

A Preliminary Examination of Minority Referrals to the Alaska Juvenile Justice System

by

N.E. Schafer

Richard W. Curtis

Cassie Atwell

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

Presented at the annual meeting of the
Midwestern Criminal Justice Association,
Cincinnati, October 1997.

JC 9501.022

Contents

Disproportionality Literature	1
Research Methodology	6
Referral Events	8
Table 1. Referrals — Demographics, 1992-1995	8
Table 2. Referral Distribution Across Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995	9
Table 3. Referral Distribution on Selected Charges within Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995	10
Table 4. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Statewide, 1992-1995	12
Referral Outcomes	13
Table 5. Percentage of Referrals for Selected Offenses Resulting in an Intake Decision to Petition, by Race, 1992-1995	15
Table 6. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions and Court Outcomes for Selected Offenses in Alaska (Statewide), 1992-1995	15
Analysis of Individuals	16
Table 7. Distribution of Persons, Age, and Referrals by Race and Sex, 1992-1995	17
Table 8. First Referral for Selected Offenses by Race (Individuals), 1992-1995	18
Table 9. Priors at Last Intake Decision and Court Decision, 1992-1995	21
Table 10. Petition Decisions, 1992-1995	21
Summary and Conclusion	23
Bibliography	26
Appendix A. Referrals and Referral Distribution	29
Table A1. Referral Distribution Across Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995	31
Table A2. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Statewide, 1992-1995	32
Table A3. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Northern Region (Excludes Fairbanks Area), 1992-1995	33
Table A4. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Fairbanks, Alaska, 1992-1995	34
Table A5. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Southcentral Region (Excludes Anchorage Area), 1992-1995	35
Table A6. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Anchorage, Alaska, 1992-1995	36
Table A7. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Southeast Region, 1992-1995	37
Appendix B. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions	39
Table B1. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995	41
Appendix C. Logistic Regression Findings	43
Table C1. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions and Court Outcomes for Selected Offenses in Alaska (Statewide), 1992-1995	45
Table C2. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995	46

A Preliminary Examination of Minority Referrals to the Alaska Juvenile Justice System

The disproportionate processing of minorities in the justice system has been noted with growing concern nationally as well as at the state level. In Alaska, as in other states, the primary basis for concern is that minorities are overrepresented among the adult prison population. Alaska Natives regularly comprise 34 percent of state prisoners, while they comprise approximately 16 percent of the total state population.

The realization that this disproportionality appears in other justice system venues has led nationally to a number of research initiatives with a focus on the overrepresentation of juveniles. In a reappropriation for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Congress directed states that receive funds to report on disproportionate minority confinement. In accordance with this directive, OJJDP funded a twelve-state study of disproportionate minority confinement (Feyerherm, 1995; Pope & Feyerherm, 1990).

In Alaska the Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) has reported that Alaska Natives and African Americans are disproportionately confined in Alaska juvenile institutions. The disproportionality occurs in both the detained and institutionalized populations (Withington, 1996).

It is, of course, possible that the disproportionate confinement of both Alaska Native and African American youth is tied to a disproportionate number of referrals by law enforcement agencies through the juvenile justice system and/or disproportionate processing. Therefore the data analyzed here are referral data provided by the Division of Family and Youth Services. These provide a statistical overview of disproportionality in the Alaska juvenile justice system—the subject of this paper.

Disproportionality Literature

A considerable body of literature exists addressing the disparate processing of minorities in the American criminal justice system. The literature compares the proportion of minorities in the system with their proportion in the general population and concludes that minorities are overrepresented. Most studies focus on the overrepresentation of African Americans in the nation's prisons, with many studies examining sentencing decisions as one possible cause. Included in this area of research are studies of the disproportionate application of the death penalty.

Research on overrepresentation is also based on arrest data; some of these studies suggest that African Americans are overrepresented because they are more criminal; others that there is a law enforcement bias against minorities which results in their increased arrest rate.

This paper is directed toward an examination of the overrepresentation of Native Americans, particularly Alaska Natives, in the justice system. Studies which examine the relationship of Native Americans to the justice system constitute a relatively rare, but growing, body of literature. Some of these studies examine the criminality of Native Americans using Uniform Crime Reporting arrest data or Bureau of Indian Affairs data (e.g., Flowers, 1988; Cross, 1982; Haring, 1982). Others examine sentencing and confinement issues in states where Native Americans are the larger minority.

Feimer, Pommersheim, and Wise (1990) examined a sample of “active” prisoners in the South Dakota State Penitentiary, 24.4 percent of whom were Native American. They found that Native Americans received shorter sentences than white inmates. An important limitation of this study was its location: it examined people already deeply into the system. Studies of charging decisions or suspended sentences might have different outcomes. In a study which compared the processing of white and Native American women, Hutton, et al. (1989) found that race was *not* a factor in the sentencing of Native American women in South Dakota.

Some studies have compared other justice system outcomes for Native Americans and African Americans with those for whites. Using Bureau of Justice Statistics data, Flowers (1988) noted Native Americans have arrest rates second to blacks in all types of crimes except crimes related to liquor law violations. Others have noted a relationship between alcohol and Native American violence (e.g., French & Hornbuckle, 1982), a phenomenon which should be assessed in studies of youth.

Studies of disproportionality at the juvenile level also focus on African American youth. They have been found to be represented in the system in much greater proportions than their proportion in the general population. And this disproportionality seems to be increasing. The General Accounting Office (1995) noted that black youth comprised 43 percent of juveniles waived to adult criminal court in 1988 and 50 percent of those waived four years later.

The Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program (National Institute of Justice, 1996) gathers data about drug use among both adult and juvenile arrestees. In nearly all of the 12 sites listed, minority youth constituted the largest percentage of juvenile arrestees. The percentages for African American youth ranged from 63 percent (in Indianapolis) to 98 percent (in Washington, D.C.) in five of the sites. In another five sites Hispanic youth constituted 46 percent (in Denver) to 72 percent (in San Antonio) of juvenile arrestees. In only two sites were white youth the largest percentage: Portland (55%) and Phoenix (48%).

Many studies compare minority youth with white youth at a variety of “decision points” in the juvenile justice system. Some of this research, instructive for a study of Alaska Native youth, will be reviewed briefly here. Feyerherm (1995) in a draft report for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention on a five-state pilot study of Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC)

noted that earlier decision points can have a major impact on confinement and should also be studied.

Because arrest is the entry point for juvenile justice processing, studies which examine arrest are of particular interest, though the arrest *decision* is difficult to assess. Kurtz, et al. (1993) examined the arrest decision by asking police officers at participating counties in Georgia to complete a questionnaire on every male youth they apprehended. The police might release the youth with no charges or file a juvenile complaint. If the latter, the youth was tracked through intake and judicial decision making also with questionnaires. They found the law enforcement decision (release or continue in process) was related to offense severity and demeanor rather than race, socioeconomic status, or other extralegal factors. (Demeanor may, however, be related to race.)

In their study of police and juveniles, Wordes and Bynum (1995) used a combination of police records, interviews with juvenile officers/detectives, and observation during ride-alongs to explore disproportionality. Using logistic regression to examine the quantitative data, they found race to be significantly associated with certain police decisions, including a decision to refer the youth to court for further processing and decisions to take youth into custody and/or securely detain them.

Some studies of juveniles have found race associated with nearly every step in the juvenile justice process. In their report to the Washington (state) legislature, the Juvenile Justice Racial Disproportionality Work Group (1994) noted that minority youth were *less* likely to be arrested than white youth, but were twice as likely to be referred to court by the police, twice as likely to be detained prior to their hearings, less likely to be diverted, 1.5 times as likely to be prosecuted, and four times more likely than white youth to be sentenced to confinement (p. 2).

McGarrell (1993) also examined several decision points and compared white and nonwhite youth using National Juvenile Court data for 1985 and 1989. He found nonwhite youth more likely than white youth to be petitioned to court, to be detained, and to receive a residential disposition. (McGarrell computed rates per 100,000 youths for white and nonwhite youth, which assists in comparisons.)

Bishop and Frazier (1996) used official Florida records from 1985-1987 and interviews with juvenile justice system officials. They used regression analysis to assess the impact of race on several decision points: intake, detention, prosecutor referral, judicial disposition, etc. They found that race was a factor in the detention decision and, because detention influences judicial dispositions, race had an indirect impact on these decisions.

An important point raised in the interview phase of their study was the extent to which official policies may be inadvertently racist. For example, both diversion and detention decisions consider family support and cooperation. Youth are ineligible for diversion if their parents or guardians: 1) cannot be contacted; 2) cannot be present at an intake interview; or 3) exhibit uncooperative attitudes and behaviors (as perceived by staff) (p. 406). Such a policy assumes that parents have a telephone,

have access to transportation, can leave work and/or find child care. These factors may work against minority youth whose parents may be less likely to have telephones, transportation, child care, etc.

These kinds of policies might also impact decisions regarding Native American youth in jurisdictions where they are the largest minority. Studies of Native American youth may focus on their behavior *or* their processing. Robbins (1985) tried to test the efficacy of control theory in explaining the delinquency of Native American youth on three reservations in Florida. He found that the type of reservation was linked to delinquency and theorized that greater contact with white culture created conflict and thus greater delinquency.

In a study of minority youth in adult jails in Minnesota, Schwartz, et al. (1988) found that proportionally more Natives (8.1%) and blacks (7.5%) than whites (3.1%) were detained with adults. Natives were more likely to be jailed for status offenses than either blacks or whites. They examined the duration of the jail stay and found Native youth held significantly longer than whites on all charges except technical violations. For crimes against persons the median hours held was 16.2 for whites and 29.9 for Natives; for property crimes the median was 6.2 for whites, 10.3 for Natives; and for Part II offenses, 4.1 hours for whites and 13.3 hours for Natives.

Using 1986 data from the judicial information system, Feld (1995) studied the processing of juveniles in the largest county in Minnesota. Minority youth (Native Americans and African Americans) comprised about 8.7 percent of the county's youth population but a third (34.0%) of the juvenile court's cases in 1986. He noted the exceptional proportion of Native American youth (40.8%) who appeared in court for status offenses. Feld also found that being Native influenced the detention decision, but only half as much as did being black (he controlled for offense severity and prior record). Race also influenced the decision to confine the juvenile after adjudication.

Leiber (1994) compared Native, black, and white youth. He examined juvenile court referrals over a ten-year period in a county where the proportions of African American and Native American youth were higher than in any other county in Iowa. He examined several decision points and decision outcomes and used regression analysis to determine which of several independent variables impacted these decisions. He found that minority youth received more severe sentences at most stages than did white youth, but Native Americans were treated more leniently than African Americans.

A recent study dealt exclusively with Native American youth. Poupart (1995) examined juvenile court records from 1985 to 1989 in a rural Wisconsin county with a substantial (7.14%) Native American population. Four decision points were analyzed: intake, detention, filing of a petition, and final disposition. At intake, 62.7 percent of Native American youth were referred to the prosecutor compared with 38.7 percent of white youth. At each additional step in the process, Native youth were likely to experience the more severe outcome.

Reports which examine Alaska Natives and the criminal justice system have been published locally by the Alaska Judicial Council or by the University of Alaska Anchorage Justice Center. Disproportional minority confinement has been noted by the Alaska Sentencing Commission (1990, 1991, 1992) and in the Alaska Judicial Council's study of plea bargaining in Alaska (Carns & Kruse, 1991). According to Alaska Department of Corrections data, Alaska Natives comprise approximately one-third of the state's confined adults and have done so regularly for several years.

Studies of Alaska Native youth and the juvenile justice system have also noted disproportionality. In accordance with Feld's (1995) observation about status offenses, Parry (1987) found that 30 percent of statewide Native referrals in 1984 were for alcohol-related offenses. This was compared to 16.9 percent of white referrals. For crimes against persons, Alaska Natives were referred proportionally more than whites but proportionally less than blacks.

Becker, et al. (1989) examined referral data for the Southcentral region, which contains approximately 60 percent of the total population of the state. Over the four years of data collection, referrals of white youth declined annually as a percentage of total referrals, beginning as 81.5 percent in 1985 and ending as 74.7 percent in 1988. Referrals of both Alaska Native and African American youth increased annually, with Native youth referrals growing by 31.9 percent over the four years and black referrals by 41 percent. The researchers noted that the fastest growing referral group was Alaska Native females whose referral numbers in Anchorage more than doubled over the four-year period.

Statewide detention data were collected by the Justice Center for the Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services to report on compliance with the mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Two studies using this data were published by the Justice Center. One, which examined data for only one year (1993), found whites associated with 43.2 percent of the instances of detention, Alaska Natives with 30.1 percent, and blacks, 8.5 percent (Schafer & Curtis, 1994). As part of this study, the authors also found the mean length of detention was 14.0 days for events associated with white youth, 12.3 days for Native youth, and 16.3 days for black youth—the median length was 1.9, 1.9, and 4.0 days, respectively.

In an analysis of five years of detention data—1989 to 1993—it was noted that 3,393 juveniles were involved in 6,483 instances of detention, an average of 1.91 detentions per youth. This led to an examination of detention frequency which found that nearly two-thirds of the individuals appeared only once in the four-year data set (62.5%). When frequency was assessed by race it was found that 12.9 percent of white youth were detained four or more times compared to 19.0 percent of Alaska Native youth and 17.9 percent of African American youth (Schafer & Curtis, 1995). These repeat appearances in the data set suggested that minorities were more likely to have prior records, a variable which should be included in any assessment of disproportionate minority representation.

For the current study the data base was large enough to permit a fairly precise assessment of prior record and also to enable us in some of the analyses to control for offense severity.

Research Methodology

The Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS) provided four years of statewide referral data for our analysis (1992-1995) from its system (PROBER). A substantial number of variables were included in the data set, but not all were complete. We chose to deal only with three races—Alaska Native, African American, and white. The other racial/ethnic groups in the data base included Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, other, and unknown. Together these groups were associated with fewer than ten percent of the 32,879 referral events in the data base.

The data entries were made by field staff, and mistakes did occur. Wherever possible, accommodations were made for flaws in data entry. In computing age it was found that date of birth was frequently entered incorrectly (resulting in appearances in the data of several infants and toddlers). Although a substantial number of referrals tied to 7, 8, and 9-year-olds appeared in the data (N=782), a decision was made to confine the analysis to youth 10 to 17 years of age.

In order to compute referral rates for each racial group for each year, enrollment data for grades 5 through 12 was obtained from the Alaska Department of Education. While this information “loses” dropouts from the system, it “adds” students who turn 18 during the year under consideration. The data can also be easily applied by geographic region.

Both demographic and legal variables as well as decision points were included in the analysis. Race, age, and gender were among the demographic characteristics, as well as location of the referral incident. Locations were categorized into DFYS regions (Northern, Southcentral, and Southeast) with major cities (Anchorage and Fairbanks) removed from their regions for separate analysis. It should be noted that the city of Anchorage holds nearly half of the entire population of the state and thus can skew results for the region and for the state as a whole. It should also be noted that 93.4 percent of African American referrals occurred in the cities of Anchorage (74.7%) and Fairbanks (18.7%).

The legal variables included charge (reason for referral) and prior record, while processing decisions included intake and judicial outcomes.

For the purposes of analysis, each referral charge was placed into one of the following categories: offenses against persons, offenses against property, offenses against the public order, and other offenses. However, within each of these categories were offenses which comprised a substantial portion of the category or which were of particular interest generally. For example, very few of the offenses against persons were felony charges. Most (60.8%) of the 4,078 offenses against persons were for fourth degree assault—a misdemeanor (N=2,481). Among property charges, theft in the

third and fourth degree (misdemeanor theft) comprised 41.6 percent of all property charges, followed by criminal mischief in the third and fourth degree (16.8%) and burglary (15.9%). In order to control for degree of severity in personal crimes our analysis of personal offenses was limited to assault in the fourth degree. The three property crimes of burglary (a felony), criminal mischief, and theft in the third and fourth degrees were also selected out for analysis, since together they account for over 70 percent of all property referrals.

Because the literature suggested a relationship between Native American processing and alcohol, we specifically analyzed referrals for possession/consumption of alcohol. These referrals comprised 63.5 percent of the public order offenses. Offenses related to controlled substances (drug possession) were also selected out because of a strong interest in Alaska in drugs as a social problem. However, they comprised only 14.7 percent of the public order offenses (N=4,788).

All referrals to the Division of Family and Youth Services of youth in Alaska for the four years under study were included in the data set. The relationship of race to the decision to refer could not be assessed with these data. Other decision points—intake and judicial decision—could be analyzed. At intake a number of choices were available: dismissal of charges; adjustments by letter, through a conference, or with a referral; informal probation; or petitions as a delinquent or for probation violations. These were reduced to three categories—dismissal, adjustment, and petition. The decisions of the juvenile court were categorized as dismissal, diversion, and adjudication (waiver to adult court was included as adjudication). To assess the significance of race at these decision points, we used a method of analysis which permits simultaneous consideration of several factors. The decision points were collapsed as dichotomous variables (dummy variables) and the influence of race (and other factors) was determined through the use of logistical regression analysis.

It should be noted that the referral data are *incident-based* and that the number of youths referred is considerably lower than the number of referrals. Referral data was reduced to individual data for some of the analyses. We were able to determine prior record for individual youth by examining previous appearances in the full data set (1992-1995). Our analysis of individuals is confined to those whose full delinquent history is in the data set. Only those youth who had no prior record at their first appearance in the data set were included. As with the referral-based analysis, the analysis of outcomes for individuals was confined to specific crimes within the larger categories of personal, property, and public order crimes in order to control for offense severity.

The analyses are presented in two sections. The first, dealing with referral events, examines these in a variety of ways having to do with race, including reason for referral and processing decision points. In the second section data on individuals are analyzed using some of the same variables. In addition, the individual data also permit examination of referral histories and comparisons using means.

Referral Events

During the four years of data collection, there were a total of 28,618 referrals in Alaska of Alaska Native, African American, and white youth 10 to 17 years old. Of these, 9,052 referrals were associated with Alaska Native youth (31.6%), 2,502 with African American youth (18.7%), and 17,064 with white youth (59.6%). Only 27.4 percent were associated with females (N=7,849).

The 28,618 referrals over the four years involved only 14,145 people—an average of two referrals per youth in the data set. The proportions of people differ considerably from the proportions of referrals for both gender and race. Females comprised 32.5 percent of all youth referred, while only 27.4 percent of the referrals were associated with females. Computing mean number of referrals by race, we found minority youth with a significantly higher mean than white youth: the mean number of referrals for Alaska Native youth was 2.43; for African American youth, 2.38; and for white youth, 1.82.

The number of referrals increased steadily over the four-year period from 6,446 in 1992 to 7,934 in 1995 (a 23% increase). It is interesting to note that both personal and property offense

Table 1. Referrals — Demographics, 1992-1995

	Number of people referred		Number of referrals		Mean referrals per person
	N	%	N	%	
Gender					
Male	9,547	67.5%	20,769	72.6%	2.18
Female	4,598	32.5	7,849	27.4	1.71
Race					
Alaska Native	3,726	26.3%	9,052	31.6%	2.43
African American	1,051	7.4	2,502	8.7	2.38
White	9,368	66.2	17,064	59.6	1.82
Total	14,145		28,618		2.03

referrals dropped between 1994 and 1995 for all three racial groups while referrals for public order offenses increased for all three groups. (See Appendix A.)

For each year, Alaska Natives comprise approximately 23 percent of the general population of 10 to 17-year-olds and 31 to 32 percent of referrals, while African Americans comprised about 5 percent of the total population and nearly 9 percent of referrals. (See Appendix A.)

The data include the most serious charge at referral. These have been categorized as offenses against persons, offenses against property, offenses against the public order, and “other” crimes which seem not to fit any precise category. (Both drug and alcohol offenses are included in the public order category.)

A number of highly publicized murders have contributed to the perception that young people in Alaska are becoming more and more violent. In the four-year data set there were 4,078 referrals for crimes against persons. For the crimes of first degree murder, second degree murder, manslaughter, and criminally negligent homicide there were a total of 40 referrals—less than a tenth of one percent of the total. The majority of the violent crimes were for misdemeanor assault. It seems inappropriate to compare first degree murder with misdemeanor assault, so much of the

subsequent analysis of crimes against persons in this paper is restricted to those referrals where the most serious charge was assault in the fourth degree. These were 61 percent of all referrals in the violent category (N=2,481).

Referrals in the other categories were also selected out for analysis: burglary in the first and second degrees, criminal mischief, and misdemeanor theft (theft in the third and fourth degree) were selected from the property crime category and, from the public order category, possession/ consumption of alcohol (4,217 referrals), and misconduct involving a controlled substance (894 referrals). (This last is a small category but it is of interest because of a growing perception that drug use is a problem among young people.) Since these offenses have specific definitions, this selection process controls for offense severity.

This subsample of referrals was associated 6,269 times with Alaska Natives, 1,546 times with African Americans, and 11,458 times with white youth, for a total of 19,273 referrals—a number adequate for most types of analysis.

Through the four-year period, there were 880 referrals for assault in the fourth degree attributed to Alaska Natives (35.5% of all fourth degree assault referrals), 304 referrals associated with African Americans (12.3%), and 1,297 referrals associated with white youth (52.3%) (see Table 2). Since Alaska Natives constitute approximately 23 percent of all Alaska youth in the 10 to 17-year-old population group, they are clearly overrepresented in the assault category, as are African American youth, who are slightly more than 5 percent of the total youth population.¹

Among property offenses we chose to analyze one felony — burglary in the first or second degree — and two misdemeanors — criminal mischief and theft in the third and fourth degree. For the three property crimes, Natives are overrepresented in the first two and, for theft, represented slightly under their proportion in the general population. Theft is the only referral offense for which white youth were referred in proportions which approximated their percentage in the youth population.

Table 2. Referral Distribution Across Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total referrals
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Offenses against persons	1,398	34.3%	498	12.2%	2,182	53.5%	4,078
Assault 4	880	35.5	304	12.3	1,297	52.3	2,481
Offenses against property	4,082	26.0%	1,466	9.3%	10,170	64.7%	15,718
Burglary	934	37.3	152	6.1	1,418	56.6	2,504
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	825	31.2	259	9.8	1,557	59.0	2,641
Theft 3 & 4	1,162	17.8	751	11.5	4,623	70.7	6,536
Public order offenses	2,838	43.5%	252	3.9%	3,427	52.6%	6,517
Possession/consumption of alcohol	2,297	54.5	34	0.8	1,886	44.7	4,217
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	175	19.5	46	5.1	677	75.4	898
Other offenses	734	31.8%	286	12.4%	1,285	55.7%	2,305
Total referrals	9,052	31.6%	2,502	8.7%	17,064	59.6%	28,618

Row percentages.

Table 3 shows that the referral offense for which Natives are referred in greater *numbers* than any other ethnic group is possession/consumption of alcohol. Almost 55 percent of all referrals for this behavior are attributed to Alaska Native youth. This behavior represents more than one-third of all Native referrals for our selected offenses (36.6%).

Although it is frequently assumed that arrest patterns (for adults or youth) reflect perpetrator data for unresolved or unreported crimes, the referral data for minor consuming cannot be assumed to reflect behavior patterns among Alaska's young people. Certainly, more African American youth experiment with alcohol than are reflected in their referrals for this behavior. Referrals for this offense probably reflect local perceptions and local concerns.

The data do not permit any assessment of the referral decision, but the referral data do suggest that Alaska law enforcement officials subscribe to the notion that alcohol is an important determinant of Native deviance. The number of referrals for Alaska Native youth for possession/consumption of alcohol was greater than the number for white youth in three of the four years under study. The

Table 3. Referral Distribution on Selected Charges within Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total referrals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Assault 4	880	14.0%	304	19.7%	1,297	11.3%	2,481	12.9%
Burglary	934	14.9	152	9.8	1,418	12.4	2,504	13.0
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	825	13.2	259	16.8	1,557	13.6	2,641	13.7
Theft 3 & 4	1,162	18.5	751	48.6	4,623	40.3	6,536	33.9
Possession/consumption of alcohol	2,297	36.6	34	2.2	1,886	16.5	4,217	21.9
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	171	2.7	46	3.0	677	5.9	894	4.6
Total referrals	6,269	32.5%	1,546	8.0%	11,458	59.5%	19,273	
					Remaining referrals		9,345	
					Total referrals		28,618	

Column percentages.

rate at which they were referred for this offense is greater than their rate of referral for any other of the selected crimes in each year (3.6 to 4.3 per 1000 Alaska Natives in the age group). Much of this difference appears in the Northern region of the state where the Native population is high and reflects local policies where alcohol use is viewed as a severe social problem and alcohol may be banned from some villages. In the Northern region for all four years, more youth were referred for this behavior than for any of the other selected offenses.

¹ Among incarcerated adults in Alaska, Alaska Natives are over-represented among sex offenders. According to a recent study (Mander, et al., 1996), 38.0 percent of inmates in the sex offender program were Alaska Natives. This appears also to be true of Alaska Native youth. Referrals for sexual assault and sexual abuse of a minor (all degrees of severity) constituted only 15.7 percent of all offenses against persons for the full data set (N=642). The proportion of these referrals that was associated with Alaska Native youth is considerably greater than their proportion in the general population and than their proportion among all referrals (41.9%). More than 60 percent of their 268 referrals were from the northern region of DFYS, where the proportion of the at-risk population is 43.2 percent Alaska Native. Referrals for sex offenses do not show a pattern. Statewide numbers were highest in 1994 and lowest in 1995, when the 138 referrals represented a 25 percent drop from 184 in the previous year.

Regional data clearly reflect differences for this behavior. In Anchorage, where 35.2 percent of all referrals for the selected offenses occurred (N=6,793), there were only 323 referrals for alcohol offenses. These constituted less than 5 percent of all Anchorage referrals. Urban priorities are more likely to play a role in such referrals, with underage drinking clearly not a priority in larger cities.

We should note that Alaska's African American population is concentrated in its two largest cities. During the four years under study, 70.5 percent of African American fifth through twelfth graders in Alaska were in Anchorage and 21.8 percent in Fairbanks. It is then not surprising that the majority of referrals attributed to African American youth occurred in Anchorage (74.7%) and the next largest proportion (18.7%) occurred in Fairbanks.

Misdemeanor theft is the offense for which the largest proportion of both African American (30.0%) and white (27.1%) youth were referred. Indeed, white youth accounted for over 70 percent of all misdemeanor theft referrals (see Table 2). Theft accounted for less than 13 percent of Alaska Native referrals.

Assault referrals comprise the second most frequent offense attributed to African Americans (12.2%), but possession/consumption of alcohol was second for white youth (11.1%).

While misconduct involving a controlled substance was included in the selected offense sample, the number of referrals for this offense was comparatively small, constituting only 5 percent of all referrals for these selected offenses. A larger proportion of white youth were referred for this offense than either black or Native youth.

Another way of expressing disproportionality is to compute the rate at which racial groups accumulate referrals. We used enrollment data provided by the Alaska Department of Education to establish the population in the age group under consideration (10-17 years of age). The data were available by race and ethnicity for each year under study. On a statewide basis, the rate of referrals per 1000 juveniles in the age range varied by race, with rates for minorities consistently higher than rates for white youth. In the years for which their rates were lowest, Alaska Native youth were referred at a rate of more than 14 referrals per 1000 Alaska Natives in the 10 to 17-year-old range, while in the years for which their rates were highest (1995), white youth accumulated referrals at a rate of fewer than 10 per 1000 of them. Rates for African American youth were consistently higher than rates for Alaska Native youth in each of the four years. Their rates ranged from a low of 17.7 per 1000 African American youth to a high of 20.5 per 1000 (see Table 4).

There are regional variations in rate of referrals, as well. We have already noted that over 90 percent of African American youth in the state reside in either Anchorage or Fairbanks. In areas of the state where the African American population is very low, the rate of referrals per 1000 is an artificial figure, and usually quite high. Note in Table A7 that in 1995, 19 referrals of black youth out of a population at risk of 68 results in a high rate of 27.9 referrals per 1000 youth.

Table 4. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Statewide, 1992-1995

	1992										1993									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	13,728	-	22.5 %	2,888	-	4.7 %	44,341	-	72.7 %	60,957	14,154	-	22.4 %	3,221	-	5.1 %	45,776	-	72.5 %	63,151
Total referrals	1,947	14.2	30.2	550	19.0	8.5	3,949	8.9	61.3	6,446	2,065	14.6	31.5	570	17.7	8.7	3,911	8.5	59.7	6,546
Offenses against persons	293	2.1	36.5 %	119	4.1	14.8 %	391	0.9	48.7 %	803	326	2.3	33.9 %	119	3.7	12.4 %	518	1.1	53.8 %	963
Assault 4	176	1.3	37.8	74	2.6	15.9	215	0.5	46.2	465	209	1.5	35.1	78	2.4	13.1	308	0.7	51.8	595
Offenses against property	848	6.2	22.6 %	346	12.0	9.2 %	2,559	5.8	68.2 %	3,753	898	6.3	24.3 %	344	10.7	9.3 %	2,460	5.4	66.5 %	3,702
Burglary	211	1.5	37.3	39	1.4	6.9	316	0.7	55.8	566	213	1.5	37.5	33	1.0	5.8	322	0.7	56.7	568
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	165	1.2	28.3	43	1.5	7.4	375	0.8	64.3	583	177	1.3	28.0	67	2.1	10.6	389	0.8	61.5	633
Theft 3 & 4	241	1.8	14.4	195	6.8	11.7	1,233	2.8	73.9	1,669	280	2.0	17.2	186	5.8	11.4	1,159	2.5	71.3	1,625
Public order offenses	612	4.5	44.0 %	49	1.7	3.5 %	730	1.6	52.5 %	1,391	698	4.9	49.4 %	49	1.5	3.5 %	665	1.5	47.1 %	1,412
Possession/consumption of alcohol	494	3.6	54.2	7	0.2	0.8	411	0.9	45.1	912	608	4.3	59.4	7	0.2	0.7	409	0.9	39.9	1,024
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	33	0.2	19.6	12	0.4	7.1	123	0.3	73.2	168	28	0.2	24.6	5	0.2	4.4	81	0.2	71.1	114
Other offenses	194	1.4	38.9 %	36	1.2	7.2 %	269	0.6	53.9 %	499	143	1.0	30.5 %	58	1.8	12.4 %	268	0.6	57.1 %	469
	1994										1995									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	15,049	-	23.0 %	3,474	-	5.3 %	46,937	-	71.7 %	65,460	15,578	-	23.4 %	3,391	-	5.1 %	47,607	-	71.5 %	66,576
Total referrals	2,527	16.8	32.9	687	19.8	8.9	4,478	9.5	58.2	7,692	2,513	16.1	31.7	695	20.5	8.8	4,726	9.9	59.6	7,934
Offenses against persons	401	2.7	33.5 %	134	3.9	11.2 %	663	1.4	55.3 %	1,198	378	2.4	33.9 %	126	3.7	11.3 %	610	1.3	54.8 %	1,114
Assault 4	243	1.6	34.8	75	2.2	10.7	381	0.8	54.5	699	252	1.6	34.9	77	2.3	10.7	393	0.8	54.4	722
Offenses against property	1,242	8.3	29.1 %	403	11.6	9.4 %	2,627	5.6	61.5 %	4,272	1,094	7.0	27.4 %	373	11.0	9.3 %	2,524	5.3	63.2 %	3,991
Burglary	243	1.6	35.0	28	0.8	4.0	423	0.9	61.0	694	267	1.7	39.5	52	1.5	7.7	357	0.7	52.8	676
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	241	1.6	34.3	75	2.2	10.7	387	0.8	55.0	703	242	1.6	33.5	74	2.2	10.2	406	0.9	56.2	722
Theft 3 & 4	389	2.6	21.4	220	6.3	12.1	1,211	2.6	66.5	1,820	252	1.6	17.7	150	4.4	10.5	1,020	2.1	71.7	1,422
Public order offenses	716	4.8	43.6 %	64	1.8	3.9 %	861	1.8	52.5 %	1,641	812	5.2	39.2 %	90	2.7	4.3 %	1,171	2.5	56.5 %	2,073
Possession/consumption of alcohol	561	3.7	54.9	7	0.2	0.7	453	1.0	44.4	1,021	634	4.1	50.3	13	0.4	1.0	613	1.3	48.7	1,260
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	38	0.3	18.2	13	0.4	6.2	158	0.3	75.6	209	76	0.5	18.7	16	0.5	3.9	315	0.7	77.4	407
Other offenses	168	1.1	28.9 %	86	2.5	14.8 %	327	0.7	56.3 %	581	229	1.5	30.3 %	106	3.1	14.0 %	421	0.9	55.7 %	756

Row percentages.

* Population based on figures from "District Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade, Grades 5-12," Alaska Department of Education, Office of Data Management, FY 92-95.

In Anchorage, where over 70 percent of the state's African American youth between 10 and 17 years old reside, the figures are more instructive. The referral rate for black youth in Anchorage ranges from 18.6 per 1000 youth in 1993 to 22.2 per 1000 in 1995. Compare these figures with those for Native youth whose rate of referral ranged from 15.8 per 1000 youth in 1995 to 20.1 per 1000 in 1994, and compare both minorities to white youth, whose ranges ranged from a low of 7.9 referrals per 1000 youth to a high of 9.7. Clearly, law enforcement agencies in Anchorage are referring African American youth at disproportionate rates.

In Fairbanks, the rates of referral for African Americans are quite high, but not in comparison with rates for Alaska Natives. There, referral rates for Natives are the highest of any region for all four years, approaching, and in one year exceeding, 30 referrals per 1000 Alaska Native youth in the region.

The regional differences are not easy to explain. In Fairbanks, Alaska Native youth were generally fewer than 30 percent of all 10 to 17-year-olds in the region. They approach 40 percent of all youth in Southeast Alaska, but there their rate of referral per 1000 youth has ranged from 14.1 in 1993 to 20.6 in 1995—considerably lower rates than were found in Fairbanks.

Referral Outcomes

Several different outcomes were possible for each referral in the data set. At intake a probation officer may decide that the charges are not warranted and dismiss the case; he or she may decide that an adjustment is appropriate and the case may be adjusted with a conference, with a letter, or with a referral to a social agency. Referrals which are adjusted in these ways are unlikely to come to the attention of the courts.

Another intake decision might be to place the referred youth on informal probation. In this case conditions are established and if the youth fails to meet the conditions the intake officer, in consultation with a field probation officer, may decide on further processing of the case. Where a formal outcome appears required, the intake officer will petition the court to establish that the child *is* a delinquent child, and the court may consider a number of possible penalties based on this referral.

For this study, intake decisions were categorized into three possible outcomes: dismissal, adjustment/informal probation, and petition.² The most likely outcome of the intake decision was some form of adjustment. Of a total of 28,245 referrals for which an intake decision was entered, 18,978 were adjusted (67.2%). A small proportion were dismissed (8.5%) and the remainder were petitioned — 24.3 percent (N=6,877). In order to control for offense severity we examined intake

² The PROBER screen for outcomes includes information on detention screening, but it is a very small category and has not been included in the analysis.

decisions for assault in the fourth degree; burglary, criminal mischief, and theft in the fourth degree; and the referrals for underage drinking and possession of controlled substances.

For misdemeanor assault (assault in the fourth degree), there were a total of 2,899 referrals in the data set. The largest proportion of these (85.6%) were for assault in the fourth degree (N=2,481) and we have therefore concentrated our attention on outcomes for this offense. For assault in the fourth degree, 67.8 percent of referrals involving Alaska Natives were dealt with informally (N=595), a proportion close to white referrals (70.3%, N=905). African American referrals were less likely to end with this outcome — 60.2 percent were handled informally. A very small percentage of each racial group's referrals resulted in dismissal at intake — 12.1 percent of Native referrals, 12.7 percent of white referrals, and 14.1 percent of black referrals.

Petitions were entered for 47.2 percent of Alaska Native referrals for burglary (N=440), for 50.3 percent of African American referrals (N=76), and for 41.7 percent of white referrals for this offense (N=581).

Misdemeanor theft (theft in the third or fourth degree) is the largest category in the data base. There were 6,536 referrals in the data base for this offense. Delinquency petitions were filed in 660 of these referrals. Of 1,157 Native referrals for this offense, 138 resulted in a petition (11.9%). Black youth were referred for this offense 748 times and only 113 resulted in petitions, though this proportion was higher (15.1%). White referrals for theft in the third or fourth degree appeared in the full data set 4,578 times. Of these 409 resulted in petitions (8.9%).

Because of concerns about alcohol abuse in the Native community as a whole, we examined outcomes of referrals for consumption/possession of alcohol. There were numerically more referrals of Natives for this offense than referrals of white youth, who greatly outnumber Natives in the population at risk and in all other offense categories. Only three to four percent of the referrals for this offense were dismissed. A larger proportion was petitioned: 192 Alaska Native referrals (8.4%), 2 African American referrals (6.2%), and 115 white referrals (6.2%). Of 4,184 referrals for minor consuming, only 33 African Americans were associated with these referrals.

More African Americans were associated with the misdemeanor crime of possession of a controlled substance (N=46), but for this offense as well they constituted a very small percentage of the total. The 5.2 percent they represented very closely approximated their percentage in the general youth population. Seventy-five percent of these referrals were associated with white youth and 19.2 percent were associated with Alaska Native youth.

For the purposes of comparison, Table 5 provides a snapshot of the most serious decision at intake (petition) by race. Of all Alaska Native referrals for burglary, for example, 47.2 percent resulted in a petition to court. This compares to petitions for 50.3 percent of all African American referrals for burglary and 41.7 percent of all white referrals for this offense. If proportions suggest inequities in the decision, then the outcome for drug referrals, for example, suggests that more black youth receive the most severe outcome for misconduct involving a controlled substance. The table shows that 41.3 percent of all African American youth referred for this misdemeanor drug

Table 5. Percentage of Referrals for Selected Offenses Resulting in an Intake Decision to Petition, by Race, 1992-1995

	Alaska Native		African American		White	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Assault 4	176	20.1%	78	25.7%	218	16.9%
Burglary	440	47.2	76	50.3	581	41.7
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	182	22.1	76	29.6	338	21.9
Theft 3 & 4	138	11.9	113	15.1	409	8.9
Possession/consumption of alcohol	192	8.4	2	6.1	115	6.2
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	37	21.8	19	41.3	100	14.9

offense were petitioned to court, while only 21.8 percent of Natives were petitioned and an even smaller proportion of whites (14.9%). The outcomes led to a search for ways to determine if race was a factor in any of the decisions.

Because we were able to control for offense severity and still have sufficient numbers for analysis, we used logistic regression analysis to identify factors related to both intake and court decisions. This type of analysis permits consideration of several factors simultaneously. Only those crimes specified above as selected offenses were used in the analysis. The variables included race, gender, age, prior record, and year of referral. The decisions were categorized as well — the intake decision was placed in one of three categories: dismissed, adjusted, petitioned. The court decision was also placed in one of three possible categories: dismissed, diverted, and adjudicated. Table 6 provides a list of those factors which were significantly associated with decision outcomes.

Table 6. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions and Court Outcomes for Selected Offenses in Alaska (Statewide), 1992-1995

All factors listed were significant at $p < .05$.

	Assault 4	Burglary	Criminal mischief 3 & 4	Theft 3 & 4	Possession/ consumption of alcohol	Misconduct w/ controlled substances
Intake Decision	(n = 2481)	(n = 2504)	(n = 2641)	(n = 6536)	(n = 4217)	(n = 894)
Dismissed	Earlier year	Female White Black Older	Black Prior	Male		
Adjusted	Female White No prior	White No prior Younger	White No prior Younger	Female White No prior Younger	No prior Older Earlier year	White No prior
Petition	Black Prior	Male Native Black Prior Older	Prior Older	Male Black Prior Older	Younger Prior	Male Black Prior
Court Outcome	(n = 468)	(n = 1085)	(n = 592)	(n = 657)	(n = 303)	(n = 154)
Dismissed		Native Black Older				
Diversion	Female No prior	Native Younger Earlier year	Native White			Female No prior Younger
Adjudicated	Prior Older	White Prior	White	Earlier year		Male

Note: The factors simultaneously entered into the logistic regression equations were gender, race, priors referred, age, and referral year. For breakdowns on intake decision by region, see Appendix B.

At issue here is the impact of race on juvenile justice decision-making. Race was significantly related to adjustments of the referral at intake. Adjustment is a medium-level decision, more severe than simple dismissal but considerably less severe than being petitioned to court for adjudication as a delinquent. For every referral offense, being white was significantly associated with adjustment, as was an indication of no prior referral (i.e., no “record”). The factors of being black and having a prior record were significantly associated with petitions for assault, and being black was a factor in petitions for burglary, theft, and misconduct involving a controlled substance. Being black was also associated with dismissal for two referral offenses—burglary and criminal mischief. Being Alaska Native was significant only for the petition decision on a referral for burglary.

Since being white was associated with the least serious decision at intake, while being black or Native was associated with the most serious decision, it appears that race is a factor in intake decision-making. However, for both the adjustment decision and the decision to petition the youth to court, prior record plays a role (no prior for adjustment). Other studies have shown that minorities in Alaska may be more likely to have a prior record, which may compound the results here (e.g., Schafer & Curtis, 1995).

Of the 19,273 referrals dealt with by intake officers, only 3,259 or 16.9 percent went to the courts. Court outcomes were categorized as dismissal, diversion, and adjudication, with adjudication being the most serious outcome.

Only for burglary referrals were there any factors associated with the court’s decision to dismiss the case. Race and older age categories were associated with dismissal. As shown, race was also a factor in the intake decision to dismiss, with being black associated with dismissal for burglary and criminal mischief referrals. It is possible that subsequent stages try to adjust for the possible excesses at previous stages, but the data are not adequate to test such a possibility. Being white was a factor in referrals for burglary and criminal mischief where the court outcome was adjudication. It should be noted that the court decision numbers are small and may not be sufficiently robust for this kind of analysis.

While analysis of referral incident-based data is informative, we also considered it important to look at data on individuals. The 28,618 referrals were associated with 14,145 individual juveniles. While some youth appeared only once in the data set, some clearly reoffended. In order to assess information about individuals in the data set, we established a sample of persons whose referral histories could be used in the analysis.

Analysis of Individuals

By using case numbers and date of birth, information about individuals could be extracted from the PROBER data set. This sample of individuals has been defined as youth between 10-17

years of age who were either white, black or Native and *whose first appearance in the data set indicated he or she had no prior record*. This resulted in a sample whose complete referral history for the four-year period was in the data set, although the sample includes “new” offenders whose first referral was in 1995 and who may be embarking on an extensive criminal history. However, we were interested in examining prior record in some detail in order to better understand intake and court decisions. For the most part the analysis focused on the youth’s *first* appearance in the data set to determine age, offense, etc. We have also again focused on the crimes of assault, burglary, theft, minor consuming, and misconduct involving a controlled substance in order to control for offense severity in the analysis.

The sample of individuals consisted of 11,799 youth, 34.3 percent of whom were female (N=4,048) and 65.7 percent of whom were male (N=7,751). The sample displayed the following racial mix: Alaska Native, 2,882 (24.4%), African American, 873 (7.4%), and white, 8,044 (68.2%) (Table 7). This breakdown approximates that of the population of 10 to 17 year-olds in the general population, but does show some disproportionality, particularly for African Americans. (For the four years under study Department of Education data shows Alaska Natives to be 22.5 to 23.4 percent of the population; African Americans, 4.7 to 5.3 percent; and white youth, 71.5 to 72.7 percent.)

Table 7. Distribution of Persons, Age, and Referrals by Race and Sex, 1992-1995

	Number of people referred		Mean age at first referral	Mean number of referrals	Total number of referrals	
	N	%			N	%
Alaska Native	2,882	24.4%	14.66	2.10	6,045	28.3%
Male	1,827	63.4	14.56	2.22	4,048	67.0
Female	1,055	36.6	14.84	1.89	1,997	33.0
African American	873	7.4%	14.71	2.10	1,788	8.4%
Male	576	66.0	14.71	2.05	1,341	75.0
Female	297	34.0	14.71	1.51	447	25.0
White	8,044	68.2%	15.05	1.68	13,527	63.3%
Male	5,348	66.5	15.06	1.79	9,579	70.8
Female	2,696	33.5	15.03	1.46	3,948	29.2
Total	11,799		14.93	1.81	21,360	

Column percentages.

Fewer than 20 percent of the sample were under 13 at their first referral (17.0%). The largest groups were 14, 15, and 16-year-olds who constituted respectively 17.7 percent, 17.7 percent, and 17.5 percent of the sample. The mean age of the 11,799 youth was 14.93—nearly 15 years. Alaska Natives had the youngest mean age—14.66 years. African Americans were nearly as young (14.71 years) and whites were the oldest (15.05 years).

The location of the youth’s first referral in the data base was of some interest since there is some variation among regions. Well above a third were first referred in Anchorage (38.5%), but when we examined mean number of referrals per person, Anchorage had the lowest mean. We

examined total number of referrals by race by location of first referral and found significant differences. In every location the mean number of referrals was higher for Alaska Natives than for either African Americans or white youth (although black youth were not greatly different). This held true both in areas where the population was 80 percent Native and regions where they are a very small proportion. Southeast Alaska had the highest mean number of referrals for both Native (2.39 referrals) and black youth (2.24 referrals).

In order to see the offenses for which this group was responsible, we examined by offense category the juveniles' first referral in the data set. For 1,580 youth, the first referral was categorized as an offense against persons (13.4%). The largest number (7,548) were referred the first time for a property offense (64.0%). There were 2,532 referrals for public order crimes (21.5%) and 139 referred for "other" offenses (1.2%). Nearly three quarters of this sample (73.6%) were referred for the selected crimes used earlier in the analysis: misdemeanor assault (N=880), burglary (N=897), criminal mischief (N=1,010), misdemeanor theft (N=3,904), possession/consumption of alcohol (N=1,604), and misconduct involving a controlled substance (N=387).

The distribution by race of the first referral charge differs considerably from the distribution of all referrals discussed above. For example, although the proportion of referrals for possession/consumption of alcohol associated with Alaska Natives was nearly 55 percent, Alaska Natives were 44.6 percent of all youth in Table 8 referred for this offense. Apparently there is some repeat behavior for this offense among Native youth. Total numbers vary slightly for individuals, since some information for some variables may be missing or has been inaccurately entered. However, the proportions remain essentially similar.

Referrals of youth for possession/consumption of alcohol are of particular interest because of strong proscriptions against alcohol abuse in the Alaska Native community. Under the state's local option law, many Native villages have voted to be "dry" villages where alcohol is not permitted at all. Alcohol is blamed for much of the aberrant behavior of Alaska Natives, both adults and youth, and drinking is therefore deemed unacceptable, perhaps particularly for youth.

Table 8. First Referral for Selected Offenses by Race (Individuals), 1992-1995

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total						Total					
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Total					
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Assault 4	135	7.4%	110	10.4%	62	10.8%	46	15.5%	357	6.7%	170	6.3%	554	7.1%	326	8.1%	880	7.5%
Burglary	250	13.7	39	3.7	38	6.6	4	1.3	504	9.4	62	2.3	792	10.2	105	2.6	897	7.6
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	190	10.4	66	6.3	58	10.1	12	4.0	544	10.2	140	5.2	792	10.2	218	5.4	1,010	8.6
Theft 3 & 4	282	15.4	248	23.5	229	39.8	188	63.3	1,655	30.9	1,302	48.3	2,166	27.9	1,738	42.9	3,904	33.1
Possession/consumption of alcohol	348	19.0	368	34.9	3	0.5	3	1.0	495	9.3	387	14.4	846	10.9	758	18.7	1,604	13.6
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	30	1.6	18	1.7	7	1.2	5	1.7	237	4.4	90	3.3	274	3.5	113	2.8	387	3.3
Other	592	32.4	206	19.5	179	31.1	39	13.1	1556	29.1	545	20.2	2,327	30.0	790	19.5	3,117	26.4
Total	1,827	15.5%	1,055	8.9%	576	4.9%	297	2.5%	5,348	45.3%	2,696	22.8%	7,751	65.7%	4,048	34.3%	11,799	

As noted above, referrals for this offense are among the most numerous in the data set. There were 4,217 referrals for alcohol possession/consumption in the four years under study, 54.5 percent of which were attributed to Alaska Natives. These offenses were committed by 2,251 individuals: 990 Alaska Natives, 15 African Americans, and 1,246 whites.

The mean number of alcohol offenses was computed for each racial group. The mean for Alaska Natives was 0.53 — a figure which we might picture as an alcohol referral for every other Native in the data set. The mean number of alcohol referrals for African American youth was 0.02 — very near zero — and for white youth, 0.19. The differences in the means are significant.

We examined means by gender for this offense and found the high mean for Native youth attributable to referrals of female Natives. Indeed, more Alaska Native girls (N=368) than boys (N=348) were referred for possession/consumption of alcohol during the period studied. The mean number of referrals for Native females was 0.68 and for males 0.45, also a significant difference. Previous research in one probation office had shown referrals of Native females growing at a faster rate than any other youth category (Becker, et al., 1989). To determine if this trend was continuing, we examined this offense by gender for each year. A mean number of alcohol referrals was computed for each Alaska Native according to their first year of referral; i.e., the 721 Alaska Native youth first referred for any offense in 1992 had a mean number of alcohol referrals of 0.63. In every year Alaska Native females had a higher mean number of alcohol referrals. Those females first referred in 1993 had a mean of 0.96 alcohol referrals—a rather astounding number, which skewed the means for all Natives. The mean for Native males was also highest for those whose first referral was in 1993 (0.60). No trend was apparent, since the mean for both males and females dropped in succeeding years; however, they could have continued to accumulate referrals after the data were collected.

Because many rural villages have banned alcohol under Alaska's local option laws, we assumed regional variations in the seriousness with which this crime was viewed by referral agencies and examined mean number of alcohol referrals by region, race, and gender.

In every region, both Native and white females had a higher average number of referrals for minor consuming than did males (the numbers for African American youth were so small that comparisons are inappropriate).

We should note that the data were entered originally by most serious charge. This means that youth who were engaged in more serious behaviors while drinking would not be counted in the possession/consumption category. It may be, for example, that males were more likely than females to be referred for aggressive behavior while intoxicated. Their alcohol offenses would not be included in the data.

PROBER data included a variable which was intended to indicate whether drugs or alcohol were associated with the referral, but the data were not always accurately entered. Of 4199 referrals

for possession/consumption of alcohol, for instance, only 4032 were alcohol-related. No entry (missing) was automatically coded as “no alcohol involvement.”

We examined alcohol referrals in other ways to determine differences in race and gender involvement in this offense. On a statewide basis for all four years of data, there were 2251 youth with at least one alcohol referral in their available referral histories. Forty-three percent of them were female; of these females, 49.1 percent were Alaska Native and 50.4 percent were white. (African American females accounted for 0.5 percent; N=5.) Alaska Native females were more likely than males to be referred for this offense on their first referral, but males were more likely to accumulate alcohol referrals in subsequent appearances in the data set.

This pattern tended to hold for three out of five regions when we examined alcohol referrals by region. Only in the Southeast region did Alaska Native females accumulate a greater number of alcohol referrals (N=92) than did males (N=86). In Anchorage, where the numbers were very small, females accumulated 27 referrals, compared to 26 for males.

The 11,799 youth in the redefined sample were responsible for 21,360 referrals, an average of 1.8 referrals for each individual in the sample. Slightly more than two thirds of the juveniles appeared only once in the data set (N=7,881). The remainder were responsible for two to eighteen referrals. Only 798 youth were referred five or more times; only 116 had ten or more referrals apiece, but these 116 were responsible for 1,386 referrals. When we examined number of referrals by race we found that 71.1 percent of those youth who appeared only once in the data set were white while 21.7 percent were Alaska Native and 7.2 percent were African American. As the number of referrals increased, the percentage of white youth responsible for them decreased while the proportion of minority youth increased. At the five-referral level, 38.9 percent were for Native youth while 53.1 percent were for Caucasian youth and 7.9 percent for black youth. At ten referrals we find 32.4 percent Native, 11.8 percent black and 55.9 percent white.

The mean number of referrals by race illustrates the entry into the system of more minorities. The mean number of referrals of Alaska Native youth was 2.10; of African American youth, 2.05; and of Caucasian youth, 1.68.

An examination of the relationship of numerous referrals (prior record) to the decisions at intake and by the courts was possible with this data. A complete referral history was available for every individual because we confined our sample only to those youth with no prior record noted at their first appearance in the data set. We therefore assessed these decisions by mean number of prior referrals. If juvenile justice decisions are based on referral histories and minorities average more referrals than whites, then the disproportionality we have noted may not be amenable to change by changing system policies.

At intake the mean number of prior referrals for youth whose most recent case resulted in dismissal was 0.83; for those whose cases were adjusted, 0.53; and for those whose most recent

referral resulted in a petition, 2.68. These numbers clearly suggest that prior record is a factor in the decision to petition at intake.

The mean number of prior referrals by race and decision point is shown in Table 9. We used the decision made at the last referral in the data base and computed the mean number of prior referrals in the data. At both decision points, intake and court, the most severe outcome for all racial groups was tied to prior record. It is interesting that the court’s decision to dismiss—the least severe outcome—also appeared to be positively related to prior record.

Table 9. Priors at Last Intake Decision and Court Decision, 1992-1995

Mean number of prior referrals by race.

	Dismissal		Adjustment		Petition	
	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals
Final intake decision						
Alaska Natives	213	0.99	2,270	0.79	387	2.88
African Americans	103	0.82	641	0.58	119	3.65
Caucasians	627	0.78	6,478	0.44	812	2.45
	Dismissal		Diversion		Adjudication	
	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals
Final court decision						
Alaska Natives	87	3.11	97	1.42	203	3.48
African Americans	32	2.63	7	0.86	80	4.30
Caucasians	148	2.46	127	1.17	519	2.70

Because these results included all cases, we did the same analyses, controlling for offense severity (Table 10). We found prior record related to severity of outcome for most of the selected offenses as well. The mean number of prior referrals for youth whose most recent referral for misdemeanor assault was petitioned was 2.61. The mean number of referrals for youth whose assault cases were dismissed was 0.72,, and for adjustment the mean number of priors was 0.73. For each of the selected crimes it appears that a petition to court was predicated on a limit in tolerance, with those who appeared many times at intake finally being petitioned.

Table 10. Petition Decisions, 1992-1995

Mean number of prior referrals by race and selected offense.

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total	
	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals	N	Mean # of prior referrals
Assault 4	32	3.28	14	3.29	53	2.02	99	2.61
Burglary	84	2.18	7	2.29	120	1.47	211	1.78
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	16	3.06	7	4.57	54	2.54	77	2.83
Theft 3 & 4	12	4.58	3	2.67	46	2.85	61	3.18
Possession/consumption of alcohol	17	4.06	0	0.00	24	3.25	41	3.59
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	13	4.69	3	0.00	23	2.70	39	3.15

Because we found minorities were more likely than white youth to have prior records and because we found prior record associated with the decision to petition the youth to court, we determined to examine referral history more closely in a subsequent report. The data for this report are not adequate for detailed analysis of referral histories.

It is possible, of course, that the system is itself implicated in subsequent referral histories. That is to say, a youth who is formally processed may be subject to subsequent noncriminal referrals—

i.e., violations of the conditions of probation—and this is an area which we could examine. To examine this possibility, we eliminated first referrals and analyzed only subsequent referrals (N=9,561). For 10 percent of these, the most serious referral charge was a probation violation (N=998).

Thus, this suggests that the system does not contribute extensively to the repeat referral history. We noted, however, that of all of the probation-related referrals processed through intake, about 75 percent resulted in a petition to revoke. Examining these by race, we found that 24.1 percent of the 784 petitions to revoke were attributed to Alaska Natives (N=189), 14.7 percent to African American youth (N=115), and 61.2 percent to white youth (N=480).

Court action on those petitions which had gone to court by the time the data were sent to us (N=767) yielded a revocation rate of 78.9 percent. By race, the proportions were: Alaska Native, 73.1 percent; African Americans, 80.0 percent; and whites, 82.6 percent. Examining these by location, we found that in Anchorage (whose numbers are so large they tend to skew the statewide figures) the revocation rate was 84.5 percent (Natives, 81.8%; blacks, 82.4%, whites, 86.1%). In other regions the proportion was considerably lower.

In the rest of the Southcentral region—excluding Anchorage—82.7 percent of those petitioned for revocation were revoked; in Fairbanks, 68.0 percent were revoked; in the Northern region, 61.7 percent; and in Southeast, 48.0 percent. It is clear that individual courts respond differently to these petitions, and since racial proportions differ from region to region the differences may appear to be racially based.

We examined *individuals* in the revocation category by race. There were 530 people who had been referred at least once for violation of probation; of these, 26.0 percent were Native (N=138), 10.9 percent were black (N=58), and 63.0 percent were white (N=334). While these figures are disproportionate in relation to racial proportions in the general population, they are not any different from the proportions seen throughout this study.

We also examined individuals with at least one probation violation referral whose referral resulted at intake in a petition to revoke. These were not the same individuals, although there was overlap. For them the racial proportions were nearly identical: 26.7 percent Native, 11.0 percent black, and 62.3 percent white.

After intake, the next step in the process is court decision. The racial representation of youth whose probations were revoked was essentially similar to the proportions at earlier stages, although black youth were represented at a higher level. Four hundred eleven youth were revoked: 24.8 percent of them were Alaska Native, 12.9 percent were African American, and 62.3 percent were white.

We also examined the mean number of petitions for probation violation by race for all youth who had been petitioned to court for revocation. For Alaska Natives the mean was 2.06; for African Americans, 2.42; and for whites, 1.98—not significant differences.

There were significant differences by race on the referral histories of those revoked. It appears that the courts revoked youth with extensive referral histories and that these histories varied by race with minorities having the longest referral histories. The mean number of referrals accumulated by Native youth who were revoked was 7.42; for blacks, 8.15; and for whites, 6.25.

Summary and Conclusion

Phase I of this project cannot assess the degree to which race influences the decision to refer youth to the Division of Family and Youth Services. Certainly minorities are disproportionately referred. The data do show quite extraordinary differences between highly urban Anchorage and the more rural parts of the state in the *types* of activities for which youth are referred. While these may result from different law enforcement priorities, they may also result from greater criminal opportunities in the city. Regional variations are shown in the Appendix.

This study, based on four years of statewide referral data collected by the Division of Family and Youth Services, does show that minority youth are disproportionately referred to DFYS and that race is significantly associated with at least some post-referral decisions.

Regression analysis was used to determine what factors, including race, were associated with either intake decision-making or court decision-making. In order to control for offense severity and assure that the referral offenses being compared were like one another, only referrals for misdemeanor assault, felony burglary, criminal mischief (a misdemeanor), misdemeanor theft, possession/consumption of alcohol, and misconduct involving a controlled substance were included in the regression analysis.

Intake decisions included dismissal of the charges, adjustment of the incident (with a parental conference, a letter, etc.), and petitioning the youth to court, which might result in institutionalization—the most severe outcome of the intake process.

Referrals associated with white youth were significantly more likely to be adjusted at intake for all but one of the selected offenses, while referrals associated with minority youth were more likely to result in a petition to court for assault, burglary, theft, and drug use. Also associated with intake decision-making was whether or not a prior record was associated with the referral.

Court decision-making was less likely to be significantly associated with any of the variables examined. For some offenses, however, race was a significant factor; dismissal was more likely for burglary referrals associated with both Native and black youth, while adjudication was more likely for burglary referrals associated with white youth. Race was also associated with referrals for criminal mischief. Prior record was also associated with some of the court decisions.

Because it is possible that minority youth are more likely than white youth to accumulate referral histories we identified a sample of individuals whose referral histories would be part of the

analysis. The youth in the sample were 10 to 17-year-olds, were either white, Alaska Native, or African American; their first appearance in the data set indicated that there was no prior record. Thus the sample contained individuals whose complete referral history for the four years under study was in the data set. (Some of the youth in the sample have had referrals since FY95, but these obviously aren't included in the data.) The 11,799 youth in the individual sample were responsible for 21,360 referrals, an average of 1.8 per person. When number of referrals was analyzed by race we found that 71.1 percent of those youth who appeared only once in the data set were white. As the number of referrals increased, the proportion attributed to minority youth also increased. The average number of referrals was also computed by race; the mean number of Alaska Native youth was 2.10; for African American youth, 2.05; and for white youth, 1.68.

Using the data on individuals, we could also examine the relationship of multiple referrals to both intake and court decision-making. We examined the outcomes for each person's most recent referral and computed the mean number of prior referrals by intake decision. The data showed that prior record influenced decision-making at both decision points, with the mean number of referrals highest at the most serious outcome. For those whose most recent case resulted in a petition to court at intake the mean number of prior referrals was 2.68. This compared to a mean of 0.88 for dismissal and 0.53 for adjustment.

When means were computed by race, both Alaska Native and African American youth had a higher mean number of referrals than white youth. In addition to examining these means at decision points we also examined by race the petition decision for the offenses selected to control for offense severity. In virtually every offense category where the intake decision resulted in a petition to court the mean number of prior referrals was higher for minority than for white youth.

We also tried to determine if the system was implicated in the accumulation of referrals. It is possible that a youth placed on probation can be referred again for noncriminal behavior, i.e., violations of the conditions of probation. To do this we returned to the referral data, eliminated the first referral, and examined only subsequent referrals (N=9,561) for probation violations. For only 10 percent or so was the most serious referral charge a probation violation. We therefore concluded that the system did not contribute substantially to the repeat appearances of individuals in the data set.

Because Alaska Natives were disproportionately petitioned to court for their first referral, the system may be implicated in establishing a referral history for Native youth—insofar as labeling theory explains repeat transgressions. The extraordinary number of referrals of Natives for possession/consumption of alcohol suggests that referring agencies view this behavior differently for Native youth than for white or black youth. Regional variations suggest differing priorities. However, this phenomenon may be related to visibility—i.e., drinking youth in small communities are readily recognizable. Reconstructing referral situations might shed some light on these questions.

The next phase of this project will include assessment of referral components. A detailed examination of the individual histories of a random sample of youth selected from the Phase I data base will be conducted. This part of the project will provide the kind of qualitative information that numbers alone cannot.

Bibliography

- Alaska Judicial Council. 1980. *Report of the Advisory Committee on Minority Judicial Sentencing Practices*. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Judicial Council.
- Alaska Sentencing Commission. 1990. *1990 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature*. Anchorage: Alaska Sentencing Commission.
- . 1991. *1991 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature*. Anchorage: Alaska Sentencing Commission.
- . 1992. *1992 Annual Report to the Governor and the Alaska Legislature*. Anchorage: Alaska Sentencing Commission.
- Austin, J. 1995. "The Overrepresentation of Minority Youths in the California Juvenile Justice System: Perceptions and Realities." In Leonard, K.K., C.E. Pope, and W.H. Feyerherm, eds., *Minorities in Juvenile Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 153-178.
- Becker, D., Read, E.E., and Schafer, N.E. 1989. "Delinquency in Southcentral Alaska." *Alaska Justice Forum* 6(2): 1, 4-7.
- Bishop, D.M., and Frazier, C.E. 1996. "Race Effects in Juvenile Justice Decision-Making: Findings of a Statewide Analysis." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 86(2): 392-414.
- Carns, T., and Kruse, J. 1991. *Alaska's Plea Bargaining Ban Re-evaluated*. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Judicial Council.
- Conley, D.J. 1994. "Adding Color to a Black and White Picture: Using Qualitative Data to Explain Racial Disproportionality in the Juvenile Justice System." *Journal of Crime and Delinquency* 31(2): 135-148.
- Cross, J. 1982. "The Economics of Indian Crime." In L. French, ed., *Indians and Criminal Justice*. Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, & Co., pp. 55-64.
- Feimer, S., Pommersheim, F., and Wise, S. 1990. "Marking Time: Does Race Make a Difference? A Study of Disparate Sentencing in South Dakota." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 13(1): 86-102.
- Feld, B.C. 1995. "The Social Context of Juvenile Justice Administration: Racial Disparities in an Urban Juvenile Court." In Leonard, K.K., C.E. Pope, and W.H. Feyerherm, eds., *Minorities in Juvenile Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 66-97.
- Feyerherm, W.H. 1995. *Lessons Learned from the Pilot State Experiences*. Draft report. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, pp. 1-20.
- Flowers, R.B. 1988. *Minorities and Criminality*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Frazier, C.E., and Bishop, D.M. 1985. "The Pretrial Detention of Juveniles and Its Impact on Case Dispositions." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 76(4): 1132-1152.
- French, L., and Hornbuckle, J.. 1982. "Indian Alcoholism." In L. French, ed., *Indians and Criminal Justice*. Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, & Co., pp. 165-178.

- General Accounting Office. 1995. *Juvenile Justice: Juveniles Processed in Criminal Court and Case Dispositions*. GAO/GGD-95-770. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.
- . 1996. *At-risk and Delinquent Youth: Multiple Federal Programs Raise Efficiency Questions*. GAO/HEHS-96-34. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.
- Harring, S. 1982. "Native American Crime in the United States." In L. French, ed., *Indians and Criminal Justice*. Totowa, NJ: Allanheld, Osmun, & Co., pp. 93-108.
- Heilbrun, A.B., Jr., Foster, A., and Golden, J. 1989. "Death Sentence in Georgia 1974-1987: Criminal Justice or Racial Justice." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 16(2): 139-154.
- Hutton, C., Pommersheim, F., and Feimer, S. 1989. "I Fought the Law and the Law Won: A Report on Women and Disparate Sentencing in South Dakota." *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement* 15(2): 177-201.
- Juvenile Justice Racial Disproportionality Work Group. 1994. *Report to the Washington Legislature*. Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the Administration for the Courts.
- Keil, T.J., and Vito, G.F. 1990. "Race and the Death Penalty in Kentucky Murder Trials" An Analysis of Post-Gregg Outcomes." *Justice Quarterly* 7(1): 189-208.
- Kurtz, P.D., Giddings, M.M., and Sutphen, R. 1993. "A Prospective Investigation of Racial Disparity in the Juvenile Justice System." *Juvenile and Family Court Journal* 44(3): 43-59.
- Leiber, M.J. 1994. "A Comparison of Juvenile Court Outcomes for Native Americans, African Americans, and Whites." *Justice Quarterly* 11(2): 257-278.
- . 1995. "Toward Clarification of the Concept of 'Minority' Status and Decision-Making in Juvenile Court Proceedings." *Journal of Crime and Justice* 18(1): 79-108.
- Mander, A.M., Atrops, M.E., Barnes, A.R., and Munafo, R. 1996. *Sex Offender Treatment Program: Initial Recidivism Study*. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Department of Corrections.
- Mauer, M., and Huling, T. 1995. *Young Black Americans and the Criminal Justice System: Five Years Later*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- McGarrell, E.F. 1993. "Trends in Racial Disproportionality in Juvenile Court Processing: 1985-1989." *Crime and Delinquency* 39(1): 29-48.
- National Institute of Justice. "Drug Use Forecasting: 1995 Annual Report on Adult and Juvenile Arrestees." Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1983. *Differential Penetration of Minority Youth into the Juvenile Justice System*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- . 1995. "Juveniles Taken Into Custody: Fiscal Year 1993." Statistics Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Parry, D.L. 1987. *An Analysis of Offense Patterns, Recidivism and Emergency Detention of Children Accused of Delinquent Acts in Alaska in 1985*. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit, Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

- Pope, C.E., and Feyerherm, W.F. 1990. "Minority Status and Juvenile Processing." *Criminal Justice Abstracts* 22(2): 327-336 and 22(3): 527-542.
- Poupart, L.M. 1995. "Juvenile Justice Processing of American Indian Youths: Disparity in One Rural County." In Leonard, K.K., C.E. Pope, and W.H. Feyerherm, eds., *Minorities in Juvenile Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 179-200.
- Radelet, M.L., and Pierce, G.L. 1991. "Choosing Those Who Will Die: Race and the Death Penalty in Florida." *Florida Law Review* 43(1): 1-34.
- Robbins, S.P. 1985. "Commitment Belief and Native American Delinquency." *Human Organization* 44(1): 57-62.
- Roscoe, M. and Morton, R. 1994. "Disproportionate Minority Representation." Fact Sheet #11. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Schafer, N.E., and Curtis, R.W. 1994. "Juvenile Detention in Alaska, 1993." *Alaska Justice Forum* 11(3): 1, 5-7.
- . 1995. "Juvenile Detention in Alaska: Preliminary Report." *Alaska Justice Forum* 12(1): 1, 3-7.
- Schwartz, I.M. 1988. "The Jailing of Juveniles in Minnesota: A Case Study." *Crime and Delinquency* 34(2): 135-149.
- Texas Youth Commission. 1993. "Overrepresentation of Minorities in the Juvenile Justice System." Austin, TX: Texas Youth Commission, Department of Research and Planning.
- Tomkins, A.J., Slain, A.J., Hallinan, M.N., and Willis, C.E. 1996. "Subtle Discrimination in Juvenile Justice Decisionmaking: Social Scientific Perspectives and Explanations." *29 Creighton Law Review* 1620-1651.
- Withington, R.P. 1996. "IR95069—Disproportionate Minority Confinement Index." Memorandum to Patty Ware. Juneau, AK: Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services. August 24.
- Wordes, M., and Bynum, T.S. 1995. "Policing Juveniles: Is there Bias Against Youths of Color?" In Leonard, K.K., C.E. Pope, and W.H. Feyerherm, eds., *Minorities in Juvenile Justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 47-65.

Appendix A. Referrals and Referral Distribution

Blank page

Table A1. Referral Distribution Across Primary Racial Groups, 1992-1995

Breakdowns by year are contained in Tables A2-A7.

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total referrals	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total referrals
	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	
	Statewide							Southcentral Region (excludes Anchorage area)						
Offenses against persons	1,398	34.3%	498	12.2%	2,182	53.5%	4,078	188	20.9%	27	3.0%	685	76.1%	900
Assault 4	880	35.5	304	12.3	1,297	52.3	2,481	97	18.4	19	3.6	412	78.0	528
Offenses against property	4,082	26.0%	1,466	9.3%	10,170	64.7%	15,718	443	13.5%	42	1.3%	2,789	85.2%	3,274
Burglary	934	37.3	152	6.1	1,418	56.6	2,504	112	17.4	8	1.2	525	81.4	645
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	825	31.2	259	9.8	1,557	59.0	2,641	106	17.9	7	1.2	478	80.9	591
Theft 3 & 4	1,162	17.8	751	11.5	4,623	70.7	6,536	89	8.3	10	0.9	973	90.8	1,072
Public order offenses	2,838	43.5%	252	3.9%	3,427	52.6%	6,517	409	25.3%	18	1.1%	1,190	73.6%	1,617
Possession/consumption of alcohol	2,297	54.5	34	0.8	1,886	44.7	4,217	332	30.5	10	0.9	747	68.6	1,089
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	175	19.5	46	5.1	677	75.4	898	23	9.8	0	0.0	211	90.2	234
Other offenses	734	31.8%	286	12.4%	1,285	55.7%	2,305	60	16.8%	2	0.6%	296	82.7%	358
Total referrals	9,052	31.6%	2,502	8.7%	17,064	59.6%	28,618	1,100	17.9%	89	1.4%	4,960	80.7%	6,149
	Northern Region (excludes Fairbanks area)							Anchorage						
Offenses against persons	637	90.9%	9	1.3%	55	7.8%	701	205	15.4%	357	26.8%	768	57.7%	1,330
Assault 4	386	91.0	6	1.4	32	7.5	424	136	17.3	219	27.9	430	54.8	785
Offenses against property	1,540	89.3%	14	0.8%	170	9.9%	1,724	967	15.0%	1,078	16.8%	4,384	68.2%	6,429
Burglary	606	90.9	10	1.5	51	7.6	667	72	13.5	83	15.5	379	71.0	534
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	332	89.0	2	0.5	39	10.5	373	147	15.9	200	21.6	577	62.4	924
Theft 3 & 4	162	89.0	1	0.5	19	10.4	182	586	15.1	594	15.3	2,710	69.7	3,890
Public order offenses	1,249	92.2%	2	0.1%	103	7.6%	1,354	201	15.9%	187	14.8%	874	69.3%	1,262
Possession/consumption of alcohol	1,098	95.3	1	0.1	53	4.6	1,152	63	19.5	6	1.9	254	78.6	323
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	36	69.2	0	0.0	16	30.8	52	43	12.8	42	12.5	252	74.8	337
Other offenses	142	97.3%	0	0.0%	4	2.7%	146	312	24.8%	246	19.5%	702	55.7%	1,260
Total referrals	3,568	90.9%	25	0.6%	332	8.5%	3,925	1,685	16.4%	1,868	18.2%	6,728	65.4%	10,281
	Fairbanks							Southeast Region						
Offenses against persons	143	24.8%	92	16.0%	341	59.2%	576	225	39.6%	13	2.3%	330	58.1%	568
Assault 4	107	30.8	53	15.3	187	53.9	347	154	38.9	7	1.8	235	59.3	396
Offenses against property	439	18.2%	301	12.5%	1,666	69.2%	2,406	692	36.9%	31	1.7%	1,154	61.5%	1,877
Burglary	47	11.8	44	11.0	309	77.3	400	97	37.6	7	2.7	154	59.7	258
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	101	26.6	45	11.9	233	61.5	379	139	37.4	5	1.3	228	61.3	372
Theft 3 & 4	195	19.5	140	14.0	666	66.5	1,001	124	32.6	6	1.6	250	65.8	380
Public order offenses	379	46.4%	39	4.8%	399	48.8%	817	600	41.0%	6	0.4%	859	58.6%	1,465
Possession/consumption of alcohol	303	62.9	13	2.7	166	34.4	482	501	42.9	4	0.3	664	56.8	1,169
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	31	20.8	4	2.7	114	76.5	149	38	31.1	0	0.0	84	68.9	122
Other offenses	47	11.8%	44	11.0%	309	77.3%	400	97	46.2%	1	0.5%	112	53.3%	210
Total referrals	1,008	24.0%	476	11.3%	2,715	64.7%	4,199	1,614	39.2%	51	1.2%	2,455	59.6%	4,120

Row percentages within each subtable.

Table A2. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Statewide, 1992-1995

	1992										1993									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	13,728	—	22.5%	2,888	—	4.7%	44,341	—	72.7%	60,957	14,154	—	22.4%	3,221	—	5.1%	45,776	—	72.5%	63,151
Total referrals	1,947	14.2	30.2	550	19.0	8.5	3,949	8.9	61.3	6,446	2,065	14.6	31.5	570	17.7	8.7	3,911	8.5	59.7	6,546
Offenses against persons	293	2.1	36.5%	119	4.1	14.8%	391	0.9	48.7%	803	326	2.3	33.9%	119	3.7	12.4%	518	1.1	53.8%	963
Assault 4	176	1.3	37.8	74	2.6	15.9	215	0.5	46.2	465	209	1.5	35.1	78	2.4	13.1	308	0.7	51.8	595
Offenses against property	848	6.2	22.6%	346	12.0	9.2%	2,559	5.8	68.2%	3,753	898	6.3	24.3%	344	10.7	9.3%	2,460	5.4	66.5%	3,702
Burglary	211	1.5	37.3	39	1.4	6.9	316	0.7	55.8	566	213	1.5	37.5	33	1.0	5.8	322	0.7	56.7	568
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	165	1.2	28.3	43	1.5	7.4	375	0.8	64.3	583	177	1.3	28.0	67	2.1	10.6	389	0.8	61.5	633
Theft 3 & 4	241	1.8	14.4	195	6.8	11.7	1,233	2.8	73.9	1,669	280	2.0	17.2	186	5.8	11.4	1,159	2.5	71.3	1,625
Public order offenses	612	4.5	44.0%	49	1.7	3.5%	730	1.6	52.5%	1,391	698	4.9	49.4%	49	1.5	3.5%	665	1.5	47.1%	1,412
Possession/consumption of alcohol	494	3.6	54.2	7	0.2	0.8	411	0.9	45.1	912	608	4.3	59.4	7	0.2	0.7	409	0.9	39.9	1,024
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	33	0.2	19.6	12	0.4	7.1	123	0.3	73.2	168	28	0.2	24.6	5	0.2	4.4	81	0.2	71.1	114
Other offenses	194	1.4	38.9%	36	1.2	7.2%	269	0.6	53.9%	499	143	1.0	30.5%	58	1.8	12.4%	268	0.6	57.1%	469
	1994										1995									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	15,049	—	23.0%	3,474	—	5.3%	46,937	—	71.7%	65,460	15,578	—	23.4%	3,391	—	5.1%	47,607	—	71.5%	66,576
Total referrals	2,527	16.8	32.9	687	19.8	8.9	4,478	9.5	58.2	7,692	2,513	16.1	31.7	695	20.5	8.8	4,726	9.9	59.6	7,934
Offenses against persons	401	2.7	33.5%	134	3.9	11.2%	663	1.4	55.3%	1,198	378	2.4	33.9%	126	3.7	11.3%	610	1.3	54.8%	1,114
Assault 4	243	1.6	34.8	75	2.2	10.7	381	0.8	54.5	699	252	1.6	34.9	77	2.3	10.7	393	0.8	54.4	722
Offenses against property	1,242	8.3	29.1%	403	11.6	9.4%	2,627	5.6	61.5%	4,272	1,094	7.0	27.4%	373	11.0	9.3%	2,524	5.3	63.2%	3,991
Burglary	243	1.6	35.0	28	0.8	4.0	423	0.9	61.0	694	267	1.7	39.5	52	1.5	7.7	357	0.7	52.8	676
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	241	1.6	34.3	75	2.2	10.7	387	0.8	55.0	703	242	1.6	33.5	74	2.2	10.2	406	0.9	56.2	722
Theft 3 & 4	389	2.6	21.4	220	6.3	12.1	1,211	2.6	66.5	1,820	252	1.6	17.7	150	4.4	10.5	1,020	2.1	71.7	1,422
Public order offenses	716	4.8	43.6%	64	1.8	3.9%	861	1.8	52.5%	1,641	812	5.2	39.2%	90	2.7	4.3%	1,171	2.5	56.5%	2,073
Possession/consumption of alcohol	561	3.7	54.9	7	0.2	0.7	453	1.0	44.4	1,021	634	4.1	50.3	13	0.4	1.0	613	1.3	48.7	1,260
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	38	0.3	18.2	13	0.4	6.2	158	0.3	75.6	209	76	0.5	18.7	16	0.5	3.9	315	0.7	77.4	407
Other offenses	168	1.1	28.9%	86	2.5	14.8%	327	0.7	56.3%	581	229	1.5	30.3%	106	3.1	14.0%	421	0.9	55.7%	756

Row percentages.

* Population based on figures from "District Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade, Grades 5-12," Alaska Department of Education, Office of Data Management, FY 92-95.

Table A6. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Anchorage, Alaska, 1992-1995

	1992										1993									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	2,229	—	9.9%	2,026	—	9.0%	18,369	—	81.2%	22,624	2,339	—	10.0%	2,265	—	9.7%	18,809	—	80.3%	23,413
Total referrals	373	16.7	16.3	401	19.8	17.5	1,521	8.3	66.3	2,295	397	17.0	17.2	421	18.6	18.2	1,495	7.9	64.6	2,313
Offenses against persons	42	1.9	16.4%	82	4.0	32.0%	132	0.7	51.6%	256	55	2.4	17.7%	86	3.8	27.7%	170	0.9	54.7%	311
Assault 4	23	1.0	15.0	55	2.7	35.9	75	0.4	49.0	153	41	1.8	22.0	56	2.5	30.1	89	0.5	47.8	186
Offenses against property	211	9.5	13.7%	256	12.6	16.6%	1,071	5.8	69.6%	1,538	236	10.1	15.5%	247	10.9	16.2%	1,040	5.5	68.3%	1,523
Burglary	20	0.9	16.9	19	0.9	16.1	79	0.4	66.9	118	24	1.0	21.8	16	0.7	14.5	70	0.4	63.6	110
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	30	1.3	15.8	29	1.4	15.3	131	0.7	68.9	190	40	1.7	16.8	52	2.3	21.8	146	0.8	61.3	238
Theft 3 & 4	136	6.1	13.8	160	7.9	16.3	686	3.7	69.9	982	139	5.9	14.9	142	6.3	15.2	655	3.5	70.0	936
Public order offenses	30	1.3	13.2%	33	1.6	14.5%	164	0.9	72.2%	227	39	1.7	18.4%	37	1.6	17.5%	136	0.7	64.2%	212
Possession/consumption of alcohol	5	0.2	13.9	0	0.0	0.0	31	0.2	86.1	36	12	0.5	21.8	1	0.0	1.8	42	0.2	76.4	55
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	5	0.2	9.1	10	0.5	18.2	40	0.2	72.7	55	9	0.4	17.6	5	0.2	9.8	37	0.2	72.5	51
Other offenses	90	4.0	32.8%	30	1.5	10.9%	154	0.8	56.2%	274	67	2.9	25.1%	51	2.3	19.1%	149	0.8	55.8%	267
	1994										1995									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	2,487	—	10.3%	2,467	—	10.2%	19,128	—	79.4%	24,082	2,639	—	10.9%	2,385	—	9.8%	19,215	—	79.3%	24,239
Total referrals	499	20.1	17.4	517	21.0	18.1	1,846	9.7	64.5	2,862	416	15.8	14.8	529	22.2	18.8	1,866	9.7	66.4	2,811
Offenses against persons	61	2.5	14.9%	101	4.1	24.6%	248	1.3	60.5%	410	47	1.8	13.3%	88	3.7	24.9%	218	1.1	61.8%	353
Assault 4	43	1.7	18.5	57	2.3	24.5	133	0.7	57.1	233	29	1.1	13.6	51	2.1	23.9	133	0.7	62.4	213
Offenses against property	312	12.5	17.4%	294	11.9	16.4%	1,190	6.2	66.3%	1,796	208	7.9	13.2%	281	11.8	17.9%	1,083	5.6	68.9%	1,572
Burglary	17	0.7	10.6	16	0.6	10.0	127	0.7	79.4	160	11	0.4	7.5	32	1.3	21.9	103	0.5	70.5	146
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	39	1.6	17.4	56	2.3	25.0	129	0.7	57.6	224	38	1.4	14.0	63	2.6	23.2	171	0.9	62.9	272
Theft 3 & 4	205	8.2	17.6	174	7.1	14.9	786	4.1	67.5	1,165	106	4.0	13.1	118	4.9	14.6	583	3.0	72.2	807
Public order offenses	51	2.1	15.4%	50	2.0	15.1%	231	1.2	69.6%	332	81	3.1	16.5%	67	2.8	13.6%	343	1.8	69.9%	491
Possession/consumption of alcohol	16	0.6	21.1	2	0.1	2.6	58	0.3	76.3	76	30	1.1	19.2	3	0.1	1.9	123	0.6	78.8	156
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	9	0.4	11.5	13	0.5	16.7	56	0.3	71.8	78	20	0.8	13.1	14	0.6	9.2	119	0.6	77.8	153
Other offenses	75	3.0	23.1%	72	2.9	22.2%	177	0.9	54.6%	324	80	3.0	20.3%	93	3.9	23.5%	222	1.2	56.2%	395

Row percentages.

* Population based on figures from "District Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade, Grades 5-12," Alaska Department of Education, Office of Data Management, FY 92-95.

Table A7. Referrals of Youth 10-17 Years Old in Alaska, Southeast Region, 1992-1995

	1992										1993									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	2,289	—	28.9%	58	—	0.7%	5,586	—	70.4%	7,933	2,496	—	30.6%	76	—	0.9%	5,596	—	68.5%	8,168
Total referrals	357	15.6	38.4	5	8.6	0.5	567	10.2	61.0	929	352	14.1	38.1	17	22.4	1.8	556	9.9	60.1	925
Offenses against persons	37	1.6	37.8%	1	1.7	1.0%	60	1.1	61.2%	98	46	1.8	40.0%	4	5.3	3.5%	65	1.2	56.5%	115
Assault 4	20	0.9	31.3	1	1.7	1.6	43	0.8	67.2	64	33	1.3	41.8	1	1.3	1.3	45	0.8	57.0	79
Offenses against property	150	6.6	34.2%	3	5.2	0.7%	285	5.1	65.1%	438	154	6.2	35.8%	12	15.8	2.8%	264	4.7	61.4%	430
Burglary	19	0.8	35.8	0	0.0	0.0	34	0.6	64.2	53	29	1.2	38.7	4	5.3	5.3	42	0.8	56.0	75
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	35	1.5	37.2	1	1.7	1.1	58	1.0	61.7	94	32	1.3	40.0	1	1.3	1.3	47	0.8	58.8	80
Theft 3 & 4	19	0.8	22.4	0	0.0	0.0	66	1.2	77.6	85	39	1.6	38.6	4	5.3	4.0	58	1.0	57.4	101
Public order offenses	139	6.1	41.6%	1	1.7	0.3%	194	3.5	58.1%	334	138	5.5	40.0%	0	0.0	0.0%	207	3.7	60.0%	345
Possession/consumption of alcohol	118	5.2	41.8	0	0.0	0.0	164	2.9	58.2	282	128	5.1	44.1	0	0.0	0.0	162	2.9	55.9	290
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	2	0.1	20.0	0	0.0	0.0	8	0.1	80.0	10	3	0.1	18.8	0	0.0	0.0	13	0.2	81.3	16
Other offenses	31	1.4	52.5%	0	0.0	0.0%	28	0.5	47.5%	59	14	0.6	40.0%	1	1.3	2.9%	20	0.4	57.1%	35
	1994										1995									
	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total	Alaska Native			African American			White			Total
	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%		N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	N	Rate per 1000	%	
Population*	2,511	—	30.3%	77	—	0.9%	5,709	—	68.8%	8,297	2,525	—	30.3%	68	—	0.8%	5,738	—	68.9%	8,331
Total referrals	386	15.4	36.8	10	13.0	1.0	653	11.4	62.2	1,049	519	20.6	42.6	19	27.9	1.6	679	11.8	55.8	1,217
Offenses against persons	66	2.6	40.0%	1	1.3	0.6%	98	1.7	59.4%	165	76	3.0	40.0%	7	10.3	3.7%	107	1.9	56.3%	190
Assault 4	47	1.9	43.1	0	0.0	0.0	62	1.1	56.9	109	54	2.1	37.5	5	7.4	3.5	85	1.5	59.0	144
Offenses against property	186	7.4	36.0%	8	10.4	1.6%	322	5.6	62.4%	516	202	8.0	41.0%	8	11.8	1.6%	283	4.9	57.4%	493
Burglary	27	1.1	32.9	0	0.0	0.0	55	1.0	67.1	82	22	0.9	45.8	3	4.4	6.3	23	0.4	47.9	48
Criminal mischief 3 & 4	27	1.1	27.8	2	2.6	2.1	68	1.2	70.1	97	45	1.8	44.6	1	1.5	1.0	55	1.0	54.5	101
Theft 3 & 4	32	1.3	35.6	2	2.6	2.2	56	1.0	62.2	90	34	1.3	32.7	0	0.0	0.0	70	1.2	67.3	104
Public order offenses	115	4.6	35.3%	1	1.3	0.3%	210	3.7	64.4%	326	208	8.2	45.2%	4	5.9	0.9%	248	4.3	53.9%	460
Possession/consumption of alcohol	88	3.5	36.2	0	0.0	0.0	155	2.7	63.8	243	167	6.6	47.2	4	5.9	1.1	183	3.2	51.7	354
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	13	0.5	37.1	0	0.0	0.0	22	0.4	62.9	35	20	0.8	32.8	0	0.0	0.0	41	0.7	67.2	61
Other offenses	19	0.8	45.2%	0	0.0	0.0%	23	0.4	54.8%	42	33	1.3	44.6%	0	0.0	0.0%	41	0.7	55.4%	74

Row percentages.

* Population based on figures from "District Enrollment by Ethnicity and Grade, Grades 5-12," Alaska Department of Education, Office of Data Management, FY 92-95.

Blank page

Appendix B. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions

Blank page

Table B1. Factors Significantly Associated with Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995

All factors listed were significant at $p < .05$.

	Assault 4	Burglary	Criminal mischief 3 & 4	Theft 3 & 4	Possession/consumption of alcohol	Misconduct w/ controlled substances
Northern Region (Excluding Fairbanks Area)	(n = 424)	(n = 667)	(n = 373)	(n = 182)	(n = 1152)	(n = 52)
Dismissed		Black			Prior	
Adjusted	No prior	White No prior Younger	White No prior Younger	No prior	No prior	
Petition	Male Prior	Native Prior Older	Native Prior Older	Older	Prior	
Fairbanks	(n = 347)	(n = 400)	(n = 379)	(n = 1001)	(n = 482)	(n = 149)
Dismissed		Native		Black Prior		Older
Adjusted	Female No prior	No prior Younger	Female No prior	Female No prior	No prior	No prior Younger
Petition	Male Prior Older	Prior Older	Male Prior Older	Male Prior Older	Prior	Prior
Southcentral Region (Excluding Anchorage Area)	(n = 528)	(n = 645)	(n = 591)	(n = 1072)	(n = 1089)	(n = 234)
Dismissed		Female White Older			Native Recent year	Female
Adjusted	White No prior	No prior Younger	No prior Younger	Female No prior Earlier year	White No prior Earlier year	No prior Younger
Petition	Native Prior	Prior Older	Prior Older	Prior	Native Prior	Prior Older
Anchorage	(n = 785)	(n = 534)	(n = 924)	(n = 3890)	(n = 323)	(n = 337)
Dismissed	Earlier year	Female Prior	Black Native	Prior Earlier year		
Adjusted	White No prior	White No prior Younger	White No prior	Female White No prior	No prior	White No prior
Petition	Black Prior	Male Black Prior Older	Prior	Male Black Prior Older Earlier year		Male Black Prior
Southeast Region	(n = 396)	(n = 258)	(n = 372)	(n = 385)	(n = 1169)	(n = 122)
Dismissed		Female Older	Black	Female Earlier year		
Adjusted	No prior	No prior Younger	No prior Earlier year	Male No prior Younger	No prior Older	Older
Petition	Prior	Prior	Prior	Prior Older	Prior Younger	Younger

Note: The factors simultaneously entered into the logistic regression equations were gender, race, priors referred, age, and referral year. Logistic regression findings are contained in Appendix C.

For factors significantly associated with intake decisions and court outcomes statewide, see Table 5.

Blank page

Appendix C. Logistic Regression Findings

Blank page

Table C1. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions and Court Outcomes for Selected Offenses in Alaska (Statewide), 1992–1995

B = Beta (standardized regression coefficient); SE = Standard error for regression coefficient

	Assault 4		Burglary		Criminal mischief 3 & 4		Theft 3 & 4		Possession consumption of alcohol		Misconduct w/ controlled substances	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Intake Decision	(n = 2481)		(n = 2504)		(n = 2641)		(n = 6536)		(n = 4217)		(n = 894)	
Dismissed												
Gender	.22	.13	.96**	-.19	-.14	.15	.33*	.13	-.09	.17	-.25	.28
Race			**		**							
Native	-.04	.14	-.47**	.15	.09	.14	.27	.14	.12	.17	.50	.27
Black	.11	.19	.59*	.23	.81**	.17	.23	.17	-.13	1.03	.28	.50
Prior	-.12	.13	.25	.15	-.18	.12	.78**	.12	.04	.18	.11	.25
Age	.01	.03	.13**	.04	.01	.03	-.01	.03	-.01	.06	.07	.08
Referral year	-.16**	.06	.10	.06	.03	.06	-.07	.05	.12	.08	-.07	.10
Adjusted												
Gender	-.23*	.10	.02	.16	-.13	.11	-.52**	.08	.13	.10	-.29	.21
Race	**		**		**		**				**	
Native	.00	.10	.03	.09	.07	.10	-.06	.09	.05	.10	-.37	.19
Black	-.40**	.14	-.75**	.20	-.61**	.14	-.42**	.11	.24	.54	-1.05**	.32
Prior	-1.00**	.10	-1.25**	.09	-1.08**	.09	-1.81**	.08	-1.10**	.12	-1.06**	.17
Age	-.04	.02	-.30**	.02	-.12**	.02	-.06**	.02	.14**	.04	-.06	.05
Referral year	.00	.04	-.08	.04	-.06	.04	-.01	.03	-.14**	.04	.07	.07
Petition												
Gender	.15	.12	.53**	.17	.25	.14	.64**	.11	-.13	.13	.69*	.28
Race	**		**				**				**	
Native	.06	.12	.24**	.09	-.09	.11	.01	.11	.04	.13	.24	.22
Black	.53**	.16	.42*	.19	.22	.16	.53**	.13	-.55	.74	1.18**	.34
Prior	1.82**	.16	1.21**	.10	1.89**	.14	2.59**	.13	2.14**	.21	1.48**	.24
Age	.07*	.03	.28**	.03	.15**	.03	.10**	.03	-.22**	.04	.04	.06
Referral year	.09	.05	-.02	.04	.02	.04	-.05	.04	.05	.05	-.08	.08
Court Outcome												
	(n = 468)		(n = 1085)		(n = 592)		(n = 657)		(n = 303)		(n = 154)	
Dismissed												
Gender	.24	.24	.29	.42	.29	.30	.22	.25	.30	.27	-.63	.61
Race			**									
Native	.21	.23	.71**	.18	.32	.22	.28	.23	.31	.28	.08	.49
Black	.13	.29	1.00**	.31	.11	.31	.17	.26	-5.14	15.73	.62	.57
Prior	-.07	.34	.38	.24	.14	.34	.09	.32	-.06	.47	.39	.63
Age	-.08	.07	.12*	.06	.13	.08	.12	.06	.04	.10	.25	.16
Referral year	.02	.10	.02	.08	.04	.09	.14	.09	.01	.12	.11	.18
Diversion												
Gender	-.80**	.29	-.59	.31	-.46	.33	.34	.40	.04	.29	-2.13**	.70
Race	*		**		**							
Native	.41	.30	.43*	.17	.62*	.26	-.07	.34	-.40	.29	.12	.63
Black	-.94	.56	-.74	.45	-1.55*	.74	-8.00	15.34	-5.22	15.72	-7.23	21.27
Prior	-1.29**	.37	-.76	.19	-.43	.36	-.28	.42	-.64	.44	-1.73**	.67
Age	-.18	.09	-.14*	.06	-.15	.10	-.13	.09	-.17	.11	-.44*	.22
Referral year	.26	.15	-.13**	.08	.17	.12	.15	.14	-.08	.13	.28	.30
Adjudicated												
Gender	.22	.22	.29	.28	.02	.25	-.28	.23	-.26	.25	1.88**	.63
Race			**		**							
Native	-.38	.21	-.68**	.14	-.58**	.19	-.20	.21	.05	.25	-.12	.44
Black	.18	.28	-.31	.27	.33	.29	.36	.25	5.34	9.55	.09	.57
Prior	.93**	.33	.34*	.17	-.11	.08	.05	.28	.60	.44	.83	.50
Age	.16*	.06	.02	.05	-.03	.07	-.05	.06	.09	.09	.06	.14
Referral year	-.13	.09	.07	.06	-.11	.08	-.17*	.08	.05	.11	-.22	.17

* = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$.

Table C2. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995

B = Beta (standardized regression coefficient); SE = Standard error for regression coefficient

	Assault 4		Burglary		Criminal mischief 3 & 4		Theft 3 & 4		Possession consumption of alcohol		Misconduct w/ controlled substances	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Northern Region												
(Excluding Fairbanks Area)												
	(n = 424)		(n = 667)		(n = 373)		(n = 182)		(n = 1152)		(n = 52)	
Dismissed												
Gender	-.11	.31	-.35	.56	-.50	.40	.30	.67	.29	.37	.19	.93
Race			**									
Native	-.04	.51	.23	.63	.40	.65	-.60	.74	.38	1.03	.87	.99
Black	1.02	1.02	5.58**	1.27	-3.72	15.73	-4.90	22.26	-3.21	36.67	—	—
Prior	-.08	.29	-.58	.35	.23	.36	1.16	.60	1.45**	.54	.44	.75
Age	.01	.08	.16	.09	-.01	.09	-.05	.12	.23	.15	-.46	.23
Referral year	-.20	.12	.00	.15	-.06	.16	.23	.25	.10	.17	-.59	.34
Adjusted												
Gender	-.31	.26	-.38	.37	-.22	.34	-.41	.55	-.36	.26	.63	.88
Race			**									
Native	.39	.40	-1.72**	.42	-.99*	.47	.21	.69	-.45	.74	-.81	.78
Black	-1.12	.94	-4.58**	1.19	-1.70	1.52	5.07	22.26	4.01	36.67	—	—
Prior	-.87**	.26	-1.08**	.20	-.82**	.27	-1.89**	.58	-1.72**	.41	-.89	.68
Age	-.08	.06	-.41**	.05	-.20**	.07	-.16	.11	-.16	.10	.29	.22
Referral year	.02	.10	-.15	.08	-.12	.12	-.15	.20	-.06	.12	-.01	.31
Petition												
Gender	.84*	.42	.55	.40	.95	.51	.36	.83	.51	.39	-1.44	1.13
Race			**									
Native	-.68	.53	1.94**	.50	1.22*	.59	8.75	53.03	5.54	12.94	.99	1.12
Black	.96	1.36	-4.92	10.88	2.64	1.61	.24	275.96	-.15	100.47	—	—
Prior	2.83**	.74	1.33**	.21	1.20**	.38	-.02	.29	2.22**	.74	.85	.95
Age	.14	.09	.39**	.05	.31**	.09	.44*	.18	.09	.14	.25	.30
Referral year	.24	.14	.15	.08	.23	.15	8.91	30.72	.01	.17	1.42	.75
Fairbanks												
	(n = 347)		(n = 400)		(n = 379)		(n = 1001)		(n = 482)		(n = 149)	
Dismissed												
Gender	.33	.38	.41	.65	1.04	.62	.59	.36	-.43	.64	-.19	1.22
Race			*				*					
Native	-.31	.41	.92*	.40	-.18	.44	-.21	.40	-1.14	.65	-.55	1.19
Black	-.58	.56	.63	.44	.39	.47	.84*	.36	-6.27	27.50	-6.20	29.42
Prior	-.09	.37	-.05	.35	.02	.36	1.00**	.32	1.03	.83	-.71	.90
Age	-.03	.10	.07	.10	-.09	.10	.01	.08	-.23	.22	1.13*	.53
Referral year	-.02	.16	.16	.13	-.11	.16	.06	.13	-.02	.26	.11	.33
Adjusted												
Gender	-.89**	.29	-.76	.44	-1.12**	.36	-1.20**	.27	-.05	.33	-.39	.75
Race												
Native	-.16	.29	-.69	.38	-.18	.28	.26	.25	-.22	.37	.84	.52
Black	.13	.38	-.55	.37	-.69	.35	-.42	.27	-.61	.85	1.60	1.29
Prior	-.98**	.31	-.82**	.25	-1.29**	.28	-2.04**	.25	-1.47**	.13	-2.58**	.61
Age	-.12	.08	-.28**	.07	-.14	.07	-.12	.06	-.05	.13	-.43*	.19
Referral year	.13	.12	-.08	.10	.02	.11	-.09	.09	-.08	.13	.17	.17
Petition												
Gender	1.15**	0.40	0.53	.44	.95*	.41	1.60**	.41	.32	.39	.56	.89
Race												
Native	.53	.36	.04	.34	.31	.31	-.21	.30	.76	.48	-.90	.53
Black	.38	.48	.20	.34	.63	.39	.08	.35	1.32	.90	-1.15	1.29
Prior	2.54**	.74	.84**	.25	2.16**	.44	2.98**	.47	2.47*	1.03	3.88**	1.05
Age	.26*	.12	.25**	.07	.25**	.09	.19*	.08	.13	.15	.19	.19
Referral year	-.20	.15	.00	.09	.05	.13	.07	.11	.14	.16	-.21	.18

* = p < .05. ** = p < .01.

Table C2. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995 (continued)

B = Beta (standardized regression coefficient); SE = Standard error for regression coefficient

	Assault 4		Burglary		Criminal mischief 3 & 4		Theft 3 & 4		Possession consumption of alcohol		Misconduct w/ controlled substances	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Southcentral Region												
(Excluding Anchorage Area) (n = 528) (n = 645) (n = 591) (n = 1072) (n = 1089) (n = 234)												
Dismissed												
Gender	.39	.34	-1.16**	.34	.25	.40	.53	.36	-.20	.29	-1.03*	.52
Race			*						**			
Native	-.11	.36	-1.96**	.73	-.55	.41	.23	.42	1.14**	.30	-.44	.84
Black	-.99	1.04	-5.48	12.31	-5.20	13.77	1.32	.81	1.44	1.09	—	—
Prior	-.10	.27	.47	.29	-.34	.28	.48	.27	-.43	.29	.21	.51
Age	-.03	.07	.23**	.08	-.11	.07	.02	.07	.01	.11	.22	.16
Referral year	.02	.13	-.11	.13	.07	.12	.03	.12	.27*	.13	-.36	.20
Adjusted												
Gender	-.28	.24	.31	.29	-.12	.26	-.76**	.23	.15	.19	.02	.39
Race	*								**			
Native	-.52*	.24	.45	.23	.50	.26	-.31	.26	-.75**	.19	.22	.56
Black	.82	.65	.39	.84	1.20	1.11	-.39	.75	-.72	.81	—	—
Prior	-.82**	.21	-1.30**	.18	-.95**	.19	-1.32**	.17	-.54**	.19	-.85*	.35
Age	-.05	.05	-.34**	.05	-.11*	.05	.00	.05	.00	.07	-.31**	.11
Referral year	-.18	.10	-.07	.08	-.04	.08	-.23**	.07	-.36**	.09	-.05	.14
Petition												
Gender	.29	.30	.25	.29	-.08	.32	1.06**	.35	-.05	.27	1.24	.65
Race	**								*			
Native	.85**	.29	.20	.24	-.14	.30	.48	.31	.73**	.26	.17	.70
Black	-.43	.78	.38	.82	-.35	1.15	-.48	1.01	-4.58	11.36	—	—
Prior	1.39**	.30	1.19**	.19	1.64**	.25	2.12**	.27	1.98**	.38	1.18*	.49
Age	.15*	.07	.36**	.05	.24**	.07	.08	.06	-.07	.10	.42**	.15
Referral year	.15	.12	-.09	.09	-.14	.09	.07	.09	.10	.12	.20	.19
Anchorage												
(n = 785) (n = 534) (n = 924) (n = 3890) (n = 323) (n = 337)												
Dismissed												
Gender	.10	.22	-1.11**	.32	-.17	.21	.28	.18	1.20	1.19	-.44	.46
Race			**		**							
Native	.17	.28	.31	.34	.60*	.24	.18	.22	.54	1.02	.08	.58
Black	.09	.23	-.26	.36	.73**	.21	.17	.22	-5.19	38.96	.40	.54
Prior	-.13	.22	.78**	.29	-.29	.19	.76**	.17	1.04	1.17	.31	.41
Age	.04	.06	.08	.07	.03	.05	-.04	.05	-.45	.33	.10	.16
Referral year	-.25**	.09	.18	.12	.04	.08	-.15*	.08	.24	.48	.04	.18
Adjusted												
Gender	-.27	.17	.04	.31	-.01	.18	-.41**	.11	-.87	.65	-.41	.37
Race	*				**		**				**	
Native	-.25	.21	-.23	.30	-.27	.19	-.12	.13	-.54	.59	.00	.42
Black	-.53**	.18	-.61*	.29	-.59**	.17	-.53**	.13	5.43	24.00	-1.53**	.36
Prior	-1.29**	.18	-1.56**	.20	-1.07**	.06	-2.01**	.11	-1.68*	.78	-1.01**	.31
Age	-.08	.04	-.24**	.05	.08	.04	-.05	.03	.31	.21	-.04	.11
Referral year	.08	.07	.00	.09	.04	.37	.09	.05	-.44	.30	.11	.12
Petition												
Gender	.24	.20	.89**	.34	.13	.22	.51**	.13	1.39	1.13	1.15*	.58
Race	**						**				**	
Native	.21	.25	.02	.28	-.16	.23	.09	.16	1.46	.77	.04	.54
Black	.71**	.21	.62*	.27	.15	.20	.66**	.15	-8.18	173.39	1.79**	.40
Prior	2.44**	.33	1.19**	.21	2.16**	.26	2.80**	.17	8.72	36.74	1.33**	.43
Age	.09	.05	.19**	.05	.07	.05	.07*	.03	.33	.40	.00	.13
Referral year	.06	.09	-.12	.09	.01	.07	-.15**	.05	.32	.38	-.25	.15

* = $p < .05$. ** = $p < .01$.

Table C2. Logistic Regression Findings for Intake Decisions for Selected Offenses in Alaska, by Region, 1992-1995 (continued)

B = Beta (standardized regression coefficient); SE = Standard error for regression coefficient

	Assault 4		Burglary		Criminal mischief 3 & 4		Theft 3 & 4		Possession consumption of alcohol		Misconduct w/ controlled substances	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Southeast Region	(n = 396)		(n = 258)		(n = 372)		(n = 385)		(n = 1169)		(n = 122)	
Dismissed												
Gender	.48	.44	-2.56**	.86	-.71	.46	-1.12*	.40	-.22	.33	8.15	28.85
Race					*							
Native	-.60	.47	.42	.63	.40	.44	.36	.40	-.20	.33	-1.37	1.12
Black	.60	1.12	-5.42	22.60	2.45*	.99	-4.92	14.90	-4.11	18.31	—	—
Prior	.01	.43	-.77	.64	-.41	.44	.79	.42	-.42	.33	-.14	.78
Age	.00	.13	.50*	.22	.11	.11	.10	.10	-.07	.11	-.24	.23
Referral year	-.20	.18	.03	.29	.16	.19	-.43*	.18	.21	.14	-.54	.39
Adjusted												
Gender	.15	.23	.50	.61	.14	.30	-.63*	.32	.31	.17	-.45	.54
Race												
Native	-.06	.23	-.21	.28	-.16	.25	-.24	.29	-.14	.17	-.65	.46
Black	1.08	1.10	-6.97	13.29	-1.25	.99	6.17	14.59	4.80	10.56	—	—
Prior	-.81**	.26	-1.24**	.30	-1.38**	.30	-1.48**	.31	-1.31**	.21	-.22	.46
Age	.13	.07	-.15*	.07	-.10	.06	-.17*	.07	.31**	.06	.33*	.13
Referral year	-.02	.10	-.02	.13	-.22*	.11	.22	.12	-.10	.07	.16	.24
Petition												
Gender	-.35	.24	.35	.59	.17	.34	.09	.44	-.29	.19	-.27	.58
Race												
Native	.26	.25	.12	.28	.04	.27	.07	.35	.24	.18	1.21*	.51
Black	-6.06	13.52	7.28	13.20	-5.15	15.33	-5.55	14.27	-4.49	10.38	—	—
Prior	1.03**	.30	1.40**	.30	2.17**	.42	1.84**	.44	2.08**	.29	.37	.53
Age	-.15	.08	.07	.07	.08	.07	.19*	.09	-.37**	.06	.34*	.14
Referral year	.12	.11	.01	.13	.20	.12	.02	.15	.05	.08	.09	.30

* = p < .05. ** = p < .01.