

Analysis of DMC in Oklahoma Updated with the Inclusion of Self-Report Student Surveys (Updated June 2013)

Final Report

June 30, 2013

Prepared for the Office of Juvenile Affairs and the
State Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

By

Paul Ketchum PhD
University of Oklahoma

B. Mitchell Peck PhD
University of Oklahoma

Patrick Polasek PhD
Benedictine University

Sebastian Davis MSW
University of Oklahoma

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background:

First mentioned in Congressional testimony in 1986, the existence of Disproportionate Minority Confinement, later renamed as Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) to better reflect the true depth of the issue, led to policy to reduce minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system by 1992. The amended Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act requires all states that participate in the Federal Formula Grants Program to measure the extent of DMC, identify causes and put measures into place to reduce minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. Failure to implement a good faith plan may result in a loss of federal funding.

Literature Summary:

Prior research, including that conducted by this research team in 2011 for Oklahoma, consistently shows significant levels of Disproportionate Minority Contact. The extent of DMC differs by location and typically becomes more concentrated with each step in the juvenile justice system.

Research Design:

This study was divided into two sections.

1) Quantitative analysis of self-report surveys of high school students criminal activity and interaction with law enforcement professionals and analysis of police arrest records for the same area. High school students from urban, suburban and rural high schools participated in surveys. The surveys included basic demographic data, self-report deviant and criminal activity for the past thirty days, all interactions with law enforcement personnel for the same time period and a comparison of this data with local arrest records.

2) Qualitative Analysis of 176 in-depth interviews with juvenile justice system professionals. We conducted semi-structured interviews using trained interviewers. Interviews were conducted with police officers, juvenile probation officers, attorneys (DA's, Juvenile Public Defenders and private defense attorneys), and Juvenile Court Justices to examine the impact of a) subtle and/or overt bias, b) institutional/procedural bias and c) social factors which may contribute to DMC at different decision points in the juvenile justice system. Interviews were audio-recorded and sent to a transcribing agency on OU's approved list. The interview was designed to exclude identifiers. Any remaining identifiers were removed in the transcription. A final check for any identifiers was made by the PI, in every transcribed interview before coding.

We also utilized Quantitative Analysis of existing law enforcement data to determine the extent of DMC in Oklahoma-

Statistical analysis of JOLTS, Municipal Court data, comparing outcome by race and type of infraction. Municipal court data is included as a possible decision point contributing to DMC may be the decision to send juveniles to Municipal Court rather than Juvenile Court, which would then impact prior record, a well-documented contributor to DMC. The following data sets were utilized to determine the extent of DMC:

- Juvenile On-Line Tracking System (JOLTS)
- Community Disadvantage Index (CDI)

- Police juvenile arrest data
- Police crime and crime location data
- Municipal Court data referencing juvenile offenders

Summary Findings:

Surveys conducted for this report show that juvenile crime rates to be very similar for Whites and non-Whites, yet treatment of the two groups to be very different. As we used the same sample for both reported criminal activity and treatment by police, there is no doubt that differential treatment is responsible for almost all DMC. The interviews conducted with juvenile justice professionals clearly show subtle bias, largely in the form of assigning different expectations of non-White families.

Recommendations:

- Nationwide, most programs designed to minimize DMC focus on treatment of non-White youth, however, the results of this study show that the emphasis should instead address retraining/educating juvenile justice professionals.
- we recommend programs and policies designed to a) draw greater numbers of minority applicants for all juvenile justice system positions and b) encourage the development of programs and policies which encourage/reward juvenile justice professionals to live in racially/ethnically diverse neighborhoods.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	ii
I. Acknowledgements	1
II. Project Overview	2
III. Literature Review.....	3
IV. The Oklahoma Juvenile Justice System Stakeholders.....	10
V. The Oklahoma Juvenile Justice System Process	11
VI. Extent of DMC (Police, Municipal Courts and JOLTS)	14
VII. Differential Involvement: School Survey Data.....	19
VIII. Differential Treatment: Interviews with Juvenile Justice Professionals	22
IX. Conclusion and Recommendations	31
X. Notes.....	33
XI. References	37
XII. Tables.....	41

I

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team gratefully acknowledges the funding support that the project received from the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs and the support of Ms. Anna Kelly, Administrator of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Unit of the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs. The research team was very pleased to have received the support of the Office of Juvenile Affairs and this opportunity to be involved in such a worthwhile endeavor. The team also gratefully acknowledges the support of each of the school district's who participated in this study and the police departments who granted us access to their data.

This project was funded by a grant to the University of Oklahoma from the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs. All statements expressed in this report reflect the best understanding of the project results by the research team and do not necessarily reflect the position of either the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs.

Dr. Paul Ketchum served as the project's lead investigator, developed instruments for collection of qualitative data and reviewed and analyzed the results of the project. Drs. Paul Ketchum and B. Mitch Peck created the survey for the high school students. Drs. Patrick Polasek and Paul Ketchum coded interviews. Mr. Sebastian Davis prepared the original police data set made available to the research team and assisted in ensuring that critical research questions were addressed. Dr. B. Mitchell Peck prepared the data for statistical manipulation and analyzed the results.

II PROJECT OVERVIEW

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) refers to the overrepresentation of minorities at contact or decision points throughout the juvenile justice system as compared to the racial/ethnic demographics for the same area. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of race/ethnicity on the outcomes at initial police contact and further decision points within the Oklahoma juvenile justice system. The study design and the focus of this report are to assist policymakers and juvenile justice specialists in understanding and finding solutions to minority overrepresentation in the Oklahoma juvenile justice system.

As this report is a continuation of our 2012 report, we have used relevant sections from that report in this one, most notably, the analysis of existing Tulsa, Lawton and Oklahoma City data. This report will; 1) examine the extent of DMC in Oklahoma utilizing existing juvenile justice data from the three largest metropolitan areas of the state, 2) analyze in-depth interviews with juvenile justice professionals from each of those same areas, 3) conduct and analyze surveys of high school students focusing on high school students from one of the metropolitan areas and utilizing surveys from suburban and rural high schools near that urban school, for comparison and 4) analyze local police data for each high school for the same time period covered by the school surveys.

In our prior study, completed in 2012, we were able to establish the extent of DMC in Oklahoma. This updated report, which will include all steps in the juvenile justice system, will focus on initial police contact and continues the prior work by; 1) looking at the relative influence of both differential involvement (minority youth involved in crime at higher rates) and differential treatment (minority youth treated in a biased manner). We used surveys of high school students from rural, suburban and urban public school districts to determine both self-report criminal activity and self-report interaction with law enforcement personnel; 2) determine the causes of differential treatment; 3) develop effective strategies for the reduction of DMC.

III LITERATURE REVIEW

Statistics consistently show that minorities are overrepresented at each level of the juvenile justice system. However, while Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the juvenile justice system is well documented, the causes are still not fully understood. Some have suggested that DMC is simply the result of disproportionate amounts of crime committed by minority youth, while others claim that racism, be it overt, subtle, individual or institutional, plays a significant role in DMC. Regardless of the cause the result is that a disproportionate number of minorities come in contact with the juvenile justice system each year. In 2008, the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (UCR) shows that 52% of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests and 33% of juvenile Property Crime Index arrests were black youth, however black youth only accounted for 16% of the age 10-17 youth population (Puzzanchera 2009).

In 2008, the UCR data shows that 52% of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests and 33% of juvenile Property Crime Index arrests were black youth. This occurred while black youth only accounted for 16% of the youth population between the ages of 10-17. The "Juvenile Arrest 2008" document focuses on arrest data as a whole but does find minorities disproportionately "involved" in juvenile arrests (Puzzanchera 2009).

In the 1980's, black juveniles had a Violent Crime Index arrest rate 6 to 7 times greater than whites. The Violent Crime Index refers to arrests made per 1,000 juveniles in a specific group, in this case race. There was a decline in the gap between black and white juveniles arrested in the 1990's. The Violent Crime Index during this time frame was approximately 4 to 1 with black youth again being overrepresented. The racial divide in arrests began to rise in 2003. The racial disparity has now risen to 5 to 1 black youth over white youth arrests. This rise in the ratio was related to an increase in black youth arrests and a decrease in white youth arrests. The black rate increased to 24% and the white rate decreased to 3%. Looking into specific crimes, black juveniles rate increased to 56% in the robbery rate while whites juveniles accounted for 30%. In aggravated assault, black youth increased 4% and white youth decreased by 9% that creates the 5 to 1 racial disparity (Puzzanchera 2009).

In 2008, black youth represented 5% of the U.S. juvenile population (ages 10-17). Whites represented 78%, Asian/Pacific Islander 5%, and American Indian 1%. Hispanics were included with whites. Despite only representing 5% of the juvenile population, blacks were arrested for 52% of violent crimes. Whites were the second highest with 47%, followed by 1% of Asian, and 1% of American Indian of juvenile violent crime arrests. The Violent Crime Index arrest rate confirms that which was discussed earlier in this document that blacks youth are arrested 5 times the rate of white youth. Compared to other racial groups, black youth were 6 times the rate of American Indian juveniles and 13 times the rate of Asian juveniles who were arrested (Puzzanchera 2009).

Property crime showed whites with 65%, blacks with 33%, Asian with 2%, and American Indian with 1% of arrested youth. The Property Crime Index shows the rate of black youth is double that of white youth. This appears to be conflicting data because if white youth account for 65% of property crime, they should not represent half of black youth property crime. The Property Crime Index does show in multiple places a greater number of black juveniles arrested from property crimes than white juveniles. The importance of this study in relation to DMC is it shows that in both violent crime and

property crime black youth were overrepresented (Puzzanchera 2009).

Disproportionate Minority Contact is not simply a black and white issue. This is why it is important to separate Hispanics from whites to show that DMC exists for Latinos as well. In a study by Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer (1995), they found Disproportionate Minority Contact for both black and Latino youth. In the 14 counties that Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer studied, blacks represented 19% of the population and Latino's represented 4%. In terms of DMC, black youth accounted for 46% of juvenile court referrals and Latino's accounted for 7%. Minority youth also had a greater chance of being detained than white youth and were found to be overrepresented at all five stages of juvenile justice system (Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer 1995).

Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer (1995) also found that Latino juveniles were most likely to have a poor family (52%), followed by 34% of blacks, and only 12% of white youth. A really interesting piece of data was that Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer (1995) found that black youths were less likely than other races to have injured the victim. This goes against stereotypical notions for differential involvement of violent minority youth as a reason for DMC. Parent and or attorney not being present at the hearing found blacks at 19%, Latinos at 18% and whites at 11%. And perhaps one of the most disproportionate numbers comes from police department referrals. The main police department of the county referred 73% of Latino youth and 62% of black youth, while only referring 31% of white youth (Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer 1995).

In 2008, black youth represented 16 percent of the general population of youth but accounted for 30 percent of juvenile court referrals, 38 percent of youth in juvenile placement, and 58 percent of youth in adult prison (Piquero 1998). The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (2007) data shows that black youth are detained at higher rates than white and Latino youth, however Latino youth are detained at higher rate than white youths. Through the findings in The Sentencing Project, which calculated state rates of incarceration by race and ethnicity, the data shows that black youth are incarcerated at a rate of six times that of white youth, while Latino youth are incarcerated at double the rate of white youth (Piquero 1998).

The information provided so far has shown that minorities are overrepresented in the juvenile justice systems. The data shows that DMC exists at different levels and minority youth are especially susceptible to it. The following section, the literature review, will show the research that has been conducted on the possible causes of minority overrepresentation and DMC.

Agency level acknowledgement of Disproportionate Minority Contact, originally referred to as disproportionate minority representation, can be traced back to two accomplishments. The first occurred when policy makers began to understand that there was a problem with minority youth being overrepresented in the juvenile justice system, especially in confinement. In 1988, the National Coalition of State Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups had a conference that focused on this issue. The second was in the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA). The JJDPA made it policy that in order for states to receive federal resources under the JJDPA, they must address over-confinement of minority youth. This was commonly referred to as DMC or disproportionate minority confinement. The mandate passed down by JJDPA created a convergence between policy and research, which would not have occurred except for developments that were made in both these areas (Feyerherm 1995).

The first mention of a problem in minority confinement occurred in June of 1986 from the testimony of Ira Schwartz before the House Subcommittee on Human Resources. Schwartz stated, "minority youth now comprise more than half of all the juveniles incarcerated in public detention and correctional facilities in the United States" (Feyerherm 1995:7). Barry Krisberg of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency stated, "minority youth are more likely than white youth to end up in public versus private facilities and more likely to end up at the deep end of custody system" (Feyerherm 1995:8) at the same hearing that Schwartz spoke.

Based on these findings researchers investigating minority overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system initially focused solely on confinement. In 2002, however, to take account of racial differences at all stages of the juvenile justice process, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act broadened the concept from disproportionate minority confinement to Disproportionate Minority Contact (Piquero 2008).

It is important to focus on all stages of the juvenile justice process because minority overrepresentation exists at every stage as it becomes more displaced the deeper the youth gets into the system (Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer 1995; Bishop and Frazier 1996; Pope, Lovell, and Hsia 2003). This begins with the arrest. Minority youth are more likely to be arrested and charged with a felony when the arresting offense could also be considered a misdemeanor (Lockhart et al. 1991). Next, in terms of representation, minority youth are less likely to have private counsel and if in adult court less likely to be transferred back to juvenile court (Juszkiewicz 2000). Then minority youth are more likely to be placed in detention and also they are more likely to receive more severe court dispositions (Austin 1995; Feld 1995; Poupart 1995; Wordes and Bynum 1995; Snyder and Sickmund 1999; Poe-Yamagata and Jones 2000). Next, minority youth are more likely to be transferred (waived/certified) to adult criminal court and subsequently more likely to be sentenced to incarceration (Snyder and Sickmund, 1999; Males 2000; Poe-Yamagata and Jones 2000). Finally, minority youth are more likely to have their cases petitioned for court involvement and less likely to have their cases diverted for services or to be handled on a deferred basis pending completion of treatment (Bishop and Frazier 1988; Frazier and Bishop 1995; Bishop and Frazier 1996; Snyder and Sickmund, 1999; Poe-Yamagata and Jones 2000).

While the degree of DMC differs with geography (Feld 1999) and decision points (Kempf-Leonard and Sontheimer 1995; Bishop and Frazier 1996; Pope, Lovell, and Hsia 2003), the existence of DMC is well documented. The causes of DMC are less well understood. One possibility is that minority overrepresentation at any level in the justice system is simply due to minorities committing more crimes (*differential involvement*). Differential involvement in crime is a result of individual traits or choices either 1) independent of social problems or 2) attributable as a result of social problems. D'Sousa (1995) aligns himself with the first possibility when he states that those who are especially cautious of young black men are simply employing rational discrimination based on prudent statistics which use racial or ethnic identity combined with gender, demeanor and other factors to exclude interaction with young black men when possible because we know that these individuals commit more crimes, especially violent and drug related crimes. A number of scholars have suggested that young, angry men of color actually commit more crimes than do other individuals (D'Sousa 1995; Herrnstein and Murray 1994; Wilbanks 1986; Wilson and Herrnstein 1985). Overrepresentation in the justice system is perceived as fallacy from this view, as observed inequities in the justice system reflect the realities of which individuals actually commit crimes rather than focusing on social problems

which lead certain groups to be more or less likely to commit a crime. This concept assumes that each individual a) has the ability to choose whether or not to commit a crime and b) that social forces take a back seat to individual choice. It should be noted that while there is little current scholarly work supporting this contention, many of those interviewed for this study continue to ascribe criminalistics tendencies to minorities.

There is an alternative view of differential involvement, which suggests that higher levels of criminal behavior from the young living in poor, minority neighborhoods are rooted in environmental factors (Martinez 2002; Anderson 1999). This perspective suggests that issues such as poverty, disrupted home-life, relative disadvantage, limited economic and educational opportunity, disenfranchisement and limited community policing are among those factors which influence both the prevalent types of crime as well as the crime rate. From this view, minority's differential involvement in crime is due to environmental factors encouraging or otherwise rewarding criminal behavior. For instance, Cherish, Damphousse and Davis (2004) found that Black and Hispanic youths in Oklahoma committed more crime than did white youth, however once environmental condition were controlled for, that difference disappeared.

Differential treatment or differential handling of minorities in the criminal and juvenile justice systems is the other side of the DMC argument. Research conducted by Wordes and Bynum, Bishop and Frazier, and Bridges and Steen suggest differential treatment of minorities by the criminal and juvenile justice systems to be the root cause of DMC.

Wordes and Bynum (1995) found that differential treatment of minorities begins at the first point of contact, which is police decision-making. Their quantitative analysis showed that DMC existed for blacks in every law enforcement agency in the nine jurisdictions they studied. The data showed that DMC was most common in communities that were predominately white. Also, just as other studies have shown, DMC increased as one went deeper into the system (Wordes and Bynum 1995, Puzanchera 2009)

Wordes and Bynum (1995) found six common themes attributed as the cause of DMC. The most common explanation for DMC was a lack of parental supervision, lack of discipline, broken homes, and single-parent families. The second most common explanation was low socioeconomic status. The third most common explanation for DMC was personal problems, poor school performance, and substance abuse issues. The fourth most common explanation was racial prejudice and bias by law enforcement officers and community members being more likely to report minorities. The fifth most common explanation for DMC was minorities commit more serious crimes and are more likely to be involved in criminal behavior. The final explanation used by juvenile officers to explain DMC was the lack of concern by city officials and more formal urban police practices (Wordes and Bynum 1995).

Patrol officers gave three reasons for making initial contact with juveniles. The first was the seriousness of the offense. The second was responding to calls. The third reason was the youth "looked suspicious" or "funny." The most common characteristic patrol officers used for whether the juvenile entered the system or the matter is handled informally was family issues (Wordes and Bynum 1995).

Police making initial contact with juveniles who "looked suspicious" or "funny" was the same reason that Piliavin and Briar found in 1964. Piliavin and Briar's (1964) research found three conclusions of

how police interact with juveniles. The first conclusion is that police used wide discretion when dealing with juveniles. The second conclusion is that discretion was directly linked to prior records of the juveniles, as well as race, grooming, and demeanor. Demeanor was strongly correlated with officer decision. The third finding by Piliavin and Briar was black juveniles' tendency to exhibit demeanor that the officers associated with true delinquent boys would lead to arrest (Piliavin and Briar 1964).

Wordes and Bynum (1995) account this differential treatment of minorities. Regardless of the type of crime: felony, misdemeanor, or status offense, minorities are more likely to receive harsher treatment than their white counterparts. Juvenile officers believe that the perceived ability of the juvenile's family to institute discipline is the most important factor in DMC. White juveniles, controlling for prior history and offense, are more likely to be dropped, diverted, or released at the scene than minorities. Blacks juveniles are more likely to be detained and referred to the courts (Wordes and Bynum 1995). At each level of the system minorities become more overrepresented, understanding the initial cause for entry into the system is important in the ultimate goal of reducing DMC.

Differential treatment of minorities can also be seen in confinement. Bridges et al. (1995) found that racial disparities in confinement are not the result of differential arrests rates and referral of minority youths. Next, they found that violent crime rate is not an accurate explanation of DMC or minority confinement. The third element they found was that minority concentration appears to have an indirect effect on minority referral rates. Next, they found that economic inequality between whites and minorities does not account for higher disparities in minority confinement. Instead, greater economic inequality may relate to lower DMC. The fifth element they found was that urbanization decreases racial disparity by increase the number of whites referred. The final finding was that minority confinement is positively related to court workload, but not when county characteristics are controlled (Bridges et al. 1995).

Bridges et al. (1995) finds the cause of the disparity in confinement or DMC is differential treatment. They found this differential treatment in the referral rate and violent crime rate data on confinement. Minorities were more likely to be confined in communities that had higher violent crime rates compared to whites. This occurred regardless of the differences in racial referral rates (Bridges et al. 1995).

Bridges and Steen (1998) found that minorities were even treated differently when it came to how probation officers described juvenile offenders. These descriptions are used to persuade judges on their decisions of what course of action to take for the juvenile offender. They used written accounts from probation officers to the judges to find minorities were assessed differently than whites in relation to sentencing recommendations and risk of reoffending. This disparity existed even when the offender characteristics and offense were controlled. Black juveniles were described as unremorseful in their attitudes and of an amoral character, while white juveniles for the same offense were victims of external circumstances. These descriptions influence judge's decisions in sentencing and potential danger of the juvenile, which can be a cause of DMC at this level of the juvenile justice system (Bridges and Steen 1998).

Austin (1995) and Frazier and Bishop (1995) found differential treatment of minorities to be the reason for DMC and that institutional racism was a central cause. They attempted to identify the significance and influence of race from several different points in juvenile processing in their study.

The decision of intake officials, decision of judges on detention, decision of state attorneys to file formal charges, and judicial decisions of state attorneys to file formal charges, and judicial decisions regarding final disposition outcomes were all points of interest in processing that Frazier and Bishop studied (Austin 1995, Frazier and Bishop 1995).

Frazier and Bishop interviewed juvenile judges, state attorneys, public defenders, and Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services intake workers all of whom they deemed “insiders” to the system. They found that at 53% of nonwhite youths that were referred to the intake officials were recommended for court, while white youths accounted for 42%. As they looked deeper into the juvenile justice system the racial disparity got worse. At the judicial disposition, 31% of minority youth were incarcerated compared to 18% of white juveniles. Even though minority youth between the ages of ten to seventeen represent 21% of the population, they account for 44% of those incarcerated or transferred (Bishop and Frazier 1996).

When controlling for the crime committed and the previous record, juvenile racial disparities still exist. At the formal processing decision, 47% of white youth were recommended compared to 54% of nonwhites. The odds of being held in a secure facility for whites were 12% and 16% for nonwhite youths. At the prosecutorial referral stage the impact of race was small but still shows a disadvantage for nonwhite youth. A white youth has a 32% of being referred to the court and nonwhite youth has a 34% chance. At the final processing stage, race becomes an important factor again. A nonwhite youth has a 16% chance of being committed compared to just 9% for whites at the judicial disposition stage (Bishop and Frazier 1996).

Through interviews with juvenile judges, state attorneys, public defenders, and Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services intake workers Frazier and Bishop found 5 major themes: 1) racial differences attributable to racial bias, 2) racial differences attributable to prejudiced individuals, 3) racial differences and economic factors, 4) racial differences and family consideration, and 5) institutional racism. These themes are significant in that they are what “insiders” in the criminal justice system believe account for DMC (Frazier and Bishop 1995).

Looking past individual prejudice, two explanations stand out. The first is racial differences and family considerations. Frazier and Bishop (1995) found respondents thought youths that came from families that could not provide good supervision and/or came from single-family homes were more likely to be referred to the court. Minority families were seen in a negative light that could not discipline their child and this could account for minority youth overrepresentation at each level of processing (Frazier and Bishop 1995).

The second is institutional racism. Institutional racism implies that the juvenile justice system is set up structurally in a way that disadvantages racial minority and ethnic groups (Frazier and Bishop 1995). Respondents noticed a reliance on common racial stereotypes in relation to differences in dispositions received by nonwhites in comparison to whites. These stereotypes focused on community, family, and interpersonal styles (Frazier and Bishop 1995).

The importance of studying multiple decision points in the criminal and juvenile justice system can be seen in most of the recent research conducted on DMC. Multiple decisions points, such as arrest, detention, petition, adjudication, and disposition, allow researchers to see how DMC exists throughout the system and see differences at each point. The studies showed that significant

differences between whites and minorities did not always occur at every decision point. Race effects can also have indirect relationship between different decision points (Pope, Lovell, and Hsia 2003).

Type of jurisdiction also has influence on race effects. Feld (1995) found that urban youths of all races are more criminally active than suburban or rural youths. He also found that urban courts are more likely to charge youths and more likely to have status offenses than rural and suburban juvenile courts.

IV THE OKLAHOMA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM STAKEHOLDERS

The juvenile justice system in Oklahoma is comprised of a number of entities at the state and county level, all subject to the provisions of the state juvenile code in Title 10 of the Oklahoma Statutes. Within Oklahoma's 77 counties, juvenile justice is administered by:

- The Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs (OJA), the state agency responsible for statewide juvenile justice planning and program development and funding. County offices of the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs, the state's juvenile justice agency, provide intake, probation, custody, and parole services in 73 counties and provide only custody and parole services in the 4 counties with juvenile bureaus.
- Four statutorily constituted juvenile bureaus under administrative control of county judges and commissioners, in four counties (Canadian, Comanche, Oklahoma, and Tulsa), supervise the provision of intake and probation services in those counties.
- County commissioners in 17 counties operate secure detention centers in conformance with the state's detention plan administered by OJA.
- OJA contracts with nine municipalities (Clinton, Duncan, Enid, Lawton, Muskogee, Norman, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Woodward) for the provision of Community Intervention Centers (CIC). CICs provide a non-secure holding facility for juveniles arrested for minor offenses, deemed not to require secure detention, to be held for up to twenty-four hours while their parents and/or guardians can be located and to retrieve their juvenile.
- OJA also contracts with 42 statutorily defined nonprofit youth services agencies for the provision of prevention, treatment, and reentry services for juvenile offenders and juveniles at risk of delinquency.
- District juvenile courts including district judges and district attorneys within each county.
- Approximately 315 state and local law enforcement agencies.
- An unknown number of municipal courts, through interlocutory agreements with county authorities, administer jurisdiction over juvenile offenders charged with various offenses including crimes, status offenses, and municipal code violations.

V

THE OKLAHOMA JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM PROCESS

When coming into contact with juveniles, law enforcement officers have a number of options. They can make an informal disposition that results in sending the juvenile home; issue the juvenile a ticket or citation or make an arrest. If a juvenile is arrested, the officer may release the juvenile to their guardian, place the juvenile in one of the nine CICs, or may request placement in a secure detention facility. If the juvenile is charged with the offense, the charge sheet prepared by the officer may be sent to the city attorney or to the county's District Attorney for an intake disposition (usually involving an intake assessment and preparation of intake recommendations by OJA county staff or juvenile bureau staff). Juveniles placed in non-secure CICs may be charged in municipal or the county district court depending on the specific terms of any existing interlocal agreement. Juveniles placed in a secure detention facility cannot be charged in municipal court.

If law enforcement officers have submitted the charges to the local city attorney, the city attorney may refer the case to the county's District Attorney, dismiss the case, or process the case through the municipal court with outcomes ranging from dismissal or the imposition of fines and/or terms and conditions involving receipt of services and/or participation in community service.

Under the terms of the state's Youthful Offender Act juveniles who have allegedly committed certain enumerated serious felonies at defined age ranges may be subject to being charged as Youthful Offenders rather than as Delinquents. The District Attorney may elect to file Youthful Offender petitions with either the adult criminal court or the juvenile court. The district criminal court may elect to transfer the juvenile to the juvenile court upon motion by defense attorney(s). The district juvenile court may elect to transfer the juvenile to the district criminal court upon motion by the District Attorney. If juveniles have been convicted as Youthful Offenders in the district criminal court they are remanded to the custody or supervision of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections as adults with a specific term sentence. If juveniles have been convicted as Youthful Offenders in the district juvenile court they are remanded to the custody or supervision of the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs with a specific term sentence. Youthful Offenders remanded to the custody or supervision of the Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs may be released depending on satisfaction of the juvenile court with their progress in treatment. Youthful Offenders who fail to make progress in treatment or who are convicted of a new felony while in the custody or supervision of OJA may be bridged to the Oklahoma Department of Corrections to serve the remainder of their sentence. Youthful Offenders placed in the custody of OJA are subject to the same out-of-home custody placements that are available for juveniles adjudicated as Delinquents.

If the juvenile's case has been assigned to the juvenile division of the District Attorney's office, the District Attorney's in that division will receive the intake information and accompanying recommendation by OJA or juvenile bureau staff and will make a final decision on how to proceed from any of the following options:

- Decline or dismiss the case from prosecution.
- Divert the juvenile to voluntary services available from community based providers.
- Initiate a deferred prosecution or deferred filing agreement with specific terms and conditions

for completion by the juvenile in order to avoid prosecution. The juvenile's status in this instance is referred to as "informal probation" .

- File a petition to charge the juvenile in court either as an adult or as a delinquent or as a Youthful Offender.

At any time, District Attorneys may elect to revise the charges against a juvenile and may elect to revise their intake decision.

If detained in a secure detention center as a result of an arrest, a juvenile is entitled to a detention hearing within two judicial days. The detention hearings are presided over by the local juvenile court judge and the District Attorney represents the state's interest. The juvenile may have legal counsel to represent his or her interest. At the detention hearing, the judge may order the juvenile released or can hold the juvenile in detention for up to 5 days pending the filing of a petition by the District Attorney. Once a petition is filed, a juvenile may be held in detention pending an adjudicatory hearing although a detention hearing must be held every 10 days thereafter. If juveniles are adjudicated as Delinquents by the juvenile court they may be placed in detention periodically to ensure their appearance in court or if they have been charged with contempt of court. Juveniles charged as Youthful Offenders may be treated as adults and placed in adult jails pending the decision of District Attorneys as to whether to file the charges in adult criminal court or juvenile court.

Juveniles charged with status offenses may not be placed in detention and if petitions are filed they can only be adjudicated as status offenders (Child In Need of Supervision) and the juvenile court's dispositional finding after adjudication is limited to ordering their supervision by a responsible party.

When the intake decision by District Attorneys has been to decline or dismiss juvenile cases or to divert juveniles to voluntary services available from community based providers no further action by the juvenile justice system is taken. Juveniles subject to District Attorney decisions to apply deferred prosecution or deferred filing agreements are subject to case related terms and conditions and to supervision by OJA or juvenile bureau staff to ensure compliance. Pending progress on completion of the terms and conditions, District Attorneys may revoke the agreements and file petitions for court involvement. Juveniles who have had petitions filed by District Attorneys accompanied by motions to certify them as adults will have their cases transferred to the adult criminal courts if the juvenile court grants the motion. Juveniles with petitions filed in the juvenile court charging them as Delinquents will be processed by the juvenile court. For these juveniles, the juvenile court may decide any of three options including:

- Dismissal in which case the juvenile returns to their legal guardian and no further action by the juvenile justice system is taken.
- Deferred adjudication in which case the juvenile court defers a decision to adjudicate and may or may not impose conditions contingent on that deferral. Ultimately, the case may be dismissed or the juvenile court proceeds to adjudicate the juvenile as a Delinquent.
- Adjudication as a Delinquent.

Following adjudication of juveniles as Delinquents the juvenile court also makes a dispositional decision depending on what it decides is in the best interest of the child. There are three possible decisions:

- Court Supervision in which case the court directly supervises the juvenile or assigns that responsibility to another responsible party other than the juvenile bureau or OJA with an obligation to report back to the court at periodic court review hearings until the court is satisfied that the case can be dismissed.
- Court ordered probation in which case the court assigns supervisory responsibility to either the juvenile bureau or to OJA until such time as the juvenile completes their probationary treatment.
- Court ordered custody in which case the court assigns the juvenile to the custody of a responsible party, generally OJA, until such time as the court is satisfied that the case can be dismissed.

Delinquent juveniles on court ordered probationary status may live with their legal guardian (parents or relative or other individual) and are on supervision by the bureau or OJA working on a court approved treatment plan and attending periodic court review hearings until the case is dismissed.

Delinquent juveniles in custody of OJA are assessed with respect to risk and needs and may or may not be placed in out-of-home custody placements, working on a court approved treatment plan and attending periodic court review hearings until the case is dismissed. Out-of-home custody facilities range on a continuum of restrictiveness including foster homes, Level E staff secure group homes, and most restrictive physically secure institutions. There are two secure institutions with one having a unit that is within the fence for maximum security. Juveniles stay in custody placements until they have completed their treatment plans or are released by court order. Out-of-home custody placements are for indeterminate lengths of stay but cannot exceed age of 18 for Delinquents and 21 for Youthful Offenders.

Delinquents and Children in Need of Supervision may retain that legal status until they reach their 18th birthday. Delinquents may continue to receive services until their 19th birthday if they have and the supervising agency and the court has agreed to an extension of services. Youthful Offenders may receive services until they are 19 at which point the court must decide whether to bridge them to the Department of Corrections; the court may defer that decision until they are 21 at which time they are either discharged from OJA or bridged to the Department of Corrections.

VI EXTENT OF DMC (POLICE, MUNICIPAL COURT and JOLTS)

In 2012, we examined race differences at 3 points of interest in the juvenile justice system to determine the extent of DMC in Oklahoma. These points loosely correspond to the typical progression through the system: police contact, intake and detention in OJA, and the legal outcome or status of the referral. We present each in turn. Graphs are used in this section to illustrate larger points, however, more detailed information can be found in the tables referenced in this section, all of which can be found in the appendix.

Police Encounters

For many juveniles, the first encounter with the juvenile justice system often involves police contact. To assess racial differences in contact with police, we examined differences in arrests and citations from police report data. The results are presented in Tables 01 – 03. We used data from 60,347 police reports from Lawton, Tulsa, and Oklahoma City in 2006, 2008, and 2010. Table 01 shows that 62.2 percent of the incidences resulted in citations, while 37.8 percent resulted in arrests. Lawton and Oklahoma City had similar rates of arrest (32.7 and 32.8 percent, respectively). Tulsa had a higher percentage of arrests (47.5 percent).

Table 02 reports the percentage of arrests by race category for the three study sites, as well as the combined data. The data shows that White juveniles were arrested in 29.2 percent of police incidents. Blacks and Native American Indians, by contrast, were arrested in almost half the incidents (46.4 and 49.4 percent, respectively). In fact, only Asians had a lower arrest rate than Whites. The data for each individual city show similar trends (see Figure 1).

Differential arrest rates are not necessarily indicative of bias or other problems in the juvenile justice system. Minority youths, for example, may have higher arrest rates because of the severity or type of behavior associated with the police encounter. The police data used for this report do not include coded categories for offense or offense type. We are unable to adequately control or adjust for type or severity of offense. We do, however, have data for age and gender.

Table 03 shows the results of binary logistic regression predicting arrest (versus citation) by race. The table shows the adjusted odds ratios for each race category relative to Whites. The data for all three cities, for example, show that Blacks are about twice as likely (2.06 times more likely) to be arrested than Whites. The results reiterate the unadjusted results from the previous table: minorities are more likely than Whites to be arrested. The exception is Asian juveniles, who are generally less likely to be arrested than Whites. For example, in the combined data, Asians are 0.62 times more likely to be arrested than Whites. Alternatively, the odds ratio of 0.62 can be interpreted that Asians are 38 percent less likely than Whites to be arrested. The data show that minorities (other than Asian) are generally more likely to be arrested than Whites. Again, without adequate controls for severity and type of offense, we must exercise caution drawing conclusions from these findings.

Intake and Detention

After initial police contact, the next step in the juvenile justice process is intake and detention decisions. Race differences in decisions at intake and detention are presented in Tables 04 – 35. The tables represent the 44,281 cases statewide referred to OJA in 2006, 2008, and 2010. In addition to the statewide data, we present aggregate data from the three study counties (Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma counties), as well as data from each county.

Table 04 shows the summary of offenses and offense categories for the cases referred to OJA during the study period. The largest category of offenses is misdemeanor property crimes. The study counties show similar patterns with several exceptions. Comanche County has fewer felony referrals than the other counties and Oklahoma County has more felony referrals (see Figure 2). Consequently, Oklahoma County has fewer misdemeanor referrals. Comanche County, however, has similar rates of misdemeanor referrals, but has a higher number of other types of referrals (status offenses and technical violations).

Tables 05 – 09 show the summary of offenses for the locations (state, 3 county aggregate data, and each individual study county) by race. The tables suggest substantial differences in referrals by race (see Figures 3-5 below). The difference, however, are not consistently in one direction. For example, Black juveniles are referred to OJA in Oklahoma County (Table 09) for felony crimes against persons at a higher rate than whites. On the other hand, White juveniles are referred for sex crimes in Oklahoma County at more than twice the rate than Blacks.

Tables 10 – 15 present summaries of intake decisions once a juvenile is referred to OJA (see also Figures 6 – 9 below). Examining the statewide data, a little more than a third (36.0 percent) of the referrals have a petition filed (Table 10). There is significant variation across the locations. For example, in Comanche County 11.1 percent of referrals have a petition filed. In Oklahoma County, by contrast, the percentage of referrals that have a petition filed is 80.6 percent. Variation in the other intake decisions (declined, diverted, informal probation) exist, but are less pronounced.

Tables 11 – 15 show the intake decisions by race for the different locations. The most striking race differences from the entire state (Table 11) show that petitions were filed against Blacks (46.5 percent) at a higher rate than Whites (31.5 percent). Likewise, Blacks received informal probation at about half the rate as Whites (13.8 and 26.1 percent, respectively). Consistent with the police data analysis, the data show that fewer Asian juveniles have petitions filed in their cases, and are more likely to receive informal probation (see Table 11). The trend is evident in the aggregate and individual county data as well (see Tables 12 – 15).

As noted above, racial differences in outcomes do not necessarily indicate bias or disproportionality. Racial differences in intake decisions may be due to differences in the severity or type of referred offense. To assess racial differences, we conducted a series of multivariate logistic regression analyses. The results of the binary logistic regression are odds ratios (OR), which indicate whether the probability of an event (such as arrest) is the same for two (or more) groups. An odds ratio of 1.0 indicates that the event is equally likely in both groups. An odds ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the event is more likely in the first group. An odds ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the event is less likely in the first group.

In the analyses, we controlled for several factors that might reasonably be related to intake decision outcomes. We included as potential confounding factors gender, age, gang membership, severity of current referral offense, and information about prior referral history. We present models separately for each of the four intake decisions (declined, petition filed, diverted, informal probation) by the five locations (statewide, 3 counties aggregated, each county separately). For each location, we present a series of 5 models. Model 1 in each table shows the unadjusted or crude relationship between race and the outcome (e.g., intake decision). Model 1 is the model with no other factors controlled. Model 2 includes the race variables and the demographic variables, gender and age. Each successive model includes all variables from the previous model plus an additional set of covariates. Adding the covariates in successive steps provides an easy way to see if—and which—variables attenuate the relationship between race and the outcome of interest. In general, when referring to the results from the logistic regression models, we will refer to the most inclusive model in each series of analyses—Model 5. The results are presented in Tables 16 – 35. We highlight only a few of the tables in the narrative.

Many of the multivariate analyses confirm the unadjusted findings presented in the previous tables. For example, for the statewide data (Table 17), the analyses show that after controlling for gender, age, gang membership, severity of current referral, and referral history, Black juveniles are 61 percent more likely (OR=1.16) than White juveniles to have a petition filed in their case. The results show, by contrast, that Asian and Native American Indian juveniles are less likely than White juveniles to have petitions filed in their cases (0.79 and 0.91, respectively). Aggregate data from the study counties show similar patterns, though the differences are not as large (Table 21).

The individual county data show interesting trends. Data from Comanche County are similar to the statewide data. In Comanche County, Blacks are 83 percent more likely to have a petition filed in their case (see Table 25). In Tulsa County, Blacks are only 2 percent more likely than Whites to have petitions filed in their cases. In Oklahoma County, Blacks have lower odds of having a petition filed in their case compared to Whites (OR=0.85, see Table 33). Also of interest from Table 33 is that Asian juveniles in Oklahoma County are 64 percent more likely than Whites to have a petition filed in their case. This is contrary to many of the other outcomes for Asians (see above for discussion of arrests versus citations and felony versus misdemeanor referrals to OJA).

Also of interest from the intake decision analyses are the results from the decision for informal probation. In general, the results are inverse of the decision to file a petition. That is, minorities, especially Blacks, were more likely to have a petition filed in their case. In general, Blacks were less likely to receive informal probation. From the statewide data (Table 19), Blacks were 48 percent less likely (OR=0.52) than Whites to receive informal probation (again, after controlling for demographics, gang membership, severity of referral, and referral history). The relationship was consistent for each of the individual counties. Minorities, especially Blacks, were less likely to receive probation. In Comanche County, Native American Indians were more likely than Whites to receive informal probation (OR=1.11, see Table 27). In Tulsa County, Asians were more likely than Whites to receive probation (OR=1.19, see Table 31). In Oklahoma County, Native American Indians were more likely than Whites to receive informal probation (OR=1.75, see Table 34).

While it is difficult to summarize briefly the findings presented in the 20 tables (Tables 16 – 35), the

findings suggest there are differential outcomes based on race in the state and the individual counties. In general, the findings suggest that minorities have outcomes (decisions) at intake and detention that generally are poorer than Whites. This finding is not universally true. Some minorities, especially Asians, tend to fare as well or better compared to Whites.

Status of Referred Cases

The final step in the juvenile justice system we examine is the status of referred cases. We examined the legal status of 12,205 cases initially referred and that had a formal charge filed. The results are presented in Tables 36 – 51.

Table 36 (and Figure 10) shows the summary of the status of referred cases. The most frequent legal outcome was probation. In the state as a whole, 61.6 percent of cases received probation. Comanche County was similar (62.6 percent). The percentage was even higher in Tulsa County (76.9 percent), but lower in Oklahoma County (50.7 percent). The second most frequent outcome was the juvenile being placed in OJA custody (29.5 percent statewide).

Tables 37 – 41 show summaries of the legal status of cases for each location (state, aggregate of the 3 counties, and each individual county) by race (see also Figures 11 – 13 below). These are the unadjusted, descriptive percentages that show legal outcomes by race without controlling for factors other than race that might influence legal outcome. The multivariate, adjusted analyses (see discussion above for more detail) are presented in Tables 42 – 51. Like the previous multivariate analyses, we included as potential confounding factors gender, age, gang membership, severity of current referral offense, and information about prior referral history. We present models separately for two of the legal outcomes (being placed in OJA custody and probation) by the five locations (statewide, 3 counties aggregated, each county separately). Similar to the previous analyses, for each location we present a series of 5 models. Model 1 in each table shows the unadjusted or crude relationship between race and the outcome (e.g., OJA custody). Model 1 is the model with no other factors controlled. Model 5 is the most inclusive model with all covariates included.

The models examining racial differences in terms of being placed in OJA custody show interesting, if not unexpected, results. The unadjusted model (Model 1) for the statewide data (Table 42) suggests that minorities are placed in OJA custody at higher rates than Whites. The odds ratios for Blacks (OR=1.23), Native American Indians (OR=1.32), those of another race (OR=1.10), and Hispanics (OR=1.03) all suggest racial differences. In the fully adjusted model (Model 5), however, Blacks, for example, are much less likely than Whites to be placed in OJA custody. The effects of race are reversed or diminished once gang membership is included in the model. After controlling for all other factors, gang members are 2.73 times more likely to be placed in OJA custody than non-gang members.

We saw the same general trend in the individual county results as well. For example, in Tulsa County, in the unadjusted model, Blacks were 1.5 times more likely to be placed in OJA custody (see Table 48). Yet, in the adjusted model, Blacks were 30 percent less likely than Whites to be placed in OJA custody (OR=0.70). In Oklahoma County the odds of a Black juvenile being placed in OJA custody did not reverse direction compared to Whites, but the race effect was attenuated significantly (see Table 50). In the unadjusted model, Blacks were 82 percent more likely than Whites to be placed in OJA custody (OR=1.82); in the adjusted model, Blacks were only 5 percent more likely (OR=1.05). In Comanche

County, the odds for a Black juvenile to be placed in OJA custody remained higher than Whites in the fully adjusted model (see Table 46).

Results from the legal status analyses show, again, that racial differences in outcomes exist in the juvenile justice system. Unlike the findings from the previous two sections, these findings suggest fewer disadvantages in the legal outcomes for racial minorities.

VII

DIFFERENTIAL INVOLVEMENT: SCHOOL SURVEY DATA

Though there have been relatively few studies examining self-report rates of juvenile crime, existing studies consistently show very small differences in crime rates between racial/ethnic groups (Sealock & Simpson 1998, Huizinga & Elliott 1987, Dannefer & Schutt 1982, Akers, Krohn, Radosevich, & Lanza-Kaduce 1981, and Voss 1963). The results of this study, consistent with the existing literature, also finds few differences in crime when controlling for race and/or ethnicity.

The survey of current high school students in urban, suburban, and rural areas of Oklahoma was intended to document juvenile involvement in criminal activity. The results are presented in a series of tables (labeled Table 52 – Table 69). The tables fall into 3 general groups: frequencies and percentages of variables from the entire sample, percentages of the same variables by specific categories (such as race and gender), and predictions of likelihood of involvement in a class of criminal activity (such as crimes against persons and drug related crimes). Each set of tables is discussed in turn.

Tables 52 through 54 show summary statistics for variables that describe the sample of students included in the analyses. Table 52 shows basic demographic characteristics of the students. A majority of the students in the sample (approximately 60%) live in a suburban area. The sample is almost evenly divided in terms of female (51%) and male (49%) participants. The students are primarily aged 18 or older (63%). About a third of the students qualify for free lunch at school (33%). Almost 10 percent of the students were unsure whether they qualify for free lunch. Most students live with their adoptive or biological mother and father (58%). For those students who do not live with both parents, most live with their mother only (25%). Less than 10% of the students live with their fathers only (8%). The remaining students live with another family member (5%) or a non-family member (5%). The students are almost evenly divided in terms of race category. About 51% of the students self-reported being white, while 49% of the students reported a race other than white.

Table 53 shows the frequencies and percentages of student involvement with specific criminal activity. The table shows 17 activities students self reported having done in the previous 4 weeks. The categories with the largest involvement include drinking alcohol, using tobacco, smoking marijuana, and engaging in physical violence. Over 25% of students reported engaging in those activities. By contrast, students were less likely to report activities such as breaking into a home or business, using a weapon to obtain property, killing or injuring another, and illegally possessing a firearm. Less than 5 percent of students reported engaging in those activities.

Table 54 is an aggregation of the activities reported in Table 53. The individual, specific activities were categorized into the 6 categories listed in Table 54. The table parallels the previous findings. Drug activities were the most common (50%), followed by activities that constitute crimes against the public order (44%). Gang membership (3%) and weapons use (6%) were the least occurring activities among the students.

Tables 55 through 57 show the same data by race category (nonwhite v. white). Table 55 shows

comparisons of basic demographic and social categories. Nonwhites are more likely to live in urban areas (28% v. 5%), with whites more likely to live in suburban (65% v. 54%) and especially more likely to live in rural areas (30% v. 17%). Nonwhites and whites are similarly represented in terms of gender and age. Nonwhites and whites also show very similar living arrangements in the sample. For example, for nonwhites, 56% of the students live with both mother and father. Similarly, 59% of white students live with both mother and father. The other living arrangements show similar patterns. Nonwhites and whites differ, however, in terms of free lunch eligibility. About 45% of nonwhites report qualifying for free lunch, compared to about half that number (22%) for whites.

Tables 56 and 57 show involvement in criminal activities for nonwhites and whites. Table 56 shows the specific activities (e.g., stealing items worth less than \$50 and stealing items worth more than \$50), while Table 57 shows the frequencies and percentages for the general categories of activities (e.g., crimes against persons and drug crimes). We will focus on the more general categories presented in Table 57 rather than the individual activities. Table 57 shows that nonwhites and whites have very similar self reported involvement in criminal activities. For example, crimes against persons (30% v. 28%), weapons crimes (7% v. 5%), crimes against property (20% v. 20%), and gang membership (4% v. 2%) are all similar within 2 percentage points. Drug crimes and crimes against the public order show the largest differences, with whites reporting more involvement. Slightly more than half (54%) the white students reported involvement with drugs/substances, while 44% of nonwhite students reported drug/substance involvement. Similarly, more whites reported involvement in activities that constitute crimes against the public order (49 and 38 percent, respectively).

Tables 58 through 60 report differences based on living arrangement. Table 58 shows there are differences in basic demographics and social categories. For example, of the 108 students who were living with both mother and father, the majority resided in the suburban area (62%). By contrast, only 12 percent lived in the urban area and 25% lived in the rural area. The table also shows that students living with mother and father are less likely to participate in the free lunch program at school. The table also shows that there are relatively few differences in living arrangement for whites and nonwhites. Whites are slightly more likely to be living in a two parent household (53% v. 47%). The percentage of nonwhites and whites living with mother only or father only are virtually identical.

Like the previous analyses by racial category, we will focus on the general categories of involvement in criminal activity. Table 60 shows there are differences in involvement in criminal activities by living arrangement, but there are no clear patterns. That is, it is not the case that students living with both mother and father always report less involvement in activities or students in single mother households report more involvement.

Tables 61, 62, and 63 show differences based on location (urban, suburban, rural). Table 60 shows the differences in social demographic characteristics and social categories. Females in the rural location were over represented in the survey (67% female v. 33% male). There were also slight differences in age categories. The biggest differences are in free lunch status, living arrangement, and race. Almost 90% of students in the urban area report receiving free lunch at school. The percentages were much lower in the suburban and rural areas (24% and 16%, respectively). Similarly, students from the urban location were less likely to live with both mother and father (43%) compared to the suburban (60%) and rural (62%) areas. Urban students were more likely to live in non-parental household compared to the other locations. There were also racial differences between the locations. In the urban area, 84%

of students were nonwhite, compared to 45% in the suburban area and 36% in the rural area.

Table 63 shows the differences in involvement in criminal activities. Students in the urban areas self report generally lower levels of involvement in criminal activities. For example, a little over one-fourth (26%) of urban students report involvement in activities related to crimes against persons, compared to 29% of the suburban students and 33% of the rural students. Similar patterns exist for the other categories.

The previous tables are generally descriptive in nature. They show frequencies and percentages of students who fall into the various demographic and social categories. In the next tables we report we results from a series of multivariate logistic regression analyses. The results of logistic regression are odds ratios (OR), which indicate whether the probability of an event (such as involvement in a given activity) is the same for two (or more) groups (such as nonwhites and whites). An odds ratio of 1.0 indicates that the event is equally likely in both groups. An odds ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the event is more likely in the first group. An odds ratio less than 1.0 indicates that the event is less likely in the first group. All of the tables show a series of models to predict the six activities. The series of models start with the simplest analysis examining the effect of race on the outcome. Each successive model adds additional variables to the model predicting the outcome. This approach is useful to see the basic (also known as crude) relationship between two variables, such as race and drug activity, and how that relationship is altered when controlling for other variables. In the models that follow, we will focus on the full models (Model 4 in each table), since none of the bivariate or crude models show any relationship between our variable of interest, race or minority status, and involvement in the six criminal activities.

Tables 64 through 69 show remarkably similar results: race is not related to involvement in criminal activity. Model 4 in Table 64, for example, shows an odds ratio of 0.9. This represents a difference of less than 10% in the odds of Whites involvement in activities related to crimes against persons. This difference is very small and statistically nonsignificant. Recall that an odds ratio of 1.0 indicates no difference between the groups. In the six tables the only consistent finding is that males are more likely to be involved in activities related to criminality than females. In Table 64, for example, the odds ratio for males is 2.7. This suggests that males are 2.7 times more likely than females (the reference group) to be involved in criminal activities against other persons. In each of the tables reporting odds ratios, the numbers are the odds compared to the reference group. For example, in Table 64, Model 4, the odds ratio for students living in mother only households is 2.2. This indicates that students in mother only households are 2.2 times more likely to commit crimes against other persons than students from households with both mother and father present (the reference group).

VIII

DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT: INTERVIEWS WITH JUVENILE JUSTICE PROFESSIONALS

A total of 179 interviews were conducted with juvenile justice specialists including police officers, both patrol and those from specialized units focused on juveniles, intake and probation specialists, and juvenile court prosecutors, defense attorneys and juvenile court justices. These interviews were conducted by both trained college students and researchers and were coded by one senior researcher and one graduate student. Any coding differences between the two were discussed and agreed upon. Due to either equipment failure or operator error, three completed interviews were not recorded at all and six others were incomplete due to missing sections. All but one interview were race matched for interviewer and participant, to insure that minority participants would only be interviewed by minority interviewers and White participants would only be interviewed by White interviewers. The sole exception, a minority participant who requested to be interviewed by a White interviewer did not use the interview script and the data from that interview was not included in any of the tables below. Participation in the interviews was voluntary. Participants were not required by their supervisors to participate nor were incentives offered to those who participated. Identifiers are limited to jurisdiction (OKC, Tulsa or Lawton), gender, White or Non-White and professional role (Police, Court, Probation) to maintain the confidentiality of participants.

The purpose of the interviews was twofold. First, interviews with juvenile justice professionals are a valuable tool utilizing the observations and experiences of those who work closest with juvenile delinquency and crime, in order to better understand both how the juvenile justice system, as a whole, operates as well as how race/ethnicity impacts juvenile justice. Second, by examining the content of interview responses (content analysis) we are able to examine the extent of subtle (and in rare cases, overt) racial/ethnic bias among juvenile justice professionals.

Every single juvenile justice professional mentioned the role of family differences in at least partially explaining DMC. Table 70 gives a breakdown of how often, on average, different groups brought up the role of family. Professionals in careers requiring higher education (lawyers and judges) mentioned the role of families 45% more often than did police or juvenile justice specialists and White interviewees mentioned the role of family 24% more often than non-Whites. The differences between White and non-White families was the most often suggested cause of DMC in the interviews, though non-Whites were much less likely to suggest it to be a major contributor.

When asked “Pretending for a moment that you had the ability, funding and support to do so (think magic or miracle if need be), what one change would you make to minimize the need for the juvenile justice system”, 31.7% suggested government or community intervention to better the lives of juveniles. Just over 20% of the participants specifically suggested that community level support and programs are necessary to minimize juvenile delinquency and crime (table 53).

R: I would increase programs available to inner city kids, to keep them busy and give them the resources that they're not getting now. (White/Male/Police)

R: Yeah, absolutely. I think it would just be repeating what I just said which is that we would have more -- like with us we might be able to go into the schools and it would be limited. We would have to have a methodology for picking the schools that have the most need which is what we are formulating now with the police athletic league. What we are trying to do is find out which schools have the most need, go in there first. Like, they have the lowest GPA, API scores, and a graduation rate. I really believe there is direct correlation -- I'm sure this will be one of the questions -- but a direct correlation with "what the communities needs are and the opportunities that they have," -- say like grocery stores, or parks, or community events and things like that. So, if they are given the same amount of opportunities in all the communities throughout the city -- the same opportunities -- then you could actually see a trend. If I were to overlay the trend of community needs, with crime, with socioeconomic status; it is all the same. **(White/Male/Police)**

R: You know, here in (deleted), I know I would -- I would -- there are no programs. There are -- there's nothing for these kids to do, nothing. That's why -- one of the reasons they get into so much trouble. There's not a lot of activities.

I: So, you'd -- you'd increase the number of program sites and activities?

R: Sure, you know, by 10 fold. There's, you know -- you know, someone has to do it and someone has to be out here doing something -- they're doing something right, unless they'll be out here doing something wrong, trying to find something -- getting into something, you know. In New York City, they had, you know - I've talked to them down there about -- they have the PAL, Police Activity Leagues. They have, you know -- Yeah. They have a lot. The police officers took time and, you know, coach baseball and coach basketball and -- and got to know the kids and you know, and that are (unintelligible) with them. It doesn't happen here. It doesn't happen here.

I: Is that lack of funding or lack of interest?

R: I think it's -- I think it's both. I think it's lack of funding and I think it's -- it's you know, they just don't -- I don't -- I don't -- because you know, we have a gang task force that just -- you know, they're focusing on the crime instead of -- instead of focusing on the kids, you know. Right, instead of being proactive, it's reactive. You know, instead of going into the schools, instead

of going in -- of having programs for them, taking them on trips to, you know -- they used to pick us up and bus us to, you know Coney Island which would be in New York, but here we drive to Six Flags, bussing a bunch of kids. You know, we have a rapport with these kids and these kids are going to be kids that -- if another kids does something wrong -- you know, when they're (unintelligible), and one kid (unintelligible), you're going to have a rapport with these kids they're going to turn them over to you. You know what I mean? (White/Male/Police)

However, placing the responsibility for juvenile issues on problems within the family was, by far, the most common response (table 56). 43.3% of the respondents placed family issues at the forefront of causes of juvenile delinquency and crime. A few of these responses followed up with recommendations for more mentoring or specialized programs to replace what was seen as missing from the family. For these respondents, society/community is seen as a potential resource to help minimize family issues which result in juvenile delinquency:

R: Short of a private prison, a boot camp type compound where kids that are at risk and on the verge, who have committed a felony crime, could be sent to where they get the discipline and the structure that I think they need to be productive. Where they could be taught right from wrong because in my opinion, that's where it starts at home. If they're not getting it at home, we should be providing it somehow. And start that type, whether it be a private or state run, but let's not get too liberal about it as far as, well you can't do this, you can't do that, you can't do this. Strict discipline along with nurturing in there together like I was raised with. You know my dad would wear me out if I messed, but he'd pat me on top of the head if I'd done good too. That's what these kids need and they're not getting it. There needs to be an alternative to the justice system. There's a completion of a three of six month live-in boot camp type environment for these kids and I think, in my opinion, it would turn them around, make them understand what's going on. These things are available, but they're not state funded that I'm aware of. A lot of the kids in trouble are financially unable to pay. The parents haven't got the money to pay for the kids to go to something like this. It would do wonders. It would do a lot of good and they wouldn't be returning to the justice system which would in turn save us money in the juvenile justice system and then in the adult system as well because they're going to end up progressing on to that. Does that make sense? (White/Male/Police)

R: I would have more programs for adults to mentor children.

Places for kids to go. I would maybe try to educate parents -- educate parents more. Oh, you said one, didn't you? I mean, I -- I just think it's the -- the -- goes back to the fact that I think that you know, most of the juvenile offenders that I see have inappropriate parenting, or don't have supervision, don't have somebody that -- that they feel like cares or takes the time. You know, maybe they do care, a lot of them probably do, but they don't -- they don't care inappropriately.

I: Could you explain -- I guess parent appropriate -- appropriately?

R: They -- they don't teach them values, morals and they're not -- you know, I -- juveniles that show up to court and -- or you know, they'll be incarcerated and they'll be in court and their parents will be there not at all, 30 minutes late. You know, they -- they're not responsible. Their parents aren't responsible.

(White/Female/Court)

R: Unlimited resources in the best of all worlds probably very efficient parenting skills development for parents at birth through age 12.

I: Some type of mandatory parenting thing?

R: Well, mandatory, even beyond that, the best of all worlds, the best teachers that could teach parenting and parenting skills to very receptive parents and very responsible parents. Those early years are the most important years, they're not the adolescent years, and too many kids get off on the wrong foot, and they may not be delinquent because they are too young to be delinquent, but when they reach adolescence then it's a mess.

(White/Male/Probation)

More common, however, were responses placing sole responsibility for juvenile delinquency and crime on poor parenting.

R: (Pause). Having more responsible parents.

(White/Male/Court)

R: Oh, lock up the parents. I find the biggest hurdles to these kiddos, a lot of these kids, and even the hardcore kids, it's a generalization problem. The parents have failed them in so many ways. They first of all don't make them, they have never held them accountable, they always make excuses for them. They

never taught them to own it and then get over it. By the same token I don't believe we have families, parents that are instilling in these children a sense of right and wrong because the parents themselves don't have that, and like I said it's a generational thing and I'm not even sure, I can't tell you how far back it would go. Some families it might go back 2 or 3 generations. Other families not as far, but they're also not, the families aren't engaging these kids as a family. The parents are so busy doing their own thing that when a kid needs help or does something that's a cry for help, it's ignored or not acknowledged that that's what it is, kid's just labeled now, and then when you get 'em into the juvenile system, the parents are the ones' that outrage you because you give the kids a list of rules and you tell the parents, well they gotta follow these rules and you gotta help us enforce 'em, you know, and a lot of parents, the kid'll be breaking the rules all over the place and they did nothing to try to hold this kid to any sort of a standard of behavior, and I really feel like a lot of the times these kid's problems, the traumatization that these kids have, you know, especially the ones that are getting into drugs and having violent tendencies, they're being raised by parents who are gang bangers, they're being raised by grandmothers because the parents aren't on the scene to parent, so I really feel like if we started holding the parents responsible, the parents were having to pay the restitution, and the parents were having to do some time every time their kid misbehaved then maybe they would start teaching these kids from a very early point knowing that if I don't do the right thing I'm the one that's going to be held responsible, not the kid. Sorry, that's my soapbox.

(White/Female/Court)

R: Magically, make every parent accountable for their kids. Make every parent love their kids, and you know, if in a perfect world, everybody wouldn't have like, you know, twenty kids and not being able to take care of all of 'em. Where they'd have enough to take care of, and not only that, have them be, you know, good parents to their kids. I think the parents are what do the kids wrong. Because if the parents aren't disciplining their kids at the early age, or if they are disciplining them wrong, you know just yell at 'em, not giving them any consequences or anything like that, they won't know, and they'll have the attitude when they grow up that, you know, I can take whatever, I won't do anything, I won't get anything. You know, that handout, you know. When you start giving out handouts also, because if we start giving them, you know, money for whatever, you know, the parents, I'm talking about the parents, start giving them money for how many

kids they have, hey you know, you got ten kids here's some money, you know to help you with that. No, if you give them nothing and let them try to support their kids by the way they do it, then they won't have that many kids. Which, I'm not saying having a lot of kids is a bad thing cause my parents had, but my dad worked hard, okay? He worked hard for what we had, okay, and there's a lot of people out there, they don't want to work hard, and they want to get a lot of stuff given to them and then they give that attitude to their kids and their kids will come out here and you know, they go rob a store or do whatever because they want that money now, you know, instead of going out there and working hard for your money, but yeah, magically, have every parent become a good parent. I'm not saying that, you know, a kid will grow up and not be bad because their parents were good or whatever, but there's a difference between, you know, love for a child and doing whatever you can to make your child be successful and to be reliable, to go out and check on them, to monitor what they are doing, you know, instead of being lazy and just letting them run around, spoil them, do whatever they want to do. To actually go out there and be, try to make them be a productive member of this society, so that's magically. Will it ever happen? I don't think so, you know, it'll never happen. (Non-White/Male/Police)

R: I guess if you're talking about having the money and having the resources uhm it would be parental education, and getting parents to be more involved in their kid's lives and knowing what their kids are doing and are up to. I know with social media being the way it is -- Facebook, Twitter. Uhm you know, I have two kids in high school, I know their -- I'm friends on their Facebook, I have their passwords to their Facebook, I can get in and see what's going on their Facebook. But, it amazes me that just for instance, one of my children's friends posted something the other day on one of their other friends sites about a rant about how stupid her mom is and this, that, and the other, and ended with something to the effect of "Yeah, well I could say the same thing about you, you stupid whore." So you know, obviously in the grand scheme of things you are talking about juvenile delinquency, you know calling your mom a whore on Facebook is small compared to committing a violent crime, but the fact is obviously this girls mom has no idea what her daughter is doing on Facebook and to me that's just embarrassing --

I: For both.

R: You know as a girl, I would be embarrassed posting something like that about my mom. and as the mom I would just be absolutely totally embarrassed that my daughter is calling me a whore on Facebook. So I jus -- I think that would be the one place where we've got to get -- we've got to educate parents to get them to pay more attention to what their kids are doing and being more you know involved in their kids' lives.
(White/Male/Police)

An assumption of differential involvement rooted in family differences as an explanation for DMC has long held sway in criminology. In 1965, Moynihan suggested that female headed Black households were the cause of differential involvement for Blacks. Others researchers followed suit. Lewis (1966), Wordes and Bynum (1995) and Anderson (1999) have all suggested that differences between White and non-White families was key in explaining DMC by either laying the blame at the feet of domineering Black, female heads of household or Black men shirking their duties as fathers. Sarkisian refutes this explanation. Recent research, however (Sarkisian 2007; Sarkisian and Gerstel 2004) has found that Blacks are more likely to have an extended kin network. They live closer and see extended kin more often, which in turn increases Black men's involvement in their involvement in their children's lives. Black women also benefit from extended kin network. Contrary to many views expressed in the interviews with juvenile justice professionals, Black men's extended family structure and cultural values bring their commitment in their children's lives on a par with socially advantaged whites (Sarkisian 2007; Sarkisian and Gerstel 2004).

Perhaps more significant, is the almost complete lack of difference in family structure between Whites and non-Whites in the student surveys (Table 55). The assumption of structural differences show no support. The "lives with mother only" category, which so disturbed Moynihan, show non-Whites to have only a slightly greater percent in this category than Whites (26.4%-24.0%). All family structures were very similar for both groups.

Research shows that normal adolescent development results in a lessening of family attachment and a growing reliance on peers for decision making. Contrary to the expectations of most interview participants, attachment to his or her family is not the most salient factor in determining delinquency or conformity. The important factor is whether the peer group values delinquency or conformity (Childs et al. 2010). Oddly, peers were almost never mentioned in the interviews, even when participants were asked about gangs. As the following interview illustrates, even questions about peers and gangs were often redirected by the juvenile justice professional, back to the topic of the failure of non-White families.

I: Oh. Some have suggested that a culture of violence (one which accepts and even embraces violence as an acceptable means for ones goals) exists in many barrio and ghetto neighborhoods. In your experience, does this seem to be the case?

R: Okay, no. Gangs are the kids looking for family and the violence

is a pressure, peer pressure. If they had family lives then we wouldn't have the problem we're having, society wouldn't.

I: Is that what you see a lot with your neglect cases?

R: Mm-mm (Note: affirmative)

I: That's interesting.

R: Again, it's a parental issue.

I: Yeah.

R: Getting away from the drugs and the drinking or whatever it is.

I: Is that what – in the majority thing you see?

R: Mm-mm (Note: affirmative)

I: Is just -?

R: Yeah and some just pretty lazy.

(White/Female/Police)

Juvenile justice officials appear unaware of or to be ignoring the research which shows that peers hold significantly more influence over adolescents than do parents and are then holding non-White families to a higher standard than White families. Respondents used an interesting rhetorical move when discussing the role of the family. Non-White families were referred to as making poor individual choices while White families were typically referred to as part of the collective norm

I: Okay. Let us address the issues outside of direct influence of the juvenile justice system. What effects, if any have you seen a lack of quality educational resources play in DMC?

R: Quality educational resources. Are you talking about just an education in general, or --

I: It's -- just whatever. What effects, if any have you seen a lack of quality education and all resources play in DMC?

R: I mean, I think that maybe through -- I mean I -- I find that maybe from their parents, you know, maybe that they didn't -- weren't educated appropriately or -- and -- but I -- I don't really think educational resources what they caused, or the -- the lack of educational resources that caused the contact.

(White/Female/Lawyer)

As family structures and values are similar, we find a likely explanation for the focus on family structure in the interviews. Family appears to be code for race (Bonilla-Silva 2006, Wordes and Bynum 1995). When juvenile justice officials suggest that poor parenting and family values are to blame for DMC, what they are saying is that nonwhites have poor parenting skills and bad family values. Masked by vague notions of individualism and choice, white respondents covertly blamed minority families for not raising their children in a correct, law-abiding way (Bonilla-Silva 2006, Wordes and Bynum 1995). The blaming of the family is a justification for why minorities are overrepresented. It is a covert way to demonize nonwhite families for DMC without sounding racist (Bonilla-Silva 2006).

The overall impression from the interviews, observations and analysis is one of unspoken, choreographed actions and beliefs, most of which if taken individually would have little significance, combined to maintain the *status quo*, evidenced by the overwhelming overrepresentation of blacks in the system, while paying little more than lip-service to acknowledging the racism so clearly present though the use of color blind rationalizations (Mills 1997). The vast majority of the individuals interviewed were very likable, and most gave the impression that they would abhor any overtly racist action. The racism present was subtle but understood by all. So systemic is the racial bias that many of the respondents included rhetorical moves which suggested that the interviewer understood their racialized assumptions:

L: Okay. Finally, what role have you seen difficult family issues play?

R: I mean, I think family issues play a large portion. I think -- although, I -- I mean, I was -- I was a single mother, but a lot of the -- a lot of them are single mothers. They have no father role. They have -- their -- their parents are just -- I mean, they come in the courtroom and they -- they -- they argue with the kids. They're loud, they're -- it's like their family is in some kind of turmoil, and -- so they turn and get something -- whatever they get from these other kids that they run around, or they have no -- you know, their parents don't pay attention to them, pay -- give them time. I think that's the big role to me.

(White/Female/Lawyer)

IX CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our conclusions and recommendations are based upon the analysis of the data available to us at the time of writing. At the same time we administered the surveys to students, we collected police data from each of the communities where the high schools, which overlapped the thirty days span of the student survey questions. This was done to compare White/non-White citation and arrest rates for each community included in the student survey. As of the time of this writing, we only recently received the data from the rural law enforcement agency and have just begun the analysis. It should be noted that the agency did all they could to get it to us earlier, but their department is relatively small and much of the data had to be extracted by hand, rather than computer. In the following months, we will submit an updated report which will include the new police data.

Existing literature clearly shows that non-Whites have more societal hurdles to overcome for success as compared to Whites. While the details of how race operates in society differ somewhat over time, this truth has remained constant for the entire history of this country. Despite the significant changes in how race operates in society today. Perhaps because of this, juvenile justice professionals appear compelled to find an explanation for DMC that does not overtly include race. Unfortunately, this results in “blaming the victim”.

Politically, it would appear easier to try to impact the “more criminalistic” behaviors of non-White youth, rather than try to change the way in which law enforcement and the juvenile court system deal with youth. Especially given that the vast majority of those interviewed displayed no overt racial discrimination, rather than overt bias. Deeply rooted bureaucratic behaviors are difficult to change, however if we truly want to minimize the extent of DMC, we need to make changes in the actions which result in DMC, most of which are located in the societal bias against non-White youths. This study is not the first to reach this conclusion.

Bridges’ and Steen’s (1998) study of probation officers examined 233 narrative reports written by juvenile probation officers in three different counties in the state of Washington in 1990 and 1991. Each narrative included the probation officers description of the crime and an assessment of the factors that motivated the crime, as well as an evaluation of the youth’s background assessment of his or her likelihood of recidivism. The probation officers “...tended to attribute crimes committed by whites to negative environmental factors (poor school performance, delinquent peers, dysfunctional family, use of drugs or alcohol)... [yet]... they tended to attribute crimes committed by Black youths to negative personality traits and ‘bad attitudes’ (refusal to admit guilt, lack of remorse, failure to take offense seriously, lack of cooperation with court officials). They also found that P.O.’s (probation officers) judged Black youth to have a significantly higher risk of reoffending than white youth” (p. 174).

Bridges and Steen (1998) found that few juvenile court judges believe racial disparities in confinement to be racially based. Instead, most judges (Bridges and Steen 1998; Secret and Johnson 1997; Leonard *et al* 1995) attributed the disparities to Blacks and other minorities “...substantial ethnic and racial differences in criminal behavior” (*Institutionalized Discrimination*) or the fact that youths of wealthier families have access to non-adjudicated facilities that the poor do not (*Contextual Discrimination*). Essentially, judges may use extralegal characteristics like race to create “ a mental map of the accused

person's underlying character" (Secret and Johnson 1997) and to predict his/her future behavior. Alternatively, the harsher treatment of African American and Hispanic juveniles might reflect both class and race biases on the part of juvenile court judges (Secret and Johnson 1997). In other words, "the individual's economic and social class and the color of his skin...determine his relationship to the legal system" (Feld 1999).

Much like Bridges and Steen, we found that subtle bias directly impacted decision making, both at the individual and organizational level, resulting in higher levels of DMC. We recommend that the bulk of efforts toward reducing DMC be focused on minimizing juvenile justice professional's bias, rather than addressing the small differences in White/non-White juvenile crime rates.

X NOTES

O.S. 10 § 2-2-103. Municipal jurisdiction of children--Interlocal agreements--Municipal juvenile facility--Fines

A. 1. A municipality with a population of at least twenty-five thousand (25,000) may, by written resolution filed with the district court, assume jurisdiction of cases involving children under eighteen (18) years of age charged with violating any municipal ordinance identified in the resolution.

2. Any other municipality may enter into an interlocal agreement with the district court pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act, to assume jurisdiction of cases involving children under eighteen (18) years of age charged with violating any municipal ordinance as agreed by the district court, the district attorney and the municipality.

3. The chief juvenile judge of the district court judicial district, or if there is no chief judge then the presiding judge of the judicial administrative district, is hereby authorized to enter into the interlocal agreement as provided for in this section for and on behalf of said judicial district if the judge determines that the agreement is constitutional and complies with state and federal law.

B. 1. A child under eighteen (18) years of age who is taken into custody for the alleged violation of a municipal ordinance relating to truancy may be held pursuant to Section 10-109 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes.

2. A child under eighteen (18) years of age who is taken into custody for the alleged violation of a municipal ordinance relating to curfews may be held temporarily under the care of a peace officer or other person employed by a police department only until the parent of the child, legal guardian, legal custodian, attorney or other responsible adult assumes custody or, if such a person cannot be located within a reasonable time of the taking of the child into custody or if such a person refuses to assume custody, until temporary shelter is found for the child. The temporary custody provided for by this paragraph shall be utilized as a means of returning the child to the home of the child or other place of shelter.

3. In no event shall the child be placed in a jail, lockup or adult detention facility. In no event shall the child be placed in a juvenile detention facility for more than twenty-four (24) hours, excluding weekends and holidays, prior to an initial court appearance and for an additional twenty-four (24) hours excluding weekends and holidays, immediately following an initial court appearance; provided, however, this provision shall not restrict or prohibit placing a child in a community intervention center pursuant to Section 9 of this act.

4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Code, a child less than eighteen (18) years of age, who is taken into custody for the alleged violation of a municipal ordinance, and who can be prosecuted in municipal court for such offense pursuant to jurisdiction assumed by the municipal court pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this subsection, may be temporarily detained by the municipality in a municipal juvenile facility, as defined by this section, but only pursuant to the following conditions:

a. the municipality shall immediately take all reasonable steps to attempt to locate the parent of the child, legal guardian, legal custodian, attorney or another responsible adult and determine if the parent, legal guardian, legal custodian, attorney or other responsible adult is willing to appear at the municipal juvenile facility and assume personal custody of the child upon the release of the child from such facility,

b. the child shall be released to the personal custody of the parent of the child, legal guardian, legal custodian, attorney or other responsible adult as soon as practicable and upon the written promise of such person to return the child to municipal court to answer the municipal charges on the date and at the time set by the municipal court and to assume responsibility for costs for damages by the child if the child causes damages while committing any acts in violation of municipal ordinances. Municipalities may enact ordinances providing penalties for failure to comply with the written promise and for refusal to assume custody of a child in a timely manner,

c. the child shall be detained in the municipal juvenile facility for no longer than twenty-four (24) hours; provided, if the parent of the child, legal guardian, legal custodian, attorney or other responsible adult fails to appear at the municipal juvenile facility and assume personal custody of the child within said twenty-four-hour period, then custody or release of the child shall be determined pursuant to the provisions of Section 40 of this act,

d. the child shall be provided with adequate fresh drinking water,

e. the child shall be provided with adequate food not less than three times in a twenty-four-hour period,

f. the child shall be provided with adequate bathroom facilities and bedding, and

g. the child shall be provided with any necessary medical care and treatment.

C. For the purposes of this section, a “municipal juvenile facility” shall mean a secure facility which is entirely separate from any jail, adult lockup, or other adult facility, or is spatially separate if contained inside any jail, adult lockup, or other adult facility which is certified by the Office of Juvenile Affairs for the temporary detention of juveniles as authorized by the provisions of this section.

1. A municipal juvenile facility shall be certified by the Office of Juvenile Affairs pursuant to the applicable certification standards. The Office of Juvenile Affairs is directed to and shall establish standards for certification of municipal juvenile facilities to include but not be limited to the conditions set forth in subparagraphs a through g of paragraph 4 of subsection B of this section.

2. Each member of the staff of the municipal juvenile facility shall have satisfactorily completed a training program provided or approved by the Office of Juvenile Affairs. The Office of Juvenile Affairs is directed to and shall provide or approve an appropriate training program for staff members of such facilities.

3. A municipality may contract with an independent public or private facility properly certified by the

Office of Juvenile Affairs for performance of the detention services authorized by the provisions of this section.

4. The provisions of this section shall not restrict or limit the use of municipal juvenile facilities for detention of juveniles who are detained pursuant to other provisions of law.

5. In no event shall a juvenile be held in an adult facility that does not meet the definition of a municipal juvenile facility.

D. 1. A child less than eighteen (18) years of age may be charged, prosecuted and, if convicted, fined for violating a municipal ordinance; provided, that the maximum fine which may be imposed shall not exceed the maximum fine authorized by law.

2. When assessing punishment, the court also may require appropriate community service work, not to exceed ninety (90) hours, in lieu of or in addition to a fine if the product of multiplying the number of hours of community service work by the prevailing minimum wage plus any fine imposed does not result in a number which exceeds the maximum fine authorized by law, or restitution, or both community service work and restitution. The court may also impose costs as authorized by law.

3. If the child fails to complete the community service, a parent or guardian of the child who knew or should have known that the child failed to complete the community service may be fined an amount equal to the number of community service hours that are not completed by the child multiplied by the hourly minimum wage amount.

4. In addition, during any calendar year that any child:

a. fails to appear for a court date on more than one occasion,

b. is convicted of two or more of the municipal offenses, which offenses occurred on different days, or

c. fails to pay any fine or cost properly assessed by a municipal court,

and after the expiration of ninety (90) days, the court clerk shall mail notice of such occurrence to the Department of Public Safety, which Department shall thereafter suspend or deny driving privileges for such child for six (6) months. The suspension may be modified as provided in Section 6-107.2 of Title 47 of the Oklahoma Statutes. In addition, the court may require the child to receive counseling or other community-based services, as necessary.

E. If a child is prosecuted for an offense in a municipal court, the child shall not be prosecuted for the offense in the district court.

F. Any fines and costs properly assessed against any child and which remain unpaid after three (3) months may be assessed by the municipal judge against the parent of the child, parents, legal guardian or legal custodian and collected and paid as provided for in Articles XXVII and XXVIII of Title 11 of the Oklahoma Statutes. Provided however, prior to such latter assessment, the court clerk shall give the parent of the child, parents, legal guardian or legal custodian notice by certified mail to their

place of residence or personal service of such action proposed to be taken.

G. All municipal arrest records, prosecution records, court records, and court proceedings for cases involving children less than eighteen (18) years of age charged with violating municipal ordinances shall be kept confidential and shall not be open to public inspection except by order of the municipal court or as otherwise provided by Chapter 6 of this Code and Section 620.6 of Title 10 of the Oklahoma Statutes. Municipal conviction records involving children less than eighteen (18) years of age convicted of violating municipal ordinances shall be open to public inspection.

H. Funds generated from fines paid pursuant to an interlocal agreement between a municipality and the district court shall be earmarked and used by the municipality only for the following purposes:

1. To fund local programs which address problems of juvenile crime;
2. To fund the costs of prosecutions authorized pursuant to the provisions of this section;
3. To fund the costs of detention authorized pursuant to the provisions of this section;
4. To fund administrative costs related to local programs that address problems of juvenile crime or related to the prosecution, detention, or punishment authorized pursuant to the provisions of this section; and
5. To fund the costs of community intervention centers authorized pursuant to Section 9 of this act.

Such earmarked funds shall not be used by the municipality for any purpose other than the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 through 5 of this subsection.

XI REFERENCES

- Akers, R., Krohn, M., Radosevich, M., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1981). Social Characteristics and Self-Reported Delinquency. *Sociology of Delinquency*, 48-62.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the Inner city*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Austin, J. (1995). Racial disparities in the confinement of juveniles: Effects of crime and community social structure on punishment. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Barkan, S., & Cohn, S. (2005). Why whites favor spending more money to fight crime: The role of racial prejudice. *Social Problems*, 52, 300-314.
- Barkan, S., & Cohn, S. (1994). Racial prejudice and support for the death penalty by whites. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 202-209.
- Bishop, D., & Frazier, C. (1988). The influence of race in juvenile justice processing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 22, 309-328.
- Bishop, D & Frazier, C. (1996). Race effects in juvenile justice decision-making: Findings of a statewide analysis. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 86 (2), 392-413.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism Without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2001. *White Supremacy and Racism in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Bonczar, Thomas P. and Allen J. Beck. 1997. *Lifetime Likelihood of Going to State or Federal Prison*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, NCJ 160092 Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bridges, G., Conley, D., Engen, R., & Price-Spratlen, T. (1995). Racial disparities in the confinement of juveniles: Effects of crime and community social structure on punishment. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Bridges, G., & Steen, S. (1998). Racial disparities in official assessments of juvenile offending: Attributional stereotypes as mediating mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*. 65, 554-570.
- Charish, C., Damphousse, K and Davis, S. 2004. "Race/Ethnicity and Gender Effects on Juvenile System Processing". Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs
- Childs, Kristina K. , Christopher J. Sullivan & Laura M. Gulledege (2010): *Delinquent Behavior Across*

Adolescence: Investigating the Shifting Salience of Key Criminological Predictors, Deviant Behavior, 32:1, 64-100

- Cole, D. (2000). *No equal justice: Race and class in the American criminal justice system*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Dannefer, D., & Schutt, R. K. (1982). Race and juvenile justice processing in court and police agencies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1113-1132.
- Eberhardt, J., Davies, P., Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Johnson, S. (2006). Looking deathworthy: Perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17, 383-386.
- Feld, B. (1995). The social context of juvenile justice administration: Racial disparities in an urban juvenile court. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Feyerherm, W. (1995). The DMC initiative: The convergence of policy and research themes. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Frazier, C., & Bishop, D. (1995). Reflections on race and effects in juvenile justice. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Glover, K. (2009). *Racial profiling: Research, racism, and resistance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.
- Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (2001). *Gang problems and gang programs in a national sample of schools*. Ellicott City, Maryland: Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
- Herrnstein, R. & Wilson, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: Free Press Paperbacks.
- Huizinga, D., & Elliott, D. S. (1987). Juvenile offenders: Prevalence, offender incidence, and arrest rates by race. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33(2), 206-223.
- Juskiewicz, J. (2000). Youth crime/adult time: Is justice served?. Building blocks for youth report. Washington, DC: Pretrial Services Resource Center.
- Kemph, L., Sontheimer, K., Sontheimer, H. (1995). Racial disparities in the confinement of juveniles: Effects of crime and community social structure on punishment. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Lockhart, L., Kurtz, P., Sutphen, R., & Gauger, K. (1991). *Georgia's juvenile justice system: A retrospective investigation of racial disparity (Tech. Rep.)*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

- Males, M., & Macallair, D. (2000). *The color of justice: An analysis of juvenile adult court transfers in California*. Building blocks for youth report, Washington, DC: Justice Policy Institute.
- Mauer, Marc. 1999. *The Sentencing Project*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Mills, C. 1997. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca, New York. Cornell University Press.
- Nichols, J. D. (2004). An exploration of discipline and suspension data. *The Journal of Negro Education*. 73, 408–23.
- Pettit, Becky and Bruce Western. 2004. “Mass Imprisonment and the Life Course: Race and Class Inequality in U.S. Incarceration”. *American Sociological Review*. 69:151-169.
- Piquero, A. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Future of Children*. 18, 59-79.
- Piliavin, I., & Briar, S. (1964). Police encounters with juveniles. *American Journal of Sociology*. 70, 206–214.
- Poe-Yamagata, E. (2000). *And justice for some: Differential treatment of minority youth in the justice system*. Washington, DC: Youth Law Center.
- Pope, C., Lovell, R., & Hsia, H. (2003). Synthesis of disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) literature (1989-1999). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention.
- Poupart, L. (1995). Juvenile justice processing of American Indian youths: Disparity in one rural county. In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Puzzanchera, C. (2009). Juvenile arrests 2008. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. njjn.org.
- Russell, K. (1998). *The color of crime: Racial hoaxes, white fear, black protectionism, police harassment, and other macroaggressions*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sealock, M. D., & Simpson, S. S. (1998). Unraveling bias in arrest decisions: The role of juvenile offender type-scripts. *Justice Quarterly*, 15(3), 427-457.
- Soss, J., Langbein, L., & Metelko, A.R. (2003). Why do white Americans support the death penalty?. *The Journal of Politics*. 65(2), 397-421.
- Snyder, H., & Sickmund, M. (1999). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice Prevention.
- Voss, Harwin L. (1963). Ethnic Differentials in Delinquency in Honolulu. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 54(3).
- Welch, K., & Payne, A. A. (2010). Racial threat and punitive school discipline. *Social Problems*. 57(1), 25-48.
- Wilbanks, W. (1986). *The myth of a racist criminal justice system*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wilson, J., & Herrnstein, R. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Wordes, M., & Bynum, T. (1995). Policing juveniles: Is there bias against youths of color?" In K. K. Leonard, C. Pope, & W. Feyerherm (Eds.), *Minorities in juvenile justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.

**XIV
TABLES**

Table A. 2006 Racial Breakdown of Comanche County, Oklahoma County, and Tulsa County

2006	State of OK	Comanche	OKC	Tulsa	all 3 counties
Population	3,579,212	109,181	691,266	577,795	1,378,242
White	2,803,755	74,740	515,915	449,329	1,039,984
White %	78.3%	68.5%	74.6%	77.8%	75.50%
White non-Hispanic	2,581,367	67,556	440,395	401,849	909,800
White non-Hispanic %	72.1%	61.9%	63.7%	69.5%	66.00%
Black	278,849	21,004	107,531	66,308	194,843
Black %	7.8%	19.2%	15.6%	11.5%	14.10%
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	287,728	6,648	23,759	30,067	60,474
Am. Indian/Alaska Native %	8.0%	6.1%	3.4%	5.2%	4.40%
Asian	60,201	2,477	23,333	11,025	36,835
Asian %	1.7%	2.3%	3.4%	1.9%	2.70%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	3,429	461	884	572	1,917
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander %	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.10%
More than 1 race	145,250	3,851	19,844	20,494	44,189
More than 1 race %	4.1%	3.5%	2.9%	3.5%	3.20%
Hispanic/Latino	247,450	9,382	82,331	51,533	143,246
Hispanic/Latino %	6.9%	8.6%	11.9%	8.9%	10.40%

Table B. 2008 Racial Breakdown of Comanche County, Oklahoma County, and Tulsa County

2008	State of Oklahoma	Comanche	OKC	Tulsa	all 3 counties
Population	3,642,361	111,772	706,617	591,982	1,410,371
White	2,846,186	78,282	528,163	459,590	1,066,035
White %	78.1%	70.0%	74.7%	77.6%	75.60%
White non-Hispanic	2,600,115	69,711	446,630	406,409	922,750
White non-Hispanic %	71.4%	62.4%	63.2%	68.7%	65.40%
Black	289,993	20,900	110,310	68,827	200,037
Black %	8.0%	18.7%	15.6%	11.6%	14.20%
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	291,390	6,405	23,697	30,342	60,444
Am. Indian/Alaska Native %	8.0%	5.7%	3.4%	5.1%	4.30%
Asian	62,770	2,435	23,842	11,939	38,216
Asian %	1.7%	2.2%	3.4%	2.0%	2.70%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	3,863	480	978	712	2170
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander %	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.10%
More than 1 race	148,159	3,270	19,627	20,572	43,469
More than 1 race %	4.1%	2.9%	2.8%	3.5%	3.10%
Hispanic/Latino	278,620	11,057	90,077	58,530	159,664
Hispanic/Latino %	7.6%	9.9%	12.7%	9.9%	11.30%

Table C. 2010 Racial Breakdown of Comanche County, Oklahoma County, and Tulsa County

2010	State of Oklahoma	Comanche	OKC	Tulsa	all 3 counties
Population	3,751,351	124,098	718,633	603,403	1,446,134
White	2,706,845	79,996	464,387	417,413	961,796
White %	72.2%	64.5%	64.6%	69.2%	66.50%
White non-Hispanic	2,575,381	73,122	425,791	393,401	892,314
White non-Hispanic %	68.7%	58.9%	59.3%	65.2%	61.70%
Black	277,644	21,669	110,890	64,779	197,338
Black %	7.4%	17.5%	15.4%	10.7%	13.60%
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	321,687	7,266	25,119	36,392	68,777
Am. Indian/Alaska Native %	8.6%	5.9%	3.5%	6.0%	4.80%
Asian	65,076	2,777	21,454	14,066	38,297
Asian %	1.7%	2.2%	3.0%	2.3%	2.60%
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander	4,369	686	780	429	1895
Hawaiian/Pac. Islander %	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.10%
More than 1 race	221,321	8,033	38,057	35,069	81,159
More than 1 race %	5.9%	6.5%	5.3%	5.8%	5.60%
Hispanic/Latino	332,007	13,896	108,543	66,582	189,021
Hispanic/Latino %	8.9%	11.2%	15.1%	11.0%	13.10%

Table 01. Summary of Police Reports that Ended in Arrest or Ticket/Citation.

	Arrests	Citations
Lawton (N=6,063)	32.7	67.3
Tulsa (N=20,352)	47.5	52.5
Oklahoma City (N=33,932)	32.8	67.2
Combined (N=60,347)	37.8	62.2

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 02. Summary of Police Reports that Ended in Arrest by Race and Location.

Race	Lawton	Tulsa	Oklahoma City	Combined
	N=6,063	N=20,352	N=33,932	N=60,347
White	24.3	39.3	22.5	29.2
Black	42.3	57.4	38.4	46.4
Native American	54.2	57.6	42.1	49.4
Asian	25.8	26.7	7.1	14.7
Other/Don't Know	44.1	54.0	39.9	40.4

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 03. Odds of Arrest for Race Groups Compared to Whites by Location.

Race	Lawton	Tulsa	Oklahoma City	Combined
	N=6,063	N=20,352	N=33,932	N=60,347
Black	2.12	1.98	2.14	2.06
Native American	3.41	2.43	2.50	2.57
Asian	1.04	0.68	0.30	0.62
Other/Don't Know	2.11	1.63	2.26	1.84

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios comparing the odds of being arrested versus cited compared to Whites. Models are adjusted by gender and age.

Table 04. Summary of Referred Offenses.

	State N=44,281	3 Counties N=17,982	Comanche County N=2,934	Tulsa County N=9,893	Oklahoma County N=5,155
<i>Felonies</i>	35.0	34.3	12.4	27.8	59.1
Sex Crimes	2.4	1.9	0.7	2.0	2.3
Against Persons	6.4	7.3	2.7	6.4	11.8
Drug Crimes	5.4	5.6	1.8	4.7	9.6
Weapon Crimes	1.6	2.2	0.6	1.4	4.5
Property Crimes	19.9	18.4	6.6	14.5	32.7
Public Order	1.6	1.2	0.3	0.9	2.3
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	55.7	53.6	55.0	59.6	41.4
Against Persons	14.5	11.0	6.6	12.5	10.5
Drug Crimes	14.3	9.2	7.1	8.3	12.1
Weapons Crimes	1.3	1.8	0.8	1.5	2.8
Property Crimes	20.8	25.4	19.7	34.9	10.5
Public Order	10.2	10.2	24.0	5.7	10.9
<i>All Others</i>	18.5	19.9	38.7	19.5	10.0
Status Offenses	15.3	15.0	37.3	11.3	9.5
Technical Violations	3.3	4.9	1.5	8.2	0.5

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 05. Summary of Referred Offenses by Race for State of Oklahoma (N=40,985).

	White N=24,141	Black N=9,938	Asian N=242	Native American N=6,214	Other N=345	Not Known N=105	Total N=40,985
<i>Felonies</i>	33.5	37.5	28.9	34.7	18.8	37.1	34.5
Sex Crimes	2.8	1.8	1.2	1.8	0.9	1.9	2.4
Against Persons	5.2	9.7	5.0	6.1	2.6	4.8	6.4
Drug Crimes	5.4	5.0	6.2	5.0	3.2	5.7	5.2
Weapon Crimes	1.2	2.5	2.9	1.3	0.6	2.9	1.5
Property Crimes	19.3	19.7	15.7	21.1	11.3	21.0	19.6
Public Order	1.5	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.4	1.9	1.6
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	56.8	53.5	64.0	56.6	45.5	46.7	55.9
Against Persons	14.5	15.7	10.7	14.6	10.7	8.6	14.8
Drug Crimes	15.9	7.1	15.3	19.0	9.3	7.6	14.1
Weapons Crimes	1.0	1.9	4.1	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.3
Property Crimes	21.2	21.5	28.1	18.5	18.3	24.8	20.9
Public Order	9.2	11.5	12.0	11.4	10.1	5.7	10.1
<i>All Others</i>	18.9	17.3	19.8	19.6	41.7	20.0	18.8
Status Offenses	15.9	12.8	18.6	16.6	41.4	20.0	15.5
Technical Violations	3.0	4.5	1.2	3.1	0.3	0.0	3.3

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 06. Summary of Referred Offenses by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma (N=16,208).

	White N=7,244	Black N=7,358	Asian N=133	Native American N=1,175	Other N=228	Not Known N=70	Total N=16,208
<i>Felonies</i>	30.6	37.3	28.6	29.7	14.0	41.4	33.4
Sex Crimes	2.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	0.4	0.0	1.9
Against Persons	5.5	9.4	5.3	6.6	3.1	4.3	7.3
Drug Crimes	5.6	5.3	6.0	4.1	2.2	5.7	5.3
Weapon Crimes	1.4	2.7	2.3	1.0	0.4	4.3	2.0
Property Crimes	16.3	19.8	15.0	17.0	8.3	25.7	17.9
Public Order	1.0	1.4	3.0	1.7	0.4	2.9	1.2
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	56.5	51.7	64.7	53.7	39.9	50.0	53.9
Against Persons	10.7	12.3	6.8	11.0	6.6	4.3	11.3
Drug Crimes	11.6	6.0	6.8	10.7	5.3	8.6	8.8
Weapons Crimes	1.2	2.1	3.8	1.3	0.4	1.4	1.6
Property Crimes	28.4	23.2	38.3	24.7	19.7	30.6	25.7
Public Order	8.6	11.9	10.5	11.7	9.6	7.1	10.3
<i>All Others</i>	20.4	18.9	20.3	25.4	51.3	12.9	20.5
Status Offenses	15.8	13.4	18.8	19.1	50.9	12.9	15.4
Technical Violations	4.6	5.6	1.5	6.5	0.4	0.0	5.1

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 07. Summary of Referred Offenses by Race for Comanche County (N=2,720).

	White N=1,252	Black N=1,088	Asian N=36	Native American N=265	Other N=78	Not Known N=1	Total N=2,720
<i>Felonies</i>	12.5	12.6	8.3	9.1	16.7	0.0	12.3
Sex Crimes	1.0	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8
Against Persons	2.4	3.3	2.8	0.8	3.8	0.0	2.6
Drug Crimes	1.9	1.9	5.6	0.8	2.6	0.0	1.9
Weapon Crimes	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7
Property Crimes	6.5	6.3	0.0	6.4	10.3	0.0	6.4
Public Order	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.3
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	52.8	53.2	63.9	65.3	60.3	100.0	54.6
Against Persons	7.4	5.7	5.6	6.4	7.7	0.0	6.6
Drug Crimes	7.6	5.2	5.6	11.3	5.1	0.0	6.9
Weapons Crimes	0.6	0.8	2.8	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.8
Property Crimes	20.4	16.9	25.0	23.0	25.6	100.0	19.5
Public Order	19.9	27.4	30.6	28.3	23.1	0.0	23.9
<i>All Others</i>	40.3	39.8	36.1	31.7	34.6	0.0	39.0
Status Offenses	38.7	38.1	36.1	30.6	34.6	0.0	37.5
Technical Violations	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.6

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 08. Summary of Referred Offenses by Race for Tulsa County (N=9,055).

	White N=4,340	Black N=3,887	Asian N=60	Native American N=686	Other N=54	Not Known N=28	Total N=9,055
<i>Felonies</i>	26.7	29.5	30.0	27.7	11.1	10.7	27.9
Sex Crimes	2.5	1.5	1.7	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.0
Against Persons	5.1	8.2	8.3	6.7	1.9	3.6	6.6
Drug Crimes	5.3	3.7	5.0	4.4	3.7	0.0	4.5
Weapon Crimes	1.0	1.9	5.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.3
Property Crimes	13.6	15.5	13.3	14.6	5.6	7.1	14.4
Public Order	0.7	1.1	3.3	1.6	1.9	0.0	1.0
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	61.3	57.9	70.0	55.0	68.5	92.9	59.6
Against Persons	11.3	14.6	6.7	13.4	14.8	7.1	12.9
Drug Crimes	10.9	4.4	6.7	9.8	7.4	7.1	7.9
Weapons Crimes	1.1	1.9	6.7	1.2	0.0	3.6	1.5
Property Crimes	37.2	32.4	48.3	30.0	44.4	71.4	34.8
Public Order	4.1	7.9	1.7	5.0	3.7	3.6	5.8
<i>All Others</i>	18.4	19.6	15.0	25.8	22.2	0.0	19.4
Status Offenses	11.3	10.0	13.3	15.6	20.4	0.0	11.1
Technical Violations	7.1	9.7	1.7	10.2	1.9	0.0	8.4

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 09. Summary of Referred Offenses by Race for Oklahoma County (N=4,433).

	White N=1,652	Black N=2,383	Asian N=37	Native American N=224	Other N=96	Not Known N=41	Total N=4,433
<i>Felonies</i>	54.7	61.1	45.9	60.3	13.5	63.4	57.6
Sex Crimes	3.5	1.7	2.7	1.8	1.0	0.0	2.4
Against Persons	8.6	14.2	2.7	12.9	3.1	4.9	11.6
Drug Crimes	9.4	9.6	8.1	7.1	1.0	9.8	9.2
Weapon Crimes	3.2	4.8	0.0	3.6	1.0	7.3	4.1
Property Crimes	30.9	33.1	32.4	37.1	8.3	39.0	32.0
Public Order	2.1	2.6	5.4	3.1	0.0	4.9	2.4
<i>Misdemeanors</i>	46.5	40.8	56.8	36.2	7.3	19.5	41.9
Against Persons	11.7	11.5	8.1	5.9	1.0	2.4	11.1
Drug Crimes	16.4	8.9	8.1	12.9	4.2	9.8	11.8
Weapons Crimes	2.1	3.0	0.0	1.3	1.0	0.0	2.5
Property Crimes	11.3	11.0	35.1	10.3	1.0	0.0	10.9
Public Order	11.7	11.2	5.4	121.9	2.1	9.8	11.2
<i>All Others</i>	10.5	8.2	13.5	17.0	81.3	22.0	11.3
Status Offenses	10.2	7.6	10.8	16.1	81.3	22.0	10.8
Technical Violations	0.3	0.6	2.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.5

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 10. Summary of Intake Decisions.

	State N=43,774	3 Counties N=17,784	Comanche County N=2,907	Tulsa County N=9,855	Oklahoma County N=5,022
Declined	31.1	27.1	54.3	28.7	8.1
Petition Filed	36.0	46.2	11.1	39.1	80.6
Diverted	9.9	11.6	18.4	15.2	0.5
Informal Probation	23.0	15.1	16.1	17.0	10.8

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 11. Summary of Intake Decisions by Race for State of Oklahoma (N=40,526).

	White N=23,885	Black N=9,791	Asian N=240	Native American N=6,162	Other N=344	Not Known N=1,004	Total N=40,526
Declined	31.9	30.2	31.3	32.2	31.1	33.7	31.5
Petition Filed	31.5	46.5	27.5	33.3	42.4	42.3	35.5
Diverted	10.5	9.4	13.8	9.0	11.0	17.3	10.0
Informal Probation	26.1	13.8	27.5	25.5	15.4	6.7	22.9

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 12. Summary of Intake Decisions by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma (N=16,048).

	White N=7,184	Black N=7,265	Asian N=132	Native American N=1,169	Other N=228	Not Known N=70	Total N=16,048
Declined	26.9	27.8	28.0	29.8	26.8	12.9	27.5
Petition Filed	40.7	50.6	34.8	45.3	49.6	57.1	45.7
Diverted	13.8	9.4	17.4	10.6	13.2	21.4	11.6
Informal Probation	18.6	12.2	19.7	14.3	10.5	8.6	15.2

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 13. Summary of Intake Decisions by Race for Comanche County (N=2,694).

	White N=1,240	Black N=1,074	Asian N=36	Native American N=265	Other N=78	Not Known N=1	Total N=2,694
Declined	53.8	56.6	50.0	50.9	52.6	0.0	54.5
Petition Filed	9.7	13.1	5.6	10.6	12.8	0.0	11.2
Diverted	18.3	16.7	25.0	21.9	20.5	100.0	18.2
Informal Probation	18.2	13.6	19.4	16.6	14.1	0.0	16.1

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 14. Summary of Intake Decisions by Race for Tulsa County (N=9,023).

	White N=4,331	Black N=3,866	Asian N=60	Native American N=684	Other N=54	Not Known N=28	Total N=9,023
Declined	26.9	30.9	30.0	28.1	37.0	28.6	28.8
Petition Filed	35.3	43.1	28.3	46.3	22.2	7.1	39.3
Diverted	17.4	12.9	23.3	9.4	25.9	50.0	15.0
Informal Probation	20.5	13.1	18.3	16.2	14.8	14.3	16.9

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 15. Summary of Intake Decisions by Race for Oklahoma County (N=4,331).

	White N=1,613	Black N=2,325	Asian N=36	Native American N=220	Other N=96	Not Known N=41	Total N=4,331
Declined	6.4	9.2	2.8	9.5	0.0	2.4	7.9
Petition Filed	79.2	80.4	75.0	84.1	94.8	92.7	80.6
Diverted	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.5
Informal Probation	13.7	10.0	22.2	5.5	5.2	4.9	11.1

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 16. Differences in Intake Decision to Decline by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.95	0.87
<i>Asian</i>	<i>0.97</i>	<i>0.96</i>	<i>0.97</i>	<i>0.96</i>	<i>1.12</i>
American Indian	1.02	1.01	1.02	1.03	1.00
Other	0.96	0.94	0.94	0.79	1.07
Unknown	1.08	1.08	1.08	1.00	0.77
Hispanic	0.72	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.78
Demographics					
Male		0.80	0.81	0.92	0.85
Age		0.99	0.99	1.00	1.03
Gang Member			0.87	0.91	0.80
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.40	1.21
Severity Score				0.98	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.04
Number of Counts					1.05
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 17. Differences in Intake Decision to File Petition by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.89	1.93	1.73	1.79	1.61
Asian	0.82	0.82	0.80	0.77	0.79
American Indian	1.09	1.10	1.07	1.04	0.91
Other	1.60	1.90	1.84	2.21	1.41
Unknown	1.59	1.73	1.75	2.01	2.79
Hispanic	1.61	1.56	1.43	1.46	1.44
Demographics					
Male		1.90	1.80	1.57	1.24
Age		1.10	1.09	1.09	1.00
Gang Member			2.64	2.64	1.64
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.76	0.71
Severity Score				1.02	1.02
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.04
Number of Counts					0.92
Severity of Counts					1.00

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 18. Differences in Intake Decision to Divert by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.89	0.88	0.96	0.93	0.67
Asian	1.36	1.34	1.36	1.36	0.73
American Indian	0.84	0.83	0.85	0.87	1.115
Other	1.06	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.61
Unknown	1.79	1.77	1.76	1.64	1.61
Hispanic	0.81	0.86	0.91	0.91	0.77
Demographics					
Male		0.48	0.50	0.54	0.92
Age		0.96	0.96	0.98	0.99
Gang Member			0.29	0.29	0.49
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.57	1.35
Severity Score				1.00	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.85
Number of Counts					1.10
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 19. Differences in Intake Decision for Informal Probation by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.45	0.45	0.50	0.50	0.52
Asian	1.07	1.10	1.13	1.13	1.27
American Indian	0.97	0.96	0.98	0.99	1.16
Other	0.52	0.45	0.47	0.45	0.45
Unknown	0.20	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.24
Hispanic	0.87	0.87	0.95	0.95	0.84
Demographics					
Male		0.89	0.93	0.96	1.00
Age		0.92	0.92	0.92	0.97
Gang Member			0.22	0.22	0.34
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.03	1.19
Severity Score				0.99	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.77
Number of Counts					1.05
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 20. Differences in Intake Decision to Decline by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.08	0.93
Asian	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.07	1.30
American Indian	1.15	1.14	1.15	1.11	0.98
Other	0.99	0.94	0.94	0.68	1.17
Unknown	0.40	0.40	0.40	0.37	0.42
Hispanic	0.83	0.84	0.84	0.87	0.80
Demographics					
Male		0.87	0.88	0.97	0.83
Age		0.98	0.98	0.99	1.02
Gang Member			0.96	0.99	0.95
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				2.22	1.38
Severity Score				0.98	0.98
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.03
Number of Counts					1.10
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 21. Differences in Intake Decision to File Petition by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.49	1.49	1.36	1.39	1.19
Asian	0.78	0.79	0.78	0.74	0.73
American Indian	1.21	1.26	1.18	1.19	0.97
Other	1.43	1.76	1.71	1.96	1.03
Unknown	1.94	2.02	2.05	2.20	4.41
Hispanic	1.54	1.45	1.33	1.32	1.31
Demographics					
Male		2.13	1.97	1.76	1.34
Age		1.07	1.07	1.05	0.97
Gang Member			2.12	2.07	1.29
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.37	0.97
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.03
Number of Counts					0.85
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 22. Differences in Intake Decision to Divert by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.65	0.66	0.72	0.70	0.85
Asian	1.32	1.25	1.28	1.27	1.43
American Indian	0.74	0.70	0.74	0.79	1.20
Other	0.95	0.75	0.77	1.02	0.47
Unknown	1.70	1.79	1.76	1.67	1.00
Hispanic	0.78	0.88	0.96	0.96	1.15
Demographics					
Male		0.33	0.36	0.38	0.79
Age		0.95	0.95	0.97	1.02
Gang Member			0.22	0.22	0.41
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.40	0.53
Severity Score				1.03	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.96
Number of Counts					1.64
Severity of Counts					0.98

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 23. Differences in Intake Decision for Informal Probation by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.61	0.60	0.67	0.66	0.78
Asian	1.08	1.07	1.10	1.13	1.15
American Indian	0.73	0.72	0.77	0.80	1.12
Other	0.52	0.46	0.47	0.53	0.60
Unknown	0.41	0.40	0.39	0.38	1.00
Hispanic	0.72	0.74	0.82	0.82	0.71
Demographics					
Male		0.78	0.85	0.90	0.93
Age		0.95	0.95	0.96	1.00
Gang Member			0.23	0.23	0.38
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.37	0.48
Severity Score				1.01	1.00
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.81
Number of Counts					1.34
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 24. Differences in Intake Decision to Decline by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.04	0.86
Asian	0.86	0.81	0.80	0.78	0.84
American Indian	0.89	0.89	0.87	0.87	0.87
Other	0.95	0.90	0.87	1.03	1.27
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.96	0.71
Demographics					
Male		0.66	0.64	0.69	0.60
Age		0.99	0.99	0.98	0.93
Gang Member			1.48	1.65	1.12
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				2.95	2.71
Severity Score				0.96	0.96
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.02
Number of Counts					1.10
Severity of Counts					1.00

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 25. Differences in Intake Decision to File Petition by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.41	1.42	1.28	1.56	1.83
Asian	0.55	0.61	0.59	0.59	0.52
American Indian	1.10	1.10	1.01	1.00	1.09
Other	1.37	1.53	1.36	1.25	1.41
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	1.13	1.11	1.06	0.84	0.97
Demographics					
Male		3.11	2.83	2.65	2.12
Age		1.15	1.14	1.25	1.13
Gang Member			2.35	2.64	1.53
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.10	0.10
Severity Score				1.09	1.09
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.06
Number of Counts					0.91
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 26. Differences in Intake Decision to Divert by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.89	0.88	0.95	0.98	0.94
Asian	1.49	1.52	1.60	1.72	1.67
American Indian	1.25	1.27	1.34	1.37	1.27
Other	1.15	1.19	1.27	1.19	0.54
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	1.20	1.20	1.24	1.24	1.65
Demographics					
Male		0.93	0.98	0.94	1.01
Age		0.83	0.84	0.85	0.88
Gang Member			0.28	0.27	0.61
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.29	0.57
Severity Score				1.02	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.88
Number of Counts					1.19
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 27. Differences in Intake Decision for Informal Probation by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.71	0.71	0.75	0.74	0.88
Asian	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.07	0.33
American Indian	0.89	0.88	0.93	0.94	1.11
Other	0.74	0.73	0.78	0.83	0.86
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.93	1.14
Demographics					
Male		1.16	1.23	1.29	0.64
Age		1.15	1.16	1.15	1.18
Gang Member			0.36	0.37	0.59
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.75	2.05
Severity Score				0.98	0.98
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.95
Number of Counts					0.94
Severity of Counts					1.00

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 28. Differences in Intake Decision to Decline by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.22	1.18	1.17	1.18	1.06
Asian	1.17	1.22	1.22	1.34	1.56
American Indian	1.06	1.05	1.04	1.02	0.92
Other	1.60	1.64	1.64	1.56	1.95
Unknown	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.17	1.10
Hispanic	1.03	0.99	0.98	0.97	1.04
Demographics					
Male		1.27	1.27	1.32	1.02
Age		0.91	0.91	0.90	0.95
Gang Member			1.05	1.08	1.10
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				2.12	0.96
Severity Score				0.98	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.98
Number of Counts					1.01
Severity of Counts					1.00

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 29. Differences in Intake Decision to File Petition by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.39	1.45	1.31	1.37	1.02
Asian	0.73	0.72	0.68	0.56	0.64
American Indian	1.59	1.70	1.60	1.56	1.10
Other	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.54	0.68
Unknown	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.21	1.00
Hispanic	1.09	1.10	1.02	0.98	0.97
Demographics					
Male		2.05	1.88	1.68	1.21
Age		1.20	1.20	1.17	1.05
Gang Member			2.19	2.05	1.06
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				3.65	2.06
Severity Score				0.98	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.09
Number of Counts					0.95
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 30. Differences in Intake Decision to Divert by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.70	0.71	0.77	0.75	1.10
Asian	1.45	1.36	1.41	1.36	0.00
American Indian	0.49	0.46	0.48	0.53	0.58
Other	1.66	1.66	1.67	1.82	0.00
Unknown	4.75	3.97	3.92	3.18	0.00
Hispanic	0.99	1.08	1.15	1.26	1.72
Demographics					
Male		0.28	0.30	0.33	0.54
Age		0.95	0.95	0.98	1.04
Gang Member			0.22	0.24	0.41
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.20	0.24
Severity Score				1.04	1.04
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.43
Number of Counts					1.70
Severity of Counts					0.98

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 31. Differences in Intake Decision for Informal Probation by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.58	0.57	0.64	0.62	0.81
Asian	0.87	0.87	0.93	0.92	1.19
American Indian	0.75	0.73	0.79	0.85	1.08
Other	0.67	0.67	0.68	0.68	0.56
Unknown	0.65	0.58	0.58	0.49	0.00
Hispanic	0.85	0.84	0.91	0.95	0.74
Demographics					
Male		0.75	0.83	0.89	0.88
Age		0.92	0.92	0.94	1.04
Gang Member			0.18	0.20	0.32
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.13	0.10
Severity Score				1.03	1.03
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.50
Number of Counts					1.10
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 32. Differences in Intake Decision to Decline by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.49	1.52	1.59	1.50	1.33
Asian	0.42	0.40	0.40	0.36	0.87
American Indian	1.55	1.54	1.63	1.67	1.24
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unknown	0.37	0.41	0.41	0.39	0.00
Hispanic	1.57	1.61	1.71	1.62	1.45
Demographics					
Male		0.77	0.79	0.82	1.13
Age		1.10	1.10	1.11	1.22
Gang Member			0.70	0.69	0.75
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.48	0.52
Severity Score				1.01	1.03
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.04
Number of Counts					0.86
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 33. Differences in Intake Decision to File Petition by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.08	1.08	0.98	1.03	0.85
Asian	0.79	0.79	0.80	0.88	1.64
American Indian	1.39	1.45	1.30	1.27	0.83
Other	4.77	5.51	5.38	4.87	0.00
Unknown	3.32	3.27	3.31	3.43	0.0
Hispanic	1.10	1.06	0.94	0.99	0.80
Demographics					
Male		1.31	1.21	1.18	1.04
Age		1.02	1.02	1.01	0.86
Gang Member			2.35	2.39	1.45
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				2.02	1.90
Severity Score				0.99	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.00
Number of Counts					1.15
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 34. Differences in Intake Decision to Divert by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.50	0.51	0.56	0.53	0.53
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
American Indian	1.34	1.29	1.47	1.51	1.75
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	0.85	0.88	1.01	0.96	1.00
Demographics					
Male		0.75	0.81	0.83	0.48
Age		1.01	1.02	1.03	1.17
Gang Member			0.29	0.28	0.00
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.44	0.54
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.74
Number of Counts					0.34
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 35. Differences in Intake Decision for Informal Probation by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.70	0.69	0.78	0.75	0.91
Asian	1.80	1.88	1.84	1.70	0.00
American Indian	0.36	0.34	0.39	0.39	0.40
Other	0.35	0.23	0.23	0.25	0.00
Unknown	0.32	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.00
Hispanic	0.62	0.65	0.75	0.72	0.79
Demographics					
Male		0.80	0.87	0.90	0.80
Age		0.92	0.92	0.93	1.07
Gang Member			0.27	0.26	0.41
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.56	0.53
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.10
Number of Counts					0.70
Severity of Counts					0.98

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 36. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals.

	State N=12,205	3 Counties N=6,129	Comanche County N=302	Tulsa County N=2,998	Oklahoma County N=2,829
Transferred to Adult Court	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.9
Placed in OJA Custody	29.5	23.6	35.8	17.7	28.5
Case Dismissed	5.8	8.8	0.3	2.1	16.9
Child in Need of Supervision	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Disposition is Pending	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	61.6	64.1	62.6	76.9	50.7
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	2.0	3.6	0.3	2.5	2.9

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 37. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals by Race for State of Oklahoma (N=11,174).

	White N=5,790	Black N=3,588	Asian N=52	Native American N=1,675	Other N=58	Not Known N=11	Total N=11,174
Transferred to Adult Court	0.7	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.0
Placed in OJA Custody	27.4	31.7	23.1	33.2	29.3	18.2	29.6
Case Dismissed	5.6	6.2	9.6	3.2	15.5	18.2	5.5
Child in Need of Supervision	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disposition is Pending	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Probation	64.7	57.1	61.5	60.5	55.2	63.6	61.6
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	1.2	3.6	5.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.0

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 38. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma (N=5,478).

	White N=2,132	Black N=2,857	Asian N=36	Native American N=415	Other N=29	Not Known N=9	Total N=5,478
Transferred to Adult Court	0.2	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
Placed in OJA Custody	18.3	27.7	13.9	23.6	31.0	11.1	23.7
Case Dismissed	10.6	7.3	13.9	4.3	27.6	22.2	8.5
Child in Need of Supervision	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.1
Disposition is Pending	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	69.6	60.0	66.7	66.7	41.4	66.7	64.2
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	1.1	3.8	5.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.7

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 39. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals by Race for Comanche County (N=280).

	White N=109	Black N=132	Asian N=2	Native American N=28	Other N=9	Not Known N=0	Total N=280
Transferred to Adult Court	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Placed in OJA Custody	30.3	42.4	0.0	25.0	44.4	0.0	35.7
Case Dismissed	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Child in Need of Supervision	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disposition is Pending	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	68.8	54.5	100.0	75.0	55.6	0.0	62.5
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 40. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals by Race for Tulsa County (N=2,774).

	White N=1,133	Black N=1,361	Asian N=15	Native American N=258	Other N=7	Not Known N=0	Total N=2,774
Transferred to Adult Court	0.4	0.9	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.7
Placed in OJA Custody	14.2	19.9	13.3	22.1	42.9	0.0	17.8
Case Dismissed	2.6	1.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	2.0
Child in Need of Supervision	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Disposition is Pending	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	51.5	73.8	73.3	72.1	57.1	0.0	76.7
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	1.1	3.7	13.3	3.5	0.0	0.0	2.6

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 41. Summary of Legal Status of Referrals by Race for Oklahoma County (N=2,424).

	White N=890	Black N=1,364	Asian N=19	Native American N=129	Other N=13	Not Known N=9	Total N=2,424
Transferred to Adult Court	0.1	1.4	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.9
Placed in OJA Custody	22.1	34.1	15.8	26.4	15.4	11.1	29.0
Case Dismissed	21.9	13.4	26.3	12.4	61.5	22.2	16.9
Child in Need of Supervision	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sent to Inpatient Psychiatric Care	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.1
Disposition is Pending	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Probation	54.5	46.8	57.9	54.3	23.1	66.7	50.0
Convicted, Sentenced as Adult	1.2	4.3	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.1

NOTE: Numbers are percentages.

Table 42. Differences in Odds of Being Placed in OJA Custody by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.23	1.23	0.86	0.86	0.71
Asian	0.80	0.80	0.64	0.63	0.75
American Indian	1.32	1.36	1.26	1.26	1.13
Other	1.10	1.08	0.88	0.89	1.00
Unknown	0.59	0.58	0.62	0.63	0.33
Hispanic	1.03	0.98	0.70	0.70	0.88
Demographics					
Male		2.36	2.06	2.00	1.68
Age		0.91	0.92	0.92	0.76
Gang Member			4.20	4.23	2.73
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.75	0.73
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.16
Number of Counts					0.91
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 43. Differences in Odds of Being Placed on Probation by Race for the State of Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.72	0.73	0.99	0.99	1.14
Asian	0.87	0.89	1.05	1.06	0.83
American Indian	0.83	0.082	0.88	0.88	0.93
Other	0.67	0.67	0.78	0.77	0.98
Unknown	0.95	0.94	0.89	0.87	1.19
Hispanic	0.86	0.90	1.21	1.21	1.04
Demographics					
Male		0.51	0.59	0.60	0.67
Age		1.05	1.04	1.04	1.25
Gang Member			0.24	0.23	0.32
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.30	1.44
Severity Score				0.99	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.91
Number of Counts					1.08
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 44. Differences in Odds of Being Placed in OJA Custody by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.71	1.67	1.07	1.05	0.96
Asian	0.72	0.71	0.61	0.60	0.53
American Indian	1.38	1.48	1.09	1.09	0.96
Other	2.00	2.00	1.37	1.45	1.92
Unknown	0.56	0.51	0.60	0.60	0.67
Hispanic	1.33	1.22	0.71	0.70	0.88
Demographics					
Male		2.81	2.06	2.01	1.69
Age		0.92	0.92	0.93	0.77
Gang Member			5.71	5.75	3.90
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.71	0.68
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.14
Number of Counts					0.90
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 45. Differences in Odds of Being Placed on Probation by Race for the Counties of Comanche, Tulsa, and Oklahoma.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.66	0.67	0.93	0.94	0.90
Asian	0.88	0.89	0.96	0.97	1.00
American Indian	0.88	0.84	1.07	1.06	1.04
Other	0.31	0.31	0.38	0.36	0.50
Unknown	0.88	0.92	0.83	0.82	0.72
Hispanic	0.76	0.82	1.21	1.22	1.07
Demographics					
Male		0.52	0.66	0.68	0.72
Age		1.06	1.05	1.05	1.22
Gang Member			0.21	0.21	0.25
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.34	1.47
Severity Score				0.99	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.94
Number of Counts					1.06
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 46. Differences in Odds of Being Placed in OJA Custody by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.70	1.77	1.30	1.47	1.21
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
American Indian	0.77	0.72	0.77	0.83	1.11
Other	1.84	2.13	1.33	1.67	1.85
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	1.32	1.11	1.08	0.98	0.25
Demographics					
Male		7.28	5.04	4.92	3.74
Age		0.92	0.93	0.93	0.88
Gang Member			7.19	7.82	5.91
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.45	0.46
Severity Score				1.02	1.02
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.17
Number of Counts					0.75
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 47. Differences in Odds of Being Placed on Probation by Race for Comanche County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.54	0.53	0.70	0.63	0.77
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
American Indian	1.36	1.46	1.39	1.30	1.02
Other	0.57	0.51	0.82	0.68	0.57
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	0.79	0.95	0.98	1.09	1.22
Demographics					
Male		0.16	0.23	0.23	0.23
Age		1.04	1.03	1.04	1.06
Gang Member					
			0.14	0.13	0.16
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				2.02	2.17
Severity Score				0.98	0.98
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.85
Number of Counts					1.53
Severity of Counts					0.98

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 48. Differences in Odds of Being Placed in OJA Custody by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.50	1.48	0.85	0.85	0.70
Asian	0.93	0.86	0.50	0.48	0.15
American Indian	1.71	1.83	1.40	1.40	1.08
Other	4.53	4.05	2.93	2.92	3.83
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	1.20	1.11	0.70	0.69	0.84
Demographics					
Male		3.95	2.72	2.68	2.43
Age		0.88	0.89	0.88	0.67
Gang Member			6.63	6.64	4.22
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.93	0.93
Severity Score				1.00	1.00
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.20
Number of Counts					0.95
Severity of Counts					1.00

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 49. Differences in Odds of Being Placed on Probation by Race for Tulsa County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.46	0.64	1.04	1.05	1.25
Asian	0.63	0.69	1.08	1.14	0.72
American Indian	0.59	0.55	0.70	0.70	0.93
Other	0.30	0.35	0.49	0.51	0.42
Unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hispanic	0.88	0.93	1.44	1.46	1.29
Demographics					
Male		0.31	0.44	0.45	0.51
Age		1.08	1.106	1.06	1.38
Gang Member			0.16	0.15	0.21
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.36	1.69
Severity Score				0.98	0.98
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.87
Number of Counts					1.07
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 50. Differences in Odds of Being Placed in OJA Custody by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	1.82	1.78	1.16	1.14	1.05
Asian	0.67	0.68	0.75	0.73	0.59
American Indian	1.26	1.36	0.85	0.85	0.89
Other	0.64	0.65	0.45	0.48	0.59
Unknown	0.44	0.42	0.46	0.47	0.50
Hispanic	1.23	1.15	0.61	0.60	0.79
Demographics					
Male		1.85	1.42	1.39	1.06
Age		0.95	0.95	0.96	0.82
Gang Member			5.52	5.51	3.51
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				0.69	0.64
Severity Score				1.01	1.01
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					1.20
Number of Counts					0.85
Severity of Counts					1.01

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 51. Differences in Odds of Being Placed on Probation by Race for Oklahoma County.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Race					
Black	0.73	0.74	0.98	0.99	0.85
Asian	1.14	1.13	1.08	1.09	1.51
American Indian	0.99	0.97	1.33	1.34	1.06
Other	0.25	0.25	0.28	0.28	0.69
Unknown	1.67	1.69	1.60	1.61	1.40
Hispanic	1.01	1.03	1.57	1.59	1.31
Demographics					
Male		0.87	1.04	1.05	1.14
Age		1.01	1.01	1.01	1.15
Gang Member			0.25	0.25	0.29
Severity of Referral					
Number of Offenses				1.09	1.12
Severity Score				0.99	0.99
Prior Referrals					
Number of Referrals					0.89
Number of Counts					1.00
Severity of Counts					0.99

NOTE: Numbers are odds ratios.

Table 52. Summary statistics of the sample (n=188).

	Frequency	Percent
Location		
Urban	31	16.5
Suburban	112	59.6
Rural	45	23.9
Gender		
Female	96	51.1
Male	92	48.9
Age		
13-14	8	4.3
15-16	33	17.6
17	29	15.5
18 or older	117	62.6
Free Lunch		
Yes	62	33.2
No	107	57.2
Unsure	18	9.6
Living Arrangement		
Mother & Father	108	57.8
Mother Only	47	25.1
Father Only	14	7.5
Other Family	9	4.8
Other Non-family	9	4.8
Race		
Nonwhite	92	48.9
White	96	51.1

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 53. Summary statistics for criminal activity (n=188).

	Frequency	Percent
Tobacco use	47	25.0
Drink alcohol	70	37.2
Smoke marijuana	41	22.0
Illegal prescription drugs	26	13.8
Legally available substances	6	3.2
Ecstasy use	5	2.7
Meth, cocaine, heroin, LSD	9	4.8
Vandalized property	12	6.4
Steal items worth < \$50	27	14.6
Steal items worth > \$50	8	4.3
Break into home or business	2	1.1
Weapon use to obtain property	1	0.5
Firearm - illegal possession	5	2.7
Physical violence	50	26.6
Weapon use to injure person	8	4.3
Killed or injured person	5	2.7
Gang member	6	3.2

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 54. Summary statistics for criminal activity by category (n=188).

	Frequency	Percent
Crime against persons	55	29.3
Drug crime	92	49.5
Weapon crime	11	5.9
Crime against property	37	20.0
Crime against the public order	82	43.6
Gang member	6	3.2

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 55. Summary statistics of the sample by race category.

	Nonwhite (n=92)		White (n=96)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Location				
Urban	26	28.3	5	5.2
Suburban	50	54.3	62	64.6
Rural	18	17.4	29	30.2
Gender				
Female	44	47.8	52	54.2
Male	48	52.2	44	45.8
Age				
13-14	5	5.5	3	3.1
15-16	16	17.6	17	17.7
17	14	15.4	15	15.6
18 or older	56	61.5	61	63.5
Free Lunch				
Yes	41	44.6	21	22.1
No	40	43.5	67	70.5
Unsure	11	12.0	7	7.4
Living Arrangement				
Mother & Father	51	56.0	57	59.4
Mother Only	24	26.4	23	24.0
Father Only	7	7.7	7	7.3
Other Family	4	4.4	5	5.2
Other Non-family	5	5.5	4	4.2

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 56. Summary statistics for criminal activity by race category.

	Nonwhite (n=92)		White (n=96)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Tobacco use	18	19.6	29	30.2
Drink alcohol	31	33.7	39	40.6
Smoke marijuana	16	17.8	25	26.0
Illegal prescription drugs	11	12.0	15	15.6
Legally available substances	3	3.3	3	3.1
Ecstasy use	2	2.2	3	3.1
Meth, cocaine, heroin, LSD	3	3.3	6	6.3
Vandalized property	9	9.8	3	3.1
Steal items worth < \$50	11	12.4	16	16.7
Steal items worth > \$50	1	1.1	7	7.3
Break into home or business	1	1.1	1	1.1
Weapon use to obtain property	1	1.1	0	0.0
Firearm - illegal possession	3	3.3	2	2.1
Physical violence	25	27.2	25	26.0
Weapon use to injure person	5	5.4	3	3.1
Killed or injured person	3	3.3	2	2.1
Gang member	4	4.3	2	2.1

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 57. Summary statistics for criminal activity by category and race category.

	Nonwhite (n=92)		White (n=96)	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Crime against persons	28	30.4	27	28.1
Drug crime	40	44.4	52	54.2
Weapon crime	6	6.5	5	5.2
Crime against property	18	20.0	19	20.0
Crime against the public order	35	38.0	47	49.0
Gang member	4	4.3	2	2.1

NOTE: The total number of students surveyed was 188. Some variable totals are less than 188 due to missing data. Percentages are calculated based on the number of valid responses.

Table 58. Summary statistics of the sample by living arrangement (percentages).

	Mother & Father (n=108)	Mother Only (n=47)	Father Only (n=14)	Other Family (n=9)	Other Non-family (n=9)
Location					
Urban	12.0	19.1	7.1	33.3	44.4
Suburban	62.0	57.4	64.3	44.4	55.6
Rural	25.9	23.4	28.6	22.2	0.0
Gender					
Female	48.1	55.3	57.1	33.3	66.7
Male	51.9	44.7	42.9	66.7	33.3
Age					
13-14	5.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
15-16	16.7	26.1	7.1	0.0	22.2
17	13.9	13.0	28.6	22.2	22.2
18 or older	63.9	60.9	57.1	77.8	55.6
Free Lunch					
Yes	25.2	42.6	21.4	55.6	66.7
No	65.4	44.7	71.4	33.3	33.3
Unsure	9.3	12.8	7.1	11.1	0.0
Race					
Nonwhite	47.2	51.1	50.0	44.4	55.6
White	52.8	48.9	50.0	55.6	44.4

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 59. Summary statistics for criminal activity by living arrangement (percentages).

	Mother & Father (n=108)	Mother Only (n=47)	Father Only (n=14)	Other Family (n=9)	Other Non-family (n=9)
Tobacco use	25.9	17.0	28.6	55.6	22.2
Drink alcohol	38.0	38.3	28.6	33.3	44.4
Smoke marijuana	24.1	19.6	23.1	22.2	11.1
Illegal prescription drugs	15.7	12.8	14.3	0.0	11.1
Legally available substances	3.7	2.1	0.0	0.0	11.1
Ecstasy use	2.8	2.1	7.1	0.0	0.0
Meth, cocaine, heroin, LSD	4.6	6.4	0.0	11.1	0.0
Vandalized property	8.3	2.1	14.3	0.0	0.0
Steal items worth < \$50	14.0	14.9	25.0	11.1	11.1
Steal items worth > \$50	2.8	2.1	14.3	11.1	11.1
Break into home/business	0.0	0.0	7.1	11.1	0.0
Weapon to obtain property	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
Firearm - illegal possession	1.9	4.3	7.1	0.0	0.0
Physical violence	21.3	38.3	21.4	33.3	33.3
Weapon to injure person	3.7	6.4	7.1	0.0	0.0
Killed or injured person	1.9	2.1	14.3	0.0	0.0
Gang member	4.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 60. Summary statistics for criminal activity by category and living arrangement (percentages).

	Mother & Father (n=108)	Mother Only (n=47)	Father Only (n=14)	Other Family (n=9)	Other Non-family (n=9)
Crime against persons	24.1	40.4	28.6	33.3	33.3
Drug crime	49.1	50.0	46.2	66.7	44.4
Weapon crime	4.6	10.6	7.1	0.0	0.0
Crime against property	20.8	17.0	38.5	11.1	11.1
Crime against public order	44.4	42.8	35.7	55.6	44.4
Gang member	4.6	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 61. Summary statistics of the sample by location (percentages).

	Urban (n= 31)	Suburban (n= 112)	Rural (n= 45)
Gender			
Female	48.4	45.5	66.7
Male	51.6	54.5	33.3
Age			
13-14	6.5	2.7	6.7
15-16	25.8	16.2	15.6
17	12.9	13.5	22.2
18 or older	54.8	67.6	55.6
Free Lunch			
Yes	90.3	24.1	15.9
No	3.2	67.9	68.2
Unsure	6.5	8.0	15.9
Living Arrangement			
Mother & Father	43.3	59.8	62.2
Mother Only	30.0	24.1	24.4
Father Only	3.3	8.0	8.9
Other Family	10.0	3.6	4.4
Other Non-family	13.3	4.5	0.0
Race			
Nonwhite	83.9	44.6	35.6
White	16.1	55.4	64.4

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 62. Summary statistics for criminal activity by location (percentages).

	Urban (n= 31)	Suburban (n= 112)	Rural (n= 45)
Tobacco use	12.9	26.8	28.9
Drink alcohol	29.0	37.5	42.2
Smoke marijuana	9.7	25.5	22.2
Illegal prescription drugs	9.7	13.4	17.8
Legally available substances	0.0	2.7	6.7
Ecstasy use	0.0	2.7	4.4
Meth, cocaine, heroin, LSD	0.0	7.1	2.2
Vandalized property	9.7	6.3	4.4
Steal items worth < \$50	12.9	16.5	11.1
Steal items worth > \$50	0.0	6.3	2.2
Break into home/business	0.0	1.8	0.0
Weapon to obtain property	0.0	0.9	0.0
Firearm - illegal possession	3.2	2.7	2.2
Physical violence	22.6	26.8	28.9
Weapon to injure person	3.2	3.6	6.7
Killed or injured person	0.0	3.6	2.2
Gang member	3.2	3.6	2.2

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 63. Summary statistics for criminal activity category by location (percentages).

	Urban (n= 31)	Suburban (n= 112)	Rural (n= 45)
Crime against persons	25.8	28.6	33.3
Drug crime	38.7	51.8	51.1
Weapon crime	6.5	4.5	8.9
Crime against property	16.1	23.9	13.3
Crime against public order	32.3	45.5	46.7
Gang member	3.2	3.6	2.2

NOTE: Numbers in the table are percentages.

Table 64. Odds-ratios predicting committing crime against persons.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		1.2	1.3	1.4
Rural		1.6	1.8	2.2
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			2.2*	2.2*
Father Only			1.2	1.5
Other Family			1.7	1.6
Other Non-family			1.8	2.4
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				2.7**
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				3.7
17				1.7
18 or older				2.4
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				1.0
Unsure				1.9

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 65. Odds-ratios predicting drug crimes.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.4
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		1.5	1.5	1.4
Rural		1.4	1.5	1.8
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			1.1	1.1
Father Only			0.9	0.9
Other Family			2.2	1.7
Other Non-family			0.9	1.0
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				1.7
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				1.1
17				1.9
18 or older				1.2
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				0.9
Unsure				0.6

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 66. Odds-ratios predicting weapons crimes.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	0.8	0.7	0.8	1.0
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		0.8	0.6	0.6
Rural		1.6	1.3	1.7
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			2.4	2.0
Father Only			1.6	3.1
Other Family			1.0	1.0
Other Non-family			1.0	0.9
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				5.4**
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				0.9
17				1.0
18 or older				1.0
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				0.6
Unsure				2.0

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 67. Odds-ratios predicting crimes against property.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		1.6	1.3	0.9
Rural		0.8	0.6	0.3‡
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			0.8	1.0
Father Only			2.4	2.3
Other Family			0.5	0.4
Other Non-family			0.4	0.5
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				2.3*
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				1.0
17				1.0
18 or older				1.0
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				4.1*
Unsure				1.1

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 68. Odds-ratios predicting crimes against the public order.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.4
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		1.5	1.5	1.1
Rural		1.5	1.6	1.7
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			0.9	0.9
Father Only			0.7	0.7
Other Family			1.7	1.2
Other Non-family			1.1	1.4
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				2.1*
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				0.9
17				1.1
18 or older				1.0
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				1.2
Unsure				0.8

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 69. Odds-ratios predicting gang membership.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Race Category				
Nonwhite (<i>reference</i>)				
White	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3
Location				
Urban (<i>reference</i>)				
Suburban		1.1	0.9	1.1
Rural		0.9	0.9	1.0
Living Arrangement				
Mother/Father (<i>reference</i>)				
Mother Only			1.0	1.0
Father Only			1.5	1.1
Other Family			1.0	1.0
Other Non-family			1.0	1.0
Gender				
Female (<i>reference</i>)				
Male				8.6‡
Age				
13-14 (<i>reference</i>)				
15-16				1.0
17				0.9
18 or older				1.5
Free Lunch				
Yes (<i>reference</i>)				
No				0.2
Unsure				1.0

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Table 70. Summary statistics of police and judicial personnel interviews.

	Race		Gender		Job/Specialty	
	Nonwhite	White	Female	Male	Lawyers & Judges	Police & Specialists
Family	2.9	3.6	4.0	3.3	4.8	3.3
Abstract Liberalism	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	4.5	2.0
Cultural Racism	2.4	2.7	1.8	2.9	3.9	2.6
Naturalization	1.5	1.7	2.3	1.6	2.0	1.6
Minimization of Racism	1.3	2.8	1.8	2.8	1.5	2.7
Reactionary Location	1.1	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.0	1.9

NOTE: Numbers in the table are average number of references per interviewee.