at intake is influenced by the same legal variables evident at detention. However, race, age, and detention affect decision making at this stage in the process. Black youth, older

Table 3. Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (County A).

	Detention Status (1)	Intake (2)	Petition (3)	Consent Decree (4)	Adjudication (5)	Judicial Disposition (6)
Race	-.228 ^a / -.061 ^b (.249) ^c .827 ^d	.182 / .051 (.101) 3.39*	-.275 / .076 (.316) .757	-.377 / -.104 (.244) 2.41	-.155 / -.043 (.112) 2.28	.296 / .081 (.211) 1.93
Age	-.031 / -.033 (.079) .152	.043 / .048 (.024) 3.11*	-.108 / -.096 (.080) 1.80	-.074 / .087 (.060) 1.18	-.141 / -.113 (.093) 2.21	-.296 / .212 (.079) 12.80***
Gender	-.758 / -.173 (.323) 5.52***	-.012 / .003 (.114) .011	.188 / .038 (.372) .255	.286 / .059 (.291) 1.03	-.420 / -.080 (.465) .817	-.635 / -.122 (.296) 4.59**
Family Status	-.167 / -.046 (.252) .437	.031 / .008 (.088) .119	.268 / .073 (.323) .684	-.001 / .001 (.236) .001	.308 / .084 (.321) .921	.230 / .063 (.214) 1.15
Prior Record	-.181 / -.215 (.283) 12.27***	.148 / .197 (.029) 25.41***	-.056 / -.090 (.071) .818	-.277 / -.411 (.079) 12.15***	.064 / .097 (.069) .831	-.288 / -.479 (.051) 32.29***
Past Disposition	-.483 / .089 (.283) 2.82*	-.055 / -.159 (.183) 19.53***	-.301 / -.075 (.397) .571	-.052 / -.012 (.401) .017	.889 / .211 (.506) 2.94*	.660 / .175 (.284) 6.12**
Court Authority	.919 / .215 (.281) 10.75***	-.914 / -.213 (.139) 43.83***	-.064 / -.017 (.349) .034	.458 / .126 (.297) 2.37	1.03 / .284 (.368) 7.84***	-.145 / -.040 (.227) 4.06
# Current Charges	-.191 / -.080 (.102) 3.61*	.335 / .138 (.076) 19.45***	-.053 / -.442 (.379) 5.05**	-.156 / -.077 (.146) 1.15***	.032 / .015 (.184) .029	.017 / .009 (.111) .021
Offense Severity	-.534 / -.375 (.097) 31.00***	.507 / .349 (.041) 152.87***	-.363 / -.261 (.122) 8.83***	-.088 / -.064 (.091) .937	-.294 / -.213 (.124) 5.88***	-.184 / -.130 (.083) 4.86**
Detention Status		-1.85 / -.208 (.406) 20.77***	.390 / .067 (.633) .381	.779 / .146 (.468) 2.80*	-.606 / .128 (.567) 1.14	.096 / .017 (.328) .085
Intercept	4.558 (1.29) 12.44***	3.78 (.802) 38.94***	.344 (1.47) .055	-2.48 (1.25) 3.88**	-1.44 (.689) .729	4.62 (1.31) 11.82***
Intercept		.763 (.602) 1.61				
AIC	803.868	3337.883	367.644	507.136	321.754	604.955
BC	660.126	3405.352	416.391	554.281	366.404	851.810
-2 Log L	583.868	3313.863	345.641	485.136	299.754	582.955
N	2030	2030	745	536	428	523

a. Parameter estimate
 b. Standardized estimate
 c. Standard error
 d. Wald chi-squares

*p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05;
 ***p less than or equal to .10

youth, and juveniles detained are more likely to move on to the petition stage than whites, younger persons, and those not experiencing detention. Of the associations, the strongest with decision making at this point is offense severity (Standardized estimate= .349) while the weakest effects are with age (Standardized estimate= .046) and race (Standardized estimate= .051).

In the third column of Table 3, very few of the variables are associated with the decision to petition youth to court. The severity of the offense and the number of charges filed against the individual are the only statistically significant factors at this stage. There is no observed race effect.

The decision to use a consent decree (formal adjustment) with a youth appears to be associated with his/her prior record and detention status. Persons with a greater number of prior contacts and those who were detained are likely to be petitioned for further court processing. The relationship of prior record with decision making here is relatively strong (Standardized estimate= -.411).

Results representing adjudication indicate that persons not under court authority at the time of the referral were likely not to be found delinquent as were youth who ranked low on the severity of the offense. Again, race does not influence decision making at this point in the proceedings.

Prior record, past disposition, and offense severity are strongly associated with judicial disposition. Youth with a greater number of prior contacts with the system, persons who

were previously adjudicated a delinquent or transferred to adult court, and those charged with a more severe offense are likely to receive a change of placement or waived to adult court.

In addition to the associations between legal variables and case outcome, relationships also exist between judicial disposition and social variables- age and gender. Younger delinquents are more likely than older delinquents to be sentenced to community-based treatment, while females are more likely than males to be given a sentence of a change of placement/transfer to adult court. Of the significant associations, prior record (Standardized estimate= $-.479$) is the strongest. The age effect is second in strength (Standardized estimate= $.212$) while the gender effect is somewhat weak (Standardized estimate= $-.122$). No statistical significant association exists between race and disposition once controls for other variables are included in multivariate models.

Summary

A goal of the present study was to assess the influence of race on decision making within the juvenile justice system in one county in the state of Iowa. Three legal factors, the severity of the offense, past delinquent involvement, and the number of current charges consistently had an impact on case outcomes in four of the six decision making points in the system. Youths who were involved in a more serious offense, persons who had more prior referrals, and individuals charged with a greater number of offenses were more likely to go on through the process and

receive the most severe Judicial disposition. Additional legal factors were also significantly associated with decision making at various points in the proceedings.

Social factors, however, influenced case processing even after controlling for the effects of legal variables. Race and age had an impact on decision making at intake, while age and gender were associated with case processing at judicial disposition. Blacks and older juveniles were disproportionately more likely to be referred on at intake than whites and younger juveniles. Older youth and females were more likely to receive a judicial disposition of a change of placement/transfer in comparison to younger juveniles and males.

CHAPTER 5
RESULTS: COUNTY B

The results from bivariate and multivariate analyses of case processing and outcomes in County B are presented and discussed in this chapter. The first step in the analysis traced the movement and racial composition of the cohort of youth as they reached various decision making stages in the proceedings. The next step utilized controls for social, legal, and processing variables to account for the observed patterns of decision making.

Movement Through the System

The movement of the cohort through the juvenile justice system from the initial referral to judicial disposition is outlined in Table 1. Proportions are provided indicating the severity of the outcome(s) at each stage among and for each racial group. A total of 2,101 referrals make up the initial cohort. White youth comprise 24% of the referrals, black 23%, American Native Indian 47%, Hispanic 4%, and Asian 2%. Again, the percentages are a by-product of the sampling procedures employed. These figures are given to provide a reference as to the changes that may occur in the racial composition of youth at each stage in the proceedings.

The practice of detention is seldomly used (n=91). Only 4-5% of all youth were held in detention at some point during the

proceedings. No observable changes in the racial composition of the cohort are evident at this stage in the proceedings.

In County B, most youth are either released (21%) or receive an informal adjustment (67%). Only 12% of the youth moved further into the system. Slight race effects appear to be present at the stage of intake. The proportion of black youth in the cohort that represent youth receiving the most severe outcome grew by 8% (31% compared to 23%), while the composition of American Native Indians decreased by 11% (36% compared to 47%).

An examination of youth who received an informal adjustment provides further insight into these relationships. Of the blacks, 58% received an informal adjustment compared to 70% and 71% for whites and American Native Indians, respectively. The composition of the cohort of American Native Indians receiving an informal adjustment is only slightly above their representation at the time of the referral (+3%). Therefore, one can conclude that American Native Indians are most likely to be disproportionately released in comparison to other racial groups.

Youth who are not involved in an informal adjustment but are instead referred on are more likely to be petitioned (78%) and adjudicated a delinquent (98%) than released or diverted away from the adjudicatory stage of the proceedings. Following intake, only 18% of the cohort were involved in a consent decree (formal adjustment). At petition, 60% of the Asians, 72% of the blacks and 78% of the American Native Indians were petitioned compared to 88% for whites and 83% for Hispanics. Leniency appears to be given at this stage to Asians, followed by blacks

and American Native Indians while whites and Hispanics are treated more harshly. The cohort of youth receiving the most severe outcome has grown somewhat for whites (+5) and blacks (+5%), decreased for American Indians (-11%), and remained relatively stable for both Hispanics and Asians.

Of the black youth, 72% did not receive a consent decree a figure much lower in comparison to the other racial groups. No Asian (n= 3) received/agreed to a consent decree. Changes in the composition of the cohort moving through the system are most evident for whites (+8%) and American Indians (-7%). Thus, the composition of the cohort represented by white youth is steadily growing. These patterns are pretty much the same at adjudication since only 3 persons were not adjudicated a delinquent.

Judicial dispositions for youths adjudicated delinquent represent the last decision making stage in the proceedings. Change of placement or transfer to adult court occurs slightly more frequently (54%) than the use of community-based treatment as a sentencing alternative. Of the whites, 38% received a change of placement or waiver to adult court in contrast to 78% for Hispanics, 73% for blacks, 67% for Asians, and 55% for American Indians. At this point in the proceedings, the findings suggest Hispanics, blacks and Asians are treated more harshly than whites and American Native Indians.

Tracing the movement of youth from the point of referral to judicial disposition reveals that whites represent 20% of the cohort, blacks 34%, American Native Indians 35%, hispanics 8%, and asians 2%. The 34% figure for blacks represents an increase

of 11%, while an increase of 100% is evident for hispanics. The changes in the composition of the cohort for American Native Indians, on the other hand, represents a significant decrease of 12%. The representation of whites and asians is very similar to their size at the point of referral. Therefore, the probabilities of a youth moving from referral to the stage of judicial disposition and receiving a change of placement/transfer is: 3.5 for whites, 6.3 for blacks, 3.1 for American Native Indians, 8.4 for hispanics, and 4.0 for asians.

In summary, race effects appear to be evident at various points in the proceedings. Whites are treated harshly at petition and consent decree but most often are subject to leniency, most notably at the stage of intake and disposition. Blacks are treated more harsh at intake and disposition, and receive leniency at the stages of petition and consent decree. American Native Indians receive lenient treatment at almost every stage in the proceedings, especially at intake; but are treated to some degree more harshly at petition than other racial groups. Hispanics are most often treated more harshly in comparison to the other youth throughout the process. Asians receive leniency at petition and relative harshness at disposition. It is important to note that the observed relationships between Hispanics and Asians with decision making stages must be viewed with caution since their numbers, especially as they moved on into the system, were very small (e.g., 9 Hispanics and 3 Asians at judicial disposition). Regardless of race, all youth were

treated harshly at adjudication as 98% of those reaching this stage were adjudicated a delinquent.

The probability of moving on from the point of referral to receiving a judicial disposition of a change of placement/transfer is greatest for Hispanics and blacks. American Native Indians are the least likely racial group to either reach this stage in the proceedings or receive the most severe judicial disposition.

Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors

In the bivariate analyses, differences are apparent involving race and decision making outcomes. These associations, however, taken alone, do not indicate racial bias. Past and current involvement with the juvenile justice system as well as age may be factors that account for the observed decision making patterns.

Table 2 presents the zero-order correlations of the variables included in the analysis (the process of comparing two variables to each other). Dummy variables were created representing each race with whites the reference category.

Negative correlations exist with the dummy variable black and prior record, past disposition, and court authority. That is, whites are more likely than blacks to have more prior contacts with the system, a less severe past disposition, and not be under court authority at the time of the referral. A positive correlation is evident between black youth and the severity of

Table 2. Zero-Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Youths Referred to Intake, Petitioned to Court, Received a Consent Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquent (County B).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	M	SD
(1) Dummy Variable (Black)	1.00															.23
(2) Dummy Variable (A.N. Indian) ^a	.6	1.00														.47
(3) Dummy Variable (Hispanic)			1.00													.04
(4) Dummy Variable (Asian)				1.00												.02
(5) Age	-.02	-.13***	.04**	-.03*	1.00											13.66
(6) Gender	-.03***	.12***	-.02	-.02	.04**	1.00										.20
(7) Family Status	-.04**	.30***	-.04**	-.03***	.11***	.05***	1.00									.62
(8) Prior Record	-.07***	.31***	-.11***	-.08***	.13***	-.10***	.17***	1.00								1.95
(9) Post Disposition	-.06**	-.01	-.01	.01	-.12***	.07***	-.01	-.16***	1.00							.96
(10) Court Authority	-.09***	-.03***	.03*	.01	-.14***	.09***	-.01	-.25***	.44***	1.00						.89
(11) # Current Charges	-.01	.05***	.02	.01	.10***	.02	.05***	.12***	-.05***	-.03*	1.00					1.12
(12) Offense Severity	.06***	-.08***	.02	.05***	.17***	-.10***	-.02	.17***	-.07***	-.15***	.05***	1.00				.68
(13) Detention Status	.01	-.01	.01	-.01	-.09***	.03*	-.02	-.05***	-.01	.06***	-.05**	-.21***	1.00			.98
(14) Intake	-.01	-.02	-.01	-.02	.18***	-.03*	-.01**	.06***	-.03*	-.10***	.01	.21***	-.27***	1.00		.90
(15) Petition	-.10*	.01	-.03	.06	-.07	-.03	.01	-.02	-.03	.04	.02	-.10*	.24***	.0		.21
(16) Consent Decree	-.16**	-.09	-.01	-.06	.01	-.05	-.06	-.11*	.09	.07	.04	-.13**	.25***			.10
(17) Adjudicated	-.06	-.02	-.03	-.02	.02	-.00	-.00	-.05	.03	.08	-.03	.02	.13*			.02
(18) Delinquency	-.20***	.02	-.11*	-.03	-.17**	.08	-.21***	-.20***	.10**	.17**	-.12*	-.04	.25***			.46

a. American Native Indian
 b. Correlation coefficients not reported for comparisons between race.
 c. Correlation coefficients not reported for comparisons between decision making stages other than the stage of detention.

***p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05; *p less than or equal to .10.

the offense. Blacks are also more likely to be male and come from homes where two members are present.

Legal variables positively correlated with American Native Indians are prior record and the number of current charges. Negative associations exist with court authority and the severity of the current offense. American Native Indians are also likely to be young, female, and come from homes where one member is present.

Statistically significant negative relationships exist between hispanic youth and prior record and court authority. These youth are also older and live with both parents.

Asian youth evidence few prior contacts with the system, and those who had such contact are more likely to have not been adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court. These juveniles also tend to be young and have two adults in the home.

The bivariate correlations of the legal variables with each of the decision making points reveal the expected relationships. For example, persons with a greater number of charges at the time of referral or those with a more serious offense are likely to be detained while youth not under court authority will most likely be free of detention. Both positive and negative associations are evident at intake. Prior record and the severity of the current offense are positively correlated with this stage in the proceedings while negative correlations exist with past disposition, court authority, and detention. Youth charged with a more serious offense and those detained are likely to be petitioned. At the point of the consent decree, persons with a

greater number of prior contacts with the system. Juveniles charged with a more serious offense or those detained are not likely to receive a consent decree (formal adjustment). Positive relationships are present with judicial disposition and past disposition, court authority, detention. Negative correlations are evident between this stage and prior record and the number of current charges.

Age, gender, and family status are correlated with various decision making stages. Younger youth are not likely to be detained or receive a judicial disposition of a change of placement/transfer. Older youth are likely to move on further into the system at the stage of intake than a release or informal adjustment. Females are less likely to be detained than males. Youth from two headed households are more likely to move on from intake and receive a more severe judicial disposition than those with a single member.

An assessment of the bivariate correlations of race with each of the outcomes reveals some statistically significant associations. A positive relationship is present between blacks and petition (blacks are likely not to be petitioned) while a negative correlation exists with judicial disposition (blacks are likely to be placed/transferred). Hispanic youth are also more likely to be placed/transferred than receive community based treatment at disposition.

The strongest correlates of decision making are legal and processing variables, though the effects of race at some points in the system are significant in size. The strongest correlates

of the decision to detain, for example, are the severity of the current offense (-.21), followed by a weak association with age (-.09). Intake outcomes are most strongly correlated with detention (-.27) and offense severity (.21) while weak coefficients are present with age (.09) and court authority (-.09). The dummy variable black is significant at petition. The strength of the coefficient (.10) is second to the association between detention status and petition (.24). Of the coefficients correlated with consent decree, detention (.25) black (.16) and the severity of the offense (-.13) are most strong. At judicial disposition, detention (.25), family status (-.23), black (-.20), and prior record (-.20) are the strongest of the correlations. The coefficient for the dummy variable Hispanic is weak in comparison (-.11).

In summary, comparisons of the zero-order correlations suggest that differences in legal, extralegal, and processing variables exist among white, black, American Native Indian, Hispanic, and Asian youth which may or may not account for the observed discrepancies in decision making. For example, the leniency given to whites and the harshness provided to blacks at judicial disposition may be the result of the differences in their prior record, past disposition, or the finding that white youth were less likely to have been under court authority at the time of the referral. Each of these variables is also associated with judicial disposition. However, zero-order correlations do not control for the influence of other possible influential effects. Thus, the next step in the analysis estimated the

effect of each independent variable while controlling simultaneously for the influence of other variables to assess the extent to which these associations and other social and legal factors influenced each outcome.

Multivariate Analyses

The logistic regression results for each of the six decision making points in the juvenile justice proceedings is presented in Table 3. Additive models were estimated as were models employing interaction effects. The results from interaction terms are reported only if they improved the overall fit of the model over the estimates of the main effects.

The small number of Hispanic and Asian youth preclude their inclusion in the multivariate analyses. Therefore, two dummy variables representing blacks and American Native Indians with whites the reference category were constructed and included in the regression models. Because of the few number of cases that involved a consent decree (n=28) and a failure to arrive at a finding of no adjudication of delinquency (n=3), models were not estimated for those specific stages in the proceedings.

Column 1 in Table 3 presents the main effects from the additive model for the decision to detain or not to detain. Individuals more likely to be held in detention are: youth with who were previously adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court, persons under court authority, and those who commit more severe offenses. Older youth are also likely to be detained.

Table 3. Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (Sample 2).

	Outcomes		Intake		Punition		Additional Punishment	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Black	.416 ^b / -.096 ^c	.406 ^b / -.013	-.243 ^b / .011	-2.317 ^b / .843	.004 ^b / .251	-1.547 ^b / .301	-1.017 ^b / .046	
(Dummy Variable)	(.337) ^d	(.300)	(.121)	(.818)	(.407)	(.573)	(.591)	
	5.12 ^e	1.09	2.07 ^e	7.90 ^{***}	3.04 ^{***}	8.34 ^{***}	3.36 ^{***}	
A.M. Indian ^f	-.127 ^b / -.034	.469 ^b / -.170	-.101 ^b / -.050	1.017 ^b / -.270	.520 ^b / -.107	-.590 ^b / .153	-4.127 ^b / 2.3 ^e	
(Dummy Variable)	(.200)	(.223)	(.121)	(.855)	(.524)	(.528)	(6.0 ^e)	
	.664	1.00	1.82	2.20	1.01	3.78	6.0 ^{***}	
Age	-.120 ^b / .314	-.132 ^b / .265	.014 ^b / -.024	-.033 ^b / -.054	-.190 ^b / .311	-.100 ^b / .195	-.104 ^b / .440	
(Continuous)	(.052)	(.052)	(.012)	(.030)	(.090)	(.071)	(.060)	
	8.20 ^{***}	8.21 ^{***}	6.51	7.91	2.02	2.20	6.00 ^{***}	
Gender	-.107 ^b / .026	1.007 ^b / .240	-.020 ^b / -.090	-.005 ^b / -.001	-.002 ^b / .133	.247 ^b / -.009	2.207 ^b / .408	
(Dummy Variable)	(.202)	(.017)	(.115)	(.518)	(.300)	(.000)	(1.10)	
	.744	2.04	.075	.001	1.07	.320	2.90 ^{**}	
Family Status	-.200 ^b / .103	-.370 ^b / .201	-.120 ^b / .011	-.120 ^b / .034	.754 ^b / -.000	-.000 ^b / .210	-.009 ^b / .212	
(Dummy Variable)	(.201)	(.203)	(.107)	(.103)	(.374)	(.021)	(.030)	
	2.20	2.00	1.41	1.42	.457	3.44 [*]	3.75 ^{**}	
Prior Record	.000 ^b / -.024	.007 ^b / -.010	.011 ^b / -.020	.013 ^b / -.033	.020 ^b / -.041	-.110 ^b / .105	-.105 ^b / .110	
(Continuous)	(.020)	(.021)	(.012)	(.012)	(.041)	(.071)	(.002)	
	.005	.007	.024	0.22	.107	2.21	1.61	
Past Punishment	-1.007 ^b / .123	-1.147 ^b / .130	-.094 ^b / -.011	-.107 ^b / -.012	-.007 ^b / .001	1.707 ^b / -.272	1.127 ^b / -.220	
(Continuous)	(.012)	(.003)	(.703)	(.204)	(.110)	(1.21)	(1.33)	
	2.01 [*]	3.15 [*]	.277	.105	.007	3.01	1.00	
Court Authority	.005 ^b / -.101	.117 ^b / -.105	-.412 ^b / .075	-.000 ^b / .110	.473 ^b / -.100	-.010 ^b / .010	-.001 ^b / .001	
(Continuous)	(.310)	(.217)	(.122)	(.204)	(.501)	(.530)	(.551)	
	2.20 [*]	3.31 [*]	5.13 ^{**}	6.00 ^{***}	.001	.017	.001	
Current Charges	-.220 ^b / .000	-.231 ^b / .002	-.020 ^b / .007	-.070 ^b / .010	.102 ^b / -.000	-.510 ^b / .175	-.217 ^b / .173	
(Continuous)	(.100)	(.004)	(.101)	(.103)	(.221)	(.505)	(.553)	
	1.00	2.00	.006	.133	.310	1.00	.000	
Offense Severity	-.030 ^b / .200	-.037 ^b / .200	.317 ^b / -.191	.444 ^b / -.271	-.101 ^b / .090	.015 ^b / -.004	.114 ^b / -.065	
(Continuous)	(.000)	(.000)	(.010)	(.005)	(.157)	(.172)	(.220)	
	51.12 ^{***}	50.30 ^{***}	12.55 ^{***}	17.05 ^{***}	1.00	.005	.200	
Punishment Status			-.257 ^b / .204	-.597 ^b / .201	2.027 ^b / -.590	0.217 ^b / .310	1.117 ^b / .342	
(Continuous)			(.210)	(.201)	(.001)	(.021)	(.102)	
			107.51 ^{***}	105.05 ^{***}	10.22 ^{***}	0.07 ^{***}	0.60 ^{***}	
A.M. Indian X Gender		-.037 ^b / .257					-2.317 ^b / .904	
(Continuous)		(.000)					(1.33)	
		5.51 ^{**}					3.00 [*]	
Black X Age				-.106 ^b / -.210				
(Continuous)				(.051)				
				4.21 ^{**}				
A.M. Indian X Age				-.000 ^b / .307			.555 ^b / -2.23	
(Continuous)				(.004)			(.203)	
				3.00 [*]			4.40 ^{**}	
Black X Court Authority				.770 ^b / -.194				
(Continuous)				(.320)				
				0.00 ^{**}				
A.M. Indian X Offense Severity				-.277 ^b / .121				
(Continuous)				(.001)				
				0.21 ^{***}				
Intercept	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.00	-1.10	2.00	0.20	
(Continuous)	(1.07)	21.00	(.470)	(.700)	(1.00)	(2.77)	(1.00)	
	27.00 ^{***}	26.00 ^{***}	10.05 ^{***}	30.00 ^{***}	.02	.007	0.10 ^{**}	
Intercept			.300	.200				
(Continuous)			(.472)	(.701)				
			.000	.000				
N	845,842	600,027	3120,201	3112,210	222,200	100,000	175,100	
MC	707,057	707,020	3110,010	3207,255	210,100	210,100	210,100	
+2 log L	822,042	610,027	3112,201	3070,210	200,200	100,000	175,100	
R	1001	1001	1001	1001	230	144	144	

a. Too few cases in categories of control group and education precluded estimation of odds.
 b. Parameter estimate
 c. Standardized estimate
 d. Standard error
 e. Wald chi-square
 f. American Native Indian

*p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05; ***p less than or equal to .10

The results from the interaction model that improved the overall fit of the additive model are represented in column 2 in Table 3. Here, the decision to detain is impacted by the effects of gender with being American Native Indian. Male American Native Indians are more likely to be detained than their female counterparts. This association is second in strength to the effects of the severity of the offense (Standardized estimate = .34 compared to .39).

The next column in Table 3 provides logistic regression results from the additive model for intake outcomes. The decision to recommend further processing at intake is influenced by the legal variables court authority and the severity of the offense and the variable, detention. Youth under court authority at the time of the referral, or those charged with a more serious crime, or persons subject to detention are likely to move on to the next stage in the proceedings.

A weak race effect is also present. Black youth appear to be treated more leniently than white or American Native Indian youth. This effect, however, is conditioned by age. The results of the influence of age with race and decision making at intake are presented in column 4 in Table 3. Here, four interaction terms are significant. The first two of these are between blacks and American Native Indians with age. The other two interactive terms involve race and two legal variables, court authority and the seriousness of the offense. All four of these relationships are described in greater detail in Table 4, designated by parts A thru C.

As can be seen in Table 4 part A, younger youth are more likely than older youth to be released or receive an informal adjustment rather than move further into the proceedings at intake. No significant age differential distinguishes those released from youth receiving an informal adjustment. The effect of race appears to be influenced, in part, by the effect of age on these two outcomes at the stage of intake. That is, younger youth appear to be treated more leniently than older youth. This association holds true for whites, blacks, and American Native Indians.

Younger white youth are either released or receive an informal adjustment, while younger black youth are disproportionately released. American Native Indians are overrepresented in both of the more lenient outcomes at this stage, though the youngest of this group fall into the outcome of informal adjustment. The oldest youth from each group goes further into the system. Here, blacks are slightly overrepresented while American Native Indians are overly underrepresented. Again, this occurrence appears to be somewhat associated with age. However, while American Native Indian youth are younger than white youth no significant age discrepancy appears to exist with them and blacks. Yet, American Native Indian youth are treated disproportionately more leniently than black youth.

In addition, white youth who are released are older than both blacks and American Native Indians receiving an informal adjustment or recommended for further processing. Therefore,

while decision making at this point is age specific for blacks, a clear pattern of that effect is not evident for whites and American Native Indians. Thus, black youth are provided some leniency in the form of release but they are also the subjects of harshness at intake in comparison to whites and American Native Indians, regardless of age.

The third and fourth interaction effect evident in column 4 of Table 3 reflects the leniency given to blacks and American Native Indians. The third interaction is between blacks and court authority while the fourth involves American Native Indians and the severity of the offense. These relationships are presented in Table 4, represented by part B and part C, respectively.

Black youth are more likely than American Native Indian and especially, white youth to be released while under a previous order of juvenile court supervision (e.g., probation). American Native Indians, however, are released at intake more often than the other two groups when charged with a felon (24% of American Native Indians compared to 18% of the blacks and 12% of the whites).

The analyses up to this point indicate that legal and processing factors play a significant role in explaining decision making at detention and intake. However, the strongest associations at intake are the effects of being black and American Native Indian with age (Standardized estimates = .35 and .31), followed by the additive effect of detention (Standardized

Table 4. Explanations of Interaction Effects at Stage of Intake.

PART A Outcomes at Intake Differentiated by Mean Age of Youth and Race

Race	Release	Informal Adjustment	Further Processing
White	14.67 (n=90)	14.33 (n=353)	15.41 (n=64)
Black	12.88 (n=125)	13.37 (n=274)	15.22 (n=76)
American Native Indian	13.91 (n=199)	12.89 (n=695)	14.66 (n=90)

PART B Youth Released Differentiated by Race and Court Authority

Race	Court Authority	
	Yes	No
White	N= 6 (7%)	N= 84 (93%)
Black	N= 22 (18%)	N=103 (82%)
American Native Indian	N= 13 (7%)	N=186 (93%)

PART C Youth Released Differentiated by Race and Severity of Offense

Race	Severity of Offense			
	Simple Misdemeanor	Serious Misdemeanor	Aggravated Misdemeanor	Felony
White	N= 55 (61%)	N= 17 (19%)	N= 7 (8%)	N= 11 (12%)
Black	N= 77 (61%)	N=10 (8%)	N= 16 (13%)	N= 22 (18%)
American Native Indian	N=122 (61%)	N= 19 (10%)	N=10 (5%)	N= 48 (24%)

estimate= -.29). A significant interaction effect between gender and American Native Indian is also present at detention.

In the fifth column of Table 3, very few of the variables are associated with the decision to petition youth to court. Juveniles not subject to detention are less likely to be petitioned (Standardized estimate= .58). A much weaker race effect is also present (Standardized estimate= .14). Consistent with the findings from the bivariate analyses, blacks are less likely than whites and American Native Indians to be petitioned. Thus, at this stage in the proceedings black youth are treated somewhat more leniently than whites and American Native Indians.

As indicated previously, regression models were not estimated for the stages of consent decree and adjudication. The last stage is represented by judicial disposition. Here, youth subject to detention, blacks, older individuals, and persons coming from a one parent household are associated with the likelihood of receiving a judicial disposition of a change of placement/ transfer to adult court (column 6 Table 3).

An interactive model that produced a significant increase in the overall fit of the additive model is presented in column 7 Table 3. There are significant interaction effects by American Native Indians for the impact of age and gender. American Native Indians receiving the more severe judicial disposition at this stage are younger than the whites and blacks who received a similar outcome. This effect is second in strength to that of being black (Standardized estimate= 2.23 compared to -2.38).

Female American Native Indians are also more likely to receive the more severe outcome than black and white females. This relationship is made more clear in Table 5. There it is evident that although the number of females given a sanction of a change of placement/transfer is relatively small at 11, nine of those were American Native Indians.

Summary

A goal of the present study was to assess what factors influence decision making within the juvenile justice system in County B. One legal factor, the severity of the offense was strongly influential at the stages of detention and intake. Youth who were involved in a more serious offense were most likely to be detained and referred on at intake. Detention status was also a significant predictor of decision making at intake, petition, and judicial disposition. Persons held in detention at some point in the proceedings were likely to receive the most severe outcome at the above mentioned three stages.

Social factors, however, influenced case processing even after controlling for the effects of legal variables. These effects were often stronger than the effects of the legal and processing variables. In particular, race, age, gender, and family status played a significant role at various points in the decision making process.

Findings from the bivariate analyses suggest blacks and especially Hispanics may be treated more harshly than other youth. American Native Indian youths and white youths appear to

Table 5. Youth Receiving a Judicial Disposition of Change of Placement/Transfer to Adult Court, Differentiated by Race and Gender

Race	Gender	
	Male	Female
White	N=18 (100%)	-
Black	N=28 (93%)	N=2 (7%)
American Native Indian	N=22 (86%)	N=9 (14%)

be given leniency throughout the proceedings, especially at intake. Blacks are almost twice as likely as whites, American Native Indians, and Asians to move through the entire system and receive an outcome of a change of placement/transfer.

Multivariate analyses support the assumption that race may account for the discrepancies in case processing. While black youth under a previous order of court authority were treated leniently at intake, older blacks overall were treated slightly more harshly than whites and significantly more so than American Native Indians. American Native Indians and whites were the recipients of leniency in comparison to blacks at almost every decision making stage. The two exceptions are at the stage of petition and judicial disposition.

Blacks received leniency at petition while female American Native Indians were given a more severe outcome than white and black females at judicial disposition. The effects of gender were also evident at detention where male American Native Indians were more likely to be detained than female American Native Indians. Older youth were treated more harshly at detention, intake, and judicial disposition. Persons from single parent family households were also treated more harshly. In short, legal and processing factors as well as extralegal variables impact juvenile justice decision making in this particular county.

CHAPTER 6
RESULTS: COUNTY C

The results from bivariate and multivariate analyses of juvenile justice decision making in County C are reported and discussed in this chapter. The first step in the analysis involves tracing the movement of the youth cohort from one stage to another. Zero-order correlations are also provided to assess the extent legal, nonlegal, and processing variables are associated with the observed decision making outcomes. Additive and interactive models are then estimated to examine the influence of race on each decision making stage in the proceedings.

Movement Through the System

The movement of the cohort through the juvenile justice system from the initial referral to judicial disposition is outlined in Table 1. Proportions are provided indicating the severity of the outcome(s) at each stage among and for each racial group. A total of 1,999 referrals make up the initial cohort. White youth comprise 50% of the referrals, black 39%, Hispanic 6%, Asian 3%, and American Native Indian 1%. The percentages are artifacts of the sampling procedure. However, they allow for assessments of the changing of the racial composition of the youth cohort as it moves from referral to each stage in the proceedings.

Table 1. Case Processing by Race (County 6).

	White • 328	Black • 205	U.S. Indian ^a • 13	Hispanic ^b • 92	Latin ^c • 35
Not Detained (N=1899)					
Released (N=1822)					
Informal Adjustment (N=576)					
No Petition Filed (N=117)					
Consent Received (N=121)					
Dismissed/Adjudication withheld (N=9)					
Community Treatment ^d (N=36)					
Intake					
Further Processing (N=368)					
Petition Filed (N=223)					
No Consent Received (N=127)					
Adjudicated Delinquent (N=122)					
Placement/Transferred (N=18)					
Detained (N=128)					
Proportion of all detained further processed of all processed further	15%	12%	32%	19%	18%
Proportion of all processed further	46%	41%	24%	7%	4%
Proportion of all processed informal adjustment	59%	22%	1%	5%	3%
Proportion of all processed informal adjustment	55%	97%	68%	92%	100%
Proportion of all processed receiving no consent degree no consent degree	4%	4%	3%	4%	5%
Proportion of all processed receiving no consent degree no consent degree	11%	12%	4%	4%	5%
Proportion of all processed adjudicated	4%	9%	100%	100%	93%
Proportion of all adjudicated delinquent	11%	11%	1%	1%	1%
Proportion of all adjudicated placed/transferred of all placed/transferred	47%	44%	100%	100%	100%
Proportion of all placed/transferred	33%	31%	3%	4%	4%

1. Mexican Native Indian
 2. Proportion within a specific category of race.
 3. Proportion of all persons.
 4. The numbers in the "Consent Received" and "No Consent Received" categories do not add up to 323 (the total number of filed petitions).
 5. The numbers in the "Community Treatment" and "Change of Placement to Adult Court" categories do not add up to 122 (the total number of adjudicated delinquents). The larger N (128) is due to the grouping of transferred to adult court into the latter category and 11 missing cases.

Detention is not practiced that often (n=130). Only 6.5% of all youth were held in detention at some point during the proceedings. However, discrepancies exist in who is subject to detention. Of the American Native Indians, 33% were detained, as were 13% of the Hispanics. These figures are quite high in comparison to the 4.5% and 7% for whites and blacks, respectively. Changes are also evident in the size of the cohort. The proportion of whites detained is 15.4% lower in comparison to their initial representation, while Hispanic representation doubled (12% compared to 6%).

In county C, most youth are either released (54%) or receive an informal adjustment (29%). Of the whites, 34% received an informal adjustment compared to 24% for blacks, American Native Indians, and Hispanics. Of the Asians, 26% received this outcome. Only 17% of the youth moved further into the system. The black representation in the cohort moving further into the system has increased by 5% (represented by the more severe outcome at this point), while that of white youth decreased by 6%.

Youth who are not released or involved in an informal adjustment but are instead referred on are more than likely to be petitioned (95%). Only 17 cases were diverted away at this stage. Keeping in mind this small number, of the Hispanics, 83% were petitioned compared to 97% of the blacks and 95% of the whites.

In contrast to the other two counties, the consent decree is often used. In fact, 59% of the youth at the stage of the

consent decree receive and/or agree to a formal adjustment. Of the whites, 38% were referred on in comparison to 83% of the American Native Indians, 52% of the Hispanics, and 50% of the Asians. Thus, white youth were more likely than other youth to receive a formal adjustment. The proportion of white youth moving on to the next stage in the proceedings is 41%, roughly a 9% decrease in their representation in the cohort. Black youth are still slightly overrepresented by 3%. Very few differences are evident among the other groups in comparison to their cohort size at the beginning of the proceedings.

At the stage of adjudication, 94% of all youth are adjudicated a delinquent. Comparisons within racial and ethnic categories reveal that Hispanics and American Native Indians are more likely than whites, blacks, and Asians to receive the most severe outcome. All of the Hispanic ($n=10$) and American Native Indian youth ($n=5$) were found to be delinquent. Again, keep in mind that only 8 juveniles were not adjudicated a delinquent. Thus, white youth are still underrepresented at this stage in the process (-9%), while blacks are slightly overrepresented (+4%).

Judicial dispositions for youths adjudicated delinquent represents the last decision making stage in the proceedings. Change of placement or transfer to adult court occurs slightly more frequently (56%) than the use of community-based treatment as a sentencing alternative. Of the whites, 47% received a change of placement or waiver to adult court ($n=24$) in contrast to 64% for blacks ($n=38$), 33% for Hispanics ($n=3$), 100% for American Native Indians ($n=2$) and 60% for Asians ($n=3$). Thus,

differential treatment appears to be given to whites relative to other youth and in particular, black youth. The size of the cohort receiving the most severe outcome at this stage is as follows: whites 34%, blacks 54%, Hispanics 4%, American Native Indians 3%, and Asians 4%. Recall, the composition of whites and blacks in the cohort at the time of the initial referral was 50% and 39%, respectively. Here, the size of the white cohort was reduced by 16% while representation by blacks increased by 15%. Although most youth do not go beyond the stage of intake, the probability of a black youth moving on to the stage of judicial disposition and receiving a change of placement/transfer is much greater than a white youth (5% compared to 2%).

In summary, results from the bivariate analyses suggest race effects may be evident at various points in the proceedings. Whites receive more lenient treatment than minority youths, especially blacks at intake, to some degree at the stage of consent decree, and significantly at judicial disposition. Hispanic youth and American Native Indian youth appear to be detained and adjudicated disproportionate in comparison to white, black, and asian youth. Again, it is important to note that the overall number of Hispanics, American Native Indians, and Asians at adjudication were small. The tracing of the racial composition of the youth from referral to judicial disposition also indicates that whites drop out of the system and receive the least severe outcome at various stages more often than blacks. No cumulative effects are evident for the other racial groups in the study.

Bivariate Comparisons Among Social, Legal and Processing Factors

In the bivariate analyses, differences are apparent involving race and decision making outcomes. These associations, however, taken alone, do not prove racial bias. Past and current involvement with the juvenile justice system as well as age may be factors that account for the observed decision making at individual stages or the changes in the racial composition of the cohort moving through the system.

Table 2 presents the zero-order correlations of the variables included in the analysis (the process of comparing two variables to each other). Dummy variables with whites as the reference category were created and included to assess the relationships of race with legal, nonlegal, and processing variables.

Black youth evidence more prior contacts with juvenile justice authorities in contrast to white youth. In addition, blacks are more likely than whites to have a past disposition that involved an adjudication of delinquency or waiver to adult court. Persons most likely to be under court authority at the time of the current referral are black rather than white. White youth, however, appear to be charged with a more serious offense than black youth. Associations also exist between race and age, gender, and family status. In contrast to blacks, whites are older, male, and come from a two member family household.

No differences are apparent in legal variables when American Native Indians are compared with whites. American Native Indian

Table 2. Zero-Order Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Variables Referred to Intake, Partitioned to Court, Received a Control Decree, and Adjudicated Delinquency (County C).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	<i>M</i>	<i>S.D.</i>	
(1) Dummy Variable (Black)	1.00															.39	.49
(2) Dummy Variable (A.N. Indian) ^a	-.06	1.00														.01	.10
(3) Dummy Variable (Hispanic)			1.00													.00	.24
(4) Dummy Variable (Asian)				1.00												.03	.18
(5) Age	-.12***	.03**	-.02	-.04**	1.00											15.13	1.05
(6) Gender	.13***	.01	-.06***	-.07***	-.02	1.00										.23	.42
(7) Family Status	.22***	-.03*	-.10***	-.13***	-.07***	.09***	1.00									.54	.50
(8) Prior Record	.14***	.02	.14***	-.07***	.10***	-.10***	.02***	1.00								1.12	2.02
(9) Past Disposition	-.07***	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.05***	.00***	.01	-.40***	1.00							.97	.50
(10) Court Authority	-.05***	.02	-.04**	.01	-.02	.03***	-.01	-.45***	.20***	1.00						.90	.50
(11) # Current Charges	.01	.01	-.01	.01	.04***	-.04**	-.03	.07***	-.00**	-.02	1.00					.21	.31
(12) Offense Severity	-.04**	.01	.03*	-.05**	.04**	-.15***	-.03***	.11***	-.10***	-.09***	.00***	1.00				1.07	1.23
(13) Detention Status	-.02	-.11***	-.07***	-.02	-.00***	.02	.04**	-.20***	.20***	.20***	-.05***	-.10***	1.00			.94	.25
(14) Intake	-.01	.04**	.01	-.01	.11***	-.09***	-.01	.21***	-.14***	-.21***	.12***	.29***	-.20***	1.00		.03	.24
(15) Pretrial	-.07	.04	.15***	-.04	-.01	.05	-.01	-.04	.02	.01	-.04	-.01	.04	-.01	.04	.05	.22
(16) Control Decree	.02	-.12**	-.06	-.04	-.01	.02	.01	-.20***	.20***	.21***	-.04	-.10***	.35***			.59	.49
(17) Adjudicated	.04	-.05	-.07	.10	.01	-.02	-.00	.02	.03	-.02	.03	-.03	.16**			.00	.24
(18) Disposition	-.17**	-.14*	.12*	-.02	.00	.10**	.00	-.24***	.10**	.24***	-.02	.00	.48***			.44	.50

a. American Native Indian

b. Correlation coefficients not reported for comparisons between race.

c. Correlation coefficients not reported for comparisons between decision making stages other than the stage of detention.

*** less than or equal to .01; ** less than or equal to .05; * less than or equal to .10.

youth appear to be older and reside in homes where two persons are present in contrast to white youth.

Comparisons between hispanics and whites reveal that the former group of youth evidence more prior referrals and serious delinquent activity than the latter. Hispanic youth are more likely to be male while white youth are likely to come from one parent households.

Whites exhibit more prior contacts with the system than Asians. In addition, white youth are involved in more serious activity. In comparison to asians whites are also more likely to be older, male, and come from one parent households.

The bivariate correlations of the legal variables with each of the decision making points reveal the expected relationships. For example, persons with a greater number of charges at the time of referral or those with a more serious offense are likely to be detained while youth not under court authority will most likely be free of detention. Similar associations are evident at intake, petition, consent decree, adjudication, and judicial disposition.

Age, gender, and family status are correlated with decision making at detention and intake. Younger youth are less likely to be detained or referred on for further processing at intake in comparison to older youth. Females are less likely than males to be recommended for further processing at intake. Last and to some degree somewhat surprisingly, youth from two member homes are more likely to be detained than those residing in single family households.

An assessment of the bivariate correlations of race with each of the outcomes reveals statistically significant associations. Both American Native Indian and hispanic youth are more likely than whites and asians to be detained during some point in the proceedings. American Native Indians are also more likely to be recommended for further processing at intake in comparison to whites. A positive association is evident between being hispanic and the likelihood of release at the stage of petition. A negative relationship exists between American Native Indians and consent decree. That is, American Native Indians are less likely than whites to receive/agree to a consent decree. At judicial disposition, white youth are more likely than black and American Native Indian youth to receive a sentence of community-based treatment. A positive association exists at this stage with the dummy variable hispanic.

The strongest correlates of decision making are legal and processing variables. The strongest correlates of judicial disposition, for example, are prior record (-.34) and court authority (.24). In comparison, the effects of the dummy variables black (-.17), American Native Indian (-.11), Hispanic (.12) and Asian (-.02) are relatively weak. This pattern is evident at each stage in the proceedings. However, the race effect pertaining to the comparison of hispanic youth to white youth with petition is the strongest of the statistically significant associations.

In summary, comparisons of the zero-order correlations suggest that differences in legal, extralegal, and processing

variables exist among white, black, American Native Indian, Hispanic, and Asian youth which may or may not account for the observed patterns in decision making. For example, the leniency given to Hispanics at petition in comparison to other racial groups may be the result of the differences in prior record or the severity of the offense. Each of these variables is also associated with the petition variable. However, zero-order correlations do not control for the influence of other possible influential effects. Thus, the next step in the analysis estimated the effect of each independent variable while controlling simultaneously for the influence of other variables to assess the extent to which these associations and other social and legal factors influenced each outcome.

Multivariate Analyses

The logistic regression results for each of the six decision making points in the Juvenile Justice proceedings is presented in Table 3. Additive models were estimated as were models employing interaction effects. The results from interaction terms are not reported because they did not improve the overall chi-square fit of the model over the estimates of the main effects.

The small number of American Native Indian, Hispanic and Asian youth preclude their inclusion in the multivariate analyses. Therefore, a dummy variable representing blacks with whites as the reference category was constructed and included in the regression models. Due to the large percentage of cases that

Table 3. Logistic Regression Results for Multiple Processing Outcomes (County C),^a

	Detention Status (1)	Intake (2)	Current Incar (3)	Judicial Disposition (4)
Black	-.371 ^b /.102 ^c (.236) ^d 2.63 ^e *	-.151/.051 (.103) 2.15	.060/-.017 (.301) .040	-.684/.152 (.517) 1.60
Age	-.001/.005 (.064) 1.00	.066/-.071 (.028) 6.48 ^e **	-.054/.042 (.105) .266	-.094/.060 (.221) .180
Gender	-.275/.005 (.275) 1.00	-.032/.007 (.117) .072	-.107/.022 (.104) .060	1.60/-.300 (.918) 4.00 ^e *
Family Status	.223/-.001 (.225) .009	.039/-.012 (.100) .151	-.015/.001 (.296) .003	.055/-.260 (.530) 3.25 ^e *
Prior Record	-.085/.020 (.051) 2.81 ^e *	.123/-.130 (.030) 16.48 ^e ***	-.161/.220 (.068) 5.59 ^e **	-.201/.523 (.115) 8.44 ^e ***
Post Disposition	.066/-.075 (.430) 4.86 ^e **	.222/-.019 (.356) .368	1.24/-.184 (.066) 3.50 ^e *	.294/-.064 (.646) .121
Court Authority	1.18/-.195 (.280) 16.23 ^e ***	-.715/.120 (.376) 16.44 ^e ***	.057/-.013 (.400) .021	-.248/.067 (.615) .162
# Current Charges	-.267/.016 (.306) .759	.500/-.066 (.150) 11.14 ^e ***	-.283/.061 (.344) .402	.222/-.047 (.670) .110
Offense Severity	-.580/.398 (.002) 41.06 ^e ***	.572/-.307 (.041) 107.82 ^e ***	-.494/.303 (.146) 11.35 ^e ***	.346/-.161 (.325) 1.13
Detention Status		-1.96/.250 (.236) 69.42 ^e ***	1.45/-.314 (.341) 18.10 ^e ***	2.58/-.700 (.602) 10.32 ^e ***
Intercept	3.60 (1.12) 10.35 ^e ***	.444 (.602) .800	.431 (1.00) .050	-.095 (3.51) .000
Intercept		-.136 (.503) 6.41 ^e **		
AIC	670.801	3124.007	324.815	124.170
BIC	725.717	3190.707	364.570	153.083
-2 log L	650.801	3100.807	302.815	102.170
N	1793	1793	271	110

a. Too few cases in categories of petition and adjudication precluded estimation of models.

b. Parameter estimate

c. Standardized estimate

d. Standard error

e. Wald chi-square

*p less than or equal to .01; **p less than or equal to .05;
***p less than or equal to .10

resulted in petition (95%) and adjudication (94%), models were not estimated for those specific stages in the proceedings.

Column 1 in Table 3 presents the main effects from the additive model for the decision to detain or not to detain. Individuals more likely to be held in detention are: those who have a greater number of past referrals, youth who were previously adjudicated a delinquent or waived to adult court, persons under court authority, and those who commit more severe offenses. Black youth are also more likely to be detained than white youth.

Of these associations, the strongest are with detention and the severity of the offense (Standardized estimate= .40) and court authority (Standardized estimate= .20). The race effect is relatively weak (Standardized estimate= .10) but moderate in strength in comparison to the effects of prior record (Standardized estimate= .09) and past disposition (Standardized estimate= .07).

The next column in Table 3 provides logistic regression results from the additive model for intake outcomes. The decision to recommend further processing at intake is influenced by the same legal variables that were significant at detention. Each of the relationships are in the positive direction. However, youth charged with a greater number of offenses at the time of the referral are also likely to move on to the next stage in the proceedings. Interestingly, juveniles who were not held in detention were most likely to be recommended for further processing. No race effect is present. Older youth, however,

are more likely than younger juveniles to go further into the system. The age effect is the weakest of the significant associations (Standardized estimate= .07) while the strongest is with intake and the severity of the offense (Standardized estimate= .39).

Regression models were not estimated at petition and adjudication. Therefore, column 3 in Table 3 presents the logistic coefficients for the stage of consent decree. Here, youth most likely to receive the more severe sanction at this stage in the proceedings are: youth with a greater number of prior contacts with juvenile court authorities, persons previously adjudicated a delinquent/transferred, those charged with a more serious offense, and juveniles held in detention at some point in the process. Of these relationships, the latter is the strongest (Standardized estimate= .34), followed by the severity of the offense (Standardized estimate= .30). Neither race nor other extralegal effects are significant with the likelihood of receiving a consent decree.

Four significant effects are present at the judicial disposition stage. Two of those effects involve strong associations with this stage and detention status (Standardized estimate= .70) and prior record (Standardized estimate= .52). Youth not subject to detention and those with a less severe past record are the likely recipients of a lenient judicial disposition. Weaker but moderate relationships also exist at this stage with gender (Standardized estimate= .30) and family status (Standardized estimate= .26). Females and youth coming

from a single parent household are likely to receive a sentence involving community-based treatment rather than an order of a change of placement/transfer to adult court.

Summary

In this county, most referrals drop out at the stage of intake with youth most often released. Of those youth who go beyond the stage of intake, they most likely will be petitioned. Some youths are diverted away from the adjudication stage at the point of consent decree. Juveniles referred on from there most often are adjudicated a delinquent. Slightly over half of the youth at judicial disposition receive the more severe outcome of a change of placement/transfer to adult court.

The probabilities of going further into the system and receiving the most severe outcome at judicial disposition is greater for blacks than whites. Legal variables appear to account for most of the differences in case processing. Legal variables and detention status were most strongly associated with decision making at various stages throughout the proceedings. In particular, the seriousness of the offense was a significant predictor of the severity of the outcome at detention and intake. Similar effects were also present at consent decree and judicial disposition. However, these were second in strength to those of detention status. Youth held in detention were not likely to receive lenient outcomes at either of these two stages. Leniency was provided to youth who had been detained at intake.

As previously discussed, the effects of detention may be overestimated at the beginning stages of the proceedings due to the operationalization of the variable. Therefore, the observed race effect at the stage of detention, (as other effects), should be viewed with caution. In addition, a very small percentage of youth have been detained (6.5%). Keeping these points in mind, it is important to discuss the relationships that appear to exist between race, detention status, and decision making outcomes.

Race may have an indirect effect on case processing, via its direct effect on detention. Blacks were more likely to be detained than whites even after controlling for legal and other nonlegal variables. Although no significant association was found with race and other stages in the proceedings, the effects of detention status were consistently significant and strong at every stage, especially at the latter stage of Judicial disposition. Thus, the total impact of race on decision making may be obscured by the effects of previous decisions or in this situation, the decision to detain or not detain. Similar arguments have been made by others studying case processing in both the juvenile and criminal justice systems (e.g., Bortner and Reed, 1985; Bishop and Frazier, 1988; Lizotte, 1978).

In addition to the possibility of an indirect race effect on case processing, several other nonlegal factors were influential at intake and judicial disposition. Youth who were older received more severe outcomes at intake, while females and juveniles from intact households were given lenient treatment at

Judicial disposition. These effects were weaker than those of the legal variables and detention status.

CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The objective of this research was to assess the extent that race influenced juvenile justice decision making in three counties in the state of Iowa. Before the impact of race on case processing was examined, however, each county was compared to determine similarities and differences in legal and nonlegal factors, and case outcomes. This task was accomplished with bivariate (two-way) comparisons using crosstabulations. Jurisdictional differences were evident in a number of variables.

The process of estimating the effect of a variable while simultaneously controlling for the effects of other variables was then performed using multivariate analyses. This procedure was conducted with logistic regression for the purpose of examining the effect of race and other factors on case processing outcomes. The findings suggest race and other nonlegal factors impact case processing in each county. Legal and processing variables are also associated with decision making outcomes. In each instance, the effects and their strength vary by the stage in the proceedings and the county observed.

In this chapter, the findings from both analyses are summarized. The implications of the results are also discussed.

Summary

County Comparisons Not Controlling for Race Effects: Results from the bivariate analyses indicate county similarities and

differences in case processing. In each of the counties, the practice of detention is seldomly used. In addition, each appears to divert referrals away from the system at intake. Youth who are not released or receive an informal adjustment at intake are most likely petitioned, adjudicated a delinquent, and receive a judicial disposition of a change of placement/transfer to adult court. This pattern is evident in all three counties.

Although similarities exist in case processing, there are some exceptions. For example, County A is more likely than the other two counties to refer juveniles to the stage of petition. County C is most likely to simply release youth, but it is also the least likely to use informal adjustments as a means of handling referrals when compared with County A and County B. Of the three counties, juveniles have a better chance of not being petitioned in County B. Consent decrees or formal adjustments are utilized more often in County C in contrast to the other two counties.

County Comparisons Controlling for Race Effects: These results are summarized in Table 1. In County A, legal factors had a significant impact on decision making at every stage in the proceedings. More specifically and as expected, youths who were involved in a more serious offense, juveniles charged with a greater number of offenses, and persons who had more prior referrals were likely to receive the most severe outcome at each stage. Detention status was also associated with decision making at intake and consent decree. Although weaker in their impact, social factors still influenced case processing even after

Table 1. The Effects of Legal and Nonlegal Variables on Juvenile Justice Decision Making in Three Counties in Iowa (Summary of Results)

	County A	County B	County C
EFFECTS^a			
STAGES			
Detention	Legal Gender	Legal Race/Gender ^b Age	Legal Race Age
Intake	Legal Detention Race Age	Race/Age Detention Race/Court Authority Race/Severity of Offense Legal	Legal Detention Age
Petition	Legal	Detention Race	---
Consent Decree	Legal Detention	---	Detention Legal
Adjudication	Legal	---	---
Judicial Disposition	Legal Age Gender	Race/Age Detention Race/Gender Family status	Detention Legal Gender Family status

- a. Order of effects is by strength
 b. Race Interaction effect
 c. Too few cases in categories to do analysis

controlling for the effects of legal variables in County A. Females were more likely than males to be detained and receive a judicial disposition of a change of placement/transfer to adult court. Blacks and older juveniles were disproportionately more likely to be referred on at intake than whites and younger juveniles. Older youth were also more likely to receive a more severe outcome at judicial disposition.

The severity of the offense was influential at the stages of detention and intake in County B. Persons held in detention at some point in the proceedings were also more likely to receive the most severe outcome at intake, petition, and judicial disposition. Despite the significance of the legal factors, however, the effects of race and other nonlegal variables were often stronger. American Native Indian youths and white youths appear to be given leniency throughout the proceedings, especially at intake. The practice of lenient treatment is evident by the finding that American Native Indians charged with a felon were more likely than similarly charged groups to be released at intake. Overall, American Native Indians and whites are substantially less likely than blacks to move through the entire system and receive an outcome of a change of placement/transfer to adult court.

The effect of being black on case outcome at intake is conditioned in part by age and whether the youth was under court authority at the time of the referral. Older youth, older black youth in particular, were likely to be referred on at this stage. It is important to note that age explains some but not all of the

discrepancy in case processing at this point. For example, youth comparable in age to black youth were not recommended for further processing. In addition, whites who were released at this point were older than blacks who moved further into the system. Leniency was given to black youth under a previous order of court authority. Blacks also received leniency at petition.

Race/gender and race/age effects were present at detention and judicial disposition. Male American Native Indians were more likely to be detained than female American Native Indians. Female American Native Indians, however, were given a more severe outcome at judicial disposition than white and black females, though the overall number of females receiving this outcome was small. American Native Indians who were given the more severe outcome at judicial disposition were younger than other youth who made it to this point in the proceedings. Persons from one single parent households were also treated more harshly at the dispositional stage in the proceedings in County B.

The seriousness of the offense was a significant predictor of the severity of the outcome at detention and intake in County C. Similar effects were also present at consent decree and judicial disposition. However, these were second in strength to those of detention status. Youth held in detention were not likely to receive lenient outcomes at either of these two stages. Leniency was provided to youth who had been detained at intake.

Black youth were more likely than white youth to be detained. Although no other race effect with decision making stages was evident, race appears to have an indirect effect on case

processing through detention. The effects of detention status were consistently significant and strong at every stage, especially at the latter stage of judicial disposition. Thus, the total impact of race on decision making may have been obscured by the effects of previous decisions or in this situation, the decision to detain (see also, e.g., Bortner and Reed, 1985; Bishop and Frazier, 1988; Lizotte, 1978). In part, this may explain why blacks were disproportionately more likely than whites to go through the system and receive a case outcome of change of placement/transfer to adult court.

In addition to the indirect effect of race on case processing, several other nonlegal factors were influential at various stages in the proceedings. Youth who were older received a severe outcome intake, while females and juveniles from single parent households received leniency at judicial disposition. These effects were weaker than those of the legal variables and detention status.

In summary, the findings from the present analyses suggest that each of the three counties differ in case processing and in what factors influence juvenile justice decision making. Common characteristics, however, are the presence of race and gender disparities in case outcomes. Although there are a few exceptions, black youth are treated more harshly than white and, when applicable, than American Native Indian youth. Females receive both harshness and leniency. The race and gender effects are conditioned by the county and stage examined. In addition,

other factors impact with race and gender to affect the decision making process.

Discussion

The results clearly suggest that youth are treated differently depending upon their race, gender, age, and family status. Because of the underlying philosophy of the juvenile justice system, - the concept of parens patriae -, however, efforts to identify and understand patterns of decision making or arrive at conclusive evidence of bias is difficult. Matza (1964), for example, suggests that an emphasis on parens patriae means "everything counts" in juvenile court decisions. Thus, juvenile justice personnel have a wide range of discretion in arriving at decisions. Therefore, a multitude of factors may be used by juvenile court officers in arriving at a decision as to what to do with a youth.

For example, it is possible that younger persons are treated more leniently than older youth because they are seen as deserving of a "second chance"; they are more amenable to treatment than older youth. Similarly, it is also possible that the quality of the family life rather than the structure of the family may explain why this variable has inconsistent effects across counties; or why blacks are treated more harshly in certain situations than in others; or why females receive either more harsh or lenient outcomes. Black youths and females may have come from environments where love and supervision were absent, irrespective of the number of members present in the

home. This may also explain why detention status plays a significant role in case processing, especially in County B and County C.

Alternatively, the race and gender effects may be the result of racial and sexual biases concerning "effective treatment", or a "good home", "proper supervision" or "appropriate conduct" (e.g., Willie, 1991; Chesney-Lind, 1977). These biases may account for the finding that black youth in all three counties are treated more harshly than other youth. It is possible that black youth, for example, may be retained in the system longer than other youth in order to "teach them a lesson"; a lesson that black youth may not receive if they were simply released or agreed to an informal adjustment. Justification for this belief may rest on the assumption that blacks come from environments where supervision is lacking or inappropriate behavior encouraged. In some situations these beliefs may be augmented by age. The finding in County B suggests that amenability to treatment is age specific for blacks but not for other youth. That is, juvenile court personnel appear to adhere to value judgments concerning older blacks that differ in comparison to whites and, when applicable, American Native Indians of similar age.

Admittedly, it is also possible that blacks may not be as willing to admit guilt and/or agree to informal adjustments at intake as whites or American Native Indians. Statements such as "I did not do it, someone else did" or "I do not agree with the stipulations of the informal adjustment, I want to go to court"

may be seen as an unwillingness to accept responsibility for wrongful conduct. Thus, instead of being released or receiving an informal adjustment black youth are instead referred further into the system.

The unwillingness to cooperate may explain why a disproportionate number of black youth go beyond this stage in the proceedings. If this is true, questions then arise as to whether youth are driven further into the system because of a need for treatment or punishment. Youth may be punished for not complying with organizational expectations. If this is occurring, cases may be going further into the system that lack evidence to warrant such action. Findings from the present study provide some support for this assumption.

In County A, the race effect at intake and not at judicial disposition, for example, suggests that the latter stage may be used as a method to rectify biases occurring earlier in the system. Recall, up to the point of the judicial disposition black youth were disproportionately overrepresented in the proceedings. After the dispositional stage, however, their representation in the cohort dramatically decreased. Thus, it is possible that juvenile court judges at this stage are faced with a disproportionate number of black youth where the legal criteria to justify the more intrusive case outcome is lacking (e.g., Hepburn, 1978; Dannefer and Schutt, 1982; Brerton and Casper, 1981-82).

Implications

The implications of the research center on the importance of focusing on multiple stages in juvenile justice proceedings to assess race and gender effects. The findings support Bishop and Frazier (1988), Pope and Feyerherm (1990b) and others' (e.g., Dannefer and Schutt, 1982) contention that the failure to do so may lead to false conclusions regarding the influence of extralegal factors on decision making. Additional support is also provided for the argument that the greatest disparities in case processing may occur before formal court intervention, such as at intake (Pope and Feyerherm, 1990b: 53-54; Bortner and Reed, 1985). Race effects were present at this stage in two of the three counties examined.

Similarly, the findings from this study also suggest that future research in this area should distinguish between youth who receive a straight release from those who agree to participate in some kind of diversion short of the filing of the petition and persons who are recommended for further processing. Failure to differentiate between multiple case outcomes at a decision making stage may obscure race effects. In this situation, if the outcome at intake was categorized as simply release/use of diversion versus further court processing, information would not have been provided indicating blacks were underrepresented in the informal adjustment outcome.

Although the small number of Hispanic and Asian youth included in the present research was too small to permit

extensive empirical analyses, preliminary assessments suggest that researchers differentiate among minority youth rather than collapsing them into one global category. In the present study, Hispanic youth were treated more harshly than all other youth in County B, while no such effect was present in County C. The finding that American Native Indian youth received leniency in comparison to blacks in County B also highlights the need to refrain from the assumption that all minority youth are treated alike within the juvenile justice system.

The results from the current research also shed light on the importance of identifying and controlling for jurisdictional differences in juvenile justice decision making. Legal factors, detention status, race and gender effects not only differed in their strength and importance but differential patterns of case processing were also evident in each county.

Finally, the research design employed here represents a first step in the study of the influence of race and other nonlegal factors on juvenile justice decision making in three counties in the state of Iowa. There are essentially two areas that need to be expanded.

The first concerns the need to do further analysis of race and juvenile justice decision making in additional counties. The inclusion of more counties would allow for greater representativeness and for further inquiry into the case processing of not only blacks but Hispanics.

The use of interviews with juvenile court officials, such as probation officers and judges, is a second area for further

exploration of the issues raised here. These individuals need to be given the opportunity to provide input regarding the findings reported here. This could possibly help contextualize and/or support or negate the explanations given here to account for the observed race and sex bias in case processing.

The need for this type of research is made evident by the finding that juvenile court officials in each of the counties examined appear to apply different philosophies of justice or treatment in handling youth. Thinking of these varying philosophies in terms of a continuum, County B would fall on the left indicative of a paternalistic approach, whereas County C would lie more to the right representing a legalistic perspective. County A appears to rest in the middle of the continuum, characterized by both a legal and treatment philosophy, as evident by the use of informal adjustments and a willingness to refer youth further into the system. Courts on the left often permit discretionary decision making where extralegal factors may be influential while those more to the right tend to base decisions more on the juvenile's behavior than on extralegal considerations (Waegel, 1989:173).

Differences in the perceptions of the purpose and/or functioning of the juvenile court could aid in the understanding of why race and other factors are important in the decision making process. For example, in County B it was found that American Native Indians were treated more leniently than blacks at intake. Discussions with the chief juvenile court officer of that county in the early beginnings of the project revealed that

their policy was to refer American Native Indians to another agency rather than recommend further court involvement. The justification for this practice rests on the belief that American Native Indian youth do not respond well to our system. This revelation provides added meaning to the discrepancies in the case processing of these youth in comparison to other juveniles. It also argues for an extension of the research reported here.

Conclusion

Legal factors, race and gender influence juvenile justice decision making. The extent each of these impact case processing is dependent upon the county and the stage in the proceedings studied. Further research that includes larger samples of Hispanic youth in the analyses and incorporates interviews would greatly enhance not only the creditability of the current research but the findings from that study would then allow for the development of specific policy recommendations to rectify race and gender disparities in juvenile justice decision making.

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County A.

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	587	71.3			
	1	Female	236	28.7			
EDUCATION							
	1		4	.5			
	2		9	1.1			
	3		19	2.3			
	4		22	2.7			
	5		29	3.5			
	6		38	4.6			
	7		76	9.2			
	8		136	16.5			
	9		148	18.0			
	10		127	15.4			
	11		84	10.2			
	12		8	1.0			
	88	No Information	123	14.9			
AGE							
	6		2	.2			
	7		2	.2			
	8		5	.6			
	9		16	1.9			
	10		27	3.3			
	11		21	2.6			
	12		36	4.4			
	13		46	5.6			
	14		93	11.3			
	15		134	16.3			
	16		181	22.0			
	17		252	30.6			
	18		8	1.0			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	433	52.6			
	2	Attending but problems	148	18.0			
	3	Nonattending	81	9.8			
	4	Other	55	6.7			
	8	No Information	106	12.9			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		87	10.5			
	1		124	15.8			
	2		167	20.3			
	3		130	15.8			
	4		109	13.2			
	5		71	8.6			
	6		29	3.5			
	7		31	3.8			
	8		11	1.3			
	9		5	.6			
	10		3	.4			
	11		2	.2			
	12		3	.4			
	88	No information	51	6.2			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	247	30.0			
	2	No	196	23.8			
	8	No information	380	46.2			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	225	27.3			
	2	No	76	9.2			
	8	No information	522	63.4			
FAMILY STATUS							
	0	Two member	230	27.9			
	1	One member	593	72.1			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					1.9	3.1	0-22

Appendix 1. continued County A

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE

TYPE-MOST SERIOUS

	1	Theft/unauthor. use	195	23.7			
2	Burglary/ break.& enter.		60	7.3			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction/ crim. mischief	46	5.6			
	4	Aggrav. assault	19	2.3			
	5	Crim. trespass	25	3.0			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/ escape	2	.2			
	8	Robbery	8	1.0			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	6	.7			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	8	1.0			
	11	Simple assault	45	5.5			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	2	.2			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	1	.1			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	2	.2			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Arson	5	.6			

LAST CRIMINAL
OFFENSE

	1	Simple misdemeanor	223	27.1			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	54	6.6			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	56	6.8			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	7	.9			
	6	Class C felony	63	7.7			
	7	Class D felony	21	2.6			
	8	Not applicable	399	48.5			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/walved to adult court.	114	13.9				
2	No adjudication/no waiver to adult court	709	86.1				

IF COMMITTED CRIME,
WAS PERSON STILL
UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	188	22.8				
1	No	635	77.2				

LENGTH OF TIME
IN JUVENILE
COURT (DAYS)

201.4 402.9 0-4921

NUMBER OF
CURRENT CHARGES

1	685	83.2					
2	96	11.7					
3	28	3.4					
4	11	1.3					
5	1	.1					
6	1	.1					
7	1	.1					

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
1		Theft/unauthor: use	392	47.6			
2		Burglary/ break.& enter.	102	12.4			
3		Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction	100	12.2			
4		Aggrav. assault	42	5.1			
5		Crim. trespass	22	2.7			
6		Recelving stolen property	---	---			
7		Resisting arrest	6	.7			
8		Robbery	20	2.4			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	12	1.5			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	30	3.6			
11		Simple assault	76	9.2			
12		Rape/sexual assault	11	1.3			
13		Prostitution/ soliciting	1	.1			
14		Arson	2	.2			
15		Forgery/fuffl	4	.5			
16		Vandalism	1	.1			
17		Murder	1	.1			
18		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
19		Indecent exposure	1	.1			

MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
0		Property	651	80.1			
1		Person	162	19.9			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	438	53.2			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	88	10.7			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	107	13.0			
	4	Class A felony	5	.6			
	5	Class B felony	17	2.1			
	6	Class C felony	122	14.8			
	7	Class D felony	46	5.6			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	432	51.3			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	88	10.8			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	106	13.0			
	3	Felony	187	23.0			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	118	14.3			
	2	Informal adjustment	362	44.0			
	3	Further court processing	343	41.7			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	38	4.6			
	2	No	785	95.4			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	5	.6			
	2	Youth shelter	5	.6			
	3	Detention facility	11	1.3			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	15	1.8			
	9	Not applicable	785	95.4			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	156	19.0			
	2	No	667	81.0			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	314	38.2			
	2	No	29	3.5			
	9	Not applicable	480	58.3			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	11	1.3			
	2	Not enough evidence	12	1.5			
	3	Moved away/ran away/Joined services	6	.6			
	9	Not applicable	794	96.6			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	62	7.5			
	2	No	19	2.3			
	3	Waiver stipulation	3	.4			
	9	Not applicable	739	89.8			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	74	9.0			
	2	Uncontested	178	21.6			
	9	Not applicable	571	69.4			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	9	1.1			
	2	No	814	98.9			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	2	Youth shelter	4	.5			
	3	Detention facility	2	.2			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	1	.1			
	5	Jail	1	.1			
	9	Not applicable	815	99.1			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	74	9.0			
	2	No	178	21.6			
	9	Not applicable	571	669.4			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	33	4.0			
	2	No	790	96.0			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	181	22.0			
	2	No	27	3.3			
	9	Not applicable	615	74.7			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	15	1.7			
	2	Not enough evidence	12	1.5			
	9	Not applicable	796	96.8			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	9	1.1			
	2	No	814	98.9			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	1	.1			
	2	Youth shelter	3	.4			
	3	Detention facility	4	.5			
	9	Not applicable	815	99.0			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	96	11.7			
	2	No	727	88.3			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	7	.9			
	2	No	816	99.1			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	14	1.7			
	2	No	809	98.3			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	12	1.5			
	2	No	811	98.5			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	41	5.0			
	2	No	782	95.0			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	135	16.4			
	2	Community based treatment	104	12.6			
	9	Not applicable	584	71.0			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Blacks

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION							
(composite)							
	1	Yes	44	5.3			
	2	No	779	94.7			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	367	44.6			
	2	Female	456	55.4			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	479	58.2			
	2	Black	76	9.2			
	8	No information	268	32.6			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	249	30.3			
	2	Obtained	11	1.3			
	9	No information	563	68.4			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County A.

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	996	82.5			
	1	Female	211	17.5			
EDUCATION							
	1		2	.2			
	2		5	.4			
	3		5	.4			
	4		11	.9			
	5		21	1.7			
	6		63	5.2			
	7		113	9.4			
	8		175	14.5			
	9		246	20.4			
	10		227	18.8			
	11		214	17.7			
	12		15	1.2			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	6		---	---			
	7		2	.2			
	8		3	.2			
	9		5	.4			
	10		12	1.0			
	11		17	1.4			
	12		35	2.9			
	13		89	7.4			
	14		132	10.9			
	15		193	16.0			
	16		260	21.5			
	17		430	35.6			
	18		29	2.4			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	663	54.9			
	2	Attending but problems	237	19.5			
	3	Nonattending	113	9.4			
	4	Other	94	7.5			
	8	No information	104	8.6			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		108	8.9			
	1		321	26.6			
	2		298	24.7			
	3		240	19.9			
	4		109	9.0			
	5		52	4.3			
	6		18	1.5			
	7		13	1.1			
	8		10	.8			
	9		2	.2			
	10		2	.2			
	11		2	.2			
	12		1	.1			
	88	No information	31	2.6			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	582	48.2			
	2	No	315	26.1			
	8	No information	310	25.7			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	752	62.3			
	2	No	98	8.1			
	8	No information	357	29.6			
FAMILY STATUS							
	0	Two member	710	58.8			
	1	One member	497	41.2			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					1.5	2.5	0-18

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE-MOST SERIOUS							
	1	Theft/unauthor. use	214	17.8			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	108	8.9			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction/ crim. mischief	89	7.4			
	4	Aggrav. assault	7	.6			
	5	Crim. trespass	28	2.3			
	6	Receiving stolen property	2	.2			
	7	Resisting arrest/ escape	12	1.0			
	8	Robbery	2	.2			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	3	.2			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	69	5.7			
	11	Simple assault	33	2.7			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	3	.2			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	2	.2			
	14	Forgery/fuffi	1	.1			
	15	Vandalism	3	.2			
	16	Indecent exposure	1	.1			
	17	Arson	---	---			
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	283	23.4			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	87	7.2			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	63	5.2			
	4	Class A felony	1	.1			
	5	Class B felony	5	.4			
	6	Class C felony	104	8.6			
	7	Class D felony	34	2.8			
	8	Not applicable	630	52.2			

Appendix 1. continued County A.

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	151	12.5				
2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	1056	87.5				

IF COMMITTED CRIME,
WAS PERSON STILL
UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	286	23.7				
1	No	921	76.3				

LENGTH OF TIME
IN JUVENILE
COURT (DAYS)

150.0 306.4 0-3061

NUMBER OF
CURRENT CHARGES

1	991	82.1					
2	131	10.9					
3	50	4.1					
4	22	1.8					
5	3	.2					
6	5	.4					
7	4	.3					
8	1	.1					

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
1		Theft/unauthor. use	431	39.3			
2		Burglary/ break.& enter.	169	14.0			
3		Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction	173	14.3			
4		Aggrav. assault	16	1.3			
5		Crim. trespass	59	4.9			
6		Receiving stolen property	2	.2			
7		Resisting arrest	10	.8			
8		Robbery	9	.7			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	9	.7			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	188	15.6			
11		Simple assault	108	8.9			
12		Rape/sexual assault	12	1.0			
13		Prostitution/ soliciting	1	.1			
14		Arson	4	.3			
15		Forgery/fuffl	11	.9			
16		Vandalism	1	.1			
17		Murder	2	.2			
18		Vehicular homicide	1	.1			
19		Indecent exposure	1	.1			
MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
0		Property	1022	84.7			
1		Person	185	15.3			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	659	54.6			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	162	13.4			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	111	9.2			
	4	Class A felony	1	.1			
	5	Class B felony	20	1.7			
	6	Class C felony	180	14.9			
	7	Class D felony	74	6.1			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	659	54.6			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	162	13.4			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	111	9.2			
	3	Felony	275	22.8			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	141	11.7			
	2	Informal adjustment	664	55.0			
	3	Further court processing	402	33.3			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	25	2.1			
	2	No	1182	97.9			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	1	.1			
	2	Youth shelter	5	.4			
	3	Detention facility	10	.8			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	1	.1			
	5	Jail	8	.7			
	9	Not applicable	1182	97.9			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	283	23.4			
	2	No	924	76.6			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	379	31.4			
	2	No	22	1.9			
	9	Not applicable	805	66.7			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	9	.7			
	2	Not enough evidence	8	.7			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	5	.4			
	9	Not applicable	1185	98.2			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	95	7.9			
	2	No	23	1.9			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	1087	90.1			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	58	4.8			
	2	Uncontested	226	18.7			
	9	Not applicable	923	76.5			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	16	1.3			
	2	No	1191	98.7			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	3	.2			
	2	Youth shelter	4	.3			
	3	Detention facility	6	.5			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	2	.2			
	9	Not applicable	1192	98.8			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	64	5.3			
	2	No	220	18.2			
	9	Not applicable	923	76.5			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	49	4.1			
	2	No	1158	95.9			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	192	15.9			
	2	No	28	2.3			
	9	Not applicable	987	81.8			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	21	1.7			
	2	Not enough evidence	3	.2			
	9	Not applicable	1183	98.1			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	15	1.2			
	2	No	1192	98.8			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	5	.4			
	2	Youth shelter	1	.1			
	3	Detention facility	9	.7			
	9	Not applicable	1192	98.8			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	102	8.5			
	2	No	1105	91.5			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	7	.6			
	2	No	1200	99.4			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	21	1.7			
	2	No	1186	98.3			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	25	2.1			
	2	No	1182	97.9			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	35	2.9			
	2	No	1172	97.1			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	181	15.0			
	2	Community based treatment	103	8.5			
	9	Not applicable	923	76.5			

Appendix 1. continued County A

Whites

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	44	3.6			
	2	No	1163	96.4			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	522	43.2			
	2	Female	685	56.8			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	625	51.8			
	2	Black	110	9.1			
	8	No information	472	39.1			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	224	18.6			
	2	Obtained	34	2.8			
	8	No information	949	78.6			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County 9.

Blacks

Variables Value Category N % X STD Range

GENDER

0	Male	380	80.0
1	Female	95	20.0

EDUCATION

0		3	.6
1		20	4.2
2		18	3.8
3		27	5.7
4		24	5.1
5		32	6.7
6		20	4.2
7		50	10.5
8		120	25.3
9		71	14.9
10		60	12.6
11		26	5.5
12		4	.8
88	No information	---	---

AGE

4		---	---
5		3	.6
6		7	1.5
7		8	1.7
8		19	4.0
9		35	7.4
10		26	5.5
11		28	5.9
12		32	6.7
13		28	5.9
14		48	10.1
15		76	16.0
16		83	17.5
17		81	17.1
18		1	.2

SCHOOL STATUS

1	Attending	232	48.8
2	Attending but problems	154	32.4
3	Nonattending	28	5.9
4	Other	---	---
8	No information	61	12.8

Appendix 1. continued County B

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		25	5.3			
	1		49	10.3			
	2		80	16.8			
	3		108	22.7			
	4		65	13.7			
	5		24	5.1			
	6		10	2.1			
	7		4	.8			
	8		16	3.4			
	9		---	---			
	10		---	---			
	11		---	---			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	94	19.8			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	157	33.1			
	2	No	111	23.4			
	8	No information	207	43.6			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	141	29.7			
	2	No	51	10.7			
	8	No information	283	59.6			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	196	41.3			
	2	One member	251	52.8			
	8	No information	28	5.9			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					1.6	2.6	0-16

Appendix 1. continued County B

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	97	20.4			
	2	Burglary break.& enter.	34	7.2			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	47	9.0			
	4	Aggrav. assault	19	4.0			
	5	Crim. trespass	6	1.3			
	6	Receiving stolen property	1	.2			
	7	Persisting arrest/escape	2	.4			
	8	Robbery	3	.6			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	4	.8			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	5	1.1			
	11	Simple assault	33	6.9			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	1	.2			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffi	2	.4			
	15	Vandalism	1	.2			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Arson	3	.6			
	18	No information	216	45.5			
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	147	30.0			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	23	4.8			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	32	6.7			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	1	.2			
	6	Class C felony	39	8.2			
	7	Class D felony	17	3.6			
	8	Not applicable	216	45.5			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent, waived to adult court	29	6.1				
2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	446	93.9				

IF COMMITTED CRIME,
WAS PERSON STILL
UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	83	17.5				
1	No	392	82.5				

LENGTH OF TIME
IN JUVENILE
COURT (DAYS)

1617.1 3057.8 0-8887

NUMBER OF
CURRENT CHARGES

1	430	92.4					
2	25	5.3					
3	7	1.5					
4	3	.6					
5	1	.2					

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

**MOST SERIOUS CURRENT
CRIMINAL OFFENSE**

1		Theft/unauthor. use	209	44.0			
2		Burglary, break.& enter.	48	10.1			
3		Disorderly conduct j-walk/ obstruction	81	17.1			
4		Aggrav. assault	20	4.2			
5		Crim. trespass	19	4.0			
6		Receiving stolen property	3	.6			
7		Resisting arrest	4	.8			
8		Robbery	7	1.5			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	6	1.3			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	20	4.2			
12		Simple assault	45	9.5			
13		Rape/sexual assault	3	.6			
14		Prostitution/ soliciting	1	.2			
15		Arson	5	1.1			
17		Forgery/fuffi	3	.6			
18		Vandalism	1	.2			
19		Murder	---	---			
20		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
21		Indecent exposure	---	---			

**MOST SERIOUS
CHARGES**

0	Property	395	82.3
1	Personal	80	16.8

Appendix 1. continued County B

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	306	64.4			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	39	8.2			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	43	9.1			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	4	.8			
	6	Class C felony	56	11.8			
	7	Class D felony	27	5.7			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	306	66.4			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	39	8.2			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	43	9.1			
	3	Felony	87	18.3			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	125	26.3			
	2	Informal adjustment	274	57.7			
	3	Further court processing	76	16.0			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	9	1.9			
	2	No	466	98.1			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	9	1.9			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	---	---			
	6	Not applicable	466	98.1			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	14	2.9			
	2	No	461	97.1			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	55	11.6			
	2	No	21	4.4			
	9	Not applicable	399	84.0			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	5	1.1			
	2	Not enough evidence	8	1.7			
	3	Moved away/ran away/Joined services	2	.4			
	9	Not applicable	460	96.8			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	16	3.4			
	2	No	3	.6			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	475	96.0			
INITIAL APPEAPANCE							
	1	Contested	4	.8			
	2	Uncontested	35	7.4			
	9	Not applicable	436	91.8			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	7	1.5			
	2	No	468	98.5			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	7	1.5			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	468	98.5			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	11	2.3			
	2	No	28	5.9			
	9	Not applicable	436	91.8			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	6	1.3			
	2	No	469	98.7			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	27	5.7			
	2	No	1	.2			
	9	Not applicable	447	94.1			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	.2			
	9	Not applicable	474	99.8			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	12	2.5			
	2	No	463	97.5			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	2	.4			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	10	2.1			
	9	Not applicable	463	97.5			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	13	2.7			
	2	No	462	97.3			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	1	.2			
	2	No	474	99.8			
GROUP HOME / FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	1	.2			
	2	No	474	99.8			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	11	2.3			
	2	No	464	97.7			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	7	1.5			
	2	No	468	98.5			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement transfer to adult court	11	2.3			
	2	Community based treatment	30	6.3			
	9	Not applicable	434	91.4			

Appendix 1. continued, County B

Blacks

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	19	4.0			
	2	No	456	96.0			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	302	63.6			
	2	Female	53	11.2			
	8	No information	120	25.3			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	355	68.3			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	120	25.3			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	25	5.5			
	2	Obtained	1	.2			
	8	No information	448	94.3			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County B.

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	381	75.0			
	1	Female	127	25.0			
EDUCATION							
	0		2	.4			
	1		7	1.4			
	2		3	.6			
	3		14	2.8			
	4		17	3.3			
	5		29	5.7			
	6		37	7.3			
	7		51	10.0			
	8		115	22.6			
	9		69	13.6			
	10		97	19.1			
	11		57	11.2			
	12		10	2.0			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	4		1	.2			
	5		---	---			
	6		1	.2			
	7		7	1.4			
	8		2	.4			
	9		7	1.4			
	10		18	3.5			
	11		30	5.9			
	12		41	8.1			
	13		39	7.7			
	14		54	10.6			
	15		71	14.0			
	16		119	23.4			
	17		117	23.0			
	18		1	.2			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	314	61.8			
	2	Attending but problems	78	15.4			
	3	Nonattending	41	8.1			
	4	Other	2	.4			
	8	No information	73	14.4			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Rang
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		44	8.7			
	1		92	18.2			
	2		92	18.2			
	3		63	12.5			
	4		36	7.1			
	5		17	3.4			
	6		4	.8			
	7		6	1.2			
	8		9	1.8			
	9		2	.4			
	10		1	.2			
	11		1	.2			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	138	27.3			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	212	41.7			
	2	No	104	20.5			
	8	No information	192	37.8			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	245	48.2			
	2	No	35	6.9			
	8	No information	228	44.9			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	305	60.0			
	2	One member	165	32.5			
	8	No information	38	7.5			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					0.9	1.9	0-22

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	84	16.5			
	2	Burglary/break.& enter.	21	4.1			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	29	5.7			
	4	Aggrav. assault	4	.8			
	5	Crim. trespass	12	2.4			
	6	Receiving stolen property	3	.6			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	2	.4			
	8	Robbery	2	.4			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	1	.2			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	9	1.8			
	11	Simple assault	15	3.0			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	1	.2			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	1	.2			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	1	.2			
	17	Arson	4	.8			
	18	No information	318	62.6			
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	119	23.4			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	19	3.7			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	17	3.3			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	1	.2			
	6	Class C felony	22	4.3			
	7	Class D felony	12	2.4			
	8	Not applicable	318	62.6			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/walved to adult court	14	2.8				
2	No adjuducation/no walver to adult court	494	97.2				

IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	25	4.9				
1	No	483	95.1				

LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)

2124.0 3414.9 0-8887

NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES

1	480	94.5
2	23	4.5
3	1	.2
4	4	.8

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

**MOST SERIOUS CURRENT
CRIMINAL OFFENSE**

1	Theft/unauthor. use	241	47.4				
2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	37	7.3				
3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction	84	16.5				
4	Aggrav. assault	6	1.2				
5	Crim. trespass	23	4.5				
6	Receiving stolen property	2	.4				
7	Resisting arrest	6	1.2				
8	Robbery	3	.6				
9	Carrying a concealed weapon	3	.6				
10	Drug/alcohol offense	66	13.0				
11	Simple assault	23	4.5				
12	Rape/sexual assault	5	1.0				
13	Prostitution/ soliciting	2	.4				
14	Arson	2	.4				
15	Forgery/fuffi.	3	.6				
16	Vandalism	---	---				
17	Murder	---	---				
18	Vehicular homicide	---	---				
19	Indecent exposure	2	.4				

**MOST SERIOUS
CHARGES**

0	Property	461	90.9				
1	Person	46	9.1				

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	336	66.1			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	68	13.4			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	33	6.5			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	2	.4			
	6	Class C felony	43	8.5			
	7	Class D felony	26	5.1			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	335	66.1			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	68	13.4			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	33	6.5			
	3	Felony	71	14.0			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	90	17.7			
	2	Informal adjustment	354	69.7			
	3	Further court processing	64	12.6			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	16	3.1			
	2	No	492	96.9			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	3	3.0			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	493	97.0			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	16	3.1			
	2	No	492	96.9			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	56	11.0			
	2	No	8	1.6			
	9	Not applicable	444	87.4			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	2	.4			
	2	Not enough evidence	2	.4			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	504	99.2			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	8	1.6			
	2	No	1	.2			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	499	98.2			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	12	2.4			
	2	Uncontested	37	7.3			
	9	Not applicable	459	90.4			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	8	1.6			
	2	No	500	98.4			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	2	.4			
	2	Youth shelter	1	.2			
	3	Detention facility	4	.8			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	1	.2			
	9	Not applicable	500	98.4			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	8	1.6			
	2	No	41	8.1			
	9	Not applicable	459	90.4			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	3	.6			
	2	No	505	99.4			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	40	7.9			
	2	No	1	.2			
	9	Not applicable	467	91.9			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	.2			
	9	Not applicable	507	99.8			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	12	2.4			
	2	No	496	97.6			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	2	.4			
	3	Detention facility	10	2.0			
	9	Not applicable	496	97.6			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	30	5.9			
	2	No	478	94.1			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	1	.2			
	2	No	507	99.8			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	1	.2			
	2	No	507	99.8			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	4	.8			
	2	No	504	99.2			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	3	.6			
	2	No	505	99.4			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	18	3.5			
	2	Community based treatment	29	5.7			
	9	Not applicable	461	90.7			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Whites

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	24	4.7			
	2	No	484	95.3			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	281	55.3			
	2	Female	52	10.2			
	8	No information	175	34.4			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	508	100.0			
	2	Black	---	---			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	21	4.1			
	2	Obtained	4	.6			
	8	No information	483	95.1			

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	652	66.3			
	1	Female	332	33.7			
EDUCATION							
	0		23	2.3			
	1		26	2.6			
	2		40	4.1			
	3		56	5.7			
	4		54	5.5			
	5		59	6.0			
	6		77	7.8			
	7		154	15.7			
	8		272	27.6			
	9		102	10.4			
	10		74	7.5			
	11		43	4.4			
	12		3	.3			
	17		1	.1			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	3		1	.1			
	4		4	.4			
	5		7	.7			
	6		15	1.5			
	7		26	2.6			
	8		34	3.5			
	9		40	4.1			
	10		64	6.5			
	11		69	7.0			
	12		89	9.0			
	13		93	9.5			
	14		125	12.7			
	15		137	13.9			
	16		149	15.1			
	17		131	13.3			
	18		---	---			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	421	42.8			
	2	Attending but problems	303	30.8			
	3	Nonattending	112	11.4			
	4	Other	2	.2			
	8	No information	145	14.7			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		44	4.5			
	1		79	8.1			
	2		118	12.0			
	3		152	15.5			
	4		137	14.0			
	5		102	10.4			
	6		88	9.0			
	7		23	2.3			
	8		18	1.8			
	9		16	1.6			
	10		---	---			
	11		3	.3			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	201	20.5			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	203	20.6			
	2	No	386	39.2			
	8	No information	395	40.1			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	129	13.1			
	2	No	161	16.4			
	8	No information	694	70.5			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	235	23.9			
	2	One member	674	68.5			
	8	No information	75	7.6			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					3.7	6.4	0-54

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	253	25.7			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	62	6.3			
	3	Disorderly conduct/J-walk/ obstruction/ crim. mischief	66	6.7			
	4	Aggrav. assault	10	1.0			
	5	Crim. trespass	44	4.5			
	6	Receiving stolen property	3	.3			
	7	Resisting arrest/ escape	17	1.7			
	8	Robbery	11	1.1			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	4	.4			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	134	13.6			
	11	Simple assault	27	2.7			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	---	---			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	1	.1			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	1	.1			
	17	Murder	1	.1			
	18	Arson	1	.1			
	19	No information	348	35.4			
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	436	44.3			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	50	5.1			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	43	4.4			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	3	.3			
	6	Class C felony	62	6.3			
	7	Class D felony	42	4.3			
	8	Not applicable	348	35.4			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	45	4.6				
2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	939	95.4				

IF COMMITTED CRIME,
WAS PERSON STILL
UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	137	13.9				
1	No	847	86.1				

LENGTH OF TIME
IN JUVENILE
COURT (DAYS)

				1131.1	2565.1	0-8887
--	--	--	--	--------	--------	--------

NUMBER OF
CURRENT CHARGES

1	888	90.2
2	68	6.9
3	15	1.5
4	6	.6
5	6	.6
7	1	.1

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	715	72.7			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	86	8.7			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	55	5.6			
	4	Class A felony	1	.1			
	5	Class B felony	8	.8			
	6	Class C felony	61	6.2			
	7	Class D felony	58	5.9			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	715	72.7			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	86	8.7			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	55	5.6			
	3	Felony	128	13.0			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	199	20.2			
	2	Informal adjustment	695	70.6			
	3	Further court processing	90	9.1			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	38	3.9			
	2	No	946	96.1			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	31	3.2			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	3	.3			
	5	Jail	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	950	96.5			

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
1		Theft/unauthor. use	455	46.2			
2		Burglary/ break.& enter..	67	6.8			
3		Disorderly conduct/J-walk/ obstruction	112	11.4			
4		Aggrav. assault	12	1.2			
5		Crim. trespass	45	4.6			
6		Receiving stolen property	1	.1			
7		Resisting arrest	32	3.3			
8		Robbery	11	1.1			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	6	.6			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	179	18.2			
11		Simple assault	50	5.1			
12		Rape/sexual assault	3	.3			
13		Prostitution/ soliciting	1	.1			
14		Arson	3	.3			
15		Forgery/fuffl	2	.2			
16		Vandalism	---	---			
17		Murder	1	.1			
18		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
19		Indecent exposure	1	.1			
MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
0		Property	873	88.7			
1		Person	111	11.3			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	5	.5			
	2	No	979	99.5			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	70	7.1			
	2	No	20	2.0			
	9	Not applicable	894	90.9			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	3	.3			
	2	Not enough evidence	7	.7			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	3	.3			
	9	Not applicable	971	98.7			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	7	.7			
	2	No	5	.5			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	972	98.8			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	13	1.3			
	2	Uncontested	47	4.8			
	9	Not applicable	924	93.9			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	10	1.0			
	2	No	974	99.0			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	1	.1			
	3	Detention facility	9	.9			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	974	99.0			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	8	.8			
	2	No	52	5.3			
	9	Not applicable	924	93.9			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	1	.1			
	2	No	983	99.9			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	51	5.2			
	2	No	1	.1			
	9	Not applicable	932	94.7			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	1	.1			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	983	99.9			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	10	1.0			
	2	No	974	99.0			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	10	1.0			
	9	Not applicable	974	99.0			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	26	2.6			
	2	No	958	97.4			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	1	.1			
	2	No	983	99.9			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	2	.2			
	2	No	982	99.8			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	6	.6			
	2	No	978	99.4			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	15	1.5			
	2	No	969	98.5			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	25	3.2			
	2	Community based treatment	31	2.5			
	9	Not applicable	928	94.3			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Native American Indians

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ra
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	43	4.4			
	2	No	941	95.6			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	545	55.4			
	2	Female	116	11.8			
	8	No information	323	32.8			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	711	72.3			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	273	27.7			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	29	2.9			
	2	Obtained	1	.1			
	8	No information	954	97.0			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County B.

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	64	77.1			
	1	Female	19	22.9			
EDUCATION							
	0		---	---			
	1		2	2.4			
	2		2	2.4			
	3		---	---			
	4		3	3.6			
	5		5	6.0			
	6		10	12.0			
	7		8	9.6			
	8		32	38.6			
	9		16	19.3			
	10		2	2.4			
	11		3	3.6			
	12		---	---			
	88	No Information	---	---			
AGE							
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		1	1.2			
	8		2	2.4			
	9		2	2.4			
	10		4	4.8			
	11		3	3.6			
	12		6	7.2			
	13		11	13.3			
	14		6	7.2			
	15		15	18.1			
	16		17	20.5			
	17		16	19.3			
	18		---	---			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	50	60.2			
	2	Attending but problems	7	8.4			
	3	Nonattending	12	14.5			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No Information	14	16.9			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Re
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		---	---			
	1		8	9.6			
	2		8	9.6			
	3		11	13.3			
	4		4	4.8			
	5		4	4.8			
	6		4	4.8			
	7		1	1.2			
	8		---	---			
	9		1	1.2			
	10		---	---			
	11		1	1.2			
	12		2	2.4			
	88	No information	39	47.0			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	29	34.9			
	2	No	9	10.8			
	8	No information	45	54.2			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	29	29.7			
	2	No	4	10.7			
	8	No information	50	59.6			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	40	48.2			
	2	One member	36	43.4			
	8	No information	7	8.4			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					.5	2.3	0-1

Appendix 1. continued County B

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE

TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	6	7.2			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	1	1.2			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction/ crim. mischief	2	2.4			
	4	Aggrav. assault	---	---			
	5	Crim. trespass	2	2.4			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/ escape	2	2.4			
	8	Robbery	---	---			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	3	3.6			
	11	Simple assault	---	---			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	1	1.2			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffi	---	---			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Arson	---	---			
	18	No information	66	79.5			

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE

1	Simple misdemeanor	9	10.8
2	Serious misdemeanor	2	2.4
3	Aggravated misdemeanor	2	2.4
4	Class A felony	---	---
5	Class B felony	1	1.2
6	Class C felony	---	---
7	Class D felony	3	3.6
8	Not applicable	66	79.5

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	4	4.8				
2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	79	95.2				

IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	6	7.2				
1	No	77	92.8				

LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)

1284.3 2892.7 0-888:

NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES

1	75	90.4					
2	6	7.2					
3	1	1.2					
4	---	---					
5	---	---					
8	1	1.2					

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

**MOST SERIOUS CURRENT
CRIMINAL OFFENSE**

1		Theft/unauthor. use	37	44.6			
2		Burglary/ break.& enter.	6	7.2			
3		Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction	9	10.8			
4		Aggrav. assault	4	4.8			
5		Crim. trespass	4	4.8			
6		Receiving stolen property	1	1.2			
7		Resisting arrest	2	2.4			
8		Robbery	---	---			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	2	2.4			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	11	13.3			
11		Simple assault	3	3.6			
12		Rape/sexual assault	1	1.2			
13		Prostitution/ soliciting	2	2.4			
14		Arson	1	1.2			
15		Forgery/fuffl	---	---			
16		Vandalism	---	---			
17		Murder	---	---			
18		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
19		Indecent exposure	---	---			

**MOST SERIOUS
CHARGES**

0	Property	72	85.7
1	Person	12	14.3

Appendix 1. continued County B.

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE						
	1	Simple misdemeanor	52	62.7		
	2	Serious misdemeanor	9	10.8		
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	9	10.8		
	4	Class A felony	---	---		
	5	Class B felony	1	1.2		
	6	Class C felony	5	6.0		
	7	Class D felony	7	8.4		
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES II						
	0	Simple misdemeanor	53	63.1		
	1	Serious misdemeanor	9	10.7		
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	9	10.7		
	3	Felony	13	15.5		
INTAKE						
	1	Release	20	24.1		
	2	Informal adjustment	51	61.4		
	3	Further court processing	12	14.5		
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION						
	1	Yes	3	3.6		
	2	No	80	96.4		
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE						
	1	Home detention	---	---		
	2	Youth shelter	---	---		
	3	Detention facility	3	3.6		
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---		
	5	Jail	---	---		
	9	Not applicable	80	96.4		

Appendix 1. continued County B

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	2	2.4			
	2	No	81	97.6			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	10	12.0			
	2	No	2	2.4			
	9	Not applicable	71	85.5			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	1.2			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	82	98.8			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	4	4.8			
	2	No	---	---			
	3	Waiver stipulation	1	1.2			
	9	Not applicable	78	94.0			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	1	1.2			
	2	Uncontested	5	6.0			
	9	Not applicable	77	92.8			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	82	98.8			

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ra
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	1	1.2			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	82	98.8			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	5	6.0			
	9	Not applicable	77	92.8			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	82	98.8			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	5	6.0			
	2	No	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	78	94.0			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	83	100.0			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	82	98.8			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	1	1.2			
	9	Not applicable	82	98.8			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	2	2.4			
	2	No	81	97.6			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	83	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	83	100.0			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	82	98.8			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	1	1.2			
	2	No	82	98.8			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	2	2.4			
	2	Community based treatment	7	8.4			
	9	Not applicable	74	89.2			

Appendix 1. continued County B

15

Hispanics

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Rai
DETENTION							
(composite)							
	1	Yes	3	3.6			
	2	No	80	96.4			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	44	53.0			
	2	Female	13	15.7			
	8	No information	26	31.3			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	58	69.9			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	25	30.1			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	5	6.0			
	2	Obtained	---	---			
	8	No information	78	94.0			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County B.

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	40	78.4			
	1	Female	11	21.6			
EDUCATION							
	0		---	---			
	1		3	5.9			
	2		2	3.9			
	3		1	2.0			
	4		1	2.0			
	5		3	5.9			
	6		8	15.7			
	7		5	9.8			
	8		15	29.4			
	9		10	19.6			
	10		1	2.0			
	11		2	3.9			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	2		1	2.0			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		1	2.0			
	7		3	5.9			
	8		4	7.8			
	9		---	---			
	10		2	3.9			
	11		4	7.8			
	12		1	2.0			
	13		7	13.7			
	14		6	11.8			
	15		6	11.8			
	16		9	17.6			
	17		7	13.7			
	18		---	---			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	26	51.0			
	2	Attending but problems	13	25.5			
	3	Nonattending	1	2.0			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No information	11	21.6			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		1	2.0			
	1		12	23.5			
	2		2	3.9			
	3		2	3.9			
	4		2	3.9			
	5		2	3.9			
	6		3	5.9			
	7		---	---			
	8		---	---			
	9		---	---			
	10		---	---			
	11		1	2.0			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	26	51.0			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	15	29.4			
	2	No	7	13.7			
	8	No information	29	56.9			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	21	41.2			
	2	No	2	3.9			
	8	No information	28	54.9			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	31	60.8			
	2	One member	7	13.7			
	8	No information	13	25.5			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					.4	1.2	0-6

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE

TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	3	5.9			
	2	Burglary/break.& enter.	6	11.8			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	---	---			
	4	Aggrav. assault	---	---			
	5	Crim. trespass	---	---			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	---	---			
	8	Robbery	---	---			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	---	---			
	11	Simple assault	1	2.0			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	---	---			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	---	---			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Arson	---	---			
	18	No information	41	80.4			

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE

1	Simple misdemeanor	3	5.9
2	Serious misdemeanor	---	---
3	Aggravated misdemeanor	---	---
4	Class A felony	---	---
5	Class B felony	---	---
6	Class C felony	3	5.9
7	Class D felony	4	7.8
8	Not applicable	41	80.4

154

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ra
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	----

PAST DISPOSITION

1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	2	3.9
2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	49	96.1

IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY

0	Yes	5	9.8
1	No	46	90.2

LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)

1964.2 3660.3 0-881

NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES

1	47	92.2
2	2	3.9
3	---	---
4	2	3.9
5	---	---

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Theft/unauthor. use	30	58.8			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	6	11.8			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/ obstruction	5	9.8			
	4	Aggrav. assault	3	5.9			
	5	Crim. trespass	---	---			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest	1	2.0			
	8	Robbery	---	---			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	1	2.0			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	2	3.9			
	11	Simple assault	1	2.0			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	---	---			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	---	---			
	14	Arson	1	2.0			
	15	Forgery/fuffl	1	2.0			
	16	Vandalism	---	---			
	17	Murder	---	---			
	18	Vehicular homicide	---	---			
	19	Indecent exposure	---	---			

MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
	0	Property	46	90.2			
	1	Personal	5	9.8			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	29	56.9			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	6	11.8			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	2	3.9			
	4	Class A felony	1	2.0			
	5	Class B felony	---	---			
	6	Class C felony	2	3.9			
	7	Class D felony	11	21.6			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	29	56.9			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	6	11.8			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	2	3.9			
	3	Felony	14	27.5			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	14	27.5			
	2	Informal adjustment	32	62.7			
	3	Further court processing	5	9.8			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	2	3.9			
	2	No	49	96.1			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	2	3.9			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	49	96.1			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	3	5.9			
	2	No	48	94.1			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	3	5.9			
	2	No	2	3.9			
	9	Not applicable	46	90.2			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	1	2.0			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	2.0			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	49	96.0			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	51	100.0			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	---	---			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	1	2.0			
	2	Uncontested	2	3.9			
	9	Not applicable	48	94.1			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	1	2.0			
	2	No	50	98.0			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ran
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	1	2.0			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	50	96.0			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	3	5.9			
	9	Not applicable	48	94.1			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	51	100.0			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	3	5.9			
	2	No	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	48	94.1			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	51	100.0			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	1	2.0			
	2	No	50	98.0			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	1	2.0			
	9	Not applicable	50	98.0			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Aslans

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	3	5.9			
	2	No	48	94.1			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	51	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	51	100.0			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	2	3.9			
	2	No	49	96.1			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	51	100.0			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	1	2.0			
	2	Community based treatment	2	3.9			
	9	Not applicable	48	94.1			

Appendix 1. continued County B

Asians

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ra
DETENTION							
(composite)							
	1	Yes	2	3.9			
	2	No	49	96.1			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	27	52.9			
	2	Female	9	17.6			
	8	No information	15	29.4			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	37	72.5			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	14	27.5			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	2	3.9			
	2	Obtained	---	---			
	8	No information	49	96.1			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.

Blacks

Variables Value Category N % X STD Range

GENDER

0	Male	552	70.1
1	Female	236	29.9

EDUCATION

0		2	.3
1		4	.5
2		7	.9
3		8	1.0
4		7	.9
5		29	3.7
6		51	6.5
7		58	7.4
8		385	48.9
9		94	11.9
10		99	12.6
11		39	4.9
12		5	.6
88	No information	---	---

AGE

4		---	---
5		---	---
6		---	---
7		2	.3
8		3	.4
9		9	1.1
10		11	1.4
11		18	2.3
12		18	2.3
13		51	6.5
14		70	8.9
15		96	12.2
16		131	16.6
17		172	21.8
18		203	25.8
		4	.5

SCHOOL STATUS

1	Attending	364	46.2
2	Attending but problems	58	7.4
3	Nonattending	69	8.8
4	Other	2	.3
8	No information	295	37.4

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		78	9.9			
	1		155	19.7			
	2		155	19.7			
	3		118	15.0			
	4		67	8.5			
	5		36	4.6			
	6		17	2.2			
	7		13	1.6			
	8		3	.4			
	9		7	.9			
	10		4	.5			
	11		1	.1			
	12		2	.3			
	88	No information	132	16.1			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	100	12.7			
	2	No	25	3.2			
	8	No Information	663	84.1			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	38	4.8			
	2	No	18	2.3			
	8	No Information	732	92.9			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	257	32.6			
	2	One member	531	67.4			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					3.1	2.9	0-21

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	185	23.5			
	2	Burglary/break.& enter.	34	4.3			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	42	5.3			
	4	Aggrav. assault	17	2.2			
	5	Crim. trespass	13	1.6			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	---	---			
	8	Robbery	17	2.2			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	9	1.1			
11	Simple assault	61	7.7				
	12	Rape/sexual assault	7	.9			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffi	1	.1			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	1	.1			
	17	Arson	6	.8			
	18	Tampering with motor vehicles	---	---			
19	Traffic offenses	---	---				
20	Extortion	1	.1				
	21	Terrorism	2	.3			
animals	22	Cruelty to animals	2	.3			
	23	Fraudulent practices	---	---			
	24	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	25	Kidnapping	---	---			
	26	Possession of explosives	---	---			
	22	No information	390	49.5			

Appendix I. continued County C.

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Rang
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	200	25.4			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	64	8.1			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	50	6.3			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	5	.6			
	6	Class C felony	58	7.4			
	7	Class D felony	21	2.7			
	8	Not applicable	390	49.5			
PAST DISPOSITION							
	1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	32	4.1			
	2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	756	95.9			
IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY							
	0	Yes	98	12.4			
	1	No	690	87.6			
LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)							
					153.4	338.5	0-2999
NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES							
	1		699	92.4			
	2		74	5.3			
	3		9	1.5			
	4		4	.6			
	5		1	.2			
	7		1	.1			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

**MOST SERIOUS CURRENT
CRIMINAL OFFENSE**

1		Theft/unauthor. use	370	47.0			
2		Burglary/ break.& enter.	47	6.0			
3		Disorderly conduct/J-walk/ obstruction	91	11.5			
4		Aggrav. assault	40	5.1			
5		Crim. trespass	27	3.4			
6		Receiving stolen property	1	.1			
7		Resisting arrest	2	.3			
8		Robbery	30	3.8			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	8	1.0			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	21	2.7			
11		Simple assault	96	12.2			
12		Rape/sexual assault	15	1.9			
13		Prostitution/ soliciting	---	---			
14		Arson	9	1.1			
15		Forgery/fuffl	8	1.0			
16		Vandalism	---	---			
17		Murder	4	.5			
18		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
19		Indecent exposure	4	.5			
20		Tampering with motor vehicle	4	.5			
21		Traffic offense	2	.3			
22		Extortion	---	---			
23		Terrorism	4	.8			
24		Cruelty to animal	--	---			
25		Fraudulent practices	3	.4			
26		Failure to give aid	1	.1			
27		Kidnapping	---	---			
28		Possession of explosives	---	---			

**MOST SERIOUS
CHARGES**

0	Property	587	75.4
1	Personal	195	24.6

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	428	54.3			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	83	10.5			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	131	16.6			
	4	Class A felony	3	.4			
	5	Class B felony	21	2.7			
	6	Class C felony	75	9.5			
	7	Class D felony	47	6.0			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	429	54.2			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	86	10.9			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	131	16.5			
	3	Felony	146	18.4			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	451	57.2			
	2	Informal adjustment	187	23.7			
	3	Further court processing	150	19.0			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	49	6.2			
	2	No	739	93.8			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	7	.9			
	3	Detention facility	36	4.6			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	1	.1			
	5	Jail	5	.6			
	9	Not applicable	739	93.8			

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

PROBATION SUPERVISION							
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Yes	56	7.1				
2	No	725	92.9				

PETITION							
----------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Yes	145	18.4				
2	No	5	.6				
9	Not applicable	638	81.0				

WHY NO PETITION							
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Out of court settlement	2	.3				
2	Not enough evidence	2	.3				
3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	---	---				
9	Not applicable	784	99.5				

WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
-----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Yes	11	1.4				
2	No	---	---				
3	Waiver stipulation	---	---				
9	Not applicable	777	98.6				

INITIAL APPEARANCE							
--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Contested	25	3.2				
2	Uncontested	109	13.8				
9	Not applicable	654	83.0				

INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

1	Yes	16	2.0				
2	No	772	98.0				

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	2	.3			
	2	Youth shelter	2	.3			
	3	Detention facility	12	1.5			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	772	98.0			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	78	9.9			
	2	No	56	7.1			
	9	Not applicable	654	83.0			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	54	6.9			
	2	No	734	93.1			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	52	6.6			
	2	No	4	.5			
	9	Not applicable	732	92.9			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	3	.4			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	785	99.6			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	16	2.0			
	2	No	772	98.0			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	13	1.6			
	5	Jail	3	.4			
	9	Not applicable	463	98.0			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	13	1.6			
	2	No	775	98.3			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	1	.1			
	2	No	787	99.9			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	6	.8			
	2	No	782	99.2			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	2	.3			
	2	No	786	99.7			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	18	2.3			
	2	No	770	97.7			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	38	4.8			
	2	Community based treatment	21	2.7			
	9	Not applicable	729	92.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Blacks

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	56	7.1			
	2	No	732	92.9			
GENDER-OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	645	81.9			
	2	Female	93	11.8			
	8	No information	50	6.3			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	723	91.8			
	2	Black	14	1.8			
	8	No information	51	6.5			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	125	15.9			
	2	Obtained	18	2.3			
	8	No information	645	81.9			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	805	80.1			
	1	Female	200	19.9			
EDUCATION							
	0		---	---			
	1		1	.1			
	2		5	.5			
	3		3	.3			
	4		5	.5			
	5		30	3.0			
	6		51	5.1			
	7		79	7.9			
	8		405	40.3			
	9		163	16.2			
	10		164	16.3			
	11		87	8.7			
	12		10	1.0			
	88	No information	2	.2			
AGE							
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		1	.1			
	8		3	.3			
	9		4	.4			
	10		8	.8			
	11		17	1.7			
	12		33	3.3			
	13		70	7.0			
	14		109	10.8			
	15		173	17.2			
	16		270	26.9			
	17		315	31.3			
	18		2	.2			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	554	55.1			
	2	Attending but problems	64	6.4			
	3	Nonattending	111	11.0			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No information	276	27.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variablies Value Category N % X STD Rai

NUMBER OF SIBLINGS

0		59	8.7
1		285	18.2
2		235	18.2
3		117	12.5
4		55	7.1
5		26	3.4
6		21	.8
7		1	1.2
8		7	1.8
9		1	.4
10		---	.2
11		---	.2
12		---	---
15		1	.1
88	No information	138	27.3

MOTHEP EMPLOYMENT

1	Yes	167	16.6
2	No	21	2.1
8	No information	817	81.3

FATHER EMPLOYMENT

1	Yes	107	10.6
2	No	16	1.6
8	No information	882	87.8

FAMILY STATUS

1	Two member	519	51.6
2	One member	486	48.4

NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES

2.3 2.5 0-21

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	133	13.2			
	2	Burglary/break.& enter.	48	4.8			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	38	3.8			
	4	Aggrav. assault	10	1.0			
	5	Crim. trespass	13	1.6			
	6	Receiving stolen property	1	.1			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	---	---			
	8	Robbery	3	.3			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	1	.1			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	34	3.4			
	11	Simple assault	32	3.2			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	5	.5			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	5	.5			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Arson	6	.6			
	18	Tampering with motor vehicles	---	---			
	19	Traffic offenses	2	.2			
	20	Extortion	---	---			
	21	Terrorism	1	.1			
	22	Cruelty to animals	---	---			
	23	Fraudulant practices	2	.2			
	24	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	25	Kidnapping	---	---			
	26	Possession of explosives	---	---			
	27	No information	670	66.7			

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
-----------	-------	----------	---	---	---	-----	-------

LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	163	16.2			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	43	4.3			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	43	4.3			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	5	.5			
	6	Class C felony	56	5.6			
	7	Class D felony	25	2.5			
	8	Not applicable	670	66.7			
PAST DISPOSITION							
	1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	13	1.3			
	2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	992	98.7			
IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY							
	0	Yes	87	8.7			
	1	No	918	91.3			
LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)							
					117.7	292.7	0-2340
NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES							
	1		896	89.2			
	2		83	8.3			
	3		22	2.2			
	4		1	.1			
	5		2	.2			
	9		1	.1			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
1		Theft/unauthor. use	382	38.0			
2		Burglary/break.& enter.	119	11.8			
3		Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction	154	15.3			
4		Aggrav. assault	31	3.1			
5		Crim. trespass	31	3.1			
6		Receiving stolen property	2	.2			
7		Resisting arrest	1	.1			
8		Robbery	17	1.7			
9		Carrying a concealed weapon	6	.6			
10		Drug/alcohol offense	95	9.5			
11		Simple assault	93	9.3			
12		Rape/sexual assault	18	1.8			
13		Prostitution/soliciting	1	.1			
14		Arson	8	.8			
15		Forgery/fuffl	17	1.7			
16		Vandalism	---	---			
17		Murder	2	.2			
18		Vehicular homicide	---	---			
19		Indecent exposure	4	.4			
20		Tampering with motor vehicle	2	.2			
21		Traffic offense	9	.9			
22		Extortion	1	.1			
23		Terrorism	4	.4			
24		Cruelty to animal	--	---			
25		Fraudulent practices	4	.4			
26		Failure to give aid	---	---			
27		Kidnapping	1	.1			
28		Possession of explosives	2	.2			
MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
0		Property	829	82.5			
1		Person	176	17.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	480	47.8			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	165	16.4			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	122	12.1			
	4	Class A felony	4	.4			
	5	Class B felony	20	2.0			
	6	Class C felony	135	13.4			
	7	Class D felony	79	7.9			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	478	47.6			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	167	16.6			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	122	12.1			
	3	Felony	238	23.7			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	519	51.6			
	2	Informal adjustment	338	33.6			
	3	Further court processing	148	14.7			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	37	3.7			
	2	No	968	96.3			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	3	.3			
	3	Detention facility	31	3.1			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	2	.2			
	9	Not applicable	969	96.3			

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	130	12.9			
	2	No	975	87.1			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	141	14.0			
	2	No	7	.7			
	9	Not applicable	857	85.3			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	3	.3			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	.1			
	3	Moved away/ran away/Joined services	3	.3			
	9	Not applicable	998	99.3			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	4	.4			
	2	No	---	---			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	1001	99.6			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	11	1.1			
	2	Uncontested	126	12.5			
	9	Not applicable	868	86.4			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	14	1.4			
	2	No	991	98.6			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	14	1.4			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	.2			
	9	Not applicable	991	98.6			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	85	8.5			
	2	No	52	5.2			
	9	Not applicable	868	86.4			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	53	5.3			
	2	No	952	94.7			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	50	5.0			
	2	No	3	.3			
	9	Not applicable	952	94.7			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	2	.2			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	.1			
	9	Not applicable	1002	99.7			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	13	1.3			
	2	No	992	98.7			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	1	.1			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	13	1.3			
	9	Not applicable	991	98.6			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Whites

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	21	2.1			
	2	No	984	97.9			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	1005	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	4	.4			
	2	No	1001	99.6			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	5	.5			
	2	No	1000	99.5			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	11	1.1			
	2	No	994	98.9			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	24	2.4			
	2	Community based treatment	27	2.7			
	9	Not applicable	954	94.9			

Appendix 1. continued County C.

Whites

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION							
(composite)							
	1	Yes	45	4.5			
	2	No	960	95.5			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	848	84.4			
	2	Female	118	11.7			
	8	No information	39	3.9			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	937	93.2			
	2	Black	25	2.5			
	8	No information	43	4.3			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	96	9.6			
	2	Obtained	41	4.1			
	8	No information	868	86.4			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER	0	Male	16	76.2			
	1	Female	5	23.8			
EDUCATION	0		---	---			
	1		---	---			
	2		---	---			
	3		1	4.8			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		1	4.8			
	7		5	23.8			
	8		10	47.6			
	9		3	14.3			
	10		1	4.8			
	11		---	---			
12		---	---				
17		---	---				
88		No information	---	---			
AGE	3		---	---			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		---	---			
	8		---	---			
	9		---	---			
	10		1	4.8			
	11		---	---			
	12		---	---			
	13		---	---			
	14		1	4.8			
15		2	9.5				
16		6	28.6				
17		11	52.4				
18		---	---				
SCHOOL STATUS	1	Attending	5	23.8			
	2	Attending but problems	1	4.8			
	3	Nonattending	5	23.8			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No information	10	47.6			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		---	---			
	1		2	9.5			
	2		8	38.1			
	3		3	14.3			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		---	---			
	8		---	---			
	9		---	---			
	10		---	---			
	11		---	---			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	8	38.1			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	2	9.5			
	2	No	4	19.0			
	8	No information	15	71.4			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	1	4.8			
	2	No	4	19.0			
	8	No information	16	76.2			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	13	51.9			
	2	One member	8	38.1			

NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES

2.4 1.4 0-4

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	6	28.6			
	2	Burglary/break.& enter.	4	19.0			
	3	Disorderly conduct/J-walk/obstruction/crim. mischief	2	9.5			
	4	Aggrav. assault	---	---			
	5	Crim. trespass	1	4.8			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	---	---			
	8	Robbery	---	---			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	---	---			
	11	Simple assault	---	---			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	---	---			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl.	---	---			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Murder	---	---			
	18	Arson	---	---			
	19	Tampering with motor vehicles	---	---			
	20	Traffic offenses	1	4.8			
	21	Extortion	---	---			
	22	Terrorism	---	---			
	23	Cruelty to animals	---	---			
	24	Fraudulent practices	---	---			
	25	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	26	Kidnapping	---	---			
	27	Possession of explosives	---	---			
	28	No information	7	33.3			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	6	28.6			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	2	9.5			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	---	---			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	---	---			
	6	Class C felony	4	19.0			
	7	Class D felony	2	9.5			
	8	Not applicable	7	33.3			
PAST DISPOSITION							
	1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	1	4.8			
	2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	20	95.2			
IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY							
	0	Yes	1	4.8			
	1	No	20	95.2			
LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)							
					158.2	349.8	0-1558
NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES							
	1		18	85.7			
	2		2	9.5			
	3		1	4.8			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	7		---	---			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Theft/unauthor. use	12	48.0			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.	5	20.0			
	3	Disorderly conduct/J-walk/ obstruction	1	4.0			
	4	Aggrav. assault	---	---			
	5	Crim. trespass	1	4.0			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest	---	---			
	8	Robbery	---	---			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	3	12.0			
	11	Simple assault	1	4.0			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	---	---			
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting	---	---			
	14	Arson	---	---			
	15	Forgery/fuffi	1	4.0			
	16	Vandalism	---	---			
	17	Murder	---	---			
	18	Veicular homicide	---	---			
	19	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	20	Tampering with motor vehicle	---	---			
	21	Traffic offense	1	4.0			
	22	Extortion	---	---			
	23	Terrorism	---	---			
	24	Cruelty to animal	---	---			
	25	Fraudulent practices	---	---			
	26	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	27	Kidnapping	---	---			
	28	Possession of explosives	---	---			
MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
	0	Property	19	90.5			
	1	Person	2	9.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Rang
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	11	52.4			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	3	14.3			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	---	---			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	---	---			
	6	Class C felony	4	19.0			
	7	Class D felony	3	14.3			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	11	52.4			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	3	14.3			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	---	---			
	3	Felony	7	33.3			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	9	42.9			
	2	Informal adjustment	5	23.8			
	3	Further court processing	7	33.3			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	5	23.8			
	2	No	16	76.2			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	1	4.8			
	3	Detention facility	3	14.3			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	1	4.8			
	9	Not applicable	16	76.2			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	1	4.8			
	2	No	20	95.2			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	6	28.6			
	2	No	1	4.8			
	9	Not applicable	14	66.7			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	1	4.8			
	9	Not applicable	20	95.2			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	---	---			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	21	100.0			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	---	---			
	2	Uncontested	6	28.6			
	9	Not applicable	15	71.4			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	2	9.5			
	2	No	19	90.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C.

1

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	R
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	2	9.5			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	19	90.5			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	1	4.8			
	2	No	5	23.8			
	9	Not applicable	15	71.4			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	21	100.0			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	5	23.8			
	2	No	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	16	76.2			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	21	100.0			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	3	14.3			
	2	No	18	85.7			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	3	14.3			
	9	Not applicable	18	85.7			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	21	100.0			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	21	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	21	100.0			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	21	100.0			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	2	9.5			
	2	No	19	90.5			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	2	9.5			
	2	Community based treatment	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	19	90.5			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Native American Indians

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ran
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	7	33.3			
	2	No	14	66.7			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	19	90.5			
	2	Female	---	---			
	8	No information	2	9.5			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	15	71.4			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	6	28.6			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	6	28.6			
	2	Obtained	---	---			
	8	No information	15	71.4			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDER							
	0	Male	103	80.6			
	1	Female	12	10.4			
EDUCATION							
	0		---	---			
	1		---	---			
	2		1	.9			
	3		---	---			
	4		3	2.6			
	5		3	2.6			
	6		12	10.4			
	7		11	9.6			
	8		58	50.4			
	9		13	11.3			
	10		8	7.0			
	11		6	5.2			
	12		---	---			
	17		---	---			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	3		---	---			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		---	---			
	8		---	---			
	9		2	1.7			
	10		2	1.7			
	11		2	1.7			
	12		7	6.1			
	13		15	13.0			
	14		11	9.6			
	15		20	17.4			
	16		27	23.5			
	17		29	24.3			
	18		1	.9			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	42	36.5			
	2	Attending but problems	13	11.3			
	3	Nonattending	21	18.3			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No information	39	33.9			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		2	1.7			
	1		13	11.3			
	2		36	31.3			
	3		10	8.7			
	4		10	8.7			
	5		14	12.2			
	6		4	3.5			
	7		1	.9			
	8		4	3.5			
	9		---	---			
	10		---	---			
	11		2	1.7			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	19	16.5			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	8	7.0			
	2	No	4	3.5			
	8	No information	103	89.6			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	7	6.1			
	2	No	2	1.7			
	8	No information	106	92.2			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	79	66.4			
	2	One member	40	33.6			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					4.6	3.9	0-15

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	21	17.6			
	2	Burglary break.& enter.	13	10.9			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction/ crim. mischief	7	5.0			
	4	Aggrav. assault	3	2.5			
	5	Crim. trespass	1	.8			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest/escape	---	---			
	8	Robbery	1	.8			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon--	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	2	1.7			
	11	Simple assault	6	5.0			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	2	1.7			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	---	---			
	14	Forgery/fuffl	1	.8			
	15	Vandalism	---	---			
	16	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	17	Murder	---	---			
	18	Arson	1	.0			
	19	Tampering with motor vehicles	---	---			
	20	Traffic offenses	---	---			
	21	Extortion	---	---			
	22	Terrorism	3	2.5			
	23	Cruelty to animals	---	---			
	24	Fraudulent practices	2	1.7			
	25	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	26	Kidnapping	---	---			
	27	Possession of explosives	---	---			
	28	No information	56	47.1			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Ran
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	24	20.2			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	4	3.4			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	14	11.8			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	1	.8			
	6	Class C felony	15	12.6			
	7	Class D felony	5	4.2			
	8	Not applicable	56	47.1			
PAST DISPOSITION							
	1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	4	3.5			
	2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	111	96.5			
IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY							
	0	Yes	18	15.7			
	1	No	97	84.3			
LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)							
					155.9	310.5	0-202
NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES							
	1		104	90.4			
	2		8	7.0			
	3		3	2.6			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	7		---	---			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables Value Category N % X STD Range

MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE

1	Theft/author.	46	40.0
2	Burglary	16	13.9
3	Disorderly		
	conduct/j-walk/		
	obstruction	9	7.8
4	Aggrav. assault	5	4.3
5	Crim. trespass	6	5.2
6	Receiving stolen		
	property	---	---
7	Resisting arrest	---	---
8	Robbery	3	2.6
9	Carrying a		
	concealed weapon	1	.0
10	Drug/alcohol		
	offense	5	4.3
11	Simple assault	11	9.6
12	Rape/sexual		
	assault	4	3.5
13	Prostitution/		
	soliciting	1	.0
14	Arson	1	.0
15	Forgery/fuffi.	1	.9
16	Vandalism	---	---
17	Murder	---	---
18	Veicular		
	homicide	---	---
19	Indecent		
	exposure	---	---
20	Tampering with		
	motor vehicle	1	.0
21	Traffic offense	1	.0
22	Extortion	---	---
23	Terrorism	4	3.5
24	Cruelty to animal	---	---
25	Fraudulent		
	practices	---	---
26	Failure to		
	give aid	---	---
27	Kidnapping	---	---
28	Possession of		
	explosives	---	---

MOST SERIOUS CHARGES

0	Property	89	77.4
1	Person	26	22.5

Appendix 1. continued County C
Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE						
	1	Simple misdemeanor	52	45.2		
	2	Serious misdemeanor	11	9.6		
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	23	20.0		
	4	Class A felony	---	---		
	5	Class B felony	3	2.6		
	6	Class C felony	17	14.8		
	7	Class D felony	9	7.8		
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES II						
	0	Simple misdemeanor	52	45.2		
	1	Serious misdemeanor	11	9.6		
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	23	20.0		
	3	Felony	29	25.2		
INTAKE						
	1	Release	63	54.6		
	2	Informal adjustment	20	17.2		
	3	Further court processing	23	20.0		
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION						
	1	Yes	16	13.9		
	2	No	99	86.1		
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE						
	1	Home detention	---	---		
	2	Youth shelter	6	5.2		
	3	Detention facility	8	7.0		
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---		
	5	Jail	2	1.7		
	0	Not applicable	99	86.1		

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	10	8.7			
	2	No	105	91.3			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	19	16.5			
	2	No	4	3.5			
	9	Not applicable	92	80.0			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	1	.0			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	2	1.7			
	9	Not applicable	112	97.4			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	---	---			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	115	100.0			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	2	1.7			
	2	Uncontested	17	14.8			
	9	Not applicable	96	83.5			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	3	2.6			
	2	No	112	97.4			

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Rar
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	1	.9			
	3	Detention facility	2	1.7			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	112	97.4			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	9	7.8			
	2	No	10	8.7			
	9	Not applicable	96	83.5			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	4	3.5			
	2	No	111	96.5			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	10	8.7			
	2	No	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	105	91.3			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	115	100.0			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	2	1.7			
	2	No	113	98.3			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	1	.9			
	3	Detention facility	1	.9			
	9	Not applicable	113	99.3			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	2	1.7			
	2	No	113	98.3			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	119	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	119	100.0			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	119	100.0			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	3	2.5			
	2	No	116	97.5			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement/transfer to adult court	3	2.6			
	2	Community based treatment	6	5.2			
	9	Not applicable	106	92.2			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Hispanics

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	16	13.4			
	2	No	103	86.6			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	90	78.3			
	2	Female	5	4.3			
	8	No information	20	17.4			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	85	73.9			
	2	Black	2	1.7			
	8	No information	28	24.3			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	23	20.0			
	2	Obtained	4	3.5			
	8	No information	88	76.5			

Appendix 1. Distributions of Variables for County C.

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
GENDEP							
	0	Male	61	92.4			
	1	Female	5	7.6			
EDUCATION							
	0		---	---			
	1		---	---			
	2		---	---			
	3		1	1.5			
	4		1	1.5			
	5		6	9.1			
	6		9	13.6			
	7		5	7.6			
	8		25	37.9			
	9		11	16.7			
	10		5	7.6			
	11		2	3.0			
	12		1	1.5			
	17		---	---			
	88	No information	---	---			
AGE							
	3		---	---			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			
	7		---	---			
	8		---	---			
	9		---	---			
	10		1	1.5			
	11		3	4.5			
	12		6	9.1			
	13		6	9.1			
	14		14	21.2			
	15		8	12.1			
	16		12	18.2			
	17		16	24.2			
	18		---	---			
SCHOOL STATUS							
	1	Attending	46	69.7			
	2	Attending but problems	2	3.0			
	3	Nonattending	3	4.5			
	4	Other	---	---			
	8	No information	15	22.7			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
NUMBER OF SIBLINGS							
	0		1	1.5			
	1		5	7.6			
	2		19	28.8			
	3		3	4.5			
	4		9	13.6			
	5		3	4.5			
	6		1	1.5			
	7		2	3.0			
	8		3	4.5			
	9		---	---			
	10		2	3.0			
	11		---	---			
	12		---	---			
	88	No information	18	27.3			
MOTHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	6	9.1			
	2	No	9	13.6			
	8	No information	51	77.3			
FATHER EMPLOYMENT							
	1	Yes	11	16.7			
	2	No	2	3.0			
	8	No information	53	80.3			
FAMILY STATUS							
	1	Two member	54	81.8			
	2	One member	12	18.2			
NUMBER OF PRIOR CRIMINAL OFFENSES							
					2.2	1.5	0-5

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
TYPE MOST SERIOUS	1	Theft/unauthor. use	5	7.6			
	2	Burglary/ break.& enter.					
	3	Disorderly conduct/J-walk/ obstruction/ crim. mischief					
	4	Aggrav. assault	1	1.5			
	5	Crim. trespass	1	1.5			
	6	Receiving stolen property					
	7	Resisting arrest/ escape					
	8	Robbery					
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon					
	10	Drug/alcohol offense					
	11	Simple assault	1	1.5			
	12	Rape/sexual assault					
	13	Prostitution/ soliciting					
	14	Forgery/fuffi	2	3.0			
	15	Vandalism					
	16	Indecent exposure					
	17	Murder					
	18	Arson	1	1.5			
	19	Tampering with motor vehicles					
	20	Traffic offenses					
	21	Extortion					
	22	Terrorism					
	23	Cruelty to animals					
	24	Fraudulent practices					
	25	Failure to give aid					
	26	Kidnapping					
	27	Possession of explosives					
	28	No Information	56	84.8			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
LAST CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	4	6.1			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	1	1.5			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	2	3.0			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	---	---			
	6	Class C felony	---	---			
	7	Class D felony	3	4.5			
	8	Not applicable	56	84.8			
PAST DISPOSITION							
	1	Adjudicated delinquent/ waived to adult court	2	3.0			
	2	No adjudication/ no waiver to adult court	64	97.0			
IF COMMITTED CRIME, WAS PERSON STILL UNDER COURT AUTHORITY							
	0	Yes	4	6.1			
	1	No	62	93.9			
LENGTH OF TIME IN JUVENILE COURT (DAYS)							
					44.1	166.8	0-1054
NUMBER OF CURRENT CHARGES							
	1		58	87.0			
	2		6	12.1			
	3		---	---			
	4		---	---			
	5		---	---			
	6		---	---			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
MOST SERIOUS CURRENT CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Theft/unauthor. use	37	56.1			
	2	Burglary break & enter.	1	1.5			
	3	Disorderly conduct/j-walk/obstruction	7	10.6			
	4	Aggrav. assault	3	4.5			
	5	Crim. trespass	3	4.5			
	6	Receiving stolen property	---	---			
	7	Resisting arrest	---	---			
	8	Robbery	1	1.5			
	9	Carrying a concealed weapon	---	---			
	10	Drug/alcohol offense	1	1.5			
	11	Simple assault	7	10.6			
	12	Rape/sexual assault	1	1.5			
	13	Prostitution/soliciting	1	1.5			
	14	Arson	1	1.5			
	15	Forgery/fuffi	2	3.0			
	16	Vandalism	---	---			
	17	Murder	---	---			
	18	Vehicular homicide	---	---			
	19	Indecent exposure	---	---			
	20	Tampering with motor vehicle	---	---			
	21	Traffic offense	1	1.5			
	22	Extortion	---	---			
	23	Terrorism	---	---			
	24	Cruelty to animal	---	---			
	25	Fraudulent practices	---	---			
	26	Failure to give aid	---	---			
	27	Kidnapping	---	---			
	28	Possession of explosives	---	---			
MOST SERIOUS CHARGES							
	0	Property	52	78.8			
	1	Person	14	21.2			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSE							
	1	Simple misdemeanor	37	56.1			
	2	Serious misdemeanor	13	19.7			
	3	Aggravated misdemeanor	11	16.7			
	4	Class A felony	---	---			
	5	Class B felony	---	---			
	6	Class C felony	1	1.5			
	7	Class D felony	4	6.1			
SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES II							
	0	Simple misdemeanor	37	56.1			
	1	Serious misdemeanor	13	19.7			
	2	Aggravated misdemeanor	11	16.7			
	3	Felony	5	7.6			
INTAKE							
	1	Release	37	56.1			
	2	Informal adjustment	17	25.8			
	3	Further court processing	12	18.2			
STAGE INTAKE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	4	6.1			
	2	No	62	93.9			
PLACE DETAINED AT STAGE							
	1	Home detention	1	1.5			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	3	4.5			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Jail	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	62	93.9			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	6	9.1			
	2	No	60	90.9			
PETITION							
	1	Yes	12	18.2			
	2	No	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	54	81.8			
WHY NO PETITION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	---	---			
	3	Moved away/ran away/joined services	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	66	100.0			
WAIVER TO ADULT COURT							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	---	---			
	3	Waiver stipulation	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	66	100.0			
INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Contested	3	4.5			
	2	Uncontested	9	13.6			
	9	Not applicable	54	81.8			
INITIAL APPEARANCE DETENTION							
	1	Yes	2	3.0			
	2	No	64	97.0			

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PLACE DETAINED AT INITIAL APPEARANCE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	---	---			
	4	Combination of 1,2,3	---	---			
	5	Mental inst.	1	1.5			
	9	Not applicable	65	98.5			
CONSENT DECREE							
	1	Yes	6	9.1			
	2	No	6	9.1			
	9	Not applicable	54	81.8			
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	4	6.1			
	2	No	62	93.9			
ADJUDICATION							
	1	Yes	5	7.6			
	2	No	1	1.5			
	9	Not applicable	60	90.9			
WHY NO ADJUDICATION							
	1	Out of court settlement	---	---			
	2	Not enough evidence	1	1.5			
	9	Not applicable	65	98.5			
ADJUDICATION DETENTION							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	66	100.0			
PLACE DETAINED AT ADJUDICATION STAGE							
	1	Home detention	---	---			
	2	Youth shelter	---	---			
	3	Detention facility	---	---			
	9	Not applicable	66	100.0			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variables	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
PROBATION SUPERVISION							
	1	Yes	2	3.0			
	2	No	64	97.0			
HOME OF RELATIVE OTHER THAN GUARDIAN							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	66	100.0			
GROUP HOME/ FOSTER HOME							
	1	Yes	2	3.0			
	2	No	64	97.0			
RESIDENTIAL SETTING							
	1	Yes	1	1.5			
	2	No	65	98.5			
TRAINING SCHOOL							
	1	Yes	---	---			
	2	No	66	100.0			
DISPOSITION TYPE							
	1	Placement transfer to adult court	3	4.5			
	2	Community based treatment	2	3.0			
	9	Not applicable	61	92.4			

Appendix 1. continued County C

Asians

Variable	Value	Category	N	%	X	STD	Range
DETENTION (composite)							
	1	Yes	6	9.1			
	2	No	60	90.9			
GENDER OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	Male	43	65.2			
	2	Female	---	---			
	8	No information	23	34.8			
RACE OF PROBATION OFFICER							
	1	White	24	36.4			
	2	Black	---	---			
	8	No information	42	63.6			
LEGAL COUNSEL							
	1	Court appointed	9	13.6			
	2	Obtained	5	7.6			
	8	No information	52	78.8			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aday, D. (1986) "Court Structure, Defense Use and Juvenile Court Decisions: The Sociological Quarterly 27(1): 107-119.
- Bailey, W.C. and R. Peterson (1981) "Legal vs. Extralegal Determinants of Juvenile Court Dispositions" Juvenile and Family Court Journal 32(2): 41-45.
- Berk, R. (1983) "An Introduction to Sample Bias in Sociological Data" American Sociological Review. 48: 386-398.
- Bishop, D. and C. Frazier (1990) A Study of Race and Juvenile Justice Processing in Florida. A Report Submitted to the Florida Supreme Court Racial and Ethnic Bias Study Commission.
- Bishop, D. and C. Frazier (1988) "The Influence of Race in Juvenile Justice Processing" Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 25(3): 242-263.
- Bortner, M., R. Sunderland, and R. Winn (1985) "Race and the Impact of Juvenile Deinstitutionalization" Crime and Delinquency 31: 35-46.
- Bortner, M. and W. Reed (1985) "The Preeminence of Process: An Example of Refocused Justice Research" Social Science Quarterly 66(2): 413-425.
- Brenten, D. and D. Casper (1981-82) "Differential Sentencing and the Functioning of Criminal Courts: Does It Pay to Plead Guilty?" Law & Society. 16: 45-70.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1977) "Judicial Paternalism and the Female Status Offender: Training Women to Know Their Place" Crime and Delinquency 8:51-59.
- Cohen, L. and J.R. Kluegel (1979) "The Detention Decision: A Study of the Impact of Social Characteristics and Legal Factors in Two Metropolitan Juvenile Courts" Social Forces 58: 146-161.
- (1978) "Determinants of Juvenile Court Dispositions: Ascriptive and Achieved Factors in Two Metropolitan Court" American Sociological Review 43(2): 162-176.
- Dannefer, D. and R. Schutt (1982) "Race and Juvenile Justice Processing in Court and Police Agencies" American Journal of Sociology 87:1113-1132.
- Fagan, J., A. Slaughter, and E. Harstone (1987) "Blind Justice? The Impact of Race on the Juvenile Justice Process" Crime & Delinquency 33:224-258.

- Farnworth, M. and P. Horan (1980) "Separate Justice: An Analysis of Race Differences in Court Processes" *Social Science Research*. 9: 381-399.
- Farnworth, M., R. Teske, and G. Thurman (1991) "Racial, Ethnic and Minority Disparity in Felony Court Processing" in M. Lynch and E.B. Patterson (eds.). *Race and Criminal Justice* New York Harrow and Heston.
- Farnworth, M. C. Frazier, and A. Neuberger (1988) "Orientation Justice: Exploratory Notes from a Statewide Survey of Juvenile Justice Decision Makers" *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 16: 477-491.
- Farrell, R. and V. Swigert (1978) "Prior Offense Record as a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy" *Law & Society Review*. 12: 437-491.
- Federal Register (1991) Notice of FY 1991 Competitive Discretionary Grant Programs and Availability of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program Announcement Application Kit. Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention. Washington D.C.
- Feld, B (1991) "Justice by Geography: Urban, Suburban, and Rural Variations in Juvenile Justice Administration" *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*. 82(1): 156-210.
- Fenwick, C.R. (1982) "Juvenile Court Intake Decision Making: The Importance of Family Affiliation" *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 10(6): 443-453.
- Feyerherm, W. and C.E. Pope (1989) "Juvenile Processing of Minority Youth" Paper Presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Washington D.C.
- Feyerherm, W. (1981) "Juvenile Court Dispositions of Status Offenders: An Analysis of Case Dispositions" in E.L. McNeely and C. Pope (eds.) *Race, Crime, and Criminal Justice* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Frazier, C. and D. Bishop (1985) "The Pretrial Detention of Juveniles and its Impact on Case Dispositions" *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*. 76(4): 301-321.
- Frazier, C. and J. Cochran (1986) "Detention of Juveniles: Its Effects on Subsequent Juvenile Court Processing Decisions" *Youth and Society*. 17: 286-305.
- Heckman, J. (1974) "Shadow Prices, Market Wages, and Labor Supply" *Econometrica*. 42(4): 679-694.
- Hepburn, J. (1978) "Race and the Decision to Arrest: An Analysis of Warrants Issued" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 15(1): 54-73.

- Hindelang, M., T. Hirschi, and J. Weis (1981) *Measuring Delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kempf, K; S. Decker, and R. Bing (1990) *An Analysis of Apparent Disparities in the Handling of Black Youth Within Missouri's Juvenile Justice Systems*. Executive Summary.
- LaFree, G. (1985) "Official Reactions to Hispanic Defendants in the Southwest" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 22(3): 213-235.
- Liska, A. and M. Tausig (1979) "Theoretical Interpretation of Social Class and Race Differentials in Legal Decision-Making for Juveniles" *Sociological Quarterly Review* 20: 197-207.
- Lizotte, A. (1978) "Extra-legal Factors in Chicago's Criminal Courts: Testing the Conflict Model of Criminal Justice" *Social Problems*. 25: 564-580.
- Maguire, K. and T. Flanagan (1991) *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics 1990*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington D.C.: USGPO.
- Marshall, I. and C. Thomas (1983) "Discretionary Decision-Making and the Juvenile Court" *Journal of Juvenile and Family Courts*. 34: 47-59.
- Matza, D. (1964) *Delinquency and Drift* New York: John Wiley.
- McCarthy, B.R. and Smith, B.L. (1986) "The Conceptualization of Discrimination in the Juvenile Justice Process: The Impact of Administrative Factors and Screening Decisions on Juvenile Court Disposition" *Criminology*. 24: 41-64.
- McNeely, R.L. and C. Pope, eds. (1981) *Race, Crime, and Criminal Justice*. Sage Publications.
- Miethe, T. and G. Moore (1986) "Racial Differences in Criminal Processing: The Consequences of Model Selection on Conclusions About Differential Treatment" *Sociological Quarterly* 27: 217-238.
- Pope, C. and Feyerherm, W. (1990a) "Minority Status and Juvenile Justice Processing: An Assessment of the Research Literature (Parts 1 and 11)" *Criminal Justice Abstracts* June 327-335; September 527-542.
- Pope, C. and Feyerherm, W. (1990b) *Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System*. Draft Report for Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Pope, C. (1984) "Blacks and Juvenile Crime: A Review" in D. Georges-Abeyie (ed.) *The Criminal Justice System and Blacks*. N.Y. Clark Boardman.

Sweet, R. (1991) Public Juvenile Facilities: Children in Custody. 1989. National Justice Reports. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 20-23.

Sampson, R. (1986) "Effects of Socioeconomic Context on Official Reaction to Juvenile Delinquency" American Sociological Review 51(6): 876-885.

Stolzenberg, R. and D. Relles (1990) "Theory Testing in a World of Constrained Research Design" Sociological Methods and Research. 18(4): 395-415.

Thornberry, T. (1979) "Sentencing Disparities in the Juvenile Justice System" Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 70(2): 164-171.

Waegel, W. (1989) Delinquency and Juvenile Control: A Sociological Perspective. N.J. Prentice-Hall.

Willie, C.V. (1991) A New Look at Black Families. General Hall Inc. New York 4th edition.

Zatz, M. (1982) "Dynamic Modeling of Criminal Processing Histories" in J. Hagan (ed.) Quantitative Criminology: Innovations and Applications Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.