4-1977

An Examination of Distinguishing Characteristics between Recidivist and Non-Recidivist Juvenile Offenders

Peter A. Draugalis
Western Michigan University

AN EXAMINATION OF DISTINGUISHING CHARACTERISTICS BETWEEN RECIDIVIST AND NON-RECIDIVIST JUVENILE OFFENDERS

by

Peter A. Draugalis

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1977

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Martin Ross, my major advisor, for the many hours, excellent advise, and encouragement offered throughout the duration of this research.

My gratitude goes to Dr. Lewis Walker, my other committee member, whose knowledge, criticisms, and helpful suggestions are an integral part of this thesis.

I wish to thank the juvenile court system in which this research was carried out. In particular, the director of court services was very cooperative, and I thank him for his assistance.

I wish to thank Sandy Philson, whose talents as a secretary and typist are also responsible for the completed work.

Finally, a special thanks goes to my wife, Marian, whose patience, understanding, and support are most responsible for the completion of this thesis.

Peter A. Draugalis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND RELATED IDEAS

Purpose and Problem Statement

The purpose of this thesis is to examine distinguishing characteristics between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders. Specifically, the problem is one of trying to scientifically ascertain those salient factors which will enable those in the juvenile justice system to recognize youngsters who are most likely to be repeaters vis-a-vis those who are not. We will address ourselves to this problem by attempting to answer three basic questions. First, are we able to ferret out certain variables to determine if there are statistically significant differences between juvenile offenders who recidivate and those who do not? Secondly, if differences are found to exist, would it then be possible to compare our findings with the results of previous juvenile recidivism research? Finally, we will attempt to answer whether or not these comparative findings are universal in nature.

It might be mentioned at this juncture that previous research has examined at least eight general types of data relating to recidivism. These are: (1) biographical data (age, education, profession, etc.); (2) judicial data (criminal record, age when first convicted,

etc.); (3) psychological traits (extraversion, neuroticism, intelligence, etc.); (4) psychiatric traits (psychopathy, schizophrenia, alcoholism, etc.); (5) family factors (broken home, the atmosphere at home, etc.); (6) school history (achievement at school, disorderly behavior, truancy, etc.); (7) work situation (unstable work history, unemployment, attitude towards work, etc.); and (8) leisure activities (lack of interests, boredom, etc.) (Buikhuisen & Hoekstra, 1974:63).

From these general data types evolve some specific related ideas involving juvenile recidivism. We will now focus our attention on this topic, which appears in the following section.

Related Ideas

Many studies involved in the research of juvenile recidivism indicate that sex is a strong predictor of recidivism (Meade, 1973; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969; Ganzer & Sarason, 1973). However, the vast majority of juvenile recidivism research only concerns itself with male juvenile offenders. This fact alone is probably indicative of the predominant position males hold in the criminal justice system; both juvenile and adult. Sexual roles may account for the overpopulation of males in the criminal justice system, in that our society has different prescribed roles for men and women, boys and girls. Even though these roles are currently undergoing change, definite prescribed sexual roles still exist today.

Society in general has a much higher tolerance level of

misbehavior for boys than it does for girls. The phrase, "Boys will be boys" indicates that these higher tolerance levels are accepted and, furthermore, are actually "taught" to our young boys while undergoing the inculturational process of our society.

Girls, however, are "taught" to behave and "act like a lady." The young female's inculturational process is completely different from that of the male. They are encouraged to be nice, gentle, kind, etc. The degree of tolerance our society has accepted for the misbehavior of females is not even close to approximating male levels.

This sexual role discrepancy has probably contributed to the overpopulation of males in our criminal justice system. The early "training" of our children almost guarantees this. With the difference in prescribed roles, it is not surprising to find that the vast majority of law violators are male. Therefore, it is assumed that correspondingly higher rates of recidivism will be found in male populations.

Age is another variable that was cited frequently by previous juvenile recidivism research studies (Meade, 1972; Arbuckle & Litwack, 1960; Ganzer & Sarason, 1973; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969; Laulicht, 1963). The review of the literature concerning the aspects of age revealed some contrast in findings. Juvenile recidivism rates were both related to older age (Meade, 1972; Sakata & Litwack, 1971; Arbuckle & Litwack, 1960) and younger age (Ganzer &

Sarason, 1973; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969; Laulicht, 1963). It appears, however, that most research citing older age as a factor was focusing on the youngster's chronological age, while the research citing younger age was focusing on age at first court referral or first institutional commitment. Both categories are actually measuring the same age component. When examining all of the "older aged" juvenile offenders, it may be that these youngsters have higher rates of recidivism because they have been in the juvenile system longer than those juvenile offenders who are younger in age, and as of yet have not had the same opportunity of becoming a recidivist.

Other research, reviewed in the literature, pointed to the broken home as a factor relating to juvenile recidivism (Buikhuisen & Hoekstra, 1974; Ganzer & Sarason, 1973). The hypothesis that broken homes produce higher recidivism rates for juvenile offenders comes from the "common sense" interpretation that something is "wrong" with the home that does not have both natural parents in it. The degree to which broken homes are significantly related to recidivism has been questioned by many researchers. There is always the problem that the broken home and juvenile recidivism may have been caused by other more significant variables.

One of the first studies linking juvenile recidivism to broken homes was conducted by Thomas Monahan (1957). He collected data on 44, 448 cases and found that the broken home appears to be a

significant factor in delinquency. Further results from this study revealed that broken homes were more prevalent among blacks than whites, females than males, and recidivists more than first offenders (Monahan, 1957:258).

In this study we will acknowledge that the broken home is one of the more controversial variables concerning juvenile delinquency and recidivism. Review of past research both support (Buikhuisen & Hoekstra, 1974; Ganzer & Sarason, 1973) and reject (Meade, 1973; Laulicht, 1967; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969) the proposition that broken homes are directly related to juvenile recidivism.

Sophia Robison has added an interesting suggestion to the controversy of broken homes. She questioned whether we are applying middle-class norms of family organization to a lower-class subculture to which they do not apply. She proposed that we examine this subculture within a framework of its own values and norms. She also suggested that the people of that subculture do not view the behavior of their children as delinquent, nor their family life as broken. In conclusion, she felt that more attention should be given to the phenomenon of delinquency and the broken home in those subcultures where they are concentrated; to view "the problem" from the viewpoint of the people who must contend with that problem (Robison, 1960).

Many research studies have found that race was associated

with higher recidivism (Kirkpatrick, 1937; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969; Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972). However, other studies have rejected the hypothesis that the racial factor (non-white) produces higher juvenile recidivism (Meade, 1973; Williams & Gold, 1972).

One recent study by Williams and Gold (1972) indicated that the discrepancy regarding race is introduced at a different point in the process involving both sex and age. The authors found:

> The blacks in our study probably began to receive differential treatment when juvenile court referrals were being considered, rather than earlier in the process; at the point of police contact or police record. Their differential treatment at that point cannot be attributed to the greater seriousness of offense compared to whites; where the seriousness of offense seems to matter little in the determination of court referrals. We speculate that it is more likely that the backgrounds of black youngsters are more often judged to require the intervention of the court. Or perhaps it is the officer's perception of the black youngster's demeanor. (Williams & Gold, 1972:226)

This type of speculation can be directly related to higher recidivism rates found in the non-white juvenile offender group. If this supposition is valid, it would help to explain any rate differential concerning recidivism between white and non-white juvenile offenders.

Another research study also supports the findings of Williams and Gold (Thornberry, 1973). This particular study by Thornberry reviewed three other research studies concerned with the racial factor in the criminal justice system. The first study that Thornberry cited points out that the assumption of racial and social class discrim-

ination exists, even though empirical research dealing with these issues is relatively sparse and poorly conceived (Terry, 1967:218). In another study cited by Thornberry, the author states that: "Members of minority groups, migrants, and persons with limited economic means are often the . . . scapegoats of the frustrated police in our local communities." (Lemert, 1951:311) Thornberry related that a similar assumption was made by another study: "It is generally an established fact that the Negroes as well as Spanish speaking peoples, on the whole, are arrested, tried, convicted, and returned to prison more often than others who commit comparable offenses." (Clinard, 1963:550) The final study cited by Thornberry, concerning the racial factor in the juvenile justice system, states without data:

> (a) Negroes are more liable to arrest than whites . . . (c) Negroes have a higher conviction than whites. (d) Negroes are often punished more severely than whites, but this is not true for all crimes. (e) Whites are most likely to receive probation and suspended sentences. (f) Negroes receive pardons less often than do whites. (Sutherland & Cressey, 1960:286)

Thornberry, in his study, felt that blacks and lower socioeconomic status subjects were more likely to be recidivists and commit serious offenses. He suggests that these legal variables should be controlled in any attempt to examine the effect of race and socioeconomic status. Otherwise, he felt, to find that blacks and lower socioeconomic status subjects received more severe dispositions may only reflect the fact that they are indeed more serious

offenders. Conclusions, according to Thornberry, about the relationship of social characteristics and dispositions should only be made when these legal variables are held constant.

Thornberry's study concluded that blacks were treated more severely than whites throughout the juvenile justice system. At the levels of the police and juvenile court, there were no deviations from this finding, even when the seriousness of offense and a number of previous offenses were simultaneously held constant. In other words, the results discovered by Thornberry lend support to the same results discovered by Williams and Gold; that non-whites have higher recidivism rates in the juvenile justice system. However, these higher recidivism rates occurred because non-whites were treated more severely than whites, according to both of the previously cited studies.

The preceding discussion of related ideas allows for a foundation from which we may develop this thesis. Our next objective would then be to review results of previous juvenile recidivism studies. This will facilitate a better understanding of what has occurred in the field of recidivism research. The following chapter begins the review of prior studies and will examine both non-institutional and institutional recidivism research.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND TESTABLE HYPOTHESES

Review of the Literature

Non-institutional Juvenile Recidivism Studies

The initial section of this chapter will deal only with the non-institutional juvenile recidivism studies. Our review begins with a study conducted by Anthony Meade (1973).

In his study, Meade examined the influence of such background variables and characteristics as social class, school problems, race, and age in distinguishing between serious and less-serious offenders, as well as between recidivists and non-recidivists. These attributes were included in his analysis and they represent traditionally proposed independent variables which were expected to influence the seriousness of delinquency, the extent of delinquency, and the behavior of court personnel within the decision-making process.

Meade selected a random sample of 500 cases from 8,476 delinquent offenders recorded by a county juvenile court from January, 1968 through December, 1970. This particular court was concerned with developing a screening instrument which would serve to distinquish those having a high probability of repeating delinquent behavior from those who would not be likely to return to court. Meade's

analysis was confined to basic demographic characteristics.

All first offenders were monitored for at least 18 months to determine their rate of recidivism. There were 54 cases which were transferred to other juvenile court jurisdictions and were lost because follow-up data were unavailable. Seven cases were excluded due to the absence of critical data. Meade's final sample included 439 cases, of which 308 involved males and 131 females. Of the total sample, 162 cases were recidivists.

Meade pointed out that recent research presented results which emphasized relationships between race, social class, and seriousness of delinquent offense (Cohen, 1969; Gold, 1970; Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972). In each of these studies, either being black or having low socioeconomic status were positively related to seriousness of offense. Similarly, studies have consistently determined that males commit more serious offenses than females (Gold, 1970; Chilton & Markle, 1972). Age of onset of delinquency and problems in school also have been found to be predictive of delinquency seriousness (Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972; Chilton & Markle, 1972; Cohen, 1969). Similarly, serious offenders were more likely to be children from broken homes (Gold, 1970; Chilton & Markle, 1972; Ferdinand, 1964).

The hypotheses Meade presented conceived of seriousness of offense as a function of traditionally proposed independent

variables. He cited blackness, low social class, educational failure, family disruption, maleness, and older age as independent variables which lead to serious delinquency. Meade, however, did not mention any specific hypotheses regarding interaction effects due to what he termed the "paucity of theoretical and empirical precedent" (Meade, 1973:480).

Meade used the same hypotheses presented for seriousness of offense as he did when considering recidivism as the dependent variable. Meade then mentioned the following supportive hypotheses:

1. Juvenile court recidivism to be related to Negro status and school problems (Kirkpatrick, 1937).

2. Lower success rates for older juvenile offenders (Arbuckle & Litwack, 1960).

3. Maleness, seriousness of first offense and race are the best predictors of recidivism (Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969).

4. Race, social class, school problems, seriousness of first offense, and court hearing at first offense directly influence recidivism (Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972).

Meade, in his study, used the Yule's Q statistic in order to become more familiar with his data and to obtain a basic configuration of statistically significant independent variables. Q has a value range between a plus 1.00 and minus 1.00.

Those four variables significantly related to recidivism were: age (plus .486), hearing (plus .354), school (plus .343) and type of first offense (minus .285). Each of these relationships held when

controlling individually for the other three variables through partial Q analysis. Type of offense, however, was related to recidivism in the direction opposite to that predicted, i. e., status offenders were more likely to recidivate than were the most serious first offenders (Weeks, 1943). Otherwise, older age, school failure, and the experience of formal hearing at the time of first offense were all predictive of recidivism. The variables of sex, race, and family structure appeared to have little relevance in the prediction of recidivism. Meade also found that social class was not significantly related to recidivism.

Meade also applied the Coleman technique to his data (Coleman, 1970). Meade found that 64% of the variation in recidivism was accounted for by four independent variables. Age accounted for 20% of the variation in recidivism. School status had the least effect upon recidivism, accounting for 12% of the variation. Hearing and type of first offense, respectively, accounted for 18% and 15%. Older age, formal hearing at time of first offense, non-serious first offense, and school failure, then, represent those states of the independent variables which were related to the recidivism state of the dependent variable.

Meade concluded that probably the most interesting findings of his present work were the following:

> First, the failure to demonstrate any systematic bias on the part of the court personnel at the point of hearing

> decision and, second, the differential, independent variable configuration observed when considering seriousness of first offense and recidivism as dependent variables. Also, it was significant to note that not one of those variables which were predictive value for seriousness of first offense were significantly related to recidivism. (Meade, 1973:484)

Another non-institutional study concerning juvenile recidivism research was conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin (1972). The authors obtained information on all boys born in 1945 who lived in Philadelphia, at least between their 10th and 18th birthdays. This involved a total of 9,945 boys, of whom 3,475 had at least one recorded police contact (Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972:244). They collected data from three different sources. School records gave them most of the background data they needed: name, birthdate, race, name of parents or guardian, addresses, IQ scores, achievement level, number of unexcused absences, behavior, etc. The Philadelphia Police Department gave them information concerning the number, type, and dates of offenses committed by members of the cohort, as well as the full description of events. As an additional check concerning mobility of the cohort members during the time period ending with their 18th birthday, they checked the Selective Service registration for Philadelphia residency at the terminal year. It should be noted that no attempt was made to determine the extent of juvenile offenses not shown in police records. The study also omits juvenile status offenses reported directly to the Juvenile Court without going through police involvement. According to Dr. Figlio, very few juvenile

status offenses were omitted in this manner.

Of the 9,945 cohort subjects, 3,475 or 35% of the boys were involved with the police at least once to the extent that an official recording of the act resulted, while 6,470 or 65% never had any such experience. Of the boys studied, 7,043 or 71% were white and 2,902 or 29% were non-white. Of the whites, 2,071 or 28.6% were classified as offenders, while 1,458 or 50.2% of the non-white boys were likewise designated.

The cohort was then further divided into groups of non-offenders, one-time offenders, and recidivists. Of the delinquents in the cohort, 54% were recidivists and 46% were one-timers. A comparison of the three groups on various background variables revealed that recidivists, one-time offenders, and non-offenders lie on a continuum. Recidivists experienced the greatest school and residential mobility and turned in the lowest IQ scores. Non-offenders lie on the other end of the continuum, and one-timers fall between the two extremes.

"Index" crimes were defined as crimes that were committed by juveniles but were also classified as crimes if committed by adults. The black male recidivism rate for all index crimes was 72%. This is 20% higher than the white male index crime levels.

Because recidivists were more than twice as likely to commit index offenses than were one-time offenders, the index crime rate of

recidivists was higher than that of one-timers. The spread between the white one-time and recidivist index crime rate was about three times the non-white spread, indicating that a proportionately greater number of index crimes were being committed by one-time non-white boys.

Further results concerning juvenile status offenses reveal that white males recorded a 77% non-recidivism rate. Black males recorded only 59% non-recidivism rate. By definition, "Juvenile Status Offense" referred to acts or behaviors that bring a juvenile under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court, but would not constitute a crime if engaged in by an adult.

The total of all offenses showed that white males had a total recidivism rate of 45%, which compared favorably against the black male total of 65%.

Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin concluded that 46% of the delinquents stop after the first offense and that a major and expensive treatment program at this point would appear to be wasteful. They suggested that intervention be held in abeyance until the commission of a third offense, for an additional 35% of the second-time offenders desist from then on. They felt they could reduce the number of boys requiring attention in this cohort from 3,475 after the first offense, to 1,862 after the second offense, to 1,212 after the third offense, rather than concentrate on all 9,945 or some other large sub-group

under a blanket community action program.

At this time we will review another study (Wadsworth, 1975) that was similar in nature but not as comprehensive as the previously cited research of Wolfgang, et al. Wadsworth researched a geographically representative sample consisting of 5,362 legitimate, single-born children drawn from the total population of children born in England, Wales, and Scotland between March 3 and 9, 1946. A subsample was drawn from this group, consisting of all 2,196 male children alive and resident in England and Wales on their 8th birthday, and these represented 87.9% of the national survey population of 2,498 males. Information about the subsample's law violations was collected from official sources, and delinquents were identified and defined as all those who appeared before the courts and were found guilty of an indictable offense or of a non-indictable offense, dealt with summarily, or who were cautioned by the police for such an offense. Of the 336 boys who were so defined (15.3% of the total sample), 35 were cautioned only, three of them on two separate occasions.

The mean age at first offense for the 205 boys who only committed one delinquent act before age 21 was 15.4 years and for those 131 who committed more than one delinquent act it was 13.7 years. Of all those who committed one offense, 50% had done so before age 16. And 76.9% of recidivists had committed their first offense

before this age. In terms of social classification, quite similar proportions of delinquents from non-manual and manual homes had committed their first and only offense by age 16 (non-manual, 46.3% and manual 52.8%). The proportions for recidivists were very different. Of all the 24 recidivists from non-manual homes, 49.4% had committed their first offense before 16 years, and of the 106 recidivists from manual-class homes, 83% had committed their offense before this age.

Wadsworth, in his article, arrived at conclusions about the usefulness of two different social class classifications. He felt it showed that class differences were to be found not only in overall incidence, but also in age of first offense committed by recidivists, but not others, and in types of offenses.

The succeeding study (Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969), which was also non-institutional in nature, presented findings of a research report by Community Action for Youth, Inc., of recidivism predictions in 21 census tracks of Cleveland, Ohio. Juvenile Court records of 2.548 youthful offenders from 1956 to 1963 were examined for traits of recidivism and arranged in production tables by IBM machines to show paired attributes using the method of configuration analysis. Six variables of statistical significance were isolated in the prediction of recidivism of the sample of delinquents: age, sex, type of offense, religion, and single or group action. Recidivists

to age 15 were predictively twice as numerous as recidivists beyond age 15. Comparatively, male recidivism rates were 39%, while the female rate was 18%. The general prediction rate for the whole sample was 32%.

The factor of age was divided into two groups, younger or older. The hope of separating the age lines at the median age was removed by the incomplete record precedure on the Juvenile Court filing cards that frequently omitted the month of birth of the child. The younger age group ran through 15 years, the older age group from 16 on upward. The sex and age factors were divided into four subgroups respectively of younger and older boys and girls. The race attributes split into white and black delinquents.

Unkovic and Ducsay (1969) found that 40% of delinquents in the younger age group of 15 years and below became recidivists, whereas only 19% of the older age group of 16 to 17 years could be predicted recidivists while in the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court. Males had a propensity to become recidivists in the ratio of 39%, while females were much lower in this tendency at 18%. The black rate of recidivism was 34% and the white rate stood at 25%. The predictability of an act of recidivism by the members of the sample, taken together, was that 32% of them referred to a second delinquent act and faced Juvenile Court hearing for it.

The final CAY report (Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969:344) states:

> It should also be noted that there was no statistically significant difference, in terms of recidivism, between those offenders whose parents were married and those whose parents were not married. This finding tends to indicate a frequent over-assessment of the importance of with whom a child lives and the marital status of his parents. It is readily acknowledged that when either parent is absent, there is likely to become affectional and economic loss to the entire family. However, other investigators have had similar findings in their studies. (Wolfgang, Savitz & Johnson, 1962)

The prevention of recidivism is a major problem in the field of work with juvenile delinquents. The various percentages of recidivism in the CAY study ranged from 14% to 46% for males in the whole sample. These findings are entirely consistent with rates of recidivism in the field of delinquency and reach upward into adult crime, which has a large base of recidivists. Uniform Crime Reports, for example, reported in 1965 that its histories of approximately 135,000 individual offenders showed that an average criminal career covered more than 10 years and averaged five arrests.

In conclusion, this report revealed that sex and age were found to be the two variables most strongly associated with recidivism. The failure rate for males was 46%, for females 14%; the sample failure rate was 32%.

The final non-institutional study we will review was conducted by Daniel J. Baer (1970). He presented material associated with a taxonomic classification of male delinquents. His data were derived from autobiographical material that he used in hopes of predicting

future recidivism. His sample consisted of 60 adjudicated male delinquents from the State of Massachusetts. The subjects had to be 15.5 years to 17 years of age, in good health with an absence of severe psychopathology, not mentally retarded, no history of violent assaultive or sexual offensive, and a willingness to participate.

A self-report, biographical questionnaire for this study consisted of 75 questions which sampled background factors not directly related to delinquent behavior. Each item offered a choice of three to six alternatives. The subject's task was to select that alternative which was most descriptive of his own background. The questions in the study involved matters related to the family constellation, physical features of the home, relationships with friends and associates, travel and outdoor experiences, habits in drinking, eating, and smoking, athletic activities, familiarity with pets and other animals, and matters concerning personal health.

Taxonomic classification of the biographical questionnaire was made by means of a program developed by Hyvarinen (1963). The profiles of responses for all the subjects were first examined and the most typical member of the group was selected on the basis of his responses compared to those most frequently chosen. This individual was then taken as a standard of comparison for selecting members of the first group. From those subjects not chosen, a second group was established. In this way, groups were formed

until all individuals had been classified. A typicality score was computed for each subject and represented the degree to which the individual had responses in common with the others in the group. The subjects were group tested one month prior to parole for the adjudicated offense. The biographical questionnaire and other background data were obtained at that time. One year after parole, the recidivism record was checked for each individual. Recidivism was defined as the return to an institution either for a new offense or for parole violation.

Resulting classification of the 60 subjects allocated 32 subjects to Group 1, 14 subjects to Group 2, and 14 subjects to Group 3. Because of the diverse nature of the questionnaire items, no attempt was made to identify the groups other than by numbers. Baer noted that Group 2 delinquents had the highest incidence of larceny-theft, but an absence of stubborn child-runaway offenders. He concluded that it would seem that these two types of delinquents have little in common with one another in regard to life experiences as measured by the biographical questionnaire. Larceny-theft is not only the most common cause of youthful arrest, but is often a form of antisocial behavior associated with gangs or groups. By participating in this form of risk taking, such behavior may provide delinquents with a feeling of maturity and identification. On the other hand, stubborn child-runaways tend to act alone or in pairs.

Because of conditions within the home, they may be motivated by feelings of worthlessness, disappointment, or not belonging anywhere. However, they express these feelings by going away from the family and home, rather than committing hard-core criminal-type offenses against property and person.

Baer concluded that although no significant association was found between taxonomic classification and subsequent recidivism, some trend was evident. He felt such groupings may not only serve as a postindicative method of establishing typologies, which are useful in theory, but may provide a means of anticipating delinquent tendencies. He believed that delinquency research had perhaps paid too much attention to past pathological behavior and traditional sociological indices and that not enough effort had been focused on the common everyday experiences of youth.

The Baer study concludes our discussion of non-institutional juvenile recidivism research. We will now focus our attention on institutional studies.

Institutional Juvenile Recidivism Studies

The first of these studies was conducted by Ganzer and Sarason (1973). They attempted to isolate variables which would discriminate between recidivist and non-recidivist youngsters. Their sample consisted of formally institutionalized juvenile delinquents. Institutional case files were selected and compared for

200 subjects, half male and half female, half recidivist and half non-recidivist. A comparison was made between 34 different family background and personality variables. Seven of these variables significantly discriminated between recidivist and non-recidivist. Recidivists got into trouble and were first institutionalized at younger ages, had lower estimated verbal intelligence, and were more frequently diagnosed as sociopathic personality than were non-recidivists. Females more frequently came from personally and socially disorganized families than did males. Ganzer and Sarason felt their findings underlined the importance of considering sex differences in future research designed to predict juvenile recidivism.

The Ganzer and Sarason sample consisted of 100 boys and 100 girls who previously had been committed to the Washington Juvenile Rehabilitation Institution. Half of each group had been identified as recidivist and the other half had no further record of recidivism for at least 20 months after release from an institution. The age range of the sample was 11 to 18 years, with a mean of 15.4 years for males and 14.9 years for females. Ganzer and Sarason defined recidivism as the return to a juvenile institution as a parole violator or a recommitment, Superior Court conviction with resulting probationary placement, or conviction and incarceration in an adult correctional institution.

Comparisons were made for males and females and

recidivists and non-recidivists. A number of cases falling within various categories were tabulated as the dependent variables. A variable of marital status of natural parents revealed that a slightly greater proportion of recidivists than non-recidivists came from broken homes. However, females more often came from broken homes than did males, regardless of whether or not they were recidivists.

Socioeconomic status was classified according to the two-factor system (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958). Socioeconomic status was not related to recidivism for either sex. However, 85% of the classifiable families fell within the two lowest socioeconomic categories.

In relation to the subject variables, the first variable mentioned by Ganzer and Sarason was age at first institutional commitment. Males who did not become recidivists were significantly older at the time of their first commitment (mean age = 16 years, 1 month) than were either the younger male recidivists (mean age = 14 years, 7 months) or female non-recidivists (mean age = 15 years, 2 months). Female non-recidivists were significantly older at commitment than were female recidivists (mean age = 14 years, 6 months). Male recidivists did not differ from female recidivists in age at first commitment.

The variable concerning diagnostic classification indicated

that there were more than twice as many females as males diagnosed as neurotic. For males, an equal number of recidivists and non-recidivists were diagnosed as neurotic. For females, however, almost twice as many diagnosed neurotics were non-recidivists as were recidivists.

Estimates of verbal intelligence were based on Wechsler's (1958) six-category classification system. Proportions of male and female recidivists and non-recidivists whose IQ's were estimated at "low average" and below did not differ significantly from those with IQ's of "high average" and above.

Ganzer and Sarason concluded that a number of variables, when cross validated, might be of practical value in predicting recidivism. They felt the most promising potential predictors of recidivism were associated with (a) several family background factors, (b) age at first offense and commitment, and (c) diagnostic classification.

Another institutional recidivism study was conducted by Sakata and Litwack (1971). In this study the incidence of recidivism among juvenile parolees released from treatment facilities had consistently frustrated treatment teams implementing rehabilitation programs for juveniles. They concluded that the majority of the studies published to date provided only descriptive data and lacked direction for the resolution of problems with recidivism.

Descriptive characteristics of juveniles found in correctional institutions that appear to differentiate the recidivist from the non-recidivist are age, placement after parole, type of offense, behavior in the institution, length of stay in the institution, and the number of previous offenses (Sakata & Litwack, 1971:351). Supporting this statement are the following studies: Weeks and Ritchie, 1956; Felstrom, 1960; Gould and Beverly, 1963; Sappington and Zeglen, 1964; Townsend, 1964; and Glasser and O'Leary, 1966. Sakata and Litwack also felt that the use of discriminating descriptive characteristics to predict recidivism was rare (Berlin, 1958; Laulicht, 1962; Schwitzgebel, 1966). This particular study by Sakata and Litwack involved a reexamination of a previous study conducted by Litwack and Herbert in 1967. Because Sakata and Litwack were reluctant to accept the predictive power of the previous study, they repeated the procedures. Their main goal was to determine whether descriptive characteristics derived from their present study would have predictive power for recidivism.

The study conducted by Sakata and Litwack was conducted at one of the correctional treatment facilities for juveniles located in northeastern Ohio. Boys ranged in age from 7 to 17 years. Most had been assigned to the treatment institution following adjudication by the juvenile court. Major problems surrounded adjustment with no multiple disabilities such as mental retardation, psychosis, or

physical disability. This treatment facility was able, generally, to handle 175 to 200 boys on a yearly basis. There was considerable overlap in the commitment periods in that the boys were generally committed for a period of 18 months.

All of the 80 boys drawn from the institutional population of 160 were provided services for 18 months and were released at the same time. These boys were selected by using a stratified random sampling procedure. A sample of 40 boys was drawn from a total of 66 recidivists. Due to the incompleteness of their files and records and the fact that they did not go through regular releases, 83 boys were not studied. No effort was made to maximize the matching of the two groups on developmental or social variables. Age, education, reason for commitment, and intelligence were not controlled. Sakata and Litwack performed chi-square tests of significance on their data. Ten of the items showed significant differences between the actual and expected proportions of the ratings. The six non-dichotomous and the ten dichotomous variables were then used as the basis for distinguishing recidivists from the non-recidivists in the final phase of their study.

Results indicated that two variables, age at time of commitment and age at time of parole (stated in months),were significantly different for recidivists and non-recidivists. The recidivist was younger in age at the time of commitment than the non-recidivist

and also at the time of parole. Further analysis found that the recidivist group showed a higher proportion of poor adjustment to general rules, a higher incidence to returning to school, and a lower proportion returning to work. Descriptive characteristics, age at time of commitment, and age at time of parole were necessarily related due to the adjudicated time stipulation for institutional treatment.

Sakata and Litwack concluded that there were two significant implications of their present study: the age at commitment and the age at parole appear significant as potential predictors of recidivism, and poor adjustment to general institutional rules provide definite signs of potential value in predicting recidivism. However, they did note a serious limitation of their study--a lack of data related to the number of older boys who returned to a correctional institution but who did not return to a juvenile setting. Consequently, there was no follow-up data concerning those juveniles placed in adult correctional institutions.

Another institutional study, somewhat similar to the previously cited Sakata-Litwack research, was conducted by Dr. Jerome Laulicht (1963). His article, "Problems of Statistical Research: Recidivism and Its Correlates," reported upon one of several research projects carried out at the Berkshire Farm for Boys in Canaan, New York. The principal concern of the report was the correlation between recidivism and a number of factors generally

regarded as associated therewith. Dr. Laulicht presented findings with respect to certain correlates of recidivism, giving particular attention to several findings related to family background, which raised interesting questions regarding the validity of current notions as to the effect upon juvenile behavior of family make-up and stability.

Dr. Laulicht pointed out that a number of studies attempting to find factors predicting parole success provided information about the correlates of recidivism. Most of these were studies of adults, and it is not known to what extent the findings are applicable to juveniles. However, there have been several studies concerning characteristics of juvenile recidivists. Laulicht cited Kirkpatrick, 1937; Arbuckle and Litwack, 1960; and Mannheim and Wilkins, 1955 concerning recidivism rates for youths.

The potential subjects for the Berkshire study were 804 boys discharged from Berkshire Farms during a nine-year period, January 1, 1950 through December 31, 1958. Since a considerable loss of subjects was anticipated, this group was large enough to insure a sufficient number of subjects for determining a recidivism rate in the correlations of failure. A boy was considered a failure or recidivist if, subsequent to his release at Berkshire, he was apprehended for a criminal act or violation of parole and as a result was committed to any state institution or to a community or county jail for at least a period of 30 days. Although it may be argued that

other definitions of recidivism, such as reappearance in court, are better or more inclusive, they prove impossible to get such information on most of the subjects.

Laulicht used no systematic set of hypotheses to choose items for his study. Rather, the procedure was to describe the population, search among the descriptive variables for correlates of recidivism, and test some previous findings and hunches about possible correlates. The only items tested were those on which systematic and objective information was available in the files. In general, the record included items about a boy's prior delinquent behavior, family background, school history, indices of his exposure to the Berkshire Farm program, and demographic characteristics of the boy and his family.

Boys who came from families with a history of criminal behavior were expected to have a tendency to become habitual delinquents and were more likely to fail after discharge than boys without such a family background. The association between failure and criminal background of the mother, the father, and of the siblings was tested. None of these variables were related to recidivism. This finding by Laulicht raises questions about the hypothesis that family background was a major cause of earlier delinquencies. Possibly, the effects of the rehabilitation program were reflected in these non-significant results.

Laulicht's study has shown that only a few types of delinquency behavior occurring prior to institutionalization--stealing and running away--were significantly related to recidivism. Although an attempt was made to demonstrate a positive relationship between exposure to instability and failure, no such association was found. In general, items dealing with family background and family structure were not related to failure. When such items were significantly related to recidivism, the direction of the association was unexpected. In common with other studies, younger boys were poorer discharge risks. Such consistent findings about age raise serious questions about the advisability of institutionalizing boys under 14 unless they have very serious emotional disturbances.

An institutional study was conducted by Buikhuisen and Hoekstra (1974) in the Netherlands. The sample they selected consisted of 451 male offenders sentenced to imprisonment and serving their sentence in a prison for juveniles at some time between 1962 and 1964. As a source of information, they had at their disposal penal dossiers which consisted of such documentation as social inquiries about the offender, psychological reports, criminal records, etc. Approximately five years after their release from prison, the authors again checked the criminal records of these offenders to determine which of them had been reconvicted. This proved to be the case for 69% of their sample, a discouragingly high percentage.

On that basis, they divided this group into two categories: those who had been reconvicted (recidivists, N = 310) and those who had not (non-recidivists, N = 141).

They next selected 22 variables from prisoner dossiers. These variables consisted largely of personal and family background characteristics. All 22 items were dichotomized to assess the importance of these variables regarding recidivism.

Buikhuisen and Hoekstra found that 10 items differentiated significantly between recidivists and non-recidivists. They also found more recidivism among offenders who were unmarried, came from a broken home, experienced a negative atmosphere at home, had siblings with criminal records, had been reared in institutions for some time, had moved relatively often before they were sentenced to imprisonment, had been subjected to a psychiatric report, had many previous convictions and spent a relatively long time in prison and, finally, had been ordered to be detained at the queen's pleasure.

The authors believed that the relationship of these variables with recidivism was rather weak, and that only two of these ten variables really contributed to recidivism--the number of previous convictions and the number of times the offender moved before he was sentenced to imprisonment. The percentage of variance explained by these factors, however, was very small (2.56% and

1.0% respectively). This clearly illustrated, according to Buikhuisen and Hoekstra, that when considered separately, the significance of these variables was negligible. From the point of view of prediction, the individual contribution of each variable was not significant.

Therefore, Buikhuisen and Hoekstra, in order to assess the total capacity of their 22 variables to predict recidivism, calculated a multiple correlation coefficient. A value of 0.41 was found, which indicated that all together their variables could explain 17% of the variance. By means of a coefficient of alienation (Guilford, 1965), they could estimate the percentage reduction errors or prediction of recidivism from the selected variables. This reduction was about 10%, a percentage so small that prediction attempts based on those variables was not warranted.

In their research, Buikhuisen and Hoekstra observed that there had not been much integration of criminological theories in recidivism studies. They felt this was remarkable in that these theories referred to the etiology of crime and some of them should have a direct bearing on the way ex-convicts develop. With regard to this concept, they then applied Sutherland's theory of "Differential Association" to the data contained in their research. Their contention was that associating with delinquents was of crucial importance in becoming a delinquent. They believed that such a relationship could be put

in an inverse way--ceasing to maintain contact with delinquents was prognostically favorable. If this deduction was correct, they expected to find less recidivism among ex-convicts who had left the neighborhood they used to live in. They tested this assumption by comparing the recidivism rates of ex-convicts who returned to their former address after release with those of ex-prisoners who moved to another neighborhood. If their assumption was correct, they could expect to find the following relationships:

(1) There should be less recidivism among delinquents who had moved to another area, and

(2) Moving to another area should delay the onset of recidivism.

To test their hypothesis, Buikhuisen and Hoekstra divided their sample into two groups--those who returned to their former address after being released from prison and those who moved to another area. Their results were in accordance with their first assumption: the percentage of subjects reconvicted after their release from prison was significantly lower in the group who did not return to their former residence.

Their second hypothesis was that moving should delay the onset of recidivism. To test this, they calculated for those movers and non-movers who relapsed into crime (N = 310) the length of time between release and the next offense committed. For the movers, the average time was 18 months, for the non-movers, 11 months, a

difference which proved to be of statistical significance. These results support their second hypothesis.

Buikhuisen and Hoekstra established an inverse relationship between moving and recidivism. They suggested that this relapse into crime might be determined by external factors, but other more individual traits can be distinguished which may have some bearing, too, upon the future development of ex-convicts. They felt, excepting for practical purposes, the distinction between internal and external factors, that it was reasonable to assume that the potential positive effect of moving was dependent on the character of the criminogenetic factors operating.

In conclusion, their results support the thesis that delinquency is a function of both environmental and individual factors, an observation well-known but too neglected in our predominantly uni-disciplined criminological theories.

The final study of juvenile institutional recidivism that we will discuss was conducted by Victor Sepsi (1971). The purpose of his research was to investigate statistically the relationships between personal variables which distinguish between female juvenile recidivists and non-recidivists.

Sepsi defined recidivism as an observable event characterized by an individual's relapse into behaviors prescribed by society after punitive or rehabilitative treatment has been applied. The character-

istic common to all recidivists is, therefore, the failure to modify personal behaviors toward conformity with culturally approved values.

When juvenile recidivism is defined as failure during the period of parole, the average juvenile recivism rate for all United States institutions serving delinquent children was about 28% in 1964, the date of the latest delinquency census. In view of the rising crime rate, this figure is probably not representative of the situation today. But, if the definition of recidivism is extended to include failures after the period of parole, juvenile recidivism rates swell to even more than 80% (Sepsi, 1974:70).

Sepsi attempts to discover whether variables routinely maintained in the institutional records of female juvenile delinquents could identify high risk recidivists. His study was only concerned with girls; other studies have investigated juvenile males with no previous studies using techniques concerning juvenile females. Recidivists were defined as girls on parole for the first time from state training institutions who were returned to the institution for violation of parole, who were recommitted to the Ohio Youth Commission, or who appeared in a higher court while on parole and were sentenced to another correctional institution. Non-recidivists, conversely, were those girls who were still on parole without having their paroles revoked, who had been discharged, and who had no further record of institutionalization.

The 210 subjects involved in the study were drawn from the total population of 715 girls. Of all the girls paroled during this period, about 42% were recidivists, a figure compatible with a 40% recidivism rate reported by a similar institution in Wisconsin for the same year. A minimum of 12 months on parole served as a basis for dividing the sample into recidivists and non-recidivists. During this period, 115 girls were returned to training schools for the first time. Of these, 10 had returned for a third commitment during the period under investigation and were eliminated as not fulfilling the definition of first-time recidivists. The remaining list of 105 girls constituted the recidivist population.

Uniform availability and objectivity were the two major criteria used for the selection of items included in this study. Well-kept records with standard forms provided ready access to data in most instances. There were, however, variations in the thoroughness with which some forms were completed and, sometimes, ambiguous terminology clouded specific issues. In such cases, data could still be obtained from other forms and sometimes from narrative summaries. An examination of the variables revealed that they could be divided into six areas of investigation. The first area related to physical characteristics such as size, disability, race, and deformity, but none of the variables within this area was found to be significantly associated with recidivism.

The second area in Sepsis' investigation involved intellectual and educational characteristics which included school grade completed, number of grades retarded, IQ scores, and school behaviors. The one variable found to be significant in this area suggested that non-recidivists tended to complete more years of formal education than recidivists.

The third area of investigation involved various characteristics of the subject's family. The presence of either or both natural parents in the home, data descriptive of natural step-parents, and information relating to siblings and step-siblings comprised this area of investigation. Three variables were found to be significant: (a) girls whose natural fathers were alive tended to recidivate; (b) girls whose present fathers were previously married tended not to recidivate; (c) girls with young fathers tended to recidivate. It should be noted that the second and third items did not necessarily refer to the girl's biological father, but rather to the male head of her household.

The fourth area of investigation concerned characteristics of the girl's home before commitment. Girls who had been living with relatives other than their immediate family or in a foster home before commitment were more likely to recidivate, while those girls living with their family or in some institutional setting were more likely to succeed.

Sepsis' fifth area of investigation related to the subject's

psychosocial history before the time of her commitment to the training school. Ten variables were found to be significant: (a) girls who had been previously placed on probation and (b) those who committed offenses while on probation tended to recidivate. In contrast, (c) girls who had been previously given a suspended sentence and (d) those who had not committed an offense while still on a suspended sentence tended not to recidivate; (e) the younger the girl at her first court appearance and (f) the younger the girl at the time of her commitment, the more likely was she to fail while on parole; (g) girls who commit the most common types of offenses were likely to recidivate, while girls who commit unusual offenses were more likely to succeed; (h) girls who had been previously placed in a private or county training school and (i) those who had previously been in a mental hospital tended to recidivate; and (j) girls who received a full diagnostic study at the time of commitment and those who received a full diagnostic study earlier or at another agency tended to recidivate.

The sixth area of investigation centered on training schools and parole factors and three variables were found to be significant: (a) girls who had been placed in lower grades at the training school and (b) those who were younger at the time of parole tended to recidivate; and (c) girls who were paroled to live with relatives other than their immediate family or in a foster home tended to recidivate.

Sepsi concluded that the results of his study were limited by the availability of life history data and the selective purpose of institutional records. However, he pointed out that significant variables did not reflect the peculiarities of institutional policy in training programs. He felt this was not remarkable, since statistical reports suggest only modest differences in the success rate of institutions with broad differences in policy and programming. Sepsi believed that his study tended to support the theory that the roots of delinquency might be found in familial patterns of inculturation. He questioned whether the rigid and socially isolated experience of a training school teaches the delinquent anything at all about living harmoniously in a fluid and pluralistic society.

The Sepsi study concludes our review of the literature concerning juvenile recidivism. We will now focus on criticisms involving the research methodology of such studies.

Research Criticisms

The first attack pertains to the "failure" of correlation techniques to relate any meaningful information concerning studies of crime and delinquency. Pitirim Sorokin related that:

> A multitude of correlational studies investigated the relationship between intelligence and criminality in some 163,000 cases in all. C. F. Chassell has carefully summed up the results of the bulk of such studies. In the first place, the results of the various studies are contradictory, some exhibiting a positive and others a negative

> relationship between these variables, some a close and others a very remote relationship. The coefficients of correlation between these variables range from minus .52 to plus .76. About as contradictory and discordant are the coefficients of correlation between delinquency and illiteracy, delinquency, and amount of schooling, criminality and school progress, delinquency and educational achievement; intelligence and morality. Thus, after a multitude of painstaking correlational studies, the contradictoriness of their "exact" coefficients of correlation leaves us as ignorant as ever about the real relationship between these variables of criminality-delinquency and intelligence. The hopelessness of the situation is aggravated by the fact that these studies do not give to us an objective basis for deciding which of these discordant coefficients are valid, and which are not. (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967:17)

A response to the attack by Sorokin was made by the authors, Hirschi and Selvin. They believed that although Sorokin sprinkled the word correlation liberally throughout his passage in an apparent attempt to establish its guilt by association, he offered no evidence that the correlation coefficient is in any way to blame for the inconsistencies it has helped to reveal. As a matter of fact, they believed that in the chapter immediately following his attack on the correlation coefficient, Sorokin presented a detailed (if heavily overdrawn) argument on why a two-variable relation should vary from one study to the next. They suggested that this exonerated the correlation coefficient.

Another criticism offered by Sorokin was that statistical methods could not predict the states of single units in mass phenomena. He cited as an example that statistics show 72% of paroled

criminals with a certain background and certain characteristics make good. This prediction did not, however, insure that J. Brown, who has the same background and traits, would necessarily make good his parole, or that M. Jones, who has a different background and different traits, would necessarily violate his parole.

Hirschi and Selvin responded to this second criticism provided by Sorokin. They believed that present day statistical prediction was much more elaborate than Sorokin's example. This criticism was invalid on its own grounds according to Hirschi and Selvin. Statistical methods could predict the states of single units, but were only unpredictable when nothing was known about the probabilities of the various outcomes or when the probabilities were equal. Neither of these conditions held in the case of J. Brown. The authors would be glad to bet on J. Brown's making good on parole. Of course, this prediction does not insure that J. Brown would make good, but this failing was not peculiar to statistical methods of prediction. The case of M. Jones they felt to be another matter. Since nothing was known about M. Jones' chances on parole, it was hardly fair to say that knowledge of J. Brown tells us nothing about M. Jones and then to use this as a criticism of statistical prediction techniques.

A more fundamental attack on quantitative delinquency research came from Irwin Deutscher, who saw no point in any study of the relations between variables. He stated:

> Investigators have dissipated their research energies in a fruitless search for factors, bewildering themselves with the fallacious behavioristic assumption of stimulus-response in the fruitless quest for "causes." Such a conception of the etiology of deviant behavior has been no more productive than the earlier assumption that people who misbehave are inherently depraved, either as a result of the influence of the devil or the defectiveness of their genetic composition. The older assumption at least had the advantage of not being as wasteful of research funds, intellectual energies, or clinical time . . . . We have been traveling up a dead-end road in our fruitless search for simple cause-and-effect relationships in our quest for factors, traits, and characteristics. (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967:20)

Deutscher's arguments are much like those expressed by Herbert Blumer in his 1956 presidential address to the American Sociological Association, and Deutscher has since gone on to develop these views in his own presidential address to the Society for the Study of Social Problems in 1965.

Hirschi and Selvin contended that both men failed in their central task--to demonstrate that quantitative research of the kind was fruitless and fallacious.

They recognized, however, that Blumer's and Deutscher's criticism of quantitative research came from rejection of these assumptions and not from examination of actual studies. Blumer ignored everything beyond the simplest two-variable relation, and Deutscher used the disparity between attitudes and behavior as a club to belabor all of quantitative research without recognizing that quantitative research helped reveal the discrepancy upon which he based his attack

without recognizing the quantitative procedures need not depend on questionnaire data and, indeed, without recognizing that quantitative researchers need not and do not assume perfect congruence between words and deeds.

Hirschi and Selvin were dissatisfied with the global anti-positivism represented by Deutscher and Blumer. They felt the alleged chaos in delinquency research was partly a result of the wide range of assumptions its critics brought to bear on judgments of its adequacy. With this in mind, this study will next focus on more generic criticism of juvenile recidivism research.

Buikhuisen and Hoekstra (1974) believed that the great majority of studies have been based upon existing reports of delinquents; in only a few cases have authors collected their data by directly interviewing or testing the offenders. Researchers, working with existing records, left them with questions about the reliability and validity of the data.

From a statistical point of view, they believed too many studies were rather unsophisticated. Often no test of significance has been applied. The majority of researchers resorted to univariate analysis, with multivariate analysis being the exception.

Buikhuisen and Hoekstra concluded their criticism with the fact that it was striking for them to see that there was hardly any integration of criminological theories in research with regard to

recidivism. They felt the consequences of a large number of studies have been neglected and that the impact of sociologically oriented theories, like differential association, differential opportunity, etc., on criminological thinking was almost completely absent. Therefore, they contended that recidivism studies, unfortunately, exist quite independently.

This final commentary concludes our discussion of research criticisms. We have reviewed ten juvenile recidivism studies, five being non-institutional in nature and the other five having institutional origins. From the review it was apparent that researchers did find distinguishing characteristics regarding juveniles who recidivate and those who do not. However, findings were not always compatible. With this in mind, we will formulate and test our own hypotheses. By doing this we will be able to compare our findings with results from some of the previously cited studies.

Hypotheses

Based upon the review of the literature and related ideas discussed earlier, the following testable hypotheses were formulated:

I. Male juvenile offenders will experience a higher rate of recidivism than female juvenile offenders.

II. Juvenile offenders who are older in age will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who are younger in age.

III. Non-white juvenile offenders will experience a higher rate of recidivism than white juvenile offenders.

IV. Juvenile offenders with school problems will experience a higher rate of recidivism than juvenile offenders without school problems.

V. Juvenile offenders who come from a broken home will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who come from homes that are intact.

VI. Juvenile offenders who commit serious offenses will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who commit status offenses.

VII. Juvenile offenders who move often will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who do not move often.

VIII. Juvenile offenders who possess low intelligence quotients will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who possess high intelligence quotients.

Hopefully, by examining the above hypotheses, using data acquired from an actual juvenile court setting, we will be able to determine whether or not there exist distinguishing characteristics pertinent to juvenile recidivism. We may also, through our findings, support or contradict the previously cited research mentioned in this chapter. Before doing this, we will begin discussion of the data and research methodology concerning the eight formulated hypotheses in the succeeding chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Setting

All of the 419 subjects involved in this study came from a county juvenile court system located in southwestern Michigan. The county in question has a population of approximately 150,000. This county has frequently been referred to as a "multiple problem" county whose welfare recipients per capita, unemployment, divorce rate, infant mortality, and rate of delinquency are among the highest in the State of Michigan.[1]

The Michigan Uniform Crime Report of 1970 reports that, in terms of reported crime, this county ranked eighth in the state, and also had the largest increase in crime over the previous year. During the years 1970 and 1971, 1,521 cases were officially petitioned into this county's juvenile court system. In terms of racial proportionment, this county was approximately 90% white, 8% black, the remaining population consisting mainly of Spanish-Americans.

In 1969 an intake inventory form was developed in order to more thoroughly examine variables concerning their clients. This

---

[1]Michigan State Plan, pamphlet prepared for the Michigan Department of Mental Health and Michigan Department of Public Health, July, 1970.

form was also established to provide the court director with better statistical data to aid in examining delinquency patterns. Included in this form were 33 different variables concerning family background data, personal data, legal data, and school data. Each form contained objective and subjective data and was completed by a probation officer whenever a youth had been formally adjudicated within the court system.

Procedures

The interviewing process was the means by which the information was gathered by each probation officer. Each officer was responsible for conducting interviews with the referred youth, parents, school authorities, police authorities, social agencies, and any other significant party involved in the case. This study includes 419 cases and represents those juvenile offenders who were first processed by both the probation officers and the clerical staff. A coding procedure was then initiated in order to facilitate the transfer of the information from the intake inventory form to IBM cards. Upon completion of the processing of the 419 cases, a one-year time period was allowed to transpire in order to ascertain the extent of recidivism.

The present study was somewhat limited in that further tracing beyond a year's period of time was found to be too difficult. In Michigan, when a youth reaches 17 years of age, he or she is

usually dropped from the Juvenile Court jurisdiction. If he or she becomes a "recidivist" beyond his 17th birthday, the Juvenile Court system usually does not have knowledge of this fact. Another limiting factor was that once a youngster turned 17, the mobility of this age group increases greatly, again making tracking very difficult.

This study defined recidivist as any youngster who has officially been adjudicated by the court more than one time. This includes both juveniles who were either under the court jurisdiction at the time of committing another offense or who had been with the court previously and had their cases officially closed and returned to the court for another offense. Of the 419 subjects in the study, the ages of the youth ranged from six years to 17 years. A majority of the youths were in the 14 through 16 year category. Of the total population of 419, 310 were boys, of which 141 were recidivists, and 109 were girls, of which 27 were recidivists.

Variables and Instruments

The related literature has led this study to examine nine variables out of a total of 33 in the intake inventory form. These variables were as follows: (1) sex; (2) age at first referral; (3) race; (4) school problems; (5) broken home; (6) seriousness of offense; (7) residential mobility; (8) intelligence quotient; and (9) recidivism.

These variables appeared in the original intake inventory form as follows:

1. Sex

Male
Female

2. Age at First Referral

Under 12
12 - 12/6
12/6 - 13
13 - 13/6
13/6 - 14
14 - 14/6
14/6 - 15
15 - 15/6
15/6 - 16
16 - 16/6
16/6 - 17

3. Race

White
Non-white

4. School Adjustment

Acceptable
Not acceptable

5. Marital Status of Natural/Legal Parents - Broken Home

Intact
Not intact

6. First Referred Offense - Seriousness of Offense

Felony
Misdemeanor
Juvenile offense

7. Residence Changes in Past Five Years

None
One or two
Three or more

8. Intelligence Quotient

Under 80
80 - 89
90 - 110
110 plus

9. Previous Court Record - Recidivism

Yes
No

The first variable, sex, was selected to determine sexual differences concerning juvenile offenders and recidivism rates.

The second variable, age at first referral, was selected to determine age at first referral. It was not a birthdate as such, but measured in terms of six-month intervals.

The third variable, race, was selected in order to determine racial percentages within the juvenile court system. The non-white classification used in this study includes 12 Spanish-Americans, with the rest of the sample being black.

The fourth variable, school adjustment, was selected to determine if there were school problems with juvenile offenders. The data for this variable were obtained from school records. "Acceptable" was defined as a student whose performance was reasonably cooperative with school officials and was making good use of his potential. "Not Acceptable" referred to those juvenile offenders who were failing or in danger of suspension or expulsion.

The fifth variable, marital status of natural/legal parents,

was selected to determine the number of broken homes within this study. "Intact," in the intake form, referred to parents who are married and living together, the exception being involuntary separations due to military service, hospitalization, etc. "Not Intact" referred to parents who were divorced, separated, or who had deserted the home.

The sixth variable, first referred offense, determined the severity of the offense. Felony was classified as most serious, misdemeanor next, and juvenile offense was the least serious. Juvenile offense was defined as an offense only committable by a juvenile; if committed by an adult, there would be no offense. Examples of this would be curfew violation, school truancy, etc.

The seventh variable, residential changes in the past five years, was selected to determine the amount of residential movement juvenile offenders experience over a five-year period of time.

The eighth variable, intelligence quotient, was selected to determine intelligence variance among juvenile offenders.

The ninth variable, recidivism, the dependent variable, was selected in order to examine distinguishing characteristics between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders. It was used for matters of comparison in each of the previously mentioned independent variables.

Data Analysis

Two and three way cross-tabulation analysis was used to examine the relationship of these variables with recidivism. The chi-square test will not be used in this study because the data are from a population of 419 subjects taken from a juvenile court intake inventory. In that there is no inference from a sample to a population, use of inferential statistics such as chi-square would be inappropriate.

Cross-tabulation analysis was the statistic used in the examination of the stated hypotheses. The starting point of any statistical analysis is the one-dimensional table. This table represents a straightforward look, showing a distribution among several groups. Such a table has descriptive and some predictive value. This type of table is the starting point for researchers, who may then continue to divide the groups into smaller subgroups in order to determine how the dependent variable varies from one group to another. This is precisely what will be presented in this study.

The next chapter will first present two way cross-tabulation analysis for each hypothesis. Following this will be several three way cross-tabulation tables, which will introduce added variables in order to determine their interaction with the variables in the proposed hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, our concern is to examine the data related to the several hypotheses formulated in Chapter II. The first section of this chapter will examine the data pertaining to each specific hypothesis. This will be accomplished by means of two way cross-tabulation. In the second section of this chapter, we shall use three way cross-tabulation analysis. By using this analysis, we will introduce other variables in order to determine what interaction they may have with recidivism and the proposed hypotheses.

Two Way Cross-Tabulation Analysis

Hypothesis I

Hypothesis I: MALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS WILL EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RECIDIVISM RATE THAN FEMALE JUVENILE OFFENDERS

As can be seen in Table 4. 1, male juvenile offenders did have a higher recidivism rate than female juvenile offenders. Only 25% of the female juvenile offenders were classified as recidivists, whereas a total of 45% of the male juvenile offenders were recidivists. These findings do support the first hypothesis as proposed in this study.

TABLE 4.1 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex*

	Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	82	75	169	55
Recidivist	27	25	141	45
TOTALS	109	100	310	100

*The chi-square test will not be used in this study because the data are from a population of 419 subjects taken from a juvenile court intake inventory. In that there is no inference from a sample to a population, use of inferential statistics such as chi-square would be inappropriate.

Hypothesis II

Hypothesis II: JUVENILE OFFENDERS WHO ARE OLDER WOULD EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN THOSE JUVENILES WHO ARE YOUNGER

This study, based upon the review of literature, divided age into younger (6-14 years) and older (15-17 years). It should be noted again that this variable is measuring the juvenile offender's age at first referral to court.

Instead of supporting the hypothesis, the data in Table 4.2 support the opposite conclusion. As can be seen, the older the juvenile offender, the less the recidivism. The percentage clearly illustrates this fact. Whereas 51% of the younger juvenile offenders were classified as recidivists, only 26% of the older offenders were classified in the same manner. This represents that 25% of the

TABLE 4.2 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Age

	6-14 years		15-17 years	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	118	49	113	74
Recidivist	121	51	47	26
TOTALS	239	100	180	100

younger offenders have a higher recidivism rate than older offenders. These results are contrary to those found in other studies discussed in the literature section.

Hypothesis III

Hypothesis III: NON-WHITE JUVENILE OFFENDERS WILL EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN WHITE JUVENILE OFFENDERS

As seen in Table 4.3, it is evident that the results support the third hypothesis. It should be noted that the non-white classification includes 12 offenders of different racial origins that are neither black nor white. Of white offenders, 63% were classified as non-recidivists; this compares favorably to the 52% of non-white youths who are non-recidivists. The results show that the non-white offenders had 13% more recidivism than their white juvenile offender counterparts. Most previous research supports the above findings. Parenthetically, further statistical examination of this

TABLE 4.3 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Race

	White		Non-White	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	184	63	67	52
Recidivist	106	37	62	48
TOTALS	290	100	129	100

hypothesis will not fully support these findings. This future analysis examines the interactions of other variables with recidivism and race and will be discussed in more detail in a later section.

Hypothesis IV

Hypothesis IV: JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH SCHOOL PROBLEMS WILL EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN THOSE OFFENDERS WHO DO NOT HAVE SCHOOL PROBLEMS

In looking at Table 4.4, we can see that the results of this study support the hypothesis. Of the juvenile offenders who were classified as having school problems, 60% were recidivists, which compares unfavorably to the 25% recidivism recorded by those offenders who did not have school problems. The findings in this study are supported by previous studies. Most research points to a high correlation between recidivism and children having school problems. The findings presented here were similar in that 35% more recidivism was found for those youngsters who had school problems

as compared to those who did not.

TABLE 4.4 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with School Problems

	No School Problems		School Problems	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	177	75	74	40
Recidivist	59	25	109	60
TOTALS	236	100	183	100

Hypothesis V

Hypothesis V: JUVENILE OFFENDERS WHO COME FROM A BROKEN HOME WILL EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN THOSE OFFENDERS WHO COME FROM A HOME THAT IS INTACT

The term "broken home" is defined as any home that does not have both natural or legal parents residing in it. The data in Table 4.5 reveal that more than 50% of the juveniles connected with this study were classified as coming from families with broken homes. The juvenile offenders who did come from broken homes had a 46% recidivism rate. Those offenders who came from a home that was intact had only a 34% recidivism rate. These findings appear to support the fourth hypothesis since those children coming from broken homes had 12% more recidivism than those children who came from homes that were intact. It is interesting to note that of all the

families, more than 50% are classified as broken, which might be indicative of juvenile delinquency in general.

TABLE 4.5 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Broken Home

	Broken Home		Intact Home	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	123	54	128	66
Recidivist	103	46	65	34
TOTALS	226	100	193	100

Hypothesis VI

Hypothesis VI: JUVENILE OFFENDERS WHO COMMIT MORE SERIOUS OFFENSES WILL EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN THOSE OFFENDERS WHO COMMIT JUVENILE OFFENSES

Juvenile offense is defined as an offense that can only be committed by a juvenile, according to law. These are also classified as "status" offenses. An adult cannot commit a juvenile offense because of his age and the nature of the law. Juvenile offenses are usually runaway, school truancy, and incorrigibility. Serious offenses are defined as misdemeanors or felonies.

As can be seen in Table 4.6, findings support this hypothesis. Of those juvenile offenders who committed serious offenses, 43% were recidivists. In contrast, 33% of those juvenile offenders who

TABLE 4.6 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Seriousness of Offense

	Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense	
	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	92	67	159	57
Recidivist	46	33	122	43
TOTALS	138	100	281	100

committtd juvenile status offenses were recidivists. It is apparent, then, that the serious offender, as established within the research of this study, has 10% more recidivism than the juvenile status offender. These findings are supported by numerous research studies.

Hypothesis VII

Hypothesis VII: A JUVENILE OFFENDER WHO HAS CHANGED RESIDENCE WILL OFTEN EXPERIENCE A HIGHER RATE OF RECIDIVISM THAN THOSE OFFENDERS WHO HAVE NOT CHANGED SO OFTEN

Before discussing the findings, it should be noted that a five-year period of time was allowed for mobility to occur. As can be seen in Table 4.7, results support the previously mentioned hypothesis. A breakdown of the table reveals that there are three categories--the first being no residential changes, the second being one or two changes, and the third being three or more changes. Of those juvenile offenders who did not move, 35% were recidivists. For those

TABLE 4.7 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Residential Mobility

	0		1-2		3+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	115	65	116	60	20	41
Recidivist	63	35	76	40	29	59
TOTALS	178	100	192	100	49	100

juvenile offenders who moved one or two times, 40% recidivism was found. The highest rate, 59%, was recorded for those juvenile offenders who moved three or more times.

Hypothesis VIII

Hypothesis VIII: JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH LOWER INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS WILL EXPERIENCE HIGHER RATES OF RECIDIVISM THAN JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH HIGHER INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENTS

As can be seen in Table 4.8, the findings do not support this hypothesis. The intelligence quotient factor was divided into three categories: under 90, 90 to 110, and over 110. A 44% recidivism rate was found for those children who had IQ's under 90. Those children with IQ's between 90 and 110 had the least amount of recidivism--37%. Those children with IQ's over 110 had a 41% recidivism rate. While findings in this fashion do not support the hypothesis, if we divide this variable into two groups, those juveniles with IQ's

TABLE 4. 8 Two Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Intelligence Quotient

	Under 90		90-110		110+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	100	56	132	63	19	59
Recidivist	78	44	77	37	13	41
TOTALS	178	100	209	100	32	100

under 90 and those juveniles with IQ's over 90, the hypothesis would be supported. This would result in the lower group (90 and under) having a 44% recidivism, which is 7% more than the higher group (90 and above). This example also appears to be more representative in terms of subject distribution.

With the completion of two way cross-tabulation analysis for all eight proposed hypotheses, we will not examine several three way cross-tabulation tables in order to more fully determine the effects of the independent variables on recidivism.

Three Way Cross-Tabulation

Table 4. 9 indicates that females have less recidivism than males in both the 6 to 14 year category and the 15 to 17 year category. Females in the 6-14 age bracket had a 35% recidivism rate whereas 56% of the males in the 6-14 age bracket were recidivists. This represents 21% more recidivism for males than females in this

category. In the older age category (15-17), females again had less recidivism than their male counterparts. Males (15-17) had a 31% recidivism rate, which compares unfavorably to the 14% recidivism found for the female juvenile offenders. This again represents 17% more recidivism for males than females.

TABLE 4.9 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Age

	Female				Male			
	6-14		15-17		6-14		15-17	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	38	65	44	86	80	44	89	69
Recidivist	20	35	7	14	101	56	40	31
TOTALS	58	100	51	100	181	100	129	100

This does add further support to Hypothesis I (male juvenile offenders will experience a higher recidivism rate than female juvenile offenders). This hypothesis was supported while controlling for both younger age (6-14) and older age (15-17), with the data revealing more recidivism for males in both categories and finding

the highest rate differential within the 6 to 14 year old category (21%).

Results of Table 4. 9 also reject the second hypothesis (juvenile offenders who are older would experience a higher rate of recidivism than juveniles who are younger). Support was not found when controlling for both male and female variables. The younger male experienced 25% more recidivism, with the younger female having a 21% higher rate. These findings, as were the findings of two way cross-tabulation, are in the opposite direction of that hypothesized.

Table 4. 10 demonstrates that there was no difference between white female recidivism and non-white female recidivism, with both categories having a 25% score. There was, however, more non-white recidivism than white when comparing male juvenile offenders. Male non-white juvenile offenders recorded a 53% recidivism rate, which was 11% higher than the 43% recidivism found for male white juvenile offenders. The data in this table adds significance to the third hypothesis in that Table 4. 3 revealed 11% more non-white juvenile offender recidivism than white; however, by means of three way cross-tabulation analysis, results show that this 11% is accounted for by the male juvenile offenders.

The data in Table 4. 10 also support the first hypothesis (sex) in that while controlling for race, female recidivism is lower (17%) for whites and (28%) for non-whites. Males have consistently higher levels of recidivism throughout all phases of this study.

TABLE 4. 10 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Race

	White				Non-White			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	64	75	120	58	18	75	49	47
Recidivist	21	25	85	42	6	25	56	53
TOTALS	85	100	205	100	24	100	105	100

The data in Table 4. 11 lend some support to our third hypothesis that non-white juvenile offenders experience a higher rate of recidivism than white juvenile offenders. However, the amount of support (5%) for the younger and (10%) for the older age groups is not substantial. The highest rate of recidivism was established in the 6 to 14 year old non-white category (54%). The next highest category was found to be the 6 to 14 year old white juvenile offenders (49%). In the 15 to 17 year old category, 34% of the non-whites were recidivists while 24% of the whites were recidivists. The data in this table indicates that recidivism rates are higher in the 6 to 14 year old category, regardless of race (which also indicates rejection of the second hypothesis).

Table 4. 12 once more reveals that in terms of sex, females have less recidivism than male juvenile offenders. Those female juvenile offenders with school problems had a 47% recidivism rate,

TABLE 4. 11 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Age and Race

	White				Non-White			
	6-14		15-17		6-14		15-17	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	76	51	108	76	42	46	25	66
Recidivist	72	49	34	24	49	54	13	34
TOTALS	148	100	142	100	91	100	38	100

TABLE 4. 12 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and School Problems

	No School Problems				School Problems			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	112	70	65	84	57	38	17	53
Recidivist	47	30	12	16	94	62	15	47
TOTALS	159	100	77	100	151	100	32	100

TABLE 4. 13 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Race and School Problems

	No School Problems				School Problems			
	White		Non-White		White		Non-White	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	130	77	47	70	54	45	20	32
Recidivist	39	23	20	30	67	55	42	68
TOTALS	169	100	67	100	121	100	62	100

which was 15% lower than the 62% found for male juvenile offenders with school problems. These findings again support the first hypothesis that male juvenile offenders would experience higher recidivism rates than females.

These findings also lend support to the fourth hypothesis, which proposed that juvenile offenders with school problems would have higher recidivism rates than those juvenile offenders without school problems. This support showed both males and females with school problems having 32% and 31% more recidivism, respectively, than juvenile offenders without school problems.

The data in Table 4. 13 indicate that the non-white juvenile offender had higher recidivism rates in both school problems and non-problem categories. Of the non-white juvenile offenders who had school problems, 68% were recidivists, while 55% of the white juvenile offenders who had school problems were recidivists. These non-white juvenile offenders who did not have school problems had 7% more (30% - 23%) recidivism than white juvenile offenders who did not have school problems. In conclusion, the non-white juvenile offender had a higher rate of recidivism whether they had school problems or not. These findings again support Hypothesis III, that non-white juvenile offenders will experience a higher recidivism rate than white juvenile offenders.

The data in Table 4. 13 also support Hypothesis IV, that

juvenile offenders with school problems will experience higher recidivism rates than those without school problems. While controlling for race, juvenile offenders with school problems always had more recidivism than did juvenile offenders without school problems. White juvenile offenders without school problems had 32% less recidivism than white juvenile offenders with school problems. Likewise, non-white juvenile offenders without school problems had 38% less recidivism than did non-white juvenile offenders with school problems.

The data in Table 4. 14 demonstrate that juvenile offenders who had school problems recorded relatively high recidivism rates regardless of offense classification. This supports the findings of Hypothesis IV, that juvenile offenders with school problems will have higher recidivism rates than juveniles without school problems. Of those juvenile offenders who committed serious offenses and also had school problems, 63% were recidivists. This represents 34% more recidivism for those juvenile offenders who committed serious offenses but did not have school problems. The same type of situation exists for those juvenile offenders who committed juvenile offenses and had school problems, vis-a-vis those juvenile offenders who committed juvenile offenses and did not have school problems. Those with school problems recorded a recidivism rate of 53%, which again was considerably higher than the 16% recorded by those

juvenile offenders not having school problems.

TABLE 4.14 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Seriousness of Offense and School Problems

	No School Problems				School Problems			
	Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense		Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	62	84	115	71	30	47	44	37
Recidivist	12	16	47	29	34	53	75	63
TOTALS	74	100	162	100	64	100	119	100

While examining this table, we also find that recidivism increases as one reads the data from left to right. In other words, those juvenile offenders who did not have school problems and only committed juvenile offenses had the lowest recidivism--16%. Next, those juvenile offenders who did not have school problems and committed serious offenses still had relatively low recidivism--29%. The largest increase comes in the next category: 53% recidivism was found for those juvenile offenders with school problems who committed juvenile offenses. Finally, those juvenile offenders with school problems that also committed serious offenses had the most recidivism--63%.

The results of this table might lead one to speculate that those juvenile offenders who have school problems will also have

relatively high recidivism rates, regardless of the type of offense committed. In both categories, the juvenile who committed the serious offense did have higher recidivism rates. This shows support for Hypothesis VI, that juvenile offenders committing serious offenses will have more recidivism than those offenders committing juvenile offenses. The most significant finding in this table was that juvenile offenders with school problems did have much higher recidivism rates than juvenile offenders without school problems.

As can be seen in Table 4. 15, females have less recidivism than males; again supporting the first proposed hypothesis, which is males having more recidivism than females. Those females whose homes were broken had a 35% recidivism rate, whereas 49% of the males in this same category were recidivists. Only 14% of the females coming from homes that were intact were recidivists, which is 27% less recidivism than found for males coming from intact homes. Once again, these findings are consistent with all other findings in this study, with females having less recidivism than males, regardless of the variable being examined. It was interesting to note, however, that there was 21% more recidivism found for those females who came from homes that were broken compared to those females whose homes were intact. Except for the variable of school problems, this amount of recidivism (35%) is the most found for females in this study.

TABLE 4. 15 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Broken Home

	Male				Female			
	Broken		Intact		Broken		Intact	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	85	51	84	59	38	65	44	86
Recidivist	83	49	58	41	20	35	7	14
TOTALS	168	100	142	100	58	100	51	100

These findings also support Hypothesis V, that juvenile offenders coming from broken homes will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders coming from homes that are intact. Both male and female recidivism rates were higher when coming from a broken home. Males from a broken home had 14% more recidivism than males coming from homes that were intact. Similarly, females had 21% more recidivism when they came from broken homes.

Table 4. 16 shows the interaction of the variables recidivism, age, and broken homes. Those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken had more recidivism than those juveniles who came from homes that were intact, regardless of age. This finding supports Hypothesis V, that juvenile offenders coming from a broken home will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders coming from intact homes. When examining those juveniles who came from homes that were broken and controlling for age, we find again that the

younger age group (6-14) had 25% more recidivism than the older age group (15-17). In looking at those juveniles who came from homes that were intact, the younger juvenile offenders again had 23% more recidivism than the older juvenile offenders.

TABLE 4.16 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Age and Broken Home

	Intact				Broken			
	6-14		15-17		6-14		15-17	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	60	56	68	79	58	44	65	69
Recidivist	47	44	18	21	74	56	29	31
TOTALS	107	100	86	100	132	100	94	100

Both of these findings also reject the second proposed hypothesis, that juvenile offenders who are older in age will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders who are younger.

Table 4.17 indicates that while juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken had a higher recidivism rate than non-white juvenile offenders who came from the same type of home. However, when examining white juvenile offenders coming from homes that were intact, a much lower recidivism rate was found when comparing this to the non-white juvenile offenders coming from homes that were also intact. In this category, non-whites had 25% more recidivism than whites. In comparison, it can be seen that

more non-whites came from broken homes than did whites. It was interesting to note, however, that in this type of situation, whites had 1% more recidivism than non-whites. Speaking in terms of race, then, the data in Table 4.17 do not support the hypothesis regarding broken homes. The non-white juvenile offender who came from a home that was intact had 7% more recidivism than those juveniles who came from homes that were broken. This is in direct contrast to Hypothesis V, that juvenile offenders coming from broken homes will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders coming from homes that are intact.

TABLE 4.17 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Race and Broken Home

	White				Non-White			
	Broken		Intact		Broken		Intact	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	81	54	103	73	42	55	25	48
Recidivist	68	46	38	27	35	45	27	52
TOTALS	149	100	141	100	77	100	52	100

The data in Table 4.18 support Hypothesis V, that juvenile offenders coming from broken homes will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders coming from homes that are intact. Those juvenile offenders coming from homes that were broken had a higher recidivism regardless of classification of offense. Those juvenile

offenders committing serious offenses also had higher recidivism rates than those juvenile offenders committing juvenile offenses, regardless of whether they came from a home that was intact or broken.

TABLE 4.18 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Seriousness of Offense and Broken Home

	Broken Home				Intact Home			
	Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense		Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	40	56	83	54	52	78	76	60
Recidivist	31	44	72	46	15	22	50	40
TOTALS	71	100	155	100	67	100	126	100

The data also support Hypothesis VI, that juvenile offenders committing serious offenses will have higher recidivism rates than offenders committing juvenile offenses. The highest recidivism rate found in this table was the 46% score established by juvenile offenders committing serious offenses coming from homes that were not intact. This was only 2% higher than the 44% recidivism found for those juvenile offenders committing juvenile offenses coming from homes that were not intact. Intact families, however, had a much larger difference in recidivism rates concerning types of offenses committed. Those juvenile offenders who committed serious offenses and lived in

a family that was intact had a 46% recidivism rate, which was 18% higher than those juveniles who committed juvenile offenses and came from families that were intact. In conclusion, the data in this table reveal that there are higher rates of recidivism for those children coming from broken homes regardless of the offense classification. Also, there was more recidivism for those children committing serious offenses as compared to those children committing juvenile offenses, regardless of whether the home situation was intact or not.

The data in Table 4. 19 indicate that male juvenile offenders had more recidivism than female juvenile offenders in both the juvenile offense and serious offense categories. For males in the juvenile offense category, 26% more recidivism was recorded and 22% more recidivism was also found in the serious offense category. The data in Hypothesis VI, that juvenile offenders committing serious offenses will have higher recidivism rates than offenders committing juvenile offenses, showed serious offenders with 10% more recidivism than offenders committing juvenile offenses. In examining Table 4. 19, we found that this percentage was explained in total by the female population. Female recidivism for those offenders committing serious offenses was 33%. This was 13% more recidivism than we found for females committing juvenile offenses.

Of the male juvenile offenders committing serious offenses, 45% were recidivists. This was actually 1% lower than the 46%

TABLE 4.19 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Seriousness of Offense

	Male				Female			
	Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense		Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	37	54	132	55	55	80	27	67
Recidivist	32	46	109	45	14	20	13	33
TOTALS	69	100	241	100	69	100	40	100

recidivism rate recorded by male offenders committing juvenile offenses. In conclusion, the data in Table 4.19 reveal that the previous results showing more recidivism for juvenile offenders committing serious offenses are attributable to female recidivism. The examination of male offenders concerning the seriousness of offense would not support Hypothesis VI. Male recidivism rates were very close for both serious offenses and juvenile offenses concerning males with only 1% more recidivism in the juvenile offense category.

The data in Table 4.20 demonstrate that younger juvenile offenders (6-14) have more recidivism than older offenders (15-17) in both juvenile offense and serious offense categories. The younger juvenile offender (6-14) had a 38% recidivism rate, which was 10% more than that found for older juveniles (15-17). Of those younger juvenile offenders committing serious offenses, 56% were recidivists, which was 31% more recidivism than we found for older juveniles.

In conclusion, the data reveal that younger offenders (6-14) have more recidivism, regardless of the type of offense committed. This rejects the second hypothesis, that juvenile offenders who are older will have higher recidivism rates than younger offenders.

TABLE 4.20 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Age and Seriousness of Offense

	Juvenile Offense				Serious Offense			
	6-14		15-17		6-14		15-17	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	45	62	47	72	73	44	86	75
Recidivist	28	38	18	28	93	56	29	25
TOTALS	73	100	65	100	166	100	115	100

While controlling for age, those juvenile offenders in the young category (6-14) commit more serious offenses and have more recidivism than those juveniles committing juvenile offenses. This was not true of the older category (15-17) where a 28% recidivism rate was found for juveniles committing juvenile offenses, which was 3% more than that found for those juveniles committing serious offenses. These results further expand the sixth hypothesis, that juvenile offenders who commit serious offenses will experience higher recidivism rates than those offenders committing juvenile offenses. This hypothesis was supported while looking at the younger (6-14) category, but was not supported in the older (15-17) category. If we total both categories

together, the proposed hypothesis is supported.

In Table 4.21, both the non-white and white juvenile offenders have more recidivism in the serious offense category than the juvenile offense category. This does support Hypothesis VI that juvenile offenders who commit serious offenses will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders committing juvenile offenses. Non-white serious offenders had a 51% recidivism rate, which was 12% more than we found for white serious offenders. This finding lends further support to Hypothesis III, that non-white juvenile offenders will experience higher recidivism rates than white offenders.

TABLE 4.21 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Race and Seriousness of Offense

	White				Non-White			
	Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense		Juvenile Offense		Serious Offense	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	77	66	107	61	15	68	52	49
Recidivist	39	34	67	39	7	32	55	51
TOTALS	116	100	174	100	22	100	107	100

The juvenile offense category had just the opposite findings. White juvenile offenders committing juvenile offenses had a 34% recidivism rate, which was 2% more than the non-white juvenile offense recidivism rate which does not support Hypothesis III.

The data in Table 4.21 are supportive of the findings in Table 4.6 (Seriousness of Offense). The data support our contention that non-white juvenile offenders will experience higher recidivism rates than white offenders when we are looking at serious offenses. However, the data fail to support this when viewing juvenile offenses.

In Table 4.22, we again find support for Hypothesis I, that male juvenile offenders will have higher recidivism rates than females. All aspects of residential mobility found female recidivism to be lower than male recidivism.

TABLE 4.22 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Residential Mobility

	Female						Male					
	0		1-2		3+		0		1-2		3+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	31	76	44	80	7	54	84	61	72	53	13	36
Recidivist	10	24	11	20	6	46	53	39	65	47	23	64
TOTALS	41	100	55	100	13	100	137	100	137	100	36	100

In considering the male juvenile offender, a correspondingly higher recidivism rate will be found the more often he changes residence. This supports Hypothesis VII, that juvenile offenders who move often will experience higher recidivism rates than those offenders who do not move as often.

The data in Table 4.23 indicate that for those homes that were

intact, higher recidivism rates were found for those juvenile offenders in direct relation to the number of residential movement. This does support Hypothesis VII, that juvenile offenders who move often will experience higher recidivism rates than those offenders who do not move as often. The no-movement category consisted of 27% recidivists, one to two movements had 38% recidivists, and three or more movements had 62% recidivists.

TABLE 4.23 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Broken Homes and Residential Mobility

	Broken						Intact					
	0		1-2		3+		0		1-2		3+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	38	53	70	59	15	42	77	73	46	62	5	38
Recidivist	34	47	48	41	21	58	29	27	28	38	8	62
TOTALS	72	100	118	100	36	100	106	100	74	100	13	100

The same cannot be said of those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken. A 47% recidivism rate was found for those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken and did not have any residential movement. This was 6% more than those juvenile offenders who moved one or two times. The highest recidivism figure was recorded for those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken and had three or more residential movements. In conclusion, increased residential mobility was a factor in

juvenile offenders having more recidivism, especially those placed in the category of three or more residential changes within a five-year period of time. The data in Table 4.24 reveal a 62% recidivism rate for those juvenile offenders who moved three or more times and came from homes that were intact. This represents 4% more recidivism than found for those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken.

TABLE 4.24 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Race and Residential Mobility

	White						Non-White					
	0		1-2		3+		0		1-2		3+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	90	72	79	62	15	41	25	47	37	58	5	42
Recidivist	35	28	49	38	22	59	28	53	27	42	7	58
TOTAL	125	100	128	100	37	100	53	100	64	100	12	100

The findings in Table 4.24 show that 28% of those white offenders who did not have any residential movement were recidivists. This compares quite well to the 53% recidivism rate found for non-white juvenile offenders. The white juvenile offender who moved one or two times had a 38% recidivism rate, whereas 42% of the non-white juvenile offenders who moved one or two times were recidivists. Of the white juvenile offenders who moved three or more times, 59% were recidivists, which was 1% more than the

non-white juvenile offenders who moved three or more times.

It can be stated that the more often a white juvenile offender changes residence, a correspondingly higher recidivism rate will be established in direct relation to the higher incidence of movement. This supports Hypothesis VII, that juvenile offenders who move often will experience higher recidivism rates than those offenders who do not move as often. This statement cannot be made of the non-white juvenile offenders. Most of the recidivism was found in the categories showing no residential movement and showing three or more residential movements, which does not support the seventh hypothesis.

An inspection of the data in Table 4.25 indicate that younger juvenile offenders (6-14) had higher recidivism rates in each category concerning residential mobility when compared to older juvenile offenders (15-17). This finding rejects our second hypothesis that those juvenile offenders who are older in age will experience higher recidivism rates than younger offenders. In the 6-14 year old age group, there was only a 14% difference between the high and low levels of recidivism. In the 15-17 year old group, however, there was a 36% difference between high and low recidivism levels. This, again, seems to indicate that the younger juvenile offenders who are in the juvenile justice system longer have a higher probability of becoming a recidivist than the older juvenile

offender, irrespective of other variables.

TABLE 4.25 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Age and Residential Mobility

	6-14						15-17					
	0		1-2		3+		0		1-2		3+	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	51	54	55	48	12	40	64	77	61	78	8	42
Recidivist	44	46	59	52	18	60	19	23	17	22	11	58
TOTALS	95	100	114	100	30	100	83	100	78	100	19	100

Those juvenile offenders who have moved three or more times also have correspondingly high recidivism, which supports the hypothesis concerning residential mobility and should be considered as a strong indicator of recidivism, regardless of the age of the juvenile. This seems to be an important finding in light of the fact that most other evidence supports age as a significant factor regarding recidivism.

The data in Table 4.26 reject our eighth hypothesis, that juvenile offenders who possess low IQ will experience a higher rate of recidivism. It might be pointed out, however, that male juvenile offenders did experience the most recidivism in the lowest IQ category (90 and under)--51%. The next highest recidivism rate for male offenders was found in the highest IQ category (110 and over)--

46%. The IQ category 90 to 110 revealed that male juvenile offenders had a 41% recidivism rate.

TABLE 4.26 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Sex and Intelligence Quotient

	90 and under				90-110				110 and above			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	66	49	34	77	90	59	42	74	13	54	6	75
Recidivist	68	51	10	23	62	41	15	26	11	46	2	25
TOTALS	134	100	44	100	152	100	57	100	24	100	8	100

Similar findings were not found for the females in this study. Whereas the males were found to have the most recidivism in the lowest IQ category, females had the most recidivism in the 90 to 110 IQ category. Of the females in the lowest IQ (90 and under) category, 23% were recidivists. This happened to be the lowest recidivism rate for the entire sample. The highest IQ category (110 and above) had 25% recidivism, which was only 1% lower than the highest rate established by female juvenile offenders found in the 90 to 110 category.

In conclusion, this table does not lend support to Hypothesis VIII. It did, however, show that the male juvenile offenders had the highest recidivism rate in the lowest IQ category (90 and under). For females, this was not found to be the case and, in fact, the direct opposite finding occurred; the lowest recidivism rate (23%) was found

in the lowest IQ category.

Findings in Table 4.27 indicate that juvenile offenders who reside in homes that are intact possess less recidivism when compared with those juvenile offenders coming from homes that are broken, regardless of the IQ category presented in this study. This supports Hypothesis V, that those juvenile offenders coming from broken homes will experience higher recidivism rates than offenders coming from homes that are intact. In the IQ category 90 and under, those juvenile offenders coming from homes that were intact had a 42% recidivism rate. Those juvenile offenders coming from homes that were broken and were also under the same IQ category (90 and under) had 3% more recidivism.

TABLE 4.27 Three Way Cross-Tabulation of Recidivism with Broken Home and Intelligence Quotients

	90 and under				90 - 110				110 and above			
	Broken		Intact		Broken		Intact		Broken		Intact	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	55	55	45	58	56	53	76	73	12	57	7	64
Recidivist	45	45	33	42	49	47	28	27	9	43	4	36
TOTALS	100	100	78	100	105	100	104	100	21	100	11	100

In the IQ category 90 to 110 (which had the largest number of subjects), we found 20% less recidivism for those children coming from homes that were intact. The IQ category 110 and above had

the smallest number of subjects from the three IQ categories. The findings in this category were similar to the previous two categories. Those juvenile offenders coming from homes that were intact had a 36% recidivism rate, which was 7% less than the rate found for juvenile offenders coming from homes that were broken.

In conclusion, the findings in this chapter seem to indicate that sex (male), younger age at first referral, school problems, and high residential mobility (3 or more) were items that significantly differentiated the juvenile recidivist from the non-recidivist. These variables always produced higher rates of recidivism than non-recidivism, in spite of the fact that we controlled for numerous factors in three way cross-tabulation analysis.

Results concerning the hypotheses of race, broken homes, and seriousness of offense were supported when we examined two way cross-tabulation. However, when we introduced other controlling factors, our findings were not consistently supportive. In fact, the addition of certain control variables often rejected the formulated hypothesis.

The hypothesis that juvenile offenders who possessed lower IQ's would experience higher recidivism rates than juveniles who had higher IQ's was rejected at all levels of analysis.

The first question in this thesis was whether or not we could ferret out certain variables to determine differences between

juvenile recidivists and non-recidivists. Our findings seem to substantiate that this is indeed possible. The second question we raised was whether or not we could compare our findings with the results of previous studies. Discussion of this begins in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

COMPARISON OF FINDINGS

A comparative analysis between the results of this study and the results found in the literature will be discussed in this chapter. The first study used for comparison will be the work of Ganzer and Sarason, discussed in Chapter II. The broken home will be analyzed first.

Broken Home

The Ganzer and Sarason study found that females more often came from broken homes than did males, regardless of whether or not they were recidivists. The data presented in the present study revealed the opposite, with males coming from broken homes more often than females. We also found that 66% of those families with marital status that was intact came from the non-recidivist group, whereas only 34% of those families that were in this group were classified as recidivists. When considering the male delinquent that comes from a family that was intact, 59% of these youngsters were non-recidivists. However, 41% of this same group were recidivists. This does, however, compare favorably with the 51% non-recidivists and 49% recidivists who came from families of broken homes.

As seen in Table 4.14, of those female juvenile offenders who came from families where their parent's marital status was intact, 86% were non-recidivists. Only 14% of the females in this category were recidivist youngsters. This compared favorably with the 65% non-recidivism and 35% recidivism rates attained by those girls from families of broken homes. In contrast to the findings of Ganzer and Sarason, this present study found a direct correlation between recidivism and the marital status of natural parents. The data in the present study suggest that a child would have a much higher probability of becoming a recidivist if he came from a broken home. This was in direct contrast to the findings of Ganzer and Sarason in that their study found only a slightly greater proportion of recidivists than non-recidivists coming from broken homes. Further examination of this variable reveals that if you are a female juvenile offender and come from a family that is intact, you have very little chance of becoming a recidivist. The recidivism rates of boys in this same category did not fare nearly as well.

Another variable used for comparative analysis will be that of intelligence quotient. Ganzer and Sarason stated that in their findings, proportions of male and female recidivists and non-recidivists whose IQ's were estimated as "low average" and below did not differ significantly from those with IQ's of "high average" and above.

As was seen in Table 4.27, the results of Ganzer and Sarason

are quite similar with the data presented in this study. Females with IQ's ranging from 90 to over 110 have almost exactly the same rates between recidivists and non-recidivists. Those females over 110 had a relatively small sample size, but still had similar recidivism rates. In the case of males, recidivism was highest for those males with IQ's under 90. However, those males with IQ's between 90 and 110, we found, had the lowest recidivism, 41%. If the originally stated hypothesis was correct (the higher a youthful offender's IQ, the lower the recidivism), we should find that male juvenile offenders with IQ's over 110 have less recidivism than those juvenile offenders who had IQ's between 90 and 110. This, however, is not the case, since the recidivism rates for males in the 110 plus category increased 5% from the previous category (90 - 110).

School Discipline Problems

The next area of comparative analysis will examine the Sakata and Litwack study. Specifically, the recidivism rates of male juvenile offenders with and without school discipline problems will be discussed.

In Table 5. 1, we can see that there were 80 boys used for analysis in the Sakata-Litwack study and 310 boys in the present study.

Of the 80 boys that were examined by Sakata and Litwack, 75%

of those boys that had school discipline problems were classified as recidivists. Those boys not having school discipline problems only had a 30% recidivism rate. The data in the present study revealed similar findings. Those boys having school discipline problems had a 62% recidivism rate. Those boys not having school discipline problems only had a 30% recidivism rate, which happened to be the exact rate found in the Sakata-Litwack study.

TABLE 5.1 Comparative Analysis of Sakata and Litwack Data with Present Study Data

	Sakata/Litwack Study				Present Study			
	School Problems		No School Problems		School Problems		No School Problems	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	9	25	31	70	57	38	112	70
Recidivist	27	75	13	30	94	62	47	30
TOTALS	36	100	44	100	151	100	159	100

The Sakata-Litwack study and the material in the present study also had the same percentage for those boys who were not school discipline problems in both the non-recidivist and recidivist categories. Of the boys who were not school discipline problems, 70% were also non-recidivists in both studies.

Examination of the variable concerning school discipline problems illustrated that in both studies, one being pre-institutional and the other being institutional, that boys with school discipline problems

had more recidivism. Furthermore, both studies found that 70% of those boys who were not a school discipline problem were non-recidivists. Therefore, the variable of school discipline appears to be a significant variable for distinguishing between those boys who would become recidivists and those who would remain non-recidivists.

Classified Offense

The final area of comparative analysis will be the study conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin. The data used for comparative examination came from their study, "Delinquency in a Birth Cohort," and occurred in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In that the data provided by the authors only included variables concerning boys, for purposes of comparison our data will consist of the same variables. These variables are: white males, black males, juvenile status offenses, criminal offenses, and all offenses.

Table 5. 2 contains the variables of juvenile status offense, black male and white male, and recidivism rates. As can be seen by the table, both white and black males committing juvenile offenses in the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study had less recidivism than white and black males committing juvenile offenses in the present study. In the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin data, white males committing juvenile status offenses only had a 23% recidivism rate. Black males committing juvenile offenses connected with the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study had a recidivism rate of 41%.

TABLE 5.2 Male Juvenile Status Offense, Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin and Present Study Data

	Wolfgang, et al. Study				Present Study			
	White		Black		White		Black	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	394	77	177	59	32	55	5	45
Recidivist	120	23	121	41	26	45	6	55
TOTALS	514	100	298	100	58	100	11	100

The data in the present study found that white males committing juvenile offenses scored a 22% higher recidivism rate (45%) than did their white male counterparts in the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study. The same situation also exists with the non-white males from the present study in that they had a 14% higher recidivism rate (55%) than the non-white males from the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study. In both studies, however, white males did have less recidivism concerning juvenile status offenses than did the non-white males, with a larger rate differential in the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study (18%) than the present study (10% difference). In conclusion, when comparing juvenile offenses, the data in this study found that the lowest recidivism rate in white males (45%) was higher than the highest recidivism rate found in black males (41%) from the Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin study.

Table 5.3 contains the variables of criminal offense, black

and white juvenile offenders and recidivism rates. The results found in this table are in direct contrast to the findings pertaining to juvenile status offenses.

TABLE 5.3 Male Criminal Offenses, Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin and Present Study Data

	Wolfgang, et al. Study				Present Study			
	White		Black		White		Non-White	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	269	44	182	31	88	60	44	47
Recidivist	338	56	411	69	59	40	50	53
TOTALS	607	100	593	100	147	100	94	100

The Wolfgang, et al., study established higher recidivism rates than the present study when examining criminal offenses. This was true for both black and white juvenile offenders. Of the white male juvenile offenders, 56% were recidivists in the Wolfgang, et al., study. This represents 16% more recidivism than we found for white males in the present study. Black males from the Wolfgang, et al., study had a 69% recidivism rate, which was also 16% more recidivism than we found for non-white males in the present study.

Another comparison finds that white male juvenile offenders in both studies had less recidivism than black male juvenile offenders. The Wolfgang, et al., study found that black male juvenile offenders had 13% more recidivism than did white male juvenile offenders.

Similarly, the present study data found that black male juvenile offenders also had 13% more recidivism than white male juvenile offenders.

Table 5.4 includes all the offenses committed by male juvenile offenders in both studies. The variable of race and recidivism will be used for comparative analysis.

TABLE 5.4 Male-All Offenses--Total, Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, Present Study Data

	Wolfgang, et al. Study				Present Study			
	White		Black		White		Non-White	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non-recidivist	1110	55	503	35	120	59	49	47
Recidivist	909	45	953	65	85	41	56	53
TOTALS	2019	100	1456	100	205	100	105	100

The Wolfgang, et al., study found that black males had a 65% recidivism rate, which was 25% more than that found for white males. The findings of the present study indicated that black males established a 53% recidivism rate, while 41% of the white males in the study were recidivists. Both the white males and black males in the Wolfgang, et al., study had more recidivism than the white males and black males in the present study. The largest discrepancy occurred in the category of black males, where the Wolfgang, et al,, study had a recidivism rate of 65%, and the data in the present study

showed a 53% recidivism rate. Total recidivism for both studies had the Wolfgang, et al., study with 54% recidivism for its males, regardless of race. This was 9% more than we found for the males in the present study.

In all three tables used for comparison, non-white males always had more recidivism than white males, regardless of the study they originated from. Also, the data in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 indicate that both studies were in direct contrast to each other regarding recidivism rates of juvenile status offenders and juvenile offenders committing criminal offenses. The possibility exists that the court system from which the data were obtained for the present study gives more attention to juvenile status offenses than the larger juvenile court system from Philadelphia.

This chapter was a response to our second question which was whether or not we could compare our findings with results from other studies. The final question concerned our attempt to discover if comparative findings are universal in nature. The contradictions of some comparisons does not lend support to the contention that findings of juvenile recidivism research are universal. The extreme differences in methodological technique might also help explain the non-universal aspects of research in this field.

There are many other variables, too numerous to mention, within the scope of this study, that could have been discussed.

However, it became quite apparent that no one individual factor could explain the differences between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders. It was evident that the problems of juvenile delinquency and corresponding recidivism rates were multifaceted in nature.

We have just reviewed some of the more recognized variables associated with juvenile recidivism research. Our findings have both supported and contradicted results of previous research.

This concludes the comparative research section presented in this study. Attention will now focus on the final chapter, summary and conclusions.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to examine distinguishing characteristics between recidivist and non-recidivist juvenile offenders. This was accomplished by applying to the hypotheses two and three way cross-tabulation analysis, presented in Chapter IV. A brief summary of each hypothesis will follow.

The first hypothesis, that male juvenile offenders will experience a higher rate of recidivism than female juvenile offenders, was supported by all studies found in the literary field and also by two and three way cross-tabulation analysis used in this study. It has been an established fact that for years males have been predominant in the criminal justice system; this includes both the juvenile justice system and the adult justice system. The results presented in this study do not differ from results found in previous studies (Meade, 1973; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969). This study supported the hypothesis that the sexual factor (male) was a good predictor of both criminal and recidivism rates. It was interesting to note that when controlling for every variable concerning sexual recidivism, males always received higher scores than females. This appeared to be extremely significant in itself.

Hypothesis II, that juvenile offenders who are older (15-17 years) will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juveniles who are younger (6-14 years), was hypothesized because of previous studies citing older age as a predictor of recidivism (Meade, 1973; Arbuckle & Litwack, 1960). Two way cross-tabulation analysis did not lend support to the hypothesis. More than half of the younger juvenile offenders were classified as recidivist, while only a quarter of the older classified offenders were recidivists.

In that this study was concerned with the age of juvenile offenders at first referral, it was apparent that previous research studies have often examined only the age of the juvenile offender. At this point it might be mentioned that researchers in general should be careful when examining the age factor, determining whether or not it was age per se or age at first referral. Results can be quite different. With this in mind, it was logical to assume that juveniles who entered the juvenile justice system at an earlier age would have more of a chance to recidivate than older juveniles who entered the system much later in their careers. An example of this would be a 6-year-old who has contact with the juvenile court system and has an 11-year period of time to recidivate. This compared unfavorably to the 15-year-old who came to the attention of the juvenile court for the first time and only had a two-year period of time in order to recidivate.

When age was examined in this study, all the three way cross-tabulation findings were in the opposite direction of the proposed hypothesis. The reasons are probably the same as was previously mentioned. This was a consistent finding throughout the study. Younger age, then, at first referral, along with sex, was one of the better predictors of higher recidivism rates concerning juvenile offenders.

Hypothesis III was that non-white juvenile offenders will experience a higher rate of recidivism than white juvenile offenders. This was derived from findings of numerous research studies (Kirkpatrick, 1937; Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972; Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969). The two way cross-tabulation analysis supported this hypothesis. Recidivism rates for non-white juvenile offenders were higher than for white juvenile offenders. It should be noted here, again, that the non-white classification included 117 black juvenile offenders and 12 juvenile offenders of different racial origins that were neither white nor black.

Three way cross-tabulation analysis foundno difference between white female juvenile recidivism and non-white juvenile female recidivism with both categories establishing exactly the same percentage. This illustrated that the higher recidivism rate concerning non-white juvenile offenders was attributable totally to the male sex factor. When this hypothesis was examined while controlling

for the age variable, results were the same in that it supported the hypothesis. The non-white juvenile offenders in both the younger (6-14) and older (15-17) categories recorded higher rates of recidivism than did their white juvenile offender counterparts.

Although the data provided for in this study found that non-white juvenile offenders had higher rates of recidivism than white juvenile offenders, the differential between non-white and white offenders was not as great as that found in the Wolfgang, et al., study.

Hypothesis IV was that juvenile offenders with school problems will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who do not have school problems. This hypothesis also found support from previous juvenile recidivism studies (Sakata-Litwack, 1971; Wolfgang, et al., 1972; Meade, 1973). The examination of two way cross-tabulation analysis showed that results did, indeed, support this hypothesis. Those juvenile offenders who were classified as having school problems had much more recidivism than those juvenile offenders who did not have school problems.

Three way cross-tabulation analysis concerning this hypothesis was examined when controlling for the variables of sex, race, and seriousness of offense. In terms of sex, both females and males had more recidivism when they were categorized as having school problems than when they did not have school problems. This

was not unexpected; however, the large differential pertaining to recidivism was felt to be extremely high. This seems to indicate that male or female juvenile offenders that possess school problems will have much higher recidivism rates than those juvenile offenders who do not have school problems.

When examining the hypothesis as stated and controlling for the race factor, the results of this study found that racial factors were insignificant in this case. Both non-whites and whites established higher recidivism when they had school problems than when they did not. Again, there was a large difference between recidivism found for those children having school problems and those children not having school problems, regardless of race. Non-white children not having school problems had less recidivism than the offenders who did have school problems. White juvenile offenders who did not have school problems also had less recidivism in this category. Results indicated that the variable of school problems was significantly related to higher recidivism for juvenile offenders.

When controlling for seriousness of offense, we found that juvenile offenders who had school problems experienced a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who did not have school problems. This was true regardless of whether the youngster committed a juvenile offense or a serious offense. The youngster who committed a juvenile offense and had school problems had a

higher recidivism rate than the youngster who committed a juvenile offense, but did not have school problems. Likewise, the youngster who committed a serious offense and had school problems also had a higher recidivism rate than the youngster who committed a serious offense, but did not have school problems.

Hypothesis IV (School Problems), then, was supported by both two and three way cross-tabulation. The large differential involving the recidivism rates of children with school problems and those without seem to indicate that this hypothesis may be one of the better predictors of juvenile recidivism.

Hypothesis V was that juvenile offenders who came from a broken home would experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who came from a stable home. This hypothesis also was supported by previous research studies (Buikhuisen & Hoekstra, 1974; Monahan, 1957). Two way cross-tabulation analysis revealed that more than half of the juveniles connected with this study were classified as coming from families with broken homes. The juvenile offenders who came from broken homes had more recidivism than those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were intact. These findings support the fourth hypothesis.

Three way cross-tabulation analysis controlled for the variables of sex, age, race, and seriousness of offense. It might be noted here that because more than half of the sample did come from homes

that were broke, this variable might be more directly related to juvenile delinquency causation rather than juvenile delinquency recidivism.

When looking at the recidivism levels of juvenile offenders coming from broken homes while controlling for sex, we found that males had recorded much higher recidivism rates than did females.. Similarly, female juvenile offenders coming from homes that were broken had more recidivism when compared to those female juvenile offenders who came from homes that were intact. The percentage of recidivism in this category was one of the highest rates established by females in this study.

When controlling for age, the results of the present study found that juvenile offenders who came from homes that were broken had more recidivism than those juvenile offenders who came from homes that were intact, regardless of whether they were in the young (6-14) category or the older (15-17) category.

In controlling for race, we found that white juvenile offenders who came from broken homes had a higher recidivism rate than those white juvenile offenders who came from homes that were intact. However, this was not the case in the non-white juvenile offender category. This was the only category where results from this study found more recidivism in homes that were intact as compared to homes that were broken.

In conclusion, the fifth hypothesis was supported by two way cross-tabulation. With the exception of the race variable, three way cross-tabulation also lent support.

The results of Hypothesis VI (juvenile offenders who commit more serious offenses will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who commit less serious offenses) was supported by previous research studies (Unkovic & Ducsay, 1969; Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972). Two way cross-tabulation analysis found that those juvenile offenders who committed serious offenses had a higher recidivism rate than those juvenile offenders who only committed juvenile offenses.

While controlling for sex, the results from this study proved to be very interesting. Three way cross-tabulation analysis showed that the third hypothesis was not supported when controlling for male and female juvenile offenders. Male juvenile offenders committing serious offenses had a slightly lower recidivism rate than male offenders committing juvenile offenses. If we only examined male offenders concerning the nature of offense, the results would support Hypothesis III. However, although recidivism rates were very close for both serious offenses and juvenile offenses for males, minimally higher recidivism was found in the juvenile offense category. When we examined female recidivism for this category, we found more recidivism for females committing serious offenses than we found

for females committing juvenile offenses.

There were contrasting findings concerning the recidivism rates of the race factor. Both the non-white and white juvenile offenders had higher recidivism rates in the serious offense category than the juvenile offense category. The non-white juvenile offenders had more recidivism in the serious offense category than the juvenile offense category. White juvenile offenders had a higher rate of serious offenses than juvenile offenses.

In conclusion, findings supported by two way cross-tabulation analysis concerning Hypothesis VI were not supported by three way cross-tabulation analysis in that the higher recidivism rate for serious offenses were totally attributable to female recidivism rates and not male.

Hypothesis VII was that a juvenile offender who has changed his residence often will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who have not changed their residence as often. This hypothesis was supported by previous research (Buikhuisen & Hoekstra, 1974). The two way cross-tabulation analysis does lend support to this hypothesis. The results were that the more often a juvenile moved, the higher the rate of recidivism would be. The residential mobility factor was limited to a five-year period of time.

Three way cross-tabulation analysis had consistent results

for males and females. The results differed only in the 0 and 1-2 movement category. Also, there was only a slightly higher recidivism rate for those females in the 0 movement category than there was for the 1-2 category. For females as well as males, most of the recidivism was found in the category that had three or more movements.

When examining the three way cross-tabulation analysis, controlling for seriousness of offense, we found most of the recidivism in the 3 plus movement category. There was again, however, some small degree of rate differential in the juvenile offense category concerning no movement and one or two movements. It was felt that this rate was so small that it would have a negligible effect upon the hypothesis.

In controlling for age, the same situation was found to be true again. Those juvenile offenders, regardless of age, who had three or more movements also had higher recidivism.

While controlling for the racial factor, white juvenile offenders fit the stated hypothesis; the more residential movement, the higher the recidivism. The non-white juvenile offenders, however, had a higher rate of recidivism in that no movement category than the one to two movement category. They did, however, record their highest rate of recidivism in the three plus movement category, as did the white juvenile offenders.

The last three way cross-tabulation analysis controlled for the broken home. Those juvenile offenders, regardless of whether they came from a broken home or not, who moved three or more times had more recidivism than those who did not move as often.

After examining the two way and three way cross-tabulation analysis, we found some support for the residential mobility hypothesis. However, support was not consistent throughout all the three way cross-tabulation tables. In general, one might be able to hypothesize in such a way that a new hypothesis might read "those juvenile offenders who have moved three or more times during a five-year period of time will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juveniles who have not moved as often."

Hypothesis VIII was that juvenile offenders with lower intelligence quotients will have higher recidivism rates than juvenile offenders with higher intelligence quotients. This hypothesis was supported by previous research studies (Ganzer & Sarason, 1973; Sepsi, 1971). An examination of the two way cross-tabulation analysis reveals that the results do not fully support the hypothesis. Those juvenile offenders with IQ's of 90 and under had more recidivism than those juvenile offenders with IQ's in the range from 90 to 110, but had less recidivism than those juvenile offenders who had IQ's over 110. This does not support the hypothesis as predicted. In fact, the analysis demonstrates that recidivism rates are lowest for those juvenile offenders in the largest IQ category (90-110) and

are highest for those on either end of the IQ continuum (under 90 and 110+).

Two tables concerning three way cross-tabulation analysis were also examined, controlling for sex and broken homes.

The table pertaining to sex showed some findings not found in the two way cross-tabulation analysis. It was discovered that male juvenile offenders with IQ's of 90 and under had the highest rate of recidivism for this category. The female juvenile offenders, however, had much less recidivism for the same category, which happened to be the lowest recidivism found in the entire table. Again, the three way cross- tabulation analysis table does not support this hypothesis.

While controlling for the variable of broken home, we find that juvenile offenders who reside in homes that are intact possess less recidivism when compared with those juvenile offenders coming from homes that are not intact, regardless of the intelligence quotient category presented by this study. The IQ category 90 to 110, which had the largest number of subjects, had the largest amount of variance between recidivism rates involving juvenile offenders coming from homes that were intact and juvenile offenders coming from homes that were not intact.

In conclusion, all of the findings in this thesis were supportive of the hypothesis pertaining to sex, school problems, and high

residential mobility. Partial support (two way cross-tabulation) was found for the hypotheses concerning race, broken homes, and seriousness of offense. The hypotheses involving older age and IQ were rejected.

With our summary of the hypotheses complete, we will now discuss some of the shortcomings in this study.

Limitations

The intake inventory form used by the probation officers within the juvenile court system from which these data were obtained was felt to be in itself a limiting factor. As was stated previously, there were a total of 35 different variables included within the format of the intake inventory. However, a number of these variables were found to be extremely subjective in nature. Because of the different types of personality and value backgrounds of the individual probation officers, some initial research concerning the subjective variables revealed a wide range of responses involving similar types of situations. With this in mind, this particular study concerned itself only with objective data.

Another factor, perhpas less limiting, was the length of time the juvenile offenders were given to recidiviate. Intake inventory forms were completed on all adjudicated youth. However, many of the children in the study had a much greater time period than one year in order to become a recidivist. This is illustrated by the fact that

the younger age group (6-14) did, in all cases, establish higher recidivism rates than the older age group (15-17). Since the intake inventory forms were completed on all existing caseloads and all new cases within the two-year period of time, it stands to reason that all new older (15-17) juvenile offenders would have less time to recidivate than the new younger juvenile offenders (6-14).

Another limiting factor of the intake inventory form was that it could not reveal the amount of recidivism. Again, by definition, recidivism referred to those juvenile offenders who came to the attention of the court and were adjudicated more than one time. It would be interesting to explore the differences between those juvenile recidivists who recidivated four or five or more times. Also, concerning the definition of recidivism, there existed the possibility that a police officer would apprehend a juvenile offender but would not always make a referral to juvenile court. So, a juvenile offender under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court could actually have committed another offense, but would not be classified as a recidivist due to the fact that the juvenile's action may never have been brought to the attention of the court.

In general, this study explored only differences between those juvenile offenders who appeared before the court one time and those juvenile offenders who appeared before the court more than once. This is not the best procedure for examining juvenile recidivism.

There are far too many complex questions that are left unanswered when using a dichotomized sample.

Another limiting factor was that approximately 10 different probation officers responded to the intake inventory form. Even when dealing with some of the objective variables, there is still a subjective thought process occurring within the minds of the individual probation officer. This was especially noticeable during the coding process. Certain officers were much more accurate and concerned about filling out the form correctly. Others felt the form to be somewhat insignificant and paid much less attention to its purposes. It is felt by this author that at the time the intake inventory form was in operation there were only a few probation officers on the staff who felt the research would prove beneficial to them.

In light of these limitations and the fact that every research study seems to leave more questions unanswered than answered, further examination of the subject is warranted. Attention will now focus on this area.

Suggestions for Future Research

As was mentioned in the preceding section, it is felt by this author that future research should be aimed in the direction of severity of recidivism. Moreover, quite often a child may commit one, two, or more offenses and, even though labeled a recidivist,

still becomes "rehabilitated" and is quite successful. In other instances, some juveniles commit two and three or more offenses and resort to adult crime for the rest of their lives. Future research should direct its efforts in the area of determining which juvenile offenders are going to be the future "hard core" adult criminal offenders. The natural place to initiate this research is, of course, the juvenile court system. To investigate the entire system is problematic, since each county juvenile court system is autonomous and establishes policy according to its own individual needs. Such a condition is not conducive to the comparative analysis of juvenile court systems, let alone attempting to implement comparisons with adult systems.

Another area of future research would be to implement a sample which would include every child entering the juvenile justice system. Such a sample would be designed in order to facilitate the needs of researchers. Our juvenile court systems today have staggering amounts of data. Most of this data, however, are not conducive to good research. The information contained within the court system usually are legally and socially oriented. It is unfortunate that more research cannot be conducted with this vast amount of available information. Politically, this is felt to be unwise by some juvenile court judges. Again, the autonomous power a judge has over his county juvenile court system determines whether or not research

will be conducted within that system.

A final question, concerned with every research study, is: Of what value is it? Thus, the final section of this study will address itself to that question.

Implications

The implications, in terms of redirecting juvenile court policy, are many. The strong support given to the first hypothesis, that male juvenile offenders will experience a higher rate of recidivism than female juvenile offenders, could possibly lead to the development of a specialized caseload for male youngsters prone to recidivism. For example, Hypothesis VI (juvenile offenders with school problems will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who do not have school problems) and Hypothesis IV (juvenile offenders who come from a broken home will experience a higher rate of recidivism than those juvenile offenders who come from a stable home) combined together with a male recidivist, might necessitate the need for a "high-risk" recidivist specialized caseload. Advantages to this would be more specialized attention, increased time with clients, increased time with family, increased community organization concerning clients, and a reduced caseload size for the probation officer. The establishment of such a "specialized caseload" might significantly reduce the amount of recidivism presently experienced by those youngsters fitting the above-mentioned hypotheses.

With the results of this study revealing support for the majority of the previously stated hypotheses, it might be possible to convince the individual court system to develop future research of its own. Presently, the juvenile court system from which this data were gathered is exploring the possibility of acquiring its own computer system in order to provide it with improved research.

In that the sixth-stated hypothesis (school problems) was strongly supported, it is felt new gains could possibly be made through the interaction of the juvenile court system and the school systems within the county. It is possible that, through improved and creative program development by the school systems in the county, delinquency prevention might be plausible. Since 1970, when the data were first gathered, there have been numerous alternative education school programs directing emphasis in this particular area.

Other implications for the juvenile court system would be to implement a screening instrument in order to determine some type of recidivism score. The research presented in this study could be a start in that direction. For example, if a child entering juvenile court for the first time has school problems, comes from a broken home, is young in age, and has experienced a lot of residential mobility, chances are that this child will be a recidivist in the not too distant future. If the opposite situation exists, a child entering court with no school problems, is older in age, and has not changed

residence in the past five years, a possible dismissal or relative easy probation period might be designated for such a client. As was stated previously, such a screening instrument could be developed from the material provided in this study, but would probably require many additional variables in order to make it a representative screening instrument.

Finally, this research study leaves many unanswered questions hopefully for future researchers to explore. It is hoped that this present study, which attempted to answer specific questions concerning juvenile recidivism, might also serve as a stimulus for others to accept the challenge of future research in this area.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Arbuckle, D. A. & Litwack, L. A study of recidivism among juvenile delinquents. Federal Probation, 1960, 45, 45-48.

Baer, D. J. Taxonomic classification of male delinquents from autobiographical data and subsequent recidivism. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76, 27-31.

Berlin, L. Adolescent recidivism. National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 1958, 4, 277-279.

Blumer, H. Sociological analysis and the "variable." American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 683-690.

Buikhuisen, W. & Hoekstra, H. A. Factors related to recidivism. British Journal of Criminology, 1974, 14(1), 63-69.

Chilton, R. J. & Markle, G. E. Family disruption, delinquent conduct and the effect of subclassification. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, 93-99.

Clinard, M. The sociology of deviant behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Cohen, A. X. Internecine conflict: The offender. In T. Sellin & M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Delinquency: Selected studies. New York: Wiley, 1969.

Coleman, J. S. Multivariate analysis for attribute data. In E. Borgatta (Ed.), Sociological methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Deutscher, I. Some relevant direction for research in juvenile delinquency. In A. Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social process. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Felstrom, D. M., Grant, R. L., Rempel, D., Steimen, M. & Stubbs, A. A. Comparative study of boys discharged from the Manitoba home for boys. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Manitoba, 1960.

Ferdinand, T. The offense patterns and family structures of urban, village, and rural delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1964, 55, 86-93.

Ganzer, V. J. & Sarason, I. G. Variables associated with recidivism among juvenile delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 1-5.

Glasser, D. & O'Leary, V. Personal characteristics and parole outcome. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1966.

Gold, M. Delinquent behavior in the city. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cal Publishing Co, 1970.

Gould, D. E. & Beverly, R. G. The initial home visit research schedule and its relationship to parole performances. California Department of Youth Authority Bulletin, 1963, 33, 16-47.

Guildford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Hirschi, T. & Selvin, H. Delinquency research: An appraisal of analytic methods. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Hollingshead, A. B. & Redleck, F. C. Social class and mental illness. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Hyvarinen, L. I.B.M. 1,620 taxonomy programs for classifying items described by qualitative properties. I.B.M. 1,620 program 6.0.201. New York: International Business Machines Corporation, 1963.

Kirkpatrick, M. E. Some significant factors in juvenile recidivism. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1973, 7, 349-359.

Laulicht, J. Problems of statistical research: Recidivism and its correlates. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Sciences, 1963, 54, 163-175.

Lemert, E. M. Social pathology: A systematic approach to the theory of deviant behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Litwack, L. & Herbert, D. J. Prediction of recidivism among juvenile delinquents. Journal of Education Research, 1967, 61, 174-175.

Mannheim, H. & Wilkins, L. Prediction methods in relation to Borstal training. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1955.

Meade, A. Seriousness of delinquency, the adjudicative decision and recidivism: A longitudinal configuration analysis. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1973, 64, 479-485.

Michigan State Plan, Michigan Department of Mental Health and Michigan Department of Public Health, 1970.

Monohan, T. Family status and the delinquent child. Social Forces, 1957, 35, 250-258.

Robison, S. Juvenile delinquency. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1960.

Sakata, R. & Litwack, L. Recidivism among juvenile parolees. Psychological Reports, 1971, 29, 351-355.

Sappington, E. H. & Zeglen, R. S. Factors associated with recidivism among three hundred Forth boys from Tennessee State Vocational Training School. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, 1964.

Schwitzgebel, R. Education counselors: Training for a new definition of after-care of juvenile parolees. Washington, D. C.: Boston University Law-Medicine Institute, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, 1966.

Sepsi, V. J. Girl recidivists. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1974, 11(1), 70-79.

Sorokin, P. A. Fads and foibles in modern sociology and related sciences. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1956.

Sutherland, E. & Cressey, D. Principles of criminology. Chicago: Lippincott, 1960.

Terry, R. Discrimination in the handling of juvenile offenders by social control agencies. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1967, 4, 218-219.

Thornberry, T. P. Race, socioeconomic status and sentencing in the juvenile justice system. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1973, 64, 90-98.

Unkovic, C. M. & Ducsay, W. J. An application of configurational analysis to the recidivism of juvenile delinquent behavior. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1969, 60, 340-344.

Wadsworth, M. E. J. Delinquency and a national sample of children. British Journal of Criminology, 1975, 15, 167-174.

Wechsler, D. The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence. Baltimore, Maryland: William & Wilkins, 1958.

Weeks, H. A. & Ritchie, O. W. An evaluation of the services of the state of Ohio to its delinquent children and youth. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Resources, Ohio State University, 1956.

Williams, J. R. & Gold, M. From delinquent behavior to official delinquency. Social Problems, 1972, 20, 209-229.

Wolfgang, M., Figlio, R. & Sellin, T. Delinquency in a birth cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Wolfgang, M., Savitz, L. & Johnson, N. Sociology of crime and punishment. New York: Wiley, 1962.

APPENDIX

INTAKE INVENTORY

NAME: _____ SCHOOL SYSTEM: _____

ADDRESS: _____

EL. SCHL. DISTRICT: _____

(1) SEX

Male
Female

(2) PREVIOUS COURT RECORD

Yes
No

(3) FIRST REFERRED OFFENSE

Felony
Misdemeanor
Juvenile Offense

(4) FIRST SPECIFIC OFFENSE

Assault
Auto Theft
B & E/Illegal Entry
Disobedient
Extortion
Forgery
Larceny
Liquor Violation
Runaway
School Problem
Sex (specify) _____
Vandalism
Other (specify) _____

(5) GROUP/SOLITARY OFFENSE (FIRST REFERRAL) If minor was accompanied and supported by companions immediately prior to, during, or after offense, indicate "group" even though those companions may not have been charged as accomplices or accessories.

Group
Solitary

(6) AGE AT FIRST REFERRAL

Under 12
12 - 12/6
12/6 - 13
13 - 13/6
13/6 - 14
14 - 14/6
14/6 - 15
15 - 15/6
15/6 - 16
16 - 16/6
16/6 - 17

	Year	Month
FIRST OFFENSE	( )	( )
DATE OF BIRTH	( )	( )
AGE AT FIRST REFERRAL	( )	( )

(7) MOST SERIOUS SUBSEQUENT OFFENSE

Felony
Misdemeanor
Juvenile Offense

(8) POLICE CONTACTS PRIOR TO FIRST REFERRAL "Contact" in this context refers to one in which minor was involved as a participant in an offense, or where there is reasonable cause to believe that he was involved; a recorded police contact of a negative nature.

Yes
No

(9) FAMILY CONTACT WITH ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES "Arrested" refers to being apprehended and/or taken into police custody whether or not actually confined and/or convicted. (In the case of a juvenile, whether or not actually petitioned into court.) In both "arrests" and "neglect," there should be a reasonable basis for believing that the alleged offense or circumstances existed in fact even though further formal action was not pursued.

Father arrested
Mother arrested
Older sibling arrested
Younger sibling arrested
"Family trouble"
Neglect complaints/referrals

(10) RACE - Mongoloid includes Orientals, Indians, and Mexican-Americans

Caucasoid
Negroid
Mongoloid

(11) RECORD - REPUTATION OF CLOSEST FRIENDS

Stable non-delinquent - no police contact and no cause to question behavior

Marginal - unacceptable home, school, community behavior, but no referrals

Delinquent - referrals made and authorized by court

(12) MARITAL STATUS OF NATURAL/LEGAL PARENTS - "Intact" refers to parents who are married and living together (except involuntary separations due to military service, hospitalization, etc.) "Not intact" includes divorce, desertions, etc.

Intact
Not Intact

(13) CHILD LIVING WITH

Natural/Legal Parents
Mother and Step-father
Mother only
Father and Step-mother
Other

(14) WELFARE HISTORY OF FAMILY - Earned benefits such as Social Security, Insurance, Workmen's Compensation, alimony/support, veteran's benefits, etc., are not to be considered as welfare.

Totally dependent on welfare
Supplementally dependent
Sporadically dependent
No dependence on welfare

(15) EARNED INCOME OR BENEFITS

0000 - 4999
5000 - 7499
7500 - 10,000
Over 10,000

(16) EMPLOYMENT OF PARENTS OR PARENT SURROGATES

Father
Mother
Both

(17) DEPENDENTS LIVING ON INCOME - Include adult(s) to whom benefits are paid but do not include persons living in the home (grandparents, boarders, etc.) who have separate incomes and no immediate responsibility for maintenance of family unit.

3 or less
4 or 5
6 or more

(18) RESIDENCE CHANGES IN PAST FIVE YEARS

None
1 or 2
3 or more

(19) COHESIVENESS OF FAMILY UNIT - Unintegrated: individual independence and lack of responsibility to and for other members. Some: attempts at interaction and involvement. Cohesive: social and emotional involvement and interaction amongst members of the family unit.

Unintegrated
Some elements of cohesion
Cohesive

(20) DOMINANT ATTITUDE OF PARENTS - relative to the child and his involvement in the offense in terms of their expressed attitudes and actions. "Defensive" may include hostility toward official authority or projection of blame and responsibility. "Inconsistent" may include hostility toward the child.

Concerned
Defensive
Inconsistent

(21) DOMINANT REACTION OF CHILD TO IMMEDIATE HOME AND FAMILY SITUATION

Favorable - generally respectful, cooperative, and concerned

Unfavorable - lacking respect, hostile to parents, defiant, etc.

(22) INVOLVEMENT OF CHILD WITH HELPING AGENCIES/ INDIVIDUALS

Include Family Counseling, Child Guidance Clinic, School Social Workers (Service rather than financial assistance).

(23) EXTRACURRICULAR INTERESTS - Include organized activities and/or individual hobbies, etc.

Yes
No

(24) ATTITUDE OF CHILD CONCERNING INVOLVEMENT IN OFFENSE

Positive - expresses and manifests concern
Negative - indifferent, rationalizes or projects blame, etc.

(25) ATTITUDE OF MINOR TOWARD COURT

Positive - expresses cooperative attitude
Negative - indifferent, hostile

(26) SCHOOL ADJUSTMENT - based on school officials' evaluation of general behavior/performance

Acceptable - reasonable cooperation and use of potential
Not acceptable - failing; in danger of suspension or expulsion

(27) SCHOOL ATTENDANCE - school officials' evaluation for current or most recent semester

Regular - no cause for concern
Irregular - absent 10% or more for questionable reasons
Drop-out

(28) INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT

Under 80
80-89
90 - 110
Over 110

(29) TYPE OF FAMILY DWELLING

Project
Multiple
Single Unit

(30) LOCATION OF HOME

Urban - within city limits
Suburban - adjoining city
Rural Community - town, village or settlement separated from city
Rural - farm or farm area

(31) PHYSICAL CONDITION OF DWELLING - in terms of repair rather than housekeeping. "Substandard" indicates that changes or repairs are needed to insure the personal safety or health of occupants, or to conform to building codes.

Standard
Substandard

(32) HOUSEKEEPING STANDARDS

Superior - meticulous to an extreme or bordering extreme
Standard - uncluttered or slightly cluttered with evidence of recent cleaning
Substandard - accumulated clutter; dirty to filthy

(33) DELINQUENCY RATE IN AREA (Elementary school district)

High
Medium
Low