

A Comparison by Race of Juvenile Referrals in Alaska

by

N.E. Schafer

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

Presented at the annual meeting of the
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences,
Albuquerque, March 1998.

JC 9501.024

A Comparison By Race of Juvenile Referrals in Alaska

N. E. Schafer

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

Abstract

A data set comprised of all juveniles referred to Alaska Youth Corrections in the Fiscal Years 1992-1996 shows disproportionate referral of Alaska Native and African American youth when compared to their proportions in the general population. Minorities also appear more likely than white youth to accumulate multiple referrals. Random samples selected within each racial group are used to seek extra-legal factors which may account for some of the disparity. Information on family and home life, school, personal problems and the details of each referral and each referral outcome were extrapolated from the files of the sample which included 39 white youth, 35 Alaska Native youth and 37 African American youth. Special attention was paid to youth who accumulated multiple referrals.

A Comparison by Race of Juvenile Referrals in Alaska

The disproportionate representation of minorities in the justice systems of the United States has been viewed with growing alarm by both researchers and policy makers. Studies of the problem tend to focus on African Americans and on the end points of the process—sentencing disparities and, especially, sentences to death (e.g., Heilbraun, et al., 1989; Radelet & Pierce, 1991; and others) at the adult level and court outcomes and detention decisions at the juvenile level (e.g. McGarrell, 1993). This paper focuses on disparity in referrals to the Alaska juvenile justice system and on comparisons among three primary racial groups—whites, Alaska Natives and African Americans—in a preliminary attempt to identify factors which might explain disparities.

Disproportionality Literature

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; Harring, 1982). Others examine sentencing and confinement issues in states where Native Americans are the largest 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 usually 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 also tracked through intake and judicial-decision making 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) constituted 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.

Research on Alaska Natives and the Criminal Justice System

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.

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.

Becker, et al. (1989) examined referral data for the Southcentral region of Alaska, 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.

Research on minority girls is rare. Fordham (1993) studied African American girls in school and Orenstein (1994) compared girls at two middle schools and found considerable differences between girls at the primarily white school and those at the predominately minority (black and Latina) school. Research which compares minority male and female delinquency is extremely rare. Farnworth (1984), in her study of African American delinquency, found differences between boys and girls related to family problems, school problems, and violence. Moore (1991) studied boys and girls in Latin American gangs and found differences based on gender stereotypes and socialization and cultural norms. Some of this research reflects stereotypes found in studies of female delinquents where race is not specified, particularly the paternalism hypotheses proposed in her early work by Chesney-Lind (1973) and iterated in a recent book (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1998).

Background of the Study

Cook Inlet Region Inc., one of thirteen corporations created under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, presented a gift to the Justice Center at the University of Alaska-Anchorage to conduct research on justice issues important to the Alaska Native community. The first research funded with the gift was an examination of disproportionate representation of minorities in the Alaska juvenile justice system. The Phase I report of this research (Schafer, et al.) was released by the Justice Center in September of 1997. In it the Center reported the results of an extensive analysis of four years of statewide juvenile referral data made available by the Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services (DFYS).

In Alaska all justice services but local law enforcement are centralized at the state level. Juvenile justice services are administered under the aegis of Family and Youth Services, a division of the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services. DFYS manages facilities for both the detention and institutionalization of juveniles as well as juvenile probation and aftercare. Because it is a state agency, data are collected in a uniform manner and entered into a statewide case management system known as PROBER. Statewide data make it possible to examine regional variations with some confidence. Of course, the data are subject to human error: they are entered by intake officers on a client-by-client basis.

The Phase I analysis (Schafer, et al., 1997) focused on comparisons of 10 to 17 year old Alaska Native, African American and white youth who together were responsible for more than 90 percent of the referral events. The final sample consisted of 14,145 youth referred during 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995; they were responsible for 28,618 referrals—an average of two referrals per youth in the data set.

In this large study we found minority youth referred to the Alaska juvenile justice system in proportions considerably greater than their proportions in the general population of 10-17 year olds. Although Alaska Native youth comprised, over the four years, 22.4 to 23.4 percent of all youth in the state, they accounted for 31.8 percent of all referrals. African American youth were 4.7 percent to 5.1 percent of all youth in the population of 10-17 years olds, but they accounted for 8.7 percent of all referrals. White youth, on the other hand, accounted for 59.6 percent of all referrals, but were for each year over 70 percent of Alaska's youth population.

Referral rates underscore these differences. In 1995, for example, Alaska Native youth were referred at a rate of 16.1 per 1000 Native youth in the general population; African American youth at a rate of 20.5 per 1000 black youth and white youth at 9.9 per 1000 white youth in the general population.

Minority youth were also disproportionately represented among those who accumulated multiple referrals. Among those with five referrals 38.9 percent were Alaska Native and 7.9 percent were African American. The mean number of referrals for each Alaska Native and African American in the data set was 2.1, while for white youth the mean was 1.68. Examining the mean is useful because the Alaska data parallel the findings of Bishop and Frazier (1996): prior record was found to be associated with the severity of both intake and court decisions and thus to disproportionate incarceration outcomes for minority youth.

The referral data were excellent for documenting disproportionality at different decision points in the Alaska Juvenile Justice system but they could not be used to *explain* the disproportionality. In this paper the results of the second phase of the project are reported. The goal of this phase was to attempt to identify some of the factors which might be associated with the decision to refer.

Research Methodology

A stratified sample of youth from the larger sample was randomly selected for in-depth study. Stratification ensured equal proportions from each racial group, but within each group subjects were randomly selected. The Division of Family and Youth Services made the files of these youth available to Justice Center researchers. Files from some offices were sent to regional headquarters (there are three DFYS regions in the state). The majority of files were available in Anchorage. Trips to Fairbanks, Juneau and Palmer were made over a period of several weeks.

The original sample consisted of 150 files, 50 randomly selected from each of the three racial groups. However some files were never found—some because the file had been transferred along with the youth to another region; some because staff were reluctant to share them, and some because they had been misplaced. Our final sample consisted of 112 youth: 40 white youth, 35 Alaska Native youth and 37 African American youth.

Each file was examined and field notes entered. Attention was paid to notes about family and school, as well as the details of each arrest report and/or referral. Notes by intake officers and probation officers about attitudes during interviews with parents and children were also examined. Some of the files were lengthy and reflected contacts with child protection agencies as well as youth corrections; others contained minimal information. The contents of some files were transcribed in ten minutes; some took two or three hours. Some of the files were very carefully organized; others were not.

One of the limitations of the study was the fact that five different people collected the data. Some doubtless overlooked information that might have provided insight, but time constraints made it impossible for one person to be responsible for data collection. We formulated some hypotheses which ordered the collection of data and the processing of it. To a large extent we were interested in examining stereotypes about juvenile offenders and about Native, black, and white youth. Our hypotheses included:

- Native youth accumulate alcohol-related referrals at a greater rate than white or black youth.
- Alcohol-related referrals are more likely to occur in rural than in urban settings.
- Black youth are more likely than Native and white youth to be referred for aggressive or dangerous behavior.
- The living situations of repeat offenders are more likely to be unstable than the families of one-time-only offenders
- Gender differences within and among racial groups will reflect the paternalism hypothesis which appears in the literature.

Findings

The sample of 112 delinquent youth consisted of 40 females and 72 males. Within racial groups, there were 18 white females and 22 white males, 10 Native females and 25 Native males, and 9 black females and 28 black males. The mean age of all youth at the time of their first referral was 14.49 years, with African American youth slightly older than white youth and Alaska Native youth slightly younger.

We examined the files of our sample for both legal and extra-legal factors which might contribute to an explanation of racial differentials in referrals. The legal data included charge at initial referral and number of referrals. The non-legal data included family and school information, location of referrals, and alcohol involvement. Aggregate data about the sample of youth are presented first; then we examine individual files in an effort to explain some of the differences noted in the data analysis.

Table 1. Charge at First Referral by Race

	Alaska Native		African American		White		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offenses against persons	4	11.4 %	9	24.3 %	3	7.5 %	16	14.3 %
Burglary	6	17.1	4	10.8	4	10.0	14	12.5
Criminal mischief	4	11.4	8	21.6	4	10.0	16	14.3
Theft 3 & 4	12	34.3	16	43.2	19	47.5	47	42.0
Possession/consumption of alcohol	8	22.9	0	0.0	7	17.5	15	13.4
Misconduct w/ controlled substances	1	2.9	0	0.0	3	7.5	4	3.6
Total	35		37		40		112	

Column percentages.

The youth were referred for a variety of behaviors, which we have categorized for ease of presentation. In Table 1, the charge at first referral is listed. Where multiple charges were listed in arrest reports, the most serious charge was used. Sixteen of the youth (14.3%) were referred on charges of offenses against persons. These sixteen included one referral for assault in the third degree and one referral for sexual abuse of a minor in the third degree. The remaining 14 were charged with fourth degree assault—the least serious misdemeanor assault charge.

Burglary was the only felony charge among all 112 first referrals. Fourteen youth were referred for burglary: four for burglary in the first degree, ten for burglary second. Three of the first degree burglary referrals were accounted for by African American youth.

Not surprisingly, theft accounted for the largest portion of all first referrals (42%). These included one count of second degree theft (a black juvenile), seven referrals for theft in the third degree, and 38 for theft in the fourth degree.

Fifteen youth (13.4% of the total) were first referred to DFYS on a charge involving possession/consumption of alcohol. These referrals were accounted for by seven white youth and eight Native youth. None of our sample of African American youth was referred for drinking on his or her first appearance in the data.

Only four of the juveniles in this sample were initially referred for misconduct involving a controlled substance: two in the fourth degree, and one each in the fifth and sixth degrees.

Because we used prior record as a screening variable, we are reasonably confident that the figures in Table 1 represent the charge at first referral for all the youth in the sample. For the number of referrals accumulated by each youth we are less confident, since additional referrals might have occurred after the data were collected. However, we found in the larger study that prior record was significantly associated with severity of outcome both at intake and in court hearings, so number of referrals becomes an important area of study.

A substantial proportion (37.5%) of the 112 juveniles had been referred only once. Half of those referred just once were white (N=21), while 14.3 percent were Alaska Native (N=6) and 35.6 percent were African American (N=15). Multiple referrals (five or more) were most likely to be accumulated by Alaska Native youth. They were more than half of all youth in this category (54.5%), while white youth were only 12.5 percent and African American youth 37.0 percent. These figures appear in Table 2, which also includes a breakdown by gender. Girls accounted for nearly half (45.9%) of all those referred two to four times, more than one third of those referred only once and just about one-fourth of the youth with at least five referrals (24.2%). More than two-thirds of girls with more than one referral were minority (68.0%), while 60 percent of girls with only one referral were white. Table 2 shows that half of white youth in the sample had only one referral, while half of Native youth had at least five. Black youth were less likely than white youth to have only one referral and also less likely than Native youth to accumulate five or more.

Table 2. Number of Referrals by Race and Gender

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alaska Native						
1 referral	5	22.7 %	1	7.7 %	6	17.1 %
2 to 4 referrals	5	22.7	6	46.2	11	31.4
5 or more referrals	12	54.5	6	46.2	18	51.4
Total	22		13		35	
African American						
1 referral	10	37.0 %	5	50.0 %	15	40.5 %
2 to 4 referrals	7	25.9	5	50.0	12	32.4
5 or more referrals	10	37.0	0	0.0	10	27.0
Total	27		10		37	
White						
1 referral	12	52.2 %	9	52.9 %	21	52.5 %
2 to 4 referrals	8	34.8	6	35.3	14	35.0
5 or more referrals	3	13.0	2	11.8	5	12.5
Total	23		17		40	
Total						
1 referral	27	37.5 %	15	37.5 %	42	37.5 %
2 to 4 referrals	20	27.8	17	42.5	37	33.0
5 or more referrals	25	34.7	8	20.0	33	29.5
Total	72		40		112	

Because family is a special interest among juvenile delinquency researchers, we examined family information with some care. Some files had *no* information about families. An assumption was made that where family information was missing it was primarily in the files of youth referred only once. This proved for the most part to be the case. Of 18 files with no information on families, 12 were the files of youth with only one referral. For three of the files missing information was noted in the files themselves. These three involved youth referred at least five times; two were files of Alaska Native males; one was the file of a white male. The three additional files lacking family information were those of Alaska Native females who had two or three referrals in their files.

We examined the availability of family information by race and found this information available for 72.5 percent of white youth (N=29), for 85.7 percent of Native youth (N=30), and for 94.6 percent of black youth (N=35). It seemed odd that intake personnel were much more likely to include in the file such data about minority youth than about white youth.

For those for whom data were available, white youth were considerably more likely than minority youth to live with both biological parents. More than half of the white youth for whom information was available lived in this situation (53.6%), while 23.3 percent of Native youth did and

14.3 percent of black youth lived with both parents. Eight of the white youth lived with one parent (seven with mother), while 10 Native youth had only one parent in the home and 15 black youth lived with only one parent (12 with mother). In all, 27 white youth lived with at least one biological parent, 21 Native youth did, and 24 black youth did. Five of the Native youth were in foster care or in group homes, and three of these had been in multiple placements. The same number of black youth were in non-family placements. Eight minority youth lived with their grandparents—four Native and four black youth; none of the white youth did. (See Table 3.) Of course, if the files had been complete we might have found a different distribution in family situations.

Table 3. Family Living Situation by Race and Gender

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alaska Native						
2 biological parents	6	31.6 %	1	7.7 %	7	21.9 %
1 biological parent	9	47.4	5	38.5	14	43.8
Relative or friend	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	3.1
Foster home/group home/mixed	1	5.3	4	30.8	5	15.6
No information	2	10.5	3	23.1	5	15.6
Total	19		13		32	
African American						
2 biological parents	1	3.7 %	4	40.0 %	5	13.5 %
1 biological parent	14	51.9	5	50.0	19	51.4
Relative or friend	8	29.6	0	0.0	8	21.6
Foster home/group home/mixed	2	7.4	1	10.0	3	8.1
No information	2	7.4	0	0.0	2	5.4
Total	27		10		37	
White						
2 biological parents	7	30.4 %	8	47.1 %	15	37.5 %
1 biological parent	8	34.8	4	23.5	12	30.0
Relative or friend	1	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.5
Foster home/group home/mixed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No information	7	30.4	5	29.4	12	30.0
Total	23		17		40	
Total						
2 biological parents	14	20.3 %	13	32.5 %	27	24.8 %
1 biological parent	31	44.9	14	35.0	45	41.3
Relative or friend	10	14.5	0	0.0	10	9.2
Foster home/group home/mixed	3	4.3	5	12.5	8	7.3
No information	11	15.9	8	20.0	19	17.4
Total	69		40		109	

Of particular interest among the Alaska Native community is the involvement of youth with alcohol. We therefore attempted to assess the extent of alcohol involvement in the referrals by race of youth. The data are presented in Table 4. If alcohol was the reason for the referral *or* was associated with any referrals, the youth was placed in the *yes* category. Because previous research

Table 4. Alcohol Involvement by Race and Gender

	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alaska Native						
Yes, alcohol	8	36.4 %	10	76.9 %	18	51.4 %
No, no alcohol	14	63.6	3	23.1	17	48.6
Total	22		13		35	
African American						
Yes, alcohol	1	3.7 %	0	0.0 %	1	2.7 %
No, no alcohol	26	96.3	10	100.0	36	97.3
Total	27		10		37	
White						
Yes, alcohol	4	17.4 %	8	47.1 %	12	30.0 %
No, no alcohol	19	82.6	9	52.9	28	70.0
Total	23		17		40	
Total						
Yes, alcohol	13	18.1 %	18	45.0 %	31	27.7 %
No, no alcohol	59	81.9	22	55.0	81	72.3
Total	72		40		112	

in Southcentral Alaska (Becker, et. al., 1989) had shown Alaska Native females referred in exceptional numbers for this behavior, the data are presented by gender as well as race.

Native youth are more likely to have alcohol use/abuse in their records. They account for 58 percent of all the alcohol-involved youth in the sample. When it comes to gender, the files of both white girls and Alaska Native girls are more likely than the files of white and Native boys to reflect alcohol use. Numerically, more females than males were involved with alcohol for both white and Native youth. Only one African American youth had alcohol mentioned in his referral. In this case, the youth along with three others was charged with theft. The police report stated that “alcohol was in use.” No African American female was referred for this offense or had alcohol use indicated in her file.

There is no evidence that young women are more likely than young men to experiment with alcohol, yet 45 percent of the female youth in this sample had alcohol use in their files compared to 18 percent of the males. This suggests that underage consumption of alcohol may be viewed as more serious for females than for males, supporting the paternalism hypothesis argued by Chesney-Lind (1977), among others. While this sample is very small, the larger sample from the Phase I report (Schafer, et al., 1997) underscores this conclusion. However, the data are not directly comparable, since the Phase I data include only referrals for underage drinking and only first referrals. The percentage of males referred for the first time for consumption/possession of alcohol was 10.9 percent, the percentage of females referred the first time for this behavior was 18.7.

Among Alaska Natives a larger *number* of girls than boys was referred for underage drinking. Together, Native boys and girls accounted for 44.6 percent of all first referrals for these alcohol offenses.

This smaller sample mirrors the larger but counts all alcohol involvement and includes all referrals for possession or consumption of alcohol, not just the first. Among this sample, half of the files of Native youth indicated some involvement with alcohol (51.4%), while fewer than a third of white files reflected alcohol involvement (30.0%).

A concern about alcohol abuse can lead to increased referrals for this offense. To determine if local priorities might have an impact on referrals for drinking, we examined alcohol involvement by DFYS location. Since the city of Anchorage has more referrals than the rest of the state, we separated Anchorage referrals from the rest. The city of Fairbanks dominates the Northern region, so we also treat it separately. With Fairbanks excluded, the Northern DFYS region contains the largest number of “dry” towns. Of 14 youth in this small sample referred from the Northern region, nine (64.3%) had alcohol involvement mentioned in their files. In Southeast, two-thirds of files contained information on alcohol. In Anchorage, where such behavior appears to be largely overlooked, only 6.9 percent of files indicated alcohol involvement.

According to aggregate data on both legal and extra-legal factors, referrals of Native youth are more likely to involve alcohol than referrals of white youth, and referrals of rural youth are more likely to involve alcohol than referrals of urban youth. Minority youth are considerably more likely than white youth to experience subsequent referrals. White youth appear to be more likely than minority youth to live in intact families and to live with at least one biological parent (whether a step-parent was present or not). The aggregate data do not provide details of the offense behavior, nor can they be used to indicate whether youths with several referrals are more likely than youths with only one to live in non-traditional family situations or if their families are more likely to be dysfunctional. The files must be examined on a case-by-case basis to determine this and to determine if there are specific factors which appear to be associated with the tendency of minority youth to accumulate a greater number of referrals than white youth do.

The files of the 33 cases with five or more referrals were reviewed to see if there was any information which might be used to predict future referrals. We began by examining the age of the youth at the first referral in the record and we compared these ages to the age of those with only one

referral. Clearly, the older the child is at his or her first referral, the less time he has available to accumulate referrals before his eighteenth birthday, and the younger the child the more time available.

The mean age of white youth at the first referral of five or more referrals was 14, while the mean age at referral for those with only one referral was 14.35—not a substantial difference. The range for the multiple offenders was 12 to 16 and for single offenders, 10 to 17. The ten-year-old was a white female who stole Pepsi and cupcakes from a grocery store. Four of the single offense white youth were 17 years old. The mean age of single offense Native youth was 15.5, with a range of 11 to 17. Three of these juveniles were 17. This compares to a mean of 12 for Alaska Native males referred five or more times and a mean of 13 for Alaska Native females referred five or more times. The range for Native youth was 5 to 15. The mean for black youth with at least five referrals was 13.5, while the mean for black males with a single referral was 15 and for black females nearly 15 (14.8 years). Four seventeen-year-olds and three sixteen-year-olds raised this mean. The range went down to 10 years. (The ten-year-old was charged with theft in the fourth degree for receiving a stolen soda at her grade school.)

The Alaska Natives who began their lengthy referral histories at age five and seven and nine are worthy of note. The five-year-old lived in a Native community. He was charged with concealment of merchandise for shoplifting a package of nuts worth \$.99. A month later with a friend he burned down a shed, causing \$400 in damage. At age nine he was charged with criminal trespass in the second degree for entering the village school through an unlocked back door. He and his friend played in the room but took nothing from it. At age 10, the boy was referred in connection with a missing/stolen bicycle, but there was nothing linking him to the theft and the charge was dismissed. His next referral was for minor in possession of alcohol at the age of 16. Five children were involved but only one was drunk, and there was no evidence that he was drinking. At age 16 he was arrested for DWI and at 17 he was charged with criminal trespass. He was in a store from which he had been banned. Six months later, at age 17, he was arrested for driving with a suspended license.

The child who began his career at age 7 was charged the first time with breaking windows on a trailer in the village in which he lived. There was no incident report in the file, but the event was entered into the log. His next referral occurred when he was almost 16. He was intoxicated and

charged with minor consuming alcohol. His mother was unable to come for him because she was intoxicated, so he was released to another relative. He was referred three more times for minor consuming—all in less than a year. At age 17, he was charged with criminal mischief in the third degree as well as minor consuming. He stole a snowmachine while drunk. He was referred to an alcohol program.

The Alaska Native girl whose history began at age 9 also lived in a Native village. She was initially referred for second degree burglary and criminal mischief. With a companion she entered a daycare center through an unlocked door. They did considerable damage to the premises and stole some dolls. Her record does not show another referral until age 15, when she was charged with underage drinking after being found staggering on the beach. She accumulated four more referrals, each including underage drinking. One involved a charge of DWI; another included assault in the fourth degree (she kicked a police officer). The other two were referrals for drinking only.

These three young people were not involved in threatening delinquent behavior. In two cases the youth had serious alcohol problems and resided in communities where alcohol use and abuse were viewed with considerable alarm. Local concerns may make law enforcement officials more likely to formally intervene in such cases. In Anchorage, where this behavior was often treated informally, there were relatively few referrals to DFYS for underage drinking.

Two other Native males were very young at their first referrals—one was eleven and the other twelve. Both lived in small villages and both were first referred for burglary. The younger of the two was referred for more burglaries, criminal mischief, assault (four counts), and probation violations. That he was intoxicated was mentioned only once in the file. The twelve-year-old began with a charge of burglary tied to the village store (the door was ajar but nothing was missing). He stole money from a teacher and was charged with theft. There was another burglary charge, two assault charges, and a referral for harassment (with a friend, he made annoying phone calls to police). There was no mention of alcohol in his file. (See Appendix A for the records of males with multiple referrals.)

Only two more files of Native males had alcohol references. In one case, all five referrals were for Minor Consuming Alcohol. Another boy was referred several times for burglary and criminal mischief, but intoxication was mentioned only once in the file. In a third case, drinking was suspected but not proven. All referrals were for burglary, criminal mischief, and/or theft.

Theft, criminal mischief (vandalism), and burglary were common charges in the remaining files and fourth degree assault appeared in several files. One child was learning disabled, perhaps an example of fetal alcohol syndrome, and another appeared to be emotionally disturbed. There was one referral for misconduct involving a weapon, but this was the only charge involving possible danger to others. The vandalism was often very costly (e.g., slitting tires on all the cars in a one or two-block area), but it usually involved a group. The thefts and burglaries were usually quite minor (cigarettes, beer, candy, soda). The assaults were often fights.

One of the hypotheses mentioned earlier was that African American youth were referred for more serious behavior. Our examination of those with at least five referrals bears this out to some extent. Three of these youth were referred for the first time for burglary, one for a charge of vehicle tampering and theft, one for criminal mischief, two for misdemeanor assault, and the remainder for theft.

An examination of the three burglars is illustrative. The first, age 13, was charged with burglary after entering a house with some companions intending to steal a gun. In March, now 14, he was referred for criminal trespass: he had agreed to stay away from the community recreation center but kept returning, and police were called. Just two months later he was charged with theft for stealing cigars and a lighter from a grocery store. The following month he was charged with vandalism. He was with other young males on bicycles who were breaking into parked cars. In a matter of weeks he was trespassing at the recreation center again, and a month after that he was detained for violating his probation and released after two days. Two weeks later, in August, he was again shoplifting cigars. At the end of the month he was again detained for violating probation. He was adjudicated in court and placed in a group home at the end of September. In ten days he was charged with assault for threatening another resident with a knife. In November, still aged 14, he was institutionalized.

The second burglar's referral history began in November when, at 15, he entered a neighbor's house in an effort to help his co-defendant get his stereo back. He admitted to his involvement in the plan and to taking a gun. He was referred for a second burglary committed just two days later but was found to not be involved, though his probation officer believed he knew about it. The following month he was charged with assault in the fourth degree and criminal trespass for threatening students and staff at after school bus loading. He and his co-defendant threatened to kill

the teacher who tried to stop them. In January he was charged with misconduct involving weapons and theft when, in a burglary with an adult co-defendant, they broke into a sports store and stole cash and two rifles. (His mother turned in the one he kept.) Also in January he was referred for stealing snowmachines. That month he was petitioned on all the charges from the previous two months. In April he was referred for throwing rocks through the windows of school. In the following year he and his co-defendant started a fire in a school locker. A year later he was charged with theft.

The third burglar began his career in January, just about a month before his sixteenth birthday. He entered a residence with others and stole items and vandalized. He knew the daughter of the house and believed all had been invited in. He returned to help clean up broken eggs. His second referral was in June, when he was accused of involvement in an incident with several others who were attacking other youths with baseball bats. In November he was charged with criminal mischief when, with others, he set a fire in a laundromat. At 16, in February, he was charged with misconduct involving a controlled substance. The principal at his high school was suspicious and asked to search his locker; drugs and money were found and police called. In March he was charged with reckless endangerment for shooting a friend in the leg. He and the friend maintained it was accidental. In September he was a passenger in a stolen car and a gun was found under the driver's seat. This was a probation violation as well as a new charge. He was institutionalized and released from custody about 18 months later, just after his nineteenth birthday.

These three black juveniles caused a great deal of trouble and considerable expense. They also were involved in weapons violations, increasing their perceived dangerousness. Four other black repeat offenders had weapons violations among their subsequent referrals, and most included in their referral histories violent behavior or threats of violence. In one case the last referral was for murder.

A comparison with the three white males who had accumulated at least five referrals finds considerable differences.

One of the white habitual offenders began his referral history at age 11. He was charged with criminal mischief for spraying gang graffiti in company with his brother. A month later he stole a pizza and was referred to a shoplifting program. The next month the brothers were caught stealing car stereos and the subject also admitted to stealing a purse. He was referred again four months later for assault on a fellow junior high student (again in company with his brother). Four

more referrals were based on charges of assault: one against his mother's boyfriend, one against a teacher at school, and one against a neighbor when he pointed a gun at him after being caught stealing from his van. At his last referral he was fourteen years old.

The second case began at age 15 with two referrals for underage drinking. The second also involved theft. The two next referrals were for criminal mischief, followed by a referral for violation of probation. The last referral was for theft—two months before the juvenile turned 18.

The third white youth accumulated nine referrals, the first for theft at age 14. This file includes two incidents prior to this which are notes rather than formal referrals. The boy left home threatening suicide and his mother called the police. The following day she saw him and tried to get him to go with her. He threatened her with a knife. Apparently some legal process occurred because he was next referred for violating a domestic violence order. He was next referred for shoplifting. He then left the state and returned. Eight months after the theft he was referred for misconduct involving a weapon (a BB gun) after police caught him and his friends throwing rocks at streetlights. Three weeks later he was caught driving a stolen vehicle; the next day referred for theft (shoes taken from a store); and a week after that for stealing from a grocery store. Six months later he was reported as a runaway. Almost two years later he was referred for disorderly conduct. At this point he was within two weeks of his eighteenth birthday.

The records of habitual offenders vary considerably by race. Alaska Native youth tend to accumulate referrals in villages for behavior which would very likely be ignored or resolved informally in a large city. The Natives whose records were accumulated in cities were less likely to be referred for alcohol violations, though their referrals for property offenses sometimes included consumption of alcohol.

African American boys who accumulated at least five referrals had referrals for assault and weapons violations as well as property offenses. Overall, their activities appear to have posed a greater danger to society than do the activities of the Alaska Native youth.

The white youth were quite different from one another. One was referred in a small town for liquor violations and minor theft; his record sounds as if it could be that of one of the Native villagers. Another seemed to be involved in gang or gang "wannabe" behavior, and a third appeared to have been emotionally or mentally disturbed.

In virtually all of these cases, the youth's home life was at least questionable, if not dysfunctional. The sixteen-year-old white drinker was on his own in a fishing town; both parents were out of state. The gang-involved boy lived with his mother and brother. His mother didn't seem particularly concerned with his behavior, according to intake notes. He was in a residential psychiatric facility more than once.

The third boy also might have been involved in a gang. His father lived out of state. His mother refused to take him in after he threatened her. The police then took him to shelters after arrests. He was admitted to a psychiatric facility in Anchorage and to another in the lower 48. He was diagnosed at the psychiatric hospital as a sociopath destined for more criminal behavior.

The Alaska Native youth seemed to come from broken families where alcohol was a problem. Only two of these youth lived with both parents. Two lived with their fathers, the remainder with mothers and/or grandparents. Field notes in several files mentioned intoxicated parents (e.g., mother too drunk to come for him; all adults in home were intoxicated). One boy seemed to often be left with others while his mother was away, and referrals seemed correlated with her absence. Others were in group homes for some part of their referral histories. In one case the village tribal council said a youth could not return to the village (although he did). At least one had a sibling in jail and some had siblings as co-offenders.

The African American habitual offenders were all from cities (most from Anchorage) or, in one case, a growing community near Anchorage. That youth was living with a friend and did not know where his parents were, although he knew his father had been recently released from prison. Two other files noted jailed or imprisoned parents. Three of the youth lived with grandparents, but at least one of these was so out of control he was placed in shelters and group homes for much of the time covered in his referral history. Three of the black youth lived with aunts or uncles. In several files moves to the lower 48 to stay with other parents or relatives were noted. One of the African American boys (whose record reflected minimal "dangerousness") was in multiple placements in Alaska, including: two foster homes, two mental health facilities, one temporary shelter, and one residential group home.

Clearly, the youths who accumulated several referrals did not have very stable living situations, and in some cases their homes could only be described as chaotic. In some cases parents

and guardians refused to take the boy in; in two, the parent requested more severe sanctions; in only one case was abuse by parents established in the file, but some of the files were not complete.

There were only ten females who accumulated at least five referrals. Eight were Alaska Native and two were white. These girls were in living situations which were just as chaotic as those of the boys. One Native girl lived with her father in a village; the others had less stable arrangements, moving from parental home to foster home or relative to group home. Some had numerous placements.

The child with the least stable home life lived with mother, father, grandparents, foster parents, psychiatric facility, residential group home. She began her referrals with a charge of Minor Consuming Alcohol. She next was referred for trespass when she went into a fast food restaurant from which she had previously been barred. She was next referred again for Minor Consuming Alcohol and then for misconduct involving a controlled substance. She was referred for driving her grandfather's car without his permission or a license. She was also referred for criminal trespass at the high school, from which she had also been barred. She accumulated six more referrals, including some probation violations and leaving placement (in a substance abuse program).

Another Native girl was referred nine times—five for Minor Consuming Alcohol, two for misconduct involving a controlled substance (she bought some marijuana at school and was later seen with a bong and a butane lighter).

Minor Consuming Alcohol featured prominently in the referral histories of three other Alaska Native females. One file contained no reference to alcohol. This file had six referrals for theft and one for burglary. Another girl accumulated 13 referrals in a two-year period.

One of the white girls who had at least five referrals had a very chaotic living situation. Her mother asked the state to take her because she was so unmanageable. She did have several placements, and she was institutionalized at the training school. She continually ran away from home and appears to have been involved with an adult male who dealt cocaine. He may have been her pimp. Her referral record does not reflect prostitution, but includes several assaults, some on her mother, some on other girls. The record also includes misconduct involving a controlled substance, attempted escape, burglary, and theft.

The other white female had both parents in the home. She was referred three times for Minor Consuming Alcohol, twice in conjunction with other offenses. Her record included a theft, a

burglary, and criminal trespass. She was also referred for receiving, since she was suspected of receiving money which her brother stole.

Because no African American girls in the sample were referred five or more times, it is difficult to make assumptions about the paternalism hypothesis in regards to minority girls. Only two white girls had numerous referrals, and this doesn't provide any ammunition for the hypothesis, not only because of the numbers but also because one girl had a long history of disturbed behavior prior to her involvement in criminal behavior. The other white girl had several charges for Minor Consuming Alcohol, perhaps reflecting a tendency for police protectiveness.

The Alaska Native girls who appeared in the five-or-more-referrals category could be differentiated by place of referral. Girls who lived in villages or small towns were more likely to accumulate referrals for Minor Consuming Alcohol than were urban-dwelling girls. Police priorities, visibility, and local concerns may play a role. Since all African American girls in the sample were from urban areas, this might explain the lack of alcohol-related referrals among them. Urban police have different priorities; city youth can drink in less visible settings and no city of size in Alaska is "dry."

We cannot suggest that Native girls are referred for alcohol offenses because they require protection. The referral locations of Alaska Native boys reflect the same regional variations as well as priorities, visibility, and local option laws. Six of the Alaska Native males were first referred from villages, and five of these six had alcohol referrals in their records. The remainder were referred in more urban areas and alcohol was not part of their referral histories.

Conclusions

This examination of a small sample of youth referred to Youth Corrections in Alaska supports several of the hypotheses derived from a larger data set. Native youth did accumulate alcohol-related referrals at a greater rate than either black or white youth, and these referrals were more likely to occur in rural than in urban settings. Youth who first came to the attention of authorities for Minor Consuming Alcohol appeared to be as likely to be white (N=7) as Native (N=8), but were not at all likely to be African American. In assessing any reference to alcohol in

the file, we found more girls' (N=18) than boys' (N=13) files to have this notation. This might lend support to the paternalism hypothesis.

This small random sample reflected the findings from the larger sample in that minority youth were more likely than white youth to accumulate referrals. We found that more than half of the white youth in this sample had been referred only once and more than half the Native youth had been referred five or more times. For black youth distribution was more even, with 40.5 percent referred only once, 32.4 percent referred two to four times, and 27.0 percent referred at least five times.

The number of referrals was tied to age at first referral. Alaska Natives with extensive referral histories were referred for the first time at younger ages than either black or white youth. Among all habitual offenders (defined for the purposes of this paper as those with five or more referrals), white youth had a mean age of 14, black youth, 13.5, and Native youth, 12.7. A substantial number of the young Natives in the habitual offender category were first referred in small villages. This suggests that local priorities and high visibility, as well as the personal knowledge of offenders common in small communities, probably play a part in the accumulation of lengthy referral histories.

A final hypothesis is worthy of some discussion. We assumed that habitual offenders would, on the whole, have more chaotic living situations than either youth referred only once or youth referred two to four times. Two interesting phenomena were observed from this small sample. First, intake officers appeared more likely to pursue information about family situations for minority youth. This was particularly true for African American youth; more than 90 percent of the files of these youth contained family information, and this was true regardless of number of offenses. At the same time, nearly a third of white youth did not have this information in their files.

The second phenomenon was that minority youth were much more likely than white youth to live with someone other than a biological parent. Only two white youth lived in non-parental homes, but six Alaska Native youth did, and eleven African American youth did. No white youth lived in foster or group homes or a combination of these and other placements, while five Native youth did and three black youth did. Did these eight juveniles appear in our habitual offender category? All of them did.

Those habitual offenders who lived with family members had chaotic homes. Three had relatives in prison, several had alcoholic parents, several moved from mother to father to grandparents, aunts and uncles, and back again. Some of them left the state for these alternative living arrangements.

Very few of the youth who accumulated at least five referrals had stable home lives and some quite clearly, had diagnosable emotional problems. Some may have suffered from fetal alcohol syndrome, though this diagnosis rarely appeared in the files.

Although we hoped to identify more precisely some of the reasons behind the differentials between white and minority youth *vis a vis* records, we are finding issues which cannot be researched with currently available data. We cannot, however, conclude that the system is biased, which was one hypothesis that underlay the research in the first place.

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.
- Chesney-Lind, M. 1973. "Judicial Enforcement of the Female Sex Role." *Issues in Criminology* 8: 51-70.
- . 1977. "Judicial Paternalism and the Female Status Offender: Training Women to Know Their Place." *Crime and Delinquency* 23(1); 121-130.
- Chesney-Lind, M, and Sheldon, R. 1998. *Girls, Delinquency and Juvenile Justice*, 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- 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.

- Farnworth, M. 1984. "Male-Female Differences in Delinquency in a Minority Group Sample." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 21: 191-212.
- 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.
- Fordham, S. 1993. "'Those Loud Black Girls': [Black] Women, Silence, and Gender Passing in the Academy." *Anthropology and Education* 24(1): 3-32.
- 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.
- Moore, J.W.. 1991. *Going Down to the Barrio: Homeboys and Homegirls*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- 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.
- Orenstein, P. 1994. *School Girls*. New York: Doubleday.
- 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.
- Schafer, N.E., Curtis, R.W., and Atwell, C. 1997. *Disproportionate Representation of Minorities in the Alaska Juvenile Justice System: Phase I Report*. Anchorage: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.
- 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 of Habitual Offenders (5 or more referrals)**

Alaska Native males

Case #	Age at first referral	Referral date	Charge	Case #	Age at first referral	Referral date	Charge
1	Age 14	Aug 1998	Minor Consuming Alcohol	7	Age 13	Feb 1994	burglary in the second degree, theft in the third degree
		Nov 1994	Minor Consuming Alcohol			May 1994	theft in the fourth degree
		Aug 1995	Minor Consuming Alcohol			Aug 1994	criminal mischief
		Oct 1995	Minor Consuming Alcohol			Nov 1995	criminal mischief
		Aug 1996	assault and misconduct involving a controlled substance			Jan 1996	theft in the second degree, criminal mischief, theft in the third degree
2	Age 7	Apr 1983	criminal mischief	8	Age 16	Sep 1992	theft in the fourth degree
		May 1994	Minor Consuming Alcohol			Nov 1992	possession of stolen property
		Jul 1994	Minor Consuming Alcohol			Nov 1992	trespass
		Oct 1994	Minor Consuming Alcohol			Feb 1993	misconduct involving a weapon
		Mar 1995	Minor Consuming Alcohol			May 1993	probation violation
Jun 1995	criminal mischief, Minor Consuming Alcohol	Aug 1993	assault in the third degree				
3	Age 5	May 1983	concealment of merchandise	9	Age 14	Mar 1994	probation violation
		Jul 1983	arson in the second degree			Jul 1994	domestic violence assault
		May 1987	criminal trespass			Apr 1993	criminal mischief, criminal trespass
		Jun 1988	found property			Dec 1994	misconduct involving a controlled substance in the sixth degree
		Jun 1994	Minor Consuming Alcohol			May 1996	sexual abuse of a minor
		Jul 1994	driving while intoxicated			May 1996	violation of domestic violence restraining order
		Nov 1994	criminal trespass			Mar 1997	probation violation
Jun 1995	driving with license suspended	Sep 1997	probation violation (warrant)				
4	Age 12	Dec 1993	burglary in the second degree	10	Age 16	Aug 1993	criminal mischief
		May 1946	theft in the third degree			May 1994	burglary in the first degree
		Oct 1994	assault in the fourth degree			Jun 1994	criminal trespass in the second degree
		Dec 1994	burglary in the first degree			Jul 1994	assault in the fourth degree
		Oct 1995	assault in the fourth degree			Sep 1994	probation violation (drug-related)
5	Age 11	Jun 1996	harrasment	11	Age 12	Oct 1994	probation violation
		Aug 1991	burglary			Feb 1993	criminal mischief
		Aug 1992	burglarv. criminal mischief			Apr 1993	theft in the fourth degree, criminal trespass
		Feb 1993	probation violation			Apr 1993	theft in the fourth degree
		Feb 1993	burglary (institutionalized)			Apr 1993	burglary
		Jan 1995	burglary			Jun 1993	indecent exposure
		Feb 1995	assault in the fourth degree			Jan 1995	criminal mischief
		Mar 1995	assault in the fourth degree, Minor Consuming Alcohol, reckless endangerment			Feb 1995	concealment of merchandise
		Nov 1995	assault in the fourth degree			Feb 1996	theft, Minor Consuming Alcohol
		Dec 1996	probation violation			Oct 1996	Minor Consuming Alcohol
6	Age 14	Jan 1994	criminal mischief	12	Age 15	Jun 1995	theft in the fourth degree
		Apr 1994	burglary in the second degree, criminal mischief			Aug 1995	mother requests he be placed on probation
		Dec 1994	burglary in the second degree			May 1996	theft in the third degree
		Apr 1995	burglary in the second degree, criminal mischief, probation violation			Oct 1996	vehicle theft
		Sep 1996	burglary, theft, criminal mischief			Nov 1996	probation violation
		Dec 1996	probation violation			Dec 1996	warrant (left home without permission)

African American males

Case	Age at first referral	Referral date	Charge	Case	Age at first referral	Referral date	Charge
1	Age 13	Feb 1993	assault in the fourth degree	6	Age 14	Aug 1994	theft in the fourth degree
		Apr 1993	criminal trespass			Oct 1994	criminal mischief in the fourth degree
		Apr 1993	assault in the fourth degree			Oct 1994	burglary in the first degree
		Jun 1994	criminal mischief in the third degree, theft in the third degree			Mar 1995	criminal mischief in the fourth degree
		Jun 1994	theft in the third degree			Apr 1995	probation violation
		Nov 1994	assault in the fourth degree			Apr 1995	probation violation
		Aug 1995	misconduct involving a controlled substance in the fourth degree			Jun 1995	probation violation (warrant, resisting arrest)
		Jan 1996	murder, assault, robbery			Aug 1995	false information
2	Age 16	Jan 1993	burglary, theft	7	Age 14	Feb 1993	theft in the third degree, vehicle tampering
		Jun 1993	disorderly conduct			May 1993	theft in the third degree, misconduct involving a weapon
		Nov 1993	criminal mischief				
		Dec 1993	"incident" at shelter			Jul 1993	assault in the fourth degree
		Feb 1994	misconduct involving a controlled substance			Feb 1994	assault in the fourth degree, disorderly conduct
		Mar 1994	reckless endangerment			Sep 1994	robbery
		Sep 1994	criminal mischief in the fourth degree (<i>institutionalized</i>)			May 1995	assault
		3	Age 16			Feb 1994	theft in the fourth degree
Aug 1994	assault in the fourth degree			Oct 1994	assault in the fourth degree		
Mar 1995	criminal mischief in the fourth degree, misconduct involving a controlled substance in the fourth degree, misconduct involving a weapon in the fifth degree			Oct 1994	assault in the third degree		
Apr 1995	cut bracelet (on electronic monitoring)			Dec 1994	assault in the fourth degree		
May 1996	misconduct involving a weapon in the second degree, misconduct involving a controlled substance in the third degree, misconduct involving a controlled substance in the fourth degree (<i>institutionalized</i>)			Sep 1995	assault (in Washington state)		
				Feb 1996	harassment, malicious mischief, resisting arrest (in Washington state)		
				Jun 1996	probation violation		
				Dec 1996	probation violation		
4	Age 13	Sep 1993	burglary	9	Age 15	Nov 1993	burglary in the first degree
		Mar 1994	criminal trespass			Nov 1993	misconduct involving a weapon in the third degree, theft in the third degree
		May 1994	theft in the fourth degree			Dec 1993	assault in the fourth degree, criminal trespass
		Jun 1994	criminal mischief			Jan 1994	theft, criminal trespass
		Jul 1994	criminal trespass			Jan 1994	failure to appear (warrant)
		Aug 1994	probation violation			Jan 1994	criminal mischief in the second degree
		Aug 1994	theft in the fourth degree			Feb 1994	burglary in the second degree
		Oct 1994	assault			Apr 1994	criminal mischief in the third degree
5	Age 12	Oct 1994	"incident" at shelter	10	Age 12	Mar 1995	criminal mischief in the third degree, criminally negligent burning
		Jan 1994	theft in the fourth degree			Jul 1996	file closed, child emancipated
		Feb 1994	assault in the fourth degree			Aug 1996	theft in the second degree, misconduct involving a weapon in the third degree, warrant issued
		Dec 1994	misconduct involving a weapon (BB gun in school)			Nov 1992	assault in the fourth degree
		Mar 1995	assault in the third degree			Jul 1994	driving without a license
		Jan 1996	theft in the fourth degree			Apr 1995	misconduct involving a weapon in the third degree
		Mar 1996	assault in the fourth degree			May 1996	theft in the second degree, burglary in the second degree
						Nov 1996	FTA -- warrant issued
		Jan 1997	misconduct involving a weapon, reckless endangerment				
		Jan 1997	robbery				

White males

Case	Age at first referral	Referral date	Charge		
1	Age 13	Jul 1993	runaway		
		Aug 1993	theft in the fourth degree		
		Sep 1993	assault in the third degree		
		Oct 1993	theft in the fourth degree (Oct 1993 – left state)		
		May 1994	misconduct involving a weapon in the fifth degree		
		Jun 1994	criminal mischief in the third degree		
		Jun 1994	theft in the third degree		
		Jun 1994	theft in the fourth degree		
		Dec 1994	runaway		
		Sep 1996	disorderly conduct		
		2	Age 12	Jul 1994	criminal mischief in the third degree
				Aug 1994	theft in the fourth degree
				Sep 1994	theft in the third degree
Nov 1994	theft in the third degree				
Mar 1995	assault in the fourth degree				
Mar 1995	assault in the fourth degree				
Apr 1995	assault in the fourth degree				
3	Age 16	May 1993	Minor Consuming Alcohol		
		Jun 1994	theft in the fourth degree, Minor Consuming Alcohol		
		Jun 1994	criminal mischief in the second degree		
		Dec 1994	criminal mischief in the second degree		
		Dec 1994	probation violation		
		Mar 1996	theft in the third degree		