

105939



STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
THE STATE OFFICE BUILDING CAMPUS
ALBANY, N.Y. 12226

CR-Sent
11-13-87

105939

THOMAS A. COUGHLIN III
COMMISSIONER

WARD DE WITT
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER

DIVISION OF PROGRAM PLANNING, RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
Frank Tracy, Director

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DEPARTMENT'S
HISPANIC INMATE POPULATION

This report presents a statistical profile of the characteristics of the Department's Hispanic inmate population.

Attached is a set of Highlights which summarize the major findings of this statistical report.

NCJRS

JUL 15 1987

December 1986

ACQUISITIONS Prepared By:

Charles H. Nygard
Program Research Specialist IV

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

105939

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

NYS Department of Correctional
Services

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

HIGHLIGHTS

This report examines several selected characteristics of the Hispanic inmate population under custody in the facilities of the New York State Department of Correctional Services. The population examined is those inmates under custody at the beginning of 1986. The Hispanic population is compared with other ethnic population aggregates to determine its relative standing on the several characteristics, such as size, sex of the offender, crime of conviction, and region of the state from which committed.

Hispanics under custody are becoming a more important component of the New York State correctional population because they are growing faster, both in number and in relative proportion than are other ethnic population aggregates. Thus, language and cultural differences between Hispanics and those of other ethnicity are assuming added importance for correctional operations. Recognizing the importance of this situation, the Department established the Hispanic Inmate Needs Task Force. The data presented in this report addresses several of their concerns.

Inmates are designated as Hispanic if they qualify on either of two criteria. When inmates are either identified as Hispanic by classification personnel at departmental reception or determined to have been born in a Spanish-speaking country, their ethnicity is designated as Hispanic. Thus, Hispanics may be from any racial category. In fact, in the Department's population, there are Hispanics from most of the general racial categories used to describe correctional populations in this country, including white, black, Oriental, and American Indian.

As of January 1, 1986, Hispanic inmates comprised 27.0 percent (9,381) of the total population under custody (34,734).

BIRTHPLACE

Hispanics born in the United States or one of its territorial possessions comprised 81.3 percent of all inmates (7,623). Only 35.7 percent were born in New York State (3,345). An additional 1.4 percent (133) were born in other states of the United States. The largest portion (44.0 percent or 4,129) were born in Puerto Rico and 0.2 percent were born in other U.S. possessions (16). Also, 18.0 percent (1,684) were born in Spanish-speaking countries, with 0.2 percent (29) being born in other Nonspanish-speaking foreign countries. Only 45 (0.5 percent) of the Hispanics were unknown as to their place of birth.

There were 5,858 (62.4 percent) of the 9,381 Hispanics who were born outside of the United States. Of the 1,684 Hispanics born in Spanish-speaking countries, 1,500 (89.1 percent) were born in five countries in the Caribbean Basin and Central or South America. There were 614 (36.5 percent) born in the Dominican Republic, 456 (27.1 percent) born in Cuba, 107 (6.4 percent) born in Panama, 275 (16.3 percent) born in Colombia and 48 (2.8 percent) born in Ecuador. Thus, Hispanics born in either one of these five foreign countries or Puerto Rico account for 5,629 (60.0 percent) of all Hispanics under custody and 16.2 percent of the total under custody population. With the addition of New York State as a place of birth, 8,974 (95.6 percent) of all the Hispanics under custody are accounted for by only seven different places of birth, namely, Puerto Rico (44.0 percent), New York State (35.7 percent), the Dominican Republic (6.5 percent), Cuba (4.9 percent), Colombia (2.9 percent), Panama (1.1 percent), and Ecuador (0.5 percent). This amounts to 25.8 percent of the under custody population with the remaining 1.2 percent being Hispanics born elsewhere.

CONVICTION CRIME

Compared with other ethnic aggregates in the under custody population, proportionally fewer Hispanics are under custody for violent or coercive crimes. Also, proportionally fewer Hispanic females than males are under custody for such crimes. Likewise, the same is true for Hispanics regarding property crimes. However, among Hispanics there are no differences between males and females on their proportions under custody for property crimes. Nevertheless, there are more Hispanics under custody for drug crimes than is true for other ethnic aggregates. More females than males are under custody for such crimes among the Hispanics. Among the Hispanics under custody, drug offenders were concentrated among females, non-Puerto Ricans and the foreign born. Among the foreign born, drug offenses were proportionally more frequent among Colombians.

COUNTY OF COMMITMENT

When region of the State from which commitment occurred is examined, disproportionately more Hispanics were committed from New York City. Unlike the situation for the State in general, there were no differences between the sexes in their region of commitment. Both male and female Hispanics were committed from New York City in disproportionately greater percentages than from elsewhere in the State.

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DEPARTMENT'S HISPANIC INMATE POPULATION

Introduction

The Hispanic population under custody in the New York State Department of Correctional Services has grown at a faster rate than has the overall inmate population since the beginning of 1984. The total population under custody on January 1, 1986 (34,734) had increased by 14.4 percent over the total population under custody on January 1, 1984 (30,360). However, the Hispanic population under custody on January 1, 1986 (9,381) had increased by 35.7 percent over the Hispanic population under custody on January 1, 1984 (6,911). At the beginning of 1984, Hispanics constituted 22.8 percent of those under custody but were 27.0 percent by 1986.

After the first ten months of 1986, there were 10,950 Hispanics under custody in the Department's population of 38,762 (28.2 percent). In these first ten months of 1986, Hispanics constituted over 30 percent of all new commitments received. Thus, the proportion of Hispanics in the under custody population has continued to increase during 1986. Hispanics have become a major part of the under custody population and continue to increase at a rate greater than the overall inmate population.

Identifying the Hispanic Population

The Department's Hispanic subpopulation is identified using two data elements collected at the inmate's reception into custody. The inmate's ethnicity and place of birth are identified for departmental record keeping purposes.

At reception, each inmate is interviewed to determine basic characteristics for departmental record keeping purposes. Based upon these observations and other available materials, such as the inmate's commitment paper and pre-sentence investigation report, one of nine ethnic descriptors is designated. These include (1) "American Indian", (2) "Chinese", (3) "Japanese", (4) (other) "Oriental", (5) "Puerto Rican Birth", (6) "Puerto Rican Parentage", (7) (other) "Hispanic", (8) "Black", and (9) "White". Inmates designated either Puerto Rican (by) Birth, Puerto Rican (by) Parentage or (other) Hispanic are identified as members of the Hispanic ethnic subpopulation.

On the same occasion as the ethnic descriptors are assigned, the inmate's place of birth is recorded.

Inmates whose place of birth was in a Spanish-speaking country or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are identified as members of the Hispanic subpopulation, regardless of any other ethnic designator which may have been assigned at reception.

Table 1 presents data relevant for examining the consequences of using either the ethnic designator assigned at reception or the inmate's place of birth to identify members of the Hispanic ethnic subpopulation. In the population under custody on January 1, 1986, out of the 34,734 inmates for whom either ethnicity or place of birth were recorded, 8,674 had been designated as Hispanic (25.0 percent). Using both the ethnic designator assigned at reception and place of birth to identify Hispanics, 9,381 inmates were classifiable as Hispanics (27.0%). Thus, 2.0 percent of the population had not been identified as Hispanics at reception by having been given a Hispanic designator. Failure to designate these 707 inmates as Hispanic resulted in a 7.5 percent under-enumeration of all the Hispanics (9,381) identified by using both assigned ethnicity and place of birth for the criteria.

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

Table 2 presents place of birth information cross-tabulated by ethnicity status, as classified according to the method described above. Compared with the White and Black ethnic groupings, proportionally fewer Hispanics were born in the United States (61.3 percent). Among "Other" ethnic groups there were even fewer (43.6 percent) who were born in the United States. Only 35.7 percent of the Hispanics were born in New York State; 1.6 percent were born in other states or U.S. possessions (excluding Puerto Rico); whereas 44.0 percent were born in Puerto Rico (4,129). There were 1,684 born in Spanish-speaking countries exclusive of Puerto Rico (18.0 percent). Thus, 62.0 percent of the Hispanics (5,813) were born outside of the continental United States in Spanish-speaking countries or Puerto Rico (see Table 3). Out of the 1,684 Hispanics born in Spanish-speaking countries, 1500 came from five countries in the Caribbean Basin and Central or South America. There were 614 born in the Dominican Republic (6.5 percent); there were 456 from Cuba (4.9 percent); there were 107 born in Panama (1.1 percent); there were 275 from Colombia (2.9 percent) and there were 48 from Ecuador (0.5 percent).

Hispanics evidence important differences from Whites and Blacks on heterogeneity in place of birth, with fewer being born in New York State and other states or U.S. possessions (exclusive of Puerto Rico). Also, more Hispanics are foreign born than are whites or blacks, but more of "Other" ethnicity are foreign born than Hispanics. Nevertheless, these are important differences within a population segment accounting for 27.0 percent of the population. With the exception of the "Other" ethnic grouping which is a very small part of the total population, Hispanics evidenced more diversity in place of birth with clusters of concentration in a few foreign countries and Puerto Rico.

CRIME CONVICTION

Table 4 presents the principal type of crime for which the inmate had been committed, classified by the inmate's ethnicity. Each inmate ethnic aggregate was examined for differences in the relative occurrence of type of crime. Crimes were classified into four types. These included felony offenses involving the use of either (1) violence or coercion, (2) offenses against property, (3) drug offenses (sale or possession) and (4) youthful offenders.

Blacks were found to have significantly more under custody for violent and coercive felony offenses (79.8 percent) than would have likely occurred by chance alone (74.3 percent). Likewise, whites (69.5 percent) and Hispanics (68.1 percent) showed significantly less violent or coercive offenders than by chance alone. Those of other ethnicity evidenced no difference from expected values for either violent/coercive offenses or any other offense type (including youthful offenders).

Whites were found to have significantly more under custody for property offenses (18.7 percent) than would have happened by chance (11.2 percent). Also, Hispanics showed fewer property offenders (6.9 percent) than for which chance could account. However, blacks tended to evidence chance levels of property offenders.

Hispanics were found to have significantly more under custody for drug offenses (24.3 percent) than could have occurred by chance (13.4 percent). Likewise, whites (10.6 percent) and blacks (8.8 percent) showed less under custody for drug offenses than by chance, alone.

Finally, youthful offenders were found to be distributed by chance occurrence among the ethnic groupings.

In conclusion, Table 4 reveals that Hispanics, tend to be under represented among the violent or coercive felony offenders and property offenders, but over-represented among drug offenders.

CONVICTION CRIME BY ETHNICITY AND SEX

The data in Table 5 reveal that sex of the offender is related to the type of offense among those under custody at the end of 1985. Females are less likely to have been under custody for violent or coercive offenses (57.7 percent) than would have been expected by chance (74.4 percent). Separate analysis revealed that this difference occurred primarily because females are less likely to have been under custody for robbery. Also, females are more likely to have been under custody for property (19.6 percent) and drug offenses (21.9 percent) than would have been

expected by chance. Females were found to have been under custody more often for grand larceny than were males. Since type of offense is related both to ethnicity and sex, the question occurs whether the ethnic differences on type of offense for Hispanics continue to be true when the influence of sex is controlled. Tables 6 and 7 explore this question.

Table 6 presents the data for the relationships between ethnic status and type of offense for the male under custody population. The relationships between ethnic status and type of offense are comparable to those found in Table 4, except black males were found to be less likely to have been incarcerated for property crimes (9.8 percent) than would have occurred by chance alone in the data in Table 6 (10.9 percent). These data show that Hispanic males are found under custody less frequently for crimes (a) of violence and coercion and; (b) against property, but more often for; (c) drug crimes than would have been expected by chance alone. Table 7 presents these same data for females.

Because of the lack of data among females for those of "other" ethnicity and for youthful offenders, they were excluded from the analysis in Table 7. The relationships between ethnic status and type of offense are different for white and black females, but not for Hispanic females. Among females, Hispanics still tend to be under custody less frequently for crimes (a) of violence and coercion and; (b) against property, but more frequently for drug crimes. Thus, these relationships are the same as those observed for Hispanics in general, regardless of sex. Therefore, the findings on type of offense for Hispanics held among both sexes compared with those of other ethnicity.

However, as Table 8 reveals, sexual differences among Hispanics are related also to differences in the type of offense for which incarceration occurred.

The relationship between sex and type of offense is presented for Hispanics separately in Table 8. Like females in general, Hispanic females are less likely to be under custody for violent or coercive offenses (45.9 percent) than are their male Hispanic counterparts (68.7 percent). Likewise, Hispanic females are more likely to be under custody for drug offenses (47.0 percent) than are male Hispanics (23.6 percent). However, the differences between males and females on property offenses do not exist among Hispanics. Both male and female Hispanics tend not to be under custody for property offenses.

Since Hispanics have greater proportions under custody for drug offenses, differences among Hispanics were examined to locate related contingency factors. In the total under custody population, 13.4 percent were there for drug offenses; however, 24.3 percent of the Hispanics were under custody for drug offenses. More Hispanics females (47.0 percent) than males (23.6 percent) were under custody for drug offenses. Fewer of Puerto

Rican background (birth or parentage) were under custody (21.8 percent) than Hispanics from other backgrounds (34.3 percent) for drug offenses. Likewise, more foreign-born Hispanics (34.3 percent) than U.S.-born Hispanics (21.9 percent) were under custody for drug offenses. The foreign-born with the highest proportion under custody for drug offenses were the Colombians (77.0 percent).

The data presented in Tables 4 through 8 may be summarized for Hispanics in the following way:

1. Hispanics in the under custody population are found less frequently to have been incarcerated for violent or coercive offenses than have members of other ethnic groupings. This relationship is true for both male and female Hispanics, separately. Like the under custody population in general, fewer female than male Hispanics are under custody for violent or coercive offenses.
2. Fewer Hispanics are under custody for crimes against property than are members of other ethnic groupings. Also, this relationship is true for males and females, separately. However, unlike the under custody population in general, there are no differences between male and female Hispanics in their being under custody for property crimes. Among Hispanics, females do not tend to be under custody more frequently for property crimes than are males.
3. More Hispanics are under custody for drug crimes than are members of other ethnic groupings. This relationship is true for both males and females, separately. Like the under custody population in general, more female than male Hispanics are under custody for drug offenses.
4. Female Hispanics, non-Puerto Rican Hispanics, and foreign-born Hispanics had higher than expected proportions of drug offenders than Hispanics, in general. Among the foreign-born, Colombians evidenced very high proportions under custody for drug offenses.

COUNTY OF COMMITMENT

The relationship between ethnic status and region of the state from which the inmate was committed is presented in Table 9. There are large differences between these ethnic groupings and the regions of the state from which they were committed. Whites show the largest differences from chance expectations. There are far fewer whites from New York City (33.6 percent) and many more from the suburban New York City, upstate urban, and upstate rural areas than would have been expected by chance

alone. Hispanics evidence the second largest differences from chance expectations. Their pattern of differentiation is exactly opposite from the white ethnic grouping's pattern. There are many more Hispanics from New York City (91.0 percent) and far fewer from suburban New York City, upstate urban, and upstate rural areas than chance would allow. While the pattern of differences observed for blacks is equivalent to that observed for Hispanics, it is much weaker. More blacks come from New York City (74.4 percent) and fewer from the upstate rural areas (1.3 percent), but the differences from expected levels for suburban New York City and upstate urban areas were not large. The only note worthy difference among those of Other ethnicity occurred when more were observed from upstate urban areas (25.3 percent) than would have occurred by chance.

The data in Table 9 reveal a distinctive pattern of differences from other ethnic groupings on region of commitment for Hispanics under custody in departmental facilities. While the pattern is similar to that found for blacks, it is much stronger. More Hispanics (91.0 percent) than expected (69.8 percent) come from New York City, while fewer Hispanics (9.0 percent) come from outside New York City (30.2 percent expected). Unlike blacks, for all of the other regions of the state (suburban New York City, upstate urban, and upstate rural) Hispanics were far fewer in number than chance would allow. Additional analysis revealed that the greater number of Hispanics from New York City were concentrated in the commitments from New York and Bronx counties.

The data in Table 10 indicate that there are differences between the sexes in the region of the state from which commitment occurred. More females under custody at the beginning of 1986 were from suburban New York City and upstate urban areas than chance alone would permit. However, these differences were accounted for primarily by white females. There were no differences between the sexes in region of commitment among Hispanics, alone (see Table 11). Both male and female Hispanics were disproportionately from New York City. Likewise, they were less represented among the commitments under custody from other regions of the state.

When the relationship between ethnicity and region of commitment was held constant by sex, the equivalent differences between ethnic groupings were observed among males and females separately. For both males and females, whites were from outside New York City. Again both blacks and Hispanics tended to be from New York City, but Hispanics were disproportionately more so than were blacks (See Tables 12 and 13).

In summary then, Hispanics tend to show a distinctive pattern on region of commitment which is different from the patterns evidenced by other ethnic groupings. Hispanics are disproportionately from New York City with fewer from the other regions of the state than chance alone would permit. Although there were

differences between the sexes in the regions from which they were committed with more females than expected from suburban New York City and upstate urban areas, there were no differences between male and female Hispanics in their region of commitment. When the influence of sex upon the relationship between ethnic groupings and region of commitment was held constant, essentially the same patterns were observed for male and female Hispanics as were observed for Hispanics in general. Thus, differences in ethnicity are more important for explaining differences in region of commitment than are sexual differences.

Table 1: Ethnic Status as Identified at Reception Cross Classified by Ethnic Status Adjusted for Spanish Speaking Place of Birth: Population Under Custody on January 1, 1966. a/

Ethnic Status as Identified at Reception	Ethnic Status Adjusted for Spanish Speaking Place of Birth					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Spanish Speaking	Other ^{1/}
<u>Total</u>	<u>34,734</u>	<u>7,693</u>	<u>17,511</u>	<u>3,568</u>	<u>5,813</u>	<u>149</u>
White	<u>8,112</u>	7,693	0	0	419	0
Black	<u>17,793</u>	0	17,511	0	282	0
Hispanic	<u>8,674</u>	0	0	3,568	5,106	0
Other ^{1/}	<u>151</u>	0	0	0	2	149
Unknown	<u>4</u>	0	0	0	4	0

a/Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned at reception and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country (0.1 percent).

^{1/}Includes "American Indian, Chinese, Japanese and Other Oriental" ethnic designators.

TABLE 2: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth Cross Classified By Place Of Birth For The Under Custody Population On January 1, 1986: Showing Number And Percentage Point Distributions For The Total Population And Each Ethnic Group. a, b, c/

PLACE OF BIRTH	Ethnic Status Identified at Reception or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth									
	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	<u>94,794</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7,693</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17,511</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9,381</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>149</u>	<u>100.0</u>
UNITED STATES	<u>91,960</u>	<u>90.9</u>	<u>7,174</u>	<u>93.2</u>	<u>16,506</u>	<u>94.3</u>	<u>7,623</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>43.6</u>
(New York State)	(21,147)	(60.9)	(6,259)	(81.4)	(11,491)	(65.6)	(3,345)	(35.7)	(52)	(34.9)
(Other States Specified) 1/	(3,409)	(9.8)	(559)	(7.9)	(2,744)	(15.7)	(101)	(1.1)	(5)	(3.3)
(Other States Unspecified)	(2,581)	(7.4)	(355)	(4.6)	(2,186)	(12.5)	(32)	(0.3)	(8)	(5.4)
(Puerto Rico)	(4,129)	(11.9)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(4,129)	(44.0)	(0)	(0.0)
(Other U.S. Possessions) 2/	(102)	(0.3)	(1)	(0.0)	(85)	(0.5)	(16)	(0.2)	(0)	(0.0)
FOREIGN BORN	<u>2,997</u>	<u> 8.6</u>	<u>380</u>	<u> 4.9</u>	<u>827</u>	<u> 4.7</u>	<u>1,713</u>	<u> 18.2</u>	<u>77</u>	<u> 51.7</u>
North America	51	0.2	22	0.3	3	0.0	19	0.2	7	4.7
(Canada)	(32)	(0.1)	(22)	(0.3)	(3)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(7)	(4.7)
(Mexico)	(19)	(0.1)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(19)	(0.2)	(0)	(0.0)
Caribbean Basin	1,843	5.3	33	0.4	719	4.1	1,088	11.6	3	2.0
(Cuba)	(456)	(1.3)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(456)	(4.9)	(0)	(0.0)
(Dominican Rep.)	(614)	(1.8)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(614)	(6.5)	(0)	(0.0)
(Jamaica)	(381)	(1.1)	(1)	(0.0)	(374)	(2.1)	(5)	(0.1)	(1)	(0.7)
(West Indies)	(192)	(0.5)	(32)	(0.4)	(156)	(0.9)	(4)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)
(Other)	(200)	(0.6)	(0)	(0.0)	(189)	(1.1)	(9)	(0.1)	(2)	(1.3)
Central America	193	0.6	0	0.0	3	0.0	190	2.0	0	0.0
(Panama)	(107)	(0.3)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(107)	(1.1)	(0)	(0.0)
(Other)	(86)	(0.3)	(0)	(0.0)	(3)	(0.0)	(83)	(0.9)	(0)	(0.0)

TABLE 2 - Continued

Ethnic Status Identified at Reception
or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth

PLACE OF BIRTH	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
South America	460	1.9	10	0.1	44	0.9	405	4.9	1	0.7
(Colombia)	(275)	(0.8)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(275)	(2.9)	(0)	(0.0)
(Ecuador)	(48)	(0.1)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(48)	(0.5)	(0)	(0.0)
(Guyana)	(55)	(0.2)	(8)	(0.1)	(49)	(0.9)	(3)	(0.0)	(1)	(0.7)
(Other)	(82)	(0.2)	(2)	(0.0)	(1)	(0.0)	(79)	(0.9)	(0)	(0.0)
Europe	329	0.9	270	9.5	42	0.2	11	0.1	0	0.0
(England)	(56)	(0.1)	(20)	(0.9)	(36)	(0.2)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)
(Italy)	(70)	(0.2)	(70)	(0.9)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)	(0)	(0.0)
(Other)	(197)	(0.6)	(180)	(2.9)	(6)	(0.0)	(11)	(0.1)	(0)	(0.0)
Africa	16	0.0	9	0.0	19	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Near East	30	0.1	30	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Asia	79	0.2	11	0.2	9	0.0	0	0.0	65	49.6
Pacific Basin	2	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
<u>UNKNOWN</u>	<u>362</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>199</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>178</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.7</u>

a/ Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

b/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

c/ See text for composition of the ethnic groups reported in this Table.

1/ Includes District of Columbia.

2/ Includes Canal Zone.

Table 3: Hispanics Identified at Reception or by Spanish Speaking Place of Birth who were a Part of the Under Custody Population (34,762) on January 1, 1986: Showing Place of Birth and Hispanic Category for those Born in New York State. a/

Place of Birth	<u>Total</u>	Percent of Hispanics <u>5/</u>	Percent of Total Population
<u>Total</u>	<u>9,381</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>27.0</u>
<u>United States</u>	<u>7,623</u>	<u>81.3</u>	<u>21.9</u>
New York State	3,345	35.7	9.6
(Puerto Rican Parentage)	(3,069)	(32.7)	(8.8)
(Puerto Rican Born)	(101)	(1.1)	(0.3)
(Other Hispanics)	(175)	(1.9)	(0.5)
Other States, Specified <u>1/</u>	101	1.1	0.3
Other States, Unspecified	32	0.3	0.1
Puerto Rico	4,129	44.0	11.9
Other U.S. Possessions <u>2/</u>	16	0.2	0.0
<u>Spanish Speaking</u> <u>Countries <u>3, 4/</u></u>	<u>1,684</u>	<u>18.0</u>	<u>4.9</u>
<u>Non-Spanish Speaking</u> <u>Countries <u>3/</u></u>	<u>26</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>
<u>Europe</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
<u>Unknown</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.1</u>

a/Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned at reception and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

1/Includes the District of Columbia.

2/Includes the Canal Zone.

3/Countries in Central or South America and the Caribbean Basin.

4/Includes Spain and Mexico.

5/Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

TABLE 4: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth Cross Classified By Type Of Offense For The Under Custody Population On January 1, 1986. a, b, c/

Ethnic Status Identified at Reception
or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth

TYPE OF OFFENSE	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	24,670	100.0	7,678	100.0	17,472	100.0	9,264	100.0	142	100.0
VIOLENT OR COERCIVE	25,776	74.4	8,998	69.5	18,242	79.2	6,977	68.1	119	79.9
PROPERTY	3,899	11.2	1,497	18.7	1,799	10.9	647	6.9	16	10.7
DRUGS	4,642	13.4	819	10.6	1,544	8.8	2,272	24.9	13	9.7
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS	959	1.0	90	1.2	200	1.1	68	0.7	1	0.7

a/ Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

b/ Excludes 64 missing observations on principal offense at commitment: 15 White, 32 Black, 17 Hispanic, and 0 Other.

c/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

TABLE 5: Sex Cross Classified By Type Of Offense For The Under Custody Population on January 1, 1986. a, b, c, d

TYPE OF OFFENSE	SEX					
	<u>TOTAL</u>		MALE		FEMALE	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>34,576</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>33,519</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,057</u>	<u>100.0</u>
VIOLENT OR COERCIVE	<u>25,722</u>	<u>74.4</u>	25,112	74.9	610	57.7
PROPERTY	<u>3,856</u>	<u>11.2</u>	3,649	10.9	207	19.6
DRUGS	<u>4,632</u>	<u>13.4</u>	4,407	13.1	232	21.9
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS	<u>959</u>	<u>1.0</u>	951	1.0	8	0.8

a/ Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status descriptors were not assigned and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

b/ Excludes 64 missing observations on principal offense at commitment.

c/ Excludes 94 missing observations where sexual status was not recorded.

d/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

TABLE 6: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place Of Birth
 Cross Classified By Type Of Offense For The Under Custody Male Population On
 January 1, 1986.

Ethnic Status Identified at Reception
 or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth

TYPE OF OFFENSE	<u>TOTAL</u>		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	<u>39,506</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7,969</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16,890</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9,103</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>100.0</u>
VIOLENT OR COERCIVE	<u>25,105</u>	<u>74.9</u>	5,169	70.1	13,571	80.9	6,256	68.7	115	79.3
PROPERTY	<u>3,647</u>	<u>10.9</u>	1,952	18.9	1,648	9.8	631	7.0	16	11.0
DRUGS	<u>4,409</u>	<u>13.1</u>	766	10.4	1,474	8.7	2,150	23.6	19	9.0
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS	<u>251</u>	<u>1.1</u>	87	1.2	197	1.2	66	0.7	1	0.7

TABLE 7: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception By Spanish-Speaking Place Of Birth
 Cross Classified By Type Of Offense For The Under Custody Female Population
 On January 1, 1986.

Ethnic Status Identified at Reception
 or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth

TYPE OF OFFENSE	<u>TOTAL</u>		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	1,056	100.0	254	100.0	544	100.0	255	100.0	3	100.0
VIOLENT OR COERCIVE	610	57.8	146	57.5	344	63.2	117	45.9	3	100.0
PROPERTY	207	19.6	62	24.4	129	23.7	16	6.3	0	0.0
DRUGS	231	21.9	43	16.9	68	12.5	120	47.0	0	0.0
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS	8	0.7	3	1.2	3	0.6	2	0.8	0	0.0

TABLE 8: Sex Cross Classified By Type Of Offense For The Hispanic Under Custody Population On January 1, 1986. a, b, c'

TYPE OF OFFENSE	SEX					
	<u>TOTAL</u>		MALE		FEMALE	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>9,358</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9,103</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>255</u>	<u>100.0</u>
VIOLENT OR COERCIVE	<u>6,373</u>	<u>68.1</u>	6,256	68.7	117	45.9
PROPERTY	<u>647</u>	<u>6.9</u>	631	7.0	16	6.3
DRUGS	<u>2,270</u>	<u>24.2</u>	2,150	23.6	120	47.0
YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS	<u>68</u>	<u>0.8</u>	66	0.7	2	0.8

a/ Excludes 17 missing observations where type of offense was not reported.

b/ Excludes 6 missing observations where sex was not reported.

c/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

TABLE 9: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place Of Birth Cross Classified By Region Of Commitment For The Under Custody Population On January 1, 1986. a. b. c/

REGION OF COMMITMENT	Ethnic Status Identified at Reception or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth									
	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	24,661	100.0	7,677	100.0	17,475	100.0	9,960	100.0	149	100.0
NEW YORK CITY 1/	24,186	97.8	2,580	99.6	12,997	74.4	8,518	91.0	91	61.1
SUBURBAN NEW YORK CITY 2/	1,255	12.9	1,759	22.9	1,959	11.2	529	5.7	8	5.4
UPSTATE URBAN 3/	1,724	19.6	2,171	28.3	2,291	19.1	224	2.4	38	25.5
UPSTATE RURAL 4/	1,496	4.8	1,167	15.2	228	1.3	69	0.9	12	8.0

a/ Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

b/ Excludes 73 missing observations where county of commitment was not recorded: 16 White, 36 Black, 21 Hispanic, and 0 Other.

c/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

1/ Includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties.

2/ Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland, and Westchester counties.

3/ Includes Albany, Broome, Cheaug, Dutchess, Erie, Monroe, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Orange, Putnam, Rensselaer, and Schenectady counties.

4/ Includes remaining counties in the state.

TABLE 10: Sex Cross Classified By Region Of Commitment For Under Custody Population On January 1, 1986. a, b, c, d

REGION OF COMMITMENT	SEX					
	<u>TOTAL</u>		MALE		FEMALE	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>34,553</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>33,499</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,054</u>	<u>100.0</u>
NEW YORK CITY <u>1</u> /	<u>24,182</u>	<u>70.0</u>	23,492	70.1	690	65.5
SUBURBAN NEW YORK CITY <u>2</u> /	<u>4,254</u>	<u>12.3</u>	4,103	12.2	151	14.3
UPSTATE URBAN <u>3</u> /	<u>4,643</u>	<u>13.4</u>	4,462	13.3	181	17.2
UPSTATE RURAL <u>4</u> /	<u>1,474</u>	<u>4.3</u>	1,442	4.3	32	3.0

a/ Excludes 28 missing observations where ethnic status designators were not assigned and place of birth was not in a Spanish-speaking country.

b/ Excludes 73 missing observations where county of commitment was not recorded: 16 White, 36 Black, 21 Hispanic, and 0 Other.

c/ Excludes 108 missing observations where sex was not reported.

d/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

1/ Includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties.

2/ Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland, and Westchester counties.

3/ Includes Albany, Broome, Chemung, Dutchess, Erie, Monroe, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Orange, Putnam, Rensselaer, and Schenectady counties.

4/ Includes remaining counties in the state.

TABLE 11: Sex Cross Classified By Region of Commitment
For The Hispanics Under Custody Population
On January 1, 1986. a, b, c

REGION OF COMMITMENT	SEX					
	<u>TOTAL</u>		MALE		FEMALE	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>9,354</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9,099</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>255</u>	<u>100.0</u>
NEW YORK CITY <u>1/</u>	<u>8,515</u>	<u>91.0</u>	8,280	91.0	235	92.2
SUBURBAN NEW YORK CITY <u>2/</u>	<u>529</u>	<u>5.7</u>	516	5.7	13	5.1
UPSTATE URBAN <u>3/</u>	<u>222</u>	<u>2.4</u>	216	2.4	6	2.3
UPSTATE RURAL <u>4/</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>0.9</u>	87	0.9	1	0.4

a/ Excludes 21 missing observations where county of commitment was not reported.

b/ Excludes 6 missing observations where sex was not reported.

c/ Percentages reported are correct within ± 0.1 percent.

1/ Includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties.

2/ Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland, and Westchester counties.

3/ Includes Albany, Broome, Chemung, Dutchess, Erie, Monroe, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Orange, Putnam, Rensselaer, and Schenectady counties.

4/ Includes remaining counties in the state.

TABLE 12: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place Of Birth
 Cross Classified By Region Of Commitment For The Under Custody Male
 Population On January 1, 1986. ^{a/}

Ethnic Status Identified at Reception
 or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth

REGION OF COMMITMENT	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>33,499</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>7,368</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>16,887</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>9,099</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>100.0</u>
NEW YORK CITY ^{1/}	23,492	70.1	2,496	33.9	12,627	74.8	9,280	91.0	89	61.4
SUBURBAN NEW YORK CITY ^{2/}	4,103	12.2	1,691	23.0	1,888	11.2	516	5.7	8	5.5
UPSTATE URBAN ^{3/}	4,462	13.3	2,058	27.9	2,152	12.7	216	2.4	36	24.8
UPSTATE RURAL ^{4/}	1,442	4.3	1,123	15.2	220	1.3	87	1.0	12	8.3

^{a/} This table reports the relationship among those males found in Table 9. Please see Table 9 for the appropriate footnotes.

^{1/} Includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties.

^{2/} Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland, and Westchester counties.

^{3/} Includes Albany, Broome, Chemung, Dutchess, Erie, Monroe, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Orange, Putnam, Rensselaer, and Schenectady counties.

^{4/} Includes remaining counties in the state.

TABLE 18: Ethnic Status Identified At Reception Or By Spanish-Speaking Place Of Birth Cross Classified By Region Of Commitment For The Under Custody Female Population On January 1, 1986. a/

REGION OF COMMITMENT	Ethnic Status Identified at Reception or by Spanish-Speaking Place of Birth									
	TOTAL		WHITE		BLACK		HISPANIC		OTHER	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	1,054	100.0	259	100.0	543	100.0	255	100.0	3	100.0
NEW YORK CITY <u>1/</u>	690	65.5	84	38.2	369	68.0	295	92.2	2	66.7
SUBURBAN NEW YORK CITY <u>2/</u>	151	14.3	68	26.9	70	12.9	18	5.1	0	0.0
UPSTATE URBAN <u>3/</u>	181	17.2	74	29.2	100	18.4	6	2.4	1	99.3
UPSTATE RURAL <u>4/</u>	32	3.0	27	10.7	4	0.7	1	0.4	0	0.0

a/ This table reports the relationships among those females found in Table 9. Please see Table 9 for the appropriate footnotes.

1/ Includes Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, and Richmond counties.

2/ Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland, and Westchester counties.

3/ Includes Albany, Broome, Chemung, Dutchess, Erie, Monroe, Niagara, Oneida, Onondaga, Orange, Putnam, Rensselaer, and Schenectady counties.

4/ Includes remaining counties in the state.