

RECEIVED

OCT 27 1976

CLERK OF  
SUPERIOR COURT

A STATISTICAL EVALUATION  
OF THE LAFAYETTE CITY COURT  
ALCOHOL REHABILITATION PROGRAM

BY

BRUCE WALTER

48482

The following statistics were derived from the Alcohol Probation Department of the Lafayette City Court from March 1, 1973 to February, 1975. The purpose of this research is to look at the frequency of those people who repeat before the court on any alcohol or drug related charges.

There were a total of 802 people who had charges brought before them by the State on alcohol and/or drug related charges. Vital statistics were noted; such as sex, age, marital status, occupation, previous alcohol arrest record, additional charges incurred as a result of alcohol, and finally instances of repeating before the court.

It is very hard to make comparisons as to the success of the Alcohol Probation Department of the Lafayette City Court, because no previous data is available for comparison. I cannot say whether the incidences of repetition have decreased from the previous judge's handling of alcohol related charges because no data exists. I do believe that these statistics will prove to be definitive in showing that the program is indeed successful in decreasing repeaters before the court.

I contacted two other programs similar to the Lafayette City Court's, and tried to find out how statistics on repeaters compared. Although vital statistics weren't individually compiled at this time, general statistics indicated that repeaters before the court were declining due to their alcohol programs. Loretta McCormick of the Muncie City Court Alcohol Program told me that there was a reduction of repeaters by 18-20% from 1972 - 1974. Public Intoxication was the most prevalent alcohol charge and was on the rise. She stated that there was a 115% decrease in Driving Under Influence charges and a 34% decrease in liquor law violations for minors.

I also contacted Cherry Langheinz, Director of the Montgomery County Alcohol Program. She was in the process of compiling statistics and told me that she had 14 repeaters out of 200 total alcohol cases (7% repetition rate). Cherry Langheinz said that public intoxication accounted for 34% of her case load and that driving under the influence was a close second with 33%.

I would have liked to have obtained data that was broken down into the repetition percentages, but this was not possible at this time. The general breakdown for the Lafayette City Court's Alcohol Probation Program is found in Table One.

Table 1

<u>Court Charge</u>	<u># charges</u>	<u>% of all charges</u>
Public Intoxication	333	41%
Driving Under Influence	241	30%
Reckless Driving	88	10%
Minor in Possession	44	5%
House Common Nuisance	36	4½%
Disorderly Conduct	22	2½%
Illegal Consumption	18	2%
3rd Degree Burglary	17	2%
Traffic Offenses	6	1%
Contributing Delinquency Minor	5	1%
Assault & Battery	4	1%
Possession of Drugs	3	1%
Trespassing	2	-
1st Degree Burglary	1	-
2nd Degree Burglary	1	-
Interferring with Police	1	-
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>100%</b>

There were a total of 107 repeaters before the court out of 802 cases (13% ratio). I have broken these down into the number of repeaters per charge, the percentage of repeaters per charge, and the percentage of total number of repeaters per charge. Table two shows these statistics.

Table 2

<u>Charge</u>	<u># Repeaters</u>	<u>% of Repeaters per charge</u>	<u>% of total # Repeaters</u>
Public Intox.	79	23%	74%
Driving Under Infl.	10	4%	9%
Reckless Driving	3	3%	2½%
Minor in Possession	5	10%	4½%
House Comm. Nuisance	1	2%	-
Disorderly Conduct	5	22%	4½%
3rd Degree Burglary	4	22%	4%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

From this table it can be seen that PI represents the vast majority of repeaters before the court (74%), of the total number of repeaters. Yet of those charged with PI before the court, only 23% repeated before the court. This appears to be a favorable percentage when checked with other programs.

The most serious alcohol related charges had an extremely low rate of repetition before the court. DUI had only a 4% repeater rate while Reckless Driving had a 3% repeater rate. This is quite significant considering that half of all fatal traffic accidents result from the overuse of alcohol. It is my opinion that the city court's Alcohol Information School has a major role in these low repeater rates. The person evidently learns that too many drinks and driving do not go together. The repercussions of losing one's drivers license also has to play an important part in the low incidence of repeaters for DUI and reckless driving.

I have included an appendix with the specific vital information and percentages for: Public intoxication, Driving under influence, Reckless driving, Disorderly conduct, Illegal consumption, Minor in possession, Contributing delinquency of minor, House of common nuisance, and Third degree burglary. Not all of the vital statistics for a charge have the same number of persons due to a lack of information in the case files. The purpose of the vital statistics information is to give the reader a better understanding of basic factors such as age, sex, etc., and see if any definite tendencies exist.

I have also included data on previous arrests for alcohol related offenses, repeaters, and what I call "compound charges." I define "compound charges" as any subsequent charges filed as a result of an alcohol and/or drug related offense.

From viewing the data sheets one can see that definite tendencies do exist as to vital statistics. Others are not as conclusive.

The sex of the individual is overwhelmingly male, about 90%. This does not necessarily mean that women don't have drinking problems. I would liken this to the reporting of the female alcoholic, where there is such an iceberg effect. It is not socially acceptable in our society for females to express their drinking prowess or desires in public, so this is done in the privacy of their homes.

In the age bracket, excluding liquor law violations for minors, 21 - 25 year olds proved to have the greatest percentage of offenders with the exception of DUI. For DUI the 26 - 30 year old had the greatest percentage of offenders. The youthful offender in the age category 18 - 30 years old had a large plurality over the other age categories 31 - 45, 46 - 60, and 61 and over.

As far as occupation goes, the average offender was employed, the figure being around 70% as an average. The highest incidences were among DUI and reckless driving as far as employment percentages go. The incidence of employment was decreased in offenses that involved strictly minors because of attending school.

Statistics on marital status do appear to be fairly consistent with respect to public intoxication, driving under influence, and reckless driving. The combined divorce-separated percentage is in the neighborhood of 22% for PI and DUI separately. Figures from Loretta McCormick indicated that 55% of the offenders in alcohol related court charges were divorced individuals. There is quite a disparity in these figures and I have no sound explanation.

As I mentioned earlier, public intoxication was the foremost offense repeated before the court. In all of the court charges related to alcohol, the person who repeated before the court did so overwhelmingly on the same charge.

Compounding charges were a fascinating area in that they were only significant in PI charges. The public intoxication compounding charges were numerous and included many charges connected with acts of violence. These additional charges ranged from assault and battery to carrying a concealed weapon. There are bound to be many repercussions for the courts and alcohol probation departments if PI is decriminalized in pending legislation.

In summation, the Alcohol Probation Program for the Lafayette City Court has done a very credible job to say the least in helping to limit repeaters before the court. The most serious offenses such as driving under influence and reckless driving have tiny repeater percentage rates before the court on alcohol related charges. Patti Gelzleichter and Judge Wireman are to be commended for a program which has the community interests in the top of their minds. I don't wish to sound patronizing but I believe this is the case. Before I started working under Patti Gelzleichter as part of my Purdue public health experience, I was very skeptical of how effective the Lafayette Court was in dealing with alcohol related problems. After seeing the program in operation and the statistics to back it up, I feel that this program is a valuable service to the Lafayette area.

Alcohol related charge abbreviations on Data Sheets

PI - Public Intoxication  
DUI - Driving under Influence  
MIP - Minor in Possession  
CDM - Contributing Delinquency Minor  
HCN - House Common Nuisance  
DC - Disorderly Conduct  
Ill Con - Illegal Consumption

## Public Intoxication

Data Sheet

Number 1

Marital Status249 Cases Available

Married	79/249	31%
Single	107/249	42%
Divorced	34/249	15%
Separated	23/249	9%
Widowed	3/249	1%

Age314 Cases Available

16 - 20	41/314	13%	
21 - 25	57/314	18%	43%
26 - 30	39/314	12%	
31 - 35	25/314	8%	
36 - 40	35/314	11%	30%
41 - 45	34/314	11%	
46 - 50	36/314	11%	
51 - 55	17/314	5%	21%
56 - 60	18/314	5%	
61 - 65	4/314	1%	
65 and over	8/314	3%	4%

Occupation278 Cases Available

Employed	189/278	63%
Unemployed	56/278	20%
Student	18/278	6%
Retired	11/278	4%
Disabled	4/278	2%

Sex333 Cases Available

Male	309/333	93%
Female	24/333	7%

Of the 333 cases that had charges filed before the court, 107 of these people had previous arrest records listed which were alcohol - drug related. This is a 32% previous arrest history for the person charged with PI.

Previous arrests107 Cases Available

PI	80/107	74%
DUI	6/107	5%
IP & DUI	6/107	5%
MIP	2/107	2%
CDM	2/107	2%
HCN	3/107	3%
PI & DC	5/107	4%
Ill Cons.	3/107	3%

\*PI was by far the most common arrest for those with a previous arrest record. Breaking this down, 51/80 were slapped with one previous arrest for a percentage of 64%. 21/80 had 2 previous PI arrests for a percentage of 26%, and these were 8/80 people who had 3 or more previous PI offenses for a total of 10%.



## Driving Under Influence

Data Sheet Number 2

Sex 241 Cases Total

Male	224/241	93%
Female	17/241	7%

Marital Status 180 Cases Total

Married	74/180	41%
Single	64/180	35%
Divorced	25/180	15%
Separated	15/180	8%
Widowed	2/180	1%

Occupation 203 Cases Total

Employed	160/203	79%
Students	20/203	10%
Unempolyed	13/203	6%
Retired	5/203	2½%
Desabled	5/203	2½%

Age 205 Cases Total

17 - 20	33/205	16%	55%
21 - 25	35/205	17%	
26 - 30	40/205	20%	
31 - 35	20/205	10%	28%
36 - 40	20/205	10%	
41 - 45	17/205	8%	
46 - 50	18/205	8%	16%
51 - 55	11/205	5%	
56 - 60	5/205	3%	
61 - 65	4/205	2%	3%
65 & over	2/205	1%	

There are a total of 64 persons who had a previous arrest record out of a total of 241 for a 27% ratio. The breakdown was as follows:

<u>Previous arrests</u>	<u>64 Cases Total</u>	
DUI	51/64	80%
PI	8/64	12%
PI & DUI	5/64	8%

Of the 51 persons who had previous arrest for DUI, 31/51 had one previous arrest (60%). 14/51 had two previous arrests (25%) for DUI, and 6/51 persons had 3 previous arrests for DUI (12%).

<u>Repeaters</u>	<u>10 Cases Total</u>	
DUI	5/10	50%
DUI & PI	1/10	10%
PI	2/10	20%
MIP	2/10	20%

## Reckless Driving

Data Sheet

Number 3

Marital Status84 Cases Available

Married	42/84	50%
Single	30/84	36%
Divorced	8/84	9%
Widowed	4/84	5%

Occupation88 Cases Available

Employed	75/88	85%
Unemployed	3/88	3%
Student	8/88	11%
Disabled	1/88	1%
Retired	1/88	1%

Age88 Cases Available

16 - 20	12/88	13%	47%
21 - 25	20/88	22%	
26 - 30	11/88	12%	
31 - 35	9/88	11%	30%
36 - 40	7/88	8%	
41 - 45	8/88	11%	
46 - 50	7/88	8%	22%
51 - 55	8/88	11%	
56 - 60	5/88	3%	
61 - 65	2/88	1%	2%
65 & over	1/88	1%	

Of the 88 cases that went before the court, 27 of the persons had previous alcohol related arrests for a percentage of 30%. The breakdown was as follows.

Previous Arrests37 Cases Available

DUI	14/27	52%
Ill Cons.	1/27	4%
PI	5/27	18%
MIP	2/27	7%
Reckless	5/27	18%

There were 3 people who repeated before this court who were originally before the court on a reckless driving charge (8%). The breakdown was as follows:

<u>Repeaters</u>	<u>3 Cases Available</u>	
PI	1/3	33%
PI & DUI	1/3	33%
DUI	1/3	33%

<u>Sex</u>	<u>88 Cases Available</u>	
Male	83/88	94%
Female	5/88	6%

## Disorderly Conduct

Data Sheet

Number 4

Sex22 Cases Available

Male	18/22	82%
Female	4/22	18%

Age20 Cases Available

17 - 20	1/20	5%	
21 - 25	8/20	40%	50%
26 - 30	1/20	5%	
31 - 35	2/20	10%	
36 - 40	2/20	10%	40%
41 - 45	4/20	20%	
46 - 50	1/20	5%	
51 - 55	1/20	5%	10%

There were a total of 9 out of the 22 people who had previous arrest records (41%). They were as follows:

Previous arrest9 Cases Available

DC	4/9	44%
PI	1/9	11%
A & B	1/9	11%
DUI	1/9	11%
1 <sup>o</sup> Burglary	2/9	22%

There were 2 people out of the 22 who had a compound arrest (11%). They were:

Compound arrest2 Cases

DC & Possession Dang. Weapon	1/2	50%
DC and A & B	1/2	50%

There were 5 people out of 22 who repeated before the court. They were:

Repeaters5 Cases

PI	2/5	40%
DUI	2/5	40%
PI & DUI	1/5	20%

Illegal Consumption

Data Sheet

Number 5

Marital Status

14 Cases Available

Single	13/14	93%
Married	1/14	7%

Occupation

15 Cases Available

Employed	5/15	33%
Unemployed	5/15	33%
Student	5/15	33%

Age

18 Cases Available

18 years old	4/18	22%
19 years old	11/18	61%
20 years old	3/18	17%

There were a total of 3 out of 18 cases that had a previous arrest record on alcohol-drug charges. They are as follows:

Previous

3 Cases Available

Juvenile alcohol	2/3	66%
Ill. Cons. & DC	1/3	33%

There were 5 persons who had compound charges out of the 18 before the court (28%). They were as follows:

Compound charges

5 Cases Available

Ill. Cons. & DC	3/5	60%
Ill. Cons. & Flee Police	1/5	20%
Ill. Cons. & tresp.	1/5	20%

Sex

18 Cases Available

Male	16/18	89%
Female	2/18	11%

Sex 44 Cases Available

Male	40/44	89%
Female	4/44	11%

Marital Status 38 Cases Available

Single	32/38	84%
Married	5/38	13%
Separated	1/38	3%

Occupation 40 Cases Available

Employed	22/40	55%
Unemployed	10/40	25%
Student	8/40	20%

There were a total of 8 people who had previous arrest records (18%). They were as follows:

Previous Arrest 8 Cases Available

Ill. Cons.	2/8	25%
Juvenile	3/8	37%
3 <sup>o</sup> Burglary	2/8	25%
DI & MIP	1/8	13%

There were 3 people who had compound arrests out of 44 for a percentage of 7%.

Compound arrests 3 Cases Available

MIP & HCN	1/3	33%
MIP & DC	1/3	33%
MIP & Ill. Cons.	1/3	33%

There were 5 repeaters out of 44 on alcohol related charges. They were as follows:

Repeaters 5 Cases Available

MIP	1/5	20%
PI	3/5	60%
DUI	1/5	20%

## Contributing Delinquency Minor

Data Sheet

Number 7

<u>Sex</u>	<u>5 Cases</u>	
Male	2/5	40%
Female	3/5	60%
<u>Age</u>	<u>4 Cases</u>	
19 - 20	1/4	25%
21 - 25	3/4	75%
<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>4 Cases</u>	
Single	3/4	75%
Separated	1/4	25%
Married	-	-
<u>Occupation</u>	<u>3 Cases</u>	
Employed	2/3	66%
Student	1/3	33%

Two of the five total, charged with CDM had a previous arrest (40%). Both persons were arrested on CDM charges.



## House Common Nuisance

Data Sheet

Number 8

Sex36 Cases Available

Male	34/36	94%
Female	2/36	6%

Marital Status33 Cases Available

Single	27/33	82%
Married	6/33	18%

Occupation35 Cases Available

Student	19/35	54%
Employed	13/35	37%
Unemployed	3/35	9%

Age36 Cases Available

16 - 20	26/36	72%
21 - 25	7/36	20%
26 - 30	3/36	8%

There was 1 repeater before the court who did so on a PI charge.

There were 2 people who had compound charges which were as follows:

Compound charges2 Cases Available

HCN & DC	1/2	50%
HCN & Dangerous Drug	1/2	50%

## 3rd Degree Burglary

Data Sheet

Number 9

Sex17 Cases Available

Male	15/17	88%
Female	2/17	12%

Occupation14 Cases Available

Employed	6/14	43%
Student	2/14	15%
Unemployed	4/14	28%
Retired	1/14	7%
Disabled	1/14	7%

Marital Status14 Cases

Single	7/14	50%
Married	2/14	15%
Divorced	3/14	21%
Widowed	1/14	7%
Separated	1/14	7%

Age16 Cases

17 - 20	3/16	19%	
21 - 25	4/16	25%	56%
26 - 30	2/16	12%	
31 - 35	1/16	6%	
36 - 40	2/16	12%	30%
41 - 45	2/16	12%	
46 - 50	0/16	-	
51 - 55	0/16	-	6%
56 - 60	1/16	6%	
61 - 65	1/16	6%	6%

There were 6 people who had previous arrests out of 17 total. They were as follows:

Previous arrests6 Cases

2 <sup>o</sup> Burglary	1/6	17%
3 <sup>o</sup> Burglary	2/6	33%
DUI	1/6	17%
PI	2/6	33%

There were 4 repeaters out of the 17 cases. They were as follows:

Repeaters4 Cases

2 <sup>o</sup> Burglary	1/4	25%
Fraud	1/4	25%
PI	1/4	25%
DUI & PI	1/4	25%

There were a total of 79 repeaters out of 333 cases that went before the court again on some drug-alcohol related charge. They are broken down as follows:

<u>Repeaters</u>	<u>79 Available Cases</u>	
PI	60/79	76%
DUI	7/79	9%
PI & DC	7/79	9%
PI & A&B	5/79	6%
PI & Theft	3/79	4%
Reckless	2/79	2%
MIP & PI	1/79	1%
HCN	1/79	1%
A & B	1/79	1%
Drug Influence	1/79	1%

\*PI was the most prevalent charge, with those arrested and charged before the court again (repeaters). Breaking down the 60 people who repeated with a PI charge; 42/60 repeated one time for 70%. There were 8/60 who repeated two times before the court on PI charges for 13% ratio. There were 10/60 people who repeated three or more times before the court for a ratio of 17%.

Of the 33 cases charged before the court, there were 83 people arrested for PI who had additional charges filed in conjunction with the PI charge (25%). They were as follows:

<u>Compound charges</u>	<u>83 Cases Available</u>	
PI & DC	46/83	55%
PI & MIP	2/83	2%
PI & A&B	9/83	11%
PI & Ill. Cons.	12/83	14%
PI & DC & RA	9/83	11%
Concealed Weapon	2/83	2%
PI & Aiming Weapon	2/83	2%
CDM & PI	1/83	1%



**END**