STUDIES OF POST-DISCHARGE ARREST AND COMMITMENT AMONG 1969-1970 DISCHARGEES

by
Irwin J. Goldman, Ph.D.

NEW YORK STATE DIVISION FOR YOUTH
RESEARCH, PROGRAM EVALUATION, AND PLANNING

October 1973

STUDIES OF POST-DISCHARGE ARREST AND COMMITMENT AMONG 1969-1970 DISCHARGEES

by
Irwin J. Goldman, Ph.D.

NEW YORK ~~STATE~~ DIVISION FOR YOUTH
RESEARCH, PROGRAM EVALUATION, AND PLANNING

October 1973

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to Mr. Milton Stark for his skills in computer programming.

Arrest and commitment records were received from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. The cooperation of Dr. Edward DeFranco, Mr. Jim O'Toole and Mr. Jim Moon is especially appreciated.

For the preparation of this manuscript at the highest level of competence acknowledgment is due to Ms. Joyce Tannenbaum, Ms. Thelma Damsky and Ms. Evelyn Barrett.

Mr. Marvin Schwartz was responsible for one of the tables in this report.

Interpretations expressed in this report are those of the author, alone, and do not necessarily represent the opinions of other members of the New York State Division for Youth or of the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURES	3
FINDINGS	13
Studies in Post-Discharge Arrest	13
Unique Predictors Assessed as a Scale	14
Multivariate Analysis of Arrest	17
Serious Arrest	22
Arrest for Burglary	27
Arrest for Robbery	29
Arrest for Drug Offenses	31
Arrest for Grand Larceny	33
Arrest for Assaultive Acts	34
Number of Arrests: First Analysis	35
Number of Arrests: Second Analysis	38
Number of Arrests, Serious Arrest and Offense Type	39
Present Petition Status: PINS versus Juvenile Delinquent	47
Constancy and Inconstancy in Unique Predictors	48
Differences Among Types of Program	50
Unique Predictors of Arrest Variables	52
Studies in Post-Discharge Commitment	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Unique Predictors Assessed as a Scale..... 56

Commitment..... 58

Narcotic Commitment..... 61

Local Commitment..... 63

State Commitment..... 65

Serious Local Commitment..... 68

Serious Commitment..... 71

Serious Commitment: Second Analysis..... 74

Unique Predictors of Commitment Variables..... 80

Youth from New York City versus Youth from Outside New York City..... 83

Predictors of Arrest Variables: New York City versus Outside New York City..... 86

Judicial Considerations in Sentencing..... 92

Some Implications and Questions..... 94

SUMMARY.....101

APPENDIX A.....175

APPENDIX B.....180

APPENDIX C.....183

APPENDIX D.....186

APPENDIX E.....189

APPENDIX F.....192

APPENDIX G.....197

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE 1:	RATES FOR ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY SCORES ON SIX DICHOTOMIZED VARIABLES.....	110
TABLE 2:	RATES FOR ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY SCORES ON FIVE REFERRAL VARIABLES.....	111
TABLE 3:	PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND ARREST.....	112
TABLE 4:	PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND SERIOUS ARREST.....	113
TABLE 5:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST.....	114
TABLE 6:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST.....	116
TABLE 7:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR BURGLARY.....	118
TABLE 8:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR ROBBERY.....	120
TABLE 9:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR DRUG OFFENSE.....	122
TABLE 10:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR GRAND LARCENY....	124
TABLE 11:	NUMBER OF ARRESTS.....	126
TABLE 12:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (FIRST ANALYSIS).....	127
TABLE 13:	MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (SECOND ANALYSIS).....	129
TABLE 14:	SIMPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN NUMBER OF ARRESTS AND OF THE ARREST VARIABLES AMONG SUBJECTS WITH AT LEAST ONE ARREST (N=450).....	131
TABLE 15:	F-VALUES AND REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF REFERRAL COUNTY AND TYPE OF PROGRAM REFERRAL COUNTY.....	132
TABLE 16:	UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST VARIABLES.....	133
TABLE 17:	RATES FOR COMMITMENT AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT ON FIVE DICHOTOMIZED VARIABLES.....	134
TABLE 18:	RATES FOR COMMITMENT AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT ON FOUR REFERRAL VARIABLES.....	134

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 19: PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND COMMITMENT..... 135

TABLE 20: PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT..... 136

TABLE 21: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT..... 137

TABLE 22: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NARCOTIC COMMITMENT..... 139

TABLE 23: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF LOCAL COMMITMENT..... 141

TABLE 24: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF STATE COMMITMENT..... 143

TABLE 25: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS LOCAL COMMITMENT..... 145

TABLE 26: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (FIRST ANALYSIS)..... 147

TABLE 27: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (SECOND ANALYSIS)..... 149

TABLE 28: UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT VARIABLES..... 152

TABLE 29: MEAN VALUES AND PERCENTAGES ON SELECTED VARIABLES BY REFERRAL COUNTY..... 153

TABLE 30: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)..... 156

TABLE 31: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)..... 158

TABLE 32: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)..... 160

TABLE 33: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)..... 163

TABLE 34: SIMPLE CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED VARIABLES WITH ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY REFERRAL COUNTY..... 166

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 35: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)..... 167

TABLE 36: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)..... 169

TABLE 37: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM N.Y.C.)..... 171

TABLE 38: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)..... 173

TABLE 39: MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF CASES FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES..... 181

TABLE 40: NUMBER OF ARRESTEES BY INTERVAL BETWEEN DISCHARGE DATE AND FIRST ARREST AND BY DISCHARGE TYPE..... 185

TABLE 41: MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT-ONE ARREST..... 195

INTRODUCTION

An important question for research within the New York State Division for Youth is the effect of its programs on participants, particularly with respect to their post-discharge delinquent or criminal behavior. In order to address this question on a continuous basis, it is important that there exist within the agency (a) a comprehensive data-collection system providing relevant information on youths as they go through the treatment process and beyond, (b) a data-analytic system enabling investigators to digest and analyze this information and thereby to determine essential relationships among youth characteristics, program activity and post-discharge outcome, and (c) a means of coordinating the two systems. Current efforts within the Division are being devoted to these goals, with the more distant aim of creating a conceptual model representing the essential relationships.

The present study is part of series intended to contribute to these goals. It concerns the value of items within the current information system in predicting outcomes related to recidivist behavior of youths. If these items are found related to outcome, it will also provide an initial mapping out of relationships between youths, programs and outcome that a conceptual model would need to incorporate. The study also pertains to the second of the above-mentioned goals i.e., data analysis. It relies upon multiple-regression techniques to examine the interrelation of a large number of variables and to determine which relations between variables are the more

essential ones, in the sense that they exist independently of the effects of the other variables. While multiple regression is in itself not a new development, its actual use in research analysis has been facilitated by relatively recent developments in computer technology, and the manner in which multiple regression could be used for research analysis, its value and its limitations, are largely open questions.

The items that served as potential predictors in this study were primarily youth characteristics as assessed at time of referral or admission. These included the age of the youth at admission, aspects of his offense history prior to referral, aspects of offense history leading to referral, characteristics related to family, school and employment, whether the youth came from New York City or not, and his ethnicity. In addition, certain simple aspects of a youth's program involvement were included i.e., the program from which he was discharged, duration of program involvement and his discharge status.

The predicted variables refer to events after a youth's discharge from a program. In this study they were: whether a youth was arrested for a fingerprintable offense; whether he was arrested for burglary, robbery, drug offenses, assaultive acts, grand larceny or any of these types; his number of arrests; whether he was committed to a state correctional institution, a local correctional institution, a narcotic rehabilitation institution, or any of these; whether he was committed with a sentence of three months or more.

In a preceding study of dischargees of 1966-1968, certain of the potential predictors were found uniquely related to post-discharge arrest, post-discharge commitment and to discharge status.[1] In the present study, which pertained to dischargees 1969-1970, these predictors were hypothesized as remaining predictive among the new cohort. Thus, the present study intended to determine whether these predictors were valid ones, in the sense that they represented relationships enduring over time. However, all of the potential predictors of the preceding study were re-assessed using the new cohort.

PROCEDURES

General Analytic Approach

Multiple regression equations were derived in sequence, adding one variable at a time according to a predetermined ordering of variables based on a standard format. The procedure corresponded to stepwise multiple regression except that the order of entry of variables was predetermined. The ordering of variables followed closely the ordering in the previous study of 1966-1968 dischargees.[2]

In order to understand the relative importance of independent variables in the analysis, a number of different types of observation were made in the course of each analysis. The principal foci were (a) the relation of the independent variable with the dependent variable by simple correlation (b) the increment to predictiveness (R-square) due to the entry of the independent variable into the equation (c) the significance of the variable as judged by the significance level of the partial regression coefficient after all referral

---

[1] Irwin J. Goldman. Multivariate Analyses of Post-Discharge Arrest, Post-Discharge Commitment and Nongraduation. New York: New York State Division for Youth, October 1972.

[2] The general concept of a hierarchical multiple regression approach and specific methods for the coding of variables were based on Jacob Cohen "Multiple Regression as a General Data Analytic System," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 70 (1968), pp. 426-443.

variables were in the equation (called Step R) (d) the significance of the contribution of the variable as judged by the significance level of the partial regression coefficient after all variables, referral and program, were in the equation (called Step E).

Sources of Data. The independent variables and the dependent variable of discharge status were taken from items of standard intake and discharge forms.[1] The measures of arrest and commitment were based on information received from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.[2]

The New York State Division for Youth maintains its intake and discharge information on computer with the New York State Office of General Services. The present study relied upon a computer-generated listing of the names of dischargees and upon a computer-generated tape on which the intake and discharge information were recorded. The programming basis of the present information system has been considerably modified in the past year to increase the accuracy of these listings.

The degree of reliability or validity of the institutional records upon which the study is based should be considered largely undetermined. Preceding studies have indicated that meaningful and reasonable relationships may be discerned through the use of these data. Thus, they appear to be sufficiently reliable and valid to justify their use in further investigation. In order to compensate for possible random measurement error, the present and previous

---

[1] See Appendix A for copies of these forms.

[2] Identifications were made on the basis of name, birthdate, ethnicity and, in problematic cases, address.

studies have relied upon relatively large samples for the major analyses.

Independent Variables and Format A The predictor or independent variables were introduced into the equation one at a time and were considered individually or as sets. The variables and the principal format (called Format A) for ordering the variables are described below.

1. Age at Admission. Coded in months.

2. Number of Previous Petitions. Coded 0, 1, 2 and 3. The latter value included 3 petitions or more. Petition at time of referral is excluded.

3. School Behavior Problems. Coded 1 if youth had been recorded as having truancy and/or acting out problems, 0 if not.

4. Principal Source of Family Income. Coded 1 if this were public or private assistance, 0 if not.

5. Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization. Coded as follows: 0 for None, 1 for less than one month, 2 for one to six months, 3 for over six months to 1 year, 4 for over 1 year to 2 years, 5 for over 2 years to 5 years, 6 for over 5 years.

6. Present Petition Status A. Coded as follows: 1 for No Petition and Person In Need of Supervision, -1 for Juvenile Delinquent and Youthful Offender.

7. Present Petition Status B. Coded as follows: 1 for Juvenile Delinquent, 0 for No Petition, Person In Need of Supervision, -1 for Youthful Offender.

8. Present Petition Status C. Coded as follows: 1 for Person In Need of Supervision, 0 for Juvenile Delinquent, Youthful Offender, -1 for No Petition.

The coding of the three Present Petition variables were intended to provide the following contrasts: (a) No Petition and Person In Need

of Supervision versus Juvenile Delinquent and Youthful Offender (b) Juvenile Delinquent versus Youthful Offender (c) Person In Need of Supervision versus No Petition. The set of variables would represent these contrasts after their entry into the equation.

A small group of youths with petition Neglected Child (N=11) were included in the category Person In Need of Supervision. (Both petition categories refer to youths under 16 years old.) A small group with petition Wayward Minor (N=26) or Convicted of Criminal Charge (N=9) were included with Youthful Offender. (Both the latter petitions represent adjudications for youths over 16 years of age.) It is considered that the categories effectively represent the four major petition categories and they are referred to by the names of these major petition categories.

9. Current Remand. Coded 0 for not in remand at referral, 1 for in remand at referral.

10. Family Intactness. Coded 0 for not living with both natural parents in youth's normal living situation, 1 for living with both natural parents.

11. Noncorrectional Institutionalization. Coded 1 if youth had previous institutionalization in child-caring institution, foster home, residential treatment center, etc., excluding correctional facilities; 0 if not.

12. Last Grade Completed. Coded by last grade completed from 6 representing 6th grade or less to 11 representing 11th grade or more. If youth was in ungraded class, this was uncoded.

13. Current School Status. Coded 1 if enrolled in school at time of referral, 0 if not.

14. Previous Employment. Coded 1 if youth had worked prior to referral,

0 if not.

15. Referral County. Coded 1 if a county in New York City, 0 if not.

16. Ethnicity A. Coded 1 if black, 0 if other.

17. Ethnicity B. Coded 1 if Puerto Rican, 0 if other.

After the set of Ethnicity variables entered the equation they would represent (a) black versus white (b) Puerto Rican versus white. A small group of youths (N=21) who were not recorded as black, white or Puerto Rican ethnicity but as "other" were placed in the Puerto Rican category. However, the category is considered to represent the Puerto Rican ethnicity, and is so named.

18. Type of Program A. Coded 1 if Home, 0 if Camp, -1 if START.

19. Type of Program B. Coded 1 if Camp, 0 if Home, -1 if START.

After the set of two variables were in the equation, they represented (a) Home versus START, and (b) Camp versus START.

20. Discharge Status A. Coded 1 if Nongraduate, 0 if other.

21. Discharge Status B. Coded 1 if Withdrawal, 0 if other.

Nongraduate is defined as a discharge of one of these types (a) absconded, (b) removed by court action (c) dismissed by staff or returned to court. Withdrawal is defined as all other discharges except Graduation.

After the set of two variables entered the equation, they represented (a) Nongraduate versus Graduate (b) Withdrawal versus Graduate.

22. Duration in Program. Coded in months.

23. Interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program. The product of the two variables.

24. Interaction of Discharge Status B with Duration in Program. The product of the two variables.

The first 17 variables in Format A are called referral variables. The following 7 variables are called program variables. If a youth had more than one program experience, it is his last program to which the program variables refer.

There were two differences between Format A in the present analyses and that of the previous study. One is that the set of variables referring to Admission Status was excluded in the present analyses. The reason was the relatively small number of those who were not New Admissions, the belief that because of the small number this set would add little to prediction, and the desire to simplify the analysis. However, a single variable representing (a) Readmission versus (b) all others (New Admissions and Transfers) was included in a set of variables whose potential contribution to the multiple regression equations was monitored. Thus, although Admission Status did not enter the equation, the influence of this variable could still be partially assessed.

A second difference is that the Present Petition Status variables are differently coded. The present coding scheme is based on the findings of the preceding study and represents the contrasts that were hypothesized as present or absent, based on those findings.

The format follows closely that in the preceding study, for comparison purposes. The original rationale is given in Appendix D.

Dependent or Predicted Variables. These were as follows:

1. Arrest defined as at least one fingerprintable arrest occurring in the period one month prior, to two years after discharge.
2. Arrest for Burglary defined as at least one arrest for burglary or

attempted burglary in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

3. Arrest for Robbery defined as at least one arrest for robbery or attempted robbery in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

4. Arrest for Drug Offenses defined as at least one arrest for any of these offenses: possession of dangerous drugs, possession of hypodermic instrument, selling dangerous drugs, criminal use of drug paraphernalia, in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

5. Arrest for Assaultive Acts defined as at least one arrest for any of these offenses: assault, murder, homicide, forcible sodomy, kidnapping or attempts at these acts, in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

6. Arrest for Grand Larceny defined as at least one arrest for this offense in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

7. Serious Arrest defined as at least one arrest for burglary, robbery, drug offenses, assaultive acts or grand larceny in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

8. Number of Arrests defined as the number of fingerprintable arrests in the period one month prior to two years after discharge.

9. Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a state correctional institution, local correctional institution or narcotic rehabilitation facility (through the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission) in the designated period (described below).

10. State Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a state correctional institution in the designated period.

11. Local Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a local correctional institution in the designated period.

12. Narcotic Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a narcotic rehabilitation facility in the designated period.

13. Serious Local Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a local correctional facility in the designated period with a sentence of at least three months.

14. Serious Commitment defined as at least one commitment to a state or local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more.

For the commitment variables, the designated period was, in the case of 1969 dischargees: one month prior to discharge to July 1, 1972. In the case of 1970 dischargees: one month prior to discharge to July 1, 1973. This meant a 2.5 to 3.5 year period with an average of approximately 3 years.

Measurement of time periods was in months, not days. That is, if a youth were arrested in the actual month preceding discharge he was recorded as being arrested one month prior to discharge; if he was arrested in the same month of discharge two years later he was recorded as being arrested two years after discharge. The reason for including a month period prior to discharge in these measurements was to include youths who may have been arrested and then officially discharged as a result of this arrest.

Subjects. Subjects in the study were all male youths with final discharges from the Camp, Home, or START programs of the New York State Division for Youth during the year 1969 and during the year 1970 (N=1365). However, in the analyses of arrest and commitment, subjects were limited to

those discharged after the age of 16 (N=1,065)[1]. The reason for this limitation was that arrest or commitment records for offenses prior to the age of 16 are not kept by the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.

Computer Programs. The multiple regression program of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to generate results for the multiple regression analyses. The Columbia University Computing Centre provided computer time.

Missing Data. Missing data was handled differently in the present analyses than in the preceding study. The correlation matrices on which the multiple regression equations were based used all subjects with data on each of the pairs of variables correlated; subjects with missing data were excluded only on the pairs of variables where inclusion would not be possible (because data was missing). In the preceding study, subjects with missing data on any of the variables in the analysis were excluded from all correlations; this was done partly because the computer program then used had no option for the alternative procedure. Since items were originally chosen because missing data on these individual items would not be large, the present procedure also appeared sounder in terms of yielding more representative results.

Significance Tests. If hypotheses were specifically stated, based on findings from the preceding study, one-tailed tests were used. Otherwise, two-tailed tests were used. In the multiple regression analyses, the N upon which the test was based was the smallest N involved in any of the

[1]Eleven youths with unknown discharge age were included in early analyses and excluded in later ones. Thus, the number for certain analyses was 1,054. Four youths missing arrest information were excluded from the above figures.

correlations of paired variables in the analysis.

Terminology. For simplicity in language the phrase post-discharge period refers to the period one month prior to two years after discharge in the case of arrest variables and to the period one month prior discharge to the cut-off date in the case of commitment variables.

The term rate refers to the proportion or percentage of youths falling into a designated category e.g., the arrest rate is the proportion or percentage of youths with at least one arrest.

Step R refers to the step of the multiple regression analysis when all referral variables have entered the equation; this step occurs with the entry of the variable Ethnicity B into the equation.

Step E refers to the step of the analysis when all variables, referral plus program, have entered the equation; this step is the concluding step or end of the analysis.

A significant variable in the multiple regression analysis at a particular step refers to a variable whose partial regression coefficient is statistically significant. A significant increment or addition to prediction refers to a statistically significant increase in R-square due to the entry of a variable or set of variables.

FINDINGS

Studies in Post-Discharge Arrest

In the following section the variables found uniquely predictive of post-discharge arrest among 1966-1968 dischargees are singled out for separate analysis. The objectives were to determine whether these variables were as a set predictive among 1969-1970 dischargees, whether each variable was contributive independently of the effects of the other variables, whether the set could serve as a scale and, if so, what kind of differentiation in arrest rate would be created by the scale.

Following this is a section concerned with the unique predictors of Arrest among 1969-1970 dischargees. By a unique predictor is meant a predictor which significantly contributes to prediction when other variables are controlled i.e., its contribution is independent of the effects of the other variables. Thus, unique predictor is a relative term depending on which other variables are in the analysis. In general the term is employed in this report to refer to the variables in the analysis at Step R (when all referral variables are in the equation) if the variable was a referral variable, and at entry if the variable was a program variable. Whether a variable was a unique predictor at Step E (when all variables were in the equation, referral and program) was also of interest.

Following this section are analyses pertaining to Serious Arrest, Arrest for Burglary, Arrest for Robbery, Arrest for Drug Offenses, Arrest for Assaultive Acts, Arrest for Grand Larceny, and Number of Arrests.

Unique Predictors Assessed as a Scale

The unique predictors of Arrest derived in the analyses of 1966-1968 dischargees were assessed as a set of variables that could serve by themselves to predict Arrest by assigning values to each predictor and observing how arrest rates were related to the score-values for dischargees of 1969-1970. Secondly, a multiple regression analysis was carried out limited to these predictors.

Table 1 presents the results for one of the two scoring methods used. This represented the simplest type of scoring method. One point each was given if a youth at referral (a) had no previous petition (b) had no school behavior problems (c) came from a family whose principal source of income was not public or private assistance (d) was not in remand at referral and (e) did not have a petition status of Juvenile Delinquent or Youthful Offender (or other adjudication for youths over 16), and at discharge (f) was not a Nongraduate.

Rates are given for both Arrest and Serious Arrest.[1] The latter was defined as an arrest for burglary, robbery, drugs, assaultive acts or grand larceny.

It may be seen that the scores were, in fact, related to both arrest rate and serious arrest rate. Low-scorers (0-2) have over double the arrest and serious arrest rates than high-scorers (5-6). Of special interest, about one-quarter (25%) of the youths scored at 0-2; based on the findings, the probability of these youths having a serious arrest in the two year post-discharge period was about one in two.

[1]These rates refer to the percentage of subjects with at least one arrest; and the percentage with at least one serious arrest.

Whether a youth was a Nongraduate would not be known at time of referral. Table 2 presents results using the same scoring method but eliminating the predictor of Nongraduation i.e., only information known at referral was used. It may be seen that the scores are related to arrest and serious arrest rate.

Of 21 youths with a score of 0, 62% were found to have a serious arrest. Of 121 youths with a score of 1, 53% were found to have a serious arrest. Of 256 youths with a score of 2, 40% were found to have a serious arrest. Of 265 youths with a score of 3, 29% were found to have a serious arrest. Of 192 youths with a score of 4, 21% were found to have a serious arrest, and of 41 youths with a score of 5, 17% were found to have a serious arrest.

The results indicate that these very simple referral variables have predictive power.

A second scoring method used weights for each variable based on the partial regression coefficients in the analysis of 1966-1968 dischargees. This gave very similar results to the simpler scoring method.

In terms of simple correlations, the scale based on the simple scoring method and including Discharge Status (i.e., Nongratuation) correlated .26 with Serious Arrest and .21 with Arrest. The scale excluding Discharge Status correlated .24 with Serious Arrest and .20 with Arrest. All coefficients were significant at the .001 level.

It may be concluded that the variables found related to arrest among 1966-1968 dischargees, when considered as a complete set, were predictive of both Arrest and Serious Arrest among 1969-1970 dischargees.

Results of the multiple regression analyses are given in Tables 3 and 4. After the last step each variable was uniquely contributive to prediction of Arrest and Serious Arrest as judged by the significance level of the partial regression coefficients. All were significant at the .05 level at least.

It may be concluded, then, that each variable in the set contributed independently to the predictiveness of the set.

These results are evidence for the validity of the set of items previously found predictive of Arrest. The set has been found predictive in the case of a new cohort of dischargees, with each variable making an independent contribution.

Whether these variables remain uniquely predictive when all the referral variables in Format A are controlled is a different question. This depends on the interrelation among a larger set of referral variables, and the relation of each of these to Arrest or Serious Arrest. Succeeding sections deal with this question.

Multivariate Analysis of Arrest

About four in ten youths (43%) had a fingerprintable arrest in the post-discharge period.

A summary of the multivariate analysis of Arrest is presented in Table 5. The multiple correlation coefficient was .31 at Step E and was .28 at Step R. Both were significant at the .01 level ($F=4.00$, $df=24,876$; $F=4.36$, $df=17,883$).

In the analysis of 1966-1968 dischargees the multiple correlation coefficients at Step E and at Step R were .32 and .27, respectively. These figures closely correspond to what was found for the 1969-1970 cohort.

At the level of simple correlations the following referral variables were significantly associated with Arrest(in order of correlation size): Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Ethnicity A, Present Petition A, Number of Previous Petitions, Referral County, Principal Source of Family Income, Current Remand, and School Behavior Problems. Youths with longer previous durations in correctional settings, black youths, youths with a petition status of Juvenile Delinquent or Youthful Offender, those with more previous petitions, from New York City, from families that relied upon external financial assistance, who were in remand at referral or who had school behavior problems were more likely to have post-discharge arrests.

Among program variables, Type of Program A, Discharge Status A and Duration in Program were significantly correlated with arrest. Youths who were nongraduates and who stayed in program shorter durations were more likely to have post-discharge arrest records. The relation of

Type of Program A to Arrest suggests that Home youths were less likely and/or that START youths were more likely to have arrests.

Hypotheses regarding incremental additions. It was hypothesized on the basis of prior findings with 1966-1968 dischargees that the following variables would add incrementally to the prediction of arrest: Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems, Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition A, Current Remand and Discharge Status A.

As Table 5 indicates, at entry Number of Previous Petitions, Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition A added significantly to prediction at the .005 level, Discharge Status A at the .025 level, and School Behavior Problems at the .05 level. The increment due to Current Remand, however, was not significant and was slight. All hypotheses regarding incremental additions were therefore confirmed except that concerning Current Remand.

Hypotheses regarding contributions at Step R. For the five referral variables, similar hypotheses were put forth regarding their contributions to prediction at Step R (when all referral variables had entered the equation). At Step R only two of the five variables were significant contributors: Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition A, both at the .025 level. The others were neglibly related to arrest. Thus, the hypotheses were confirmed with respect to Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition A but not confirmed with respect to the three other variables.

Hypotheses regarding contributions at Step E. Similar hypotheses

were put forth for the referral variables and for Discharge Status A at Step E (when all variables, referral plus program were in the equation). The hypotheses were confirmed in the case of Principal Source of Family Income (at the .025 level), Present Petition A (at the .05 level) and Discharge Status A (at the .025 level). They were not confirmed with respect to the other variables.

Incremental Additions: Other Variables. As noted above, at the level of simple correlation the variables most closely associated with arrest were Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Ethnicity A. These variables assumed a more prominent role in the present analysis than in that of 1966-1968 dischargees. Both variables were significant at entry at the .001 level. Referral County was also significant at entry (at the .05 level) but its influence quickly vanished with the introduction of Ethnicity A. That is, the effect of Referral County appeared almost completely due to Ethnicity A.

Among the program variables, it has already been mentioned that Discharge Status A was significantly incremental to prediction. In addition, the set of two variables representing Type of Program added significantly to prediction at the .01 level.

Contributors at Step R: Other Variables. At Step R, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Ethnicity A were significantly contributive at the .01 level.

Examination of the potential and actual contributions of variables in the steps preceding Step R indicated the following reasons for the decline in importance of Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior

Problems and Current Remand. The introduction of Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization considerably reduced the importance of Number of Previous Petitions (from F=13.89 to F=3.94) and the further addition of Present Petition A almost completely eroded its contribution (from F=3.94 to F=0.97). Current Remand would have been significant had it entered the equation at any point prior to Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, the entry of which variable reduced it to a negligible status. The influence of School Behavior Problems was eroded by many variables but the chief ones appeared to be Current School Status, Family Intactness and Referral County.

Step E: Other Variables. At Step E, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Ethnicity A were significant contributors at the .05 and .01 levels, respectively.

It was noted that Discharge Status A was a significant contributor at Step E. It should also be noted that at this step an interaction term representing the interaction of Discharge Status A with Program Duration was also in the equation. This interaction term approached significance ($p < .10$).

At Step E the set of two variables representing Type of Program appeared to maintain its importance, judging by the F-values for each variable as compared to their F-values at entry.

Predicted Arrest Rate Differentials at Step R. Using the partial regression coefficients to indicate the predicted differences in arrest rate due uniquely to significant contributors at Step R, the following are the predicted differences:

Principal Source of Family Income -- 10 percentage points higher if public or private assistance.

Present Petition Status -- (compared to Person In Need of Supervision) 2 percentage points higher if No Petition; 9 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent; 10 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 5 percentage points higher for each unit increase on the seven-point scale.

Ethnicity A -- 12 percentage points higher if black rather than white.

Predicted Differences due to Program Variables. Using the partial regression coefficients at the entry of the set of two variables representing Type of Program, the following were the predicted differences in arrest rate due to their unique contribution.

Type of Program -- (compared to Home) 8 percentage points higher if Camp; 20 percentage points higher if START.

Using the partial regression coefficient at Step R to derive predicted differences in arrest rate due to Discharge Status A combined with the interaction term of Discharge Status A and Duration in Program:

Discharge Status A -- (compared to Graduate) 18 percentage points higher if Nongraduate minus 2.1 percentage points for each month in program.

After the set of two variables representing Discharge Status was entered into the equation the difference between Graduates and Nongraduates, as indicated by the partial regression coefficient, was 9 percentage points. This would represent the estimated predicted difference when not taking into account Duration in Program.

General Summary. Among the set of five variables previously found uniquely predictive when all referral variables were considered, only Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition A held up in the present analysis of 1969-1970 dischargees. While it was shown earlier that all five variables form a set which predicts to arrest, and within the set each contributes to prediction, within the totality of Format A variables, a different pattern of interrelations appears to be present among the 1969-1970 cohort than among the 1966-1968 cohort. This pattern brought into prominance among the referral variables Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Ethnicity A. Among the program variables Discharge Status A added to prediction as hypothesized, but in addition, Type of Program also assumed importance. Also the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program may be predictive. Substantively, the latter effect would mean that Nongraduates of shorter program duration are especially likely to acquire post-discharge arrests while those of longer duration are not.

Serious Arrest

An arrest was defined as a Serious Arrest if it were for (a) burglary or attempted burglary (b) robbery or attempted robbery (c) drug offenses, including possession of dangerous drugs, selling dangerous drugs, possession of hypodermic instrument, criminal use of drug paraphernalia (d) assaultive acts, including assault, murder, homicide, rape, forcible sodomy, kidnapping (or attempts at these acts) (e) grand larceny. These types of offenses appeared to be the most frequent, and, generally, in one arrest

more than one type did not appear.[1]

About one-third of subjects (34%) had at least one serious arrest in the post-discharge period. For the multiple regression analysis the dependent variable was the presence of at least one serious arrest in subject's post-discharge period (versus its absence). Results of the analysis are given in Table 6.

The multiple correlation coefficients at Step E and Step R were .35 and .31, respectively. This was somewhat higher than that found in the preceding analysis of arrest (.32 and .27 respectively). Both coefficients were significant at the .01 level ($F=5.02$, $df=24,876$; $F=5.55$, $df=17,883$).

At the level of simple correlation, the same set of variables found correlated with Arrest were also found correlated with Serious Arrest; and in approximately the same order of size of correlation. Comparison of the correlation coefficients in the two analyses indicates that correlations tended to be somewhat higher with Serious Arrest than with Arrest.

---

[1]Offenses not included in these categories but occurring in arrest records of 1969 dischargees were in order of frequency: criminal possession of weapons, petit larceny, motor vehicle offenses, possession of burglary tools, resisting arrest, criminal trespass, parole violation, forgery, criminal mischief, disorderly conduct, escape, arson and a variety of other offenses occuring no more than one time each among this sample. None of the offenses just listed occurred more frequently than the serious offense categories.

Hypotheses regarding incremental additions. Similar hypotheses as were put forth for Arrest were set forth for Serious Arrest. Table 6 indicates that the results were similar to that for Arrest: Number of Previous Petitions, Principal Source of Family Income, and Present Petition A added significantly to prediction at the .005 level, Discharge Status A at the .025 level, and School Behavior Problems at the .05 level. The increment due to Current Remand was not significant.

Hypotheses Regarding Contributions at Step R. For the five referral variables hypothesized as unique predictors at Step R, the results were again similar to that for Arrest. Present Petition A was a significant contributor at the .005 level, and Principal Source of Family Income at the .025 level. Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems and Current Remand were not significant contributors.

Hypotheses Regarding Contributions at Step E. Again, results were similar to that for Arrest. At Step E, Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition A were significant at the .025 level, and Discharge Status A at the .005 level. Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems and Current Remand were not significant contributors.

Incremental Additions: Other Variables. The results here parallel that in the analysis of Arrest, with some exceptions or variations. As in the results for Arrest, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Ethnicity A were significant at entry. One exception to the results for Arrest occurred on the entry of Referral County, which was was significant at the .001 level, implying a stronger relationship than

that found in the analysis of Arrest. Of greater importance, the influence of Referral County was not erased by the entry of the Ethnicity variables as it was in the analysis of Arrest. After the entry of Ethnicity, Referral County remained significant at the .05 level.

Among the program variables, as in the analysis of arrest, the variables representing Type of Program significantly added to prediction (at the .05 level). In addition, the interaction term representing the interaction of Discharge Status A and Duration in Program was significant at the .05 level after the entry of the set of interaction terms. In the analysis of Arrest, this interaction term approached but did not reach significance.

Contributors at Step R: Other Variables. At Step R Ethnicity A and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization were significant contributors at the .01 and .05 levels, respectively. Two other variables were significant (at the .05 level): Referral County and Current School Status. The latter variable, which was not significant in the analysis of Arrest, assumed importance with the entry of Referral County (its F-value rising from 2.08 to 4.70 with the entry of Referral County).

Step E: Other Variables. At Step E, Ethnicity A was a significant contributor at the .01 level, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Referral County and Current School Status at the .05 level. As already noted, both Discharge Status A and the interaction term representing the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program were

significant. The set of two variables representing Type of Program also appeared to maintain their influence.

Predicted Serious Arrest Rate Differentials at Step R. As estimated by the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences in serious arrest rate due to the unique contribution of variables found significantly contributive were as follows:

Principal Source of Family Income -- 10 percentage points higher if public or private assistance.

Present Petition Status -- (compared to No Petition) 0 percentage points higher if Person In Need of Supervision; 9 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent; 12 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 5 percentage points higher for each unit increase on the seven-point scale.

Ethnicity A -- 11 percentage points higher if black rather than white.

Referral County -- 9 percentage points higher if New York City.

Current School Status -- 9 percentage points higher if not enrolled in school at time of referral.

Predicted Differences Due to Program Variables. Based on the partial regression coefficients at entry of the set of two variables representing Type of Program:

Type of Program -- (compared to Homes) 6 percentage points higher if Camp; 18 percentage points higher if START.

Based on the partial regression coefficients after the entry of Discharge Status A and B:

Discharge Status A -- (compared to Graduate) 10 percentage points higher if Nongraduate.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step E:

Discharge Status A plus the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program -- (compared to Graduates) if a Nongraduate, 22.0 percentage points higher minus 2.6 percentage points for each month in program.

General Summary. Results were similar to that in the analysis of Arrest. Influential variables in predicting to serious arrest included Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Ethnicity A, Discharge Status A, and Type of Program. Unlike the results for Arrest, Referral County and Current School Status appeared uniquely related to Serious Arrest. Also, the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program, which approached significance in the analysis of Arrest, was significant in the analysis of Serious Arrest.

Arrest for Burglary

About one in eight youths (12%) had at least one arrest for burglary in the post-discharge period. Table 7 summarizes the multivariate analysis seeking to derive predictors of youths arrested for this offense.

At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .21 and at Step R the coefficient was .18. Both values were significant at the .05 level ($F=1.71$, $df=24,876$; $F=1.75$, $df=17,883$).

By simple correlation the following referral variables were significantly related to burglary arrest: Present Petition A, Number of Previous

Petitions, Present Petition B, and Principal Source of Family Income. Subjects with a present petition of Juvenile Delinquent or Youthful Offender, who had more previous petitions, or who came from families relying on external financial assistance were more likely to be arrested for burglary. The presence of Present Petition B suggests that Juvenile Delinquent youths were more likely to be arrested for burglary than the Youthful Offender.

Among the program variables Type of Program A was significantly correlated with burglary arrest. This suggests that Home youths were less likely or START youths more likely to have a burglary arrest.

Referral Variables. At Step R two variables were significant contributors to prediction. These were Present Petition A and Current School Status, both significant at the .05 level. The influence of Current School Status increased with the entry of Age at Admission (to F=3.96) and of Principal Source of Family Income (to F=4.87). Both Present Petition A and Current School Status were significant at entry. The only other variable significant at entry was Number of Previous Petitions whose influence dropped to nonsignificance with the entry of Present Petition A. At Step E Present Petition A remained a significant contributor ($p<.05$) but Current School Status only approached significance ($p<.10$). (Its influence was reduced by Type of Program).

At Step R the predicted differences in burglary arrest rate due to the unique contribution of variables as indicated by the partial regression coefficients were as follows:

Present Petition A -- (compared with No Petition) 2 percentage

points higher for Person In Need of Supervision; 10 percentage points higher for Juvenile Delinquent; 4 percentage points higher for Youthful Offender.

Current School Status -- 5 percentage points higher if not enrolled in school at referral.

Program Variables. Neither the set of variables representing Type of Program nor any other program variable except Discharge Status B was significant at entry. At entry of Discharge Status B this variable represented the comparison between Withdrawals and Graduates. Withdrawals tended to have a higher burglary arrest rate, with the predicted difference 8 percentage points.

General Summary. In this analysis the variables that appeared most important in predicting arrests appeared to be Present Petition A and Current School Status. Withdrawals were found to have higher predicted burglary arrest rates when compared to graduates but the small percentage of withdrawals in the sample (9%) leads one to suspect that the results may be specific to this particular sample.

Arrest for Robbery

About one in eleven youths (9%) had at least one arrest for robbery. Results of the multivariate analysis of robbery arrest are given in Table 8. The dependent variable was at least one robbery arrest (versus no robbery arrests).

The multiple correlation coefficients were much higher than that for burglary arrest. At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .31 and at Step R it was .30. Both figures were significant at the .01 level

(F=3.96, df=24,876; F=5.20, df=17,883).

At the level of simple correlation, Ethnicity A was significantly related to robbery arrest. Its correlation (r=.23) ranks high relative to the simple correlations that have generally been found with the arrest variables. Other referral variables significantly correlated with robbery arrest were Referral County, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Principal Source of Family Income, and School Behavior Problems. Subjects who were black, from New York City, with more previous petitions, from families requiring external financial assistance, who had been in remand at referral or who had school behavior problems were more likely to have robbery arrests. No program variable correlated with robbery arrest.

Referral Variables. At Step R, Ethnicity A was a significant contributor at the .001 level and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization at the .05 level. No other referral variable was significant at Step R. At entry Number of Previous Petitions, Principal Source of Family Income and Referral County were significantly incremental. Number of Previous Petitions was reduced to nonsignificance by Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization; Principal Source of Family Income by Referral County; and Referral County by Ethnicity A.

At Step E, Ethnicity A was still significant at the .001 level and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization approached significance ($p<.10$).

Program Variables. Neither the set of variables representing Type of Program nor any other program variable added significantly to prediction.

Predicted Differences. Based on the regression coefficients at Step R, predicted differences due to the significantly contributing variables were:

Ethnicity A -- (compared to whites) 11 percentage points higher for blacks.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 2.3 percentage points higher for each unit on the seven-point scale.

General Summary. In predicting to robbery arrests, the two variables of importance appear to be Ethnicity A and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization. There appears to be a strong difference between dischargees of white and black ethnic groups with the latter having more robbery arrests, controlling for other background or program variables.

Arrest for Drug Offenses.

About one in seven youths (14%) had at least one arrest for drug offenses. The dependent variable in the multiple regression analysis was an arrest record with at least one drug arrest. Results of the analysis are given in Table 9.

At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .27; and at Step R it was .24. Both figures were significant at the .01 level ($F=2.76$, $df=24,876$; $F=3.13$, $df=17,883$).

At the level of simple correlation seven referral variables were significantly correlated with drug arrest. These were Referral County, Ethnicity A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Number of Previous Petitions, Principal Source of Family Income, School Behavior

Problems and Present Petition A. Type of Program A was also significantly correlated with drug arrest.

Referral Variables. At Step R, Referral County was a significant contributor at the .001 level and Ethnicity B at the .05 level. The variables Number of Previous Petitions, Principal Source of Family Income, and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization were significant at entry. Number of Previous Petitions was rendered nonsignificant by Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization; Principal Source of Family Income and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization were diminished by the entry of Referral County. However, with the entry of Referral County, Ethnicity B rose in importance.

Using the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences in drug arrest rate due to the unique contribution of the significant variables were:

Referral County -- 12 percentage points higher if from New York City.

Ethnicity B -- (compared with white) 8 percentage points lower if Puerto Rican; (compared with black) 9 percentage points lower if Puerto Rican.

At Step E, both variables were still significant contributors, Referral County at the .001 level, and Ethnicity B at the .05 level.

Program Variables. At entry, the set of two variables representing Type of Program contributed significantly to prediction. (at the .01 level). No other program variable added significantly to prediction. Using the partial regression coefficients at entry of the set representing Type of Program, the following were the predicted differences:

Type of Program -- (compared to Home) 2 percentage points higher if Camp; 16 percentage points higher if START.

General Summary. The variables most closely related to arrest for drug offenses appear to be Referral County, Ethnicity B and Type of Program. The effects of Ethnicity B were apparent only when Referral County was controlled. The relation of drug arrest and Referral County seems relatively strong.

Arrest for Grand Larceny

About one in eleven youths (9%) had at least one arrest for grand larceny. The dependent variable in the multiple regression analysis was at least one arrest for grand larceny (versus no arrests for grand larceny). Results of the analysis are given in Table 10.

At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .22 and at Step R it was .19. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=1.87$, $df=24,876$; $F=1.99$, $df=17,883$).

By simple correlation the following variables were significantly related to arrest for grand larceny: Ethnicity B, Referral County, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Last Grade Completed and Current Remand. Subjects who were Puerto Rican, from New York City, with longer durations in correctional settings, with fewer grades completed and in remand at referral were more likely to have arrests for grand larceny. Among the program variables, Type of Program A correlated significantly with arrest for grand larceny.

Referral Variables. At Step R the sole significant contributor was

Ethnicity B, significant at the .01 level. At entry, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Referral County were significantly incremental. The former variable was reduced in importance by Current Remand and Referral County, and the latter by Ethnicity B.

According to the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences due to Ethnicity B were: (compared to whites) 10 percentage points higher if Puerto Rican; (compared to blacks) 9 percentage points higher if Puerto Rican.

At Step E, Ethnicity B remained significant at the .01 level.

Program Variables. The set of two variables representing Type of Program significantly added to prediction at the .05 level. No other program variable was significantly incremental.

According to the partial regression coefficients, after the addition of the variables representing Type of Program, the predicted differences in rates for arrest for grand larceny were:

Type of Program -- (compared to Home) 3 percentage points higher if Camp; 9 percentage points higher if START.

General Summary. The variables found uniquely related to arrest for grand larceny were Ethnicity B and Type of Program.

Arrest for Assaultive Acts.

Only 5.7% of the study population were arrested for assaultive acts (assault, murder, homicide, rape, forcible sodomy, kidnapping or attempts). A multivariate analysis of Arrest for Assaultive Acts was conducted with Format A variables. However, neither at Step E nor at Step R was the

multiple correlation coefficient significant (R=.19, R=.17). The only variable that was a significant contributor ($p<.05$) at Step R or Step E was Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization.

At the level of simple correlation, significantly related to Arrest for Assaultive Acts were Number of Previous Petitions (r=.07), Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization (r=.10), Ethnicity A (r=.10) and Present Petition B (r=.07).

Because of the absence of a significant multiple correlation coefficient, the unique predictors of Arrest for Assaultive Acts are regarded as undetermined. However, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization may be considered a possible unique predictor.

Number of Arrests: First Analysis

The distribution for Number of Arrests in the two-year post-discharge period is given in Table 11. The mean number of arrests was .80.

The interpretation of Number of Arrests as a measure of recidivism is complicated by the factor of post-discharge commitment. It is possible, for example, that youths confined after a small number of arrests are more "arrest-prone" than unconfined youths with many arrests. In the present analysis the chief difficulty would be caused by youths with at least one commitment and with one arrest. (Beyond one arrest, number of arrests is already "high".) A separate analysis to determine the effects on the results due to this group is reported in Appendix F.

Results of the multivariate analysis of Number of Arrests are given in Table 12. At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .37 and at Step R it was .33. Both values were significant at the .01 level (F=5.68, df=24,866; F=6.49, df=17,873).

At the level of simple correlation, the following referral variables were significantly correlated with Number of Arrests: Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Referral County, Number of Previous Petitions, Ethnicity A, Present Petition A, Principal Source of Family Income, Current Remand, Present Petition B, School Behavior Problems and Current School Status. Among program variables, Type of Program A and Discharge Status A were significantly correlated with Number of Arrest.

These variables are similar to those found correlated with Arrest but with these differences: Referral County appears somewhat more important, Ethnicity A somewhat less important; Present Petition B, which did not correlate significantly with Arrest, did so with Number of Arrests.

Referral Variables. At Step R, Length of Correctional Institutionalization, and Principal Source of Family Income were significant contributors to prediction at the .01 level and Present Petition A at the .05 level. These results correspond to that in the analysis of Arrest, except relationships were somewhat stronger. Ethnicity A, while significant at the .05 level, showed a much weaker relationship than for Arrest (F=3.97 compared to F=7.22). On the other hand, Referral County which was not a unique predictor in the analysis of Arrest was a unique predictor of

Number of Arrests (at the .01 level). In addition, Number of Previous Petitions which contributed negligibly to Arrest at Step R, was of borderline significance.

According to partial regression coefficients at Step R the following would be the predicted differences in number of arrests due to the unique contribution of variables:

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- .14 of an arrest more with each unit increase of the seven-point scale.

Referral County -- .29 of an arrest more if from New York City.

Principal Source of Family Income -- .26 of an arrest more if public or private assistance.

Ethnicity A -- (compared to white) .21 of an arrest more if black.

Number of Previous Petitions -- .09 of an arrest more with each petition.

Present Petition A -- (compared with Person In Need of Supervision) .12 of an arrest more if No Petition; .24 if Youthful Offender, .34 if Juvenile Delinquent.

At Step E, all variables significant at Step R remained significant except for Present Petition A, which approached significance ($p < .10$).

Program Variables. As with Arrest, the set of two variables representing Type of Program was significantly incremental (.01 level); and Discharge Status A was significantly incremental (.05 level).

Predicted differences due to the unique contributions of these variables as estimated by partial regression coefficients at entry were:

Type of Program -- (compared to Home) .16 of an arrest more if Camp; .62 of an arrest more if START.

Discharge Status A -- (compared with Graduate) .20 of an arrest more if Nongraduate.

Number of Arrests: Second Analysis

A second analysis of Number of Arrests was undertaken to clarify the differences between predictors of Arrest and predictors of Number of Arrests. In this analysis subjects were limited to those with at least one arrest. The question was: among those who have arrests, which variables predict to a greater number?

Results of this analysis are given in Table 13. At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .37 and at Step R it was .34, both values significant at the .01 level ($F=2.36$, df=24,349; $F=3.77$, df=17,356). This indicates that there is power in the variables to predict to Number of Arrests beyond that of predicting to Arrest.

At Step R two referral variables were significant contributors to prediction: Referral County at the .01 level, and Number of Previous Petitions at the .05 level. By partial regression coefficients, predicted differences due to the unique contributions were:

Referral County -- .46 of an arrest more if from New York City.

Number of Previous Petitions -- .14 of an arrest more for each petition.

At Step E Referral County remained significant at the .01 level and Number of Previous Petitions approached significance ($p<.10$).

At entry neither the set of two variables representing Type of Program

nor any other program variable was significantly incremental. However, the increment due to the set of two variables representing Type of Program approached significance ($p<.10$). By the partial regression coefficients the differences due to the unique contribution of this set were as follows:

Type of Program -- (compared with Homes) .16 of an arrest more if Camp; .53 of an arrest more if START.

General Summary. The unique predictors of Number of Arrest were the same as those for Arrest except for the addition of Referral County and, at a borderline level, Number of Previous Petitions. Limited to youths with at least one arrest, Referral County and Number of Petitions were uniquely predictive of Number of Arrests; while the increment due to Type of Program approached significance.

If a youth was arrested once, he was likely to have subsequent arrests if he was from New York City (controlling for other variables), to the estimated extent of an average of about one-half of an arrest more. Also, if a youth had more previous petitions at referral, he was likely to have more subsequent arrests, if arrested once. Type of Program was found in the earlier analysis uniquely predictive of post-discharge arrest; the findings suggest that after a first arrest, it may also be related to further arrests.

Number of Arrests, Serious Arrest and Offense Type

Table 14 gives the simple correlations between Number of Arrests and other arrest variables among subjects with a post-discharge arrest

record. Those with a greater number of arrests (among those arrested) were more likely to have at least one serious arrest and were more likely to have at least one arrest for any of the serious offense types. The highest correlation was that between Number of Arrests and Arrest for Drug Offenses (r= .31).

In view of this, one might expect an overlap between predictors of Number of Arrest and predictors of Serious Arrest or any of the offense types. The variables uniquely predictive of Number of Arrests which were also uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest or any of the offense types were Referral County and Type of Program. The offense type that both variables were uniquely predictive to was Arrest for Drug Offenses.

Analyses were undertaken to determine whether Referral County was uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest when Number of Arrests was controlled; and whether Referral County was uniquely predictive of Number of Arrests, when Serious Arrest was controlled. These analyses were identical to that of Tables 6 and 12 except that prior to the entry of the first referral variable, a control variable was introduced, either Number of Arrests or Serious Arrest.

There were four possible outcomes which were taken to indicate the following hypothetical relationships:[1]

---

[1]It should be noted that the following refer to contributions or tendencies due to Referral County, independent of the effects of all other referral variables; in particular, independent of Ethnicity A.

1. Referral County could remain uniquely predictive both of Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests. This would imply that dischargees from New York City were both more likely to have a greater number of arrests and more likely to have serious arrests, with both tendencies independent of each other.

2. Referral County could remain uniquely predictive of Number of Arrests but not of Serious Arrest. This would imply that the tendency of New York City dischargees to have at least one serious arrest was due to their tendency to have a greater number of arrests.[1]

3. Referral County could remain uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest but not of Number of Arrests. This would imply that youths with serious arrests tend, for some cause correlated with serious arrest (e.g., being more likely to be under surveillance) to also have a greater number of arrests and since New York City dischargees tend to have serious arrests they therefore also tend to have a greater number of arrests.

4. Referral County could cease to be a unique predictor of both Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests. This would imply that both Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests reflect a common attribute e.g., that certain youths tend to have both serious arrests and a greater number of arrests because they are more "delinquent-prone," and New York City dischargees have a greater percentage of this group than dischargees from outside New York City.

The four outcomes represent ideal results in that they are formulated as though they were mutually exclusive and as though unique predictiveness were an all-or-none variable. In fact, any or all of these tendencies may

[1]The term due to refers here to a logical relationship of the type: If NYC dischargees did not have a greater number of arrests, they would not be more likely to have at least one serious arrest.

be present to some degree. Examination of the partial regression coefficients as well as of its reliability (its probability level) provide some indication of the possible importance of the hypothesized tendencies vis-a-vis one another.

Table 15 presents the results for Referral County of the two analyses at Step R. The effect of Referral County was not significant in either analysis. The size of the regression coefficients was considerably reduced, when compared with the analyses lacking the control variables. The findings therefore support the fourth hypothesis. There is a suggestion that the second hypothesis may also be valid, but the probability value of the relationship ($.20>p>.10$) indicates it should be considered of doubtful reliability.

The findings therefore suggest that the tendency of New York City dischargees to have at least one serious arrest might be in part due to the tendency to have a greater number of arrests, but that this would not explain the tendency completely. It appears that the tendency to both have a greater number of arrests and to have at least one serious arrest reflects some unitary attribute among the New York City dischargees.

A similar examination was done for Type of Program. The F-values and regression coefficients were observed after the entry of the two-variable set. Here the results were somewhat more clear-cut in that Type of Program remained uniquely predictive of Number of Arrests (with Serious Arrest controlled) and totally vanished as a predictor of Serious Arrest (with Number controlled). However, regression coefficients in predicting Number of Arrests were considerably reduced.

The findings therefore indicate that program differences in serious arrest were due at least in part to the tendencies of youths from the different programs to have different numbers of arrests. However, the reduction of regression coefficients in both analyses suggests that Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests may also reflect some common tendency which differs for dischargees of the different programs. There is no evidence of program differences in having more serious arrests independent of Number of Arrests.

The interrelation of Referral County, Number of Arrests and Arrest for Drug Offenses was similarly studied. Results are given in Table 15. It may be seen that Referral County remained uniquely predictive of Arrest for Drug Offenses when Number of Arrests was controlled, but did not remain significantly or substantially predictive of Number of Arrests when Arrest for Drug Offenses was controlled. The regression coefficient in predicting Arrest for Drug Offenses was similar when Number of Arrests was controlled or not controlled.

The findings therefore indicate that New York City dischargees tend to have drug arrests, independent of Number of Arrests, but the findings do not support the hypothesis that they have a greater number of arrests independent of arrest for drug offenses. The findings suggest that if it were not for drug arrests, New York City dischargees would not differ markedly in number of arrests from dischargees from outside New York City.

Types of program also differed in both Number of Arrests and Arrest for Drug Offenses. A similar analysis as the preceding was carried out for Type of Program (see Table 15). The results indicated that there

were significant differences among program types in Number of Arrests, controlling for Arrest for Drug Offenses. While there were no significant differences among types of program in Arrest for Drug Offenses, controlling for Number of Arrests, the probability level was not high enough or the regression weights low enough to rule out the possibility completely. Regression coefficients in both analyses were considerably lower than in the comparable analyses without the control variables.

The findings indicate that the differences between programs in the tendency of dischargees to have at least one drug arrest is due at least in part to the differences among dischargees from different types of programs to have different numbers of arrests. However, differences among types of program may also be due in part to the two tendencies operating independently of each other as well as to differences among dischargees from the various types of program in some common attribute characterizing both those who have a greater number of arrests and arrest for drug offenses.

Three further analyses were undertaken to clarify the interrelation of Serious Arrest, Drug Arrest and Referral County. The question studied was whether Referral County was related to Serious Arrest solely through Drug Arrest. For these analyses the variable Serious Arrest was redefined to include all the offense types included under Serious Arrest, as defined originally, with the exception of Arrest for Drug Offense. The new variable was called Serious Arrest-Two.

Table 15 presents the results of these analyses. When the dependent variable was Arrest for Drug Offenses and the control variable was

Serious Arrest-Two, Referral County was a unique predictor at the .001 level. When the dependent variable was Serious Arrest-Two and the control variable was Arrest for Drug Offense, Referral County was not a unique predictor and the relationship almost vanished completely. When the dependent variable was Serious Arrest-Two and there was no control variable, Referral County was still not significantly a unique predictor, although its F-value was somewhat higher than with the control variable of Arrest for Drug Offense.

In conjunction with the previous findings showing a relationship between Referral County and both Serious Arrest and Arrest for Drug Offense, the present findings indicate that independent of the effects of Serious Arrest (redefined to exclude drug arrests) New York City referrals tend to have drug arrests, that New York City referrals do not tend significantly to have serious arrests (excluding drug arrests); and that the relatively small and nonsignificant tendency to have more serious arrests, excluding drug arrests, is due to those arrested for drug offenses.

In short, it would appear that the greater number of arrests which characterizes referrals from New York City is due to their involvement in drug offenses; and the larger percentage of youths from New York City with at least one serious arrest is due primarily to their arrests for drug offenses.

General Summary. It appears that the tendency of referrals from New York City to have a greater number of arrests and to have at least one serious arrest is in large part due to their greater probability of having

arrests for drug offenses. Among types of programs, differences in serious arrest appeared due in part to differences in number of arrests, but this in turn was not completely due to differences in arrest for drug offenses.

Present Petition Status: PINS versus Juvenile Delinquent

A recent court decision has ruled against the commingling of PINS (Person In Need of Supervision) and Juvenile Delinquents within the state schools. A question relevant to this decision is whether the labels PINS and Juvenile Delinquent refer to different types of youth apart from the explicit criteria for these designations. In the preceding analyses, PINS were not directly contrasted with Juvenile Delinquents. Instead, the coding values for the three Present Petition Status variables were based on expectations from findings among 1966-1968 dischargees and directly tested these hypotheses:

1. Youths with PINS petitions and with No Petition differ from youths with petitions of Juvenile Delinquent or Youthful Offender. This hypothesis was tested in the multiple regression analyses by the variable Present Petition A.

2. Youths with Juvenile Delinquent petition would differ from youths with petition of Youthful Offender. This was tested by Present Petition B.

3. Youths with PINS petition would differ from youths with No Petition. This was tested by Present Petition C.

It was expected in the analyses of Arrest and Serious Arrest that the first hypothesis would be upheld and the second and third not upheld.

Present Petition A was found uniquely predictive of Arrest, Serious Arrest, Number of Arrests and Arrest for Burglary. Neither Present Petition B nor Present Petition C was uniquely predictive of any of the arrest variables. The first hypothesis was supported in the case of Arrest, and Serious Arrest, and can be extended to Number of Arrests and Arrest for Burglary. The second and third hypotheses were not supported

and the results do not suggest they can be extended to other arrest variables.

The findings, therefore, support the view that the youths (within this particular study population) with PINS petition and those with No Petition do not markedly differ from each other in post-discharge arrest; and that the Juvenile Delinquent and Youthful Offender do not markedly differ from each other. However, the two subcategories (a) PINS and No Petition versus (b) Juvenile Delinquent and Youthful Offender, do appear to differ significantly in post-discharge arrest.

Constancy and Inconstancy in Unique Predictors.

The unique predictors of post-discharge arrest found in the study of 1966-1968 dischargees are compared with those found in the present study of 1969-1970 dischargees, below, with respect to Arrest and Serious Arrest.

1966-1968 (Arrest)	1969-1970 (Arrest)	1969-1970 (Serious Arrest)
Principal Source of Family Income	Principal Source of Family Income	Principal Source of Family Income
Present Petition Status A	Present Petition Status A	Present Petition Status A
Number of Previous Petitions	Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization	Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization
Current Remand		
School Behavior Problems		Current School Status
	Ethnicity A	Ethnicity A
		Referral County
Discharge Status A	Discharge Status A	Discharge Status A
	Type of Program	Type of Program

Three variables were uniquely predictive in both of the studies: Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition Status A, and Discharge Status A. There is, however, further commonality when the referents of the variables are considered. Both Number of Previous Petitions, which appears in the first list, and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, which appears in the second and third lists, refer to seriousness of past offense history. Both Current Remand (first list) and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization (second and third list) refer to some type of detention or incarceration. Also, the differences among Home, Camp and START which were significant in the present analysis were present as nonsignificant trends in the previous analysis. It should also be noted that one of the unique predictors of Serious Arrest in the present study was Current School Status, which has a parallel to School Behavior Problems, a unique predictor of Arrest in the preceding study.

Considering these commonalities one may say that both studies converge in indicating areas where variables predictive of Arrest or Serious Arrest are present. These appear to be (a) seriousness of past offense history (b) history of detention or incarceration, past or present (c) petition status at referral (d) type of discharge from DFY facility (e) problems in adapting to or staying in school.

In addition, in the present study Ethnicity was found uniquely predictive of Arrest and Serious Arrest, and Referral County of Serious Arrest. While Serious Arrest was not analyzed in the preceding study, it correlates highly with Arrest, and both Ethnicity and Referral County showed very weak relationships to Arrest either at entry or at Step R in the preceding study. It would appear that the unique relationship of Ethnicity

and Referral County to Arrest and Serious Arrest, respectively, are new developments within the time period examined. It would also appear that differences among types of program have increased from the one time period to the other.

While not all the unique predictors among the 1966-1968 dischargees remained uniquely predictive among 1969-1970 dischargees, as a set they remained predictive.[1] Taken by themselves, each variable contributed significantly and independently of the others, and the correlation of a simple scale composed of the set was .21 with arrest and .26 with serious arrest.

The results, then, support the view that certain general classes of variables are uniquely predictive of arrest and tend to remain so over time, but they also indicate that the most predictive variable within these classes may change and that variables not previously uniquely predictive may become so.

Differences Among Types of Program

The three types of program, Home, Camp and START differed systematically in Arrest, Serious Arrest, Number of Arrests and arrest for various offense types. Whether this result was due to systematic differences among youths at referral, which went uncontrolled in the analyses, or whether this was

---

[1]See page 2.

due to differences in relative effectiveness of the program types cannot be answered by these data.

However, the existence of the differences does make pertinent the setting forth of the two possibilities as hypotheses and consideration of how they may be further examined.

If different types of youth are chosen for the different types of program and if this choice is performed on a rational basis, one may assume that there are definite criteria used by those making the decisions for choice. Therefore, youths can be described in terms of the criteria used by the decision-makers. If these criteria can be described and measured, research can then determine the extent to which post-discharge outcome is related to the criteria, and the extent to which systematic differences among types of program remain, after statistically controlling for the effects of the variables representing the criteria.

For example, intake workers may use as criteria for choice of one type of program rather than another <u>their</u> estimation of the delinquency-proneness of a youth. Those perceived as more delinquency-prone may, for example, be sent to a START rather than a Home. If so, ratings of delinquency-proneness by the intake workers may be obtained for each youth and statistically controlled in research analyses.

If the criteria for selection are statistically controlled in these analyses, and if systematic differences still occur among types of program, there would be a very strong suspicion that the differences were due to differences in relative effectiveness rather than to differences in youth composition.

Unique Predictors of Arrest Variables

Table 15 summarizes the results of the preceding sections concerning the unique predictors of arrest variables. The symbol X in the table indicates significant contributors at Step R in the case of referral variables and at entry in the case of the program variables. The symbol (X) indicates relationships that approached significance ($p < .10$). The symbol [X] indicates the variable that was significant in the multiple regression Format A analysis of assaultive acts, but is considered problematic because the total set of variables was not found significantly predictive.

As indicated in the table, the most reliable unique predictors of Arrest were Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Ethnicity A, Type of Program and Discharge Status A.

The most reliable unique predictors of Serious Arrest were the same variables plus Referral County and Current School Status.

The various offense types are all components of Serious Arrest. It is apparent that variables which are uniquely predictive of one offense type are not as predictive of another offense type. From this one can infer that youths who were likely to be arrested for one type of offense were not equally likely to be arrested for another type of offense.

Ethnicity B, which at Step R compares Puerto Ricans and whites, was not a unique predictor of Serious Arrest but was a unique predictor of two offense types: Arrest for Drug Offenses and Arrest for Grand Larceny. Controlling for other referral variables (of most importance, here,

controlling for Referral County) Puerto Ricans were more likely to be arrested for grand larceny and less likely to be arrested for drug offenses than whites. They were also more likely than blacks to be arrested for grand larceny and less likely to be arrested for drug offenses. There was no significant relationship between Ethnicity B and Serious Arrest apparently because the greater likelihood of Puerto Rican arrests for one type of offense and the lesser likelihood of another meant that the likelihood of Serious Arrest was not higher for Puerto Ricans than for the other ethnic groups.

By logic, all of the variables uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest should be uniquely predictive of at least one of the offense types. Otherwise, they could not be uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest, which refers to these offense types and to nothing else. Of variables which in Table 15 are significantly related to Serious Arrest but not to any offense type, one must say that at this point their relationship to offense types is undetermined rather than that none exists.

Considering each variable separately, it may be seen in Table 15 that Principal Source of Family Income was significantly related to Serious Arrest but not to any offense type. The findings also suggest a relationship to burglary arrest (which approached significance).

Present Petition A was found uniquely predictive of arrest for burglary.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization was found uniquely predictive of arrest for robbery; and, less reliably, the findings suggest it may be uniquely predictive of arrest for drug offenses and for assaultive acts.

Current School Status was found uniquely predictive of arrest for burglary.

Referral County was found uniquely predictive of drug arrests, and the findings suggest it may be uniquely predictive of robbery arrest.

Ethnicity A was found uniquely predictive of arrest for robbery.

Type of Program was found uniquely predictive of arrest for robbery, drugs, and grand larceny.

Discharge Status A was found uniquely predictive of serious arrest but its relationship to the offense types is undetermined.

Discharge Status B was found uniquely predictive of arrest for burglary. However, the absence of any other relationship between this variable and the other arrest variables and the small percentage of Withdrawals in the sample makes one suspect this may be a peculiarity of the sample.

The relationship of Ethnicity B to the offense types has been noted above.

Substantively, the relationships indicate that, after controlling for other variables, those arrested for burglary were more likely to be (at referral) youths with a petition status of Juvenile Delinquent or Youthful Offender, not enrolled in school and, possibly from families requiring external financial assistance and with a discharge status of withdrawal.

Those arrested for robbery were more likely to be youths who at referral had longer durations in correctional settings, black youths, dischargees from START facilities and, possibly, referrals from New York City.

Those arrested for drug offenses were more likely to be referrals from

New York City, START dischargees and possibly, youths having longer durations in prior correctional settings; and they were less likely to be Puerto Rican.

Those arrested for grand larceny were more likely to be Puerto Rican and START dischargees.

Those arrested for assaultive acts were, possibly, more likely to be youths who had longer durations in correctional settings.

The most reliable and strongest relationships appeared to be that between Referral County and drug arrests; and between Ethnicity A and robbery arrest. The predicted percentage of dischargees from New York City with drug arrests was twelve percentage points higher than dischargees from outside New York City, after controlling for other variables. The predicted percentage of black youths with robbery arrests was eleven percentage points higher, after controlling for other variables. Since the actual percentage of youths arrested for drug offenses was only 14%, and for robbery only 9%, the sizes of these differences are quite striking.

Studies in Post-Discharge Commitment

The following sections concern commitment after discharge. The first section examines the variables previously found uniquely predictive of Commitment among 1966-1968 dischargees with respect to their ability to predict Commitment and Serious Commitment among 1969-1970 dischargees. Succeeding sections are concerned with deriving the unique predictors of Commitment, Narcotic Commitment, Local Commitment, State Commitment, Serious Local Commitment and Serious Commitment among 1969-1970 dischargees.

Unique Predictors Assessed as a Scale.

In the analyses of 1966-1968 dischargees the unique predictors of commitment were Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Present Petition Status A, Current School Status and Discharge Status A.

These variables were examined for their predictive power among 1969-1970 dischargees by considering them items of a scale and observing the relation to rates of Commitment and of Serious Commitment to the scale scores. Serious Commitment was defined as a commitment to a state or local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more.

Two scoring methods were used. One, representing the simplest method, dichotomized all variables and gave one point each if (a) youth had no previous petitions (b) was not in remand at referral (c) did not have a petition of Juvenile Delinquent, Youthful Offender or other adjudication for youths over 16 (d) was enrolled in school at referral and (e) was not a Nongraduate.

Results for the simple scoring method are shown in Table 17. It may be seen that the commitment and serious commitment rates are related to the scores. For example, those scoring 0-1 have over four times the serious commitment rate of those scoring 4-5.

The simple correlation of the scale with commitment was .21 and with serious commitment .22, both values significant at the .001 level. Using score-values based on the regression coefficients in the analysis of 1966-1968 dischargees provided substantially similar results. The correlation of this scale was .20 with commitment and .23 with serious commitment.

Table 18 presents the results of the simple scale excluding the last variable referring to discharge status. That is, all variables of the scale are referral variables. The simple correlation of this scale was .18 with commitment and .21 with serious commitment.

Of 50 youths with a score of 0, 28% were found to have a serious commitment. Of 165 youths with a score of 1, 27% were found to have a serious commitment. Of 257 youths with a score of 2, 16% were found to have a serious commitment. Of 277 youths with a score of 3, 10% were found to have a serious commitment, and of 185 youths with a score of 4, 5% were found to have a serious commitment.

As with the results previously found for Arrest and Serious Arrest, the results indicate that the very simple referral variables have power in predicting to post-discharge outcome.

Multiple regression analyses (for Commitment and Serious Commitment) limited to these variables indicated that in predicting Commitment each variable was significantly incremental at entry (Tables 19, 20). However, Current School Status ceased to be a significant contributor when Discharge Status A entered the equation. In the analysis of Serious Commitment, Current School Status was neither significant at entry nor with all variables in the equation. This variable (Current School Status) approached significance ($p<.10$) at entry, and with all variables in the equation, in both analyses.

The findings are evidence for the validity of the set of items previously found predictive of Commitment. As a set they have been found to maintain their predictive power in the case of a new cohort of dischargees.

Commitment

About one in five youths (21%) had at least one post-discharge commitment to a state or local correctional facility or to a narcotic rehabilitation facility. Results of the multivariate analysis of Commitment are summarized in Table 21.

At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .33 and at Step R it was .30. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=4.50$, $df=24,876$; $F=5.06$, $df=17,883$).

At the level of simple correlation eight referral variables were significantly related to commitment. Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Number of Previous Petitions, Present Petition A and Current Remand had the highest correlations. Also related were Ethnicity A, Referral County, Current School Status, and Principal Source of Family Income.

Among the program variables, three were significantly correlated: Type of Program A, Discharge Status A and Duration in Program.

Hypotheses Regarding Incremental Additions. Based on the findings for 1966-1968 dischargees it was hypothesized that these variables would add significantly to prior ones in predicting commitment: Number of Previous Petitions, Present Petition Status A, Current Remand, Current School Status and Discharge Status A. These hypotheses were sustained at the .001 level for Number of Previous Petitions, at the .005 level for Present Petition A and for Discharge Status A, at the .025 level for Current School Status and at the .05 level for Current Remand.

Hypotheses at Step R. It was hypothesized that the referral variables cited above would be significantly contributive at Step R as judged by the significance of partial regression coefficients. The hypotheses were all

sustained: at the .005 level for Current School Status, at the .025 level for Present Petition Status A, and at the .05 level for Number of Previous Petitions and Current Remand.

Hypotheses at Step E. It was hypothesized that the referral variables plus Discharge Status A would be significantly contributive at Step E as judged by the significance of partial regression coefficients. These hypotheses were all sustained: at the .005 level for Discharge Status A, at the .025 level for Current Remand and Current School Status, and at the .05 level for Number of Previous Petitions and Present Petition A.

Incremental Additions: Other Variables. At entry, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization was significantly incremental at the .001 level; and the following variables were significantly incremental at the .05 level -- Principal Source of Family Income, Employment, Referral County and Ethnicity A.

Among the program variables, the set representing Type of Program was significantly incremental at the .05 level. As noted above, Discharge Status A was significantly incremental. In addition, the interaction term representing the interaction of Duration in Program with Discharge Status A was significantly incremental at the .05 level.

Contributors at Step R: Other Variables. At Step R, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization was significantly contributive at the .01 level, and both Ethnicity A and Family Intactness at the .05 level. Family Intactness increased in importance with the entry of Employment and of Ethnicity A. Referral County and Employment decreased

in importance with the entry of Ethnicity A, and Principal Source of Family Income with Ethnicity B. However, Employment later reappeared as a significant contributor with the control of program variables.

Contributors at Step E: Other Variables. In addition to the hypothesized variables a multiplicity of other variables were significant contributors at Step E, all at the .05 level: Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Present Petition C, Family Intactness, Employment, Ethnicity A and the interaction term representing the interaction of Duration in Program with Discharge Status A.

Predicted Differences in Rates of Commitment. As judged by the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences in rate of commitment due to the unique contribution of significant variables were as follows:

Number of Previous Petitions -- 3 percentage points higher for each petition.

Present Petition Status -- (compared with Person In Need of Supervision) 8 percentage points higher if No Petition, 9 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender, 12 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent.

Current Remand -- 7 percentage points higher if in remand at referral.

Current School Status -- 9 percentage points higher if not enrolled in school at referral.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 4.7 percentage points higher with each unit on the seven-point scale.

Ethnicity A -- 7 percentage points higher if black compared to white.

Employment was not a significant contributor at Step R but was at entry and at Step E. At all these steps the predicted difference due to this variable would be:

Employment -- 6 percentage points higher if youth had never worked.

Predicted differences due to Type of Program at the entry of the set of variables representing Type of Program were:

Type of Program -- (compared to Home) 3 percentage points higher if Camp; 11 percentage points higher if START.

Predicted differences due to Discharge Status A after the entry of the two variables representing Discharge Status:

Discharge Status A -- 10 percentage points higher if a Nongraduate compared with a Graduate.

At Step E, the predicted differences due to Discharge Status A and to its interaction with Duration in Program:

Discharge Status A -- (compared with Graduates) 18.5 percentage points higher minus 2.1 percentage points for each month in program.

General Summary. Hypotheses regarding the unique predictiveness of five variables were all sustained. In addition, a variety of other variables appeared to be uniquely predictive of commitment.

Narcotic Commitment

The dependent variable in this analysis was the dichotomy (a) at least one commitment to a rehabilitation center for narcotic addicts (via the Narcotics Addiction Control Commission) in the post-discharge period, versus (b) no narcotic commitment. The percentage of the youths who had at least one such commitment was 4.6%.

Results for the multivariate analysis are given in Table 22.

At Step E the multiple correlation coefficient was .26 and at Step R it was .24. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=2.61$, df=24,876; $F=3.22$, df=17,883).

Referral Variables. At the level of simple correlation, Referral County, Ethnicity A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Principal Source of Family Income and Present Petition B were significantly related to narcotic commitment. Youths from New York City, of black ethnicity, with longer previous durations in correctional settings, and from families whose principal source of income was public or private assistance were more likely to have post-discharge narcotic commitment. The relation of Present Petition B to narcotic commitment suggests that Juvenile Delinquents were more likely to have narcotic commitment than Youthful Offenders.

At entry, Referral County and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization were significant at the .001 level; Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition B and Ethnicity A at the .01 level.

At Step R, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization was a significant contributor at the .01 level; and Principal Source of Family Income, Referral County and Ethnicity A at the .05 level. At Step E, these relationships remained.

Program Variables. The set of two variables representing Type of Program added to previous variables in the prediction of narcotic commitment (at the .05 level). No other program variables were significant contributors.

Predicted Differences in Narcotic Commitment. Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences in narcotic commitment rate due to the unique contribution of variables would be as follows:

Principal Source of Family Income -- 3.6 percentage points higher if public or private assistance.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 2.8 percentage points higher for each unit increase on the seven-point scale.

Referral County -- 4.4 percentage points higher if New York City.

Ethnicity A -- 4.1 percentage points higher if black rather than white.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at entry of the set of variables representing Type of Program:

Type of Program -- (compared with Home) 1.7 percentage points higher if Camp; 6.6 percentage points higher if START.

General Summary. Uniquely predictive of post-discharge narcotic commitment were the variables Principal Source of Family Income, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Referral County, Ethnicity and Type of Program.

Local Commitment

The dependent variable was at least one commitment to a local correctional facility in the post-discharge period (versus no such commitment). Ten percent of the youths had at least one such commitment.

Results of the multivariate analysis of this variable are summarized in Table 23.

The multiple correlation coefficient at Step E was .30 and at Step R it was .28. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=3.53$, df=24,876; $F=4.46$, df=16,884).

Referral Variables. The referral variables related to local commitment by simple correlation were (by size of correlation) Referral County, Present Petition A, Current Remand, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Number of Previous Petitions, Ethnicity A, Present Petition B, and Principal Source of Family Income.

At entry, significantly adding to prediction were Number of Previous Petitions and Referral County at the .001 level, Present Petition Status A, Current Remand and Employment at the .01 level, and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Present Petition Status B at the .05 level.

Employment (which was not significantly related to local commitment by simple correlation) assumed some importance with the entry of Number of Previous Petitions.

At Step R, significant contributors were Referral County, Employment and Current Remand at the .01 level; and Present Petition A at the .05 level. Number of Previous Petitions had been reduced to nonsignificance with the entry of Present Petition A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization with the entry of Current Remand, Present Petition B with the entry of Referral County.

The four referral variables significant at Step R remained so at Step E.

Program Variables. Neither the set of two variables representing Type of Program nor any other program variable added significantly to

preceding variables in predicting local commitment.

Predicted Differences in Local Commitment. Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences due to the unique contributions of variables were as follows:

Referral County -- 9 percentage points higher if New York City.

Employment -- 6 percentage points higher if youth had never worked prior to referral.

Current Remand -- 7 percentage points higher if in remand at referral.

Present Petition -- (compared to Person In Need of Supervision) 4 percentage points higher if No Petition; 5 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender; 11 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent.

General Summary. Uniquely predictive of post-discharge local commitment were the variables Referral County, Employment, Current Remand and Present Petition Status.

State Commitment.

The dependent variable was at least one commitment to a state correctional facility in the post-discharge period (versus no such commitment). Nine percent of youths had such a commitment.

Results of the multivariate analysis of state commitment are given in Table 24.

The multiple correlation coefficient at Step E was .31 and at Step R was .26. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=3.95$, df=24,876; $F=3.89$, df=17,883).

Referral Variables. By simple correlation, Number of Previous Petitions, Referral County, Current School Status, Length of Previous

Correctional Institutionalization, Present Petition A, Ethnicity B, Current Remand, School Behavior Problems and Present Petition C were significantly related to state commitment.

At this level it is apparent that the relation of referral variables to state commitment is quite different than their relation to local commitment. Referrals from New York City were significantly more likely to have local commitments but significantly less likely to have state commitments. Youths with school behavior problems were significantly less likely to have state commitments; the direction (not significant, however) was the reverse for local commitment. Current School Status appears much more important for state than local commitments. Puerto Rican youths were significantly less likely to have state commitments; no such relation appeared for local commitment. The present petition status variables appear somewhat differently related to state than to local commitment. These findings suggest that a quite different pattern of interrelations are involved in state versus local commitments.

At entry, Number of Previous Petitions and Referral County were significant at the .001 level, Current School Status at the .01 level, and School Behavior Problems, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Present Petition B at the .05 level.

At Step R, Number of Previous Petitions and Referral County were significant contributors at the .01 level; School Behavior Problems, Current School Status and Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization at the .05 level. By Step E, these relationships remained significant except for Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and

Current School Status. The latter variable approached significance ($p < .10$) and the former was on the borderline of the .10 level.

Program Variables. The set of two variables representing Type of Program was not significantly incremental. However, Discharge Status A added significantly to preceding variables at entry (at the .01 level) and the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program also added significantly (at the .01 level).

Predicted Differences in State Commitment. For variables significant at Step R the predicted differences in rate of state commitment due to the unique contribution of variables was at Step R as follows:

Number of Previous Petitions -- 3 percentage points higher for each petition.

Referral County -- 7 percentage points higher if outside of New York City.

School Behavior Problems -- 5 percentage points higher if youth had no school behavior problems at referral.

Current School Status-- 5 percentage points higher if out of school at referral.

Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization -- 2.3 percentage points higher for each unit increase on the seven-point scale.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at the entry of the set of variables representing Discharge Status:

Discharge Status -- 6 percentage points higher if Nongraduate rather than Graduate.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step E:

Discharge Status -- (compared to Graduates) 16 percentage points higher if Nongraduate minus 2.1 percentage points for each month in program.

General Summary. Uniquely predictive of state commitment were the variables Number of Previous Petitions, Referral County, School Behavior Problems, Current School Status, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Discharge Status A.

These represent a different set of variables than the unique predictors of local commitment. The one overlapping variable is Referral County. However, the direction of the relationship was opposite for state commitment than for local commitment.

The different pattern of relationships suggest different processes are involved in state versus local commitments. This appears partially based on geographic locale (New York City versus outside New York City). To what extent these differences are due to differences between youths from New York City and outside New York City; and to what extent these differences are due to differences in legal and judicial criteria involved in state as against local commitments is a question posed by these findings.

Serious Local Commitment.

Serious local commitment was defined as a commitment to a local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more. The dependent variable in the analysis was (a) at least one such commitment versus (b) no such commitment, in the post-discharge period. The percentage of youths with at least one serious local commitment was 7%. Of youths with a local commitment, about two-thirds (66%) fell into this

category.

Results for the multivariate analysis of serious local commitment are given in Table 25. As might be expected they generally parallel that for local commitment.

At the level of simple correlation, the major difference is the higher correlations that are generally exhibited by the referral variables with serious local commitment as compared with local commitment.

The multiple correlation coefficients were therefore higher, .35 at Step E and also .35 at Step R. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=5.04$, df=24,876; $F=7.02$, df=17,883).

At Step R, three of the four variables that had been significant in the analysis of local commitment were significant in the analysis of serious local commitment. In each case the F-values were considerably higher: Referral County and Current Remand were significant at the .001 level and Present Petition A at the .01 level. The fourth variable that had been significant in the analysis of local commitment (at Step R) was Employment; this variable was of little influence in the prediction of serious local commitment ($F=0.8$ at Step R). On the other hand, Ethnicity A, which was not significant in the analysis of local commitment ($F=1.1$ at Step R) was significant at Step R in the analysis of serious local commitment (at the .05 level). Also, Present Petition B was significant at Step R in the analysis of serious local commitment and Present Petition C approached significance.

It would appear from these findings that Employment is a factor only in less serious local commitments while Ethnicity and the Present

Petition variables are of increased importance in predicting the more serious local commitments.

All relationships significant at Step R were significant at Step E. Present Petition C moved from near-significance to significance by Step E.

As indicated by the multiple correlation coefficients at Step R and Step E, reported above, the entrance of the program variables added practically nothing to the prediction of serious local commitment.

Predicted differences due to variables as estimated by the partial regression coefficients at Step R were as follows:

Referral County -- 9 percentage points higher if from New York City.

Current Remand -- 7 percentage points higher if in remand at referral.

Present Petition -- (compared with Person In Need of Supervision) 3 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender; 5 percentage points higher if No Petition; 11 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent.

Ethnicity A -- 5 percentage points higher if black rather than white.

A comparison of these predicted differences with those reported in the analysis of local commitment indicates that for Referral County, Current Remand and Present Petition Status they are almost identical. This suggests that almost all of the differences in local commitment due to the unique contribution of these variables was, in fact, due to differences in serious local commitment.

General Summary. Referral County, Current Remand and the set of Present Petition variables were uniquely predictive of serious local commitment and this appeared to account for their relation to local commitment. Ethnicity A, which was not a unique predictor of local commitment,

was a unique predictor of serious local commitment. Employment, which was a unique predictor of local commitment, was not a unique predictor of serious local commitment. In sum, Referral County, Current Remand, Present Petition and Ethnicity appear important in predicting serious local commitment while Employment appears to be a factor in less serious local commitments.

It is rather surprising that none of the unique predictors of state commitments were unique predictors of serious local commitments. Considering state and local commitments as representing different channeling processes, the findings suggest either that (a) the relation of background variables to post-discharge offense variables differs among youths entering the two channels and/or (b) the two channeling processes have quite different criteria for entry.

Serious Commitment

A serious commitment was defined as a commitment to either a state or local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more. The dependent variable in this analysis was at least one such commitment in the post-discharge period. The percentage of youths with at least one serious commitment in the post-discharge period was 15%.

Logically, a serious commitment is either a serious local commitment or a state commitment. One would expect the predictors of serious commitment to represent the predictors of serious local commitments or state commitments, but with a stress on common features of the interrelationships involved in the two types of commitment and a de-emphasis on discrepant features. Thus,

one would not expect Referral County, which was positively related to local commitment and negatively related to state commitment to play a role in predicting serious commitment.

Results for the multivariate analysis of serious commitment are summarized in Table 26.

The multiple correlation coefficient at Step E was .32 and at Step R was .30. Both values were significant at the .01 level ($F=4.28$, $df=24,876$; $F=4.98$, $df=17,883$).

Referral Variables. At the level of simple correlation, Number of Previous Petitions, Present Petition A, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization and Current Remand were most highly related to Serious Commitment. To a significant but lesser degree, Current School Status, Ethnicity A and Present Petition C were also related.

At Step R, the four variables most contributive to prediction of Serious Commitment were Current Remand, Number of Previous Petitions, Current School Status and Present Petition A. By two-tailed tests, the first variable was significant at the .01 level; the latter three variables at the .05 level. These were the variables that were hypothesized as being related to Commitment (see page 48) and the hypotheses had been extended to Serious Commitment. In addition to these variables, Present Petition C, School Behavior Problems and Last Grade Completed were significant contributors at the .05 level (at Step R). All of the variables significant at Step R remained significantly contributive at Step E.

Program Variables. Among the program variables only Discharge Status A and the interaction term representing Discharge Status A in interaction with Duration in Program significantly added to prediction of Serious Commitment.

Predicted Differences. The predicted differences due to the unique contribution of referral variables as judged by the partial regression coefficients at Step R were as follows:

Number of Previous Petitions -- 3.4 percentage points higher with each petition.

School Behavior Problems -- 6 percentage points higher if youth had no school behavior problem at referral.

Current Remand -- 9 percentage points higher if in remand at referral.

Current School Status -- 7 percentage points higher if not enrolled in school at referral.

Last Grade Completed -- 2.5 percentage points lower with each grade completed.

Present Petition Status -- (compared with Person In Need of Supervision) 9 percentage points higher if No Petition; 9 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender; 12 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at entry of the Discharge Status variables:

Discharge Status A -- (compared with Graduate) 7 percentage points higher if a Nongraduate.

Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step E:

Discharge Status A -- (compared with Graduates) 15.1 percentage points higher if a Nongraduate, minus 2.0 percentage points for each month in program.

General Summary. Uniquely predictive of Serious Commitment were the variables, Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Current School Status, Present Petition Status A, and Discharge Status. These relationships confirmed hypotheses based on 1966-1968 dischargees. In addition, School Behavior Problems, Last Grade Completed, Present Petition Status C and the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program were uniquely predictive.

The results of this analysis suggest a modification in an initial expectation. It was expected that the contrast between (a) No Petition and Person In Need of Supervision versus (b) Juvenile Delinquent and Youthful Offender would be significant and this was confirmed by the significant contribution of Present Petition A. However it was also expected that there would be no marked difference between the categories No Petition and the Person In Need of Supervision. This expectation was disconfirmed (i.e., Present Petition C was a significant contributor). In view of this, it appears that the principal distinction here is between (a) Person In Need of Supervision versus (b) all others. The Person In Need of Supervision appears less likely to have a serious commitment than youths in any of the other categories.

Serious Commitment: Second Analysis

In this analysis six variables referring to the post-discharge

arrest histories of subjects preceded the referral and program variables. These were Arrest, Number of Arrests, Serious Arrest, Arrest for Burglary, Arrest for Robbery, Arrest for Drug Offenses, Arrest for Assaultive Acts, Arrest for Grand Larceny. The purposes of the analysis were (a) to examine the extent to which the post-discharge arrest variables predicted serious commitment (b) to examine which arrest variables were the most contributive in prediction and the nature of the relationships (c) to examine the effect of controlling the arrest variables on the predictiveness of the referral and program variables.

It should be noted that the arrest variables refer to a two year post-discharge period while the dependent variable, Serious Commitment, refers to a 2.5 to 3.5 year post-discharge period. Also, it is possible that a given arrest came after a serious commitment, rather than before. However, in the great majority of cases the arrest record of the two year post-discharge period preceded any Serious Commitment in the more extensive period.[1] Approximately, then, the analysis indicates the ability to predict from a prior arrest record of the two year period to a Serious Commitment sometime in the more extended period, and whether referral or program variables are related to Serious Commitment when the arrest variables (of the two year period) are controlled.

The ordering of the arrest variables in the multiple regression analysis was not pre-determined. For these variables the computer program chose first the variable with the highest relation to Serious Commitment, then the variable with the highest relation controlling for the first variable, etc. This procedure would allow one to judge which

---

[1] See Appendix E.

subsets of arrest variables were most predictive of serious commitment. However the ordering of the referral and program variables were predetermined, following Format A.

A summary of the analysis is given in Table 27.

Arrest Variables. Of the six arrest variables the one most highly related to serious commitment was Number of Arrests. Knowing only the value of this variable, as indicated by the partial regression coefficient after the first step, the predicted rate of serious commitment would increase by 13.6 percentage points for each arrest.

Controlling for Number of Arrests, the variable that would add the most to prediction (among the arrest variables) was Serious Arrest. Knowing both the number of arrests and if a youth had at least one serious arrest (in the post-discharge period), the predicted rate of serious commitment (as indicated by the partial regression coefficients after the second step) would increase by 10.2 percentage points for each arrest and an additional 11.5 percentage points if there was at least one serious arrest.

Controlling for the two previous variables, the arrest variable that added the most to prediction of serious commitment was Arrest for Drug Offenses. Here, however, the partial regression coefficient was negative. Based on the partial regression coefficients after Step 3, the rate of serious commitment would increase by 11.5 percentage points for each arrest, and by an additional 16.4 percentage points if there was at least one serious arrest; but then decrease by 17.4 percentage points if the arrest was for a drug offense. In short, a serious arrest would

generally lead to an increased probability of serious commitment but to a lesser extent if the arrest was for a drug offense.

All of these variables were significant at entry.

Following these variables were Arrest for Robbery, Arrest for Burglary, Arrest for Grand Larceny, and Arrest. None of these variables was significant at entry. Arrest for Assaultive Acts did not then enter the equation because its F-value was 0.00 i.e., it could add nothing to prediction.

With all contributory arrest variables in the equation, Number of Arrests and the four variables representing arrest for different types of offenses were significant contributors. Based on the partial regression coefficients at this step, the rate of serious commitment would increase by 8.4 percentage points for each arrest, by an additional 11.5 percentage points if there was at least one arrest for robbery, by an additional 9.8 percentage points if there was at least one arrest for burglary, by an additional 10.1 percentage points if there was at least one arrest for grand larceny, and by a decrement of 10.8 percentage points if there was at least one arrest for drug offenses.

The most reliable of the predictors was Number of Arrests, significant at the .001 level. Arrest for Robbery was significant at the .01 level and the other three variables at the .05 level.

The multiple correlation coefficient was at this stage in the analysis .50. Needless to say, it was highly significant (F=41.80, df=7,893).

Referral Variables. After the arrest variables were in the equation, the referral variables which would have added significantly to prediction

if added to the equation on the next step were Number of Previous Petitions (.001 level); Present Petition A, Present Petition C and Current Remand (all at the .01 level); Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, School Behavior Problems and Current School Status (all at the .05 level). Last Grade Completed was negligibly related to Serious Commitment (F=0.6). Thus, all the variables found uniquely predictive of serious commitment in the analysis without the arrest variables were predictive controlling for arrest variables, except Last Grade Completed.

Adding to prediction of serious commitment beyond that of the arrest variables, at the entry of the variable, were Number of Previous Petitions, which was significantly incremental at the .001 level, and School Behavior Problems, Present Petition A, Present Petition C and Current Remand, all significant at the .05 level. At Step R, Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems, Present Petition C and Current Remand were significant contributors at the .05 level. At Step E, all these variables were significant contributors with Current Remand moving to the .01 significance level.

The regression coefficients of Current School Status and Last Grade Completed (unique predictors of Serious Commitment when not controlling for arrest variables) both approached significance at Step R and Step E ($p < .10$).

Program Variables. After the step when the arrest variables were in the equation, no program variable would have significantly added to prediction had it entered the equation. In the incremental analysis,

no program variable did add significantly to prediction. Discharge Status A had been found related to serious commitment in the analysis without the arrest variables (in the preceding section) both by simple correlation and as a unique predictor. In the present analysis its contribution was considerably reduced. It would therefore ap ear that the relation of Discharge Status A to serious commitment was partially through the relation of Discharge Status A to the arrest variables.

Predicted Differences in Serious Commitment. Based on the partial regression coefficients at Step R, the predicted differences in serious commitment rate due to the unique contribution of referral variables were as follows:

Number of Previous Petitions -- 2.5 percentage points higher for each petition.

School Behavior Problems -- 6.8 percentage points higher if youth had no school behavior problem at referral.

Current Remand -- 6.6 percentage points higher if in remand at referral.

Present Petition Status -- (compared to Person In Need of Supervision) 5 percentage points higher if Youthful Offender; 7 percentage points higher if Juvenile Delinquent; 8 percentage points higher if No Petition.

General Summary. Not surprisingly, the set of arrest variables were predictive of Serious Commitment. Youths with a greater number of arrests and with an arrest for burglary, robbery and grand larceny were more likely to have a Serious Commitment. Beyond this, however, Number of Previous

Petitions, School Behavior Problems, Current Remand and Present Petition variables appeared related to serious commitment. Whether this was due to the nature of offenses committed by a youth which were not represented by the arrest variables or whether this was due to decisions of judges or juries (using criteria not based directly on offenses for which the youth was tried) is a question raised by these findings. The findings suggest that the relation of Discharge Status A to serious commitment was at least in part through the relation of Discharge Status A and the arrest variables. As in the analysis of Serious Commitment not controlling for arrest variables, the findings in the present analysis also indicate a lower probability of Serious Commitment for youths who had been in the PINS category, compared with youths in all the other categories.

Unique Predictors of Commitment Variables

The referral and program variables found uniquely predictive of commitment variables are summarized in Table 28.

It is of interest that different sets of referral and program variables predict to the three different types of commitment, state, local and narcotic. This is apparently one reason why so many variables were uniquely predictive of the global measure, Commitment.

Since different sets of independent variables predict to the three types of commitment, it seems proper to infer that they reflect different processes associated with the types of commitment. That is, there is a different pattern of relationships either among the independent variables or between the independent and dependent variables, or both, associated with the different types of commitment. These might be applied to youths

generally subject to these commitments or might be specific to youth from DFY programs.

These differences may be due to the different legal criteria involved in these types of commitment. Generally, state commitments are for felonies, local commitments for misdemeanors, and narcotic commitments for drug usage. However, in the comparison of state versus local commitments, Referral County was a unique predictor; youths from New York City were more likely to have local and less likely to have state commitments. There was no evidence that the arrest records of these youths were less serious than those from outside New York City. Also, one would not necessarily expect a completely different set of predictors if state commitment represented a more serious offense record than local commitment. The same variables might predict, but with different predictive power. In view of these considerations, it may be hypothesized that at least one reason for the differences in unique predictors is to be associated with differences between youths from New York City and from outside New York City as they interact with the judicial or other institutions.

Since sentences for state commitments are relatively long (over one year), it would appear that one determinant of long sentences is simply region of residency.

While completely different sets of individual predictors were found for state and local commitments, there was also similarity in that two of the predictors for both types of commitment referred to the seriousness of youth's offense history at referral.

None of the predictors runs counter to what one might have expected on the basis of the delinquency literature or previous findings, except perhaps, School Behavior Problems. Youths without such problems were more likely to have state commitments than youths with such problems. This, despite the fact that youths enrolled in school at referral and with more grades completed were less likely to have state commitments.

An interpretation that would account for the relations of all three school variables to state commitment would be that the decision by a judge to commit a youth to a state institution is based, in part, on the perception of this institution as providing educational opportunities. A state commitment could be seen as advantageous to a youth, for example, in his acquiring a high school equivalency diploma. Youths who need further education and who have not shown behavior problems in the school setting would then be preferred candidates by this criteria.

Another possible, and perhaps more plausible, explanation is that the minority of youths admitted into DFY programs who do not have school behavior problems have other types of problems; and that these other types of problems directly or indirectly affect the decisions of judges in later years. For example, youths with no school behavior problems may tend to have, at time of referral, more serious offense histories or more criminogenic home environments. It is for some such reason that they are accepted into DFY programs. The suggestion was made in an earlier section that information be collected on the reasons why each youth is sent to one rather than another program. To clarify whether youths with school behavior problems differ from those without, and to answer other questions of this type,

similar information is needed, i.e., the reasons why the youth was chosen as being in need of DFY program treatment.

Youth from New York City versus youth from outside New York City.

In view of the preceding findings, a closer comparison was made of youth from New York City versus youth from outside New York City on the variables in the analyses. Subjects were those discharged after the age of 16.

Table 29 presents differences on variables describing the two categories of youth.

On the post-discharge variables, youth from New York City (in comparison with youth from outside New York City) were seven times as likely to have a serious local commitment (14% compared to 2%) and less than one-half as likely to have a state commitment (5% compared to 12%). They were four times as likely to have a narcotic commitment (8% compared to 2%).

It seems reasonable to hypothesize from these differences and preceding findings that a serious local commitment and perhaps a narcotic commitment often substituted for a state commitment among New York City youth, in the sense that had these youth not been from New York City but had the same offense record, they would have received state commitments.

There were many differences on referral variables. With respect to variables referring to the judicial or other institutional systems, those from New York City were much more likely at referral to be Person In Need of Supervision (47% compared to 29%), less often Youthful Offender (8% compared to 29%), more often in remand at referral (30% compared to 19%), and more often had an experience of prior correctional detention or

incarceration (51% compared to 30%). They were more likely to have school behavior problems (88% compared to 74%) but were also more likely to be enrolled in school (83% compared to 58%).

The question was posed as to whether the predictors of serious commitment would differ among New York City versus outside New York City referrals.[1] Multiple regression analyses were performed, with the results given in Tables 30 and 31.

For New York City youth, at Step R the significant predictors were Present Petition Status A and Current Remand. At Step E, Present Petition A and Current Remand were still significantly predictive. No program variable made a significant contribution.

For youth from outside New York City, at Step R the significant predictors were School Behavior Problems, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Current School Status, and at the borderline, Current Remand. Discharge Status A was highly significant at entry. Discharge Status B was also significant. At Step E, the significant contributors were Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Current School Status, Discharge Status A and (borderline) Last Grade Completed.

The findings suggest that Present Petition A had a greater role in the serious commitments of New York City youth than in the serious commitments of youth from outside New York City; while the school variables and discharge status were more important in the serious commitments of youth from outside New York City.

---

[1]Because of the small percentages involved it did not seem feasible to examine this question with respect to state, local, serious local or narcotic commitments, individually.

Two further analyses were undertaken in which the arrest variables (for the two-year post-discharge period) were entered into the analyses preceding the referral and program variables. At Step R, and at Step E, Present Petition A was the sole referral or program variable significant for New York City referrals (Tables 32 and 33). For those from outside New York City the significant predictors at Step R were School Behavior Problems, Current School Status, and Current Remand. Discharge Status A was significant at entry, and at Step E the same referral variables were significant as at Step R with Discharge Status A approaching significance.

The findings for the arrest variables also indicated different predictors when comparing referrals from New York City with those from outside New York City. With all arrest variables entered into the equation the significant predictors in the case of New York City referrals were Number of Arrests, Arrest for Grand Larceny, and Arrest for Robbery. In the case of those from outside New York City they were Number of Arrests and Arrest for Drug Offenses (the latter was a negative relationship). (At Step E, these variables were still significant contributors except for Arrest for Robbery which approached significance.)

The findings indicate that differences found in the predictors of local versus state commitment were due, in part, to differences in the predictors of commitment of youth from New York City versus those from outside New York City. For youth from New York City the petition status at referral was uniquely predictive of serious commitment while school variables and discharge status were not. For youth from outside New York City, school variables and discharge status were predictive while petition status at referral was not. In addition, it would appear that offense records of youths that lead to serious commitment may differ when New York City youths are compared to others.

Predictors of Arrest Variables: New York City versus Outside New York City

Since the predictors of Serious Commitment differ between referrals from New York City and those from outside New York City, one may ask whether similar results would not be obtained in the case of the Arrest variables.

In Table 34 simple correlations between Format A variables and Arrest and Serious Arrest are given for the variables previously found predictive of Arrest or Serious Arrest, by Referral County.

The most interesting aspect of the table are the simple correlations for Discharge Status A with Arrest and Serious Arrest. These are exactly zero for the referrals from New York City. They are significant for referrals from outside of New York City ($p < .01$). At the level of simple correlation, then, Nongraduates show a heightened probability of Arrest and Serious Arrest in the case of referrals from outside New York City; but do not show this heightened probability in the case of referrals from New York City.

However, in both cases there is a suggestion of an interaction effect in the size and direction of difference between the correlations of Discharge Status A in comparison with Discharge Status A in interaction with Duration in Program.

Another difference appears in the relatively high correlation between Present Petition A and the two arrest variables for referrals from New York City in comparison with the same correlations for referrals from outside New York City.

The findings suggest that the differences due to Referral County in the predictors of Serious Commitment may reflect differences in the predictors of Arrest or Serious Arrest.

Multiple regression analyses were undertaken to further clarify the issue. The analysis of Arrest limited to New York City referrals (N=446) is given in Table 35. The analysis of Arrest limited to referrals from outside New York City (N=608) is given in Table 36. Corresponding analyses of Serious Arrest are given in Tables 37 and 38.

In all the analyses, the multiple correlation coefficients at Step R and Step E were significant by at least the .05 level.

The most straightforward finding in these analyses pertains to the effect of Discharge Status A when duration in program is not taken into account. The variable was uniquely predictive of Arrest and Serious Arrest for referrals from outside New York City but not uniquely predictive for referrals from New York City.

The predicted difference in Arrest between Nongraduates and Graduates for referrals from outside New York City (after the entry of the two variables representing Discharge Status) was 16 percentage points higher for Nongraduate; and the corresponding difference in Serious Arrest was 18 percentage points higher for Nongraduate. The latter result was significant at approximately the .0001 level. In the case of referrals from New York City the predicted differences are 0.0 and 0.5 percentage points, or practically zero in both cases. It would appear that the status of Nongraduate was predictive only for referrals from outside New York City.

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

However, when Duration in Program is taken into consideration the picture changes somewhat. The interaction term of Discharge Status A in interaction with Duration in Program was significant in the case of New York City referrals when predicting Serious Arrest and showed a non-significant trend in the same direction when predicting Arrest. In the case of referrals from outside New York City, the interaction term was far from significant (and the regression weight much smaller).

The predicted difference in Serious Arrest for referrals from New York City when taking into account duration in program was 23 percentage points higher for Nongraduate (compared to Graduate) minus 4.7 percentage points for each month in program (of the Nongraduate). The first-mentioned figure approached significance ($p < .10$) while the second, as mentioned above, was significant ($p < .05$).

The findings, then, indicate that the status of Nongraduate (compared to Graduate) was associated with higher probability of Arrest and Serious Arrest in the case of referrals from outside New York City. In the case of referrals from New York City, it appears that duration in program should be taken into account. That is, the findings suggest that, among these referrals, Nongraduates of shorter program duration have a higher probability of Serious Arrest while Nongraduates of longer program duration do not.

The variables that were uniquely predictive in both the analysis of Arrest and Serious Arrest at Step R were in the case of referrals from New York City: Present Petition A; and in the case of referrals from outside New York City: Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization

and Ethnicity A.

In the case of Present Petition A the differences between the two categories of referrals seems much greater than in the case of Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization. That is, for Present Petition A the regression weight at Step R for referrals from outside New York City was quite small (-.01 for Arrest, -.02 for Serious Arrest) while the regression weight for Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization for referrals from New York City (.04 for both Arrest and Serious Arrest) could be interpreted as a nonsignificant trend in the same direction as the significant trend found for referrals from outside New York City.

In the case of Ethnicity A, the mode of analysis obscures a similarity in results for both categories of referrals. The reason for this is that at Step R the variable represents the contrast between blacks and whites and there were only a small number of whites among the New York City referrals. When Ethnicity A entered the analysis (one step before Step R), the variable represented the contrast between blacks and all others in the sample. At this step, the variable was significant among both the referrals from New York City and from outside New York City. That is, when blacks were compared with all others, the blacks had higher predicted Arrest and Serious Arrest rates in the case of both categories of referrals.

The set of two variables representing Type of Program added significantly to prediction in the case of referrals from outside New York City but not in the case of referrals from New York City in both the analyses of Arrest and Serious Arrest. However, the regression weights of the variables

representing Type of Program were similar for both categories of referrals and so it does not seem warranted to cite this as a difference.

Nonsignificant trends showing Current School Status negatively related to Arrest and Serious Arrest were present among both classes of referrals. (This variable had earlier reached significance as a unique predictor of Serious Arrest among the total study population.)

The variable Discharge Status B (representing Withdrawals versus Graduates when it entered the analysis) showed a negligible relation to Arrest and Serious Arrest among New York City referrals. For the referrals from outside New York City the variable was significantly predictive of Serious Arrest and approached significance in the analysis of Arrest when it entered the equations. This variable had been found uniquely predictive of Serious Arrest among the total study population and one may conclude that this was principally due to referrals from outside New York City.

There is a suggestion that the variables Family Intactness and Noncorrectional Institutionalization may be predictive of Arrest (and possibly, Serious Arrest) among referrals from outside New York City. In the analysis of Arrest, both were significant at entry, both approached significance at Step R, and Family Intactness regained significance with the addition of the program variables. The direction of the relationship is such that those with intact families and without an experience of noncorrectional institutionalization have higher predicted arrest rates.

Conclusions Comparing referrals from New York City and those from outside New York City, the main differences between the unique predictors of

Arrest and/or Serious Arrest appear to be (a) the greater predictiveness of the variables Discharge Status A and Discharge Status B among referrals from outside New York City (b) the greater predictiveness of the variable representing the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program among referrals from New York City (c) the greater predictiveness of Present Petition A among referrals from New York City. There is also a suggestion that (d) the variables Family Intactness and Noncorrectional Institutionalization may be predictive among referrals from outside New York City.

In general, while there appear to be differences among the predictors of Arrest and Serious Arrest between referrals from and not from New York City, they do not appear to be marked differences. The differences between the two categories of referrals in Serious Commitment seem much greater. If these inferences are valid, they suggest that the latter differences (in Serious Commitment) are greater because they represent the result of two distinct processes each making for differences between the two categories of referrals, i.e., (a) processes leading to post-discharge arrest, and (b) processes leading to post-discharge commitment.

One research question raised by these findings (and those of preceding sections) is whether prediction instruments would be greatly improved by deriving separate instruments for referrals from New York City and referrals from outside New York City. The findings suggest that this approach might be justifiable when predicting Serious Commitment but would have less justification in predicting to Arrest or Serious Arrest. (However, this question needs further exploration.)

Judicial Considerations in Sentencing

On the basis of findings in preceding sections and findings from the preceding study of 1966-1968 dischargees, hypotheses may be formulated regarding what judges take into account directly or indirectly in sentencing a youth to incarceration. These hypotheses, and the findings that suggest them, are given below. All pertain to aspects of a youth's life as of time of referral to the Division.

(1) The judge takes into account the previous offense history of the youth.

The evidence supporting this hypothesis is (a) in the present study Number of Previous Petitions was a unique predictor of Serious Commitment controlling for arrest variables (b) Nonsignificant results in the same direction were found for referrals from New York City and referrals from outside New York City (c) in the preceding study Number of Previous Petitions was a unique predictor of Commitment among subjects with (post-discharge) arrest records.

(2) The judge takes into account past remands and incarcerations.

The evidence supporting this hypothesis are (a) Current Remand was a unique predictor of Serious Commitment with arrest variables controlled (b) Nonsignificant trends in the same direction were found both for referrals from New York City and referrals from outside New York City (c) in the preceding study, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization was a unique predictor of Commitment among subjects with (post-discharge) arrest records.

(3) Judges from outside New York City take into account the school record of the youth.

Evidence for this hypothesis is (a) for referrals from outside New York City, Current School Status was a unique predictor of Serious Commitment with arrest variables controlled (b) in the preceding study, Current School Status was a unique predictor of Commitment among subjects with (post-discharge) arrest records.

(4) Judges from outside New York City take into account the discharge status of the youth.

Evidence for this hypothesis is (a) for referrals from outside New York City the variable Discharge Status A (Nongraduate versus Graduate) was a unique predictor of Serious Commitment with arrest variables controlled (b) in the preceding study, Discharge Status A was a unique predictor of Commitment among subjects with (post-discharge) arrest records.

Some Implications and Questions

The general tenor of the findings is that rather crude variables taken from the intake and discharge forms currently in use are systematically related to outcome variables related to recidivism. There is evidence that the relationships are stable over time, although not perfectly so.

It seems reasonable to conclude that more carefully chosen items for the intake or discharge forms would lead to the ability to predict more accurately.

The question which such findings pose to administrators is to what extent future probabilities are taken into consideration and should be taken into consideration in intake policy or in program and aftercare services. If the probability of a youth's being committed to a correctional institution with a sentence of at least three months can be determined at intake, for example, to be .27 should the same services be given to this youth as to a youth with a probability of only .05? Based on the findings of this study, about one-fifth of admissions have the former probability and over one-fifth the latter, when using a simple scale based on predictors from an earlier study to assess probability values.

In the present study's findings there appeared to be systematic differences among dischargees from the three types of program (Home, Camp, START) with respect to arrest variables. These may be due to youth differences at intake not tapped by present intake items or may be due to differential program effectiveness. Trends in the same direction,

but not statistically significant, existed in the earlier study (1966-1968 dischargees). The question which these findings raise is whether the differences were due to differential program effectiveness. The issue is complicated if it is assumed that different types of youth are admitted to different types of program, but even with this assumption conclusions regarding differential program effectiveness would be of use. It is possible, for example, that certain program components belonging to the more relatively effective type of program would also prove useful for types of youth other than the ones for whom the component was developed. It was suggested earlier that the question could be (in theory) resolved by research even in the absence of experimental-control design but with the necessary assistance of intake personnel. What is basically required are the reasons for the decision on the part of intake workers as to why each particular youth was sent to this rather than that type of program. To the extent that the admission criteria can be measured and quantified, they can be statistically controlled in analyses. If types of program (or individual programs) still differed in dischargee outcome after statistically taking into account the effects due to differences on admission criteria, one would conclude that the outcome variations reflected differences in relative program effectiveness.

This is a practical and logical means of comparing the effects of DFY programs with each other. In the absence of experimental-control studies, it is probably the only means.

The status of Nongraduate is associated with higher arrest and commitment rates especially when there is short program duration. State commitment rates are particularly high. The predicted difference in such rates due to the unique contribution of Nongraduate status was 16 percentage points higher than Graduate, minus 2.1 percentage points for each month in program. The extent to which this is a logical rather than an empirical relationship has not been determined.[1] However, it seems reasonable to conclude that the selection of youths for admission to DFY programs who have a probability of becoming a Nongraduate with short program durations is not helpful to many of these youths. The findings suggest that this problem may pertain primarily or solely to youths referred from outside of New York City rather than to youths referred from New York City. The predicted difference in Serious Arrest due to the unique contribution of Nongraduate status was 22 percentage points higher than Graduate, minus 2.6 percentage points for each month in program. For the Nongraduate from outside New York City the predicted difference in Serious Arrest was 18 percentage points higher than for Graduate, (with duration in program not a factor). The hypothesis that Nongraduation is a sign of healthful assertiveness (an hypothesis put forth by one DFY administrator) is not supported by these findings in the case of Nongraduates from outside New York City although it may hold for certain categories of youth.

The findings regarding predictors of Arrest or Serious Arrest in this and the preceding study suggest that recidivists tend to be those with the

[1]The status Nongraduate may include youths returned to court and committed as a result of violation of probation or of arrest while in program, i.e., their Nongraduation or in-program actions may be a direct basis for commitment. It also includes youths who are discharged, enact new offenses, and are committed for this reason. The weight of the evidence is that the relationship is not primarily a logical one: only a small proportion of Nongraduates have arrests within the month before official discharge (based on findings for 1969 dischargees), and only a small proportion have a commitment record without an arrest record.

most tangential or problematic attachments to adult structured institutions. In the present study, they tended at referral to have dropped out or been forced out of school, to have come from families whose principal source of income was not an occupation, and to have exhibited in the past a willingness to violate the criminal laws; after admission, they tended not to complete the program. Their ethnic group membership tended to be that of a minority group that has been an object of prejudice and discrimination in this country. The presence of Referral County on the list of predictors of Serious Arrest was traced to the connection of New York City with drugs; so that even with this predictor there arises the connotation of a problematic attachment to conventional institutions.

One implication this has for programs is to raise the question of the extent relatively short-term programs, such as the Division administers, can affect such attachments. In this connection the relative stability of the arrest rate may be noted. In this study it was 41.5%.[1] In past studies with samples of dischargees 1961-1966, 1966-1967, and 1968 the rate was 37%, 42% and 38%. That is, over many years about four out of ten dischargees have had fingerprintable arrests within the two year post-discharge period. This suggests a certain temporal stability in the factors influencing arrest rate of dischargees. Attempts to alter youths may have little effect without concomitant changes in these factors. In the Division's Youth and Work Study approximately one-half of 1,137 applicants to four neighborhood work training programs were found to have subsequently acquired fingerprintable arrest records.[2] There were no marked differences found between trainees and control subjects (applicants randomly selected, who did not enter these programs) except

[1]Based on all dischargees 1969-1970.

[2]New York State Division for Youth. Youth and Work Training Programs: An Evaluative Study. 1973.

in the case of one program where the experimental arrest rate was higher than that for controls. While these work training programs did appear to have altered attitudes of youths with respect to holding onto jobs, they did not appear to have led to any improvement in the youth's general job situation. On the basis of such findings it is questionable to what extent attempts to alter youths will by themselves affect their subsequent criminal behavior without changes in social structural factors over which they have little control.

With respect to the state's criminal justice system, in general, the findings regarding the relation of Referral County to local and state commitments raise some interesting questions. The two types of commitments are generally distinguished by different lengths of sentence; state commitments by over one year, local by one year and under. The findings suggest that by virtue of living outside New York City a youth has a greater likelihood of a state commitment and by virtue of living in New York City a youth has a greater likelihood of local commitment. There was no evidence that these likelihoods were based on a more serious arrest record for those living outside New York City. A possible explanation of this finding is that plea-bargaining is more extensive within New York City than outside New York City; so that charges for the city youths are more often reduced from felonies to misdemeanors. The questions this inference raise are whether the different sentences are associated with different durations in correctional institutions (as one would expect), whether this is inequitable and what are the effects of the differences in commitment on subsequent criminal behavior or in other aspects of the youths' lives.

Findings in this study also bear on the issue of the commingling of youths adjudicated as Juvenile Delinquent and those adjudicated as Person In Need of Supervision. One of the arguments in favor of commingling is that the youths with these two labels do not basically differ. For the population of this study the findings do not support this position. The petition of Juvenile Delinquent appears associated with a higher probability of post-discharge arrest, and of serious arrest, and with a greater number of post-discharge arrests, than a petition of Person In Need of Supervision.

If hypotheses suggested by the findings, regarding judicial considerations in sentencing are true, they also raise certain issues. They imply that deficiencies of a youth at an early point in time will be among the criteria for commitment of a youth at a later point in time. For example, a petition at age 14 or being out of school at age 16 becomes a criterion for commitment at age 18. Whether this is equitable, rational or effective is one issue raised. If Nongraduate status is among the criteria for commitment the Division for Youth, itself, then appears to bear a certain responsibility. This status arises when (a) a youth is accepted as suitable for treatment and (b) in the interaction between program and youth something "goes wrong" and treatment is terminated prematurely. Salient questions here are whether youths with high probability of becoming Nongraduates can be identified at intake, whether certain youths should be excluded from admission to the programs because of this high probability, whether additional positive incentives

than presently exist can be devised to induce youths to remain until program completion, whether the criteria used by the Division to label a youth by one of the Nongraduate categories (e.g., absconder) are sound ones, and whether the actions of the Division leading to Nongraduate status (e.g., dismissed by staff) are reasonable.

SUMMARY

The present study assessed variables taken from items of intake and discharge forms with respect to their ability to predict outcomes related to post-discharge recidivism. Subjects of the study were dischargees from Homes, Camps and START centers in 1969 and 1970 who were discharged after the age of 16. The study was done in anticipation of revisions of these forms and of the information system of the Division for Youth. Arrest and commitment data were obtained from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services.

The main statistical procedure used was multiple regression analysis. Variables were assessed for their effects independent of the effects of other variables in the analyses. The variables reflected these areas: (a) characteristics as of time of referral or admission -- age, past offense record, legal status at time of referral, school, employment, family, ethnicity, referral county, main source of family income (b) program activity -- program from which youth was discharged, discharge status and duration in program.

In a preceding study of 1966-1968 dischargees six variables had been found uniquely predictive of post-discharge arrest and five of post-discharge commitment.[1] For arrest these were Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems, Principal Source of Family Income, Current Remand, Present Petition and Discharge Status. For commitment these

[1]A variable predictive of outcome independent of the effects of other variables is called a unique predictor.

were Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Present Petition, Current School Status and Discharge Status. The two sets of variables were used as scales by dichotomizing each variable and assigning one point to the favorable direction of each variable. Another set of scales was limited solely to the referral variables. The scales were examined with respect to outcomes called Arrest, Serious Arrest, Commitment and Serious Commitment (defined below). The scales were found to differentiate the 1969-1970 dischargees. For example, on the scale for post-discharge arrest limited to referral variables, youths scoring 0-1 (representing one-sixth of dischargees) were over 2.5 times as likely to have serious arrests as youths scoring 4-5 (representing about one-quarter of dischargees). On the scale for commitment limited to referral variables, those scoring 0-1 (representing over one-fifth of dischargees) were about five times as likely to have serious commitments as those scoring 4 (representing about one-fifth of dischargees).

Using multiple regression analysis it was found that (with one possible exception)[1] each variable contributed independently to the predictiveness of the composite set of variables.

The findings were taken to support the general approach of seeking out unique predictors of arrest and commitment and then constructing a scale composed of these predictors with the expectation that relationships in general would hold over time.

When the analyses of Arrest, Serious Arrest, Commitment and Serious

[1]One variable approached but did not reach significance.

Commitment included the full complement of variables -- those that were uniquely predictive in the earlier study and those that were not -- it was found that all of the variables found previously to be uniquely predictive of commitment were uniquely predictive of Commitment and Serious Commitment among 1969-1970 dischargees. Thus, their value as unique predictors was confirmed in the present study. However, only three of the six variables found uniquely predictive of Arrest in the earlier study were found uniquely predictive in the present study. (These were Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition and Discharge Status). It was concluded that when all variables were considered, the pattern of interrelationships appear to have altered somewhat over time.

The full complement of variables was used for the following analyses referring to a two-year post-discharge period: Arrest -- at least one fingerprintable arrest in the post-discharge period; Serious Arrest -- at least one arrest for burglary, robbery, drug offense, assaultive acts or grand larceny; Number of Arrests -- the number of arrests in this period; Arrest for Burglary; Arrest for Robbery; Arrest for Drug Offense, Arrest for Assaultive Acts; Arrest for Grand Larceny. The latter five variables refer to at least one arrest for the designated offense type in the two year post-discharge period.

These variables were found uniquely related to Arrest, Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests: Principal Source of Family Income, Present Petition, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Ethnicity, Type of

Program and Discharge Status. For Serious Arrest, Current School Status and Referral County were also unique predictors, as was the interaction of Discharge Status with Duration in Program. For Number of Arrests, Referral County and Number of Previous Petitions were also unique predictors.

The common dimension that almost all the relationships appeared to connote was a tangential or problematic relationship to social institutions or adult-structured settings. Assuming that Arrest, Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests are indicators of recidivism, predictors of recidivism include these youth characteristics (a) having dropped out or been forced out of school (b) being a member of a family whose principal source of income was not a job (c) having a petition at referral denoting violation of the criminal law (Juvenile Delinquent, Youthful Offender) (d) a history of detention or incarceration in the past (e) terminating the DFY program without completing it and after a short program stay (f) being black (g) coming from New York City. Even the last-mentioned characteristic was found to connote problematic attachment to social institutions in that the relation of this characteristic to both Serious Arrest and Number of Arrests was found due to its relation to Arrest for Drug Offense. That is, New York City youths were found to have a greater probability of arrest for drug offenses and because of this to have a greater number of arrests and to have a higher probability of at least one serious arrest.

Type of Program was also found to be a unique predictor. Predicted differences were in the direction: Homes (lowest) STARTs (highest). Whether this was due to youth characteristics not tapped by present intake

form or to differential program effectiveness is a question posed by these findings.

Findings regarding the unique predictors of the different offense types indicated that different types of youth are associated with different offense types. There appeared to be ethnic differences, with black ethnicity associated with robbery, and Puerto Rican ethnicity with grand larceny; also, Puerto Rican youths had a lower probability than others of having an arrest for drug offenses. Being a New York City referral was strongly associated with arrest for drug offenses.

Commitment as a predicted event was differentiated into these variables, referring to a period 2.5-3.5 years after discharge: Commitment -- at least one commitment to a state or local correctional facility or to a narcotic rehabilitation facility; Serious Commitment -- at least one commitment to a state or local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more; Local Commitment -- at least one commitment to a local correctional facility; State Commitment -- at least one commitment to a state correctional facility; Narcotic Commitment -- at least one commitment to a narcotic rehabilitation facility; Serious Local Commitment -- at least one commitment to a local correctional facility with a sentence of three months or more.

It was found that different sets of variables were uniquely predictive of state, local and narcotic commitment. For state commitment the unique predictors were Referral County, Number of Previous Petitions, School Behavior Problems, Current School Status, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Discharge Status, and the interaction

of Discharge Status with Duration in Program. For local commitment the unique predictors were Referral County, Employment, Current Remand, and Present Petition Status. For narcotic commitment the unique predictors were Referral County, Principal Source of Family Income, Length of Previous Correctional Institutionalization, Ethnicity and Type of Program. Referral County, (New York City versus others) was positively related to local and narcotic commitment but negatively related to state commitment. Apparently as a result of different sets of unique predictors emerging for the three kinds of commitment, a large number of variables were uniquely predictive of the global measure Commitment, namely all of the above with the exception of Referral County, Principal Source of Family Income and School Behavior Problems.

When the predictors of Local Commitment and of Serious Local Commitment were compared, it appeared that Employment was a factor primarily in commitments with short sentences (less than three months) while Referral County, Current Remand and Present Petition were important in longer sentences (three months or more). Ethnicity was also a unique predictor of Serious Local Commitment.

Unique predictors of Serious Commitment were Number of Previous Petitions, Current Remand, Current School Status, Present Petition, School Behavior Problems, Last Grade Completed, Discharge Status and the interaction of Discharge Status with Duration in Program. Controlling for the Arrest variables, all these predictors appeared to retain predictive strength with the exception of Discharge Status, and Discharge Status in interaction with Duration in Program. The latter two variables appeared to be related to

Serious Commitment at least partially through their relationship to the Arrest variables.

Because of the opposite direction of the relationship between Referral County and State Commitment compared with Referral County and Local Commitment, it was hypothesized that at least part of the reason for the differences in predictors of state versus local commitments was due to differences between referrals from New York City versus those from outside New York City. These two categories of referrals were analyzed separately with respect to Serious Commitment. The findings upheld the hypothesis in that school variables (School Behavior Problems, Current School Status and Last Grade Completed) and Discharge Status were predictive of Serious Commitment for those referred from outside New York City but not for those referred from New York City. Present Petition, on the other hand, was predictive of Serious Commitment if the youth was from New York City but not if he was from outside New York City. With Arrest variables controlled, these results appeared to stand.

The two categories of referrals (New York City versus outside New York City) were also analyzed separately with regard to Arrest and Serious Arrest. The primary differences appeared to be (a) the greater importance of Present Petition Status as a predictor for referrals from New York City (b) the greater importance of Nongraduate Status as a predictor, by itself, for referrals from outside New York City (c) the greater importance of the interaction of Nongraduate Status with duration in program as a predictor for referrals from New York City.

The study's findings indicate that the set of variables of the intake

and discharge forms are, as a set, related to post-discharge arrest and commitment variables. There also appears to be a measure of stability in these relationships over time. On the negative side, the multiple correlation coefficients were generally low from the perspective of ideal results. That is, most of the variation between youths in post-discharge arrest and commitment appears due to causal factors not reflected in the intake or discharge forms. Considering the restricted nature of these forms, the absence of psychological variables (attitudes, values, beliefs, other personality dispositions) or of social-psychological variables (relations with peers, parents) and important social background variables (census tract) and considering the fact that predictions were made primarily from characteristics at admission rather than from characteristics after discharge, this is not unexpected.

The study's findings also indirectly related to certain substantive issues. To the question of whether the Person In Need of Supervision is basically the same as the Juvenile Delinquent (a question involved in a recent court decision against commingling of the two groups), the findings support the position of a difference; the Person In Need of Supervision was less likely to have post-discharge arrests and commitments. To the question of whether Nongraduation may be considered a healthful or deleterious sign, the findings support the view of a deleterious sign when the Nongraduates have had a short program duration and/or when the Nongraduates come from outside New York City, since these youths have a higher probability of arrest and commitment. The findings also suggested that judges from outside New York City use Nongraduation Status as one of the criteria for commitment.

The findings regarding differences between local and state commitments and between different predictors of Serious Commitment among New York City referrals versus referrals from outside New York City suggest that different legal and judicial processes are at work in determining the vicissitudes of these youths; in particular, the length of a sentence, the type of commitment, and the predictors of arrest and commitment may depend on where the youth resides.

To the question of whether the two year post-discharge arrest rate of male dischargees is a relatively stable figure, the findings indicate it has been stable, with about four out of ten youths arrested among dischargees of early (1961-1966), middle (1966-1968) or late (1969-1970) periods.

With respect to anticipated revisions in and enlargement of the Division for Youth's information system, this study illustrated the potential value of multiple regression techniques in selecting out those characteristics most directly related to specific outcomes.

TABLE 1

RATES FOR ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY SCORES
ON SIX DICHOTOMIZED VARIABLES

Score	N	Arrest Rate	Serious Arrest Rate
6	34	17.6	8.8
5	141	29.1	20.6
4	249	38.6	26.5
3	237	43.0	34.6
2	178	58.4	52.8
1	40	57.5	47.5
0	10	70.0	70.0
Total	889	42.6	33.7

TABLE 2

RATES FOR ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY SCORES
ON FIVE REFERRAL VARIABLES

Score	N	Arrest Rate	Serious Arrest Rate
5	41	24.4	17.1
4	192	30.7	21.4
3	265	39.2	28.7
2	256	48.8	40.2
1	121	58.7	52.9
0	21	66.7	61.9
Total	896	42.7	33.9

TABLE 3

PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND ARREST

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Previous Petitions	.132	.01752	.01752	16.511***	.132***	.03730	4.393**
School Behavior Problems	.147	.02155	.00403	3.811*	.070**	.07081	3.154*
Source of Family Income	.172	.02961	.00806	7.675***	.096***	.10411	7.811***
Present Petition A	.200	.03986	.01025	9.856***	-.137***	-.05383	9.966***
Current Remand	.208	.04342	.00355	3.424*	.093***	.06867	3.192*
Discharge Status A	.218	.04752	.00411	3.969**	.074**	.07009	3.969**

***p<.005
**p<.025
*p<.05

TABLE 4

PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND SERIOUS ARREST

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Previous Petitions	.159	.02524	.02524	23.981***	.159***	.04622	7.464***
School Behavior Problems	.172	.02949	.00424	4.046**	.073**	.06871	3.287*
Source of Family Income	.198	.03929	.00981	9.432***	.106***	.10943	9.551***
Present Petition A	.226	.05099	.01170	11.378***	-.152***	-.05509	11.557***
Current Remand	.236	.05547	.00448	4.369**	.106***	.07363	4.062**
Discharge Status A	.248	.06133	.00586	5.752**	.087***	.08019	5.752**

*** $p<.005$
** $p<.025$
* $p<.05$

TABLE 5

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.018	.00031	.00031	0.282	-.018	-.00081	0.117	-.00248	0.966
Number of Previous Petitions	.128	.01640	.01609	14.687	.127	.01377	0.523	.01009	0.281
School Behavior Problems	.142	.02015	.00375	3.431	.069	.02658	0.372	-.01459	0.104
Source of Family Income	.170	.02897	.00882	8.138	.099	.10338	6.488	.09669	5.705
Previous Corr. Inst.	.210	.04430	.01533	14.361	.167	.05225	6.925	.04520	5.189
Present Petition A	.230	.05272	.00842	7.946	-.134	-.04245	4.721	-.03454	3.006
Present Petition B	.230	.05272	.00000	0.001	.042	-.00564	0.039	.00564	0.038
Present Petition C	.230	.05272	.00000	0.000	.005	-.00756	0.085	.01084	0.170
Current Remand	.232	.05360	.00087	0.820	.096	.03500	0.709	.04321	1.095
Family Intactness	.235	.05528	.00169	1.589	.022	.05067	1.818	.05076	1.817
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.237	.05639	.00111	1.042	-.060	-.03310	0.666	-.03293	0.663
Last Grade Completed	.238	.05653	.00014	0.128	-.035	-.01186	0.515	-.00927	0.308

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 5

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.242	.05838	.00186	1.749	-.048	-.07321	3.509	-.06003	2.371
Employment	.242	.05873	.00035	0.326	.055	.02433	0.461	.01480	0.172
Referral County	.252	.06350	.00477	4.508	.111	.04634	1.111	.04147	0.893
Ethnicity A	.278	.07701	.01351	12.937	.159	.11766	7.221	.11844	7.368
Ethnicity B	.278	.07742	.00042	0.399	-.039	-.03766	0.399	-.04041	0.465
Type of Program A	.296	.08755	.01013	9.807	-.165			-.09813	10.715
Type of Program B	.297	.08795	.00040	0.383	-.004			-.01311	0.233
Discharge Status A	.305	.09299	.00504	4.888	.073			.18071	6.228
Discharge Status B	.307	.09444	.00145	1.412	.006			.11121	1.531
Duration in Program	.309	.09533	.00089	0.861	-.064			.00136	0.052
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.314	.09836	.00304	3.303	.020			-.02092	3.303
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.314	.09878	.00042	0.409	-.014			-.00806	0.409

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test), $p<.025$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062, p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 6

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.014	.00020	.00020	0.182	-.014	-.00058	0.067	-.00250	1.098
Number of Previous Petitions	.155	.02411	.02391	22.002	.155	.02277	1.594	.02046	1.293
School Behavior Problems	.168	.02817	.00406	3.745	.072	.01731	0.176	-.01861	0.190
Source of Family Income	.198	.03926	.01109	10.341	.110	.09829	6.537	.09128	5.689
Previous Corr. Inst.	.237	.05613	.01687	15.995	.184	.04666	6.155	.03903	4.328
Present Petition A	.256	.06575	.00962	9.210	-.150	-.05147	7.734	-.04599	5.963
Present Petition B	.257	.06580	.00005	0.045	.040	-.01282	0.224	-.00319	0.014
Present Petition C	.257	.06599	.00019	0.184	.019	.00075	0.001	-.00110	0.002
Current Remand	.259	.06716	.00117	1.113	.111	.03441	0.764	.04283	1.204
Family Intactness	.261	.06825	.00109	1.041	.013	.04125	1.343	.04337	1.484
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.263	.06931	.00106	1.013	-.061	-.02845	0.548	-.02966	0.602
Last Grade Completed	.263	.06931	.00001	0.006	-.028	-.00695	0.197	-.00583	0.136

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 6

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.267	.07153	.00221	2.113	-.053	-.08746	5.582	-.07551	4.198
Employment	.267	.07153	.00000	0.001	.044	.00520	0.024	-.00337	0.010
Referral County	.292	.08536	.01383	13.385	.159	.09407	5.102	.08773	4.472
Ethnicity A	.311	.09642	.01106	10.818	.169	.10942	6.960	.11222	7.400
Ethnicity B	.311	.09648	.00006	0.058	-.009	-.01362	0.058	-.01576	0.079
Type of Program A	.323	.10446	.00799	7.896	-.163			-.08460	8.912
Type of Program B	.325	.10535	.00088	0.870	-.017			-.01917	0.557
Discharge Status A	.335	.11205	.00670	6.639	.087			.21987	10.315
Discharge Status B	.338	.11424	.00219	2.173	.010			.13567	2.549
Duration in Program	.339	.11496	.00072	0.718	-.069			.00327	0.336
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.347	.12023	.00527	5.789	.023			-.02618	5.789
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.348	.12083	.00060	0.602	-.010			-.00925	0.602

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test), $p<.025$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 7

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR BURGLARY

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.042	.00173	.00173	1.559	-.042	-.00154	0.920	-.00207	1.448
Number of Previous Petitions	.103	.01052	.00878	7.972	.095	.01288	1.002	.01239	0.920
School Behavior Problems	.103	.01052	.00000	0.002	.014	-.02135	0.525	-.04168	1.843
Source of Family Income	.118	.01395	.00343	3.118	.064	.05238	3.650	.04940	3.228
Previous Corr. Inst.	.120	.01452	.00057	0.521	.061	.00341	0.065	.00009	0.000
Present Petition A	.156	.02436	.00984	9.013	-.117	-.02969	5.061	-.02793	4.261
Present Petition B	.160	.02545	.00110	1.006	.079	.02844	2.165	.03359	2.959
Present Petition C	.160	.02569	.00023	0.214	-.000	.00972	0.306	.01317	0.543
Current Remand	.161	.02596	.00027	0.248	.043	.01094	0.152	.01429	0.260
Family Intactness	.162	.02637	.00041	0.377	.011	.01820	0.514	.01691	0.437
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.163	.02648	.00011	0.102	-.019	.00741	0.073	.00731	0.071
Last Grade Completed	.163	.02665	.00017	0.155	-.036	-.00382	0.117	-.00334	0.086

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 7

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR BURGLARY

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.178	.03152	.00486	4.453	-.053	-.05368	4.134	-.04881	3.398
Employment	.180	.03235	.00084	0.768	.050	.02181	0.812	.01749	0.520
Referral County	.180	.03239	.00004	0.035	.023	-.00163	0.003	-.00816	0.075
Ethnicity A	.180	.03250	.00011	0.102	.024	.01213	0.168	.01445	0.238
Ethnicity B	.180	.03258	.00008	0.069	.008	.01054	0.069	.01104	0.075
Type of Program A	.192	.03677	.00419	3.837	-.099			-.04247	4.352
Type of Program B	.192	.03680	.00003	0.029	.020			-.00089	0.002
Discharge Status A	.196	.03847	.00166	1.523	.038			.08775	3.183
Discharge Status B	.207	.04295	.00448	4.117	.030			.12147	3.958
Duration in Program	.207	.04299	.00004	0.035	-.026			.00250	0.380
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.210	.04400	.00102	1.276	.015			-.00883	1.276
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.212	.04478	.00078	0.713	.005			-.00723	0.713

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 8

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR ROBBERY

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.012	.00015	.00015	0.130	-.012	.00148	1.138	.00113	0.579
Number of Previous Petitions	.116	.01350	.01335	12.155	.116	.01691	2.321	.01625	2.113
School Behavior Problems	.131	.01711	.00362	3.300	.066	.01934	0.579	.02255	0.721
Source of Family Income	.164	.02701	.00990	9.117	.104	.03608	2.327	.03330	1.961
Previous Corr. Inst.	.197	.03888	.01187	11.051	.149	.02307	3.974	.02193	3.538
Present Petition A	.197	.03891	.00003	0.028	-.051	.00102	0.008	.00239	0.042
Present Petition B	.199	.03949	.00058	0.539	.044	-.00682	0.167	-.00667	0.156
Present Petition C	.202	.04063	.00113	1.055	-.006	-.02796	3.408	-.03267	4.464
Current Remand	.208	.04333	.00271	2.520	.105	.03635	2.252	.03752	2.393
Family Intactness	.208	.04333	.00000	0.001	-.025	.00486	0.049	.00989	0.200
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.214	.04596	.00263	2.450	-.051	-.02746	1.349	.02996	1.591
Last Grade Completed	.218	.04740	.00143	1.335	-.051	-.01714	3.162	-.01694	2.978

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 8

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR ROBBERY

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.219	.04811	.00072	0.667	.025	-.00887	0.152	-.00727	0.101
Employment	.222	.04940	.00129	1.204	-.017	-.01900	0.829	-.01900	0.821
Referral County	.255	.06511	.01570	14.866	.181	.04601	3.224	.04895	3.606
Ethnicity A	.302	.09096	.02585	25.139	.230	.10919	18.306	.10987	18.369
Ethnicity B	.302	.09097	.00001	0.012	-.017	.00378	0.012	.00285	0.007
Type of Program A	.302	.09099	.00002	0.017	-.050			-.00253	0.021
Type of Program B	.302	.09143	.00044	0.427	-.014			-.00745	0.218
Discharge Status A	.307	.09414	.00271	2.632	.058			.07383	3.012
Discharge Status B	.310	.09586	.00172	1.676	-.046			-.03585	0.461
Duration in Program	.310	.09597	.00011	0.108	-.005			.00265	0.572
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.313	.09776	.00179	1.621	.030			-.00861	1.621
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.313	.09777	.00000	0.003	-.020			.00042	0.003

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 9

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR DRUG OFFENSE

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.011	.00011	.00011	0.101	-.011	.00046	0.074	-.00046	0.066
Number of Previous Petitions	.086	.00733	.00721	6.525	.085	.00925	0.467	.00642	0.223
School Behavior Problems	.106	.01130	.00397	3.602	.068	.02909	0.880	.01681	0.271
Source of Family Income	.126	.01584	.00454	4.135	.071	.04288	2.207	.04445	2.362
Previous Corr. Inst.	.148	.02199	.00616	5.633	.108	.02446	3.001	.02087	2.167
Present Petition A	.153	.02330	.00131	1.195	-.067	-.01426	1.054	-.00710	0.249
Present Petition B	.157	.02475	.00145	1.328	.057	.01048	0.265	.02042	0.988
Present Petition C	.157	.02478	.00003	0.025	.004	-.00674	0.133	-.00881	0.219
Current Remand	.158	.02500	.00022	0.199	.029	-.01586	0.288	-.01248	0.179
Family Intactness	.159	.02524	.00024	0.220	.006	.01142	0.182	.01326	0.243
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.164	.02693	.00170	1.550	-.053	-.03047	1.115	-.02688	0.866
Last Grade Completed	.172	.02947	.00254	2.322	.027	.01550	1.738	.01533	1.650

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 9

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR DRUG OFFENSE

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.172	.02972	.00025	0.225	-.007	-.04056	2.130	-.03243	1.356
Employment	.177	.03144	.00172	1.576	-.020	-.03365	1.745	-.03476	1.856
Referral County	.223	.04966	.01822	16.969	.169	.12207	15.239	.12091	14.872
Ethnicity A	.229	.05265	.00299	2.790	.130	.01052	0.114	.00616	0.039
Ethnicity B	.238	.05686	.00421	3.946	-.030	-.08420	3.946	-.08759	4.277
Type of Program A	.255	.06480	.00794	7.584	-.117			-.05943	7.702
Type of Program B	.264	.06949	.00469	4.443	-.059			-.03932	4.103
Discharge Status A	.264	.06965	.00016	0.149	.019			.03130	0.366
Discharge Status B	.264	.06969	.00004	0.038	.010			.04489	0.489
Duration in Program	.264	.06969	.00000	0.000	-.010			.00183	0.184
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.264	.06974	.00005	0.148	.015			-.00316	0.148
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.265	.07034	.00060	0.564	-.011			-.00676	0.564

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, p .01 (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, p .05 (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, p .10 (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 10

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR GRAND LARCENY

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.029	.00086	.00086	0.775	-.029	.00089	0.512	.00052	0.153
Number of Previous Petitions	.062	.00390	.00304	2.738	.056	.00355	0.126	.00155	0.024
School Behavior Problems	.063	.00392	.00002	0.015	.012	-.01644	0.515	-.03211	1.808
Source of Family Income	.063	.00397	.00005	0.046	.011	-.02013	0.891	-.02247	1.104
Previous Corr. Inst.	.096	.00925	.00529	4.775	.089	.01436	1.896	.01179	1.264
Present Petition A	.096	.00927	.00002	0.015	-.023	-.00080	0.006	.00353	0.112
Present Petition B	.105	.01097	.00170	1.536	.054	.01646	1.200	.02205	2.108
Present Petition C	.106	.01114	.00017	0.154	.023	-.00301	0.049	-.00423	0.092
Current Remand	.113	.01275	.00161	1.450	.070	.02097	0.923	.02351	1.161
Family Intactness	.113	.01275	.00000	0.000	-.008	-.00091	0.002	-.00019	0.000
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.114	.01310	.00035	0.315	-.020	-.00892	0.175	-.00873	0.167
Last Grade Completed	.131	.01719	.00409	3.696	-.072	-.01692	3.794	-.01568	3.158

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 10

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST FOR GRAND LARCENY

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.131	.01719	.00000	0.001	.007	-.01076	0.275	-.00530	0.066
Employment	.131	.01719	.00000	0.000	.002	.00266	0.020	-.00071	0.001
Referral County	.152	.02321	.00602	5.453	.100	.02072	0.804	.01915	0.682
Ethnicity A	.159	.02538	.00218	1.974	-.001	.01280	0.310	.01221	0.281
Ethnicity B	.192	.03682	.01144	10.483	.138	.10138	10.483	.10001	10.198
Type of Program A	.211	.04445	.00763	7.057	-.094			-.04334	7.491
Type of Program B	.212	.04476	.00031	0.282	-.004			-.00539	0.141
Discharge Status A	.218	.04759	.00283	2.614	.057			.05410	2.000
Discharge,Status B	.219	.04801	.00043	0.396	.002			.04223	0.791
Duration in Program	.219	.04801	.00000	0.000	-.023			.00143	0.206
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.220	.04827	.00025	0.363	.040			-.00366	0.363
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.221	.04865	.00039	0.355	-.006			-.00396	0.355

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF ARRESTS

No. of Arrests	N	%
0	604	57.3
1	225	21.3
2	128	12.1
3	56	5.3
4	24	2.3
5	10	0.9
6	1	0.1
7	4	0.4
8	1	0.1
9	1	0.1
TOTAL	1054	100.0

TABLE 12

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (FIRST ANALYSIS)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.027	.00074	.00074	0.655	-.027	.00056	0.009	-.00399	0.420
Number of Previous Petitions	.188	.03551	.03478	32.018	.187	.09087	3.847	.07852	2.888
School Behavior Problems	.199	.03952	.00401	3.701	.076	.07588	0.514	-.00409	0.001
Source of Family Income	.228	.05179	.01227	11.468	.118	.25953	6.891	.24474	6.186
Previous Corr. Inst.	.266	.07063	.01884	17.942	.203	.14307	8.762	.12408	6.630
Present Petition A	.284	.08048	.00985	9.467	-.161	-.11435	5.774	-.08616	3.163
Present Petition B	.288	.08270	.00222	2.132	.095	.05055	0.526	.08685	1.540
Present Petition C	.288	.08288	.00018	0.172	-.008	-.05834	0.847	-.07271	1.289
Current Remand	.290	.08389	.00101	0.972	.111	.09350	0.851	.11400	1.286
Family Intactness	.295	.08697	.00309	2.977	.034	.15368	2.815	.16511	3.243
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.298	.08902	.00205	1.977	-.076	-.10650	1.169	-.10160	1.075
Last Grade Completed	.299	.08926	.00024	0.229	-.015	.00113	0.001	.00761	0.035

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 12

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (FIRST ANALYSIS)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.299	.08927	.00000	0.005	.006	-.08009	0.710	-.04586	0.235
Employment	.299	.08930	.00004	0.036	.048	.02509	0.083	.00851	0.010
Referral County	.323	.10415	.01485	14.502	.189	.28928	7.310	.28139	6.965
Ethnicity A	.334	.11176	.00761	7.487	.173	.21227	3.969	.21001	3.927
Ethnicity B	.335	.11214	.00037	0.368	-.005	-.08829	0.368	-.09725	0.453
Type of Program A	.354	.12509	.01296	12.920	-.178			-.26993	13.666
Type of Program B	.357	.12746	.00237	2.368	-.028			-.08827	1.792
Discharge Status A	.364	.13222	.00475	4.764	.074			.44844	6.468
Discharge Status B	.364	.13248	.00026	0.261	-.007			.12168	0.310
Duration in Program	.364	.13251	.00003	0.034	-.037			.00920	0.399
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.369	.13596	.00345	3.359	.030			-.05124	3.359
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.369	.13597	.00001	0.010	-.002			-.00304	0.010

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test), $p<.025$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test), For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 13

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (SECOND ANALYSIS)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.031	.00099	.00099	0.367	-.031	.00658	0.504	.00495	0.258
Number of Previous Petitions	.197	.03874	.03775	14.570	.196	.14331	4.219	.13329	3.635
School Behavior Problems	.200	.04016	.00142	0.548	.057	.00058	0.000	-.06100	0.109
Source of Family Income	.221	.04880	.00864	3.351	.101	.17472	1.392	.16165	1.181
Previous Corr. Inst.	.235	.05505	.00625	2.433	.152	.09156	1.751	.07811	1.256
Present Petition A	.247	.06080	.00575	2.247	-.135	-.05688	0.523	-.02499	0.096
Present Petition B	.267	.07103	.01023	4.031	.136	.10976	0.987	.18186	2.546
Present Petition C	.267	.07109	.00006	0.023	-.031	-.08439	0.592	-.09117	0.671
Current Remand	.268	.07163	.00054	0.211	.090	.03610	0.056	.01923	0.016
Family Intactness	.278	.07733	.00570	2.242	.036	.22194	2.490	.23305	2.683
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.283	.08021	.00288	1.134	-.074	-.16887	1.076	-.18936	1.326
Last Grade Completed	.288	.08305	.00285	1.121	.030	.05368	0.730	.05981	0.880

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 13

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS (SECOND ANALYSIS)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.297	.08848	.00543	2.145	.098	.11583	0.612	.12611	0.721
Employment	.299	.08915	.00067	0.263	.008	-.06807	0.226	-.06913	0.230
Referral County	.341	.11661	.02746	11.128	.236	.45783	8.333	.44188	7.696
Ethnicity A	.342	.11665	.00004	0.015	.111	-.00268	0.000	.01068	0.004
Ethnicity B	.342	.11671	.00006	0.025	.075	.03762	0.025	.04304	0.033
Type of Program A	.358	.12799	.01128	3.965	-.126			-.24894	4.487
Type of Program B	.360	.12933	.00134	0.545	-.051			-.04111	0.168
Discharge Status A	.368	.13538	.00605	2.471	.041			.37671	1.641
Discharge Status B	.368	.13538	.00000	0.001	-.030			-.10589	0.068
Duration in Program	.372	.13805	.00266	1.084	.033			.02310	0.746
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.373	.13877	.00073	0.154	.037			-.01792	0.154
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.374	.13983	.00105	0.428	.024			.04663	0.428

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).

TABLE 14

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN NUMBER OF ARRESTS AND OTHER ARREST VARIABLES AMONG SUBJECTS WITH AT LEAST ONE ARREST (N=450)

	r
Serious Arrest	.27***
Burglary	.21***
Robbery	.24***
Drugs	.31***
Assaultive	.15**
Grand Larceny	.27***

*** $p < .001$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 15

F-VALUES AND REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF REFERRAL COUNTY AND TYPE OF PROGRAM REFERRAL COUNTY

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	Control Variable	F	Regression Coefficient	P	Without Control Variable: Regression Coefficient
Referral County[1]	Number of Arrests	Serious Arrests	2.03	.11	<.20	.29
Referral County	Serious Arrest	Number of Arrests	0.49	.02	>.40	.09
Type of Program[2]	Number of Arrests	Serious Arrests	3.67	-.13 (A) -.05 (B)	<.05	-.26 (A) -.10 (B)
Type of Program	Serious Arrest	Number of Arrests	0.00	.00 (A) .00 (B)	>.99	-.08 (A) -.02 (B)
Referral County	Number of Arrests	Arrest for Drugs	0.51	.07	>.40	.29
Referral County	Arrest for Drugs	Number of Arrests	9.82	.09	<.01	.12
Type of Program	Number of Arrests	Arrest for Drugs	3.59	-.17 (A) -.03 (B)	<.05	-.26 (A) -.10 (B)
Type of Program	Arrest for Drugs	Number of Arrests	1.75	-.02 (A) -.03 (B)	<.25	-.06 (A) -.04 (B)
Referral County	Arrest for Drugs	Serious Arrest Two	15.79	.12	<.001	.12
Referral County	Serious Arrest Two	Arrest for Drugs	0.34	.02	> 40	.04
Referral County	Serious Arrest Two	-	1.21	.04	> 20	-

[1] df=1,872

[2] df=2,874

TABLE 16

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST VARIABLES

	Arrest	Serious Arrest	Burglary	Robbery	Drugs	Assaultive	Grand Larceny	Number of Arrests
Principal Source Family Income	X	X	(X)					X
Present Petition A	X	X	X					X
Length of Previous Correctional Inst.	X	X		X	(X)	[X]		X
Number of Previous Petitions								X
Current School Status		X	X					
Referral County		X		(X)	X			X
Ethnicity A	X	X		X				X
Ethnicity B					X		X	
Type of Program	X	X		X	X		X	X
Discharge Status A	X	X						X
Discharge Status B			X					
Interaction Dis. A and P.D.		X						

Note.--X=Significant, (X)=Nearly significant (p .10), [X]=significant but problematic (see text).

TABLE 17

RATES FOR COMMITMENT AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT ON FIVE DICHOTOMIZED VARIABLES

Score	N	Commitment	Serious Commitment
5	134	9.0	6.0
4	253	16.2	8.3
3	256	18.8	14.5
2	175	25.7	20.0
1	97	40.2	32.0
0	12	41.7	41.7
TOTAL	927	20.5	14.8

TABLE 18

RATES FOR COMMITMENT AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT ON FOUR REFERRAL VARIABLES

Score	N	Commitment	Serious Commitment
4	185	11.4	5.4
3	277	16.2	10.1
2	257	20.2	16.0
1	165	35.8	27.3
0	50	30.0	28.0
TOTAL	934	20.6	14.8

TABLE 19

PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Previous Petitions	.160	.02571	.02571	24.436***	.160***	.04059	7.841***
Present Petition Status A	.193	.03743	.01172	11.259***	-.158***	-.04365	9.610***
Current Remand	.215	.04628	.00885	8.575***	.130***	.08582	7.491***
Current School Status	.222	.04925	.00297	2.883*	-.081**	-.04421	2.415
Discharge Status A	.244	.05960	.01035	10.148***	.109***	.09122	10.148***

*** $p < .005$
** $p < .025$
* $p < .05$

TABLE 20

PREVIOUS PREDICTORS AND SERIOUS COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Previous Petitions	.180	.03247	.03247	31.077***	.180***	.03989	9.910***
Present Petition Status A	.217	.04709	.01461	14.186***	-.177***	-.04314	12.282***
Current Remand	.243	.05907	.01199	11.770***	.150***	.08963	10.690***
Current School Status	.248	.06146	.00239	2.346	-.079**	-.03545	2.032
Discharge Status A	.258	.06674	.00528	5.218**	.080**	.05719	5.218**

*** $p < .005$

** $p < .025$

TABLE 21

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.022	.00048	.00048	0.433	.022	.00124	0.408	-.00043	0.044
Number of Previous Petitions	.165	.02717	.02669	24.638	.163	.02879	3.441	.02677	2.981
School Behavior Problems	.165	.02720	.00003	0.029	.009	-.03627	1.042	-.05915	2.577
Source of Family Income	.178	.03166	.00446	4.124	.066	.06346	3.681	.05696	2.980
Previous Corr. Inst.	.222	.04932	.01766	16.626	.188	.04652	8.265	.04076	6.352
Present Petition A	.242	.05847	.00915	8.685	-.158	-.03267	4.212	-.02914	3.221
Present Petition B	.244	.05929	.00083	0.784	.049	.01585	0.462	.02027	0.748
Present Petition C	.248	.06141	.00212	2.014	-.055	-.03916	3.421	-.04506	4.413
Current Remand	.255	.06499	.00358	3.409	.126	.06565	3.757	.07189	4.563
Family Intactness	.260	.06752	.00253	2.414	.030	.06198	4.096	.06694	4.755
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.260	.06778	.00026	0.248	.000	.01711	0.268	.01373	0.174
Last Grade Completed	.265	.07046	.00268	2.560	-.047	-.02147	2.537	-.02078	2.329

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 21

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.274	.07495	.00449	4.303	-.080	-.08804	7.642	-.07939	6.244
Employment	.281	.07915	.00421	4.046	-.012	-.05557	3.625	-.06248	4.608
Referral County	.288	.08323	.00408	3.935	.082	.03156	0.776	.03098	0.750
Ethnicity A	.298	.08867	.00545	5.284	.106	.07453	4.363	.07643	4.618
Ethnicity B	.298	.08876	.00008	0.081	-.009	.01386	0.081	.01023	0.045
Type of Program A	.304	.09246	.00370	3.614	-.118			-.05001	4.190
Type of Program B	.305	.09317	.00072	0.695	-.030			-.01401	0.400
Discharge Status A	.322	.10351	.01033	10.144	.105			.18492	9.817
Discharge Status B	.322	.10358	.00007	0.073	-.027			.03345	0.208
Duration in Program	.323	.10463	.00105	1.030	-.067			.00103	0.044
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.331	.10956	.00493	4.936	.034			-.02084	4.936
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.331	.10968	.00012	0.114	-.023			-.00346	0.114

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test), $p < .005$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test), $p < .025$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test), $p < .005$ (one-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062, p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 22

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NARCOTIC COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.009	.00009	.00009	0.080	.009	.00176	2.985	.00171	2.460
Number of Previous Petitions	.018	.00032	.00023	0.209	.015	-.01073	1.733	-.01249	2.319
School Behavior Problems	.045	.00200	.00168	1.512	.039	-.00242	0.017	-.00980	0.253
Source of Family Income	.106	.01129	.00929	8.415	.096	.03567	4.216	.03659	4.396
Previous Corr. Inst.	.163	.02664	.01535	14.116	.123	.02779	10.691	.02665	9.707
Present Petition A	.163	.02665	.00001	0.006	-.017	-.00018	0.000	.00298	0.121
Present Petition B	.179	.03190	.00525	4.843	.062	.02011	2.697	.02366	3.645
Present Petition C	.180	.03227	.00038	0.346	.026	.00661	0.353	.00596	0.276
Current Remand	.187	.03491	.00263	2.429	-.005	-.03056	2.953	-.03038	2.913
Family Intactness	.190	.03592	.00101	0.932	.011	.01945	1.462	.02020	1.548
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.190	.03592	.00001	0.007	-.006	.00331	0.036	.00481	0.076
Last Grade Completed	.190	.03592	.00000	0.000	-.009	-.00245	0.120	-.00205	0.081

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 22

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF NARCOTIC COMMITMENT

(Continued from previous page)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.192	.03674	.00082	0.755	-.007	-.02937	3.083	-.02671	2.526
Employment	.192	.03675	.00000	0.002	.002	.00089	0.003	-.00047	0.001
Referral County	.226	.05102	.01428	13.313	.155	.04404	5.477	.04433	5.491
Ethnicity A	.242	.05835	.00733	6.884	.149	.04102	4.792	.03823	4.131
Ethnicity B	.242	.05836	.00000	0.001	.007	-.00091	0.001	-.00330	0.017
Type of Program A	.250	.06234	.00398	3.827	-.076			-.02514	3.785
Type of Program B	.251	.06288	.00054	0.446	-.025			-.00793	0.458
Discharge Status A	.251	.06321	.00033	0.308	.031			-.03259	1.090
Discharge Status B	.251	.06321	.00001	0.006	.008			-.00591	0.023
Duration in Program	.252	.06329	.00008	0.074	-.016			-.00137	0.282
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.258	.06671	.00342	3.122	.058			.00877	3.122
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.258	.06672	.00001	0.009	.001			.00052	0.009

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 23

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF LOCAL COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.013	.00017	.00017	0.151	-.013	.00133	0.830	.00141	0.807
Number of Previous Petitions	.124	.01531	.01514	13.807	.123	.01176	1.009	.01012	0.736
School Behavior Problems	.131	.01726	.00195	1.783	.051	.00790	0.087	.00379	0.018
Source of Family Income	.144	.02083	.00357	3.269	.064	.01855	0.553	.01487	0.351
Previous Corr. Inst.	.165	.02729	.00645	5.937	.124	.00977	0.641	.00945	0.589
Present Petition A	.189	.03565	.00837	7.759	-.130	-.03059	6.485	-.02730	4.877
Present Petition B	.205	.04204	.00639	5.954	.107	.02855	2.635	.03010	2.848
Present Petition C	.206	.04233	.00029	0.273	-.028	-.02216	1.925	-.02716	2.767
Current Remand	.225	.05042	.00808	7.586	.128	.06990	7.485	.07100	7.681
Family Intactness	.225	.05081	.00039	0.368	.005	.02000	0.750	.02190	0.878
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.225	.05083	.00001	0.012	-.023	.00252	0.010	.00056	0.001
Last Grade Completed	.226	.05091	.00009	0.082	-.026	-.00431	0.179	-.00224	0.047

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 23

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF LOCAL COMMITMENT

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.226	.05108	.00016	0.152	.011	-.01939	0.651	-.01673	0.479
Employment	.243	.05888	.00781	7.352	-.056	-.05881	7.134	-.06031	7.409
Referral County	.279	.07791	.01903	18.263	175	.08563	10.035	.08873	10.620
Ethnicity A	.281	.07906	.00115	1.102	.116	.02769	1.058	.02783	1.057
Ethnicity B	.281	.07914	.00008	0.072	.040	.00985	0.072	.00957	0.068
Type of Program A	.283	.07986	.00073	0.692	-.065			-.01556	0.700
Type of Program B	.283	.07997	.00010	0.099	.016			.00755	0.201
Discharge Status A	.286	.08159	.00162	1.552	.040			.05576	1.541
Discharge Status B	.288	.08308	.00149	1.433	-.044			-.03232	0.336
Duration in Program	.288	.08312	.00004	0.034	-.000			.00200	0.292
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.290	.08396	.00084	0.799	.023			-.00638	0.799
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.290	.08397	.00001	0.008	-.027			-.00069	0.008

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 24

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF STATE COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.045	.00205	.00205	1.850	.045	-.00109	0.650	-.00256	3.174
Number of Previous Petitions	.145	.02107	.01901	17.440	.137	.03080	8.042	.03114	8.293
School Behavior Problems	.162	.02624	.00517	4.762	-.073	-.05125	4.247	-.06860	7.127
Source of Family Income	.162	.02634	.00011	0.100	-.016	.02618	1.279	.02145	0.869
Previous Corr. Inst.	.176	.03084	.00449	4.150	.113	.02321	4.198	.01860	2.718
Present Petition A	.183	.03340	.00256	2.371	-.107	-.00465	0.174	-.00533	0.222
Present Petition B	.194	.03768	.00428	3.973	-.059	-.01903	1.361	-.01732	1.123
Present Petition C	.202	.04090	.00322	2.993	-.065	-.02262	2.329	-.02284	2.332
Current Remand	.206	.04255	.00164	1.530	.085	.03620	2.331	.04137	3.107
Family Intactness	.209	.04367	.00112	1.044	.027	.02641	1.518	.02820	1.735
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.210	.04396	.00030	0.275	.017	.00419	0.033	.00178	0.006
Last Grade Completed	.216	.04647	.00251	2.335	-.020	-.01157	1.504	-.01212	1.629

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 24

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF STATE COMMITMENT

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.234	.05484	.00837	7.855	-.118	-.04683	4.414	-.04201	3.594
Employment	.234	.05486	.00002	0.017	.046	-.00291	0.020	-.00799	0.155
Referral County	.259	.06715	.01229	11.659	-.130	-.06922	7.618	-.07370	8.728
Ethnicity A	.262	.06869	.00155	1.467	-.024	.01195	0.229	.01609	0.421
Ethnicity B	.264	.06976	.00106	1.008	-.092	-.03413	1.008	-.03485	1.070
Type of Program A	.268	.07181	.00205	1.963	-.083			-.02735	2.576
Type of Program B	.269	.07236	.00055	0.526	-.041			-.00872	0.319
Discharge Status A	.285	.08138	.00902	8.639	.092			.15979	15.069
Discharge Status B	.291	.08481	.00343	3.297	.008			.08262	2.615
Duration in Program	.295	.08698	.00216	2.079	-.078			.00114	0.112
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.312	.09733	.01035	10.295	-.002			-.02099	10.295
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.312	.09762	.00029	0.280	.001			-.00379	0.280

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062,p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 25

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS LOCAL COMMITMENT

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.008	.00007	.00007	0.060	-.008	.00210	3.148	.00185	2.104
Number of Previous Petitions	.128	.01632	.01625	14.836	.128	.00544	0.327	.00425	0.196
School Behavior Problems	.130	.01701	.00070	0.635	.033	-.01484	0.465	-.01772	0.603
Source of Family Income	.159	.02540	.00839	7.711	.094	.01722	0.722	.01641	0.646
Previous Corr. Inst.	.187	.03484	.00943	8.748	.142	.00710	0.513	.00664	0.440
Present Petition A	.214	.04579	.01095	10.261	-.145	-.02532	6.739	-.02314	5.302
Present Petition B	.246	.06033	.01454	13.820	.143	.03925	7.554	.04053	7.807
Present Petition C	.247	.06089	.00056	0.528	-.043	-.02387	3.385	-.02728	4.222
Current Remand	.275	.07543	.01454	14.011	.159	.07150	11.876	.07254	12.125
Family Intactness	.275	.07546	.00004	0.038	-.033	-.00002	0.000	.00039	0.000
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.275	.07586	.00039	0.377	-.031	-.00408	0.040	-.00345	0.029
Last Grade Completed	.277	.07698	.00112	1.077	-.043	-.01215	2.165	-.01108	1.729

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 25

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS LOCAL COMMITMENT

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.278	.07710	.00012	0.118	.018	-.02197	1.268	-.02017	1.052
Employment	.280	.07822	.00112	1.074	-.004	-.01633	0.834	-.01704	0.894
Referral County	.339	.11464	.03643	36.413	.231	.08861	16.295	.09084	16.835
Ethnicity A	.343	.11775	.00310	3.110	.161	.04633	4.491	.04525	4.224
Ethnicity B	.345	.11913	.00138	1.381	.069	.03497	1.381	.03417	1.305
Type of Program A	.346	.11982	.00070	0.699	-.062			-.01236	0.668
Type of Program B	.346	.11986	.00004	0.040	-.001			-.00300	0.048
Discharge Status A	.346	.11997	.00011	0.111	.018			.00975	0.071
Discharge Status B	.347	.12060	.00062	0.623	-.023			-.03783	0.696
Duration in Program	.348	.12081	.00022	0.218	-.010			-.00100	0.111
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.348	.12114	.00032	0.212	.009			-.00268	0.212
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.348	.12130	.00016	0.163	-.007			.00257	0.163

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062, p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 26

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (FIRST ANALYSIS)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.023	.00053	.00053	0.480	.023	.00059	0.123	-.00089	0.242
Number of Previous Petitions	.082	.03317	.03264	30.313	.180	.03450	6.456	.03396	6.242
School Behavior Problems	.186	.03441	.00124	1.151	-.031	-.06131	3.890	-.07989	6.119
Source of Family Income	.190	.03592	.00151	1.408	.037	.03121	1.163	.02635	0.830
Previous Corr. Inst.	.213	.04542	.00949	8.902	.160	.02387	2.844	.01967	1.926
Present Petition A	.241	.05804	.01262	11.979	-.177	-.02889	4.300	-.02823	3.934
Present Petition B	.243	.05882	.00078	0.744	.051	.01720	0.711	.01896	0.852
Present Petition C	.251	.06280	.00397	3.781	-.084	-.04544	6.016	-.04867	6.700
Current Remand	.268	.07207	.00927	8.905	.148	.08818	8.855	.09346	10.037
Family Intactness	.270	.07292	.00085	0.812	.012	.03151	1.382	.03308	1.512
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.270	.07292	.00000	0.001	-.010	.00077	0.001	-.00179	0.004
Last Grade Completed	.278	.07755	.00463	4.458	-.053	-.02507	4.519	-.02491	4.357

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 26

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (FIRST ANALYSIS)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.286	.08175	.00420	4.055	-.081	-.06629	5.659	-.06048	4.715
Employment	.287	.08212	.00038	0.364	.036	-.01284	0.253	-.01855	0.529
Referral County	.289	.08356	.00143	1.383	.042	.00840	0.072	.00662	0.045
Ethnicity A	.295	.08711	.00355	3.439	.074	.05571	3.183	.05844	3.514
Ethnicity B	.295	.08729	.00018	0.171	-.015	.01759	0.171	.01566	0.137
Type of Program A	.298	.08890	.00162	1.570	-.094			-.02981	1.937
Type of Program B	.299	.08912	.00022	0.211	-.020			-.00689	0.126
Discharge Status A	.309	.09555	.00643	6.255	.080			.15146	8.570
Discharge Status B	.310	.09609	.00054	0.527	-.013			.04453	0.481
Duration in Program	.314	.09848	.00239	2.332	-.068			-.00036	0.007
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.324	.10475	.00626	6.208	.007			-.02049	6.208
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.324	.10487	.00013	0.123	-.016			-.00316	0.123

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062, p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 27

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (SECOND ANALYSIS)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Arrests	.457	.20868	.20868	237.073	.457	.07860	21.082	.07718	20.145
Serious Arrest	.468	.21949	.01081	12.441	.407	.04502	0.742	.03217	0.375
Arrest for Drug Offense	.488	.23837	.01888	22.233	.159	-.09332	4.763	-.08392	3.809
Arrest for Robbery	.491	.24062	.00225	2.651	.277	.10985	6.026	.11307	6.355
Arrest for Burglary	.492	.24252	.00191	2.252	.300	.09333	4.440	.09848	4.918
Arrest for Grand Larceny	.495	.24537	.00285	3.372	.251	.10222	4.298	.10668	4.659
Arrest	.497	.24682	.00145	1.718	.407	.05809	1.864	.05973	1.965

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 27

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (SECOND ANALYSIS)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.499	.24863	.00182	2.155	.023	.00060	0.160	-.00028	0.030
Number of Previous Petitions	.508	.25806	.00943	11.327	.180	.02506	4.286	.02599	4.548
School Behavior Problems	.512	.26227	.00420	5.070	-.031	-.06775	5.967	-.07433	6.570
Source of Family Income	.512	.26255	.00029	0.347	.037	-.00335	0.017	-.00469	0.032
Previous Corr. Inst.	.513	.26335	.00080	0.964	.160	.00488	0.148	.00378	0.088
Present Petition A	.517	.26760	.00424	5.138	-.177	-.01383	1.225	-.01656	1.665
Present Petition B	.517	.26770	.00011	0.127	.051	.01067	0.341	.00806	0.189
Present Petition C	.521	.27122	.00352	4.274	-.084	-.03811	5.311	-.03966	5.512
Current Remand	.525	.27611	.00489	5.975	.148	.06640	6.311	.06927	6.849
Family Intactness	.526	.27624	.00013	0.153	.012	.01562	0.428	.01593	0.436
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.526	.27656	.00032	0.394	-.010	.01212	0.221	.00965	0.139
Last Grade Completed	.529	.27946	.00290	3.545	-.053	-.01771	2.816	-.01846	2.956

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 27

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (SECOND ANALYSIS)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.531	.28246	.00300	3.682	-.081	-.04696	3.554	-.04596	3.376
Employment	.532	.28307	.00061	0.744	.036	-.01885	0.685	-.02156	0.887
Referral County	.532	.28323	.00016	0.191	.042	-.01603	0.323	-.01632	0.331
Ethnicity A	.532	.28339	.00017	0.203	.074	.01320	0.220	.01636	0.335
Ethnicity B	.532	.28342	.00002	0.027	-.015	.00628	0.027	.00523	0.019
Type of Program A	.532	.28349	.00007	0.091	-.094			.00393	0.041
Type of Program B	.532	.28349	.00000	0.004	-.020			.00103	0.003
Discharge Status A	.534	.28504	.00155	1.891	.080			.07813	2.806
Discharge Status B	.534	.28514	.00009	0.113	-.013			.01453	0.063
Duration in Program	.536	.28710	.00197	2.402	-.068			-.00185	0.234
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.536	.28713	.00003	0.039	-.016			-.00160	0.039
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.538	.28946	.00233	2.852	.007			-.01249	2.852

Footnote--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test), $p<.025$ (one-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test), $p<.005$ (one-tailed test).
For N=1002 and Simple r=.062, p=.05 (two-tailed test). For N=891 and Simple r=.066, p=.05 (two-tailed test).
No N on which simple correlations were based was lower than 891.

TABLE 28

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT VARIABLES

Predictor	Commitment	Narcotic	Local	State	Serious Local	Serious
Number of Previous Petitions	X			X		X
Principal Source of Family Income		X				
School Behavior Problems				X		X
Previous Correctional Institutionalization	X	X		X		
Present Petition A	X		X		X	X
Present Petition B					X	
Present Petition C						X
Current Remand	X		X		X	X
Last Grade Completed						X
Current School Status	X			X		X
Employment	X		X			
Referral County		X	X	X	X	
Ethnicity A	X	X			X	
Type of Program	X	X				
Discharge Status A	X			X		X
Discharge Status A and Duration of Program	X			X		X

TABLE 29

MEAN VALUES AND PERCENTAGES ON SELECTED VARIABLES BY REFERRAL COUNTY

Variables	NYC (N=446) Mean	N[1]	Outside NYC (N=608) Mean	N
Age	16.22	446	16.56	605
Number of Previous Petitions	1.06	425	0.81	571
Length of Previous Correctional Inst.	0.90	427	0.50	581
Last Grade Completed	8.44	392	8.56	554
Number of Arrests[2]	1.07	446	0.61	608
	%	N	%	N
School Behavior Problems (Yes)	88	425	74	578
Source of Family Income (External Assistance)	37	395	16	565
Previous Correctional Institution (Yes)	51	427	30	581
Current Remand (In Remand)	30	436	19	584
Family Intactness (Yes)	26	439	31	587
Noncorrectional Institution (Yes)	19	425	25	585
Current School Status (Enrolled)	83	417	58	573
Employment (Previous Work Experience)	64	409	70	579
Ethnicity: Black	62	434	21	588
Ethnicity: White	12	434	75	588
Ethnicity: Puerto Rican and Other	26	434	4	588
Present Petition: PINS[3]	47	434	29	581

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 29

MEAN VALUES AND PERCENTAGES ON SELECTED VARIABLES BY REFERRAL COUNTY

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	NYC (N=446) Mean	NYC (N=446) N[1]	Outside NYC (N=608) Mean	Outside NYC (N=608) N
	%	N	%	N
Present Petition: JD	34	434	23	581
Present Petition: YO[4]	8	434	29	581
Present Petition: None	12	434	20	581
Discharge Status: Nongraduate	30	443	28	601
Discharge Status: Withdrawal	9	443	7	601
Discharge Status: Graduate	61	443	65	601
Type of Program: Home	27	443	33	604
Type of Program: Camp	65	443	54	604
Type of Program: START	8	443	13	604
Arrest[5]	49	446	38	608
Serious Arrest	43	446	27	608
Arrest for Burglary	13	446	12	608
Arrest for Robbery	15	446	5	608
Arrest for Drug Offense	21	446	9	608
Arrest for Assaultive Acts	7	446	4	608
Arrest for Grand Larceny	10	446	5	608

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 29

MEAN VALUES AND PERCENTAGES ON SELECTED VARIABLES BY REFERRAL COUNTY

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	NYC (N=446)		Outside NYC (N=608)	
	Mean	N[1]	Mean	N
	%	N	%	N
Commitment	25	446	18	608
State Commitment	5	446	12	608
Local Commitment	17	446	6	608
Narcotic Commitment	8	446	2	608
Serious Commitment	17	446	13	608
Serious Local Commitment	14	446	2	608

[1]Due to missing data Ns will vary on individual variables.
[2]Post-discharge variable
[3]Includes Neglected Child
[4]Includes all other adjudications for youths over 16 years old.
[5]Post-discharge variable. Other post-discharge variables follow.

TABLE 30

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.118	.01385	.01385	4.958	.118	.00513	2.526	.00406	1.312
Number of Previous Petitions	.250	.06250	.04865	18.268	.206	.03695	2.985	.03662	2.874
School Behavior Problems	.250	.06255	.00005	0.018	-.007	.00824	0.016	.01671	0.060
Source of Family Income	.252	.06349	.00094	0.351	.021	.00562	0.018	.00712	0.028
Previous Corr. Inst.	.260	.06744	.00395	1.479	.138	.00230	0.010	.00163	0.005
Present Petition A	.335	.11195	.04450	17.439	-.294	-.07618	7.392	-.06625	5.144
Present Petition B	.335	.11253	.00058	0.226	.135	.00324	0.005	.01344	0.083
Present Petition C	.340	.11567	.00315	1.231	-.170	-.04541	1.746	-.05482	2.429
Current Remand	.358	.12811	.01244	4.923	.159	.10456	4.826	.10798	5.065
Family Intactness	.358	.12831	.00020	0.079	-.009	-.00299	0.004	-.00231	0.002
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.359	.12908	.00076	0.301	-.002	.02430	0.221	.02886	0.300
Last Grade Completed	.362	.13137	.00229	0.901	-.008	-.01799	0.685	-.01766	0.630

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 30

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.364	.13214	.00078	0.305	-.097	-.03602	0.432	-.02530	0.203
Employment	.365	.13333	.00119	0.468	.032	-.02286	0.300	-.02605	0.382
Ethnicity A	.370	.13679	.00345	1.357	.092	.10538	3.010	.09964	2.621
Ethnicity B	.375	.14099	.00420	1.652	-.029	.08609	1.652	.08388	1.537
Type of Program A	.377	.14212	.00113	0.444	-.102			-.02501	0.417
Type of Program B	.380	.14454	.00242	0.950	-.089			-.03888	1.103
Discharge Status A	.381	.14546	.00093	0.364	.013			.04280	0.184
Discharge Status B	.385	.14848	.00302	1.184	-.072			-.04470	0.125
Duration in Program	.387	.15004	.00156	0.612	-.011			.00083	0.008
Duration X Dis. Stat A	.392	.15353	.00349	1.368	-.046			-.01705	1.394
Duration X Dis. Stat B	.392	.15363	.00010	0.040	-.047			-.00420	0.040

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).

TABLE 31

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.022	.00048	.00048	0.255	-.022	-.00197	0.975	-.00318	2.330
Number of Previous Petitions	.152	.02318	.02270	12.387	.148	.03239	3.242	.03740	4.272
School Behavior Problems	.166	.02746	.00428	2.341	-.060	-.08166	5.346	-.11939	10.639
Source of Family Income	.171	.02928	.00183	0.999	.040	.06192	2.090	.05996	2.009
Previous Corr. Inst.	.213	.04542	.01614	8.960	.169	.04127	5.091	.02884	2.471
Present Petition A	.218	.04760	.00218	1.210	-.093	-.00566	0.113	-.01117	0.432
Present Petition B	.219	.04786	.00025	0.141	-.022	.00524	0.049	.01044	0.194
Present Petition C	.223	.04961	.00176	0.974	-.033	-.02645	1.353	-.02376	1.062
Current Remand	.238	.05649	.00688	3.836	.133	.07738	3.852	.08050	4.278
Family Intactness	.247	.06121	.00472	2.641	.034	.05489	2.668	.05388	2.595
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.248	.06146	.00024	0.136	-.014	-.01148	0.105	-.01912	0.296
Last Grade Completed	.262	.06877	.00732	4.109	-.084	-.02696	3.625	-.02697	3.616

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 31

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.278	.07724	.00847	4.789	-.105	-.07300	5.084	-.06806	4.519
Employment	.278	.07726	.00002	0.011	.049	.00156	0.002	-.01704	0.258
Ethnicity A	.280	.07854	.00128	0.722	.031	.02854	0.568	.04181	1.242
Ethnicity B	.282	.07925	.00071	0.401	-.029	-.04957	0.401	-.04396	0.324
Type of Program A	.286	.08188	.00263	1.484	-.086			-.03480	1.777
Type of Program B	.287	.08227	.00039	0.218	.025			.01262	0.304
Discharge Status A	.322	.10354	.02127	12.244	.135			.19821	10.329
Discharge Status B	.334	.11142	.00788	4.569	.037			.13488	2.826
Duration in Program	.338	.11403	.00261	1.512	-.109			-.00132	0.077
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.346	.11967	.00565	3.290	.050			-.01895	3.339
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.346	.11979	.00012	0.067	.000			-.00254	0.067

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).

TABLE 32

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Number of Arrests	.534	.28476	.28476	140.541	.534	.09105	15.978	.09061	15.098
Arrest for Grand Larceny	.542	.29423	.00946	4.720	.334	.16017	5.192	.16286	5.223
Arrest for Robbery	.552	.30517	.01095	5.531	.322	.10860	3.436	.10913	3.401
Arrest for Burglary	.555	.30846	.00329	1.664	.284	.05950	0.813	.06870	1.051
Arrest for Assaultive Acts	.556	.30885	.00038	0.194	.148	-.02331	0.112	-.02092	0.088
Serious Arrest	.556	.30896	.00011	0.056	.432	.00943	0.011	.00261	0.001
Arrest	.556	.30924	.00028	0.141	.408	-.00653	0.008	-.00474	0.004
Arrest for Drug Offence	.556	.30956	.00032	0.160	.249	-.00240	0.002	-.00207	0.001

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 32

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.569	.32339	.01382	7.053	.118	.00509	3.254	.00443	2.025
Number of Previous Petitions	.583	.33994	.01655	8.624	.206	.02589	1.938	.02612	1.922
School Behavior Problems	.584	.34077	.00083	0.434	-.007	-.02624	0.217	-.01486	0.062
Source of Family Income	.584	.34107	.00030	0.157	.021	-.03112	0.724	-.02560	0.471
Previous Corr. Inst.	.584	.34149	.00042	0.218	.138	-.00471	0.053	-.00216	0.010
Present Petition A	.599	.35876	.01727	9.157	-.294	-.05326	4.682	-.05374	4.385
Present Petition B	.599	.35880	.00004	0.021	.135	-.00411	0.011	-.00450	0.012
Present Petition C	.600	.35982	.00101	0.534	-.170	-.02685	0.806	-.03120	1.031
Current Remand	.604	.36438	.00457	2.422	.159	.06538	2.461	.06592	2.445
Family Intactness	.604	.36541	.00102	0.541	-.009	-.02300	0.337	-.02281	0.316
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.605	.36563	.00023	0.121	-.002	.01236	0.076	.01396	0.092
Last Grade Completed	.606	.36689	.00126	0.662	-.008	-.01219	0.417	-.01396	0.518

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 32

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Current School Status	.606	.36694	.00005	0.024	-.097	-.01234	0.066	-.01200	0.059
Employment	.607	.36830	.00137	0.718	.032	-.02771	0.581	-.02778	0.569
Ethnicity A	.607	.36875	.00045	0.234	.092	.06334	1.429	.06278	1.361
Ethnicity B	.609	.37137	.00262	1.377	-.029	.06905	1.377	.06946	1.359
Type of Program A	.610	.37202	.00065	0.339	-.102			.01887	0.309
Type of Program B	.610	.37249	.00047	0.245	-.089			-.02059	0.400
Discharge Status A	.611	.37387	.00138	0.720	.013			-.03378	0.149
Discharge Status B	.613	.37548	.00161	0.840	-.072			-.03757	0.116
Duration in Program	.614	.37684	.00136	0.711	-.011			-.00309	0.154
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.614	.37695	.00011	0.058	-.046			-.00390	0.094
Duration x Dis.Stat B	.614	.37712	.00017	0.086	-.047			-.00536	0.086

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p<.01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p<.05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p<.10$ (two-tailed test).

TABLE 33

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Arrest	.407	.16555	.16555	105.945	.407	.10196	3.461	.10315	3.549
Arrest for Burglary	.430	.18448	.01893	12.373	.310	.06950	1.001	.07965	1.308
Arrest for Robbery	.451	.20305	.01857	12.396	.228	.12270	2.563	.12939	2.844
Arrest for Drug Offense	.462	.21344	.01038	7.010	.046	-.22976	9.952	-.20362	7.474
Number of Arrests	.475	.22517	.01173	8.024	.389	.06722	6.466	.06323	5.717
Serious Arrest	.480	.23053	.00537	3.689	.385	.11680	2.099	.08909	1.204
Arrest for Grand Larceny	.480	.23059	.00005	0.037	.160	.00710	0.009	.00775	0.010
Age	.481	.23104	.00046	0.313	-.022	-.00168	0.872	-.00251	1.721
Number of Previous Petitions	.487	.23741	.00636	4.390	.148	.02229	1.866	.02589	2.424
School Behavior Problems	.493	.24308	.00567	3.935	-.060	-.07708	5.830	-.09885	8.635
Arrest for Assaultive Acts	.493	.24310	.00002	0.015	.172	-.01840	0.052	-.01002	0.015

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 33

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Source of Family Income	.493	.24328	.00017	0.120	.040	.03810	0.970	.03749	0.937
Previous Corr. Inst.	.496	.24582	.00254	1.760	.169	.01156	0.468	.00547	0.102
Present Petition A	.496	.24588	.00006	0.039	-.093	.00244	0.026	-.00140	0.008
Present Petition B	.496	.24589	.00001	0.005	-.022	.00842	0.150	.00997	0.205
Present Petition C	.498	.24835	.00246	1.700	-.033	-.02737	1.778	-.02726	1.666
Current Remand	.505	.25461	.00626	4.350	.133	.07270	4.181	.07547	4.499
Family Intactness	.506	.25562	.00101	0.704	.034	.03030	0.980	.03183	1.065
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.506	.25610	.00048	0.330	-.014	.01709	0.283	.01284	0.157
Last Grade Completed	.510	.25975	.00366	2.545	-.084	-.01701	1.726	-.01746	1.759
Current School Status	.515	.26567	.00591	4.140	-.105	-.06038	4.241	-.05829	3.937
Employment	.516	.26613	.00046	0.324	.049	-.02127	0.490	-.02995	0.949

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 33

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple r	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Ethnicity A	.516	.26641	.00027	0.191	.031	-.01960	0.314	-.00892	0.064
Ethnicity B	.517	.26766	.00125	0.874	-.029	-.06608	0.874	-.06085	0.741
Type of Program A	.518	.26821	.00055	0.387	-.086			-.01646	0.460
Type of Program B	.518	.26843	.00021	0.148	.025			.00890	0.177
Discharge Status A	.525	.27534	.00691	4.847	.135			.10997	3.722
Discharge Status B	.526	.27709	.00175	1.228	.037			.04636	0.393
Duration in Program	.528	.27857	.00148	1.039	-.109			-.00222	0.261
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.530	.28081	.00223	1.569	.050			-.01135	1.411
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.530	.28086	.00005	0.037	.000			.00171	0.037

Note--For all F-values above 6.70, $p < .01$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 3.86, $p < .05$ (two-tailed test).
For all F-values above 2.73, $p < .10$ (two-tailed test).

TABLE 34

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED VARIABLES
WITH ARREST AND SERIOUS ARREST BY REFERRAL COUNTY

VARIABLE	Correlation With Arrest		Correlation With Serious Arrest	
	NYC Referral	Others	NYC Referral	Others
Source of Family Income	.10	.04	.10	.04
Previous Correctional Institution	.14	.16	.16	.16
Present Petition A	-.20	-.11	-.22	-.13
Current School Status	-.08	-.08	-.10	-.10
Ethnicity A	.13	.13	.11	.13
Type of Program A	-.16	-.17	-.15	-.16
Discharge Status A	.00	.13	.00	.16
Interaction: Discharge Status A x Duration in Program	-.05	.07	-.07	.10

TABLE 35

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

(Continued on following page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.036	.00133	.00133	0.469	-.036	-.00506	1.302	-.00728	2.247
Number of Previous Petitions	.118	.01401	.01268	4.528	.116	.00040	0.000	-.00054	0.000
School Behavior Problems	.128	.01627	.00226	0.808	.060	.07276	0.670	.05242	0.314
Source of Family Income	.160	.02550	.00923	3.314	.102	.10289	3.220	.09656	2.761
Previous Corr. Inst.	.193	.03744	.01194	4.329	.143	.04020	1.548	.03638	1.214
Present Petition A	.246	.06038	.02294	8.497	-.196	-.07611	3.908	-.06032	2.269
Present Petition B	.246	.06040	.00001	0.005	.125	-.01147	0.035	.00144	0.001
Present Petition C	.248	.06140	.00101	0.372	-.071	-.02716	0.330	-.03961	0.675
Current Remand	.251	.06280	.00140	0.514	.092	.04291	0.430	.05382	0.669
Family Intactness	.253	.06409	.00129	0.475	-.043	-.02537	0.166	-.03159	0.247
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.259	.06722	.00312	1.149	.014	.07022	0.978	.08122	1.262
Last Grade Completed	.260	.06734	.00013	0.046	-.047	-.01471	0.243	-.01367	0.201
Current School Status	.270	.07282	.00547	2.013	-.085	-.10920	2.104	-.09579	1.552
Employment	.271	.07335	.00054	0.197	.053	.03190	0.309	.02875	0.247

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 35

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM NEW YORK CITY)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Ethnicity A	.300	.08998	.01662	6.193	.131	.07999	0.918	.06922	0.673
Ethnicity B	.304	.09215	.00217	0.808	-.129	-.08273	0.808	-.09186	0.981
Type of Program A	.314	.09879	.00664	2.484	-.156			-.08420	2.518
Type of Program B	.316	.09960	.00081	0.303	.006			-.03042	0.359
Discharge Status A	.316	.09961	.00001	0.002	.000			.12404	0.823
Discharge Status B	.316	.09969	.00008	0.031	-.029			.03048	0.031
Duration in Program	.322	.10394	.00426	1.581	-.010			-.00174	0.020
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.331	.10962	.00568	2.118	-.054			-.02861	2.087
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.331	.10969	.00006	0.024	-.007			-.00441	0.024

TABLE 36

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.036	.00131	.00131	0.698	.036	.00155	0.300	.00017	0.003
Number of Previous Petitions	.125	.01554	.01424	7.708	.122	.02578	1.016	.02472	0.919
School Behavior Problems	.135	.01816	.00262	1.418	.047	.01374	0.075	-.04215	0.653
Source of Family Income	.144	.02078	.00262	1.422	.042	.07482	1.509	.07529	1.560
Previous Corr. Inst.	.191	.03648	.01570	8.638	.161	.06785	6.805	.05398	4.263
Present Petition A	.200	.03997	.00348	1.920	-.113	-.01281	0.287	-.01280	0.280
Present Petition B	.201	.04046	.00049	0.270	-.047	-.00032	0.000	.01488	0.194
Present Petition C	.203	.04111	.00065	0.357	.027	.01540	0.227	.02077	0.400
Current Remand	.203	.04132	.00021	0.113	.070	.03079	0.302	.03312	0.357
Family Intactness	.224	.05015	.00883	4.880	.085	.09427	3.892	.09756	4.189
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.240	.05746	.00731	4.066	-.099	-.08775	3.031	-.09796	3.824
Last Grade Completed	.241	.05789	.00043	0.239	-.021	-.01378	0.468	-.01297	0.412
Current School Status	.245	.06000	.00211	1.172	-.083	-.05989	1.693	-.05309	1.354
Employment	.248	.06133	.00134	0.742	.076	.04255	0.794	.01936	0.164

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 36

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Ethnicity A	.276	.07621	.01487	8.373	.129	.15145	7.910	.16014	8.972
Ethnicity B	.276	.07645	.00024	0.136	-.032	-.04104	0.136	-.04355	0.157
Type of Program A	.297	.08844	.01199	6.813	-.169			-.09919	7.111
Type of Program B	.298	.08896	.00052	0.296	-.029			-.01288	0.156
Discharge Status A	.324	.10466	.01570	9.048	.128			.21949	6.239
Discharge Status B	.333	.11088	.00622	3.603	.026			.22925	4.020
Duration in Program	.333	.11103	.00015	0.089	-.101			.00287	0.179
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.334	.11182	.00078	0.453	.072			-.01252	0.718
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.337	.11333	.00152	0.875	-.025			-.01302	0.875

TABLE 37

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM N.Y.C.)

(Continued on following page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.016	.00024	.00024	0.086	-.016	-0.00312	0.508	-0.00534	1.248
Number of Previous Petitions	.129	.01663	.01639	5.866	.129	0.00061	0.000	0.00018	0.000
School Behabior Problems	.151	.02289	.00626	2.248	.087	0.11292	1.661	0.11113	1.463
Source of Family Income	.179	.03194	.00905	3.272	.100	0.10123	3.207	0.09178	2.583
Previous Corr. Inst.	.214	.04574	.01380	5.048	.155	0.03773	1.403	0.03584	1.220
Present Petition A	.272	.07403	.02828	10.629	-.220	-0.08537	5.058	-0.07121	3.274
Present Petition B	.272	.07403	.00000	0.000	.127	-0.01153	0.036	-0.00171	0.001
Present Petition C	.274	.07483	.00081	0.302	-.075	-0.02739	0.346	-0.03644	0.591
Current Remand	.282	.07936	.00453	1.696	.127	0.08134	1.591	0.09268	2.056
Family Intactness	.282	.07950	.00014	0.053	-.019	0.00377	0.004	0.00335	0.003
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.286	.08199	.00249	0.931	-.001	0.06061	0.750	0.06969	0.963
Last Grade Completed	.287	.08237	.00038	0.141	-.050	-0.01593	0.293	-0.01515	0.255
Current School Status	.299	.08938	.00701	2.624	-.105	-0.12298	2.746	-0.11575	2.346
Employment	.299	.08946	.00008	0.029	.050	0.01538	0.074	0.01329	0.055

TABLE 37

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Ethnicity A	.316	.09983	.01038	3.908	.107	0.07899	0.921	0.07633	0.848
Ethnicity B	.317	.10037	.00054	0.201	-.096	-0.04073	0.201	0.04284	0.221
Type of Program A	.323	.10426	.00389	1.464	-.154			-0.06113	1.375
Type of Program B	.324	.10513	.00087	0.325	.000			-0.03014	0.365
Discharge Status A	.324	.10518	.00005	0.019	.001			0.23491	3.058
Discharge Status B	.324	.10529	.00011	0.042	-.026			0.08251	0.235
Duration in Program	.328	.10785	.00256	0.957	-.007			0.00737	0.368
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.351	.12333	.01548	5.862	-.075			-0.04683	5.791
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.351	.12352	.00019	0.071	-.003			-0.00750	0.071

TABLE 38

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued on following page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.050	.00251	.00251	1.344	.050	.00085	0.107	-.00098	0.131
Number of Previous Petitions	.155	.02415	.02164	11.820	.151	.04016	2.931	.04242	3.257
School Behavior Problems	.158	.02491	.00076	0.414	.022	-.01593	0.120	-.06852	2.077
Source of Family Income	.165	.02711	.00220	1.200	.037	.06273	1.262	.06244	1.291
Previous Corr. Inst.	.200	.04017	.01306	7.212	.162	.05439	5.200	.03729	2.448
Present Petition A	.211	.04467	.00450	2.491	-.131	-.02087	0.904	-.02398	1.181
Present Petition B	.217	.04715	.00249	1.379	-.077	-.02125	0.470	-.00802	0.068
Present Petition C	.220	.04836	.00121	0.670	.035	.02490	0.705	.03112	1.080
Current Remand	.220	.04862	.00026	0.142	.051	-.01428	0.077	-.01281	0.064
Family Intactness	.230	.05304	.00442	2.450	.064	.06338	2.091	.06819	2.463
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.243	.05881	.00577	3.212	-.088	-.06949	2.260	-.08189	3.217
Last Grade Completed	.243	.05885	.00004	0.023	.000	-.00542	0.086	-.00748	0.165
Current School Status	.252	.06342	.00457	2.549	-.104	-.07952	3.549	-.07465	3.223
Employment	.252	.06361	.00019	0.104	.066	.01631	0.139	-.00661	0.023

TABLE 38

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS ARREST (REFERRALS FROM OUTSIDE N.Y.C.)

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Ethnicity A	.282	.07957	.01596	9.017	.129	.14512	8.635	.15550	10.181
Ethnicity B	.282	.07967	.00010	0.056	-.026	-.02421	0.056	-.02745	0.075
Type of Program A	.299	.08934	.00966	5.497	-.165			-.08136	5.757
Type of Program B	.302	.09138	.00205	1.164	-.060			-.02769	0.868
Discharge Status A	.339	.11500	.02362	13.774	.157			.22393	7.815
Discharge Status B	.353	.12444	.00943	5.549	.026			.24122	5.357
Duration in Program	.353	.12492	.00048	0.280	-.116			.00132	0.046
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.354	.12546	.00055	0.321	.096			-.01010	0.562
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.356	.12706	.00160	0.936	-.026			-.01228	0.936

F 103
Revised 1/69

Appendix A
INTAKE BUREAU DATA FORM

YOUTH'S NAME _____ DATE ASSIGNED _____
LAST FIRST

INTAKE WORKER _____

1-5. Log Number __ __ __ __ __

6-9. Referral Date __ __ ( ) __ __
Month Day Year

10. Deck # 1

11-12. Referral County __ __

(_____)
(County)

13. Type of Referral Agency __
1. Family Court
2. Criminal Court
3. Supreme Court
4. Other Court
5. Police Department
6. School
7. Youth Board
8. Dept. of Welfare
9. Social Agency
0. Self-or parental referral

14. Type __
1. Voluntary
2. Probation

15. Sex __
1. Male
2. Female

16-21. Birthdate __ __/ __ __/ __ __
Month Day Year

22-23. Age at referral date __ __

24. Race or ethnic group __
1. White
2. Negro
3. Puerto Rican
4. Oriental
5. American Indian
6. Other

25. Religion __
1. Roman Catholic
2. Greek Orthodox
3. Protestant
4. Jewish
5. Other
6. None

26. Present Petition or status __
1. Person in Need of Supervision (PINS)
2. Juvenile Delinquent (J.D. or D.C.)
3. Wayward Minor (W.M.)
4. Youthful Offender (Y.O.)
5. Convicted of criminal charge
6. Neglected Child (N.C.)
0. None

27-28. Current Complaint __ __
00. None
11. Murder or Manslaughter
12. Forcible Rape
13. Other Sex Offense(s)
14. Robbery
15. Assault
16. Burglary-Breaking, Entering
17. Auto Theft
18. Other Larceny
19. Weapons-Carrying, Possessing
20. Violation of Drug Laws
21. Disorderly Conduct
22. Vandalism
23. Traffic Offense(s)
24. Other Felony or Misdemeanor
31. Running Away
32. Truancy
33. Ungovernable Behavior
34. Possession or Drinking of Liquor
41. Neglect

29. Current Legal Status __
1. Probation- no V.O.P.* Order
2. Probation- V.O.P. Order
3. Probation Intake
4. Referred prior to final disposition
0. None of the above
(*V.O.P.- " Violation of Probation" Order)

30. Current Remand __
0. No
1. Yes

31. # of Previous Petitions
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three or more

Note.--Items and codes from intake and discharge forms used in this study are as given in the forms of Appendix A, with the exception of codes designating facility, which correspond to the facilities in existence during the time of the

32. Total # of Previous Arrests __
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five or more

33. Previous Correction Institution __
0. None
1. Remand or Detention
2. City Reformatory
3. State Training School
4. State Reformatory
5. State Prison
6. State Hospital for Criminally Insane
7. Work House
8. Other Institution

34. Length of Correctional Institution __
0. None
1. Less than one month
2. One month to six months
3. Over six months to 1 year
4. Over 1 year to 2 years
5. Over 2 years to 5 years
6. Over 5 years

35. Previous other Institutionalization __
0. None
1. Child-caring Institution
2. Mental Hospital
3. Foster Home
4. Other Hospital
5. State School
6. Other Institution
7. Residential Treatment Center

36. Length of other Institutionalization __
0. None
1. Less than one month
2. One month to six months
3. Over six months to 1 year
4. Over 1 year to 2 years
5. Over 2 years to 5 years
6. Over five years

37. Number of Foster Placements __
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five or more

38. I.Q. Range __
1. Very Superior (130+)
2. Superior (120-129)
3. Bright Normal (110-119)
4. Normal or Average (90-109)
5. Dull Normal (80-89)
6. Borderline (70-79)
7. Defective (69 and below)

39. Last Grade Completed __
1. Sixth Grade or less
2. Seventh Grade
3. Eighth Grade
4. Ninth Grade
5. Tenth Grade
6. Eleventh Grade or Higher
7. Ungraded "600" School
8. C.R.M.D.
9. Other Ungraded Class

40. School Behavior Problems __
0. None
1. Truancy Only
2. Acting-Out Behavior Only
3. Truancy and Acting-Out Behavior

41. Current School Status __
1. Enrolled Day School
2. Enrolled Night School
3. Drop-Out
4. Suspended
5. Expelled
6. Exempted for Medical Reasons

42. Current Employment Status __
0. Unemployed
1. Employed Part-Time
2. Employed Full-Time

43. Previous Employment __
0. Never Worked
1. Part-Time Only
2. At least one full time job

44. Number of Jobs Held __
0. None
1. One
2. Two
3. Three
4. Four
5. Five or more

45. Length of time longest job held __
    0. Never Worked
    1. One Month or less
    2. Over 1 month to 3 months
    3. Over 3 months to six months
    4. Over 6 months to 1 year
    5. Over 1 year to 2 years
    6. Over 2 years

46. Currently Living With __
    0. Alone
    1. Both Natural Parents
    2. One Natural Parent-other deceased
    3. One Natural Parent-divorce, separated
    4. Relative(s)
    5. Foster Parent(s)/Guardian(s)
    6. Shelter, Orphange, Group Residence, Special School
    7. Institution
    8. Spouse
    9. "Y"

47. Mother-Figure in Home __
    0. None
    1. Natural Mother
    2. Step-Mother
    3. Adoptive Mother
    4. Relative
    5. Foster Mother (non-relative)

48. Father-Figure in Home __
    0. None
    1. Natural Father
    2. Step-Father
    3. Adoptive Father
    4. Relative
    5. Foster Father(non-relative)

49. Primary Source of Family Income __
    0. Not Applicable(group residence, institution)
    1. Father or Father-Figure
    2. Mother or Mother-Figure
    3. Both Parents (Parent Figures)
    4. Relatives in Household
    5. Relatives Outside of Household
    6. Public Assistance
    7. Private Assistance
    8. Self-Supporting

50. Annual Family Income __
    0. Not Applicable
    1. Under $3,000 per annum
    2. $3,000 to $3,999 per annum
    3. $ 4,000 to $4,999 per annum
    4. $5,000 to $5,999 per annum
    5. $6,000 to $6,999 per annum
    6. $7,000 to $7,999 per annum
    7. $8,000 to $9,999 per annum
    8. $10,000 and above per annum

51. Number of People Supported by Income ____
    0. Not Applicable
    1. One
    2. Two
    3. Three
    4. Four
    5. Five
    6. Six
    7. Seven
    8. Eight
    9. Nine or more

52-55. Date of Decision __ __ ( ) __ __
    Month Day Year

56. Type of Decision __
    1. Accepted
    5. Withdrawn: no show for interview(s)
    6. Withdrawn: requested additional information
    7. Withdrawn: New Offense
    8. Withdrawn: Other Reason(s)
    9. Rejected

57. Reasons for Rejection __
    0. Not Rejected
    1. Mental Retardation
    2. Physical Handicap
    3. Improper Age
    4. Homosexuality
    5. Drug Addiction
    6. Too Disturbed
    7. Extensive Prior Institutionalization
    8. Resistive to Placement
    9. Other Reason(s)

F-103
Rev. 3/70

Name of youth _____ Log Number __ __ __ __ __

Intake Worker _____

58-59. FACILITY IN WHICH PLACED __ __

11. Great Valley
12. Masonville (Camp Brace)
31. Buffalo Home
32. Syracuse Home (Ernie Davis)
33. Rochester Home
34. Nassau Home
41. Rensselaerville (Camp Cass)
42. Caroline Center (Camp MacCormick)
43. Camp Annsville
51. Middletown S.T.A.R.T. (Fitzgerald)
52. Auburn S.T.A.R.T. (Dugan)
61. New York City Home (Sheppard)
62. Bronx Home
82. Willowbrook S.T.A.R.T.
84. Brentwood S.T.A.R.T. (Lewisohn)
85. White Plains Home
86. Niagara S.T.A.R.T.

60-63. DATE OF FINAL DISPOSITION __ __ ( ) __ __
Month Day Year

64. FINAL DISPOSITION __

1. Admitted
2. Accepted-Withdrawn: new offense
3. Accepted-Withdrawn: other placement
4. Accepted-Withdrawn: other reason(s)

65. LENGTH OF TIME BETWEEN DECISION AND FINAL DISPOSITION __
(Accepted Cases only)

0. Two weeks or less
1. Over two weeks to one month
2. Over one month to two months
3. Over two months to three months
4. Over three months to four months
5. Over four months to five months
6. Over five months to six months
7. Over six months

66-70. FORMER LOG NUMBER # __ __ __ __ __
(For re-referrals only)

F-102
Rev 3/70

NOTICE OF DISCHARGE

Date_____

NAME OF YOUTH_____ BIRTHDATE_____
Last First Month Day Year

ADDRESS RETURNING TO:_____ PHONE #_____

CITY & STATE_____ COUNTY_____

1-5. LOG NUMBER __ __ __ __ __

6-9. DATE OF ADMISSION __ __ ( ) __ __
Month Day Year

10. DECK NUMBER 2

11-12. AGE AT ADMISSION __ __

13. TYPE OF ADMISSION __
1. New Admission
2. Transfer
4. Readmission from discharge

14-15. FACILITY __ __
11. Great Valley
12. Masonville (Camp Brace)
31. Buffalo Home
32. Syracuse Home (Ernie Davis)
33. Rochester Home
34. Nassau Home
41. Rensselaerville (Camp Cass)
42. Caroline Center (Camp MacCormick)
43. Camp Annsville
51. Middletown S.T.A.R.T. (Fitzgerald)
52. Auburn S.T.A.R.T. (Dugan)
61. New York City Home (Sheppard)
62. Bronx Home
82. Willowbrook S.T.A.R.T.
84. Brentwood S.T.A.R.T. (Lewisohn)
85. White Plains Home
86. Niagara S.T.A.R.T.

16-19. DATE OF DISCHARGE __ __ ( ) __ __
Month Day Year

20-21. AGE AT DISCHARGE __ __

22-23. LENGTH OF STAY IN PROGRAM IN MONTHS __ __

24. TYPE OF DISCHARGE __
0 Absconded
1. Parental Request
2. Removed by court action re: new offense
3. Dismissed by staff or returned to court
4. Completion of treatment
5. Enlisted in Armed Forces
6. Transfer to another Division Facility
7. Removed to Mental Hospital
8. Other_____
(Specify)

25. SUPERVISION STATUS AT DISCHARGE __
0. None - other than DFY Aftercare
1. Social Agency
2. Probation
3. Mental Hospital
4. Correctional Institution
5. Placed in remand - final disposition not available
6. Moved to a new jurisdiction
7. Other_____
(Specify)
8. Transfer to another Division Facility

26. RETURNED TO LIVE WITH __
0. Alone or with peer(s)
1. Parent(s)
2. No Information
3. Transfer to another Division Facility
4. Relatives
5. Foster parent(s) guardian(s)
6. Shelter orphanage special school
7. Correctional Institution
8. Spouse
9. Armed Forces
X. Mental Hospital

27-28. COUNTY RETURNED TO __ __

(_____)
(County)

APPENDIX B

TABLE 39

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF CASES FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cases
Age	196.917	8.67	1051
Number of Previous Petitions	.914	.98	1007
School Behavior Problems	.802	.40	1014
Source of Family Income	.243	.43	971
Previous Corr. Inst.	.664	.95	1019
Present Petition A	.055	1.00	1026
Present Petition B	.075	.68	1026
Present Petition C	.206	.70	1026
Current Remand	.239	.43	1031
Family Intactness	.290	.45	1037
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.224	.42	1021
Last Grade Completed	9.509	1.07	956
Current School Status	.689	.46	1000
Employment	.678	.47	998
Referral County	.427	.49	1065
Ethnicity A	.381	.49	1033
Ethnicity B	.136	.34	1033

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 39

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF CASES FOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cases
Type of Program A	.202	.59	1058
Type of Program B	.523	.66	1058
Discharge Status A	.289	.45	1055
Discharge Status B	.094	.29	1055
Duration in Program	6.602	4.00	1065
Duration x Dis. Stat A	1.165	2.44	1055
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.411	1.92	1055

APPENDIX C

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

Time Interval to First Arrest

The following table presents the time interval between discharge date and first (fingerprintable) arrest for dischargees of 1969 who were discharged above the age of 16 and had at least one arrest within 24 months of discharge. It appears in the context of this report as an exploration of a possible measure of recidivism. It is apparent from the table that with increased lapse of time from discharge, the numbers of those obtaining a first arrest tend to decrease. If it is assumed that an arrest is highly correlated with the commission of an offense, and that more than one offense may have occurred prior to a first arrest, the table suggests the importance of relatively early intervention after discharge to prevent a first offense.

The column marked P indicates the probability of an arrest (in the given interval) if a youth had no prior post-discharge arrest. This probability appears to decrease with time-since-discharge in the first year.[1] It is not clear whether the probability decreases further in the second year. Substantively, the finding suggests that, for the first year after discharge, the longer the time a youth manages to be free of a post-discharge arrest record, the less likely is it that he will acquire one in the immediate future.

---

[1]For example, knowing only that a youth has just been discharged, the probability of an arrest in the first 3 months after discharge is about one in eleven (.09). Knowing that he has had no arrest in the first 9 months after discharge, the probability of an arrest in the next 3 months is only about one in twenty (.05).

TABLE 40

NUMBER OF ARRESTEES BY INTERVAL BETWEEN DISCHARGE DATE AND FIRST ARREST AND BY DISCHARGE TYPE

Interval	Graduate N	Non-Graduate N	Withdrawal N	Total N	Total %	P^1
First 3 Months	27	16	3	46	23.2	.093
Above 3 to 6 Mo.	24	9	3	36	18.2	.080
Above 6 to 9 Mo.	23	8	5	36	18.2	.087
Above 9 to 12 Mo.	13	3	4	20	10.1	.053
Above 12 to 15 Mo.	12	4	1	17	8.6	.050
Above 15 to 18 Mo.	5	6	1	12	6.1	.037
Above 18 to 21 Mo.	11	4	1	16	8.1	.051
Above 21 to 24 Mo.	7	5	3	15	7.6	.051
Total	122	55	21	198	100.0	

Note--Ten subjects with an arrest prior to discharge were excluded. Ten subjects with missing or ambiguous information regarding Discharge Type or Discharge Date were also excluded. Exact Discharge and Arrest Dates (Day, Month, Year) were used. The number of subjects not arrested (one month before to 24 months after discharge) was 296.

^1P is the probability of a youth having a first arrest in the given interval if he has no post-discharge arrest prior to this interval. It represents the proportion of 1969 dischargees discharged after age 16 who have no prior post-discharge arrest and who have an arrest in the given interval. The N that is the basis for this statistic is 494. For example, after three months only 448 subjects (494 minus 46) can have a first arrest. Of these 36 were arrested. The proportion is therefore 36 divided by 448 or .080.

APPENDIX D

ORIGINAL RATIONALE FOR THE SEQUENCE OF VARIABLES

In the analysis of arrest, Format A, the first set consisted of Age at Admission in order to determine the effects of the remaining variables on arrest with age controlled. Sets 2 through 5 consisted of variables which previous study had suggested would be among the most predictive of arrest. It was considered desirable to control these variables before examining (a) the effects of variables which previous study had not indicated related to arrest in order to determine whether these variables would be found predictive when the major predictors of arrest were controlled, (b) the effects of Ethnicity and Referral County, which had been found related to arrest, in order to determine whether their effects would vanish when the major predictors were controlled. Within Sets 2 through 5 the variables referring to previous offense history are in the order of past to present, i.e., Previous Number of Petitions, and Previous Correctional Institutionalization precede Present Petition and Current Remand. Sets 6 through 9 represent social background or personal history variables of the youth. Set 6 referring to the youth's family situation (or its absence), and 7 referring to the youth's school and work history are considered to represent more specific types of influence than Sets 8 and 9 (Referral County, Ethnicity). Under the assumption that more global influences would have to be explained ultimately in terms of more specific types of influences, Sets 8 and 9 were placed after Sets 6 and 7. Set 10 represented a characteristic related to type

of program involvement and different in nature from the preceding variables which do not refer to program involvement.[1] It was therefore entered into the equation after the social background and personal history variables. Sets 11 through 14 also represent aspects of program involvement. Set 11 precedes Set 12 to accord with the time sequence represented by these variables (residing in a program preceding discharge) and Set 12 precedes Set 13 to test the effects of Duration in Program after controlling for Discharge Status.

---

[1] Not included in the present study.

APPENDIX E

CONTROLLING FOR ARREST VARIABLES IN ANALYSES OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT

In a number of analyses of serious commitment aspects of a youth's arrest record of the first two post-discharge years were controlled. For reasons of convenience (e.g., to avoid additional coding, punching and programming) the total two year period was used. It was assumed that the arrest record of the total two year period would approximate that portion of the arrest record occurring in the two year period that preceded a youth's first serious commitment. This assumption was evaluated using as subjects 1969 dischargees with discharges over the age of 16.

There were 79 subjects with at least one arrest in the two-year post-discharge period and at least one serious commitment. For 63 youths, (or 80% of the 79 subjects) all arrests occurring withing the two year post-discharge period did, in fact precede the youth's first serious (post-discharge) commitment.

For the remaining 16 subjects, all but one had at least one arrest occurring in the two year period and preceding the first serious commitment; and all but 7 had at least two arrests in the two year discharge period and preceding the first serious commitment. The number of arrests occurring after the first serious commitment but within the two year period was either 1 or 2 for all but three subjects.

There were also seven additional subjects with a serious commitment but without a recorded arrest for the two year period. For these subjects use of the complete two year period was equivalent to use of that part of

the two-year period preceding first serious commitment.

From these figures one may conclude that use of the complete two-year period approximated that portion of the arrest records of the youths within the two-year period that preceded serious commitment.

APPENDIX F

COMMITMENT AND ONE ARREST

In order to aid in the interpretation of results in the analyses of Number of Arrests a new variable called Commitment-One Arrest was created. The variable was defined as the presence of a commitment record in the post-discharge period and exactly one arrest in the two year post-discharge period (versus all other possibilities). A multiple regression analysis was performed to elicit the predictors of Commitment-One Arrest. It was presumed that youths who were confined after one arrest and who did not have a subsequent arrest (in the post-discharge period) may not have had a relatively high number of arrests (defined as two or more) because of their confinement. If the variable Number of Arrests was to be used as an indicator of the number of arrests expected of unconfined youths, it was thought that findings from the analyses called Number of Arrests, First Analysis (p. 35) and Number of Arrests, Second Analysis (p. 38) would have been distorted principally because of this group.

The percentage of subjects falling into the Commitment-One Arrest category was 7%. Among youths with at least one arrest it was 17%. The small percentage among all subjects suggests that there would not be too great distortion in Number of Arrests, First Analysis.

Results of the multiple regression analysis are given in Table 41. At Step R, the only significant unique predictor was Ethnicity A. The variable remained significant at Step E. Black youths (compared to white youths) were more likely to fall into the Commitment-One Arrest category. Assuming that some of these youths would have had more arrests if they

had not been committed, one would conclude that the predicted differences between blacks and whites for the variable Number of Arrests was an underestimation if Number of Arrests was used to indicate the expected number of arrests for unconfined youths. The regression weight of .06 indicates that black youths exceeded white youths in Commitment-One Arrest by 6 percentage points.

At Step R, approaching significance were Current School Status, Last Grade Completed and School Behavior Problems. At Step E Discharge Status A was significant with the interaction of Discharge Status A and Duration in Program approaching significance. The findings suggest that youths not enrolled in school at referral, with fewer grades completed, without school behavior problems, with both Nongraduate status and short program duration were more likely to fall into the Commitment-One Arrest group.

In Number of Arrests, First Analysis or Number of Arrests, Second Analysis the only characteristics of those listed above that emerged as significant predictors were Ethnicity A and Nongraduate Status. The "school" variables showed little predictiveness in the two analyses but the interaction of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program approached significance in Number of Arrest, First Analysis.

A reasonable inference from these findings is that if youths had not been confined after one arrest the predictors that emerged in the Number of Arrests analyses would have remained as predictors. Assuming that the "Commitment-One Arrest" youths would have had more arrests, the interaction term of Discharge Status A with Duration in Program might have reached significance in Number of Arrests, First Analysis and the difference between blacks and whites in both analyses would have been greater.

TABLE 41

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT-ONE ARREST

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Age	.028	.00077	.00077	0.682	.028	-.00032	0.063	-.00025	0.033
Number of Previous Petitions	.053	.00278	.00201	1.791	.044	-.00233	0.052	-.00257	0.062
School Behavior Problems	.064	.00416	.00138	1.231	-.040	-.04130	3.125	-.05394	4.877
Source of Family Income	.072	.00519	.00103	0.915	.028	.02657	1.482	.02213	1.020
Previous Corr. Inst.	.099	.00981	.00462	4.128	.080	.01426	1.787	.01359	1.605
Present Petition A	.123	.01509	.00529	4.744	-.091	-.01593	2.301	-.01508	1.953
Present Petition B	.127	.01620	.00111	0.992	-.026	-.01146	0.555	-.01014	0.424
Present Petition C	.128	.01644	.00024	0.218	-.034	-.00601	0.184	-.00554	0.151
Current Remand	.131	.01725	.00081	0.723	.057	.01836	0.674	.02017	0.812
Family Intactness	.135	.01810	.00085	0.761	.016	.02341	1.342	.02139	1.097
Previous Noncorr. Inst.	.135	.01819	.00009	0.081	.002	.00712	0.107	.00443	0.041
Last Grade Completed	.144	.02086	.00267	2.396	-.034	-.01526	2.937	-.01368	2.286
Current School Status	.157	.02474	.00388	3.486	-.076	-.03949	3.545	-.03696	3.077
Employment	.160	.02564	.00091	0.817	.059	.01953	1.028	.01596	0.680

(Continued on following page.)

TABLE 41

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF COMMITMENT-ONE ARREST

(Continued from previous page.)

Variables	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	F Entry	Simple R	B Step R	F Step R	B Step E	F Step E
Referral County	.160	.02571	.00006	0.056	-.023	-.02548	1.164	-.02817	1.407
Ethnicity A	.188	.03534	.00963	8.726	.073	.05932	6.364	.06243	6.997
Ethnicity B	.188	.03534	.00000	0.002	-.054	.00144	0.002	.00284	0.008
Type of Program A	.191	.03631	.00097	0.877	-.064			-.01676	1.062
Type of Program B	.194	.03780	.00149	1.349	.024			.01904	1.682
Discharge Status A	.201	.04023	.00244	2.207	.043			.08451	4.632
Discharge Status B	.202	.04091	.00068	0.619	-.001			.05928	1.481
Duration in Program	.202	.04100	.00009	0.081	-.031			.00243	0.560
Duration x Dis. Stat A	.209	.04351	.00250	2.740	.000			-.01031	2.740
Duration x Dis. Stat B	.210	.04427	.00076	0.689	-.014			-.00565	0.689

APPENDIX G

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Principal Source of Family Income	Public or Private Assistance vs. all others	10 points higher
Present Petition Status	No Petition vs. PINS	2 points higher
	JD vs. PINS	9 " "
	YO vs. PINS	10 " "
Previous Correctional Institutionalization	Less than One Month vs. None	5 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	10 " "
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	15 " "
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	12 points higher
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	9 points higher
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	8 points higher
	START vs. Home	20 points higher

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF SERIOUS ARREST*

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Principle Source of Family Income	Public or Private Assistance vs. all others	10 points higher
Present Petition Status	PINS vs. No Petition	0 points higher
	JD vs. No Petition	9 " "
	YO vs. No Petition	12
Previous Correctional Institutionalization	Less than One Month vs. None	5 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	9 " "
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	14 " "
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	11 points higher
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	9 points higher
Current School Status	Not Enrolled vs. Enrolled	9 points higher
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	6 points higher
	START vs. Home	18 " "
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	10 points higher
Discharge Status with Duration in Program	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	22.0 points higher minus 2.6 points for each month in program (of the Nongraduate)

* Arrest for burglary, robbery, drug offense, assaultive acts or grand larceny.

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF NUMBER OF ARRESTS

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Number of Arrests (with other variables controlled)
Previous Correctional Instution-alization	Less than One Month vs. None	.14 of an arrest more
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	.28 " " " "
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	.42 " " " "
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	.29 of an arrest more
Principle Source of Family Income	Public or Private Assistance vs. all others	.26 of an arrest more
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	.21 of an arrest more
Number of Previous Petitions	One vs. None	.09 of an arrest more
	Two vs. None	.18 " " " "
	Three vs. None	.27 " " " "
Present Petition	No Petitions vs. PINS	.12 of an arrest more
	YO vs. PINS	.24 " " " "
	JD vs. PINS	.34 " " " "
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	.16 of an arrest more
	START vs. Home	.62 " " " "
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	.20 of an arrest more

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST FOR BURGLARY

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Present Petition	PINS vs. No Petition	2 points higher
	JD vs. No Petition	10 " "
	YO vs. No Petition	4 " "
Current School Status	Not Enrolled vs. Enrolled	5 points higher
Discharge Status	Withdrawal vs. Graduate	8 points higher

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST FOR ROBBERY

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	11 points higher
Previous Correctional Instution-alization	Less than One Month vs. None	2.3 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	4.6 points higher
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	6.9 points higher

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST FOR DRUG OFFENSE

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	12 points higher
Ethnicity	Puerto Rican vs. White	8 points lower
	Puerto Rican vs. Black	9 " "
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	2 points higher
	START vs. Home	16 " "

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF ARREST FOR GRAND LARCENY

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Differences in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Ethnicity	Puerto Rican vs. White	10 points higher
	Puerto Rican vs. Black	9 " "
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	3 points higher
	START vs. Home	9 " "

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT

	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Number of Previous Petitions	One vs. None	3 points higher
	Two vs. None	6 " "
	Three vs. None	8 " "
Present Petition Status	No Petition vs. PINS	8 points higher
	YO vs. PINS	9 " "
	JD vs. PINS	12 " "
Current Remand	In Detention vs. Not in Detention	7 points higher
Current School Status	Not Enrolled vs. Enrolled	9 points higher
Previous Correctional Institutionalization	Less than One Month vs. None	4.7 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	9.4 " "
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	14.1 " "
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	7 points higher
Employment	Never Worked vs. Worked	6 points higher
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	3 points higher
	START vs. Home	11 " "
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	10 points higher
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	18.5 points higher minus 2.1 points for each month in program (of the Nongraduate)

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF NARCOTIC COMMITMENT

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Principle Source of Family Income	Public or Private Assistance vs. all others	3.6 points higher
Previous Correctional Institutionalization	Less than One Month vs. None	2.8 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	5.6 " "
	Over Six Months to One Year vs. None	8.4 " "
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	4.4 points higher
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	4.1 points higher
Type of Program	Camp vs. Home	1.7 points higher
	START vs. Home	6.6 " "

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF LOCAL COMMITMENT

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	9 points higher
Employment	Never Worked vs. Worked	6 points higher
Current Remand	In Detention vs. Not in Detention	7 points higher
Present Petition	No Petition vs. PINS	4 points higher
	YO vs. PINS	5 " "
	JD vs. PINS	11 " "

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF STATE COMMITMENT

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Number of Previous Petitions	One vs. None	3 points higher
	Two vs. None	6 " "
	Three vs. None	9 " "
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	7 points lower
School Behavior Problems	No vs. Yes	5 points higher
Current School Status	Not Enrolled vs. Enrolled	5 points higher
Previous Correctional Instutitionalization	Less than One Month vs. None	2.3 points higher
	One Month to Six Months vs. None	4.6 " "
	Over Six Months to One Year	6.9 " "
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	7 points higher
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	16 points higher minus 2.1 points for each month in program (of the Nongraduate)

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF SERIOUS LOCAL COMMITMENT

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Referral County	New York City vs. all others	9 points higher
Current Remand	In Detention vs. Not in Detention	7 points higher
Present Petition	YO vs. PINS	3 points higher
	No Petition vs. PINS	5 " "
	JD vs. PINS	11 " "
Ethnicity	Black vs. White	5 points higher

UNIQUE PREDICTORS OF SERIOUS COMMITMENT

Unique Predictor	Comparison	Predicted Difference in Percentage Points (with other variables controlled)
Number of Previous Petitions	One Petition vs. None	3.4 points higher
	Two Petitions vs. None	6.8 " "
	Three Petitions vs. None	10.2 " "
School Behavior Problems	No vs. Yes	6 points higher
Current Remand	In Detention vs. Not in Detention	9 points higher
Current School Status	Not Enrolled vs Enrolled	7 points higher
Last Grade Completed		2.5 points lower for each grade completed
Present Petition Status	No Petition vs. PINS	9 points higher
	YO vs. PINS	9 " "
	JD vs. PINS	12 " "
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	7 points higher
Discharge Status	Nongraduate vs. Graduate	15.1 points higher minus 2.0 points for each month in program (of the Nongraduate)

END