

National Criminal Justice Reference Service

ncjrs

This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS 1953-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41 CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

REPRODUCED UNDER
THE EMERGENCY
DOCUMENTS ACT
OF 1972

✓ THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RESTITUTION AS A SOLE SANCTION
AND AS A CONDITION OF PROBATION:
RESULTS FROM AN EXPERIMENT IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

By

Anne Larason Schneider

and

Peter R. Schneider

February, 1984

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJJDP/NIJ

U.S. Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

unding for this research was provided by Grant Nos. NJ-99-0005, 79-JH-AX-0009, and 82-JS-AX-0025 from the Office of Justice Administration and Research, National Institute of Juvenile Justice, Department of Justice, Washington D.C. to the Institute of Policy Analysis, Eugene, Oregon. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Department of Justice.

ABSTRACT

The Oklahoma County juvenile court was one of six selected from throughout the United States to participate in a major national experiment involving the use of restitution as a sanction for juvenile delinquents. Oklahoma county was selected because its approach to restitution emphasized accountability and individual responsibility by the offender and because they were one of only a handful of courts interested in using restitution as a sole sanction rather than as a condition of probation.

The experiment involved comparisons among three groups: sole sanction restitution, restitution and probation, and a control group comprised of juveniles who were on probation but for whom no restitution requirements were made.

The results of the experiment indicate that youths who were given restitution as a sentence, without the usual probationary requirements or supervision, were generally as successful in completing the restitution requirements as were those who also participated in a probationary program. Furthermore, the results showed that there were no differences in recidivism among the three groups which indicates that restitution, when imposed as a sole condition on the delinquent, is no more and no less effective than probationary requirements.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most profound changes in juvenile justice during the past decade has been the increased use of restitution as a sanction for juvenile offenders. Virtually every state now has legislation which permits the use of restitution either as a direct sanction or as a condition of probation and several states require that judges order restitution unless the youth can prove an inability to pay (1).

In 1976 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) undertook a major initiative to encourage the use of restitution in juvenile courts and to assess the consequences of this disposition on juveniles and victims. Eight-five courts received funds under the federal program and a major national evaluation, separately funded from the National Institute of Juvenile Justice, was given the responsibility for conducting an implementation study, a process evaluation including all 85 sites, and an impact study based on field experimental designs in six locations (2).

One of the primary purposes of the experimental designs was to assess the impact of restitution on recidivism of juvenile offenders. The experiments differed in terms of the restitution program models that were used and, most importantly, they differed in relation to the comparison that

was made.

One of the experiments (Boise, Idaho) was structured to provide a comparison of restitution against short-term detention. The Washington D.C. design provided a comparison of victim-offender mediation restitution against probation whereas the Clayton County, Georgia study involved a comparison of restitution (with and without a counselling component) against counselling. The study in Dane County, Wisconsin (Madison) was structured to compare two different models of restitution (programmatic vs. ad hoc) against each other.

All of the results from the national evaluation, thus far, have been quite encouraging. In Washington D.C., the youths randomly assigned to the victim-offender mediation restitution program had lower recidivism rates than those randomly selected for normal probation (Griffith, 1983). The juveniles in both programs were serious/chronic offenders with more than 60 percent having at least one prior court contact. More than half were convicted of a serious violent crime or burglary. The results of the study, which were based on official records for more than 400 juveniles, showed that the recontact rate for the restitution group was 53 offenses, per year per 100 youths compared with 65 offenses, per year, per 100 youths in the probation group. A multiple regression analysis indicated that the differences in recidivism rates between the groups were maintained after other potentially confounding variables were controlled.

In Boise (Ada county) Idaho, the juveniles randomly assigned to the restitution program committed fewer subsequent offenses than did those who were assigned to short term detention (Griffith, 1983). Forty seven percent of the restitution youths had no subsequents during the 22 months of follow-up compared with 41 percent of the detention group. The overall reoffense rate for the restitution group was 86 offenses per year, per 100 youths compared with 100 offenses, per year, per 100 youths for the comparison group. Self report data from Boise also showed lower rates of offending for the restitution group.

In Clayton county, Georgia, (a suburb near Atlanta) the restitution groups had substantially lower recontact rates (Schneider and Schneider, 1984). Fifty two percent of the restitution group, for example, had no reoffenses compared with 44 percent of the nonrestitution controls during the 35 months of followup. The overall reoffense rates, per 100 youths per year was 55 for the restitution group and 80 for the controls. These patterns also were maintained when potentially confounding variables were controlled in a multiple regression design.

The study in Dane county contrasted programmatic restitution with "ad hoc" restitution and the results showed that a programmatic approach had a striking impact on successful completion which, in turn, had a substantial effect on recidivism rates of the youths (Schneider and Schneider, 1984).

The purpose of this report is to present the findings from one additional experiment conducted as part of the national evaluation: the experiment in Oklahoma county in which restitution was used as a sole sanction and as a condition of probation. Both of these groups will be compared with a non-restitution control.

THE PROGRAM AND THE DESIGN

The Oklahoma county program was unique among the experimental sites and was one of only a handful of programs in which restitution was used as a sole sanction disposition.

Oklahoma county established its first juvenile restitution program in 1974 as part of an effort to be more responsive to the victims of crime (Schneider and Schneider, 1980). In 1977, the Institute of Policy analysis conducted a survey of the use of restitution in juvenile courts and found that the Oklahoma county model was one of only two that clearly emphasized "accountability" as the primary purpose of the program (Schneider, et al, 1977). When the federal funds became available, Oklahoma county applied in an attempt to expand the use of restitution and to incorporate it more completely into the overall functioning of the court.

Oklahoma county was selected to be in the national evaluation primarily because of the uniqueness of their approach, including both the emphasis on accountability and

their willingness to test restitution as a sole sanction disposition.

Consistent with the concept of offender accountability, the Oklahoma county program placed considerable emphasis on the individual to find work from which money could be raised to pay restitution. There were no program subsidies, for example, and only six percent of the cases involved any adjustments in the amount of restitution. Restitution counsellors provided assistance in identifying job openings in the private sector as well as with charitable institutions and public agencies, but the program did not have revolving "job slots" and did not "place" juveniles in paying positions.

Eligible cases in Oklahoma county included all adjudicated delinquents excepting those convicted of murder and rape for whom a monetary value could be placed on victim losses. The program case workers identified all eligible youths and the IPA evaluation specialist then randomly assigned these cases into one of three groups: the restitution only group; restitution and probation; and a control group which would receive whatever sanction the judge deemed appropriate, so long as it did not include restitution. For those who were to be in either of the restitution groups, program staff developed restitution recommendations which were presented to the judge along with other pre-sentencing information.

The Oklahoma county juvenile judges generally followed

the random assignments into restitution and control conditions except they reserved (and exercised) the right to incarcerate youths if they believed such a disposition was necessary. Decisions to incarcerate were about equally likely in all three groups: nine percent of the restitution only group were committed to the state for incarceration; ten percent of the restitution and probation group were given this disposition, and eleven percent of the control group were committed to the state (3).

After the disposition hearing, juveniles in the restitution groups were assigned a restitution counselor and those who also were on probation were assigned a probation officer. A meeting was held immediately after the sentencing to discuss the restitution requirements and the implementation. Approximately half of the youths were ordered to pay monetary restitution and the others did community work service.

METHODOLOGY

The design in Oklahoma county permitted the comparison of restitution with nonrestitution sanctions and, for those who were required to make restitution to victims, a comparison could be made between restitution as a sole sanction and restitution as a condition of probation. The specific questions were:

1. Whether there were any differences in the proportion of youths successfully completing the restitution requirements between those for whom restitution was a sole sanction and those who also were on probation;
2. Whether there were any differences in the recidivism rates of juveniles for whom restitution was the sole sanction and those who also were on probation; and
3. Whether there were any differences in recidivism between juveniles who received the restitution sanctions and the nonrestitution controls.

Measuring Successful Completion

Successful completion was measured in several different ways. One of these was the program decision on whether the youth had completed the restitution successfully. Generally, the criteria used by the program were that the youth had completed successfully if he or she had paid 95 percent or more of the restitution ordered by the court. If community service work had been ordered, successful completion was defined as finishing 95 percent or more of the hours ordered.

The other definitions of successful completion were based on actual case data from the program (4). These included the proportion of the restitution ordered actually paid, the percentage of youths who paid 100 percent of the restitution order, and the percentage of youths who paid all of the outstanding victim loss. There were problems with the latter measure, however, since many of the offenses involved multiple offenders and each was ordered to pay a fraction of the outstanding loss. Since data were not necessarily available on all of the juveniles (or adults) involved in a particular crime, it was not possible to determine the proportion of a victim's loss returned in restitution.

For community service orders, successful completion was defined as the percentage of youths who worked all of the hours that had been ordered.

Measuring Recidivism

Recidivism was defined as recontacts with the Oklahoma county juvenile or adult court for a delinquent or criminal offense. The search of official records was completed in the spring of 1983 and, on the average, provided for 24 months of followup beyond referral to the program. The measurement and analysis of recidivism were complicated by the fact that each youth had a different amount of time at risk and by the problems of incorporating both the frequency and the seriousness of the reoffenses.

The approach taken here was to use multiple measures of recidivism and to assess the impact of the restitution sanctions in terms not only of their magnitude, but the consistency of their effects. The measures used were:

1. Overall Recidivism. Overall recidivism was a composite score including all recontacts with the court for delinquent acts during the follow-up period. Frequency was used as one measure of overall recidivism (i.e., the total number of recontacts) and the overall rate of recidivism was calculated by dividing the number of reoffenses committed by the youth by the amount of time the youth had been at risk.

2. Crime Specific Recidivism. The frequency and rate of recidivism for each of six different categories of crimes were also calculated. The categories were violent offenses (Table 2 contains a complete listing of the crimes in each category), serious property offenses (burglary and arson), other felony property offenses, minor property offenses, minor personal offenses, and trivial offenses.

3. Seriousness Indices. Three variables representing seriousness indices were used. One of these was an ordinally-coded variable representing the most serious offense committed by the juvenile. Violent personal offenses were coded "6" followed by serious property offenses "5", other felony property offenses "4", minor personal offenses

"3", minor property offenses "2", and trivial offenses, "1".

A second variable representing seriousness was created by scoring each reoffense in terms of its seriousness and then summing these to obtain an overall measure of frequency and seriousness of reoffenses. The final variable representing seriousness was a seriousness rate in which the overall score for each youth was divided by the amount of time at risk thereby taking into account that youths with longer follow-up periods would be expected to have more reoffenses.

In all instances, the rate of reoffending (frequency divided by time at risk) was actually an adjusted rate in which a small constant (.01) was added to the numerator so that the scores of persons who had no recidivist offenses would be scaled in terms of their time at risk.

Establishing Causality

Juveniles were randomly assigned into the program and control conditions. In an ideal experiment, the random assignment alone would be sufficient to insure that the statistical measure of program impact was not confounded with other variables. Field experiments, however, seldom meet the rigid requirements of experimental conditions and the one in Oklahoma was no exception. The only major problem in Oklahoma county, however, was with "crossovers" which comprised slightly less than 10 percent of the cases.

It is always difficult to know what to do with crossover cases but the analysis here follows the common

recommendation which is to consider a case in the group to which it was assigned, even if the actual treatment was something different (Riecken and Baruch, 19xx). In addition, all of the regression models were run with the cases in the actual, rather than assigned, groups. The results of these analyses, although not reported here, were identical to the results when the juveniles were considered to be in their assigned groups.

For the analysis, bivariate regressions (with the assigned group as the independent variable) were conducted and, to insure that potentially confounding effects did not interfere with the interpretation, multiple regression analysis also was undertaken. Again, there were no differences in the results and only the multiple regression results are reported here.

FINDINGS

Table I shows the characteristics of the 296 youths in the Oklahoma county experiment. These were divided rather evenly among the three groups with 104 in the sciol sanction restitution group, 116 in restitution and probation, and 78 in the non-restitution control. There were some differences among the three groups: the control group contained comparatively more females and contained youths who were more likely to be full-time students. These characteristics, however, should not be interpreted to mean that the control

TABLE 1. PROFILE OF REFERRALS TO THE EVALUATION GROUPS
IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

	Sole Sanction Restitution And Restitution	Restitution And Probation	Control Group
SCHOOL STATUS			
(# of Cases)	(104)	(116)	(76)
Full Time Student	65 %	69 %	72 %
Not in School Full Time	35	31	28
RACE			
(# of Cases)	(106)	(116)	(79)
White	66 %	54 %	68 %
Black	30	35	29
Indian	4	8	4
Musican	0	3	0
AGE			
(# of Cases)	(106)	(115)	(83)
13 and Under	14 %	10 %	11 %
14	6	14	13
15	22	17	14
16	24	29	29
17	27	23	25
18 and Over	7	7	7
PRIOR OFFENSES			
(# of Cases)	(107)	(116)	(83)
None	41 %	41 %	32 %
One	24	29	28
Two to Four	30	27	33
Five or More	5	3	5
SEX			
(# of Cases)	(107)	(116)	(79)
Male	91 %	87 %	85 %
Female	9	13	15

group contained less serious offenders since the overall number of prior offenses for the controls was slightly higher than for either of the other groups. Only 32 percent of the controls were first offenders compared with 41 percent of the other groups. The groups did not differ much in terms of age or racial characteristics.

The types of referral offenses are shown in Table 2. The groups are very similar in terms of the presenting offense with approximately 20 percent being in the violent personal categories, one-fourth in the serious property group (burglary and arson), and most of the remainder in the minor property offense categories.

Successful Completion

On most of the indicators, the juveniles who also were on probation did slightly better in terms of completing their restitution requirements, but the differences were small and may have been produced by chance. In terms of the program's definition of successful completion, 88 percent of the youths who were both on restitution and on probation completed successfully compared with 82 percent of the sole sanction group. There were no differences in the groups in terms of the proportion of the restitution order repaid (92 percent) although slightly more of the probation group paid all of the restitution ordered (91 percent). The sole sanction group was more successful in terms of repaying all of the outstanding victim loss (58 percent compared with 36

TABLE 2. TYPES OF REFERRAL OFFENSES
IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

	Sole Sanction Restitution		And Control Group	
	Restitution	Probation	Group	
	N	%	N	%
VIOLENT				
Robbery	9	7	8	
Aggravated Assault	4	2	1	
% of Group Total	12%	8%	11%	
SERIOUS PROPERTY				
Burglary	24	30	25	
Attempted Burglary	3	2	0	
Arson	0	0	1	
% of Group Total	25%	27%	26%	
OTHER FELONY PROPERTY				
Motor Vehicle Theft	12	13	8	
Forgery, Fraud, Embzl.	2	2	3	
% of Group Total	13%	13%	13%	
MINOR PERSONAL				
Simple Assault	2	1	1	
Resisting Arrest	1	0	0	
% of Group Total	3%	1%	0%	
MINOR PROPERTY				
Shoplifting	13	19	9	
Larceny	2	2	1	
Purse Snatch	1	0	1	
Theft from Motor Vehc.	8	8	4	
Bicycle Theft	0	1	3	
Other Thefts	14	14	12	
Stolen Property (Buying, Receiving, Selling)	1	2	2	
Vandalism	11	10	3	
Criminal Mischief	0	2	1	
% of Group Total	47%	48%	43%	
TRIVIAL OFFENSES				
Fight	0	1	0	
Trespass	0	2	0	
% of Group Total	0%	3%	0%	

TABLE 3. SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF RESTITUTION ORDERS IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

Sole Sanction Restitution	Restitution as a Condition of Probation
(# of Cases) (82)	(94)
Successful Completion (as Defined by Programs)	82 % 88 %
MONETARY RESTITUTION	
(# of Cases) (45)	(64)
Restitution Payments as Proportion of Restitution Order (Average, per youth)	92 % 92 %
Percentage of Youths Paying 100% of Restitution Ordered	84 % 91 %
Percentage of Youths Paying all of the Outstanding Victim Loss (1)	58 % 36 %
COMMUNITY SERVICE	
(# of cases) (38)	(31)
Percentage of Youths Working all the Hours Ordered	74 % 77 %

(1) Some incidents involved co-offenders and the full payment may have been made to the victim when the amounts from all offenders are combined.

percent). The groups were basically alike in terms of their completion of community service hours.

Recidivism

The reoffense patterns of youths in all three groups are shown in Table 4. Overall, about half of the youths had at least one reoffense in the 24-month (average) follow-up period. About one-third of the juveniles in all three groups had one or two reoffenses and slightly less than 20 percent had three or more offenses.

By type, most of the subsequent crimes were in the less serious categories: almost half, in fact, were either trivial offenses or minor property crimes. Nevertheless, some of these youths were involved in subsequent activity that would be considered serious: about ten percent were recontacted for a violent personal crime and almost one third were recontacted for a felony property offense.

The group reoffense rates are shown on the second page of Table 4. These rates represent the number of offenses committed by each 100 youths, each year. The sole sanction group had an overall reoffense rate of 72 crimes, per 100 youths, per year, compared with 64 for the restitution and probation group. The control group had a 74 per 100 rate. On the average, a juvenile in the sole sanction group would be expected to commit 1.4 offenses per year compared with 1.3 for the restitution and probation group and 1.5 for the controls. Again, these differences are very small and

TABLE 4. REOFFENSE PATTERNS OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

	Sole Sanction Restitution	Restitution and Probation	Control Group
# of Cases	(107)	(116)	(83)
OVERALL RECIDIVISM			
% with 0 Reoffenses	51	50	48
% with 1 Reoffense	20	21	16
% with 2 Reoffenses	10	11	16
% with 3 Reoffenses	6	5	5
% with 4-6 Reoffenses	8	10	12
% with 7+ Reoffenses	5	3	3
VIOLENT SUBSEQUENT OFFENSES			
% With 0	92	92	89
% with 1 or more	8	8	11
SERIOUS PROPERTY (BURGLARIES)			
% with 0	83	81	78
% with 1 or more	17	19	22
OTHER FELONY PROPERTY			
% with 0	83	87	81
% with 1 or more	17	17	19
MINOR PERSONAL			
% with 0	95	97	99
% with 1 or more	5	3	1
MINOR PROPERTY			
% with 0	68	72	69
% with 1	18	16	18
% with 2 or more	14	12	13
TRIVIAL			
% with 0	85	88	83
% with 1 or more	15	12	17

TABLE 4. [CONTINUED]

	Sole Sanction Restitution	Restitution and Probation	Control Group
GROUP REOFFENSE RATES			
# of Cases	(107)	(116)	(83)
# Of Subsequent Offenses	149	147	123
Months of Risk Time	2,463	2,764	2,003
Avg. Risk Time per Youth (in months)	23	24	24
Avg. No. of Offenses Per Year	1.4	1.3	1.5
Overall Reoffense Rate, per 100 Youths, per Year	72	64	74
CRIME SPECIFIC RATES (Per 100 youths, per year)			
Violent	5	5	8
Serious Property (Burglary and Arson)	15	15	19
Other Felony Property	9	7	7
Minor Personal	3	2	1
Minor Property Offenses	31	26	27
Trivial Offenses	9	8	13

probably are of no particular importance.

Offense rates by type of crime also are shown in Table 4. The rates for violent personal offenses and for serious property offenses are slightly higher in the control group compared with the restitution groups whereas the other categories show no particular differences.

Pre and post group rates are shown in Table 5. The purpose of this analysis is to determine whether the intervention had the effect of reducing or slowing down the commission of delinquent offenses. None of the interventions reduced the overall offense rates. In fact, the youths in both restitution groups tended to reoffend slightly more afterward than before whereas the control group continued at the same rate.

To test the impact of the program on recidivism, multiple regression models were developed in which the program and control condition was the independent variable (scored 0 and 1), the various measures of recidivism were the dependent variables, and age, sex, priors, school status and time at risk (for the frequency variables) were controlled. The results for each measure of recidivism, testing restitution as a sole sanction against restitution plus probation, are shown in Table 6. There were no differences in recidivism rates of juveniles in the sole sanction condition compared with the restitution and probation groups, regardless of how recidivism was measured and regardless of the type of offense committed. The three measures of

TABLE 5. PRE POST COMPARISONS OF GROUP OFFENSE RATES

	Sole Sanction Restitution		Restitution and Probation		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
OVERALL RATES (Per 100 youths, per year)						
	66	72	56	64	75	74
Violent	8	5	6	5	8	8
Serious Property (Burglary & Arson)	14	15	13	15	13	19
Other Felony Property	7	9	5	7	11	7
Minor Personal	2	3	2	2	2	1
Minor Property	31	31	25	26	34	27
Trivial	3	9	5	8	7	13

TABLE 6. COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM RATES OF YOUTHS IN SOLE SANCTION RESTITUTION WITH YOUTHS IN RESTITUTION/PROBATION

Type of Offense N=218	B	SE B	Beta	OSL	R SD (t)
OVERALL RECIDIVISM					
Frequency Rate	-.08 -.03	.27 .14	0.02 0.01	.77 .84	.10 .12
VIOLENT OFFENSES					
Frequency Rate	.00 .00	.05 .03	.00 -.01	.99 .82	.08 .04
SERIOUS PROPERTY					
Frequency Rate	.06 .02	.10 .06	.04 .03	.58 .68	.11 .09
OTHER FELONY PROPERTY					
Frequency Rate	.00 .00	.08 -.04	.00 .00	.94 .92	.03 .02
MINOR PROPERTY					
Frequency Rate	-.01 .00	.03 .02	-.02 -.01	.67 .84	.06 .07
MINOR PERSONAL					
Frequency Rate	-.07 -.03	.15 .07	-.03 -.02	.40 .73	.09 .08
TRIVIAL OFFENSES					
Frequency Rate	-.05 -.02	.08 .04	-.05 -.04	.50 .58	.03 .03
SERIOUSNESS INDICES					
Most Serious Reciffense	.25	.28	.06	.38	.15
Seriousness Score	.00	.75	.00	.99	.14
Seriousness Rate	.00	.40	.00	.99	.16

Variables controlled in the equation were age, sex, priors, school status, and (for the frequency variables) time at risk. The first column contains the unstandardized regression coefficient (b) between the recidivism measure and the type of restitution experience the youths had (0=sole sanction; 1=restitution and probation). The standardized coefficient (beta) is shown in column 3. OSL refers to the observed significance level of the coefficient, based on a two-tailed t test.

seriousness show no differences either. The two measures of seriousness which incorporate both severity of the reoffense and frequency of reoffending show absolutely no differences as the beta was .00 which has a probability of .99 of occurring by chance.

Comparisons of both restitution groups (combined) against the nonrestitution controls also show no effect (see Table 7). Table 8 shows the full multiple regression models for four of the measures of recidivism (total subsequents, subsequent rate, adjusted seriousness rate, and the most serious reoffense). The treatment (restitution vs. control) had no impact at all and neither did age. The only good predictor of reoffending was the number of prior offenses and even this was not a particularly accurate predictor. Sex was a good predictor, as well, with females consistently being less likely to reoffend.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings from this experiment indicate that youths who were given restitution as a sanction, without benefit of probation requirements or probation supervision, were generally as successful as those who received probation along with restitution. Furthermore, the results indicate that youths who received restitution sanctions did no better and no worse than the control group of probation youths in terms of recidivism.

These results differ slightly from previous findings

TABLE 7. COMPARISON OF RECIDIVISM RATES OF YOUTHS IN RESTITUTION PROGRAMS WITH YOUTHS ON PROBATION

Type of Offense N = 293	B	SE B	Beta	DSL	R SQ (t)
OVERALL RECIDIVISM					
Frequency	.00	.27	.00	.97	.11
Rate	-.00	.15	.00	.99	.12
VIOLENT OFFENSES					
Frequency	-.04	.05	.05	.40	.09
Rate	.03	.03	-.05	.35	.08
SERIOUS PROPERTY					
Frequency	-.06	.10	-.03	.58	.07
Rate	-.02	.06	-.02	.72	.08
OTHER FELONY PROPERTY					
Frequency	-.07	.07	0.05	.37	.03
Rate	-.03	.04	0.05	.36	.04
MINOR PROPERTY					
Frequency	-.05	.03	-.10	.09	.05
Rate	-.03	.02	-.10	.10	.05
MINOR PERSONAL					
Frequency	-.02	.14	0.01	.85	.07
Rate	-.00	.07	0.00	.90	.07
TRIVIAL OFFENSES					
Frequency	.05	.08	.04	.52	.04
Rate	.02	.04	-.03	.61	.02
SERIOUSNESS INDICES					
Most Serious Reoffense	.08	.28	.02	.75	.13
Seriousness Score	.15	.77	.01	.85	.12
Seriousness Rate	.07	.43	.00	.87	.13

Variables controlled in the equation were age, sex, priors, school status, and (for the frequency variables) time at risk. The first column contains the unstandardized regression coefficient (b) between the recidivism measure and the type of restitution experience the youths had (0=restitution, 1=control). The standardized coefficient (beta) is shown in column 3. DSL refers to the observed significance level of the coefficient, based on a two-tailed t test.

TABLE 8. MULTIPLE REGRESSION MODELS FOR SELECTED MEASURES OF RECIDIVISM IN OKLAHOMA COUNTY

	Total Subsequents	Subsequent Rate	Adjusted Seriousness Rate	Most Serious Offense Rate
	b DSL	b DSL	b DSL	b DSL
Restitution	.00 .97	.05 .35	.00 .87	.02 .76
Age	-.07 .26	-.12 .05	.00 .87	.00 .96
Sex (1=male 2=female)	-.08 .15	.910 .08	-.11 .04	-.14 .01
Number of Priors	-.30 .00	.25 .00	.34 .00	.33 .00
School (1=in school;2=not in school)	-.08 .19	-.03 .35	-.08 .18	-.08 .15
Risk Time	.08 .14			.03 .56
² Multiple R	.11	.08	.13	.13

The probability of t is based on a two-tailed test.
Variables which had a (p)t below .05 were not in the equation
for the calculation of the multiple R square.

based on the full set of data from 85 juvenile restitution programs. In the earlier study, we found that sole sanction restitution requirements appeared to be correlated with higher completion rates and lower recidivism, compared with restitution imposed along with probation. It was pointed out at the time that in the absence of random assignment, a selection bias or "creaming effect" could account for some or all of the apparent relationship (Schneider, et al., 1982).

In that respect, the current study is more valid because the design effectively eliminated the possibility that the sole sanction group was comprised of less serious offenders. However, one should be cautious about interpreting the findings from Oklahoma county as the conclusive answer to the question of whether restitution should be imposed as a sole sanction or as a condition of probation. This experiment, although it may have a high degree of internal validity, is only one test, in one place, and replications are needed before final conclusions are drawn.

With regard to the other issue--whether restitution is a more effective sanction than probation--the results in Oklahoma county suggest that recidivism rates are about the same for both groups and that neither type of intervention effectively alters the offense rate of juvenile delinquents.

FOOTNOTES

1. All statutory analyses on restitution are seriously out of date (including the work by Feinman, 1978 and Gottsman, 1979).

2. This study is part of the national evaluation of the OJJDP-sponsored national restitution programs. The programs were funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the National Evaluation was funded by the National Institute of Juvenile Justice (NIJJ). Special recognition should go to Pamela Swain and Dr. James Howell of NIJJ and to Douglas Dodge and Emily Martin of OJJDP for their support during this study. In Oklahoma county, particular recognition should be given to Ann Asplan, program director, who carefully guided both the program and the experiment to a successful completion and to Ann Stephan-Kopko who was the on-site evaluation specialist for the Institute of Policy Analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armstrong, Troy, "Restitution: A Sanction for All Seasons," presented at the Fourth Symposium on Restitution and Community Service Sentencing, Minneapolis, Minnesota, September 24-26, 1980.

Feinman, Howard, "A Summary of State Statutes on Restitution in Juvenile Courts," Institute of Policy Analysis, 1977.

Gottsman, R. and L. Mountz, "Restitution: Legal Analysis," National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, University of Nevada, Reno, 1979.

Griffith, William R., "The Victim Survey: An Overview and Description of Results in the Six National Evaluation Sites," Institute of Policy Analysis, Eugene, Oregon, 1983.

Hudson, Joe and Burt Galaway, Victims, Offenders, and Alternative Sanctions, Heath/Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, 1980.

Hutzler, J. L., T. S. Vereb, and D. R. Dexel, "Restitution and Community Service as Dispositional Alternatives in Delinquency Cases," National Center for Juvenile Justice Research, Pittsburgh, 1981.

Michael J. Wilson, "The Juvenile Offender Instrument: Administration and Description of Findings," Institute of Policy Analysis, 1983.

Schneider, A. L., "Policy Expectations and Program Realities in Juvenile Restitution," in Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson (Eds.), Victims Offenders, and Alternative Sanctions, Lexington Books, Lexington Mass, 1977.

Schneider, Anne L. and Peter R. Schneider, "An Overview of Restitution Program Models in the Juvenile Justice System," Juvenile and Family Court Journal, Vol. 37, 1980.

Schneider, P. R. and Anne L., "Restitution Requirements for Juvenile Offenders: A Survey of Practices in American Juvenile Courts," Juvenile Justice Journal, Vol. 18, 1977.

Schneider, P. R., W. R. Griffith and A. L. Schneider, "Restitution as a Sole Sanction or Condition of Probation," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, January, 1982.

Schneider, Peter R., Anne L. Schneider, William Griffith and Michael Wilson, "Two Year Report on the National Evaluation of the Juvenile Restitution Initiative: An Overview of Program Performance," Institute of Policy Analysis, June, 1982.

United States Congress House Subcommittee on Human Resources,
"Oversight Hearings on Juvenile Restitution Programs," March
3, 1981.

END