

UCLA

AAPI Nexus: Policy, Practice and Community

Title

Profiling Incarcerated Asian and Pacific Islander Youth: Statistics
Derived from California Youth Authority Administrative Data

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2bm9g886>

Journal

AAPI Nexus: Policy, Practice and Community, 4(2)

ISSN

1545-0317

Authors

Arifuku, Isami

Peacock, Delores D.

Glesmann, Caroline

Publication Date

2006

DOI

10.36650/nexus4.2_95-110_ArifukuEtAl

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Resource Paper

Profiling Incarcerated Asian and Pacific Islander Youth: Statistics Derived from California Youth Authority Administrative Data

Isami Arifuku, Delores D. Peacock,
and Caroline Glesmann

Abstract

This article provides data about youth in the California Youth Authority (CYA) and compares and contrasts Asian and Pacific Islander (API) youth with other wards with regard to youth characteristics, commitment offenses, incarceration, parole, and discharge. The data shows that although API youth constituted 5% of the total population in February of 2002, some API ethnicities are vastly over-represented in the CYA population and have had high levels of gang involvement. At the same time, API wards had the highest percentage with honorable discharges and the lowest percentage with dishonorable discharges from CYA.

This Resource Paper presents statistical data on wards under the jurisdiction of the CYA¹ focusing on differences and similarities between API youth and the total population at CYA as well as to other racial groups. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency's (NCCD) previous work (Le et al. 2001a, 2001b) found that although API youth generally had low arrest, adjudication, and incarceration rates as compared to other racial groups, when disaggregated by API ethnicity, differences within the group emerged. Some API ethnicities had arrest and out of home placement rates that were among the highest in the jurisdiction. The information in this Resource Paper provides additional insights by analyzing administrative data from California's juvenile correctional institutions.

Introduction

CYA was created by law in 1941, and began providing institutional training and parole supervision for juvenile and young

adult offenders in 1943. It is the largest agency for youth offenders in the nation, with about 5500 young men and women in institutions and camps, and approximately 4000 more on parole on December 31, 2002². (The in-custody population had declined to 3207 by August 31, 2005³.)

The youth offender population comes from both juvenile and criminal court referrals. The Youthful Offender Parole Board (YOPB), a separate administrative body, determines when offenders committed directly to CYA are scheduled for release on parole. The length of incarceration is determined by the severity of the commitment offense and the offender's progress toward parole readiness. The youth's custody time may not exceed the limits of determinate sentences for adults committing the same crime. CYA's jurisdiction for the most serious felony offenders, both juvenile and young adults, ends on the offender's 25th birthday.

A number of factors add to the interest in examining API youth in CYA. Although some states have a higher rate for API youth in residential custody (Poe-Yamagata and Jones 2000), California had the largest number of API youth in a state residential facility from the late 1990s through 2002 (1005 API were under its jurisdiction as of June 30, 1999). Information about API youth in such a facility has not been published before and may inform the fields of community corrections, re-entry into the community, services for youth, and culturally appropriate services for API youth.

Method

Aggregated data from CYA is readily available on its website in the form of reports, e.g., "A Comparison of First Commitment Characteristics, 1990-2001;" however, generating more detailed statistics requires access to individual level data that can be tabulated by ethnic and other categories not available in the publicly available publications. Because these records are considered confidential and sensitive, special procedures are required for researchers interested in analyzing the micro-level data. For the Resource Paper, the authors made a special request to the research division to obtain extracts from their OBITS (Offender Based Information Tracking System) system which tracks the movement of youth within CYA. This involved 1) completing an application which included a proposal identifying the purpose of the request, the data required, and duration of the project; 2) approval from NCCD's

Institutional Review Board (committee for the protection of human subjects, i.e., to ensure that privacy and confidentiality issues were addressed); and, 3) resume for the lead investigator. Within CYA, the procedure required review by the Chief of the Ward Information and Parole Research Bureau and several conversations to work out details and options for providing the data. As conditions for using the administrative data, the authors agreed that the data from CYA would be used solely for statistical reporting and analysis and identified the procedures and processes to ensure security and protection of the data: only authorized staff would have access to the data; all staff working with the data would be required to sign a security pledge; and specific information was provided about storage of data to ensure privacy and confidentiality.

NCCD received three automated data files from CYA to be used by the Asian Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center (API Center), a project of NCCD. The three files obtained from CYA were for youth first admitted to CYA during calendar year 1998 (N=1763), youth released on parole during calendar year 1998 (N=3208), and youth incarcerated in CYA in February 2002 (N=6121). The latter file is used to describe CYA wards whereas the cohort admitted in 1998 and those paroled in 1998 provide information about parole, length of incarceration, and outcomes of parole. The dataset included a large number of administrative categories but variables of greatest interest included demographic information (birthdate, sex, race, and ethnicity); dates of admission, latest admission, parole, and discharge; gang affiliation; commitment offense(s); and county of residence.

The comparisons are by racial group. Pacific Islanders (PI) are included with Asians; sometimes the data is presented by specific Asian ethnicities as well as Pacific Islanders. Specific Pacific Islander ethnicities were not available in the data extracts received from CYA, nor were API ethnicities available in the 1998 parolee cohort.

Youth Characteristics

Table 1 presents some key demographic characteristics of the 2002 CYA cohort. The first column contains the absolute count, the second column contains the percentage distribution for each demographic category, and the last column reports the parity index. For the parity index, a value of 1 indicates that a group's share of the CYA population is on par with their share of the state's youth

population (10 to 24 years old), a value greater than 1 indicates a disproportionately higher share of the CYA population, and a value less than 1 indicates a disproportionately lower share of the CYA population. Mathematically, the parity index is calculated by dividing the percentage a group represents in the CYA population by their percentage in the California population. Overall, males in the 2002 ward cohort outnumbered females by a ratio of 19 to 1. White and Native American categories have the largest percentage of females in this cohort, at 8% and 10%, respectively. Four percent of API youth are females. The statistics show that Hispanic youth were the largest racial group while API youth constituted one of the smaller racial groups, representing 5% of the wards. Among API youth, Laotians followed by Vietnamese were the most numerous of API ethnicities.

Table 1. Youth Characteristics
2002 Ward Cohort

	Number	Percent	Index
Gender	(N=6121)	(P=100%)	
Male	5839	95%	1.8
Female	282	5%	0.1
Race	(N=6121)	(P=100%)	
White	1019	17%	0.4
Hispanic	2905	48%	1.1
African American	1820	30%	4.0
API	308	5%	0.4
Native American	49	1%	0.8
Other	20	<1%	—
API Ethnicity	(N=308)	(P=100%)	
Cambodian	45	15%	4.0
Chinese	16	5%	0.2
Japanese	1	<1%	0.1
Korean	10	3%	0.3
Laotian	81	26%	9.4
Thai	30	10%	8.1
Vietnamese	60	20%	1.3
Filipino	32	10%	0.2
Pacific Islander	31	10%	2.2
Unknown	2	1%	—

Sum of the percentages may not add to 100.

The parity index values reveal significant disparities in the overrepresentation of certain racial and ethnic groups within CYA. According to the 2000 Census, among the California population aged 10-24 years, Hispanics constituted the largest percentage (42%) followed by Whites (38%), Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (12%), African Americans (7%) and Native Americans (1%). According to the parity index, African Americans and Latinos are both overrepresented: African Americans are incarcerated in CYA four times greater than would be expected by their numbers in the 10 to 24 year old population in California and Latinos 1.1 times more. On the other hand, Native American, White, and API youth are underrepresented; these groups are fewer in number than would be expected by their share of the 10 to 24 year old population in California.

When the percentage of API ethnicities in CYA is compared to their 10 to 24 year old population in California, Laotian, Thai, Cambodian, Pacific Islander, and Vietnamese youth are overrepresented by indices of 9.4, 8.1, 4.0, 2.2, and 1.3, respectively. Filipino, Korean, Chinese, and Japanese youth are underrepresented with indices of 0.2, 0.3, 0.2, and 0.1, respectively. (The California population of 10 to 24 year-olds consisted only of the nine ethnicities confined in the Youth Authority.) The API ethnicities overrepresented in CYA are generally immigrant groups that came in significant numbers to the U.S. after the mid-1970s whereas those groups underrepresented have histories in the U.S. from the nineteenth century, with an additional influx after 1965.

Administrative data also provides information on the age of wards at the time admitted to CYA and the youth's prior place of residence. The mean age at admission has steadily increased from 1998 (16.51 years) through 2002 (17.4 years). API ethnicities with thirty or more in the cohort also indicate a trend of increasing age at admission between 1997 and 2002, with some of the largest groups, such as Laotians (N=81) increasing in age from 16 years to 18 years and Vietnamese (N=60) from 16 years to 20 years. The gradual increase in age at admission may reflect the increasingly more serious nature of the commitment offenses of the wards over time.

The largest proportion of youth admitted to CYA were from Southern California (45%), including more than half of all African American and Hispanic wards. The largest percentage of API youth (34%) also came from this region. The next largest percent-

age of youth as a whole (25%) was from San Francisco/Bay Area counties⁴. Among API wards, the lone Japanese, most Korean (80%), and the majority of Vietnamese (52%) youth were from Southern California; Cambodian (51%), Thai (43%), and Laotian (41%) youth were primarily from the Central Valley; and most Pacific Islander youth (65%) were from the San Francisco/Bay Area. One important factor in the study of youth-at-risk is gang membership, and the CYA data provides some insights into those who are incarcerated. For the 2002 cohort, Hispanic and API wards were identified as having the highest percentage of gang membership (74% and 73%, respectively) whereas White youth (36%) had the lowest percentage. When verified gang members were compared by API ethnicity, Cambodian (91%), Laotian (88%), and Thai (87%) youth showed the highest levels of gang membership of those incarcerated in CYA in February 2002.

One would expect a relationship between gang membership and broad type of commitment offense for wards. More than 60% of gang members had a violent primary commitment offense as compared to 53% for non-gang members ($p=.000$, not shown). Gang members and non-gang members were similar on property, drug, and other primary commitment offense. In contrast, a higher percentage of non-gang members had a sex related commitment offense than gang members ($p=.000$, not shown).

Admission Status

Table 2 reports the statistics on the admission status for the 2002 cohort (first admission, parole violation, and recommitment) by race. Of all racial groups, API youth incarcerated in CYA in February 2002 had the lowest percentage that were first-time admissions (Table 2) and were the most likely to be admitted for a parole violation. The patterns for first time commitments, parole violations, and recommitments were very similar for Whites, Hispanics, and African Americans. API youth patterns were noticeably different and the differences observed for the whole table approaches statistical significance. When API ethnicities are compared, no statistically significant differences are observed.

API youth paroled from CYA in 1998 had the second highest percentage of first admission to CYA. API youth were among the least likely to be admitted for a parole violation, but the most likely to be recommitted for a new offense. This is inconsistent with the

Table 2. Admission Status by Race*
2002 Ward Cohort

	White	Hispanic	African American	API	Native American	Other	Total
	(N=1019)	(N=2905)	(N=1820)	(N=308)	(N=49)	(N=20)	(N=6121)
First admission	85%	85%	84%	79%	86%	80%	84%
Parole violation	14%	14%	15%	20%	10%	20%	15%
Recommitment	2%	1%	1%	1%	4%	0%	1%
Total	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*p=.06 Sum of the percentages may not add to 100.

findings for the 2002 cohort that API youth had the lowest percentage of first admissions, were the most likely to be admitted for a parole violation, and among the least likely to have been recommitted. The discrepancy between the cohort paroled in 1998 and the cohort admitted to CYA in 2002 resides in changes in the admissions status of these two cohorts. White, Hispanic, and African American youth changed markedly in their admission status but API youth admission status remained fairly consistent. When the 1998 parole and 2002 ward cohorts are compared:

- First admissions: increased 17% to 23% for White, Hispanic, African American, and Native American youth but API increased by 7%.
- Parole violations: decreased 15% to 21% for White, Hispanic, African American, and Native American youth but decreased 3% for API.
- Recommitments: decreased up to 2% for White, Hispanic, and African American youth but decreased 3% for API youth.

CYA reported up to five offenses for which youth were admitted. The mean number of offenses by type was calculated using data from the five reported commitment offenses. The data used for other analyses reflect the primary offense for which youth were incarcerated. These data were categorized as violent, sex, property, drug, and other.

Table 3 indicates that the highest mean for all groups, except Native American (whose highest mean was for other offenses), was for violent offenses. African American youth had the highest mean number of violent commitment offenses (\bar{M} =1.5) among the

wards in February 2002 while API and Hispanic youth had the second and third highest mean for violent commitment offenses (\underline{M} =1.4 for API and \underline{M} = 1.3 for Hispanic). White and API youth had the highest mean (\underline{M} =1.2) for property offenses.

Among API ethnicities, Pacific Islander youth incarcerated in CYA in February 2002 had the highest mean for violent offenses (\underline{M} =1.7) and Laotian youth had the highest mean for property offenses (\underline{M} =1.5).

API youth had the highest percentage (65%) of violent offenses as their primary commitment offense. In addition, the data (not shown) also shows the following regarding API youth:

- 19% of the 2002 Ward Cohort were admitted for Murder 1, Murder 2, manslaughter, or attempted murder; a greater percentage of API youth (38%) were committed for these crimes than any other group.
- White youth were the most likely to have a sex offense as their primary commitment offense; in comparison, API youth were the least likely to be incarcerated for a sex related offense. Among API ethnicities, Laotian youth had the largest percentage incarcerated for sex offenses (14%).
- Korean youth had the highest percentage (90%) of youth whose primary commitment offense was for violent offenses followed by Vietnamese (75%), Pacific Islander (74%), and Thai (70%).
- 57% of Thai youth were admitted to CYA for homicide and attempted homicide, as were 44% of Pacific Islander and Korean youth.
- 37% of Cambodian and 33% of Vietnamese youth had robbery as their primary commitment offense, followed closely by Pacific Islander youth (30%).

Parole and Discharge

Youth appear before the Youthful Offender Parole Board (YOPB) soon after entering the CYA system. The YOPB reviews a case, indicates which program(s) the youth must complete, and sets a date the youth can be considered for release to parole based upon the offense (California Youth Authority, n.d.). Youth appear before the YOPB annually to determine the progress they have made in achieving goals. They are considered for parole if they have served the set minimum for the offense committed, behaved well in the

Table 3. Mean Charges by Type among Commitment Offenses by Race, 2002 Ward Cohort

	White	Hispanic	African American	API	Native American	Other	Total
Type	(N=1019)	(N=2905)	(N=1820)	(N=308)	(N=49)	(N=20)	(N=6121)
Violent*	1.0	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.3
Sex**	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1
Property+	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.2	0.7	1.3	1.0
Drugs++	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	<0.1	0.2	0.2
Other+++	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.6	0.7
Total†	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3

* p = .000 for ANOVA test on violent offenses between ethnicities; pairwise tests showed p= .002 between Hispanic and African American, p=.000 between White and Hispanic, White and Asian, and White and African American.

** p = .000 on ANOVA test between ethnicities on sex offenses; pairwise tests showed p = .000 between White and Hispanic, White and Asian, and White and African American.

+p = .000 on ANOVA test between ethnicities on property offenses; pairwise tests showed p = .000 between White and Hispanic, and White and African American, p = .002 between Hispanic and Asian.

++ p = .000 on ANOVA test between ethnicities committed on drug offenses; pairwise tests showed p = .000 between White and Hispanic, and White and African American, p = .018 between Hispanic and Asian, p = .000 between Asian and African American.

+++ p = .000 on ANOVA test between ethnicities on Other offenses; pairwise tests between ethnicities showed p = .000 between White and Asian, and White and African American, p = .041 between White and Native American, p = .000 between Hispanic and Asian, and Hispanic and African American, p = .000 between Native American and Asian, and Native American and African American.

†No statistical significance on total number of commitments.

institution, completed or made progress toward completing pre-determined goals, and progressed toward parole readiness.

The offender released to parole is supervised in the community, usually for one to three years, and discharged from CYA jurisdiction by his or her twenty-first or twenty-fifth birthday. Youth that perform well on parole and pay all of their court-ordered restitution can be honorably discharged from CYA jurisdiction. If a youth does not perform well or is convicted of a new crime while on parole, he or she can be dishonorably discharged. Once discharged, CYA no longer has authority over the youth.

An examination of the data on those admitted in 1998 provides insights into the length of incarceration and release as a parolee. In 1998, of the 1764 youth admitted to CYA, 1003 (57%) were paroled by February 2002 after serving an average of 2.25 years

before parole. API youth served an average of 2.24 years before parole, compared to 2.29 years for African American youth and 2.22 years for White youth. Among this cohort of wards admitted in 1998, the API group constituted the largest percentage paroled by 2002 (72%); in contrast, Native American and African American youth had the lowest percentages at 44% and 49%, respectively. Examining releases by year, Table 4 shows that for the cohort admitted in 1998 and paroled by 2002, the largest numbers of youth were released in 2000 and 2001. No significant differences between the groups were found, using chi-square.

The data point to two interesting patterns that indicate that API youth fare better within the system in terms of being paroled. Among youth admitted to CYA in 1998, a higher percentage of API youth was paroled than other racial groups for most primary commitment offense types, including homicide, robbery, and assault. Since a high percentage of API youth was incarcerated for violent offenses, their release to parole before other racial groups seems unusual. This may indicate that API youth function well within the institution, completed or made progress toward completing goals, and progressed quickly toward parole readiness in the estimation of CYA staff. For this same cohort, 27% of API youth had been discharged from CYA by February 2002. In contrast, 39% of White youth admitted during the same year, followed by African American youth (36%), were the most likely to have been discharged by

Table 4. Youth Paroled by Race and Year Paroled*
1998 Admissions Cohort

	White	Hispanic	African American	API	Native American	Other	Total
	(N=244)	(N=926)	(N=436)	(N=123)	(N=23)	(N=12)	(N=1764)
1998	0.4%	0.9%	0.7%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
1999	11.5%	9.2%	6.7%	9.8%	13.0%	8.3%	9.0%
2000	20.5%	24.2%	21.1%	32.5%	13.0%	33.3%	23.4%
2001	23.4%	23.5%	19.5%	25.2%	17.4%	16.7%	22.5%
2002	0.8%	1.1%	1.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Total	56.6%	58.9%	49.3%	71.5%	43.5%	58.3%	56.9%

*No statistically significant results using chi-square test.

Table 5. Mean Years of Incarceration by Race and Offense Type*
1998 Admissions Cohort

Offense Type	White	Hispanic	African American	API	Native American	Other	Total
Violent	(N=50) 2.38	(N=280) 2.38	(N=120) 2.40	(N=53) 2.54	(N=4) 2.16	(N=2) 1.92	(N=509) 2.40
Sex	(N=6) 2.03	(N=6) 2.16	(N=5) 2.40	(N=0) 0.0	(N=2) 2.84	(N=0) 0.0	(N=19) 2.25
Property	(N=68) 2.24	(N=152) 2.10	(N=53) 2.23	(N=28) 1.95	(N=4) 1.64	(N=4) 2.50	(N=309) 2.14
Drug	(N=5) 2.38	(N=53) 2.30	(N=21) 2.34	(N=3) 1.79	(N=0) 0.0	(N=0) 0.0	(N=82) 2.30
Other	(N=9) 1.93	(N=54) 2.05	(N=16) 2.22	(N=4) 1.78	(N=0) 0.0	(N=1) 2.02	(N=84) 2.06
1998 Parolee Cohort							
Violent	(N=193) 2.30	(N=830) 2.42	(N=578) 2.45	(N=156) 2.58	(N=12) 2.08	(N=10) 2.30	(N=1779) 2.43
Sex	(N=16) 2.94	(N=16) 3.06	(N=14) 3.93	(N=0) 0.0	(N=0) 0.0	(N=0) 0.0	(N=46) 3.28
Property	(N=234) 1.68	(N=409) 1.67	(N=186) 1.96	(N=56) 1.54	(N=12) 2.25	(N=3) 2.33	(N=900) 1.73
Drug	(N=12) 1.42	(N=108) 1.86	(N=69) 1.81	(N=7) 1.71	(N=0) 0.0	(N=4) 1.75	(N=200) 1.81
Other	(N=34) 2.15	(N=162) 1.72	(N=64) 1.83	(N=21) 1.71	(N=2) 1.50	(N=0) 0.0	(N=283) 1.79

* No statistical significance between ethnicities on any of the offenses for 1998 Admissions Cohort. No statistical significance between ethnicities for violent, sex, drug, and Other offenses for 1998 Parolee Cohort. ANOVA showed $p = .009$ between ethnicities on property offenses; $p = .046$ on pairwise tests between Hispanic and African American

February 2002. This would seem to indicate that youth of other races made a smoother adjustment to living in the community than API youth, or that factors that are not readily apparent enter into the decision to discharge youth from CYA.

When length of incarceration is compared by commitment offense type and ethnicity for the 1998 admissions cohort, the following differences were observed although none were statistically significant:

- Violent commitment offense: API youth served longer sentences than any other group.
- Property commitment offense: years served by API youth were shorter than the average of 2.14 years for the cohort. White, African American, and other youth were incarcerated

for longer periods of time than API youth.

- Drug commitment offense: API youth had the shortest commitment time of all groups.
- Other commitment offense: API youth had the shortest period of incarceration of all groups.

A similar pattern exists for youth paroled in 1998. Only the difference among youth whose primary commitment offense was for property crimes was statistically significant.

There are differences by race in the average (mean) number of years on parole, as reported in the top panel of Table 6. API youth were on parole significantly longer (1.52 years) than the overall mean of 1.31 years. Again, this may be related to challenges API youth experience in adjusting to living in the community after a period of incarceration, or other factors such as parole officers’ perceptions of API parolees’ behavior.

Of the 1998 paroled wards, API youth were the most likely to successfully complete parole without a violation (53%) and the least likely (31%) to have their parole revoked. In comparison, 42% of White youth successfully completed their parole, while 34% had their parole revoked; similarly, 40% of Hispanic youth were discharged without a parole violation, while 36% had their parole revoked.

By February 2002, 403 of 3208 youth (13%) paroled in 1998 were still on parole. The API group had the highest percentage (17%) still on parole. This may be due to API youth having the highest percent-

Table 6. Mean Years on Parole and Under Jurisdiction by Race*
1998 Parolee Cohort

White	Hispanic	African American	API	Native American	Other	Total
Mean Years on Parole*						
(N=437) 1.27	(N=1319) 1.30	(N=811) 1.27	(N=199) 1.52	(N=25) 1.36	(N=14) 1.79	(N=2805) 1.31
Mean Years Under Jurisdiction by Race**						
(N=316) 3.34	(N=910) 3.57	(N=543) 3.57	(N=146) 3.92	(N=15) 3.60	(N=13) 3.92	(N=1943) 3.56

* p = .004 for ANOVA; pairwise tests showed p = .017 between Asian and White, p = .018 between Asian and African American, and p = .007 between Asian and Hispanic

** No statistical significance between ethnicities for years under jurisdiction.

age of violent offenders and primary commitment offense for homicide; 70% versus 41% to 64% and 14% versus 0% to 12%, respectively, for other racial groups. Among the youth whose parole was revoked, API youth were among the least likely (8% compared to a range of 6% to 14% for other groups) to have their parole revoked for a violent offense; however, they had the highest percentage of parole revocation for committing murder.

Sixty percent (or 1932) of 3208 youth paroled in 1998 were discharged by February 2002; 213 (11%) were honorably discharged, meaning they had performed well on parole and completed their court obligations. API youth paroled from CYA in 1998 had the highest percentage for honorable discharge (25%, compared to 8-23% for other groups) and the lowest percentage with a dishonorable discharge (39%, compared to 54% to 66% for other groups).

The bottom panel of Table 6 shows youth averaged 3.56 years under CYA jurisdiction before discharge from the system. (CYA jurisdiction includes the time youth were incarcerated through the time they were discharged from CYA.) API youth were under the jurisdiction of CYA for noticeably longer than the average for all wards. This is consistent with API youth being on parole longer than other racial groups.

Since API youth have the highest percentage of first time on parole, discharge with no violations, and honorable discharge, the longer jurisdiction time appears inconsistent. The combination of gang membership, commitment offense type, and age at admission may affect the length of time API youth are under CYA jurisdiction. API youth have a higher percentage of gang membership, violent primary commitment offense, and homicide as a primary commitment offense than White, Hispanic, or African American youth.

Summary

The statistics in this Resource Paper illustrate that disaggregating the API category is critical to providing a more accurate picture of ethnic disparities. Accessing and analyzing the administrative data reveal significant variations in the API ethnicities admitted to, paroled from, and incarcerated in CYA. These differences include youth characteristics, commitment offenses, length of incarceration, length of parole, and length of jurisdiction.

The findings here are consistent with those from previous work done by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency

(Le et al. 2001a, 2001b). The most noteworthy similarity is that API ethnicities are relatively small groups, but several are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. Of some import is that API ethnicities overrepresented in CYA are from groups that immigrated to the U.S. after the mid-1970s. The finding that API ethnicities with a shorter history in the U.S. are overrepresented is a theme in many of the results.

Unfortunately, the published data available to the public and many key decision makers obscures the sizeable heterogeneity in outcomes by ethnicity, and this can lead to policy and programmatic neglect of API youth groups that are facing serious problems that are ultimately manifested in their disproportionate numbers within the juvenile justice system. We strongly recommend that public agencies as well as researchers continue disaggregating API ethnicity data and focus on the groups with the shortest history in the U.S.

Notes

1. The authors wish to thank the Division of Juvenile Justice (formerly known as the California Youth Authority) for providing data for this analysis, and to the editors of the *Nexus Journal* Special Issue for their editorial suggestions.
On July 1, 2005, CYA was officially renamed the Division of Juvenile Justice in the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. CYA will continue to be used in this article because of its more familiar name.
2. Retrieved on January 22, 2004. from <http://www.cya.ca.gov>
3. Monthly Population Report as of August 31, 2005. Retrieved on September 14, 2005 from http://www.cya.ca.gov/research/rfp_attach3.pdf.
4. North=Northern California counties include: Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Tuolumne, Yolo, and Yuba. SF=San Francisco/Bay Area counties include: Alameda, Contra Costa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Sonoma. South=Southern California counties include: Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura. Central=Central Valley counties include: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare.

References

- California Youth Authority. n.d. "Youthful Offender Parole Board Initial Appearance Hearings, 2001." <<http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/DivisionsBoards/DJJ/about/faqs.html#q7>>, [downloaded 9/19/06].
- Le, Thao, Isami Arifuku, Cory Louie, and Moshe Krisberg. 2001a. *Not Invisible: Asian Pacific Islander Juvenile Arrests in Alameda County*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Le, Thao, Isami Arifuku, Cory Louie, and Moshe Krisberg. 2001b. *Not Invisible: Asian Pacific Islander Juvenile Arrests in San Francisco County*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Poe-Yamagata, Eileen and Michael Jones. 2000. *And Justice for Some*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

ISAMI ARIFUKU, D. Crim., is a Senior Researcher with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and Assistant Director of the Asian Pacific Islander Youth Violence Prevention Center.

DELORES D. PEACOCK, M.A., is a Research Associate with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

CAROLINE GLESMANN, B.A. is a Research Associate with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

SUBSCRIBE NOW—

and receive a free copy of the National Asian Pacific American Political Almanac 2005-2006!

Don't Miss the Next Issue of **aapi nexus!**
Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders Policy, Practice and Community
—special focus—

“AAPI Art and Cultural Museums”

Future issues will focus on “Impact of Welfare Reform”
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/aasc/nexus>

We accept payment in the form of check or credit card.
Make checks payable to “UC REGENTS.”

Send this order form to:

aapi nexus
UCLA Asian American Studies Center Press
3230 Campbell Hall, Box 951546
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1546

I want to subscribe to aapi nexus (two issues a year)

\$25.00/year (individual)* \$_____

\$125.00/year (institution)* _____

Single issue/\$13.00+\$4.00 (Shipping & Handling) _____

*California residents add 8.25% sales tax _____

Foreign subscriptions add \$15.00 per year _____

(310) 825-2968/2974 Total \$_____

FAX (310) 206-9844
order by email: ascpress@aasc.ucla.edu
www.sscnet.ucla.edu/aasc

Name

Street Address

City State Zip

Credit Card Number VISA/MASTERCARD/DISCOVER accepted Expiration Date

Signature Phone #