

Chapter 2: Assessment

*Michael Leiber, Dorinda Richetelli, and William Feyerherm**

Although the identification stage of the DMC process provides jurisdictions with a description or an account of the extent of minority overrepresentation, the assessment stage is an indepth examination of how DMC occurs. An assessment is a search for the factors that contribute to DMC, with the goal that the results may lead to strategies or interventions to reduce DMC. This chapter discusses mechanisms that may result in DMC and explains how to conduct the assessment.

It is important to note that the nature of the assessment process necessarily depends on the preceding identification stage. The logic of the assessment phase builds on the results of the identification process. If a community has sufficient identification information for all or most of the major stages in the juvenile justice system, then it can use the findings to further refine and focus the needed inquiry of the assessment. On the other hand, if a community does not have adequate information to complete the identification process, then the techniques suggested here for conducting the assessment will be less successful. To improve on the value that the assessment study can provide for addressing DMC, it is imperative that the community complete, or come as close as possible to completing, the identification process.

An Overview of Assessment

The assessment process looks more carefully at the decision points that the identification process has targeted to determine how DMC is created or amplified, specifying the mechanisms at work in a particular jurisdiction. The outcome of the assessment study should result in an understanding of the DMC process that will permit policymakers to make choices about strategies for reducing DMC.

To accomplish this purpose, the authors suggest a multistage investigative process:

Stage 1: Generate possible explanations. At this stage, the starting point is to choose specific stages, groups, and jurisdictions to explore. This is the likely outcome from the identification stage. Using community leaders, agency personnel, and key informant processes, analysts should generate a set of plausible/possible explanations for the level of DMC observed in the jurisdiction (by stage and racial/ethnic group) for the targeted stages, groups, and jurisdictions.

**About the authors:* Michael Leiber, Ph.D., is a professor in the Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia. Dorinda Richetelli is Vice President at Spectrum Associates in Avon, Connecticut. William Feyerherm, Ph.D., is Vice Provost of Research at Portland State University in Portland, Oregon.

Stage 2: Identify the types of data and the pattern of results needed. These should be consistent with the possible explanations and will distinguish between the possible explanations.

Stage 3: Obtain the data. Identify sources of the needed data, focusing on those that are most readily available and suitable for comparison over multiple time periods. If data sources are available, make sure that you know how the data are collected and what each data item actually means. If the needed data are not available, then develop plans to collect them. You could use existing files, collect additional data, or develop a hybrid model in which you collect additional/supplemental data on a periodic basis.

Stage 4: Analyze the data and identify the most likely mechanism(s) creating DMC in this jurisdiction. Conduct the analyses according to the patterns you expect to emerge (stage 2). Examine the data analysis to see whether the patterns you have observed are consistent with possible explanations. If the data results are consistent with more than one explanation, you may need to plan additional analyses that may help distinguish between options. Develop feedback methods for taking the data results back to the community and key informants to verify the interpretations and begin the process of selecting interventions.

Stage 1: Generating Possible Explanations: Mechanisms Leading to DMC

To assess and address DMC issues, jurisdictions must explore and identify the mechanisms by which DMC is created. This section will explore the major mechanisms that the research literature has identified, briefly explain the means by which each mechanism operates, and provide some simple examples of the mechanism. The authors will then return to the full list to describe the pattern of Relative Rate Index (RRI) values that you might expect to find if this mechanism is at work and, finally, provide some ideas of the types of assessment work and analysis that might lead to greater confidence that a particular mechanism was actually a significant contributor to DMC in a specific jurisdiction. The material that follows is a partial list of mechanisms found in the research literature. The list is modified from the OJJDP-funded Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) publication *Seven Steps To Develop and Evaluate Strategies To Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)* by Ashley Nellis, available at www.jrsa.org/jjec/about/dmc_guidebook.html.

You may wish to use the list as a stimulus to practitioners, policymakers, and community members as they think about how their juvenile justice system operates and examine possible methods by which DMC is introduced into their system. These activities should generate a listing of mechanisms for this specific community to explore.

Differential Behavior

The research literature raises the possibility that the rates at which youth from various racial and ethnic subgroups are involved in delinquent activity may differ (e.g., Lauritsen,

2005). Differing rates of involvement is not a universal phenomenon, nor is it presented here to suggest that disproportionate contact is acceptable. As the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act specifies, one of the means of addressing DMC is through prevention activities, which may not only address DMC but also provide substantial benefits to children and youth generally. Several forms of differential behavior are plausible contributors to DMC, including:

- Involvement in a different set of offense categories (often including more serious activities such as possession or sale of controlled substances), involvement in gang-related activity, and more frequent involvement in offenses generally and in offenses with higher levels of severity.
- Involvement in delinquent activities at an earlier age.
- Involvement with other social services or justice-related systems, such as the child welfare system (dependency or neglect cases). It is noteworthy that many other social services systems are also establishing initiatives or standards related to cultural competency and issues similar to DMC, thus providing the opportunity for cross-system collaboration in addressing issues of racial or cultural disparities.

Mobility Effects: Importation/Displacement

One of the realities of modern life is easy access to automobiles and other means of mobility, so that youth who reside in one community may, in fact, spend considerable time in other jurisdictions. While present in those other jurisdictions, it is possible that youth may commit delinquent behavior, resulting in their being arrested and, perhaps, processed further in a jurisdiction other than their own home area. When arrest statistics are compared to census statistics on juvenile population, which are based on the area of residence, the result may be that the rate of juvenile arrests in one area may appear either higher or lower than would be expected. Several forms of such mobility-related DMC have been observed.

Seasonal Mobility

Seasonal mobility occurs when a community has an influx of juveniles during a particular season, frequently either a holiday season (spring break) or a vacation season (summer break). A community may be a destination for many families or youth; depending on the patterns of movement, this may result in higher numbers of youth of color in a community than were recorded in census estimates. For example, many resort communities draw youth from larger urban areas during school holidays. That influx will temporarily change the demographic composition of the juvenile population. As an extreme example, one midwestern county discovered that the arrests of African American youth exceeded the total number of youth estimated in the census as county residents. Further exploration suggests that this county serves as a summer retreat destination for many families, which has the impact of substantially increasing the number of African American youth in the community during the summer.

Attractive Nuisance

Attractive nuisance is a term that might be applied to a number of commercial or entertainment areas, particularly in urban settings. For example, a shopping mall or entertainment facility may be located in a suburban community or an urban neighborhood that has lower proportions of minority residents but draws youth from across an urban area. It is likely that the demographic profile of youth in such a location reflects a higher proportion of minority youth than does the census estimate for the area immediately surrounding the facility.

Immigration- and Migration-Related Mobility

Immigration- and migration-related mobility may have an impact on communities to create higher levels of DMC, particularly where policies of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS, formerly Immigration and Naturalization Service) are a major concern. To the extent that jurisdictions detain Hispanic (or other) youth suspected of illegal immigration, DMC numbers are likely to be affected. Moreover, as networks of illegal behavior become more organized and youth from other countries join as participants, DMC numbers may be exacerbated. For example, in one community that monitors RRI numbers, the juvenile agency noticed increasing RRI values for Hispanic youth at the detention stage. The agency generated a list of possible factors, including concerns such as availability of interpretive services, availability of alternative programs, staffing changes, etc. When the agency presented this list to its advisory council, one judicial officer noted that she had seen several cases involving youth from another country who were explicitly brought to the United States as runners for drug trafficking. Upon further exploration, it became clear that there were multiple examples of this phenomenon and that when such youth were excluded from the activity counts, the RRI values were reduced for Hispanic youth. Such a finding provides an opportunity for collaboration between the juvenile justice system and both prevention workers and other agencies concerned with such activity.

Institutional Effects

Institutional effects may occur when a jurisdiction provides residential or detention capacity for a number of other jurisdictions. For example, if a county operates a regional detention facility, then it might appear that its volume of detention activity is higher than in surrounding counties, and if the county includes these nonresident youth in its RRI calculation, it might create erroneous results. This artificial effect is usually eliminated by calculating detention activity or residential placements based on the county making the commitment placement, not the county physically holding the youth.

Indirect Effects

“Indirect effects” is a broad term that reflects the fact that in this society, economic status, education, location, and a host of risk factors associated with delinquent behavior, among other factors, are linked with race and ethnicity. These factors, in turn, are related to delinquent activity or to other forms of contact within the justice system. Thus, the

impact of race or ethnicity is not direct but is “indirect” through these third factors. Those effects in terms of DMC issues are at least threefold:

Specific Risk Factors

Specific risk factors, which are correlated with race or ethnicity, may lead to differential offending issues. Risk factors such as poor school performance or living in disorganized neighborhoods are more likely to occur to minority youth, putting them at a greater risk of system involvement. As an example, Sampson (1987) discovered that male unemployment is related to family disruption, a risk factor related to delinquency rates, thus creating a set of links with particular impact on African American youth.

Programming Access/Eligibility

Access to or eligibility for programming (public or private) may be affected as well. For example, access to some forms of behavioral health or substance use treatment is often contingent on medical insurance coverage. That coverage is, in turn, often contingent on economic circumstances, which places many minority families at a disadvantage in obtaining such services. The use of alternative private schools as a preventive measure is also highly related to economic circumstances, again creating a link to race and ethnicity. Juvenile justice decisionmakers report that, in some situations, the only way they can obtain needed treatment services for minority youth is to commit them to state custody, thus adding to the DMC levels for that community.

Decisionmaking Factors

Decisionmaking factors used within the juvenile justice system may be linked to race and ethnicity. For example, a number of studies have indicated that juvenile justice decisionmakers respond differently to youth from an “intact” two-parent family setting than to youth from a single-parent home. A greater proportion of minority youth in those justice systems lived in single-parent households or other family structures that created a difference in handling within the justice system (Bishop and Frazier, 1996). Thus, what appears to be a decision based on relevant factors made in “good faith” may still contribute to DMC. An alternative may be to expand the search to look for an adult willing to take responsibility for the youth, thus reaching past the two-parent home to examine the capacity of other family structures.

Differential Opportunities for Prevention and Treatment

The allocation of prevention and treatment resources within communities is seldom uniform or universally accessible across the entire community. In some instances, those allocations create a disadvantage for minority youth. This can occur in at least four ways:

Access

Access may be limited by geography, hours of operation, or other means. For example, if a program is located in an area of a community that is not accessible through public transportation, the unintended outcome may be that only families who have access to

private automobiles may participate. If a program is structured so that it is available only during normal working hours, then youth whose parents cannot leave their place of employment during work hours may be unable to participate. If a program is not located in those sections of a community with high concentrations of minority youth, then minority youth are less likely to access it.

Eligibility

Eligibility criteria may be used in many programs to define a set of youth most likely to benefit from the program or to exclude those youth that program leaders believe will likely disrupt the program or otherwise be less likely to benefit from the program resources. Some of those eligibility criteria may work to the disadvantage of minority youth. For example, drug court or mental health programs may have entry criteria that exclude youth with some types of prior delinquency or other histories. These criteria may be more likely to exclude minority youth. When such criteria are evidence based, they may suggest other intervention strategies to address DMC (e.g., to work on the factors that lead to these eligibility criteria differences).

Implementation

Implementation characteristics may play a role in encouraging or discouraging minority youth participation. The physical tone of a facility may be inviting or discouraging, may indicate an appreciation of multiple cultures, or may be sterile and institutional. Staff attitudes and demeanor may be welcoming or the opposite. For those youth who do not speak English, the lack of materials and interpretive services in their own language may create barriers to participation. These and other attributes may affect a program's capacity to retain minority youth participation over time, which is important to achieving the intended prevention or intervention outcomes. As an example, examination of an intervention program to improve the social skills and employment opportunities of troubled African American delinquent males "one step away from the state training school" revealed that these youth were not likely to complete the 4-month program because the lead staff members were neither African American nor male. In this instance, the characteristics of staff seemed to be critical to success with minority clients. This does not, of course, mean that such an impact will occur for all programs or all youth, simply that implementation characteristics need to be considered when differential success is present.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the capability to achieve intended outcomes. Many prevention or treatment programs have been developed initially with a particular group of youth in mind, often white youth. Whether the prevention/treatment model is sufficiently culturally adapted or neutral is a question that is frequently noted in the compilation of evidence-based programs, such as the OJJDP *Model Program Guide*. The issue for examination in DMC is whether the program outcomes (e.g., prevention) are accomplished at equal rates for youth of differing racial and cultural backgrounds.

Differential Processing or Inappropriate Decisionmaking Criteria

Differential processing or inappropriate decisionmaking criteria can be an issue in determining program eligibility, implementing diversion programs, and selecting alternative decision outcomes. The fundamental questions are:

- What are the bases or criteria on which decisions are made?
- Are those criteria applied consistently across all groups of youth?
- Are the criteria structured in a manner that places some groups at a disadvantage?

As an example of such issues, consider the use of the term “gang-related,” which is frequently cited as a factor in decisions about how to handle juveniles. To assess its impact, it is important to know how a jurisdiction defines the term, how it is created, and whether the question about being gang related is only asked for youth from certain areas of the community. If so, then use of this criterion likely will place minority youth at some disadvantage relative to white youth, especially white youth from areas of the community not believed to be gang affected. As another example, consider the use of “family” in some detention decisions. It is common to find that one of the criteria for releasing a youth from custody is that a family member must be willing to retrieve the youth. But if the definition of family member extends only to a parent, then the youth from a single-parent home is at a disadvantage. Moreover, the youth who is living with a brother or sister, an aunt or uncle, a grandparent, or other adult is at a disadvantage in such a situation. In many jurisdictions, minority youth are more likely to live in these alternative living arrangements; therefore, the way in which the decision criteria are structured may place such youth at a disadvantage in terms of consideration for being released from detention (or not held in detention at all). A last example centers on the requirement by states that before a youth may participate in diversion at intake, he or she must admit guilt. Although the criterion itself may be racially neutral, studies have raised questions concerning the extent to which minority youth, because of past discriminatory practices and/or distrust of the juvenile justice system, are more likely not to admit guilt and, therefore, are less likely to be involved in diversion than white youth (e.g., Leiber, 1994).

Justice by Geography

Justice by geography concerns the concept that youth in general, and minority youth in particular, may be processed or handled differently in one jurisdiction than in another within the same state. Differing responses may occur based on whether the youth was processed in an urban versus a rural setting or an urban versus a suburban setting, differences in resources (availability of diversion services), or differences in operating philosophies between jurisdictions (for instance, how a jurisdiction defines “accountability” for youthful misconduct or whether a jurisdiction uses deterrence as a primary rationale for system action as opposed to other philosophies of public safety) (e.g., Bridges and Steen, 1998; Feld, 1991). For example, in Iowa, a study discovered that in one jurisdiction, the juvenile court adhered to an ideology of juvenile accountability and racial stereotyping of African American youth as being more delinquent and in need of intervention. This resulted in blacks being subjected to different case processing and

case outcomes than similarly situated whites. In another jurisdiction, the juvenile court espoused a strong emphasis on *parens patriae* at a time when multiple minority groups were moving into the area and local perceptions held that these groups did not adhere to middle-class standards of dress, demeanor, marriage, and respect for authority. As a consequence, the court responded to minority youth differently than white youth (Leiber, 2003). Another example of justice by geography can occur when minority youth in a large jurisdiction (e.g., a state) are concentrated in areas or jurisdictions (communities) where rates of processing differ from those prevalent in other portions of the larger jurisdiction. The end result is that minority youth are more likely to live in jurisdictions where higher rates of contact with the system occur; therefore, in the aggregate state-level calculations, minority youth are more likely to have high rates of system contact compared with white youth who live in other jurisdictions. A similar explanation can lead to lower levels of DMC when minority youth live in jurisdictions in which lower levels of system processing occur.

The essential characteristics of justice by geography involving the last example are twofold:

- Jurisdictions have a wide variation in the rates of juvenile justice system activity.
- The geographic distribution of minority youth populations correlates strongly with the variation in rates of juvenile justice system activity.

A further explanation of these characteristics emerges from the following example. In one midwestern state, researchers were discussing the results of the identification process with probation supervisors. One astute supervisor noted that the RRI values at the state level were higher than the values for any of the counties in the state. The explanation was that the jurisdictions in which minority youth live in that state were also the jurisdictions that had higher rates of juvenile justice activity (e.g., arrest, detention, prosecution, etc.). As a result, the minority youth in that state not only experienced a higher level of contact than their counterparts within their own community, but, compared with white youth in other sections of the state, their rates of juvenile justice system contact/activity were much higher.

The identification of justice by geography as a mechanism leading to DMC is particularly difficult in a system of government that embraces local variation and adaptation. The recognition that these variations may have unintended consequences may lead to discussions within and across jurisdictions about the basis for local variations in practice. This does not mean that any particular local practice is “wrong,” simply that policymakers need to be aware of the consequences of the differences in policy and practice across communities.

Legislation, Policies, and Legal Factors With Disproportionate Impact

Policies enacted through legislation or through administrative action may sometimes contain elements that create a disadvantage for minority youth. These disadvantages may

occur for a variety of reasons, but the most common are those that target some specific aspect of delinquent behavior, those that target specific locations, and those that use prior delinquent or criminal history as an element of the policy. As examples, consider the following:

- **Policies that target certain types of offenses or offense characteristics may have a disproportionate impact on minority youth.** For example, statutes that define drug offenses tend to treat crack cocaine more seriously than powdered cocaine, which, given the usage patterns for the two forms of cocaine, creates a disadvantage for minority youth. Likewise, policies that treat gang activity more seriously than comparable activity by nongang members may place minorities at a disadvantage based on greater likelihood they will be perceived as gang involved.
- **Policies that target location issues (e.g., certain types of offenses near schools or public housing areas) may place minority youth at a disadvantage given the location characteristics.** For example, an Illinois automatic transfer law mandates that 15- and 16-year-old youth charged with a drug offense that occurs within 1,000 feet of a school or public housing project are automatically tried in adult court. Although white youth use and sell drugs at similar or higher rates than youth of color, the impact of the law has almost wholly affected African American and Latino youth (www.buildingblocksforyouth.org/illinois/). As another example, Portland, Oregon, has an ordinance permitting police to exclude an individual from specified drug- or prostitution-“free” zones. Individuals violating that exclusion order are subject to arrest for trespassing. Since those zones are in portions of the city with the highest proportions of minority residents, it is not surprising that the ordinance creates DMC results.
- **Policies that mandate specific handling (e.g., moving a case to adult court) may have eligibility or threshold criteria based on prior delinquency or offense histories.** The use of criteria such as “three strikes” may place a minority youth at a higher risk of application of such sanctions when minority youth as a category have more extensive records of justice system contact (e.g., Feld, 1999; Bishop, 2005).

This is not to say that all such policies or practices that result in differences in treatment are necessarily wrong or need to be modified. What is suggested is that if such policies result in accentuating DMC, then policymakers, analysts, and community members should be aware of those consequences and ensure that the policies are well founded and that the jurisdiction considers whether to continue those policies, end them, or seek to modify them in order to address DMC effects.

In some communities, for example, an intentional decision to reduce gang activity may result in an increase in DMC measures, which is predicted and understood as a consequence of that public safety objective. The point is not to expect to eliminate all such disparate impacts at once, but rather to examine and monitor these impacts when they occur to ensure that public safety, rehabilitation of gang members, and fair juvenile justice system response all are kept in an intentional balance. For example, although a short-term increase in DMC may be likely to result from a gang-suppression initiative,

the long-term expected outcome of a comprehensive and balanced approach would be reduced levels of DMC.

Accumulated Disadvantage

One of the more disturbing aspects of the DMC issue is that the impact on minority youth as a group tends to accumulate, rather than dissipate, through the system. This phenomenon is displayed in at least two different ways.

Simple Accumulation

There may be a higher rate of arrest for minority youth, followed by a lower rate of diversion, higher rates of formal processing as delinquent, etc. In most stages of the juvenile justice system, minority youth (particularly black and Hispanic youth) appear to receive handling that is either harsher than their white counterparts or equal to their white counterparts. Thus, although the differential treatment at any particular stage may appear “small,” the cumulative impact across the entire juvenile justice system may be relatively large. The impact here is essentially equivalent to compound interest—a 10-percent difference in volume of activity (RRI value = 1.10) that occurs at each of eight decision stages in the juvenile justice system will accumulate into a rate of DMC that is more than double the level of overall contact for that minority group.

Impacts On Later Decisions

Another example where race and ethnicity may work indirectly through factors that influence decisionmaking is the impact of earlier stages on later stages of the justice system, such as the impact of pre-adjudicatory detention. Studies have indicated that decisions made at earlier stages, such as detention, affect outcomes at later stages and, in particular, judicial disposition. That is, detention strongly predicts more severe treatment at judicial disposition. Although minority youth and white youth who have been detained may be treated similarly, because the former group is more likely to be detained, they receive more severe dispositions than do their white counterparts. Consequently, race or ethnicity may not directly influence judicial disposition, but its effects may be masked, operating through a racially linked criterion of pre-adjudicatory detention (e.g., Leiber, and Fox, 2005).

Stage 2: Identifying Data Types and Expected Results

Once the team has identified a short list of potential mechanisms that it will explore, the next task is to identify the types of data and results that might be expected to be consistent with those hypothesized mechanisms. The logic here is not to prove that a particular mechanism is at work, but rather to explore the possibility that it is at work and to rule out those mechanisms that have less support and are not consistent with the data available in the jurisdiction. The table on pages 12–14 summarizes the types of data needed and the types of data patterns you might expect for each mechanism.

Most of the data types and patterns are based on the expectation that the jurisdiction has some form of database available that can provide refined information. In the examples noted above with respect to the importation mechanism, to test this mechanism, one would first examine the RRI values based only on cases involving residents of the jurisdiction. For example, if an attractive nuisance is expected to draw youth from outside the county, then assessing the RRI values when calculated only for youth residing in the county should provide a much lower RRI value (closer to 1.00). You can conduct that analysis only if the county has a database that includes information on whether a youth is a resident of the county. Likewise, examining geographic access requires that the county locate both the residences of the youth and the location of programs.

Three general types of data are suggested in the following table. The first is termed RRI-level data, which means the ability to create volume counts for subsets of cases, as in the examples in the preceding paragraph. The second is termed case-level data, which implies the ability to examine attributes of specific cases and combine them in tabular form. For example, in the assessment of differential opportunities for prevention or intervention programs, issues of program retention and completion are noted. Those issues will require (1) specific data about juvenile cases referred to such programs and (2) an ability to count the cases (youth) who enter, stay, and complete the programs. The third level of data is termed transactional data; this means data systems with the ability to track individual cases through multiple stages in the juvenile justice system and attach many attributes of the youth to the data—for example, any of the items considered under the heading of indirect effects.

If a community does not have a data system adequate to provide the needed information, it will have to design methods to create or acquire data with those characteristics for the assessment process. Because it is anticipated that many communities are likely to fit this description, a subsequent section of this chapter discusses the design of methods for gathering such data.

It is also likely that some communities will have database systems that can address many, but not all, of the analyses projected here. For such communities, it may make sense to use their database systems to move as far as possible in the assessment process and then supplement those findings with additional data collection and analysis strategies along the lines of those suggested in the sections on stage 3 and stage 4.

Data Types and Expected Patterns Resulting From Various Mechanisms That Create DMC

DMC Mechanism	Data Type and Analysis	Data Pattern Expected
1. Differential Behavior		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different offense categories. • More frequent involvement. • Involvement at an earlier age. • Involvement with other service systems. 	<p>Transactional data, multivariate analysis, or multiple controls in cross-tabulations to explore RRI subsets.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High correlation of offense type, age at first offense, or other system involvement with race or ethnicity. • When multivariate analysis is conducted and the variables representing offense type, age at first offense, or other system involvement are used as control variables, the correlation of race/ethnicity with system contact stages is significantly reduced, <i>or</i> • When subsets with similar characteristics are tested, the RRI value is reduced.
2. Mobility Effects: Importation/Displacement		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal mobility. • Attractive nuisance. • Immigration and migration. 	<p>Case-level data with information about residence of youth, nationality, and seasonality.</p>	<p>When RRI scores are calculated based only on resident youth, the RRI values should be substantially lower than the values calculated for all youth. If seasonal mobility is expected, then the nonresident cases will cluster within expected date/time slots.</p>
3. Indirect Effects		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific risk factors. • Access and eligibility for programming. • Decisionmaking factors. 	<p>Transactional data with information on characteristics thought to result in the indirect effects (e.g. economic status, family structure, detention status).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High correlation of the variables believed to carry the indirect effects with race/ethnicity. • When multivariate analysis is conducted, the correlation of race/ethnicity with system contact stages is significantly reduced, <i>or</i> • When subsets of cases with similar characteristics are tested, the RRI value is reduced. <p style="text-align: right;">(continued)</p>

Data Types and Expected Patterns Resulting From Various Mechanisms That Create DMC (continued)

DMC Mechanism	Data Type and Analysis	Data Pattern Expected
4. Differential Opportunities for Prevention, Treatment		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access. • Eligibility criteria. • Implementation characteristics. • Effectiveness. 	<p>Case-level data with information about program entry, retention and outcomes, residential location.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program utilization rates for services differ by race/ethnicity; geographical mapping of service locations does not correspond with locations of minority youth. • Stated eligibility criteria are correlated to race/ethnicity within the pool of those who might participate in the program. • Program retention/ completion data are correlated with race/ethnicity among those who enter the program. • Qualitative studies of the program climate, customer satisfaction studies of participants, and those who do not complete the programs show racial/ethnic differences. • Outcome measures among program completers are correlated with race/ethnicity.
5. Differential Processing/Decisionmaking Criteria		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the criteria on which decisions are made? • Are those criteria applied consistently? • Are the criteria stated to create disadvantage? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transactional data with information about the variables or items that may be used as decision criteria. • Multiple regression or cross-tabulations with controls. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expected criteria are closely related to decision outcomes. • The criteria are related to race/ethnicity within the set of cases eligible for each decision. <p align="right">(continued)</p>

Data Types and Expected Patterns Resulting From Various Mechanisms That Create DMC (continued)

DMC Mechanism	Data Type and Analysis	Data Pattern Expected
6) Justice by Geography		
Differences in localities may exist in terms of crime, detection and court referrals, case proceedings and outcomes, and development and use of services that may be the result of factors unique to localities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transactional or case-level data with information on characteristics thought to impact case outcomes. • Multivariate analysis or multiple controls in cross-tabulations RRI-level data. 	<p>Compare jurisdictional case outcomes and identify various structural characteristics of communities and organizational characteristics of the juvenile court, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jurisdictions have a wide variation in the rates of juvenile justice system activity. • The geographic distribution of minority youth populations correlates strongly with the variation in rates of juvenile justice system activity.
7. Legislation, Policies, Legal Factors		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies about offense types or characteristics. • Policies about location issues. • Policies that mandate specific handling. 	Case-level data showing who is affected by the policies and who is not.	Impact rates (cases that the policies affect) are greatly different by race/ethnicity.
8. Accumulated Disadvantage		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simple accumulation. • Impacts on later decisions. 	RRI-level data, transactional data including race/ethnicity and the outcomes of multiple decisions within the juvenile justice system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low RRI values at most decision points, all in the direction that indicates disadvantage for minority youth. • Decisions early in the system, especially detention, will be strongly correlated to later decisions.

Stage 3: Obtaining the Data

The extent of DMC and the contributing factors varies by state and within individual jurisdictions. Recognizing this, OJJDP encourages states and localities to develop innovative approaches to conduct the assessment. A DMC assessment, however, must resolve several methodological issues, including which jurisdictions and decision points and what type of research design and data or subjects are most appropriate and feasible. Before addressing these methodological issues, this section discusses the need for state and local DMC committees to plan and collaborate with researchers on the DMC assessment study before, during, and after it is undertaken.

Planning

The process of planning should be examined from at least two perspectives: that of the state or local agency, and that of the persons or groups conducting the assessment study.

State and/or Locality Perspective

The DMC lead agency typically coordinates DMC activities statewide and gets local decisionmakers and other community representatives involved at both the state and local levels. This collaboration between state and locality is extremely important in the assessment phase. The information needed to conduct the assessment can be quite extensive and often crosses agency lines, so it is imperative that key agency personnel participate in the process from the start. These individuals will know what the data are, what problems might exist with the data, and what barriers interested parties may face when attempting to access the data. Further, DMC tends to be an emotional issue, and, with its emphasis on causes, some may view the assessment phase as a mechanism for placing blame or attempting to enact quotas. Therefore, participation of key personnel at the onset can help alleviate these concerns and facilitate the collection of the data. Thus, there is a need from the start to discuss and identify who the key actors and agencies are and to map a strategy to involve them before any assessment study is conducted.

Once central personnel are on board, a committee should discuss issues that pertain to the cost of the study, what should be studied, what kind of assessment study should be conducted, and what the process will be for recruiting someone either internally (inhouse) or externally (such as an agency or a university) to conduct the study. The committee should examine past assessment research that has been conducted locally as well as national studies to provide direction for the proposed study in terms of what kind of assessment may be needed and the skill needed to conduct the research.

In the past, few state planning agencies, state advisory groups, or DMC subcommittees (state or local) possessed, inhouse, the technical expertise to conduct a formal assessment study. A formal study generally involves both quantitative and qualitative techniques that include following the same youth from initial contact with the police or the juvenile court to a final case outcome. The use of multivariate analyses is also incorporated to examine the relationships of many factors (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, crime type, crime severity,

etc.) at one time on decisionmaking. Because of the complexities of a formal assessment study, many states and localities choose to contract with other agencies, organizations, or universities that possess the needed qualifications.

Ideally, an assessment study should examine as many decisionmaking stages as possible with relevant independent variables and the use of multivariate procedures. This kind of assessment study takes into consideration decisionmaking as a process and attempts to emulate the factors that influence case proceedings. If data and resources are not available to conduct such a detailed assessment study, states and/or localities, with input from the researcher, may decide to conduct a study that focuses only on those decision points with the highest RRI values, to include fewer independent variables, or to exclude multivariate analysis. While reducing the decision points examined, reducing the data elements included, or excluding multivariate analysis will reduce the time and resources needed to conduct the study, the results of the study will likely inspire less confidence than a more robust study.

Regardless of what kind of assessment study the committee plans, jurisdictions should consider naming a person who is involved in the research as a member of the DMC committee. This provides the committee access to information on the progress of the assessment study and the chance to benefit from the experiences and knowledge of the person or group conducting the research.

In addition to discussions concerning the specifics of the assessment study, the committee should also focus on issues involving the delivery of the final product. Things to consider are a period of time to provide feedback on drafts prior to the completion of the writeup of the findings, at a minimum a final report that includes not only the results but recommendations, and oral presentations to the committee as well as to the state advisory group.

OJJDP encourages the state and/or locality to contact the Office to address issues that may arise concerning the planning phase of the assessment research. Some states and localities, for example, have requested technical assistance to help in the planning phase.

DMC Assessment Researchers

Many of the same things discussed with regard to planning for the state and DMC subcommittees apply to the researcher(s) considering undertaking the assessment study. In addition to those concerns, the DMC researcher should be clear about what the committee wants and expects. In most instances, the state and DMC subcommittees will rely on the researcher for input and direction for what should be done and how the assessment can be conducted.

Besides the expertise that the researcher may possess, it is imperative that he or she also examine previous assessment studies to help in the process of planning the research and working with the state and/or localities. As part of the planning, the researcher should, in conjunction with developing what is to be studied (including what type of assessment study should be conducted), work with the state and/or locality to identify the data

source(s) the researcher might need to conduct the assessment research. It is imperative that the researcher develop a thorough understanding of the workings of the particular juvenile justice system(s) to be studied. It is through this understanding that the researcher may assist the state/locality in developing a study that gets at the important issues for the system.

The committee and the researcher should discuss deliverables and timeframes early in the process. That is, what kind of report should the researcher develop and what should the researcher include in the report. Other responsibilities could include being a member of a state or local DMC subcommittee, providing oral presentations, and working with federal technical consultants.

The committee and the researcher should also discuss what responsibilities, if any, the researcher may have once the assessment research is completed. This may include such issues as who owns the data once they are collected and what can be done with the data following the completion of the assessment study. That is, can the researcher attempt to publish the assessment study and other work from the data? If so, what responsibilities does the researcher owe to the state and/or locality?

Methods

Because the extent of DMC and the contributing factors varies among jurisdictions and the data and resources available to conduct an assessment study may vary, OJJDP encourages states and localities to choose the type of assessment study that meets their needs. Irrespective of what type of assessment study a jurisdiction conducts, however, it must address several methodological issues.

Site Selection

To conduct a DMC assessment, either a formal assessment study or something less, the state, jurisdictions, or localities must decide where to focus their efforts. Although a state would ideally choose to conduct a statewide DMC assessment, financial and time limitations as well as practicality may prevent such an undertaking. Results from the RRI, census information, and crime reports should provide a guide to areas for study. For example, a jurisdiction should direct any DMC effort where it can influence the lives of as many youth as possible; therefore, those jurisdictions with a high concentration or large number of minority youth are good candidates. The site selection process should also consider other structural factors, such as urban versus rural settings, and the concentration of racial poverty and inequality (Sampson and Laub, 1993). For example, in Washington State, disproportionality was associated with urbanization and levels of violent crime and chronic offending.

While most assessment studies have focused site selection efforts exclusively on counties (Leiber, 2002), others have gone a step further and identified areas within the selected counties for assessments. Smaller units of geographical measurement can provide more helpful information for deciding on action or interventions to address DMC than larger

areas. In Pennsylvania, for example, police precinct data were obtained in the counties that had the greatest problems with minority overrepresentation to determine where the activities selected to address DMC could have the greatest impact. This type of information enabled Pennsylvania to channel resources to the localities where the greatest impact could be expected. Although dependent on the availability of resources and what the RRI reveals, site selection should include at least two to three areas, if not more, to allow for comparisons and consideration of the effects of justice by geography. What may explain DMC in one jurisdiction may not explain DMC in another.

Decision Points Selection

A number of studies have shown that minority overrepresentation may occur at any point in the system (e.g., Pope and Feyerherm, 1992; Bishop, 2005; Hamparian and Leiber, 1997; Leiber and Mack, 2003; Hsia, Bridges, and McHale, 2004). Understanding the relationships among decision points is also critical. The experiences of OJJDP's five DMC pilot states indicate that "understanding overrepresentation is a matter of understanding how a specific juvenile justice system operates, with all its interdependent parts, to result in more minority juveniles entering and penetrating further into the system" (Devine et al., 1998: 4). As discussed, the influence of race or ethnicity on any one point may be enhanced or canceled out at a following point. Thus, the assessment research should approach the juvenile justice system in a holistic manner.

Because the effect of previous decisionmaking may influence a youth's further movement into the system and because this effect may be greater for minority youth, the committee must consider multiple decision points to capture the process of decisionmaking. Examining all the significant contact points (police contact, arrest, referral to juvenile court, intake, diversion, petition, adjudication, judicial disposition, detention, transfer to adult court) will provide the greatest confidence in understanding where, how, and why DMC exists (Nellis, 2005). In most states, though, considerations of funding, time, data, and logistics prevent such a comprehensive formal assessment. If a jurisdiction must limit the scope of its research to just a few decisionmaking points, the most important determinant of the points to be studied should come from an examination of the RRIs and previous research, including past assessments. In addition, states may try to use answers from questions concerning why DMC exists to aid in the determination of what stages to examine.

Research Design

Most states and localities have relied on either quantitative or qualitative research designs to conduct their assessments (Pope and Leiber, 2005). Quantitative data are in the form of numbers, such as the number of referrals to nonsecure facilities or the number of youth arrested. Quantitative studies are used when statistically reliable results are desired. Qualitative data are used to gather indepth information about something but do not provide statistically reliable results. Qualitative data are often in the form of words or text, not numbers, e.g., a description of the decisionmaking process the juvenile probation officer uses or the text of written policies and procedures.

Results from a quantitative study typically allow for more generalizations concerning decisionmaking practices and procedures than those obtained from a qualitative study. On the other hand, a qualitative approach can provide better insights and allow for a meaningful interpretation of quantitative data. To understand why DMC exists, both quantitative and qualitative data must be examined.

Quantitative Research Design

To undertake a quantitative study, researchers must consider a number of factors.

Sampling

Depending on a variety of factors, a researcher may not want to examine every case processed in the juvenile court or every police-youth contact but instead may choose a subset or sample of those cases, especially if the jurisdiction in question processes a large number of cases in the specified timeframe. The sampling technique the researcher will use depends, to a large degree, on the decision points to be examined, as well as the number of cases processed or size of the juvenile court. If, for example, the research examines the police decision to arrest, the researcher must ensure that the available data are representative of police contacts with minority youth: there must be an adequate number of cases for each type of police decisionmaking outcome (i.e., release, referral, arrest).

If the juvenile court is the target of the assessment, a researcher must first determine the number of cases to be included in the research and calculate the number of youth for each racial group to be studied. In an analysis that will examine decisionmaking across a number of decision points, it is imperative to start with an initial sample of 500 to 1,000 cases per research site. This is because, given that youth drop out from the point of intake to judicial disposition, most often only 10 percent of the cases at intake reach judicial disposition. As a result, with an initial sample of 500 to 1,000, it is likely that only 50 to 100 cases will be available at the judicial disposition stage for purposes of analysis.

Decision Points To Be Examined

Because most state assessment efforts have focused on the decisions encompassed by the juvenile court and, to a lesser degree, arrests, the following discussion centers on police and the juvenile court.

Police. Variable selection for this decision point (arrest or not arrest) requires that the researcher ask the question: What factors play a role in a police officer's decision to arrest?

- Unfortunately, many of the existing client-tracking data systems in juvenile justice do not include arrest information; the first point of contact reported in the system is usually referral to juvenile court. The type of information that law enforcement agencies routinely collect also tends to be of limited utility in conducting quantitative analyses of minority overrepresentation because they do not record many of their contacts with youth. For example, data may be available

on youth who were arrested but not on youth who came into contact with the police and were just warned and released.

- If researchers examine police case files or reports, information is needed on all police youth contacts, not merely those resulting in arrest. There is little research on the relationship between law enforcement decisionmaking and minority overrepresentation (Conley, 1994) that provides guidance on the selection of variables. The research that does exist suggests that variables must reflect certain characteristics of the youth, the situation that led to police involvement, the officers themselves, victims, the community, and how the police agency is organized (e.g., Black and Reiss, 1970; Carter, 1986; Harstone and Richetelli, 2001; Jackson, 1992; Pope and Snyder, 2003; Sampson, 1986; Smith and Visser, 1981; Smith, 1986). Examples of such variables are presented in exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1: Examples of Variables That Might Influence the Decision To Arrest

Characteristics of Youth	Officer Characteristics	Community Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race • Age • Gender • Demeanor • Family situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race • Age • Gender • Education • Length of service • Knowledge of the suspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic situation • Racial/ethnic composition • Extent of racial segregation • Status of race relations
Characteristics of Contact	Victim Characteristics	Police Agency Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of crime • Reason youth was contacted, taken into custody, or arrested • Involvement of a weapon • Place of contact • Presence of bystanders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Race • Gender • Victim's wish to press charges • Relationship between youth and victim 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police expenditures • Deployment patterns • Organization ideology

Juvenile Court. Although key decision points of the juvenile justice process may vary across the country, similarities include referral to juvenile court, diversion, detention, petition/charges filed, delinquency findings, probation, confinement in a secure correctional facility, and transfer to adult court. When the juvenile court is the subject of research, and if resources and the data allow, decisionmaking at these stages should be examined. If not, at least two or more stages should be examined.

Data/Analysis Considerations

Variables. The previous section focused on the decisionmaking points that could or should be examined. In addition to using decisionmaking data, it is important that researchers include independent variables in the assessment study. The independent variables should include the seriousness of the case (e.g., type of charge, severity of the charge, use of a weapon, victim injury) and the juvenile’s prior involvement with the juvenile justice system (e.g., prior referral, adjudication, placement), as well as “extralegal” factors such as race, ethnicity, gender, family status, etc. (e.g., Bishop and Frazier, 1988; Bridges et al., 1995; Leiber and Fox, 2005; Leiber, 2003; Sampson and Laub, 1993). In multivariate analysis, the more information on these independent factors that are included, the greater the confidence a researcher can have in the results. Examples of variables are presented in exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2: Examples of Variables That Might Influence Juvenile Court Decisionmaking

Characteristics of Youth	Characteristics of Current Offense	Community Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race • Gender • Age • Demeanor • Family situation • School situation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race • Age • Gender • Education • Length of service • Knowledge of the suspect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic situation • Racial/ethnic composition • Extent of racial segregation • Status of race relations
Prior Court Involvement		Other Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior delinquency • Severity of past disposition • Youth under authority of court at time of current offense 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperativeness of youth and family • Youth’s mental health history • Type of legal representation • Race of victim • Relationship between victim and youth

Missing Decision Points. If data that are crucial for a particular decision point are not readily available via computer records, researchers should consider manual abstraction of the data. For example, if in a particular jurisdiction, system practitioners theorize that the disparity in the use of pre-adjudicatory detention for minority and white youth is attributable to the fact that parents of minority youth are more difficult to contact, they should undertake an effort to gather that data. The police or detention staff may record whether a parent was contacted on a form even though they may not enter the information into a computer. If researchers think this issue may have a major impact on what happens to the youth, it is important that they include this information in the multivariate analysis. The analysis may reveal that it is not a significant factor in the greater use of detention for minority youth, in which case system practitioners would need to be educated. However, if it is revealed that not being able to reach a parent is a significant factor in the use of detention, then strategies could be developed to address the issue.

Defining Race and Ethnicity. Of all the pieces of information to be collected, it is perhaps most critical that “race/ethnicity” and “referral to juvenile court” be correctly and consistently defined. Many states have treated race as a dichotomy: white versus minority (Hamparian and Leiber, 1997; Pope et al., 2002). This classification of race fails to capture differences in case processing and outcomes that may exist among different minority groups, defined both in terms of racial grouping and ethnicity. Disproportionate minority arrest, secure detention, and commitment to secure corrections are not equivalent issues for all minority groups: in most states and localities, African American juveniles are arrested and confined at a greater rate than youth of other minority groups.

Defining Decision Outcomes. Similarly, the disposition at intake has been inappropriately defined, most often as release/diversion versus a recommendation for further court proceedings or petition. Putting released youth and diverted youth into one category may mask differences in the use of release and participation in diversion for whites compared with minorities. Previous research and results from state RRIs have shown that white youth are more likely to be diverted from formal court proceedings than are minority youth (Leiber and Stairs, 1999), and the failure to differentiate among these outcomes precludes an examination of this important decision. Appendix A of this chapter presents an example of a survey instrument that includes definitions of decision outcomes as well as variables that may influence juvenile court decisionmaking.

Qualitative Research Design

Although quantitative research will help a jurisdiction determine the precise decision points at which DMC may occur and the factors that may significantly impact decisionmaking, researchers can use qualitative research to develop a deeper understanding of some of the issues around DMC and decisionmaking.

Types of Qualitative Research

Typically, qualitative research includes focus groups and/or indepth interviews. Focus groups of 8 to 10 participants, lead by a moderator using a semistructured discussion guide, are brought together to discuss a particular issue. The moderator ensures that all

participants are given the opportunity to contribute to the discussion, and the group explores the various important aspects of the discussion topics. In-depth interviews are typically semistructured, one-on-one discussions between an interviewer and interviewee. Appendix B of this chapter presents an example of a semistructured interview instrument.

Selecting a Qualitative Research Methodology

There are a number of factors that the researcher must consider when determining whether to use focus groups or in-depth interviews: geography, candor/confidentiality, and cost.

Geography. Traditionally, a focus group includes participants from a small geographical area because they would all need to travel to one central location for the meeting. A study might include a series of groups to cover the various geographic areas within a jurisdiction. Some jurisdictions may have access to videoconferencing technology that makes it possible to include participants who are geographically dispersed in the same focus group.

In-depth interviews are useful when the participants are geographically dispersed, making it difficult to get many of them to a central location for a focus group. The researcher conducts the interviews one participant at a time, typically at a location that is convenient for the interviewee (e.g., his or her office). When necessary, the researcher can conduct in-depth interviews via telephone; however, it is preferable to conduct the interviews in person, as a rapport develops more easily between the interviewer and interviewee when they meet face-to-face.

Candor/Confidentiality. When conducting focus groups with system practitioners, it is most effective to hold separate groups with administration and line staff from the agencies. This will increase the comfort level of line staff so they can speak honestly and candidly about their experiences within their agency without risking on-the-job repercussions. In addition, it may be necessary to hold separate focus groups with personnel from different justice system agencies. In some jurisdictions, police officers, probation officers, and corrections officers may hold a constructive group conversation, but in other jurisdictions, the group may become a forum for the “blame game,” with each agency blaming the other for the justice system’s problems. As in-depth interviews are conducted one-on-one, confidentiality is less of an issue, assuming the interviewer gains the confidence of the interviewee.

Cost. No hard-and-fast rules exist on how many focus groups or in-depth interviews researchers should conduct for a particular study. It is always necessary to balance the issue of cost against the number of participants included in the qualitative research. Obviously, the more focus groups/interviews conducted, the greater the costs. However, it is important that the study include enough focus groups/interviews to ensure that the findings are not based only on certain geographical areas, certain types of system practitioners, or a few strongly opinionated practitioners.

There are many variables that can greatly impact the cost of conducting focus groups or one-on-one interviews. Focus groups provide the advantage of gathering information from multiple practitioners (e.g., 8 to 10) at the same time. However, if a series of groups must be conducted to cover various geographical areas, and separate groups need to be held with administrators and staff as well as different justice agencies, the number of groups can become large, greatly increasing the cost of the qualitative research.

Where the focus groups are held will have a big impact on the cost of the groups. Professional facilities equipped to handle the logistics of conducting focus groups provide a neutral environment in which to hold the discussions. Although there are obvious advantages to conducting focus groups in such facilities rather than in a conference room of a local state office building, it is more costly to do so.

One-on-one interviews involve time and travel expenses for each interview conducted. If a large geographical area must be covered, the travel expenses can add up. Although it is possible to conduct the interviews via telephone rather than in person, thereby reducing the travel costs per interview, it is more difficult to get the interviewee to talk candidly about difficult issues.

When To Use Qualitative Research

It is important to remember the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research. Its biggest strength is that it provides indepth information about issues; its biggest weakness is that there are no means of statistically assessing the confidence to place in the information. To examine DMC issues, qualitative research should typically be used with quantitative research, not instead of quantitative research.

Prior to Quantitative Research. Qualitative research can provide researchers with a thorough understanding of the juvenile justice system being examined. Although researchers can learn how a particular jurisdiction works based on a review of legislation and policy and procedure manuals, they can use qualitative research to learn how practitioners actually implement the system.

A cautionary note about using qualitative research prior to quantitative research: It is important that the qualitative research not be used to limit the scope or focus of the quantitative research. By its very nature, qualitative research includes a small number of participants. Therefore, having a small number of system practitioners determine which decision points or which areas of the jurisdiction should or should not be examined using quantitative methodologies could lead to the exclusion of important information from the study, resulting in a flawed assessment of the justice system.

After Quantitative Research. Qualitative research can be useful after quantitative research has identified specific problem areas within the juvenile justice system. Via focus groups or indepth interviews, system practitioners can provide their perspectives on what may contribute to DMC at particular decisionmaking points. In addition, researchers can ask practitioners for their suggestions on how to address the problems found. This provides an opportunity for possible solutions to come from different perspectives within the

various justice agencies (and from different levels within the agencies). Also, given that system practitioners must ultimately implement any actions developed to address DMC issues, providing them with an opportunity to make suggestions at the beginning will increase their motivation to implement the changes.

Stage 4: Analyzing the Data and Identifying the Most Likely Mechanism(s) Creating DMC

Once data are obtained, the next step is to analyze the data to determine if they fit the patterns expected in terms of the DMC mechanisms identified. The table in the discussion of stage 2 outlines many of the patterns you might expect. However, a jurisdiction and its research team must always keep an eye out for unexpected results. Just because the key system players did not identify a particular mechanism during the planning process does not mean that it is not an issue within the jurisdiction.

As noted previously, the kind of statistical analysis procedures that researchers might use depends on the level of confidence desired for the assessment findings and on the data that may be accessible for the study. Cross-tabulations and other statistical procedures that compare only two variables at a time are relatively simple to do and can provide very useful information. Because these types of statistical procedures allow for the examination of associations rather than prediction, the level of confidence in the results would be lower than would be the case with research that used multivariate procedures. For example, analysis of race by detention status may inform researchers that a relationship exists between the two. However, the effects of the severity of the charge, prior record, age, and other factors on the decision to detain are unknown. Thus, it is not possible to determine whether it is race/ethnicity and/or other legal and extralegal variables that explain the decision to detain. To increase the level of confidence, researchers may want to test for relationships beyond two-way comparisons and attempt to include as many variables as possible.

Multivariate techniques, on the other hand, make it possible to estimate the influence of a variable on a dependent variable or a decisionmaking stage while simultaneously controlling for the effects of a large number of other variables. Ordinary Least Squares Regression (OLS) and Logistic Regression are two examples of multivariate techniques. The latter procedure is the statistical technique researchers are most likely to use, because many of the decisionmaking stages can and should be expressed as a dichotomy (e.g., adjudicated delinquent versus not, detained versus not). Further, specific techniques allow researchers to explore the possibility that factors other than race and ethnicity may condition decisionmaking or work in combination with other variables. Being African American and female may have an association with case outcomes, whereas just being African American may not have such an interaction effect. The use of multivariate analyses in the form of regression also allows researchers to test for indirect racial/ethnic effects.

It is not the purpose of this section to provide a primer on data analysis, because the analyst or contractor conducting the DMC assessment will have a basic understanding of the subject. However, some nuances of this type of analysis should be described—perhaps most importantly those concerning the methods of multivariate analysis or, more specifically, conducting either regression-based analyses (i.e. logit analysis or hierarchical multiple regression) or cross-tabulations with multiple controls. In either instance the logic is similar, consisting of several simple questions:

- Does the variable (mechanism) have the hypothesized relationship to race/ethnicity?
- Does the variable (mechanism) have the expected relationship to the juvenile justice decision that is being explained?
- If the impact of that variable is held constant, does the relationship of race/ethnicity to juvenile justice system decisions become markedly reduced?

If the answer to all three items is yes, then support exists for the interpretation that this mechanism helps to explain DMC. An example may help: See exhibit 3 (the numbers presented are hypothetical; the examples are based on real situations).

Exhibit 3: Example: Detention, Access to Alternatives, and Geography

Assume that a community has a high RRI value for African American and Hispanic youth for the detention stage. After discussing the issue with law enforcement officers, detention workers, judicial staff, community agency directors, and others, the research team believes that access to detention alternatives may explain part of that high level of DMC. Researchers collect information about the location of alternative programs such as afterschool centers and other options and classify the neighborhoods in the community into those that have available options for youth and those that do not. Of the 3,000 youth referred to the court each year for possible detention intake, researchers can identify the neighborhoods in which most of them live.

In the identification stage, the researchers found results as shown in table 1, as follows:

Table 1

	Arrest Volume	Detention	Detention Rate	RRI
White	1550	218	14.06	
African-American	900	252	28.00	1.99
Hispanic	550	143.5	26.09	1.86

In examining the first question above, researchers find that the available detention alternatives definitely do not serve minority youth. As seen in table 2 below, while overall 48 percent of youth live in neighborhoods with alternative programs, only 11 percent of African American youth and 27 percent of Hispanic youth live in such neighborhoods.

(continued)

Exhibit 3: Example: Detention, Access to Alternatives, and Geography (continued)

Table 2

	Live in neighborhoods with detention alternatives?		Total	Percent yes
	Yes	No		
White	1200	350	1550	77
African American	100	800	900	11
Hispanic	150	400	550	27
Total	1450	1550	3000	48

In addressing the second question (see table 3 below), researchers find that the availability of detention alternatives is clearly related to the use of detention. Youth from the neighborhoods with available services are detained at a 10-percent rate when arrested, while those from neighborhoods not served show a 30-percent rate of detention.

Table 3

Live in neighborhoods with detention alternatives	Detained?		Total	Percent Detained
	Yes	No		
Yes	152	1298	1450	10
No	462	1088	1550	30
Total	614	2386	3000	20

Finally, to answer the third question, researchers can look at table 4, which contains all three variables: race and ethnicity, neighborhood, and detention.

Table 4

Live in Neighborhoods With Alternative Services				
	Arrest Volume	Detention	Detention Rate	RRI
White	1200	120	10.00	
African American	100	12	12.00	1.20
Hispanic	150	20	13.33	1.33
Live in Neighborhoods Without Alternative Services				
White	350	98	28.00	
African American	800	240	30.00	1.07
Hispanic	400	124	31.00	1.11

In this table, compared with the table that came from the identification process, the size of the RRI values is substantially smaller, indicating that a substantial part of the impact of race on detention is carried through the neighborhood in which the youth lives, and especially whether that neighborhood has available alternatives as a substitute for detention. In this instance, researchers would conclude that geographic access is a mechanism worth addressing in terms of DMC at the detention stage.

In reality, Multnomah County, Oregon, reached results like those in exhibit 3 when it assessed the mechanism contributing to DMC at the detention stage. In addition, researchers hypothesized other mechanisms that, in fact, supported an analysis similar to the suggestions here for the assessment phase. Not only was there a gap in the geographic availability of alternatives to detention services, but the researchers' analysis identified and confirmed two other issues. The first was related to the implementation of services in the juvenile department, specifically to the cultural competence of staff. The county used extensive training programs and intentional recruitment and hiring to increase the number of staff from racial and ethnic minority populations. Beyond that, the researchers' examination of decisionmaking criteria revealed that the criteria were not being applied with the desired level of consistency and held substantial disadvantages for minority youth.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation and others have documented the resulting interventions elsewhere. The point for this manual is that *jurisdictions should not assume that only one mechanism is at work to create DMC*. It may be very likely that the analysis will support a finding that several mechanisms are in place and that the successful intervention strategy may be one that addresses multiple mechanisms.

Once the data analysis has taken place, it is useful and necessary to describe the results to the groups who helped to identify the possible lists. This step is necessary for several reasons.

- First, it provides feedback for those groups with respect to the ideas that they generated, showing which ones appear to be supported and which ones are not supported.
- It permits clarification and testing of the explanations that are used. The objective of the assessment step is not just to collect data; it is to generate explanations for DMC that jurisdictions may use to address the issue. From that vantage point, those explanations are essentially stories about how the juvenile justice system operates. It is important to check the plausibility of those stories and explanations.
- By focusing on the plausible explanations, it may be possible to start these same groups thinking about solutions.
- Finally, by identifying the mechanisms that are at work to create DMC, one also sensitizes those working in the system to those mechanisms, serving not only to help them avoid using those mechanisms but also to make them aware of changes and help them watch for changes in the future. This may assist in the ongoing monitoring of DMC in the jurisdiction.

Conclusion

This chapter lays the groundwork for the assessment process, which means asking questions about how DMC is created within a jurisdiction and then obtaining data to validate the answers received to those questions. The objective is not to arrive at a complete sociological and psychological description of the juvenile justice system but

instead to reach a plausible understanding of the way the juvenile justice system operates and creates DMC. Ultimately, the objective of the assessment phase is to provide enough information so that jurisdictions may choose to implement DMC reduction strategies and interventions based on evidence from their own community.

References

- Bishop, D. 2005. "The role of race and ethnicity in juvenile justice processing," in *Our Children, Their Children: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in American Juvenile Justice*. D. Hawkins and K. Kempf-Leonard (eds.). The John T. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp 23–82.
- Bishop, D., and Frazier, C. 1988. "The influence of race in juvenile justice processing." *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 25: 242–263.
- Bishop, D., and Frazier, C. 1996. "Race effects in juvenile justice decision-making: Findings of a statewide analysis." *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 86:392–414.
- Black, D., and Reiss, A. 1970. "Police control of juveniles." *American Sociological Review* 35: 63–77.
- Bridges, G., Conley, D., Engen, R., and Price-Spratlen, T. 1995. "Racial disparities in the confinement of juveniles: Effects of crime and community social structure on punishment," in *Minorities in Juvenile Justice*, K. Kempf-Leonard, C. Pope, and W. Feyerherm (eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 128–152.
- Bridges, G., and Steen, S. 1998. "Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offenders: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms." *American Sociological Review* 63:554–570.
- Carter, D. 1986. "Hispanic police officers' perceptions of discrimination." *Police Studies* 9(4): 204–210.
- Conley, D. 1994. "Adding color to a black and white picture: Using qualitative data to explain racial disproportionality in the juvenile justice system." *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 31:135–148.
- Devine, P., Coolbaugh, K., and Jenkins, S. 1998. *Disproportionate Minority Confinement: Lessons Learned From Five States*. Bulletin. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Feld, B. 1991. "Justice by geography: Urban, suburban, and rural variations in juvenile justice administration." *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 82:156–210.
- Feld, B. 1999. *Bad Kids: Race and the Transformation of the Juvenile Court*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Hamparian, D., and Leiber, M.J. 1997. "Disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles in secure facilities: 1996 national report." Prepared for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Champaign, IL: Community Research Associates.
- Harstone, E., and Richetelli, D. 2001. *A Reassessment of Minority Overrepresentation in Connecticut's Juvenile Justice System*. Spectrum Associates Market Research.
- Hsia, H., Bridges, G., and McHale, R. 2004. *Disproportionate Confinement—2002 Update*. Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Jackson, P. 1992. "Minority group threat, social context, and policing," in *Social Threat and Social Control*, A. Liska (ed.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 89–102.
- Lauritsen, J. 2005. "Racial and ethnic differences in juvenile offending," in *Our Children, Their Children: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in American Juvenile Justice*. D. Hawkins and K. Kempf-Leonard (eds.). The John T. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp 83–104.
- Leiber, M. 1994. "A comparison of juvenile court outcomes for Native Americans, African Americans, and whites." *Justice Quarterly* 11:257–279.
- Leiber, M. 2002. "Disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) of youth: An analysis of efforts to address the issue." *Crime & Delinquency* 48(1):3–45.
- Leiber, M. 2003. *The Contexts of Juvenile Justice Decision Making: When Race Matters*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Leiber, M., and Fox, K. 2005. "Race and the impact of detention on juvenile justice decision making." *Crime & Delinquency* 51(4):470–497.
- Leiber, M., and Mack, K. 2003. "The individual and joint effects of race, gender, and family status on juvenile justice decision-making." *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 40(1):34–70.
- Leiber, M., and Stairs, J. 1999. "Race, contexts, and the use of intake diversion." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36:56–86.
- Nellis, A. 2005. *Seven Steps To Develop and Evaluate Strategies To Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)*. Washington, DC: Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center.
- Pope, C.E., and Feyerherm, W. 1992. *Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System: Full Report*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Pope, C.E., and Leiber, M. 2005. "Disproportionate minority contact (DMC): The federal initiative," in *Our Children, Their Children: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in American Juvenile Justice*. D. Hawkins and K. Kempf-Leonard (eds.). The John T. and Catherine MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 351–389.

Pope, C.E., Lovell, R., and Hsia, H. 2002. *Synthesis of Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC) Literature (1989–1999)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Pope, C.E., and Snyder, H. 2003. *Race as a Factor in Juvenile Arrests*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sampson, R. 1986. "Effects of socioeconomic context on official reaction to juvenile delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 51: 876–885.

Sampson, R. 1987. "Urban black violence: The effect of male joblessness and family disruption." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:348–382.

Sampson, R., and Laub, J. 1993. "Structural variations in juvenile court processings: inequality, the underclass, and social control." *Law & Society Review* 27:285–311.

Smith, D. 1986. "The neighborhood context of police behavior," in *Communities and Crime*, A. Reiss and M. Tonry (ed.). *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, vol 8. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 313–342

Smith, D., and Visher, C. 1981. "Street-level justice: Situational determinants of police arrest decisions." *Social Problems* 29:167–177.

Appendix A: Example—Youth Interview (Spectrum Associates)

Date: _____ Time Started: _____ Time Ended: _____

Youth ID: _____ DOB: _____ Gender: Male = 1 Female = 2

RACE: Black = 1 Hispanic = 2 White = 3

Town of Residence: _____

Hi, my name is _____

As you were told by the Long Lane staff when you were asked to take part in this study, I work for Spectrum Associates, which is a private research organization. I do not work for DCF, Long Lane, the police, the court, or the State of Connecticut.

We are conducting a research project to learn more about the state’s juvenile justice system and how the police, juvenile courts and Long Lane treat juvenile offenders. We hope this study will help make the system better meet the needs of youth who come into contact with police, the courts, and Long Lane.

As part of our study, we are talking with 30 kids at Long Lane.

You have my word that everything you tell me will be kept confidential. That is, our report on the study might say something like one-half of the kids we spoke with felt they were helped by Long Lane and one-half of the kids said they were not. But, it will not name anybody.

So, please answer the questions honestly. *Nobody* will see your answers.

Also, please don’t discuss this interview (either the questions or your answers) with any other kids as we don’t want their answers to be influenced.

I. GENERAL QUESTIONS (LONG LANE, POLICE, AND JUVENILE COURT)

Long Lane

1. How long have you been at Long Lane? _____ (**RECORD MONTHS**)
(**IF ASKED:** this placement only)

2. At the time you were placed at Long Lane School (for this placement):

Did you want to come to Long Lane, or 1 (GO TO Q.5)

Did you want to go to some other facility..... 2 (GO TO Q.3)

NO PREFERENCE 8 (GO TO Q.8)

3. Why didn't you want to come to Long Lane? Where did you want to go instead?

4. Did you tell your lawyer that you didn't want to go to Long Lane?

Yes 1

No..... 2 (GO TO Q. 8)

5. Why did you want to come to Long Lane?

6. Did you tell your lawyer that you wanted to come to Long Lane?

Yes 1

No..... 2

7. Which of the following was most important in your wanting to come to Long Lane?

Your friends were here..... 1

You thought the staff here could help you, or 2

You thought you would need to serve less time here than if you were placed in another facility 3

NONE, WOULDN'T ANSWER..... 9

8. How helpful has your stay at Long Lane School been so far? Would you say:

Very helpful 5

Somewhat helpful 4

Neither helpful nor harmful 3

Somewhat harmful, or..... 2

Very harmful..... 1

How has Long Lane (helped) (harmed) you?

9. Would you say that Long Lane staff:
- Treats all the kids the same, or.....1 (GO TO Q.11)
 Treats some kids better than others.....2 (GO TO Q.10)
DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.11)
10. Please tell me more about that. (**PROBE:** What types of kids are treated better and what types of kids worse? Do some types of staff treat kids better than others while others don't? How so?)
-
11. Would you say that most of the staff at Long Lane usually:
- Have been fair in how they treat you, or.....1 (GO TO Q.13)
 Have not been fair in how they treat you2 (GO TO Q.12)
DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.13)
12. What have they done that was unfair to you? Which type of staff?
-

Police

I am now going to ask you a few questions about the police.

13. Thinking back to your experiences with the police, would you say that police officers:
- Treat all the kids they stop the same, or.....1 (GO TO Q.15)
 Treat some kids better than others2 (GO TO Q.14)
DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.15)
14. Please tell me more about that. What types of kids are treated better and what types of kids worse?
-
15. Would you say that the police officers you have dealt with usually:
- Were fair in how they treated you, or1 (GO TO Q.17)
 Were not fair in how they treated you2 (GO TO Q.16)
DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.17)

16. What have they done that was unfair to you?

Juvenile Court

17. Let's switch over to juvenile court. Would you say that people at the court like the juvenile probation officer, your attorney, the prosecutor and the judge:

- Treat all the kids the same, or1 (GO TO Q.18)
- Treat some kids better than others2
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.18)**

Please tell me more about that. What types of kids are treated better and what types of kids worse? Are some types of court staff less fair than others? How so?

18. Would you say that people at the court were:

- Fair in how they treated you, or1 (GO TO Q.19)
- Not fair in how they treated you2
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.19)**

Who was unfair to you? How?

II. RACE-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

The next group of questions ask you about whether you think the juvenile justice system handles Black, Hispanic and White youth the same or differently. I will ask you questions about Long Lane first, then the police, and then juvenile court.

Long Lane

19. Overall, would you say that Long Lane staff treat Black, Hispanic and White juveniles the same or differently?

- The same1 (GO TO Q.25)
- Differently.....2 (GO TO Q.20)
- DON'T KNOW.....3 (GO TO Q.25)**

20. Who gets treated the best at Long Lane? Would you say residents that are:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White.....3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.22)**

21. Why do you feel that way? (**PROBE**: Specifically, how do they get treated better? What type of staff treats them better?)

22. Who gets treated the worst by the Long Lane staff? Would you say residents that are:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White.....3
- DON'T KNOW9 (GO TO Q.24)**

23. Why do you feel that way? (**PROBE**: Specifically, how do they get treated worse? What type of staff treats them worse?)

24a. (**HISPANIC YOUTH**) Do you think that the Hispanic staff treat you better, the same or worse than the other staff?

- Same.....1 (**GO TO Q. 25**)
- Better, or2
- Worse3

How so? _____

24b. (**BLACK YOUTH**) Do you think that the Black staff treat you better, the same or worse than the other staff?

- Same.....1 (**GO TO Q. 25**)
- Better, or2
- Worse3

How so? _____

24c. **(WHITE YOUTH)** Do you think that the White staff treat you better, the same or worse than the other staff?

- Same.....1 **(GO TO Q. 25)**
- Better, or2
- Worse3

How so? _____

Police

Let's switch to the police.

25. Overall, would you say that the police usually treat Black, Hispanic and White juveniles the same or differently?

- The same1 **(GO TO Q.30)**
- Differently.....2 **(GO TO Q.26)**
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.30)**

26. Who gets treated the best by the police? Would you say:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White juveniles3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.28)**

27. Why do you feel that way? (PROBE: Specifically, how do they get treated better?)

28. Who gets treated the worst by the police? Would you say:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White juveniles3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.30)**

29. Why do you feel that way? (PROBE: Specifically, how do they get treated worse?)

30. Overall, do you think that police officers are most likely to arrest:

- Black kids.....1
- Hispanic kids.....2
- White kids, or.....3
- the police do not consider the kid's race or ethnicity in
their arrest decisions.....4
- DON'T KNOW.....9**

Juvenile Court

Let's go back to people at the juvenile court, like the juvenile probation officer, your attorney, the prosecutor and the judge.

31. Overall, would you say that the juvenile court usually treats Black, Hispanic and White juveniles the same or differently?

- The same 1 (GO TO Q.36)
- Differently..... 2 (GO TO Q.32)
- DON'T KNOW.....3 (GO TO Q.36)**

32. Who gets treated the best by the juvenile court? Would you say:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White juveniles3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.34)**

33. Specifically, how do they get treated better? What type of court people treat them better?

34. Who gets treated the worst by the juvenile court? Would you say:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White juveniles3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.36)**

35. Specifically, how do they get treated worse? What type of court people treat them worse?

36. Overall, do you think that the juvenile courts give more severe placements and punishments to:

- Black1
- Hispanic, or2
- White juveniles3
- DON'T KNOW.....9 (GO TO Q.38)**

37. In what ways do they get harder punishments?

38. Do you think that the juvenile court is most likely to place:

- Black kids at Long Lane1
- Hispanic kids at Long Lane2
- White kids at Long Lane, or3
- the juvenile court makes no distinction in placing
Black, Hispanic and White kids at Long Lane.....4
- DON'T KNOW.....9**

LAST QUESTION

39. One last question. What do you want to do when you leave Long Lane?

I want to thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me. It was very helpful.

As you know, to show our appreciation to the kids who are helping us out on this study, each of you is receiving \$10. We have given \$10 to the staff here at Long Lane to deposit in your account You should receive a deposit receipt within a few days.

As I mentioned earlier, please do not talk to the other kids here about the questions on this interview or your answers as we don't want their answers to be influenced. I would really appreciate it.

Appendix B: Example—Juvenile Court Coding Instrument for Case Records, Iowa, 2005

- (1) Case Number (identification no.)
- (2) Study ID (sample no. coded case)
- (3) Date of proceedings
- (4) Age
- (5) Race
 - 1) White
 - 2) Black
 - 3) Other
 - 4) American Indian
 - 5) Hispanic
 - 6) Asian
 - 8) No information
- (6) Gender
 - 1) Male
 - 2) Female
 - 8) No information
- (7) Education (highest grade completed)

School Performance

- (8) School Status
 - 1) Attending
 - 2) Attending but problems
 - 3) Not attending
 - 4) Other (GED, alternative high school)
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

Family

- (9) Number of siblings (brothers/sisters)
88 No information

Parents

- (10) Mother's education (highest grade completed)
 - 88 No information
 - 99 Not applicable

- (11) Employment
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (12) If employed, type of job
 - 1) Clerical
 - 2) Craftsman
 - 3) Farmer
 - 4) Laborer
 - 5) Manager
 - 6) Operative
 - 7) Professional
 - 8) Service
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable

- (13) Father's education (highest grade completed)
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable

- (14) Employment
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (15) If employed, type of job
 - 1) Clerical
 - 2) Craftsman
 - 3) Farmer
 - 4) Laborer
 - 5) Manager
 - 6) Operative
 - 7) Professional
 - 8) Service
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable

- (16) Receiving welfare
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
- (17) Family status
- 1) Married
 - 2) Living together
 - 3) One family member present
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (18) Who is taking care of the child
- 1) Mother
 - 2) Father
 - 3) Grandmother
 - 4) Other (anything else)
 - 5) Parents
 - 6) Relatives (two present)
 - 7) Foster parents
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Independent living
- (19) Family cooperative
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

Legal

- (20) Number of prior criminal offenses
- 88) No information
- (21) Previous criminal offense type (most serious)
- 1) Theft/unauthorized use
 - 2) Burglary/breaking and entering
 - 3) Disorderly conduct/jaywalking/obstruction/criminal mischief
 - 4) Aggravated assault
 - 5) Criminal trespassing
 - 6) Receiving stolen property
 - 7) Resisting arrest/escape
 - 10) Robbery
 - 11) Carrying a concealed weapon
 - 12) Drug offense
 - 15) Simple assault

- 16) Rape/sexual assault
 - 17) Prostitution/soliciting
 - 18) Loitering
 - 19) Arson
 - 21) Forgery/fuffi
 - 22) Vandalism
 - 23) Murder
 - 24) Vehicular homicide
 - 25) Indecent exposure
 - 26) Tampering with a car
 - 27) Traffic offense
 - 28) Extortion
 - 29) Terrorism
 - 30) Cruelty to animals
 - 31) Fraudulent misrepresentation
 - 32) Failure to give assistance
 - 33) Kidnapping
 - 34) Explosives
 - 35) Alcohol
 - 36) Interference
 - 37) Delinquency by profanity
 - 38) DWLS
 - 77) Other
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable
- (22) Previous criminal offense
- 1) Simple misdemeanor
 - 2) Serious misdemeanor
 - 3) Aggravated misdemeanor
 - 4) Class A felony
 - 5) Class B felony
 - 6) Class C felony
 - 7) Class D felony
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

Prior court supervision, prior supervision (type)

Informal adjustment (type)

- (23) Just stay out of trouble
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (24) Refer to other agency
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (25) Community service
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (26) Community service (informal or formal probation)
 - 1) Park service/ maintenance service
 - 2) People service
 - 3) Both
 - 4) Other
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (27) If community service, how many hours
 - 88 No information
 - 99 Not applicable

- (28) If community service, did successfully complete
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (29) Restitution
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (30) Restitution (\$ amount), if over \$1,000 put 998
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (31) If restitution , did successfully complete
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (32) Volunteer supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (33) Length of volunteer supervision (days)
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

- (34) Official supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (35) If official supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

- (36) Intensive supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (37) If intensive supervision, number of contacts per week
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (38) If intensive supervision, method
 - 1) Phone
 - 2) In person
 - 3) Both
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (39) If intensive supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

- (40) If intensive supervision, did successfully complete
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No

- (41) Shoplifting program
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (42) If shoplifting program, did successfully complete
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (43) Education (tutoring)
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (44) If tutoring program, did successfully complete
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (45) Home of relatives (other than guardians)
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (46) Foster home/group home
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (47) Residential setting
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (48) Training school
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information

- 9) Not applicable
- (49) Was child found to be delinquent (adjudicated)
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (50) Waived to adult court
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 3) Waiver stipulation
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (51) Length of time from current situation to last involvement in juvenile court (days)
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable
- (52) Number of current criminal charges
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (53) List most serious current criminal offense
 - 1) Theft/unauthorized use
 - 2) Burglary/breaking and entering
 - 3) Disorderly conduct/jaywalking/obstruction/criminal mischief
 - 4) Aggravated assault
 - 5) Criminal trespassing
 - 6) Receiving stolen property
 - 7) Resisting arrest/escape
 - 10) Robbery
 - 11) Carrying a concealed weapon
 - 12) Drug offense
 - 15) Simple assault
 - 16) Rape/sexual assault
 - 17) Prostitution/soliciting
 - 18) Loitering
 - 19) Arson
 - 21) Forgery/fuffi
 - 22) Vandalism
 - 23) Murder
 - 24) Vehicular homicide
 - 25) Indecent exposure
 - 26) Tampering with a car
 - 27) Traffic offense

- 28) Extortion
 - 29) Terrorism
 - 30) Cruelty to animals
 - 31) Fraudulent misrepresentation
 - 32) Failure to give assistance
 - 33) Kidnapping
 - 34) Explosives
 - 35) Alcohol
 - 36) Interference
 - 37) Delinquency by profanity
 - 38) DWLS
 - 77) Other
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable
- (54) Seriousness of criminal offense
- 1) Simple misdemeanor
 - 2) Serious misdemeanor
 - 3) Aggravated misdemeanor
 - 4) Class A felony
 - 5) Class B felony
 - 6) Class C felony
 - 7) Class D felony
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (55) How many person were present when criminal offense took place (besides person that committed offense)
- 0) None
 - 1) One
 - 2) Two
 - 3) Three
 - 4) Four of more
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (56) If committed new crime, was person still under court authority
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 7) No information
 - 8) Not applicable
- (57) Violated condition of probation
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information

- 9) Not applicable

Stages

- (58) Intake
 - 1) Dismiss
 - 2) Informal adjustment
 - 3) Further court processing/petition
 - 4) Dismiss and can't locate
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (59) At intake stage was child cooperative (always answer)
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

If Informal Adjustment

- (60) Held open, no other intervention/just stay out of trouble
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (61) Refer to another agency
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (62) Community service
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (63) Community service (informal or formal probation)
 - 1) Park service/maintenance service
 - 2) People service
 - 3) Both
 - 4) Other
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (64) If community service (how many hours)
88 No information
99 Not applicable
- (65) Restitution
1) Yes
2) No
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (66) Restitution (\$ amount), if over \$1,000 put 998
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (67) Volunteer supervision
1) Yes
2) No
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (68) Length of volunteer supervision (days)
8889) No information
10000) Not applicable
- (69) Official supervision
1) Yes
2) No
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (70) If official supervision length in days
8888) No information
9999) Not applicable
- (71) Intensive supervision
1) Yes
2) No
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (72) If intensive supervision, number of contacts per week
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (73) If intensive supervision method
1) Phone

- 2) In person
 - 3) Both
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (74) If intensive supervision, length in days
 8888) No information
 9999) Not applicable
- (75) Shoplifting program
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (76) Education (tutoring)
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (77) Petition (if youth gets this far, have to answer yes or no)
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (78) Waived to adult court (if person reached this stage need to answer 1, 2, or 3)
- 1) Yes (if yes, stop now)
 - 2) No
 - 3) Waiver stipulation
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (79) Initial appearance (if yes to petition)
- 1) Contested (fights case)
 - 2) Uncontested (will not fight case)
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (80) If yes to petition consent decree (proceedings suspended/open)
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No (if no, go to variable 98)
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

If yes to consent decree, informal adjustment type

- (81) Just stay out of trouble
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (82) Refer to another agency
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (83) Community service
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (84) Community service (informal or formal probation)
 - 1) Park service/maintenance service
 - 2) People service
 - 3) Both
 - 4) Other
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (85) If community service, how many hours
 - 888 No information
 - 999 Not applicable

- (86) Restitution
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (87) Restitution (\$ amount), if over \$1,000 put 998
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (88) Volunteer supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information

- 9) Not applicable
- (89) Length of volunteer supervision (days)
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable
- (90) Official supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (91) If official supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable
- (92) Intensive supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (93) If intensive supervision, number of contacts per week
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (94) If intensive supervision, method
 - 1) Phone
 - 2) In person
 - 3) Both
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (95) If intensive supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable
- (96) Shoplifting program
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (97) Education (tutoring)
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No

- 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (98) Adjudication (here if yes to petition and no to consent decree)
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

Disposition

- (99) Straight probation
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (100) Refer to another agency
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (101) Community service
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (102) Community service (informal or formal probation)
- 1) Park service/maintenance service
 - 2) People service
 - 3) Both
 - 4) Other
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (103) If community service, how many hours
- 888 No information
 - 999 Not applicable
- (104) Restitution
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (105) Restitution (\$ amount), if over \$1,000 put 998
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (106) Volunteer supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (107) Length of volunteer supervision (days)
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

- (108) Official supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (109) If official supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

- (110) Intensive supervision
 - 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (111) If intensive supervision, number of contacts per week
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (112) If intensive supervision, method
 - 1) Phone
 - 2) In person
 - 3) Both
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable

- (113) If intensive supervision, length in days
 - 8888) No information
 - 9999) Not applicable

(114) Shoplifting program

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

(115) Education (tutoring)

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

Placement

(116) Home of relative (other than guardian)

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

(117) Group home/foster home

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

(118) Residential setting

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

(119) Training school/mental health institute

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

Detention

(120) Stage intake

- 1) Yes
- 2) No
- 8) No information
- 9) Not applicable

- (121) Where
- 1) Home detention
 - 2) Youth shelter
 - 3) Detention facility
 - 4) Combination of 1,2,3
 - 5) Jail
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (122) Initial appearance
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (123) Where
- 1) Home detention
 - 2) Youth shelter
 - 3) Detention facility
 - 4) Combination of 1,2,3
 - 5) Jail
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (124) Adjudication
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (125) Where
- 1) Home detention
 - 2) Youth shelter
 - 3) Detention facility
 - 4) Combination of 1,2,3
 - 5) Jail
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (126) Gender of probation officer
- 1) Male
 - 2) Female
- (127) Length of detention for variable 120 (time is in hours)
- 888 No information
- 999 Not applicable

- (128) Length of detention for variable 122 (time is in hours)
888 No information
999 Not applicable
- (129) Length of detention for variable 124 (time is in hours)
888 No information
999 Not applicable
- (130) If legal counsel (type at any time)
1) Court appointed
2) Obtained
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (131) For variable 77, if no petition why not
1) Out of court settlement
2) Not enough evidence
3) Moved away/ran away/joined services
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (132) Site of coding
1) Black Hawk County
2) Polk County
3) Woodbury County
4) Scott County
- (133) If no adjudication, why not
1) Out of court settlement
2) Not enough evidence
8) No information
9) Not applicable
- (134) Race of probation officer
1) White
2) Black
3) Spanish
4) Other
8) No information
- (135) Prior disposition for previous most serious offense
1) Dismissed
2) Informal adjustment
3) Adjudication
4) Waived

- 5) Adjudication and placement

- (136) If answered 5 to variable 135, then answer
 - 1) Home of relative (other than guardian)
 - 2) Group home/foster home
 - 3) Residential setting (youth shelter)
 - 4) Training school
 - 9) Not applicable

- (137) List second serious criminal offense type
 - 1) Theft/unauthorized use
 - 2) Burglary/breaking and entering
 - 3) Disorderly conduct/jaywalking/obstruction/criminal mischief
 - 4) Aggravated assault
 - 5) Criminal trespassing
 - 6) Receiving stolen property
 - 7) Resisting arrest/escape
 - 10) Robbery
 - 11) Carrying a concealed weapon
 - 12) Drug offense
 - 15) Simple assault
 - 16) Rape/sexual assault
 - 17) Prostitution/soliciting
 - 18) Loitering
 - 19) Arson
 - 21) Forgery/fuffi
 - 22) Vandalism
 - 23) Murder
 - 24) Vehicular homicide
 - 25) Indecent exposure
 - 26) Tampering with a car
 - 27) Traffic offense
 - 28) Extortion
 - 29) Terrorism
 - 30) Cruelty to animals
 - 31) Fraudulent misrepresentation
 - 32) Failure to give assistance
 - 33) Kidnapping
 - 34) Explosives
 - 35) Alcohol
 - 36) Interference
 - 37) Delinquency by profanity
 - 38) DWLS
 - 77) Other
 - 88) No information
 - 99) Not applicable

- (138) Seriousness of criminal offense
- 1) Simple misdemeanor
 - 2) Serious misdemeanor
 - 3) Aggravated misdemeanor
 - 4) Class A felony
 - 5) Class B felony
 - 6) Class C felony
 - 7) Class D felony
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (139) With the current referral, was there any mention of drugs involved
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 3) Alcohol
 - 4) Both drugs and alcohol
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (140) With the current referral, was there any mention of a weapon involved (gun, knife, stick, club, pipe)
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 8) No information
 - 9) Not applicable
- (141) Was an examination ordered
- 1) Mental health
 - 2) Substance abuse (CADS)
 - 3) Combination of 1 & 2
 - 6) No
 - 8) No information
- (142) If adjudicated, disposition sentenced to detention facility
- 1) Yes
 - 2) No
 - 9) Not applicable