

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH

RECIDIVISM STUDY

501

013998

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
REHABILITATIVE SERVICES
DIVISION OF YOUTH SERVICES

PREPARED BY:
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
RESEARCH AND PLANNING

Division of Youth Services
Recidivism Study

Prepared by:
Bureau of Research,
Statistics & Planning

Preface:

The following Recidivism Study for children released in FY 1968 - 69 from Florida's Training Schools indicates that 33% of those children eventually ended up in the Florida Adult Correctional System. (Although it is satisfying to compare ourselves with national averages that generally indicate recidivism rates of 60-65%, it remains an appalling thought in terms of human suffering and tax dollar expenditures that so many children do not become successful and contributing members of society.) As citizens we have an obligation to ask why so many of our young children fail even when exposed to a degree of treatment that is nationally recognized as one of the nation's finest programs?

In a recent published report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals we can see part of the answer to our question.

"The failure of major institutions to reduce crime is incontestable. Recidivism rates are notoriously high. Institutions do succeed in punishing, but they do not deter. They protect the community, but that protection is only temporary. They relieve the community responsibility by removing the offender, but they make successful reintegration into the community unlikely. They change the committed offender, but the change is more likely to be negative than positive."

If we as citizens can accept the fact that institutionalization should be used only as a last resort we may begin to solve our problem. Many children committed to the State Training Schools should not have been committed in the first place. As an example, in 1972 almost

one-third of the young people committed from the courts were committed for offenses that had they been adults would not have been crimes, (CINS offenses) such as truancy, running away and ungovernable behavior. The psychological damage of perceiving of oneself as a criminal and failure as a result of the experience of institutionalization can in many cases never be overcome. As citizens we should begin to give greater consideration to improving our community programs and assuming the individual responsibility for helping children with behavioral problems.

Recidivism only partially measures the effectiveness of our treatment programs. Recidivism also measures our sense of community responsibility and our tolerance for acting out children. The greatest potential deterrent to future crime may be in extending our use of probation, greater use of community resources and an expanded volunteer effort by the public.

Bureau of Research,
Statistics and Planning
Division of Youth Services

Introduction

This preliminary study is part of a larger research project conducted by BRSP to analyze factors known at the time of a juvenile's commitment which might be predictive of Aftercare success or failure. The report presents the results of a descriptive and inferential statistical analysis based on an examination of certain key variables thought to be significant to juvenile recidivism.

The basic questions this study sought to answer were: to what extent did DYS youths released from training schools to Aftercare remain law abiding, and what variables were associated with subsequent lawless behavior. The general procedure was first, to determine who the successes and failures were and secondly, to learn the ways the resulting two groups differed in terms of factors presumably related to success or failure. Recommitment to a juvenile institution, placement on adult probation, or commitment to an adult institution were the criteria used to gauge success or failure. In effect, this definition reduces the number of failures to an unrealistic minimum. It does, however, have the advantage of being clear and unambiguous.

Highlights

This recidivism study revealed that 48% of a sample of DYS youths released to aftercare from training schools were later re-committed to a DYS institution or entered adult jurisdiction; 33.3% were either committed to adult correctional institutions or were placed on adult probation, and 11.4% re-entered DYS institutions. Another 3.3% were committed to a federal reformatory or mental health facility.

The variables of race, sex, type of offense, and number of prior commitments were found to be statistically significant to the criterion variable. Generally, higher recidivism percentages were associated with blacks over whites, males over females, younger youths over older ones, property and person offenders over drug and juvenile status offenders, those with prior commitments over those with no prior commitments, those serving longer commitment time periods over those serving shorter commitments and those from rural and urban committing counties over suburban ones.

A capsule summary of recidivism percentages by selected categories is listed in Table A. A further breakdown of these results by race and sex is presented in the Appendix, Table 13.

TABLE A

Category	N	Recidivism %
Overall	246	48.0
Black	135	55.6
White	111	38.7
Male	200	54.0
Female	46	21.7
14 Years & Under	88	56.8
15 Years	73	42.5
16 Years & Over	85	43.5
Property Offender	140	55.0
Person Offender	20	50.0
Drug Offender	7	28.6
Juvenile Status Offender	79	36.7
No Prior Commitments	170	42.4
One Prior Commitment	54	51.9
Two or more Prior Commitments	22	81.8
Up to 6 Months Commitment	91	50.5
Up to 9 Months Commitment	111	44.1
Up to 12 Months Commitment	26	46.2
Over 12 Months Commitment	18	61.1
Rural Committing County	35	51.4
Suburban Committing County	67	38.8
Urban Committing County	144	51.4

Procedure

Sample

The sample consisted of 246 DYS youths released to Aftercare supervision during FY 68-69. A 12.5% random selection of individuals on the Aftercare Admissions Roster was the basis for sample inclusion. Each youth was studied either for a follow-up period of three years subsequent to the date of his release to aftercare, or to the date of his discharge from DYS jurisdiction.

Data on each subject was first drawn from DYS case files. The files contain a current record on all ward behavior which results in official action on the part of the juvenile justice system, from initial contact through termination. Termination of DYS jurisdiction may occur when: (1) a youth successfully fulfills Aftercare obligations, (2) a 17 year old youth on Aftercare commits a new offense and is certified as an adult by a court and thereby transferred to adult jurisdiction, either adult probation or prison, (3) a youth is committed to a State residential mental health facility, or (4) jurisdiction is lost to another state due to an offense committed by the youth in that state.

In addition, records from the Division of Corrections were used to identify those subjects who were subsequently committed to state adult institutions. A serious limitation of the study, however, is that it does not consider those individuals who are successfully terminated from DYS jurisdiction but who, as adults, commit offenses and are placed on adult probation. Neither DYS records nor these from the Division of Corrections would reflect those situations. Therefore, the recidivism figures reported in this study are somewhat low.

Table B shows the composition of certain basic characteristics of the sample.

TABLE B
Sample Characteristics

Category	N	% of Sample
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	200	81.3
Female	46	18.7
<u>Race</u>		
Black	135	54.9
White	111	45.1
<u>Age at this Commitment*</u>		
14 years and under	88	35.8
15 years	73	29.7
16 years and over	85	34.5
<u>Committing County Classification</u>		
Rural	35	14.2
Suburban	67	27.2
Urban	144	58.6
<u>Offense Type at this Commitment*</u>		
Property	140	56.9
Person	20	8.2
Drug	7	2.8
Juvenile Status	79	32.1
<u>Prior Commitments</u>		
None	170	69.1
One	54	22.0
Two or more	22	8.9
<u>Length of this Commitment*</u>		
Up to 6 months	91	37.0
Up to 9 months	111	45.1
Up to 12 months	26	10.6
More than 12 months	18	7.3

*Refers to commitment immediately preceding ward's release to Aftercare in FY 68-69.

Variables Selected for Study

Thirteen variables were selected for use in this report. Six of them pertained to the commitment which directly preceded the youth's release to aftercare in FY 68-69: Sex, race, age committing county classification, type of offense which led to commitment, and the length of the commitment. The other seven variables concerned the youth's prior and subsequent commitment history: offense at first commitment, age at first commitment, number of prior DYS commitments, type of recommitment following release to Aftercare in FY 68-69, type of adult commitment, length of adult sentence, and type of adult offense, if any.

Assumptions and Variable Definitions

The follow-up used in this study consisted of a records search in DYS and Adult Corrections case files to locate any subsequent commitments to juvenile institutions or adult probations and commitments following the youth's release to aftercare in FY 68-69. Obviously, a complete follow-up study was not conducted. No attempt was made to determine the youth's degree of social functioning or adjustment in his community. Certainly, the follow-up did not unequivocally ascertain whether or not the youth was engaging in delinquent or criminal behavior, for only official, recorded contact with law enforcement agencies was noted in the case files. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that a follow-up of persons committed to correctional institutions is in reality a study of the failure of all the institutions that affected them prior to commitment, not just the consequences of the correctional institutional experience.

A three year follow-up period was utilized for three reasons. First, a three year period following release to Aftercare normally equals or exceeds the length of DYS jurisdiction for most youths. Therefore, a complete record of post-release offense history while under DYS jurisdiction would be available. secondly, a three year follow-up period is regarded by many criminal justice authorities to be a reasonable amount of time in which to measure post-release behavior. Finally, a three year period would provide a greater number of observations and thus greater statistical validity than the fifteen month period used by many researchers in the field of corrections.

This study does not equate recommitment or adult probation as the only criteria for delinquency or recidivism. It was, however, a definition that could be operationalized and measured with the data that was available. Clearly, the confined population may contain individuals who were wrongfully committed, and certainly, the unconfined population contains individuals who are engaged in delinquent or criminal behavior which is not detected. The study merely attempts to describe certain characteristics of DYS recommitments while cognizant of its limitations in analyzing a particularly complex set of relationships with admittedly crude methodology.

Offenses were classified into the four categories displayed by Table 1 in the Appendix: property, person, drug, and juvenile status offenses. Juvenile status offenses are those which are classified as delinquent acts solely by the fact that a juvenile commits them.

The committing county was categorized as being urban, suburban, or rural. For this study, counties were considered to be urban if according to the 1970 census they contained a city of 50,000 or more inhabitants, and suburban if a city of 25-50,000 population was

situated in the county. All other counties were classified as rural ones. Table 2 in the Appendix lists the Florida counties according to these criteria.

Results of Data Analysis

Relationship of Key Variables to Recidivism

The dependent or criterion variable of the study was the degree of post-release recidivism. This variable was separated into two categories: non-recidivist and recidivist. Each background variable was then related to the recidivist/non-recidivist criterion by means of a contingency table and the significance of the relationship tested by Chi-Square. The results of that procedure are summarized in Table C.

TABLE C

Relationships Between 9 Variables and Recidivism

Variable	N	Recidivist	Non-Recidivist	Percentage Recidivist	x ² + C
<u>Race</u>					
Black	135	75	60	55.6	6.24**
White	111	43	68	38.7	C = .158
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Sex</u>					
Male	200	108	92	54.0	14.33****
Female	46	10	36	21.7	C = .235
Total	246	118	128	48.0	

TABLE C (cont'd)

Variable	N	Recidivist	Non-Recidivist	Percentage Recidivist	$\chi^2 + C$
<u>Age at this Commitment⁺</u>					
14 Yrs. & Under	88	50	38	56.8	4.32
15 Yrs.	73	31	42	42.5	C = .131
16 Yrs. & Over	85	37	48	43.5	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Type of Offense at this Commitment⁺</u>					
Property	140	77	63	55.0	7.87*
Person	20	10	10	50.0	C = .176
Drug	7	2	5	28.6	
Juvenile Status	79	29	50	36.7	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Prior Commitments</u>					
None	170	72	98	42.4	12.57***
One	54	28	26	51.9	C = .221
Two or More	22	18	4	81.8	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Length Commitment</u>					
Up to 6 Mo.	91	46	45	50.5	2.17
Up to 9 Mo.	111	49	62	44.1	C = .094
Up to 12 Mo.	26	12	14	46.2	
More than 12 Months	18	11	7	61.1	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>County Classification</u>					
Rural	35	18	17	51.4	3.10
Suburban	67	26	41	38.8	C = .111
Urban	144	74	70	51.4	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Age at First Commitment</u>					
14 & Under	128	71	57	55.5	6.07
15	59	23	36	39.0	C = .155
16 & Over	59	24	35	40.7	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	
<u>Type of Offense At First Commitment</u>					
Property	145	78	67	53.8	6.20
Person	14	7	7	50.0	C = .157
Drug	5	1	4	20.0	
Juvenile Status	82	32	50	39.0	
Total	246	118	128	48.0	

- * Sign at .05 level
- ** Sign at .02 level
- *** Sign at .01 level
- **** Sign at .001 level

⁺"this commitment refers to the commitment immediately preceding the youth's release to aftercare in FY 68-69.

Only four of the nine variables were found to have statistical significance: race, sex, type of offense for this commitment, and number of prior commitments.* As used in this report, "this commitment" refers to the commitment immediately preceding the youth's release to aftercare in FY 68-69. The categories of each independent variable as well as the statistical significance of the relationship are shown. The Chi-Square indicates whether or not the independent variable is statistically associated with the criterion variable, and the contingency coefficient (C) measures the strength of the relationship. The statistical significance of the contingency coefficient is measured by the significance of the Chi-Square.

Race

Race was significantly related (.02 level) to the criterion. Blacks in the sample showed a greater than expected percentage of recidivism, 55.6% as opposed to 38.7% for whites. This result is consistent with other studies of juvenile and adult offenders. A recent study conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin of delinquency in Philadelphia concluded that race was the strongest single predictor of delinquency. The authors also found that non-whites commit more offenses and more serious ones, begin their careers earlier, and desist later than whites (Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, 1972).

Many factors may be involved in this relationship. Oppressive

*In other words, they were so strongly related to the criterion or dependent variable that mere chance could not account for the relationship.

socio-economic conditions, early exposure to aggressive role models and environment, possibly greater police surveillance and detection of black offenders, and differential judicial processes with regard to charges and convictions may be related to this finding (Molof, 1965).

Sex

Among the nine background variables examined, the highest level of statistical significance (.001) was between sex and the criterion. Clearly, males are much more likely to be recidivists than females. Again, this is not an inconsistent finding.

One reason for this outcome may be the greater freedom frequently permitted to boys so that they are more likely to become involved in infractions of the law. (Juvenile Court Statistics for Alabama, 1972) In addition, studies have traditionally noted that delinquency has a strong relationship with lower-class communities. Furthermore, in many lower-class communities, violence is associated with masculinity and is not only acceptable but admired behavior (Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, 1967). Perhaps these factors explain the significant relationship between males and recidivism found in this study. It should be noted, however, that social class was not measured by this study and no such conclusion can be drawn from it.

Table 3 in the Appendix displays the relationship of recidivism with race and sex. Note that the relationship of males of both races to recidivism is still strong and significant at the .05 level, while the association of females of either race to recidivism is not statistically significant.

Age

The inverse relationship of recidivism and age at first commitment and/or age at release to parole has been found to be among the most powerful predictors of recidivism among youths, for both males and females (Molof, 1970). Several explanations possibly account for this relationship. It is assumed that older adolescents have established better self-concepts which prohibit the more damaging and negative consequences of institutionalization than for younger youths. Also, the younger the youth is when committed to an institution, the more likely he is to have a disturbed home and community situation (Molof, 1970).

Early involvement in crime, and each experience of arrest and correctional confinement may increase estrangement from home and school and at the same time enhance prestige and self-esteem in delinquent social circles. Also, the later one commits deviant acts, the more time the home, church, school, and other institutions have had to instill ideas which may effectively oppose the influence of a delinquent peer group (Glasser, 1969).

This study, however, did not find a statistically significant relationship between recidivism and age at first commitment or age at this commitment.

Youths aged 14 years and under did show, however, a higher percentage of recidivism than those of age 15 years and over. In addition, statistical significance at the .02 level was obtained for white males when race, sex, and age at this commitment were considered. (See Table 4 in Appendix)

Other observations, though not statistically significant, are interesting. Note that the recidivism percentages for a black male

stay relatively constant throughout the age categories. No other definite trends are discernable, although females again possessed the lower recidivism percentages when compared with males. Black females exhibited lower recidivism percentages among 15 year olds, while white females had lower recidivism percentages in the younger and older age categories.

Type of Offense

Studies conducted by Daniel Glaser have indicated that those who commit economic crimes are more likely to continue in criminal activity than those whose offenses are against persons or are statutory in nature. The President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime also found that offenders against persons are better parole risks than offenders against property. Another interesting observation by Glaser is that inmates most likely to be sentenced to prison again for new incidences of lawbreaking are those whose offenses are economic and not accompanied by violence.

Those findings were not confirmed by this study, although type of offense was significant at the .05 level to recidivism. Table C reveals that while virtually the same percentage of property and person offenders are recidivists, drug and juvenile status offenders are much less likely to be recidivists. This is also reflected in Table 5 in the Appendix when age and race are considered. With this breakdown, statistical significance disappears, but other relevant observations can be made. Again the black children had higher recidivism percentages than their white counterparts. As commitment age increased, juvenile status offenders of both races showed smaller percentages of recidivism. Property offenders aged 14 years or younger showed less of a tendency to be recidivists than person

offenders of the same age. No such comparison could be made for those aged 15 because there were no person offenders, but the 16 year and over category exhibited a reversal in which person offenders had the lower recidivism percentages.

Table 6 in the Appendix relates type of offense with recidivism when considering race and sex. Females of both races were overwhelmingly committed for juvenile status offenses and had a very low recidivism percentage. The recidivism percentages for white and black male property and person offenders were almost a mirror image. That is, black male property offenders showed a higher recidivism percentage than white male property offenders, but white male person offenders had a higher percentage or recidivism than black person offenders.

Furthermore, the study revealed that type of offense at first commitment was significantly related (.001 level) to type of offense at this commitment. That is, type of offense did not change from first to subsequent commitments.

Prior Commitments

The evidence of most studies of criminality tend to support the conclusion that the extent of an offender's prior criminal record will indicate the probability of him adding to it. Those imprisoned on a first felony conviction have lower rates of post-release criminality than two time or more losers. (Glaser, 1969)

In this study the number of commitments prior to the FY 68-69 commitment was statistically significant (.01) in a positive relationship to subsequent recidivism. Table C demonstrates that 81.8% of those with two or more prior commitments were later

recidivists in comparison with 42.4% of first commitments. The effects of race and sex with the relationship are displayed in Table 7 in the Appendix. Note the extremely small recidivism percentage for black females with no prior commitments. This is significant at the .02 level.

Unexpected results were obtained for white females and white males, however. Note that for white females, those with no prior commitments have a higher recidivism percentage (25%) than those with a previous commitment (0%). Also, white males with one prior commitment have a slightly lower recidivism percentage (37.5%) than those white males with no prior commitments (40.8%). Nonetheless, all four of the white males with more than one prior commitment are recidivists. There is no obvious explanation for these rather unusual findings, although the small sample size could conceivably be a plausible cause.

County Classification

There exists a large body of evidence which consistently demonstrates the importance of urbanization as a crucial variable in criminal behavior (Dilemmas in Criminology, 1967).

The relationship of committing county classification to recidivism was not statistically significant in this study. Observe in Table C though, that the suburban category is lower than the urban and rural categories which are the same. This relationship as affected by race and sex is shown in Table 8 in the Appendix. Again, note the consistently higher black and male levels of recidivism. In all categories, rural recidivism percentages are higher than urban and suburban ones. Table 9 in the Appendix, however, which compares the relationship of committing county classification and recidivism in

regard to number of prior commitments shows that urban counties and the number of prior commitments are significantly related (.05). Only the rural wards with more than one prior commitment had a higher recidivism percentage than the urban categories.

Length of Commitment

In the study conducted in Philadelphia by Wolfgang, et. al., it was found that offenders who were punished severely had worse subsequent delinquency record than those punished mildly in the same broad category of offenses (Wolfgang, 1972).

This study, however, found no significant relationship between length of commitment and recidivism. Nonetheless, Table C does show a relatively higher recidivism percentage for those committed 12 months or longer. Table 10 in the Appendix relates age to the relationship and displays no strong trends. Fifteen year olds, however, do have smaller recidivism percentages than 14 year olds, as do 16 year olds with the exception of the up to 12 months category. For those aged 15 years and under, serving an incarceration period of 12 months or more seems to be detrimental. For 16 year olds and older, however, recidivism percentages for the up to 9 month category are small in comparison to the other two categories.

Table 11 in the Appendix illustrates the effect of race and sex to the length of commitment/recidivism relationship. Length of commitment appears to have no major influence on blacks, but for whites and females, the 12 month and over category shows a high recidivism percentage. And for males, the up to 12 month category produces the highest recidivism percentage.

Adult Commitment

Of the total sample, 33.3% (82) were later committed to adult correctional institutions or placed on adult probation. Table 12 in the Appendix shows adult recidivism by race and sex. Again, males of both races were significantly over represented (.05 level). Clearly, females are not likely to be committed to adult institutions or placed on adult probation.

Certainly, it is disappointing that 48% of the DYS wards in the sample were subsequently recommitted to DYS, placed on adult probation, or entered adult institutions. This figure is not so overwhelming, however, when contrasting it with adult prison recidivism percentages. The Federal Bureau of Investigation completed a national study in 1970 of persons released from prison in 1965. It revealed that within four years, 37% of those fined or placed on probation, 61% of those who completed their parole, and 75% of those who completed their sentence were rearrested (Crime in the United States, 1970, FBI).

Future Analysis

The results of this study have provided a preliminary indication of the variables which might appear in subsequent multivariate analyses. A multivariate analysis will be used so that significant variables may be examined simultaneously and hopefully to determine the important inter-relationships among them as they affect the criterion variable.

This study is important because it provides base line data against which subsequent recidivism studies will be compared.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Bobbs-Merrill Inc., Indianapolis, 1969.
2. Johnston, N., L. Savitz, and M. Wolfgang (eds.). The Sociology of Punishment and Corrections. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1970.
3. Molof, Martin J. Prediction of Future Assaultive Behavior Among Youthful Offenders. State of California, Department of the Authority, Report No. 41, Sacramento, May 1965.
4. Molof, Martin J. Statistical Prediction of Recidivism Among Female Parolees in the California Youth Authority. State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Report No. 57, Sacramento, January, 1970.
5. Savitz, Leonard. Dilemmas in Criminology. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.
6. Wolfgang, M. R. Figlio, and T. Sellin. Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1972.
7. Juvenile Court Statistics for Alabama 1972. State of Alabama, Department of Pensions and Security, Montgomery, 1972.
8. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, 1967.
9. Crime in the United States - Uniform Crime Reports - 1970. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, 1971.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
Offense Classification

Property

Arson
Vandalism
Forgery
Worthless Checks
Petty Larceny (Includes Purse Snatching)
Attempted Petty Larceny
Grand Larceny
Attempted Grand Larceny
Breaking and Entering
Robbery
Possession of Stolen Property
Receipt of Stolen Property
Unauthorized Use of Motor Vehicle
Auto Theft

Person

Obstructing Justice
Resisting Arrest
Possession of Concealed Weapon
Threatening Bodily Harm
Discharging Firearm
Non-Aggravated Assault
Aggravated Assault
Assault and Robbery
Assault and Battery
Armed Robbery
Manslaughter
Murder
Sex Offenses (Excludes Rape)
Rape

Drug

Public Intoxication
Possession of Alcoholic Beverages
Possession of Paraphenelia
Possession of Marijuana
Sale of Marijuana
Possession of a Non-Narcotic Drug
Sale of a Non-Narcotic Drug
Possession of Narcotics
Sale of Narcotics

TABLE 1 (cont'd.)

Juvenile Status

Runaway
Crossing State Lines
Truancy
Ungovernable by Counselor
Ungovernable
Incompetent

TABLE 2

Committing County Classification

Urban Counties

Alachua
Broward
Dade
Duval
Escambia
Hillsborough
Leon
Orange
Palm Beach
Pinellas

Suburban

Bay
Brevard
Charlotte
Clay
Collier
Columbia
Indian River
Lee
Manatee
Monroe
Okaloosa
Polk
St. Lucie
Sarasota
Seminole
Volusia

Rural

Baker
Bradford
Calhoun
Citrus
Desoto
Dixie
Flagler
Franklin
Gadsden
Gilchrest
Glades
Gulf

TABLE 2 (cont'd.)

Hamilton
Hardee
Hendry
Hernando
Highlands
Holmes
Jackson
Jefferson
Lafayette
Lake
Levy
Liberty
Madison
Marion
Martin
Nassau
Okeechobee
Osceola
Pasco
Putnam
St. Johns
Santa Rosa
Sumter
Suwanee
Taylor
Union
Wakulla
Walton
Washington

TABLE 3

Recommitment by Race and Sex

Category	Recommitment		Non-Recommitment		Totals
	No.	%	No.	%	
Black Male*	69	63.3	40	36.7	109
White Male*	39	42.9	52	57.1	91
Black Female	6	23.1	20	76.9	26
White Female	4	20.0	16	80.0	20
Totals	118		128		246

*Significant at .05 level

TABLE 4

Recommitment by Race, Sex and Age[†]

Category	Recommitment						Non-Recommitment						Totals
	14 yrs. & Under		15 years ^{Age}		16 yrs. & Older		14 yrs. & Under		15 years ^{Age}		16 yrs. & Older		
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	
Black Male	25	65.8	21	67.7	23	57.5	13	34.2	10	32.3	17	42.5	109
White Male*	20	62.5	6	25.0	13	37.1	12	37.5	18	75.0	22	62.9	91
Black Female	4	44.4	1	10.0	1	14.3	5	55.6	9	90.0	6	85.7	26
White Female	1	11.1	3	37.5	0	0.0	8	88.9	5	62.5	3	100.0	20
Totals	50		31		37		38		42		48		246

*Significant at .02 level

[†]at this commitment

TABLE 5

Recommitment by Race, Age⁺, and Type of Offense⁺

Category	Recommitment								Non-Recommitment							
	Type of Offense								Type of Offense							
	Property		Person		Drug		JFO		Property		Person		Drug		JFO	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Black, 14 yrs. and under	16	66.7	3	75.0	0	0.0	10	52.6	8	33.3	1	25.0	0	0.0	9	47.4
White, 14 yrs. and under	13	54.2	2	100.0	1	100.0	5	35.7	11	45.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	64.3
Black, 15 yrs.	16	69.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	40.0	7	30.4	2	100.0	1	100.0	9	60.0
White, 15 yrs.	6	33.3	-	-	0	0.0	3	23.1	12	66.7	-	--	1	100.0	10	76.9
Black, 16 yrs. and over	17	60.7	4	44.4	-	--	4	33.3	11	39.3	5	55.6	-	--	6	66.7
White, 16 yrs. and over	9	40.9	1	33.3	1	25.0	2	22.2	13	59.1	2	66.7	3	75.0	7	77.8
Totals	67		10		2		30		62		10		5		50	

⁺at this commitment

TABLE 6

Recommitment by Race, Sex, and Type of Offense⁺

Category	Recommitment								Non-Recommitment																							
	Property				Person				Drug				JSO				Property				Person				Drug				JSO			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Black Male	49	68.1	6	42.9	0	0.0	14	63.6	23	31.9	9	57.1	0	0.0	8	36.4																
White Male	28	45.2	3	60.0	2	33.3	6	33.3	34	54.8	2	40.0	4	66.7	12	66.7																
Black Female	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	5	23.8	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	16	76.2																
White Female	0	0.0	-	-	-	-	4	22.2	2	100.0	-	-	-	-	14	77.8																
Totals	77		10		2		29		62		11		5		50																	

Totals for Black Male - 109

White Male - 91

Black Female - 26

White Female - 20

246 Total⁺ at this commitment

TABLE 7

Recommitment by Race, Sex, and Prior Commitments

Category	Recommitment						Non-Recommitment						Totals
	No. Prior Commitments						No. Prior Commitments						
	None		One		More than One		None		One		More than One		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Black Male	38	57.6	19	67.9	12	80.0	28	42.4	9	32.1	3	20.0	109
White Male	29	40.8	6	37.5	4	100.0	42	59.2	10	62.5	0	0.0	91
Black Female*	1	5.9	3	50.0	2	66.7	16	94.1	3	50.0	1	33.3	26
White Female	4	25.0	0	0.0	-	--	12	75.0	4	100.0	-	--	20
Totals	72		28		18		98		26		4		246

*Significant at .02 level

TABLE 8

Recommitment by Race, Sex, and County Classification

Category	Recommitment						Non-Recommitment						Totals
	County Classification						County Classification						
	Rural		Suburban		Urban		Rural		Suburban		Urban		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Black Male	7	70.0	15	57.7	47	64.4	3	30.0	11	42.3	26	35.6	109
White Male	7	50.0	8	32.0	24	46.2	7	50.0	17	68.0	28	53.8	91
Black Female	2	40.0	2	25.0	2	15.4	3	60.0	6	75.0	11	84.6	26
White Female	2	33.3	1	12.5	1	16.7	4	66.7	7	87.5	5	83.3	20
Totals	18		26		74		17		41		70		246

TABLE 9

Recommitment by County Classification and Prior Commitments

Category	Recommitment						Non-Recommitment						Totals
	No. Prior Commitments						No. Prior Commitments						
	None		One		More than One		None		One		More than One		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Rural	11	44.0	4	57.1	3	100.0	14	56.0	3	42.9	0	0.0	35
Suburban	13	32.5	8	40.0	5	71.4	27	67.5	12	60.0	2	28.6	67
Urban*	48	45.7	16	59.3	10	83.3	57	54.3	11	40.7	2	16.7	144
Totals	72		28		18		98		26		4		246

*Significant at .05 level

TABLE 10

Recommitment by Age[†] and Length of Commitment

Category	Recommitment						Non-Recommitment						Totals
	Age						Age						
	14 yrs. & Under		15 yrs.		16 yrs. & Over		14 yrs. & Under		15 yrs.		16 yrs. & Over		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Up to 6 mo.	15	55.6	11	42.3	20	52.6	12	44.4	15	57.7	18	47.4	91
Up to 9 mo.	22	56.4	16	43.2	11	31.4	17	43.6	21	56.8	24	68.6	111
Up to 12 mo.	7	50.0	1	20.0	4	57.1	7	50.0	4	80.0	3	42.9	26
Over 12 mo.	6	75.0	3	60.0	2	40.0	2	25.0	2	40.0	3	60.0	18
Totals	50		31		37		38		42		48		246

[†]at this commitment

TABLE 11

Recommitment by Race, Sex, and Length of Commitment

Category	Recommitment								Non-Recommitment							
	Race				Sex				Race				Sex			
	Black		White		Male		Female		Black		White		Male		Female	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Up to 6 mo.	26	61.9	20	40.8	45	53.6	1	14.3	16	38.1	29	59.2	39	46.4	6	85.7
Up to 9 mo.	34	54.8	15	30.6	45	49.5	4	20.0	28	45.2	34	69.4	46	50.5	16	80.0
Up to 12 mo.	9	45.0	3	50.0	10	76.9	2	15.4	11	55.0	3	50.0	3	23.1	11	84.6
Over 12 mo.	6	54.5	5	11.4	8	66.7	3	50.0	5	45.5	2	28.6	4	33.3	3	50.0
Totals	75		43		108		10		60		68		92		36	

TABLE 12

Adult Commitment by Race and Sex

Category	Adult Commitment								Totals
	None		Adult Probation		County Jail		Div. of Corrections		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Black Male*	54	50.9	12	11.3	6	5.7	34	32.1	106
White Male*	61	69.3	7	8.0	7	8.0	13	14.8	83
Black Female	23	88.5	0	0.0	1	3.8	2	7.7	26
White Female	18	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	18
Totals	156		19		14		49		**238

*Significant at .05 level

**8 wards not represented, 1 - Federal Reformatory, 7 - Mental Health

Recommitment Percentages by Selected Categories

TABLE 13 -- BLACK MALE

Category	N	Recommitment %
Overall	109	63.3
Rural	10	70.0
Suburban	26	57.7
Urban	73	64.4
14 years and under	38	65.8
15 years	31	67.7
16 years and over	40	57.5
No prior commitments	66	57.6
One prior commitment	28	67.9
Two or more prior commitments	15	80.0
Property Offender	72	68.1
Person Offender	15	42.9
Drug Offender	-	-
Juvenile Status Offender	22	63.6

TABLE 13 -- WHITE MALE

Category	N	Recommitment%
Overall	91	42.9
Rural	14	50.0
Suburban	25	32.0
Urban	52	46.2
14 years and under	32	62.5
15 years	24	25.0
16 years and over	35	37.1
No prior commitments	71	40.8
One prior commitment	16	37.5
Two or more prior commitments	4	100.0
Property Offender	62	45.2
Person Offender	5	60.0
Drug Offender	6	33.3
Juvenile Status Offender	18	33.3

TABLE 13 -- BLACK FEMALE

Category	N	Recommitment %
Overall	26	23.1
Rural	5	40.0
Suburban	8	25.0
Urban	13	15.4
14 years and under	9	44.4
15 years	10	10.0
16 years and over	7	14.3
No prior commitments	17	5.9
One prior commitment	6	50.0
Two or more prior commitments	3	66.7
Property Offender	3	0.0
Person Offender	1	100.0
Drug Offender	1	0.0
Juvenile Status Offender	21	23.8

TABLE 13 -- WHITE FEMALE
(cont'd)

Category	N	Recommitment %
Overall	20	20.0
Rural	6	33.3
Suburban	8	12.5
Urban	6	16.7
14 years and under	9	11.1
15 years	8	37.5
16 years and over	3	0.0
No prior commitments	16	25.0
One prior commitment	4	0.0
Two or more Prior commitments	-	-
Property Offender	2	0.0
Person Offender	-	-
Drug Offender	-	-
Juvenile Status Offender	18	22.2

END