



# ALASKA JUSTICE FORUM

A Publication of the  
Justice Center

Alaska Justice  
Statistical Analysis Unit

Spring 1995

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Vol. 12, No. 1

## Detention of Juveniles in Alaska: Preliminary Report

N.E. Schafer and Richard W. Curtis

### Introduction

In a previous article ("Juvenile Detention in Alaska, 1993," Fall 1994) we examined 1993 detention data collected under the auspices of the Division of Family and Youth Services. In that article we paid particular attention to the utilization of detention in Alaska, and we found that length of detention varied among racial and ethnic groups and that length of detention was longer for probation violation events than for most other charges.

For this article we make use of five years of detention data. Although 1989 information is less than complete, our analysis uses 1989 as the base year. Data for the remaining years are considerably more reliable. They include every instance of detention where the juvenile was held for more than 45 minutes.

The information includes: the date and time of admission; the date and time of release; the juvenile's date of birth, sex and race; and the reason for the detention. This information was entered each time a youth was detained in a juvenile detention or hold-over facility or held formally in an adult jail or lockup. (Juveniles who were booked and released from adult facilities were not included in the data set.)

*The primary data collected were detention events, not individuals.* Because of internal transfers from facility to facility within the overall system, one incident requiring detention may result in multiple *detention events* being included in the data set.

### Reasons for Detention

The reasons for the detention events are of particular interest. We have categorized reason for detention (charge) for ease of comparison. Some of these categories are conventional (e.g., crimes against person, property crimes, etc.) and some less so. We were particularly interested in status offenses and in detentions for protective custody. (Alaska statutes require police to take inebriates into custody for their own protection.)

The number and per cent of detention events associated with the different charge categories are displayed in Table 1. Two categories accounted for the most detentions in every year but 1989: property offenses and probation violations. Together these two reasons for detention account for 43.1 per cent of all detentions in the data set.

Detentions for property offenses, although they have constituted a substantial portion of all detentions since 1990, exceeding probation violations in 1990 and 1993, do not show a pattern. The numbers dropped

### HIGHLIGHTS INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- The Alaska Judicial Council designs a new case management system for the Alaska Court of Appeals (page 2).

in 1991 and 1992 from 322 events in 1990 and then jumped to 367 in 1993.

The table suggests that there has been a steady increase in detentions for crimes against persons. Within this category, murder accounted for very few instances of detention, although there was an increase in this crime from one in 1990 to three in 1991, five in 1992 and seven in 1993, for a total of 16 in all five years. There was only one detention for manslaughter—in 1991. The 682 instances of detention for crimes against persons included 62 charges of sexual assault—less than 10 per cent of the total. The majority of these charges for crimes against persons involved assault (N=565), which showed an almost 100 per cent increase between 1990 and 1993. In 1990, this charge was associated with 6.9 per cent of all reasons for detention; in 1993, these events constituted 13.2 per cent of all detention events.

Status offenses constituted a negligent

*Please see Juvenile Detention, page 3*

**Table 1. Reason for Detention of Juveniles in Alaska (Charges) by Year, 1989-1993**

*Number and percent of detention events in charge categories by year.*

	1989		1990		1991		1992		1993		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Offenses against persons	22	2.6%	127	8.6%	136	9.8%	168	10.3%	229	14.8%	682	9.9%
Offenses against property	72	8.7	322	21.9	274	19.7	244	14.9	367	23.7	1,279	18.6
Offenses against public order	39	4.7	96	6.5	86	6.2	103	6.3	88	5.7	412	6.0
Traffic offenses	29	3.5	90	6.1	72	5.2	89	5.4	75	4.8	355	5.2
Status offenses	91	11.0	30	2.0	25	1.8	35	2.1	33	2.1	214	3.1
Protective custody	118	14.2	162	11.0	126	9.0	179	11.0	127	8.2	712	10.3
Probation violations	343	41.3	318	21.6	294	21.1	379	23.2	355	22.9	1,689	24.5
Warrant	51	6.1	116	7.9	180	12.9	136	8.3	114	7.4	597	8.7
Court/detention order	45	5.4	110	7.5	127	9.1	161	9.9	90	5.8	533	7.7
Internal	20	2.4	99	6.7	72	5.2	132	8.1	65	4.2	388	5.6
Other	1	0.1	2	0.1	2	0.1	8	0.5	6	0.4	19	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>831</b>		<b>1,472</b>		<b>1,394</b>		<b>1,634</b>		<b>1,549</b>		<b>6,880</b>	

## Case Management System Developed for the Alaska Court of Appeals

The Judicial Council and the Alaska Court of Appeals have further expanded a computerized case management system designed by the Council for the appellate court. The first version of the system, which was funded by a federal grant of \$100,000, has been in place since late 1994. William Cotton, Peggy Skeers-Kerr and Alan McKelvie of the Judicial Council worked on the project with Judge David Mannheimer, Appellate Clerk of Court Jan Hansen and others from the court system.

The design of the new system follows a report on Alaska criminal justice computer systems prepared for the Judicial Council by Wolfe and Associates, a management consulting firm. The Council commissioned the statewide study at the direction of the state legislature. The Wolfe report, released in May 1994, examined computer management systems in the Alaska Court System, in the Departments of Law, Corrections, and Public Safety and in other agencies involved with the criminal justice process and made recommendations for future development. (See "Coordinating Criminal Justice Information Systems," *Alaska Justice Forum*, Spring 1994.) The study estimated that the design of a system for the Alaska Court of Appeals would cost approximately \$250,000.

Currently, the new appellate case management system is available only through terminals in the offices of the Court of Appeals and the Appellate Clerk in Anchorage, and access is limited to court personnel and members of the Judicial Council design team.

### System Capability

For fiscal year 1994, the Court of Appeals reported 422 cases filed and 411 disposed, and at the end June 1994, 453 cases were pending. The previous case management system utilized computerization to a very limited extent; many tasks were performed manually. Completely built anew using Microsoft Access and Windows-based WordPerfect, the new system permits thorough computer tracking of case information as well as overall management of tasks and document creation and imaging. The system uses 486 and Pentium PCs for both server and workstations.

### Case Information

Appellate court personnel can now enter

case information and monitor the progress of the appeal process. Case data are presented through a series of linked screens displaying general case information (number, status, parties, attorneys and judges); opening pleading information; status and location of trial court record and transcript; information on motions; information on briefs; information on oral arguments; chambers information (the assignment and drafting of opinions); and publication information.

### Task Information

The case management system permits monitoring of task assignments, scheduling and status by user and case number. The revised version of the system also permits automatic scheduling of some case tasks as they appear in the appellate process.

### Document Creation

Users can create documents through WordPerfect and scan in documents through Paperbridge software. (Ordinarily, only documents of ten pages or less are scanned; longer documents are maintained in paper form.) Templates for many routine orders and notices are available in WordPerfect.

### Future Development

The system design also provides the capability for court personnel to give timely feedback and suggestions on improvements to the Judicial Council design team. Further revisions of the software will continue to address such user concerns.

As funding becomes available, the Council plans to expand the operation of the system to the Alaska Supreme Court and to Fairbanks and Juneau and to make limited access available to offices and agencies regularly involved with the Court of Appeals, such as the Office of Special Prosecutions and Appeals and the Office of the Public Defender.

In addition, this case management system has been designed to permit future integration with a new system for the Alaska Supreme Court and, as recommended by the Wolfe report, to interface with other justice system management systems as they evolve. The current software permits inclusion of the Arrest Tracking Number (ATN) now being adopted throughout the criminal justice system to facilitate more accurate com-

pilation of criminal histories.

Because this design represents the state of the art in computerized appellate case management, the Judicial Council hopes to make its work available to other courts throughout the country.

## Recent BJS Reports

The following recent studies and reports from the Bureau of Justice Statistics are available from the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit:

*"Prison Sentences and Time Served for Violence," national data on length of confinement, NCJ-153838.*

*"Felony Sentences in State Courts, 1992," national data from a biannual survey on sentencing, NCJ-151167.*

*"Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 1993," employment survey of all federal arrest personnel, NCJ-151166.*

*"Comparing Federal and State Prison Inmates, 1991," demographic, social and criminal history data on prisoners, NCJ-145864.*

*"National Corrections Reporting Program, 1992," data on all prison admissions and releases and on all parole entries and discharges, NCJ-145862.*

*"Felony Sentences in the United States, 1990," the latest available figures on both state and federal sentencing, NCJ-149077.*

*"Criminal Victimization 1993," results of the national annual survey of households, NCJ-151658.*

*"Jails and Jail Inmates 1993-94," results from the national 1993 Census of Jails and the 1994 Annual Survey of Jails, providing information on staff, facilities and expenditures.*

*"Tort Cases in Large Counties," data from a 1992 survey of tort cases in state courts, NCJ 153177.*

Table 2. Demographic Information for Individuals by Year\*

	1989		1990		1991		1992		1993		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Age</b>												
Under 15	129	23.5%	181	19.5%	169	20.2%	182	19.1%	253	25.0%	791	23.3%
15	107	19.5	186	20.0	143	17.1	169	17.7	198	19.6	639	18.8
16	145	26.4	227	24.5	212	25.3	267	28.0	261	25.8	856	25.2
17	169	30.7	334	36.0	313	37.4	335	35.2	299	29.6	1,107	32.6
<b>Gender</b>												
Male	276	50.2%	627	67.6%	598	71.4%	673	70.6%	767	75.9%	2,289	67.5%
Female	140	25.5	193	20.8	179	21.4	236	24.8	232	22.9	761	22.4
Missing	134	24.4	108	11.6	60	7.2	44	4.6	12	1.2	343	10.1
<b>Race</b>												
White	123	22.4%	327	35.2%	401	47.9%	414	43.4%	466	46.1%	1,354	39.9%
Alaska Native	123	22.4	203	21.9	188	22.5	306	32.1	289	28.6	808	23.8
Black	12	2.2	48	5.2	78	9.3	100	10.5	91	9.0	240	7.1
Hispanic	1	0.2	23	2.5	23	2.7	20	2.1	32	3.2	79	2.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	0.5	6	0.6	14	1.7	20	2.1	22	2.2	51	1.5
Other	2	0.4	10	1.1	19	2.3	23	2.4	36	3.6	68	2.0
Other/missing	286	52.0	311	33.5	114	13.6	70	7.3	75	7.4	793	23.4
(Total individuals)	550 individuals		928 individuals		837 individuals		953 individuals		1,011 individuals		3,393 individuals	
(Total events)	847 events		1483 events		1404 events		1646 events		1554 events		6483 events	

\* Files for each year were computed separately. The total column for 1989-1993 includes individuals who appear in more than one year, and therefore adds to fewer than the totals per year.

## Juvenile Detention (continued from page 1)

proportion of the total number of detentions in the combined data set, and in each year after 1989 constituted a decreasing proportion of the total, reflecting the impact of concerted efforts by the state to reduce detentions on these charges. Detentions for reasons of protective custody did not show a pattern, but they constituted fewer detention reasons than we had predicted.

### Data on Individuals

Because we wished to look at information about *individuals*, not just detention events, we combined personal identifiers included in the data with date of birth, thus reconfiguring the event data as individual data. Since combining data from five years into a single data set resulted in some missing data, totals may vary according to the variables under discussion. During the five years a total of 6931 detentions were experienced by 3393 Alaska juveniles—more than two events per person. Clearly, there were a number of recidivists in our data; this group is of particular interest and will be examined in detail, particularly because of the possibility of several records based on a single charge (transfers).

Our descriptions of the individuals involved in the detention events begin with Table 2, which provides demographic data by year of detention for individuals. We should note that the recording of demographic data improved over the five years. Gender was omitted from about one-third

of the records in 1989 and race was omitted from approximately two-thirds. (The age data are accurate for all years, since date of birth determined entry into the data set for each year.) However, we were able to extract gender and race data for individuals if the individual appeared more than once in the data set, considerably reducing the missing information.

Because each year in the table was computed as a separate file, the number of individuals detained in each separate year is accurate, but one cannot add the numbers for each year into a total since some juveniles appear from year to year. There are, therefore, fewer individuals in the five-year data than annual addition would provide. We computed the totals column separately, counting individual juveniles in the combined data set only once, regardless of when or how often each appeared in the five-year period.

The age data, which contain very little missing information, show that 17-year-olds constituted the largest proportion of detainees in every year, with 16-year-olds consistently constituting the second-largest proportion.

For each year after 1989, two to three males were detained for each female detained. These proportions are not particularly unusual when compared with other kinds of juvenile data elsewhere, though national *arrest* data suggest proportions closer to four to one for youth and eight or nine to one for adults.

The data on race in Table 2 show that whites and Alaska Natives form the bulk of all juveniles detained every year. Alaska

Natives appear to be overrepresented among detained youth for the two years (1992 and 1993) for which race data are nearly complete. They constituted less than 20 per cent of the combined white/Native population of 10 to 19-year-olds in the total state population (Alaska Department of Labor, *Alaska Population Overview*, 1991), but they were more than 30 per cent of all detainees in 1992 and 28.6 per cent of all detainees in 1993. White youth were less than 50 per cent of detainees in both years.

### Frequency of Detention

For each separate year, the average number of detentions per juvenile was 1.5 to 1.7. For the total data set, which carried individuals from year to year, the average was closer to two (1.91 detentions per person). When we examined the full data set we found that 62.5 per cent of the individuals appeared only once in 5 years (N=2121). This does not, of course, indicate that these 2000-plus juveniles offended only once. Those whose last detention of many was in 1989 would be included in this figure, as would those whose first of many occurred in 1993. Of the remaining juveniles, 563 appeared twice in the data set; 284, three times; 182, four times; 99, five times; and 144, six or more times. The individual record for frequency of detention during the five years was 27 times.

Table 3 presents data on detention frequency by the demographic characteristics of age, race, and gender. Proportionately

Please see *Juvenile Detention*, page 4

**Table 3. Detention Frequency of Individuals by Demographic Characteristic**

	Detained once		Detained 2-3 times		Detained 4-5 times		Detained 6 or more times		Total N
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
<b>Age</b>									
Under 12	35	85.4%	4	9.8%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	41
12	41	53.9	15	19.7	9	11.8	11	14.5	76
13	104	46.4	64	28.6	27	12.1	29	12.9	224
14	227	50.4	124	27.6	59	13.1	40	8.9	450
15	328	51.3	182	28.5	92	14.4	37	5.8	639
16	512	59.8	249	29.1	70	8.2	25	2.9	856
17	874	79.0	209	18.9	22	2.0	2	0.2	1,107
<b>Gender</b>									
Male	1,362	59.5%	617	27.0%	211	9.2%	99	4.3%	2,289
Female	467	61.4	186	24.4	63	8.3	45	5.9	761
Missing	292	85.1	44	12.8	7	2.0	0	0.0	343
<b>Race</b>									
White	817	60.3%	363	26.8%	116	8.6%	58	4.3%	1,354
Alaska Native	429	53.1	225	27.8	90	11.1	64	7.9	808
Black	126	52.5	71	29.6	30	12.5	13	5.4	240
Hispanic	48	60.8	21	26.6	9	11.4	1	1.3	79
Asian/Pacific Islander	30	58.8	16	31.4	5	9.8	0	0.0	51
Other	43	63.2	15	22.1	5	7.4	5	7.4	68
Missing	628	79.2	136	17.2	26	3.3	3	0.4	793

Row percentages.

**Juvenile Detention**  
(continued from page 3)

more African American youth appeared in our data set more than once (47.5%) than any other race category, followed by Alaska Natives (46.9%). The frequency with which males and females appeared in the data set was proportionally similar for each frequency category, with males slightly less likely to appear only once and slightly less likely than females to appear six or more times. For both race and gender, the amount of missing data may affect these proportions, though we can probably assume that the missing race and gender data would approximate the distribution of known race and gender.

**Repeat Offenders**

Because so many youth appear in the data multiple times, we have looked more closely at the 144 juveniles who appeared in the data set six or more times, a group we have defined as our repeat offenders. In this group, 38.2 per cent were detained 6 times (N=55); 20.1 percent, 7 times (N=29); and 21.5 percent, 8 times (N=31). Twelve juveniles in the full data set experienced 9 detentions; four juveniles, 10 detentions; three juveniles, 11 detentions; and four, 12 detentions. Each of the remaining six juveniles experienced a different number of detentions over the period: 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 27 (Table 4). Together these 144 youth accounted for 1,112 detentions.

The repeat offenders differ from the full sample in the distribution of both race and gender. Females accounted for 31.3 per cent

of the subsample, compared with 21.7 per cent of the total sample. Alaska Natives are the largest portion of the repeat offender subsample. They are 44.4 per cent of the total (N=64), while whites are 40.3 per cent (N=58) and blacks are 9.0 per cent (N=13). This differs greatly from the proportion of Alaska Natives in the full sample (21.6% compared to 37.1% for whites) and is greatly disproportionate to their appearance in the general population of Alaska youth. The disparities raise some questions about the reasons for detention and the degree to which there may be bias in the system.

We used an SPSS random sample generator program to identify a subsample of these repeat offenders for more careful study. The fifteen offenders are profiled in Table 5. If our subsample of repeat offenders is a mirror, Alaska seems to have relatively few seriously criminal youth whose repeated detentions are tied to repeated criminal acts.

Case #13 was one of these relatively few. He was a white male aged 14 who was detained 10 times; three of these detentions were for probation violations. His first appearance was for burglary (which may have been changed to theft when transferred on the same day to Anchorage from Kenai). He was detained five times for assault, and once for criminal mischief. He may have violated probation more times than the data indicate, since where a criminal charge was listed as a reason for violation, the event was entered in our data under the more serious charge.

Considerably more cases in this subsample suggest that many instances of detention result from a single act, that many

are “paperwork” detentions tied to movement across the system or even within the facility, and that some juveniles are detained frequently and ultimately institutionalized for relatively minor but frequent misbehavior. Consider the history of Case #14, a 12-year-old female African American who first appeared in our data set in August 1990 for violation of probation. She continued to violate her probation and was detained three more times on this charge. We assume that she was ultimately institutionalized for her behavior: one year after her fourth probation violation she was placed in detention for reasons of program discipline. (It is not uncommon for youths in treatment to be placed in detention for disciplinary reasons. The youth centers all contain separate detention/treatment areas, and while treatment has no high-custody holding area, the detention area does.) At 15 she was detained on a charge of minor consuming alcohol (a status offense under JJDP guidelines) and then experienced two more detentions for violating the conditions of probation—six detentions for probation violation out of a total of eight.

Our sample of repeat offenders raises two important areas for further examination: race/gender differentials and the large proportion of probation violations recorded as the reason for the detention event—25 per cent of all detention events. We begin with an exploration of probation violators. We reiterate that engaging in criminal behavior is grounds for a probation violation but may or may not be included in the information we compiled. Where criminal charges were mentioned along with a probation violation, we entered the most serious criminal charge as the reason for detention. However, although the record may indicate only a probation violation, this may subsume another illegal act.

**Table 4. Repeat Offenders\***

Number of detentions	N	%
6	55	38.2%
7	29	20.1
8	31	21.5
9	12	8.3
10	4	2.8
11	3	2.1
12	4	2.8
13	1	0.7
15	1	0.7
16	1	0.7
17	1	0.7
18	1	0.7
23	1	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	

\* Repeat offenders were defined as individuals detained six or more times from 1989 to 1993. 144 repeat offenders accounted for 1,112 detention events in the five-year period.

The repeat offender subsample contains a large proportion of probation violators. Seven of the fifteen in the subsample appeared in our data for the first time for a violation of probation; only three of this

subsample had no detentions for probation violations. The remainder had one to six detentions for this reason (two had six, one had five, two had four, etc.). Since the full sample contained a substantial number of

probation violators, we examined *all* probation violators as another subsample. In Table 6 we show the number of probation

*Please see Juvenile Detention, page 6*

**Table 5. Subsample of Repeat Offenders**

Age	Detention event #	Date	Charge	Location	Age	Detention event #	Date	Charge	Location
<i>Case 1—Male, White</i>					<i>Case 9—Male, White</i>				
16	1	01/21/90	Probation violation	Fairbanks	16	1	02/05/92	Warrant: probation violation	Kenai
	2	04/23/90	Program discipline	Fairbanks		2	02/06/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
17	3	01/28/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks		3	04/09/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
	4	02/08/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks		4	05/10/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
	5	05/21/91	Detention order	Anchorage	17	5	11/16/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
	6	07/17/91	Transfer	Fairbanks		6	11/25/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
<i>Case 2—Female, Alaska Native</i>					<i>Case 10—Female, White</i>				
15	1	01/02/90	Probation violation	Anchorage	13	1	10/09/89	Probation violation	Anchorage
	2	02/28/90	Controlled substance	Anchorage	14	2	05/05/90	Probation violation	Anchorage
16	3	06/09/90	Probation violation	Anchorage		3	05/26/90	Probation violation	Anchorage
	4	02/21/90	Assault	Anchorage		4	08/15/90	Criminal mischief	Anchorage
17	5	07/28/91	Bench warrant	Anchorage	15	5	01/15/91	Shoplifting	Anchorage
	6	11/07/91	Transfer	Fairbanks		6	02/11/91	Probation violation	Anchorage
	7	12/19/91	Transfer	Anchorage	<i>Case 11—Female, Alaska Native</i>				
<i>Case 3—Male, Black</i>					15	1	04/25/91	Minor consuming	Aniak
16	1	12/16/90	Probation violation	Anchorage		2	12/02/91	Program discipline	Bethel
	2	01/26/91	Transfer	Fairbanks	16	3	02/25/92	Detention order	Anchorage
	3	06/26/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks		4	10/02/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
	4	07/02/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks		5	10/30/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
17	5	10/01/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks	17	6	07/12/93	Probation violation	Bethel
	6	11/16/91	Program discipline	Fairbanks		7	10/05/93	Probation violation	Bethel
	7	03/16/92	Probation violation	Fairbanks		8	10/15/93	Probation violation	Bethel
<i>Case 4—Female, Alaska Native</i>					<i>Case 12—Female, Alaska Native</i>				
15	1	04/25/90	Program discipline	Bethel	13	1	02/05/90	Protective custody	Nome
	2	10/04/90	Child in Need of Aid	Bethel		2	05/31/90	Protective custody	Nome
16	3	01/23/91	Medical transfer	Fairbanks		3	06/23/90	Protective custody	Nome
	4	08/15/91	Probation violation	Anchorage	14	4	07/19/90	Probation violation	Nome
	5	08/16/91	Probation violation	Bethel		5	09/21/90	Bench warrant	Fairbanks
17	6	02/22/92	Probation violation	Anchorage	16	6	02/05/93	Assault	Nome
	7	02/26/92	Probation violation	Bethel	<i>Case 13—Male, White</i>				
<i>Case 5—Male, Alaska Native</i>					14	1	07/13/91	Burglary	Kenai
15	1	11/20/90	Probation violation	Bethel		2	07/13/91	Theft	Anchorage
16	2	02/05/91	Probation violation	Bethel		3	12/29/91	Assault	Anchorage
	3	05/01/91	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel		4	02/12/92	Assault	Anchorage
17	4	02/28/92	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel	15	5	07/30/92	Probation violation	Kenai
	5	06/06/92	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel		6	07/31/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
	6	07/27/92	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel		7	11/05/92	Assault	Anchorage
	7	09/02/92	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel		8	02/19/93	Criminal mischief	Glennallen
	8	10/17/92	Protective custody (alcohol)	Bethel		9	02/20/93	Probation violation	Anchorage
	9	11/05/92	Probation violation	Bethel		10	03/10/93	Assault	Anchorage
<i>Case 6—Male, White</i>					<i>Case 14—Female, Black</i>				
16	1	02/24/91	Burglary	Anchorage	12	1	08/24/90	Probation violation	Anchorage
	2	04/19/91	Bench warrant	Anchorage	13	2	10/11/90	Probation violation	Anchorage
	3	05/16/91	Bench warrant	Anchorage		3	01/17/91	Probation violation	Anchorage
17	4	03/26/92	Bench warrant	Anchorage		4	03/05/91	Probation violation	Anchorage
	5	05/15/92	Bench warrant	Anchorage	14	5	03/05/92	Program discipline	Anchorage
	6	06/21/92	Program discipline	Anchorage	15	6	01/04/93	Minor consuming	Anchorage
<i>Case 7—Male, Alaska Native</i>						7	02/09/93	Probation violation	Anchorage
	8	03/01/93	Probation violation	Anchorage		8	03/01/93	Probation violation	Anchorage
15	1	07/01/90	Protective custody	Juneau	<i>Case 15—Male, White</i>				
	2	10/13/90	Bench warrant	Juneau	13	1	09/17/91	Theft	Anchorage
	3	12/11/90	Protective custody	Juneau		2	09/28/91	Criminal mischief	Anchorage
16	4	01/14/92	Transfer from another facility	Anchorage		3	04/04/92	Assault	Anchorage
	5	01/16/92	Transfer from another facility	Fairbanks	14	4	10/09/92	Probation violation	Anchorage
17	6	05/22/92	Absent without leave	Fairbanks		5	03/01/93	Probation violation	Anchorage
<i>Case 8—Male, Alaska Native</i>					15	6	09/14/93	Controlled substance	Anchorage
15	1	02/29/91	Burglary	Fairbanks					
	2	06/30/91	Warrant: failure to appear	Anchorage					
16	3	11/26/91	DWI	Anchorage					
	4	10/03/92	Driving with license revoked	Anchorage					
	5	10/07/92	Bench warrant	Glennallen					
	6	10/08/92	Driving with license revoked	Anchorage					

**Table 6. Probation Violators**

N = 950

		N	%
<b>Gender</b>	Male	693	72.9%
	Female	220	23.2
	Missing	37	3.9
<b>Race</b>	White	423	44.5%
	Native	272	28.6
	Black	75	7.9
	Hispanic	23	2.4
	Asian/Pacific Islander	11	1.2
	Other	15	1.6
	Missing	171	18.0
<b>Reason for first detention</b>	Offenses against persons	59	6.2%
	Offenses against property	192	20.2
	Offenses against public order	15	1.6
	Traffic offenses	10	1.1
	Status offenses	8	0.8
	Protective custody	31	3.3
	Probation violations	534	56.2
	Warrant	48	5.1
	Court/detention order	35	3.7
	Internal	8	0.8
	Other	10	1.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>950</b>	

for this reason, but 180 were detained twice for reasons of violating probation and 176 were detained three or more times. One juvenile achieved 12 detentions for violating probation.

The race and gender data in this table are more complete than those in some earlier tables. Gender information is missing in only 3.9 per cent of this subsample. There was little difference between the proportions of males and females who were detained once for violations of probation.

We also examined the charge for which the 950 probation violators first appeared in our data and found that more than half appeared in the five-year data set for the first time on a charge of probation violation (56.2%). The next largest group appeared initially for property offenses (20.2%). As noted above, our early data “catches” 17-year-olds who are finishing their histories of delinquency and may also constitute a substantial portion of those whose initial appearance in our data was for a probation violation.

est racial categories and have collapsed other races and combined them with data events where race is missing. This allows us to focus on the differences between white and Alaska Native detention events. Further, we have consolidated frequency into three categories: one appearance in the five-year data set; two to six appearances; and six or more appearances. Finally, we have separated the data by gender in order to determine whether gender compounds the differentials.

Although for a large portion of juveniles who appeared only once in the data race was not recorded, as the number of detentions for each individual increased, our ability to derive this data item from other recorded events also increased. We assigned the appropriate race to those events where it was not recorded. Among males detained only once, 18.6 per cent were missing and 15.1 per cent were identified as other races. Among those detained two to six times, 9.0 per cent were missing and 18.5 per cent were identified as other races; and among the very frequent category, less than four per cent of the data was missing.

For males, as frequency of detention occurs, there is a steady increase in the proportion of Alaska Natives in the data. For those detained six or more times, the difference is greater not only proportionally but also numerically. The reasons for the detentions vary among frequency categories.

**Juvenile Detention**  
(continued from page 5)

violations for each of the 950 juveniles detained at least once for a probation violation by gender and by race. Most probation violators (62.5%) were detained only once

**Race and Gender**

Using detention event data from all five years, we compared reason for detention by frequency of detention by race in Table 7. We have examined whites and Alaska Natives specifically because they are the larg-

**Table 7. Reason for First Detention by Number of Detention Events, Race, and Sex**

	1 detention event						2-5 detention events					
	White		Alaska Native		Other/missing		White		Alaska Native		Other/missing	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Males</b>												
Offenses against persons	104	16.5%	43	15.9%	64	14.0%	91	8.2%	59	9.7%	66	10.1%
Offenses against property	156	24.8	51	18.9	95	20.8	253	22.8	87	14.4	157	24.1
Offenses against public order	52	8.3	32	11.9	43	9.4	64	5.8	40	6.6	32	4.9
Traffic offenses	80	12.7	12	4.4	52	11.4	49	4.4	20	3.3	29	4.4
Status offenses	6	1.0	4	1.5	33	7.2	6	0.5	10	1.7	20	3.1
Protective custody	15	2.4	55	20.4	36	7.9	17	1.5	66	10.9	15	2.3
Probation violations	73	11.6	30	11.1	80	17.5	357	32.2	175	28.9	216	33.1
Warrant	68	10.8	16	5.9	24	5.3	112	10.1	47	7.8	48	7.4
Court/detention order	65	10.3	17	6.3	17	3.7	94	8.5	51	8.4	49	7.5
Internal	10	1.6	10	3.7	11	2.4	61	5.5	48	7.9	20	3.1
Other	1	0.2	0	0.0	2	0.4	5	0.5	3	0.5	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>46.4%*</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>19.9%*</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>33.7%*</b>	<b>1,109</b>	<b>46.9%*</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>25.6%*</b>	<b>652</b>	<b>27.5%*</b>
<b>Females</b>												
Offenses against persons	18	10.7%	13	9.3%	13	8.2%	13	5.5%	20	7.0%	9	5.6%
Offenses against property	37	22.0	10	7.1	31	19.6	42	17.9	14	4.9	25	15.4
Offenses against public order	10	6.0	9	6.4	6	3.8	10	4.3	16	5.6	7	4.3
Traffic offenses	20	11.9	7	5.0	7	4.4	10	4.3	8	2.8	3	1.9
Status offenses	7	4.2	8	5.7	24	15.2	2	0.9	9	3.1	8	4.9
Protective custody	5	3.0	56	40.0	29	18.4	6	2.6	86	30.1	19	11.7
Probation violations	17	10.1	9	6.4	29	18.4	89	37.9	62	21.7	59	36.4
Warrant	33	19.6	11	7.9	5	3.2	34	14.5	38	13.3	13	8.0
Court/detention order	16	9.5	11	7.9	8	5.1	20	8.5	13	4.5	8	4.9
Internal	5	3.0	5	3.6	5	3.2	9	3.8	20	7.0	11	6.8
Other	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>36.0%*</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>30.0%*</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>33.9%*</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>34.4%*</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>41.9%*</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>23.7%*</b>

\* Percentages in “Total” rows are row percentages.

For whites who appear only once in the data set, the most likely reason for detention was a property offense charge (24.8% of white one-time males), followed by a crime against persons (16.5%). Natives who appear only once were most likely to be detained for reasons of protective custody. Probation violations are the most likely reason for detention for both white and Native males in both other frequency categories.

Regardless of frequency category, Alaska Native males are more likely than white males to be detained for protective custody purposes. This difference is particularly pronounced among those who appear in the data only once. Twenty per cent of Alaska Native males detained once were detained for protective custody reasons, compared to 2.4 per cent of whites. It is the only detention reason where the numeric difference holds over all three frequency categories.

Alaska statutes allow (indeed, require) police to take inebriates into custody for their own protection. Detention is only one option for inebriated juveniles, but other options are more likely to be available only in urban areas. For this article we are unable to examine some of the questions which might be related to protective custody detentions (rural vs. urban, season, etc.), but we note that many rural areas have largely Native populations and fewer sleep-off options.

Among females, protective custody is the primary reason for detention for Alaska Natives detained once and for those detained two to six times. It is the second most likely reason for detention for those detained six or more times. The racial distribution of total detention events differs considerably for females than for males. While Alaska Natives account for 26.5 per cent of all male detentions (1184 of 4460 events), Alaska Native females account for 44.3 per cent of all female detentions (670 of 1514 events). There are more Natives than whites in the two to six detentions category, as well as the six or more detentions category. There are *numerically* more protective custody events among Alaska Native females than among Alaska Native males.

Other research performed elsewhere has found that gender is a major determinant in the decision to detain, with females considerably more likely to be detained for status offenses than males. It is doubtful that young Native women are more likely than young Native men to become inebriated, but it is possible that they are viewed by system personnel as more in need of protection.

**Conclusion**

This preliminary analysis pinpoints areas for future research on detention by race and gender. Because record-keeping has improved, the data may be used to examine annual changes in detention policies, but the weaknesses of the 1989 and 1990 data make definitive analysis of trends impossible at this point.

Our primary purpose was to describe the detention data. The proportion of detentions for probation violations led us to examine repeat detainees, and the proportion of minorities among these repeaters led us to an initial examination of race, gender and detention frequency.

Although our findings suggest important differences in the reasons for detaining female Native youth, different kinds of analysis as well as elimination of the less satisfactory data years may erase some of these differentials. We suggest, however, that researchers studying racial disparities control for gender to see if the kinds of differences we have found appear elsewhere.

Our data suggest that “detention recidivists” are frequently involved in fairly minor deviant behaviors and that alternative placements for probation violators might lessen the cost of detention and decrease institutional crowding.

*N.E. Schafer is a professor at the Justice Center. Richard W. Curtis is a Justice Center research associate.*

**National Task Force**

Dr. Allan Barnes, Director of the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit within the Justice Center at UAA, accepted an appointment to a national task force assembled by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Through a series of meetings in spring 1995, the task force consulted on the future of the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data and assembled a strategic plan for the archive.

Task force members also included Professor William Bailey of Cleveland State University; Professor Gary LaFree of the University of New Mexico; Professor James Fox of Northeastern University; Dr. Joel Garner of Washington, D.C.; Dr. Elizabeth Martin of the Bureau of the Census; Professor Wesley Skogan of Northwestern University; Robert Tinari of the Bureau of the Census; and Professor Franklin Zimring of the University of California Law School.



**Alaska Justice Forum**

Editor: Antonia Moras  
 Editorial Board: John Angell, Allan Barnes, Robert Congdon, Richard Curtis, Kimberly Martus, Roger Miller, Lisa Rieger, Nancy Schafer, Lawrence Trostle  
 Typesetting and Layout: Melissa S. Green

Justice Center, John Angell, Director

Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit, Allan Barnes, Director

Published quarterly by the Justice Center and the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit at the University of Alaska Anchorage, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508; (907) 786-1810; fax 786-7777; Internet address [ajjust@orion.alaska.edu](mailto:ajjust@orion.alaska.edu).

© 1995 Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage  
 ISSN 0893-8903

The Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, provides approximately thirty-five per cent of the funding for this publication.

The opinions expressed are those of individual authors and may not be those of the Justice Center or the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

The University of Alaska provides equal education and employment opportunities for all, regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, or status as a Vietnam-era or disabled veteran.

**6 or more detention events**

White		Alaska Native		Other/missing	
N	%	N	%	N	%
17	5.9%	19	6.2%	8	5.7%
53	18.4	51	16.6	29	20.7
5	1.7	9	2.9	6	4.3
5	1.7	11	3.6	3	2.1
1	0.3	1	0.3	4	2.9
3	1.0	24	7.8	7	5.0
123	42.7	70	22.7	47	33.6
27	9.4	30	9.7	11	7.9
24	8.3	39	12.7	10	7.1
30	10.4	54	17.5	15	10.7
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>288</b>	<b>39.1%*</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>41.8%*</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>19.0%*</b>
7	6.5%	35	14.3%	0	0.0%
17	15.7	9	3.7	1	7.7
0	0.0	8	3.3	0	0.0
0	0.0	3	1.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	7	2.9	0	0.0
2	1.9	43	17.6	0	0.0
53	49.1	78	32.0	10	76.9
18	16.7	17	7.0	1	7.7
5	4.6	24	9.8	1	7.7
6	5.6	20	8.2	0	0.0
0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>108</b>	<b>29.5%*</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>66.8%*</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3.6%*</b>

## Minorities and Justice Careers

Throughout June 1995, the Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage is again offering an intensive course designed for minority students who are considering pursuing careers within the justice system. Fourteen students from cities and villages throughout the state and from several other states are enrolled.

Through a series of lectures, field trips, readings and seminars, the course introduces participants to the structure of the justice system and provides academic guidance for those interested in developing justice careers.

The course is being taught by Kimberly Martus of the Justice Center; Shawn Seetomona is the program coordinator.

## Justice Students Serve as Interns

Two UAA Justice Center undergraduates have been selected as participants for national programs based in Washington, D.C.

Rhonda Horn is serving as an intern within the new U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS). COPS has been established to implement Part Q of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994: "Public Safety and Community Policing: Cops on the Beat." Interns, who are selected on the basis of academic achievement and career interest in law enforcement, receive

substantive exposure to the administration of the new federal program and opportunities to participate in developmental activities, such as tours of government and justice institutions and discussions with justice officials.

Bernadette Joseph participated in May 1995 in the Eleventh Annual Women as Leaders Academic Seminar, which is sponsored by AVON Products Foundation, Inc. The seminar is designed to develop leadership skills and assist participants in examining their personal aspirations. Rhonda Horn also participated in this seminar.

---

**Alaska Justice Forum  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508**

**Non-Profit Organization  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Anchorage, Alaska  
Permit No. 107**

Address correction requested.