



ALASKA JUSTICE FORUM

A Publication of the
Justice Center

Alaska Justice
Statistical Analysis Unit

Fall 1994

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Vol. 11, No. 3

Juvenile Detention in Alaska, 1993

N.E. Schafer and Richard W. Curtis

In Alaska juveniles are detained for a variety of reasons in facilities of all types throughout the state. Some may have been arrested on criminal charges and are awaiting juvenile court hearings; others may have been detained for their own protection (e.g., under Title 47, which permits incarceration of both juvenile and adult inebriates for their own protection for up to twelve hours or until sober). Many are held for very brief periods; all must have a hearing within 48 hours. Those who are detained in adult facilities (jails and lockups) are usually released within hours to a responsible adult or, if a longer period of detention is warranted, they are transferred to a facility which detains only juveniles. This article provides a preliminary examination of 1552 instances of detention in Alaska during calendar year 1993, using the amount of time spent in detention as a basis for comparing different detention events.

The data for this study were collected by the Justice Center in the process of

monitoring the state's compliance with the mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The data, collected on behalf of the Division of Family and Youth Services, include the date and time of admission; date and time of release; the juvenile's date of birth, sex and race; and the reason for the detention (charge). This information was entered each time a juvenile was detained in a juvenile detention center or holdover 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 data missing from adult lockups are thought to be minimal, since many village lockups are rarely used to detain either adults or juveniles. Lockups which did report information accounted for only 45 detention events—2.8 per cent of the total. We posit that the 48 non-reporting lockups would account for no more detention events than did the reporting lockups. (It is probable that they would actually account for fewer.)

Because of reports of crowding in detention units during 1993, we have used the admission/release time data to determine

HIGHLIGHTS INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- The Bureau of Justice Statistics describes the redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey (page 2).
- Task force examines gender equality in the courts (page 3).
- The Department of Public Safety and the Justice Center initiate a study (page 7).
- Mediation project receives grant (page 7).
- Center receives DOC grant (page 7).

the number of days involved in detaining juveniles in Alaska. Our analysis uses detention length to compare a variety of factors in the data set.

A general picture of detention is provided in Table 1, indicating that 1552 detention events were recorded between January 1 and December 31, 1993. Names of juveniles

Please see Juvenile Detention, page 5

Table 1. Juvenile Detentions in Alaska by Event, 1993

	Persons		Detention events		Number of detention days		Mean length of detention	Median length of detention
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Total	1023		1552		21,452.0 days		13.8 days	1.9 days
Gender								
Male	767	75.0 %	1174	75.6 %	17,801.8 days	83.0 %	15.2 days	2.0 days
Female	234	22.9	356	22.9	3,647.3	17.0	10.3	1.2
Age								
Less than 15 years	255	24.9 %	365	23.5 %	5,156.7 days	24.0 %	14.2 days	1.9 days
15 years	202	19.7	336	21.6	5,479.4	25.5	16.4	2.7
16 years	264	25.8	405	26.1	5,823.1	27.1	14.5	2.0
17 years	302	29.5	446	28.7	4,992.9	23.3	11.3	1.2
Race								
White	462	45.2 %	670	43.2 %	9,301.9 days	43.4 %	14.0 days	1.9 days
Alaska Native	276	27.0	467	30.1	5,704.1	26.6	12.3	1.9
Black	91	8.9	132	8.5	2,155.9	10.0	16.3	4.0
Hispanic	32	3.1	57	3.7	888.0	4.1	15.6	2.6
Asian/Pacific Islander	22	2.2	32	2.1	630.3	2.9	19.7	3.4
Other/missing	140	13.7	194	12.5	2,735.9	12.8	14.2	0.8

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of missing information. Detention events were the primary units of analysis and other variables were computed from this variable in combination with other variables (e.g., "Persons" was computed using birthdate, initials, and gender provided for each event).

BJS Report

National Crime Victimization Survey Redesign

What is the National Crime Victimization Survey?

The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is one of two Justice Department measures of crime in the United States. A pioneering effort when it was begun in 1972, the survey was intended to complement what is known about crime from the FBI's annual compilation of information reported to law enforcement agencies (the Uniform Crime Report). The survey, which also counts incidents not reported to the police, provides a detailed picture of crime incidents, victims, and trends from the victim's perspective. Data are collected every year from a sample of approximately 50,000 households with more than 100,000 individuals age 12 or over.

Victimizations are categorized as personal or property crimes. Personal crimes, including attempts, involve incidents with direct contact between the victim and offender. (Murder is *not* measured by the NCVS because of the inability to question the victim.) Property crimes do not involve personal confrontation and include such crimes as household burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft.

Recent BJS Reports

In addition to the report summarized in the accompanying article, the following recent studies and reports from the Bureau of Justice Statistics are available from the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit:

"Comparing Federal & State Prison Inmates, 1991," figures on offenses, sentence lengths, and criminal histories of inmates nationwide, NCJ-145864.

"Violence and Theft in the Workplace," data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, NCJ-145125.

"Murder in Families," detailed information on the nature and extent of this type of crime and on the response of the justice system, NCJ-143498.

Why redesign?

- Criticism of the earlier survey's capacity to gather information about certain crimes, including sexual assaults and domestic violence, prompted numerous improvements.

- Improved survey methodology enhances the ability of people being interviewed to recall events.

- Public attitudes toward victims have changed, permitting more direct questioning about sexual assaults.

What is the redesign?

The new methodology was systematically field-tested and introduced starting in 1989, and its results are being published for the first time this year. New questions were added to accommodate heightened interest in certain types of victimizations. Improvements in technology and survey methods were incorporated in the redesign. The extended effort to improve the survey is paying off, as the numbers from the redesign will be available in October 1994. An advisory panel of criminal justice policymakers, social scientists, victim advocates, and statisticians oversaw the work of a consortium of criminologists and social and survey scientists who conducted research on the improved procedures.

What are the results of the redesign?

Victims are now reporting more types of crime incidents to the survey's interviewers. Previously undetected victimizations are being captured. For example, the survey changes have substantially increased the number of rapes and aggravated and simple assaults reported to interviewers. For the first time other victimizations, such as non-rape sexual assault and unwanted or coerced sexual contact that involves a threat or attempt to harm, are also being measured.

Why are survey participants reporting so many more victimizations?

The survey now includes improved questions and cues that aid victims in recalling victimizations. Survey interviewers now ask more explicit questions about sexual victimizations. Advocates have also encouraged victims to

talk more openly about their experiences. Together, these changes substantially improve reporting for many types of personal and household crimes.

Can the new results be compared with previous years?

Measuring annual change in crime victimizations is one of the most important uses of NCVS. The transition to the redesigned survey preserved the ability to detect annual change during the turnover period. Both versions of the survey were used simultaneously to collect data for 1992-93. The overlap also permits measuring the differences between the old and new surveys to show whether the 1992-93 differences were due to changes in crime or changes in the survey.

Why did the Justice Department pick this time to release these findings?

Annual change estimates of crime victimizations are regularly published in the fall. For the first time data collected with the redesigned survey are available for two consecutive years. The transition to the redesigned survey began in 1989, and this release has been planned since that time.

What do the results of the redesign tell us about the adequacy of information from the original survey?

- *Number of victimizations.* The original National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) benefited from survey methods that were state of the art at the time it was developed. The improvements in survey procedures for the redesigned NCVS have resulted in increased reporting of victimizations. Because victims are reporting more victimization experiences, the redesigned survey is in fact producing a more comprehensive picture of the overall volume of crime.

- *Characteristics of victimizations.* The standards the NCVS uses to define different types of victimizations remain largely the same in the redesigned survey. Details other than what happened to the victim, such as age, race, victim-offender relationship, and location of the offense are also comparable with information provided by the original



**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.

© 1994 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.

Gender Equality in the Courts: A Preliminary Look

Sarah Josephson and Teresa Carns

Now you see it, now you don't—gender bias problems appear obvious to some and nonexistent to others. This was a primary finding of a series of surveys recently conducted by the Joint State-Federal Courts Gender Equality Task Force. Practicing attorneys from Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau and Ketchikan commented on gender bias issues in their communities and suggested solutions. The findings, in combination with earlier surveys by the group and with Anchorage surveys of non-attorneys who work in the courts, present an overall picture of gender equality issues. (A similar survey of federal courts and attorneys who practice in them is also being conducted, but its results are not presented here.) Two of the surveys administered by the task force also analyzed work choices by gender, to see whether men and women differed in their reasons for working in certain environments.

Chief Judge Holland of the U.S. District Court and Chief Justice Moore of the Alaska Supreme Court formed the task force in October 1993 to identify issues of gender bias and recommend solutions. The task force has established subcommittees which include other judges, attorneys, staff people and interested citizens throughout the state. The task force defines gender bias as any action or attitude based on preconceived notions about the nature, roles, and abilities of men and women rather than upon evaluations of individuals.

General Results

Almost equal numbers of men and women responded to the surveys, although the proportions varied greatly by community. (See Table 1.) The initial round of surveys in Ketchikan, Juneau and Fairbanks went only to attorneys. Anchorage surveys were sent to in-court clerks, legal assistants, guardians ad litem, and CASA volunteers, as well as to attorneys. (During the next year, the other communities plan to work with non-attorneys who appear in, or use, the courts.)

The task force surveyed attorneys at the Alaska Bar Convention in Juneau in 1992 and sent additional detailed surveys to lawyers in Anchorage, Ketchikan, Juneau and Fairbanks during 1993 and 1994. Overall, the survey findings showed that far more female attorneys than male attorneys

Table 1. Respondents by City and Sex

City	Female	Male	Total
Anchorage	75	32	107
Fairbanks	29	45	74
Juneau	26	39	65
Ketchikan	3	12	15
Total	133	128	261

knew of or had experienced gender bias. The surveys uniformly found that biases prevailed more strongly in attorney interactions than during judge-attorney interactions. Respondents also saw gender-related bias in interactions between lawyers or judges and other persons in the courtroom, including jurors, witnesses, security personnel and other court staff.

All surveys included similar questions about experience with, or knowledge of, gender bias. A majority of the female attorneys responding to the three surveys perceived gender bias by judges, lawyers and parties. In contrast, less than half of the men perceived gender bias in any context, including bias against men as defendants or parties in domestic relations cases. The perception of bias was closely related to the gender of respondents and the type of bias observed also appeared closely related. Men mentioned sex-related bias against men (particularly in domestic relations cases) far more often than women mentioned sex-related bias against men. Conversely, women appeared most knowledgeable of, and concerned with, bias against women.

More specific findings supported these preliminary overall results. For example, over twice as many female attorneys as male attorneys in Fairbanks said they had seen judges show gender bias. Nearly all female attorneys had seen gender bias by other attorneys (93%), compared to less than half of the male attorneys (40%). Anchorage percentages closely resembled Fairbanks, with 89 per cent of Anchorage female attorneys seeing gender bias by other attorneys, and 23 per cent of the male attorneys. Over half of the female attorneys in Fairbanks had perceived gender bias by parties, compared to 39 per cent of male attorneys. Thirty-eight per cent of the Anchorage male attorneys and 63 per cent of the Anchorage female attorneys had seen

survey. Consequently, data collected about the characteristics of crime incidents are equally reliable, regardless of which questionnaire was used to collect it.

- *Annual change estimates.* Year-to-year victimization comparisons have always been calculated on data collected with like questionnaires and procedures. Comparisons for 1991-92 were calculated using the old questionnaire and those for 1992-93 were prepared with information from the new questionnaire. Consequently, any published findings of differences between consecutive years should be considered reliable, although comparisons between results from years before the redesign and those from years after must recognize the probable effect of the changes.

This article is based on a BJS Fact Sheet released by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Copies are available through the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit, Justice Center.

Please see Gender Equality, page 4

Gender Equality (continued from page 3)

bias from lawyers to parties, witnesses or jurors. Of the Anchorage male attorneys, 27 per cent reported bias from parties, witnesses or jurors toward lawyers; 44 per cent of the Anchorage female attorneys had seen parties, witnesses or jurors show bias to lawyers. Male and female Fairbanks attorneys saw about the same amount of gender bias by witnesses, court staff and jurors, with less than one-third perceiving this type of bias.

The Anchorage survey included non-attorney professionals and volunteers who appear regularly in the courts. Surveys went to guardians ad litem, CASAs (volunteer advocates in children's proceedings), in-court clerks, and legal assistants. Small numbers responded from each group. In the experience of the members of these groups who were in court, gender bias appeared most frequently between lawyers and parties, witnesses or jurors.

Detailed Comments

All survey respondents were asked to explain gender bias they had observed or experienced. In all communities, women cited specific incidents of gender bias. One Juneau woman lawyer wrote that she still encounters the attitude that only men are "real attorneys," and women are second-rate at best. She added that "sexist humor is

making a comeback." Most Juneau respondents praised the judges, but one respondent noted that while the judges in Southeast are good, "they're all male. That has to affect their world view and rulings."

Respondents commented that not only attorneys and judges, but litigants in the courts, were subject to gender biases. One said, "Women are at a distinct disadvantage with respect to financial burdens of civil and criminal litigation and when dealing with male-dominated institutions." Another attorney wrote that "parties, especially insurance companies appear to offer women lower settlements."

Respondents to the Anchorage surveys focused on the gender difficulties that seem most pronounced in domestic cases. Some respondents believed that people involved in domestic cases often based decisions on stereotypes. One noted that an assumption is made in some settlement conferences that a woman should receive extra because "women make less money." Another commented that some judges and attorneys believe that female lawyers will do better with domestic cases than will men. Both men and women argued that child custody investigations sometimes appeared to rely on sex-related stereotypes and may favor either the mother or father as a result. (Which gender appeared to be favored was associated with the respondent's own gender.)

Men found gender bias as well. One male attorney stated that "judges seem to fail to recognize a pretty face can hide a malignant heart" and "fail to address attorney misconduct because it is practiced by a woman." A Fairbanks attorney argued that "female judges meet with female lawyers in a bar group designed to advance the position of females, as opposed to males, on the basis of their sex." Another male attorney maintained that "women are the beneficiaries of a bias against men in the criminal system (simple example—a man and a woman own a house—drugs are found in the house—the man is charged, the woman is not—sentencings are far more lenient as to women)." Finally, some men argued that men were disadvantaged in domestic violence and domestic relations cases. One noted, for example, that "Guardians ad litem (GALs) should be appointed that don't see child molester/abuser dads around every corner. A court decision relying on a biased GAL investigation can't be fair."

Another difficulty that survey respondents noted was women who were biased against other women. One attorney wrote that some of the sexism at Tanana Valley Bar Association meetings seemed to

come from women lawyers who were copying the male chauvinism against their own sex in order to be "one of the boys." A female Juneau lawyer wrote "I really hate it when I am referred to in court by my first name and male lawyers are referred to as 'Mr. _____.' (This has not been by judges but by other counsel including women lawyers!)"

Many women commented that, while a male lawyer might be described as a "zealous advocate," a female attorney behaving similarly was described as being "emotionally involved in this case." Another frequent occurrence noted by women was the use of gender-biased language, such as using "gentlemen" to include a woman. Others noted that attorneys and others refer to women as "sweetie" or "honey." One woman said, "A judge in state court once asked my client where his attorney was when I was sitting right next to him." She added that "In federal bankruptcy court, it is clear that you get a better result if you are one of the 'old boys.' For example, certain bankruptcy judges will let male attorneys address the motions/petitions, etc. first regardless of whose motion it is."

The most frequently repeated complaint among all the surveys focused on the Tanana Valley Bar Association (TVBA) in Fairbanks. About 23 per cent of the Fairbanks respondents (male and female answers combined) commented about TVBA sexist attitudes and humor. No other professional group in the four communities came under such intense scrutiny.

Gender-Related Differences in Work Choices

The surveys also questioned attorneys in Fairbanks and Juneau about factors influencing their choices of jobs. Respondents ranked the importance of independence, income, work environment, lack of other opportunities, and other variables in their choice of jobs. The analysis compared choices by men and women, taking into account years of practice (1 to 6 years, 7 to 17 years, 18 years and over) and type of work (private practice or government).

Women and men chose the same four factors as most important for their job choices, but weighted some of them differently. Over half the men rated independence as the most important reason for working where they did. The majority of women (55%) named subject area and work environment as the most important factors. An equal percentage (17%) of men and women chose income as important, with this factor ranking second in importance for both. Men

Court Video Completed

The Alaska Court System and the Justice Center have released the video "You Are the Court System: A Focus on Customer Service." The video, which is designed to instruct court personnel in customer service issues, will be distributed throughout the Alaska Court System and to state courts throughout the country. An instructional handbook accompanies the video.

Production of the video was funded by a grant from the State Justice Institute. Charlene Dolphin was project director for the Alaska Court System and author of the handbook. Antonia Moras of the Justice Center wrote and produced the video. The director was Patrick Murphy.

listed work environment and subject area as other primary reasons for choosing to work where they did. For women, independence (tied with income) was a fourth important reason for their work choices.

Women chose hours, benefits, flexible time, and lack of other opportunities as a second set of factors in making work choices. Men also noted benefits and flexible time as important. Relatively few men (8%) said that lack of other opportunities was important; an equal percentage of men said that opportunity to advance was an important reason for choosing the job. Only one woman (3%) chose opportunity to advance as one of her top three reasons for taking her job, as compared to six women (20%) who said they worked in a particular job because of lack of other opportunities.

Some of the findings from the Fairbanks

survey differ from the Juneau survey. Smaller numbers of women in Juneau named benefits, opportunity to advance, hours and work assignments as the most important factors in their job choices. Some Fairbanks women saw benefits, hours, and flexible time as important. Interestingly, 20 per cent of them saw lack of other opportunities as a reason for working where they did, in contrast to 23 per cent of Juneau women who saw opportunity to advance as important in their job choice. Although the numbers of survey respondents are small in both groups, this suggests that some women in Juneau see their jobs as offering more chance to move ahead than do some women in Fairbanks. The somewhat different proportions of attorneys in each “years of practice” grouping also might contribute to these variations, in addition to the difference in location and actual job opportunities.

Addressing the Issues

The Gender Equality Task Force plans to write recommendations for changes in the courts and legal profession during the next several months. Possible suggestions include promoting the use of gender-neutral language, creating or adapting training programs and materials for judges, attorneys and others, and improving procedures to encourage fairness for all parties. By next fall the task force plans to have designed specific projects addressing gender equality that law firms, nonprofits, agencies or individuals can sponsor.

Sarah Josephson worked as an extern with the Alaska Judicial Council during summer 1994. She is currently a second-year law student at Catholic University. Teresa Carns is the senior staff associate with the Judicial Council.

Juvenile Detention
(continued from page 1)

were not included in the data set for reasons of confidentiality, but we were able to combine initials and birthdates (to which we added gender as a check) to determine the number of individuals involved in these instances of detention. We found that there were 1023 youths detained during 1993. Hence, many were detained at least twice. Indeed, only 716 youth had only one detention in 1993 (although some of these might have been detained in previous years); 178 experienced two detentions in 1993; 73 experienced three; 38, four; 10, five; one, six; 5, seven; and 2 accounted for nine detention events during the year. Since each detention *event* was recorded, it should be noted that two events would be recorded for a single juvenile who was transferred from an adult facility to a juvenile detention facility—the first in the records of the adult facility and the second in the records of the juvenile facility.

From the data on date and time admitted and date and time released we computed the length of stay in hours for each detention, summed these, and divided by 24 to find that 1023 youth spent a total of 21,452 days in detention. The average length of stay for each instance of detention was 13.82 days, with a range from 0 to 267.7 days. Because the long range skews the distribution, we also provide the median length of stay per detention (1.9 days). This is the midpoint: half the detentions were longer and half were shorter.

Table 1 also describes detention length as related to the demographic variables of

gender, age and race. (Some events are missing from totals because the gender or race was not recorded.) The data on gender show that 767 boys accounted for 1174 instances of detention while 234 girls accounted for 356. Boys account for 75 per cent of all detentions recorded and for 83 per cent of the days spent in detention. Age data reveal an interesting anomaly: fifteen-year-olds are the smallest group of individuals and account for the fewest detention events of all age categories, but their mean length of stay is considerably longer than that of the other age groups and their median is higher as well.

Forty-three per cent of detention events were accounted for by 462 white youth and 30 per cent were accounted for by Alaska Native youth. Racial data also exhibit an interesting anomaly: the detentions of the smallest racial categories (Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander) tend to be longer in duration than those of either whites or

Alaska Natives. Though African-American youth account for only 8.5 per cent of all detentions recorded, they account for 10 per cent of the total number of days spent in detention. The median length of detention when black youth were involved was four days—a higher median than any other racial category and twice as high as the medians for whites and Alaska Natives. Our data provide no basis for explaining either the racial differences or those tied to fifteen-year-olds.

Where were the 21,452 detention days actually spent? In all, 35 facilities across the state reported detaining juveniles. As Table 2 shows, 92 per cent of detention days were spent in facilities whose responsibility it is to detain juveniles (detention centers and juvenile holdover facilities). Adult facilities (jails and lockups combined) recorded 118 detentions, all of which

Table 2. Juvenile Detentions in Alaska by Type of Facility, 1993

N = 1543*

	Detention events		Total number of detention days	Mean length of detention	Median length of detention
	N	%			
Adult lockups	45	2.9 %	12.8 days	0.3 days	0.2 days
Adult jails	73	4.7 %	20.4 days	0.3 days	0.1 days
Juvenile facilities (total)	1425	92.4 %	21,419.2 days	15.7 days	2.1 days
McLaughlin Youth Center	791	51.3	13,043.2	16.5	2.5
Fairbanks Youth Center	264	17.1	3,130.6	11.9	1.9
Johnson Center	153	9.9	2,782.8	18.2	2.9
Bethel Youth Center	90	5.8	1,873.9	20.8	0.9
Nome Youth Center	94	6.1	568.8	6.1	2.1
Juvenile holdover facilities	33	2.1	33.9	0.6	0.6

* Detailed information on time was missing for 8 adult jails and one juvenile facility.

Juvenile Detention (continued from page 5)

consumed only 33.2 days.

Alaska's largest juvenile facility, McLaughlin Youth Center in Anchorage, recorded 791 detentions. Although this is only 51 per cent of the total number of detention events in the state (1552), these detentions consumed 61 per cent of the total detention days (13,043.2 of 21,452 days). It is therefore not surprising that McLaughlin experienced some crowding of its detention unit during 1993. The mean lengths of stay at both Bethel Youth Center and Johnson Youth Center in Juneau were longer than that at McLaughlin (16.5 days) and Johnson's median was greater as well. Johnson accounted for 13 per cent of the total detention days but only 10 per cent of total detention events. Fairbanks Youth Center's 3,130.57 detention days are less than 15 per cent of the total, yet Fairbanks recorded 17 per cent of the events. While the data do not provide any basis for explaining these regional differences, we might speculate that they can be accounted for by differences in decision-making and by differences in the kinds of reasons for which youth are detained.

It is important to our understanding of juvenile detention to know the reason for each instance of detention as reported. When more than one reason (charge) was given, we entered into our data only the most serious charge. Thus a detention which recorded a probation violation for an assault and possession of a controlled substance was entered as an assault.

We have categorized the reasons for these 1993 detention into several categories; some are conventional (offenses against persons, offenses against property), while others are

not normally used in studies of offense behavior. These categories are listed in Table 3. We were interested in the number of detentions involving status offenses (behaviors which are illegal only because of one's youth) and in protective custody detentions because of federal guidelines.

Although there has been a general perception that juveniles in Alaska are becoming increasingly violent, the detention data for 1993 show relatively few detentions for violence. Only 16.6 per cent of all detention events were for offenses against persons, a category that included assault (205 detentions), robbery (27 detentions), sexual assault (9 detentions), murder (7 detentions) and others. Detentions for these charges resulted in 4797.6 detention days, 22.3 per cent of all detention days. Although the mean length of stay for violent offenses was greater than that for property offenses, the median is slightly shorter.

Property offenses were the reason for 21.6 per cent of all detention events (N=333) and accounted for 21.5 per cent of total detention days. Seventy-five of these events were for theft and 100 for criminal mischief (often vandalism).

The category of public order offenses includes possession of a controlled substance (17 events) as well as disorderly conduct (5 events), weapons offenses, etc. These account for a very small proportion of the total number of events (5.9%) and consume an even smaller proportion of detention days (3.3%).

Status offenses, even though they include minor consuming alcohol, form a very small portion of total detention events. The Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage has found that Alaska juveniles who have been drinking are more likely to be detained under Title 47 (a protective

custody category) than under delinquency statutes. This category, however, comprises only 8.2 per cent of all detention events and includes protective custody for mental reasons as well. Although Title 47 permits holding inebriates for up to 12 hours, both the mean and median for this offense are 6 hours, with a range of .017 to 2.6 days.

Probation violations account for a larger proportion of detention days than any other category analyzed (38.7%), although they account for only 23.5 per cent of all of the detention events. The median number of days for probation violations (the point at which half of the detentions are longer and half shorter) is considerably greater than that of any other of our categories. These detention events require some explanation and further analysis.

When a juvenile is detained for violation of probation, a specific reason may or may not be recorded in the data available to us. For the 362 detention events under discussion, no reason was provided for 152 events (41.9%). Of the remainder, 200 detentions (55.1%) were for technical violations (violations of the conditions of probation) and ten events were recorded with a new charge which was not specified. (These 362 events did not include 77 probation violation events where the charge was specified: these were included under the offense category appropriate to the charge.) We should note that a probation violation may include what would have been a criminal charge if it had come to the attention of police. A failed urinalysis test, for example, may result in a violation, but not in a charge of possession of a controlled substance.

Probation violators probably contribute to the group of individuals who accounted for more than one detention in 1993, because they have already been processed into the system for delinquent behavior and are by definition repeat offenders. Some, in fact, may be chronic offenders.

A juvenile who is detained for a probation violation (or for any reason) must have a hearing within 48 hours. At this arraignment the charges are presented and a date for a disposition hearing is set. If the youth is a chronic offender, is a danger to himself or others, or has a history of leaving placement, the probation officer may recommend that the youth be detained until disposition. Juveniles in detention must have a disposition hearing in thirty days—a period which can be continued under certain circumstances. First offenders, on the other hand, will not have a history and may be released, pending adjudication or disposition, to an adult in well under 48 hours. In all, a youth on probation might be

Table 3. Length of Detention of Juveniles in Alaska by Reason for Detention, 1993

N = 1543*

	Detention events		Total number of detention days		Mean length of detention	Median length of detention
	N	%	N	%		
Offenses against persons	256	16.6 %	4,797.6 days	22.3 %	18.7 days	1.8 days
Offenses against property	333	21.6	4,619.2	21.4	13.9	1.9
Offenses against public order	91	5.9	717.3	3.3	7.9	1.7
Status offenses	32	2.1	122.0	0.6	3.8	0.6
Traffic offenses	75	4.9	281.4	1.3	3.8	0.2
Probation violations	362	23.5	8,309.3	38.6	22.9	17.0
Internal	81	5.2	908.9	4.2	11.2	6.0
Protective custody	127	8.2	51.4	0.2	0.4	0.4
Warrant	114	7.4	1,505.5	7.0	13.2	2.3
Other	72	4.7	139.4	0.6	1.9	0.3

* Detailed information on time was missing for 8 adult jails and one juvenile facility.

detained for 32 days, a number which helps to explain the longer total, mean and median detention days in Table 3.

Though we have characterized probation violators as repeat, or even chronic, offenders it is difficult to determine how many individuals were responsible for the probation violations in 1993. We can determine from our data that for 179 juveniles a probation violation was the reason for their first detention in 1993 and that 77 of these were detained at least once more in 1993. Twenty-one of the 77 were detained three times during the year and 13 were detained four to nine times. However, the reasons for their subsequent detentions may or may not be continued violations of probation.

Two other categories are likely to have involved multiple detentions in 1993: the internal category and the warrant category. The category labeled *internal* comprises detention events based on reasons internal to the (juvenile) facility and includes

medical transfers and transfers for programmatic reasons, which would result in an individual being logged in multiple times. (These 81 detention events appear to be the only ones over which detention center officials themselves might exert some influence.) The internal detentions consume only 4.2 per cent of all detention hours.

Warrants are issued after a juvenile has failed to do what the court has directed him or her to do. The warrant category includes failure to appear, traffic offenses, etc. (Warrants tied to probation violations have been included in the probation violation category.) Detention events based on warrants from the court consumed 1505.5 detention days in 1993, a considerable proportion of the total (7.0%).

This article has focused on the amount of time consumed by detaining Alaska juveniles in 1993: 1023 juveniles were held for a total of over 21,000 days. This figure may have value in assessing the use of resources within the juvenile justice system

and for comparing the use of different facilities for different purposes. The use of detention length to compare detention by gender, age, race, etc. has identified some differentials which officials might want to explore. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to assess costs, it is clear that the total of 21,452 detention days does consume resources. If detention units are crowded, health and safety issues arise in addition to increased demand for resources. It can be noted that very few detention days were spent in adult facilities; hence, the state is essentially in compliance with that aspect of federal regulation which prohibits juveniles from being held in adult facilities.

Because there are other ways of examining detention in Alaska, it is our intention in a future article to examine trends in juvenile detention using five years of detention data.

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

DPS Does Statewide Study

The Justice Center at the University of Alaska Anchorage and the Alaska State Troopers are implementing a project to increase resident involvement in solving the problems of community safety in rural villages. The project, which is being conducted by the Justice Center, will compile information on public safety needs, preferences and expectations in a sampling of villages across the state. In addition, drug use patterns and criminal victimization information from throughout the state will be obtained for developing and evaluating Alaska Department of Public Safety substance abuse programs.

The project planning was initiated at the direction of Major Glenn Godfrey, Acting Director of the Alaska State Troopers, and has involved trooper support staff and operational officers. Major Godfrey anticipates the project resulting in a more complete understanding of citizen perceptions of drug and crime problems in

the various regions and communities of Alaska. The Troopers intend to use this knowledge in assessing their programs and enhancing their effectiveness in assisting local citizens with the unique priorities of their communities.

The rural component of the study will involve village surveys administered on-site by a Justice Center research team. A survey instrument and study approach are first being tested in Hooper Bay. The Justice Center is working with the Alaska Native Justice Center, regional nonprofit corporations and other Native groups to identify other villages to be surveyed.

The project is being funded through a federal grant from the Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Department of Public Safety grants manager Catherine Katsel is administering the project for the Department of Public Safety. The Justice Center expects to complete the project in early 1995.

Sex Offender Data

The Justice Center at UAA has received a \$34,000 grant to assist the Alaska Department of Corrections in the design and implementation of a data base for the DOC sex offender treatment programs throughout the state. The data base will contain demographic data, treatment information and recidivism information on individuals participating in the programs. It will be used to administer and evaluate the sex offender

programs and to document treatment procedures.

The Justice Center has contracted to create the computer program which will contain the data and to train DOC personnel in its implementation. The Center will also assist DOC in producing summary statistics from the data. Dr. Allan Barnes is supervising the work of the Center on this project.

Mediation Project Receives Funding

First National Bank of Anchorage has awarded a grant of \$3000 to the Victim-Offender Mediation Project to provide for continued operation of this juvenile mediation program. The project, which was initiated in late 1993, provides an opportunity for victims of certain types of offenses to meet offenders in the presence of a trained mediator for the purpose of reaching a joint resolution.

Initial funding for the Victim-Offender Mediation Project came through University of Alaska Anchorage faculty development grants awarded to the co-directors of the program—Lawrence Trostle of the Justice Center and Patrick Cunningham of the Department of Social Work at UAA. The Alaska Youth and Parent Foundation provides office space and facilities for the project.



HAPPY HOLIDAYS FROM THE
FACULTY AND STAFF OF THE
JUSTICE CENTER.



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.