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The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was established by the President and Congress through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDPA) Act of 1974, Public Law 93–415, as amended. Located within the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP’s goal is to provide national leadership in addressing the issues of juvenile delinquency and improving juvenile justice.

OJJDP sponsors a broad array of research, program, and training initiatives to improve the juvenile justice system as a whole, as well as to benefit individual youth-serving agencies. These initiatives are carried out by seven components within OJJDP, described below.

**Research and Program Development Division** develops knowledge on national trends in juvenile delinquency; supports a program for data collection and information sharing that incorporates elements of statistical and systems development; identifies how delinquency develops and the best methods for its prevention, intervention, and treatment; and analyzes practices and trends in the juvenile justice system.

**Training and Technical Assistance Division** provides juvenile justice training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments; law enforcement, judiciary, and corrections personnel; and private agencies, educational institutions, and community organizations.

**Special Emphasis Division** provides discretionary funds to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to replicate tested approaches to delinquency prevention, treatment, and control in such pertinent areas as chronic juvenile offenders, community-based sanctions, and the disproportionate representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system.

**State Relations and Assistance Division** supports collaborative efforts by States to carry out the mandates of the JJDPA Act by providing formula grant funds to States; furnishing technical assistance to States, local governments, and private agencies; and monitoring State compliance with the JJDPA Act.

**Information Dissemination Unit** informs individuals and organizations of OJJDP initiatives; disseminates information on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and missing children; and coordinates program planning efforts within OJJDP. The unit’s activities include publishing research and statistical reports, bulletins, and other documents, as well as overseeing the operations of the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.
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Foreword

Today’s juvenile justice system is facing unprecedented challenges. Policymakers and practitioners have a greater need than ever before for the most current and complete information on juvenile crime and violence as they develop policies and programs.

Such information is critical to enhance their understanding of the nature and extent of delinquent behavior and to monitor these trends closely. In releasing OJJDP’s Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report, Attorney General Janet Reno remarked that “this report is a road map to the next generation of crime — unless we do something now.”

OJJDP funded the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) to produce this 1996 Update on Violence to their landmark Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report.

The NCJJ research team has updated selected parts of the National Report, including most of those sections using data from the FBI on violent juvenile arrests, clearances, and juvenile homicides. These updates present the most recent data (1994) released from the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting Program and their Supplementary Homicide Reports.

In addition, results from several new studies are summarized, including a national survey regarding school crime and a recent Government Accounting Office study of juvenile transfers to criminal court.

Readers are encouraged to use this 1996 Update as an addendum to the National Report. Published in September of 1995, the full report contains the most current information on a wider range of issues and will help provide a context for much of the data presented in this report.

I expect that you will find this 1996 Update to be a useful supplement to the growing “encyclopedia” on juveniles as victims and offenders, helping us to ask the right questions and find the right answers on issues that affect the future of our Nation’s children.

Shay Bilchik
Administrator
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The number of juveniles murdered increased 82% between 1984 and 1994

Juveniles were murdered at a rate of 7 per day in 1994

The FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program asks local law enforcement agencies to report detailed information on all known homicides. The FBI’s Supplementary Homicide Reports contain data on victim and offender demographics, the victim-offender relationship, the weapon used, and the circumstances surrounding the homicide. Between 1980 and 1994, the FBI estimates that 92% of all homicides committed in the U.S. were captured in the UCR’s Supplementary Homicide Report Program.

From 1980 through 1994 an estimated 326,170 persons were murdered in the U.S. Of these murder victims, 9% or 30,200 were youth under age 18. There was a 1% increase from 1980 through 1994 in the total number of murders. In comparison, the number of juveniles murdered in 1994 was 47% greater than the number in 1980. In 1980 juveniles were murdered at a rate of 5 per day; in 1994 the rate was 7 per day. The majority (53%) of juveniles killed in 1994 were teens ages 15–17 and 30% were younger than age 6.

In 1994, 1 in 5 murdered juveniles were known to be killed by a juvenile offender. The proportion of murdered juveniles killed by a juvenile offender varied substantially with the age of the victim.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim age</th>
<th>Percent killed by juvenile offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent increases in murders of juveniles stem largely from rising teen murders, although murders of very young children have also increased

From 1980 to 1994 the proportion of juveniles killed by adults decreased while the proportion killed by juveniles and unknown offenders increased

Juvenile homicides declined nearly 20% between 1980 and 1984, from an estimated 1,810 to 1,460. By 1993 the number of juveniles murdered in the U.S. had grown to 2,840 — a 94% increase in a 10-year period.

In 1994, 53% of juveniles were killed by adults, 19% by juveniles, and 28% by offenders whose age was unknown.

The growth in juvenile homicide victimizations from the mid 1980’s through 1994 was completely firearm-related.

Between 1980 and 1994 most murdered children below age 6 were killed by a family member, while most murdered older juveniles were killed by an acquaintance or a stranger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim-offender relationship</th>
<th>Victim age</th>
<th>All juveniles</th>
<th>0–5</th>
<th>6–11</th>
<th>12–14</th>
<th>15–17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1980 and 1994, 93% of white and black juvenile homicide victims were killed by persons of their same race.

The proportion of juvenile homicides in which the offender was unknown increased with the age of the victim.

Young children were the least likely to be killed by a stranger.

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding.


Between 1980 and 1994 most murdered children below age 6 were beaten to death, while most older juveniles were killed with a firearm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon</th>
<th>Victim age</th>
<th>All juveniles</th>
<th>0–5</th>
<th>6–11</th>
<th>12–14</th>
<th>15–17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firearm</td>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife/blunt object</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal*</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juvenile male homicide victims were twice as likely to be killed with a firearm as were juvenile females (59% vs. 30%).

Black juvenile homicide victims ages 12–17 were more likely to be killed with a firearm than were white juvenile homicide victims that age (81% vs. 65%).

* Personal weapons include hands, fists, and feet. Other weapons include fire, asphyxiation, strangulation, drowning, drugs, poisons, and explosives.

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding.


More children are being killed by parents, more older juveniles by strangers and acquaintances.

Between 1980 and 1994 the characteristics of the offender were unknown when the data were collected in 1 in 4 juvenile murders. The proportion of juveniles killed by unknown offenders increased over this period, from 20% in the early 1980’s to 28% in the early 1990’s.

Murs of juveniles by family members increased 9% between 1980 and 1994. In comparison, the number of juvenile homicides committed by acquaintances increased 78%, while murders by strangers increased 51%. There were substantial differences for white and black victims. Between 1980 and 1994, the number of whites killed by acquaintances increased 44%, while the number of blacks killed by acquaintances increased 115%. The number of whites killed by strangers and unknown offenders changed little from 1980 to 1994, while substantially more black juveniles were killed by strangers (120%) and unknown offenders (153%).

Increases in juvenile homicides were found in the youngest and oldest juvenile age groups. These increases differ substantially in the types of offenders involved. For the youngest victims (below age 6), parents and other family members accounted for 44% of the increase in murders between 1980 and 1994, acquaintances accounted for 41% of the increase, and strangers or unknown offenders accounted for 14%. In contrast, the number of juveniles ages 15–17 murdered by family members actually declined slightly between 1980 and 1994. Half of the increase in murders...
of these older juveniles were murders committed by acquaintances, with the other half murders by strangers or unknown offenders.

**Black homicide victims were more likely to be killed by a firearm than were white victims**

Between 1980 and 1994, in homicides in which the weapon was reported, 60% of black juvenile murder victims were killed with a firearm, compared to 46% of white victims. In the first half of the 1980’s this disparity was much less (46% vs. 39%). But as the juvenile murder rate increased, so did the disparity. Between 1990 and 1994, firearms were involved in the murder of 71% of black victims and 54% of white victims.

**Trends show that acquaintances and strangers who murder juveniles were more likely to use firearms**

Increases in juvenile murders between 1980 and 1994 were primarily increases in murders by non-family members using firearms. Firearm murders by acquaintances increased 156% over this period. In 1980, 46% of the juveniles murdered by acquaintances were killed with a firearm — by 1994 this proportion had increased to 67%. Juvenile homicides by strangers using a firearm increased 120% between 1980 and 1994. In 1980, 59% of juveniles killed by strangers were killed with a firearm — in 1994 it was 86%. Juveniles killed by unknown assailants with a firearm increased 140% between 1980 and 1994, with the proportion killed by firearms increasing from 45% in 1980 to 72% in 1994.

**While juvenile homicide victimizations not involving firearms remained constant, those involving firearms nearly tripled from 1984 to 1994**

![Graph showing the increase in firearm-involved homicides from 1980 to 1994.](image)

In 1994, 65% of juvenile murder victims were killed with a firearm — 72% of males and 42% of females.


**Over the years firearms were used in a greater proportion of the homicides of black than white juveniles**

![Graph showing the percentage of firearm-involved homicides for black and white juveniles.](image)

Juvenile homicide victims are disproportionately male and black

Homicides of older juveniles have grown substantially

Trends in juvenile homicides varied across age groups. Between 1980 and 1994 the risk of homicide increased for very young and, to a greater extent, for older juveniles. The annual number of murders of juveniles ages 4 through 11 remained essentially constant between 1980 and 1994. In contrast, murders of children below age 4 increased 31%. Even greater increases were found for juveniles between ages 12 and 17. Murders of juveniles ages 12–17 increased 95% between 1980 and 1994.

The increase in the numbers of males killed has outpaced the growth for females across all age groups. This difference is greatest among teens. For example, in the 5 years from 1990 through 1994 more than 5,700 males ages 15–17 were murdered — 131% more than were killed in the 5 years 1980–1984. In comparison, the increase for females ages 15–17 was 11%.

As a result, the male proportion of homicide victims has increased. In 1980 males accounted for fewer than two-thirds of juvenile homicide victims. That proportion gradually increased so that by 1994 nearly three-quarters of victims were male.
A substantial proportion of 6th–12th grade students report high levels of violent crime, weapons, and gangs in their school

New survey details students’ exposure to crime in schools

In the spring of 1993 the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) asked a nationally representative sample of 6th through 12th grade students about violence (i.e., physical attack, robbery, and bullying) in school. The survey asked students if they had been a victim, had witnessed or knew of such crimes in their schools, and if they were worried about becoming a victim of a crime during the current school year.

Younger students were more likely than older students to be victimized and to worry about crime

Victimization was reported by 15% of students in grades 6–8 compared to 8% of students in grades 9–12. A greater proportion of younger students (32%) than older students (20%) worried about becoming a victim of crime.

Students at larger schools were more likely than others to know of and witness crime at school

Approximately 3 in 4 students at schools with a population of 600 or more were aware of crime at school. In comparison, fewer than 3 in 5 students attending schools with a student population of 300 or less reported knowing of such incidents. School size had little impact on the proportion of students who worried about crime in school or on the proportion of students personally involved in such incidents.

In 1989 females were less likely than males to carry weapons to school, by 1993 they were nearly as likely to do so

The School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) interviewed a nationally representative sample of students ages 12–19 in 1989. Two percent of students reported carrying something to school to protect themselves from attack or harm at least once during a 6-month period. The 1993 NCES survey reported that a slightly larger proportion of students carried a weapon to school (3%). Both surveys found that males were only slightly more likely than females to carry a weapon to school. In 1989, 3% of males versus 1% of females said they carried a weapon to school and in 1993, 4% of males versus 3% of females reported carrying a weapon.
Black students were more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to know of weapons in school

In 1993, 42% of students in grades 6–12 reported knowing of weapons in school. A somewhat greater proportion of male (45%) than female (38%) students knew that others brought weapons to school. Forty-eight percent of black students reported knowing of weapons in school compared to 41% of both white and Hispanic students and 34% of students of other races.

The presence of gangs in school greatly increased in four years

The 1989 NCVS reported that 15% of students claimed there were “street” gangs in school. In contrast, the 1993 NCES survey found that 35% of students identified “fighting” gangs in school. Roughly the same proportion of males and females reported the presence of gangs (36% and 34%, respectively). The proportion of students who said there were gangs in

Students reporting weapons and gangs in school were more likely to be victims of violent crime

| Students aware of | Victim of crime | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | Physical attack | Robbery | Bullying | Physical | Robbery | Bullying | Physical | Robbery | Bullying | Physical | Robbery | Bullying |
| Weapons           | 6%             | 2%       | 10%      | 46%       | 10%      | 56%      | 14%       | 9%      | 21%      |
| No weapons        | 2%             | 1%       | 7%       | 23%       | 2%       | 31%      | 7%        | 4%      | 15%      |
| Gangs             | 6%             | 2%       | 10%      | 44%       | 11%      | 54%      | 15%       | 10%     | 23%      |
| No gangs          | 3%             | 1%       | 7%       | 26%       | 3%       | 35%      | 7%        | 4%      | 15%      |

Students reporting weapons and gangs in school were at least twice as likely as others to worry about physical attacks and robbery.


Males were more likely than females to be victims of violence at school; males and females were equally likely to fear school violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of students reporting</th>
<th>Victim of crime</th>
<th>Aware of crime</th>
<th>Witnessed crime</th>
<th>Worried about crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fourteen percent of males, compared with 9% of females, reported being physically attacked, robbed, or bullied in school.
- A student’s race/ethnicity had little impact on the reported level of crime at school

school varied by race and ethnicity. Gangs were more likely to be reported by Hispanic students (51%) than black students (42%), students of other races (40%), or white students (31%). Even so, in 1993 the total number of minority students who said there were gangs in school was less than the number of white students reporting gangs in schools.

**Students reporting gangs in school were twice as likely to report weapons in school**

Weapons in school were reported by 42% of students in 1993. When there were gangs in school, the proportion of students reporting the presence of weapons increased to 62%, compared to 31% of those who said there were no gangs in their schools.

**Violence was more likely in schools with drug dealers and easy access to controlled substances**

In 1993 approximately one-quarter of students said it was easy to obtain controlled substances at school. Twenty-nine percent of students reported easy access to beer/wine or marijuana at school, 26% said it was easy to get liquor, and 22% stated it was easy to get other drugs at school.

Students reporting easy access to controlled substances (i.e. beer/wine, liquor, marijuana, and other drugs) were more likely than others to know of violence at school. For example, students that said it was easy to obtain beer/wine were more likely than others to know of incidents of physical attack (54% versus 38%), robbery (17% versus 9%), and bullying (67% versus 52%).

Students reporting the presence of drug dealers at school were also more likely than others to report incidents of physical attack (61% versus 39%), robbery (23% versus 9%), and bullying (76% versus 53%).

School violence was more likely to be reported by students who knew of other students attending school under the influence of controlled substances. For instance, incidents of physical attack were more likely to be reported by students aware of others attending school either drunk (56%) or high (59%) than those who were unaware of others attending school either drunk (36%) or high (37%).
Child protective service agencies received 2 million reports of child maltreatment in 1993

NCANDS monitors the caseloads of child protective services

The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) annually collects information on cases handled by State child protective service agencies. The National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) includes information on the number of reports received, the number of children involved, the number of reports that were substantiated after investigation, information on the perpetrators in substantiated cases, and information on disposition of the cases.

Nationally, child protective service agencies received an estimated 2 million reports of alleged child abuse and neglect in 1993. Many of these reports involved more than one child (e.g., siblings) and a child may be involved in more than one report in a year. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how many individual children were involved in these reports. Child protective service agencies conducted approximately 1.6 million child abuse and neglect investigations.

The allegation of child abuse or neglect was substantiated (i.e., the allegation of maltreatment or risk of maltreatment was supported or founded on the basis of State law or policy) or was indicated (i.e., the allegation could not be substantiated, but there was reason to suspect that the child was maltreated or was at risk of maltreatment) in 39% of investigations in 1993. About half (55%) of allegation investigations were not substantiated or indicated.

All types of children are victims of maltreatment

In 1993 information on substantiated or indicated victims of maltreatment provided by States to NCANDS found the following:

- 53% of the victims were female.
- 7% of victims were under the age of 1, 53% were under the age of 8, and 7% were 16 or older.

Reports of alleged child maltreatment have increased 155% between 1980 and 1993

Educators are the most common source of reports of abuse and neglect to child protective service agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of referral</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal justice</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and community</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/neighbors</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives—not parents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes child care providers, perpetrators, and sources not otherwise identified.


- The increasing trend in child maltreatment reports over the past decade is believed to be the result, at least in part, of a greater willingness to report suspected incidents. Greater public awareness both of child maltreatment as a social problem and the resources available to respond to it are factors that contribute to increased reporting.

Note: Child reports are counts of children who are the subject of reports. Counts are duplicated when an individual child is the subject of more than one report during a year.

59% of the victims were white, 27% were black, 10% were Hispanic, and 4% were other races.

4 in 5 perpetrators were parents of the victim.

1,028 children were known to have died as a result of abuse or neglect in 1993 in the 46 States reporting such deaths — 1 death for every 1,000 substantiated victims.

Victims removed from home declined slightly in 1993

NCANDS reported that 15% of the victims in substantiated or indicated cases were removed from their homes in 1993. In 1992, 18% of victims were removed from their homes.

Court actions (e.g., filing for temporary custody, filing for guardianship, filing a dependency petition, and other such civil actions) were initiated for 17% of the victims in substantiated or indicated cases in 1993.

Neglect is the most common form of substantiated or indicated maltreatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of maltreatment</th>
<th>% of Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional maltreatment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical neglect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total is greater than 100% because victims can be in more than one category when more than one type of abuse or neglect has occurred.

In 1994 law enforcement agencies made over 2.7 million arrests of persons under age 18

Six percent of all juvenile arrests in 1994 were for a Violent Crime Index offense — half of these arrests involved juveniles below age 16, half involved whites, and 1 in 7 involved females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense charged</th>
<th>Estimated number of juvenile arrests</th>
<th>Percent of total juvenile arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ages 16 and 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,714,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Index Total</td>
<td>898,300</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Index</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>55,200</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>85,300</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>748,100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>143,200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>505,100</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>88,200</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonindex offenses</td>
<td>1,815,700</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assaults</td>
<td>211,700</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and counterfeiting</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property; buying, receiving, possessing</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>152,100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.</td>
<td>63,400</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution and commercialized vice</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offenses (except forcible rape and prostitution)</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse violations</td>
<td>158,600</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses against the family and children</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under the influence</td>
<td>13,600</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor law violations</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>170,500</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other offenses (except traffic)</td>
<td>422,300</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew and loitering law violations</td>
<td>128,400</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>248,800</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 71% of juvenile arrests for murder involved 16- and 17-year-olds.
- 91% of juvenile arrests for driving under the influence and for liquor law violations involved whites.
- The majority of juvenile arrests for running away from home (57%) involved females.

Note: UCR data do not distinguish the ethnic group Hispanic; Hispanics may be of any race. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.
Females accounted for 1 in 7 juvenile violent crime arrests in 1994

### Female juvenile violent crime arrests more than doubled between 1985 and 1994

In 1985 approximately 9,000 Violent Crime Index arrests involved a female below age 18. By 1994 this number had increased to more than 21,000. Between 1985 and 1994 Violent Crime Index arrest rates for juvenile females increased 125%, while the male rate increased 67%. Female arrest rates increased more than male rates in the high-volume violent crimes of robbery (110% versus 51%) and aggravated assault (134% versus 88%). This same pattern is also evident in simple assault arrests (141% versus 102%).

In 1985, 11% of juvenile arrests for a violent crime involved females. Over the next 10 years this proportion increased annually, reaching 14% in 1994. Similar patterns were found in property arrests. Between 1985 and 1994 the female proportion of property crime arrests grew from 21% to 25%.

Juvenile drug arrests increased dramatically between 1993 and 1994, up 42% in one year, with the one year growth being greater for females than males. In 1985 females were involved in 7 in 10 juvenile prostitution arrests, but by 1994 there were nearly equal numbers of juvenile male and female arrests. The female proportion of juveniles arrested for running away remained essentially constant from 1985 through 1994. Over this time period 57% of juveniles arrested for running away were female, making it the only offense category in 1994 in which females accounted for the majority of arrests.

### Between 1985 and 1994 the percentage growth in female arrests was greater than the increase in male arrests for most offense categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent change in arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Index Total</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonindex offenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assaults</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offense</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the family</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under influence</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor law violations</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other offenses (except traffic)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the absolute number of female arrests is less than male arrests, a larger percentage increase in female arrests does not necessarily imply a larger increase in the actual number of arrests. For example, while the percentage increase in female arrests for robbery was greater than the male increase between 1985 and 1994, the increase in the number of arrests was over 7 times greater for males than for females.

From 1985 to 1994, the percentage increases in arrests have been greater for juveniles than adults

35% of all 1994 juvenile arrests involved persons under age 15

Young juveniles (under age 15) were more involved in arrests for arson, vandalism, runaway, larceny-theft, simple assault, and burglary, and less involved in arrests for drug abuse violations, murder, prostitution, and liquor law violations.

The proportion of juvenile arrests involving youth below the age of 15 increased slightly between 1985 and 1994 in most offense categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Proportion of juvenile arrests under age 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Index</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple assault</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor laws</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The small increases in the proportions indicate that increases in juvenile violent crime arrests from 1985 through 1994 were somewhat greater for younger than older juveniles.

### Between 1985 and 1994 the percentage growth in juvenile arrests for murder, robbery, weapons law violations, and motor vehicle theft far surpassed the growth in adult arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonindex offenses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other assaults</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor law violations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other offenses (except traffic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Because the absolute number of juvenile arrests is far below the adult level, a larger percentage increase in juvenile arrests does not necessarily imply a larger increase in the actual number of arrests. For example, while the percentage increase in juvenile arrests for a weapons law violation was much greater than the adult increase between 1985 and 1994, the increase in the number of arrests was actually 27% greater for adults.

* Not applicable to adults.

12 Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1996 Update on Violence
In 1994 juveniles accounted for 19% of all violent crime arrests and 14% of all violent crimes cleared by law enforcement.

How much of the crime problem is caused by juveniles?

Arrest proportions accurately characterize the ages of individuals entering the justice system. The fact that juveniles were 17% of all persons arrested for murder in 1994 implies that 17% of all persons entering the justice system on a murder charge were juveniles, not that the juveniles committed 17% of all murders.

Because juveniles are more likely than adults to commit crime in groups, arrest percentages are likely to exaggerate the juvenile contribution to the crime problem. The FBI clearance data provide a better assessment of the juvenile contribution to crime.

Juveniles were responsible for 14% of all violent crimes cleared in 1994 and 25% of all property crimes cleared.

The juvenile contribution to the crime problem in the U.S. in 1994 varied considerably with the nature of the offense. Based on 1994 clearance data, juveniles were responsible for:

- 10% of murders.
- 13% of aggravated assaults.
- 14% of forcible rapes.
- 20% of robberies.
- 21% of burglaries.
- 25% of larceny-thefts.
- 25% of motor vehicle thefts.
- 48% of arsons.

Crimes with greater discrepancies between the arrest and clearance proportions may be those in which group behavior is more common. For example, while the discrepancy is small for forcible rape, it is relatively large for motor vehicle theft, burglary, murder, and robbery.

---

**Juveniles accounted for a much larger proportion of property crime arrests than violent crime or drug arrests in 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Percent of Arrests Involving Juveniles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All arrests</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Index total</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Index</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle theft</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-theft</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly conduct</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor laws</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex offense</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple assault</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible rape</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the family</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly one-third of all persons arrested in 1994 for robbery were below age 18, well above the juvenile proportion of arrests for murder (17%), aggravated assault (16%), and forcible rape (16%).

Juveniles were involved in 1% of all arrests for driving under the influence and prostitution, but more than 40% of all arrests for arson, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

Note: Running away and curfew violations are not presented in this figure because, by definition, only juveniles can be arrested for these offenses.

After more than a decade of relative stability, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate soared between 1988 and 1994

The increase in the juvenile arrest rate for violent crimes began in the late 1980’s

From 1975 through 1988 the number of juvenile arrests for a Violent Crime Index offense (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) varied with the changing size of the juvenile population. However, in 1989, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate broke out of this historic range.

The years between 1988 and 1994 saw more than a 50% increase in the rate of juvenile arrests for violent crimes. This rapid growth over a relatively short period moved the juvenile arrest rate for violent crime in 1994 far above any year since the mid-1960’s, the earliest time period for which comparable statistics are available.

19% of persons entering the justice system in 1994 for a violent crime were below age 18

The juvenile proportion of violent crime arrests declined from the mid-1970’s (23%) through 1988 (15%). Since 1988 this proportion has been increasing, but is still below the levels of the mid–1970’s.

The increasing juvenile proportion of violent crime arrests has been paralleled by the increasing proportion of violent crimes cleared by juvenile arrest. Since juveniles more than adults tend to commit crimes in groups, juvenile arrest proportions have traditionally been substantially larger than the proportion of crimes cleared by juvenile arrest. From 1988 through 1994 the juvenile proportion of violent crimes cleared climbed from 9% to 14%.

Less than one-half of 1 percent of juveniles in the U.S. were arrested for a Violent Crime Index offense in 1994

6% of juveniles were arrested in 1994 — of those, about 7% were arrested for a Violent Crime Index offense.

Note: This analysis is based on the assumption that (1) the average arrested juvenile is arrested 1.5 times per year and (2) the average juvenile arrested for a violent crime is arrested for 1.2 violent crimes per year.

If trends continue as they have over the past 10 years, juvenile arrests for violent crime will more than double by the year 2010

How many juvenile violent crime arrests will there be in 2010?

The accuracy of juvenile violent crime arrest projections rely on the appropriateness of the underlying assumptions and the validity of existing data. In Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report, two projections were developed using different assumptions. Both were based on the FBI’s published age-specific arrest rates and the population projections developed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Both controlled for racial variations in violent crime arrest rates and population trends.

The first projection assumed that the rates of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests through 2010 would be equal to the rate in 1992 — the latest year for which FBI age-specific arrest rates were available. Under this constant arrest rate assumption, the report projected that the number of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests would increase 22% between 1992 and 2010, corresponding to the projected growth in the juvenile population.

In contrast to the constant rate assumption, the report presented a second projection based on the assumption that juvenile arrest rates would increase annually as they had in the prior ten-year period. Under the assumptions of population growth and increasing arrest rates, the number of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests was projected to double by 2010. The projected growth was expected to vary across offense categories, with the number of juvenile arrests for murder increasing 145% over the 1992 level, forcible rape arrests increasing 66%, robbery arrests up 58%, and aggravated assault arrests up 129%.

New 1994 data indicate that both projections may be low

Under the constant rate assumption, it was predicted there would be 141,300 juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests in 1994. Under the increasing rate assumption, 147,000 arrests were predicted. Based on data in Crime in the United States 1994 there were 150,200 arrests, more than even the higher projection had expected.
In 1994 the States of New York, Florida, California, New Jersey, and Maryland had the highest juvenile violent crime arrest rates.

States with high juvenile arrest rates for some violent crimes do not necessarily have high juvenile arrest rates for all violent crimes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Reporting %</th>
<th>Violent Crime Index arrests per 100,000 juveniles ages 10–17</th>
<th>0 to 200</th>
<th>200 to 350</th>
<th>350 to 500</th>
<th>500 or above</th>
<th>Data not available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>514 13 20 189 292</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>309 15 8 94 192</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>384 16 40 79 249</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>496 15 7 95 378</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>318 18 19 92 190</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>760 16 13 261 353</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>527 5 21 129 372</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>580 12 20 202 346</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>372 5 62 65 240</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,584 60 21 589 915</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>856 15 29 272 540</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>465 12 20 141 292</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>258 6 21 114 117</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>261 4 4 25 228</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>463 5 3 64 391</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>252 1 11 33 207</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>323 5 18 67 233</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>506 19 18 107 362</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>127 1 13 36 77</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>684 20 32 236 396</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass.</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>596 4 17 155 419</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>466 25 32 139 270</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>413 7 41 125 240</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>NA NA NA NA NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rate calculations for jurisdictions with less than complete reporting may not be accurate. Rates were classified as “not available” when reporting agencies represented less than 50% of the state population. Readers are encouraged to review the technical note at the end of this summary. Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

The Violent Crime Index is dominated by arrests for robbery and aggravated assault.

The Violent Crime Index combines four offenses (murder/nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault). In 1994, 94% of juvenile Violent Crime Index arrests were for robbery and aggravated assault. Thus, a jurisdiction with a high juvenile Violent Crime Index arrest rate does not necessarily have a high juvenile arrest rate in each component of the Index. For example, while New Jersey had one of the highest juvenile Violent Crime Index arrest rates in 1994, its juvenile murder arrest rate was below the national average.

Counties within a State exhibited diverse juvenile violent crime arrest rates in 1993

Note: Rates were classified as “Data not available” when reporting agencies represented less than 75% of the county population.

Trends in juvenile arrests for specific violent crimes show different patterns

**Murder/Nonnegligent Manslaughter**

The juvenile arrest rate varied little from 1975 to 1987, increased 84% from 1987 to 1991, and then remained relatively constant through 1994.

Paralleling the growth in juvenile arrest rates, the juvenile proportion of murders cleared grew from 5% in 1987 to 10% in 1994.

**Forcible Rape**

Unlike the Violent Crime Index trend, the juvenile arrest rate for forcible rape has been relatively constant since the mid 1980's.

While juveniles have been involved in about 15% of forcible rape arrests since the late 1970's, the percentage of forcible rapes cleared by juvenile arrests grew substantially between 1989 and 1994.

Note: 1993 and 1994 arrest rates were estimated by the National Center for Juvenile Justice by using data presented in *Crime in the United States* reports and population data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
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Unlike the trends for other violent crimes, juvenile robbery arrest rates declined during most of the 1980’s before reversing in 1989.

The juvenile proportion of robbery arrests and robberies cleared by juvenile arrest dropped through the late 1980’s and has been increasing since then.

Aggravated Assault

Juvenile arrest rates for aggravated assault remained relatively constant from the mid 1970’s through the mid 1980’s before increasing sharply through 1994.

The juvenile proportion of aggravated assault arrests and crimes cleared by juvenile arrests dropped through the late 1980’s and has been increasing since then.

Note: 1993 and 1994 arrest rates were estimated by the National Center for Juvenile Justice by using data presented in Crime in the United States reports and population data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Adults are responsible for most of the recent violent crime increases, but juveniles contribute more than their fair share

**Users of reported crime and arrest statistics face difficult interpretation problems**

Violent crime is increasing. Based on their representation in the general population, juveniles are responsible for a disproportionate share of this increase. But is it fair to say that juveniles are driving the violent crime trends?

Violent crimes reported to law enforcement agencies increased 40% between 1985 and 1994. Knowing that over this same period, juvenile arrests for violent crime grew 75%, while adult arrests increased 48%, some may conclude that juveniles were responsible for most of the increase in violent crime. However, even though the percentage increase in juvenile arrests was more than the adult increase, the majority of the growth in violent crime cannot be attributed to juveniles.

An example shows how this apparent contradiction can occur. Of the 100 violent crimes committed in 1985 in a small town, assume that juveniles were responsible for 10, and adults for 90. If the number of juvenile crimes increased 70% in 1994, juveniles would be committing 17 (or 7 more) violent crimes. A 50% increase in adult violent crimes would mean that adults were committing 135 (or 45 more) violent crimes. If each crime resulted in an arrest, the percentage increase in juvenile arrests would be more than the adult increase (70% versus 50%). However, 87% of the increase in violent crime (45 of the 52 additional violent crimes) would have been committed by adults. Juvenile arrests represent a relatively small fraction of the total; consequently, larger percentage increases in juvenile arrests do not necessarily translate into larger contributions to overall crime growth.

**Adults are responsible for three-fourths of the recent increase in violent crimes**

In 1985 the FBI reported juveniles were arrested in 9.6% of the violent crimes for which someone was arrested; this juvenile clearance percentage was 14.2% in 1994. If it is assumed that juveniles were responsible for similar percentages of the unsolved violent crimes in these years, then it is possible to estimate the number of crimes committed by juveniles and by adults in 1985 and 1994.

Based on FBI reported crime and clearance statistics, juveniles committed an estimated 137,000 more Violent Crime Index offenses in 1994 than in 1985, while adults committed an additional 398,000. Therefore, juveniles were responsible for 26% of the growth in violent crime between 1985 and 1994.

Between 1985 and 1994 juveniles were responsible for a substantial portion of the increase in robberies (50%), forcible rapes (48%), murders (35%), and aggravated assaults (21%). Juveniles, especially juveniles in the higher crime-producing age groups, represent a small percentage of the U.S. population, but contribute disproportionately to the increase in violent crime in the U.S.
Juvenile arrest rates for weapons law violations nearly doubled between 1987 and 1994

The FBI’s arrest statistics do not reflect the full volume of arrests involving a weapons law violation

The juvenile arrest rate for weapons possession is at an historic high. A weapons law violation was the most serious charge in 63,400 juvenile arrests in 1994. However, many more arrests undoubtedly involved a weapons law violation. FBI coding procedures require an arrest to be classified by the most serious charge involved. Consequently, none of the arrests of juveniles for killing someone with a handgun, aggravated forcible rape, armed robbery, or aggravated assault with a firearm would be included in the arrest count for weapons law violations.

Interim findings from a recent study by the National Institute of Justice that interviewed 4,000 arrestees in 11 cities (Atlanta, Denver, Detroit, Indianapolis, New Orleans, Los Angeles, Miami, Phoenix, San Diego, St. Louis, and Washington, DC) found that:

- 40% of juvenile males reported possessing a firearm at some time.
- Over a third admitted owning a firearm in the previous month.
- 22% reported carrying a gun all or most of the time.
- 55% of juvenile arrestees reported that they had been threatened with a gun.
- 50% had a gun fired at them.
- 11% had been injured by a gunshot.
- 38% believed that it was okay to shoot someone who hurts you.

This study found that gang membership and involvement in drug sales appear to be highly associated with gun ownership among arrestees. In addition, the study found that juveniles who had been violently victimized (i.e., threatened or shot at) were more likely to admit owning a gun.

Increases in juvenile arrests for a weapons law violation support a picture of growing juvenile violence

Between 1985 and 1994 the adult arrest rate for weapons law violations increased 26%, while juvenile arrests grew 103%. In most of the violent crime categories, juvenile arrests show similar increases: murder up 150%, robbery up 57%, aggravated assault up 97%, and simple assault up 144%. These changes are more disquieting when they are compared to the relatively small 11% increase in juvenile property crime arrests over this same period. If arrest statistics actually do reflect a change in juvenile behavior, the large increases in violent, and not property, crime arrests indicate that the last 10 years have not seen an increase “across-the-board” in law-violating behavior of youth, but changes primarily in the most serious types of criminal behavior.

The 20-year trend in the rate of juvenile arrests for weapons law violations closely parallels the juvenile arrest trend for murder

Note: 1993 and 1994 arrest rates were estimated by the National Center for Juvenile Justice by using data presented in Crime in the United States reports and population data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

The number of juvenile homicide offenders tripled between 1984 and 1994 — the increase is all firearm-related

There were more than 2,800 juvenile homicide offenders in 1994

FBI Supplementary Homicide Report data provide information about homicide offenders and victims. For some homicides, however, the characteristics of the perpetrator are unknown at the time the data are collected. For 1980 through 1994 overall, the age of offender(s) was unknown in about 3 in 10 homicides, although the proportion has increased some over time. A profile of juvenile homicide offenders can be developed from data on homicides where the offender was identified as a juvenile.

From 1980 through 1994 there have been more than 26,000 known juvenile homicide offenders. While the number of juvenile homicide offenders decreased between 1980 and 1984, the number has risen significantly since the mid-1980’s. There were more than 2,800 juvenile homicide offenders in 1994 — nearly three times the number in 1984.

From 1980 through 1994 there were 27,000 victims killed by offenders known to be juveniles. The trend for victims of juvenile homicide offenders paralleled the trend for juvenile homicide offenders. The number of victims killed by juveniles dropped from 1980–1984, then increased through 1994. There were more than 2,300 victims killed by juveniles in 1994 — more than two and a half times the number in 1984.

Since 1980 the number of juvenile homicide offenders has nearly doubled and the vast majority have been age 15 or older

Since 1987 black juvenile homicide offenders have outnumbered white juvenile homicide offenders

In 1980, 48% of juvenile homicide offenders were white and a slightly smaller proportion were black (46%). By 1994, 61% of juvenile homicide offenders were black and 36% were white.

From 1980–1994, about 9 in 10 juvenile homicide offenders were male.

Over the 15 years since 1980, male and female homicide offending trends have been very different. The number of female homicide offenders increased 29% since 1980, while the number of male offenders has doubled.

Although the number of female juvenile homicide offenders has increased, the female proportion of juvenile homicide offenders declined from the early 1980’s to the early 1990’s.


---

**3 in 10 juvenile homicide offenders killed a stranger**

Data for 1980 through 1994 show that juvenile homicide offenders tended to kill acquaintances (47%) or strangers (31%) more than parents or other family members (10%). For 12% of juvenile offenders, their relationship to the victim was unknown. Older juvenile homicide offenders were more likely than younger offenders to kill strangers and less likely to kill family members.

**Male and female juveniles tend to kill different types of victims**

Acquaintance-victims accounted for the largest proportion of both male and female juvenile homicide offenders. However, aside from the preponderance of acquaintance-victims, males and females tended to kill different types of victims. Females were more likely than males to kill family members. Males were more likely than females to kill strangers.

**Victim’s relationship to offender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victim’s Relationship</th>
<th>Percent of offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>8%  38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>47%  43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>32%  13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%  100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females were more likely than males to kill other juveniles (35% vs. 25%). Females who killed juveniles typically killed children younger than 12 years old. Males who killed juveniles typically killed 15–17-year-olds. Males were more likely than females to kill young adults in the 18–24 age range. Almost half of both male and female...
juvenile homicide offenders killed adults age 25 or older.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of offenders</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–11</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly half of juvenile offenders’ victims were 15–24 years old

The majority of juvenile homicide offenders are older teens. Between 1980 and 1994, 88% of juvenile homicide offenders were teens ages 15–17, 11% were juveniles ages 12–14, and 1% were younger than age 12.

Older teens were less likely to kill family members and more likely to kill strangers than were younger juveniles. For example, 9% of 15–17-year-olds killed a family member and 31% killed a stranger. In comparison, 18% of 12–14-year-olds killed a family member and 27% killed a stranger.

Nearly half of the victims killed by juvenile offenders were 15–24 years old (46%). Victim age varied with the age of the offender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of offenders</th>
<th>6–11</th>
<th>12–14</th>
<th>15–17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–11</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, homicide offenders ages 6–11 were most likely to kill another child under age 12, typically a family member or acquaintance. Older teens, in comparison, were most likely to kill adults between 18 and 49 years old, generally an acquaintance or stranger.

Most homicide offenders and their victims were the same race

In most homicides involving juvenile offenders, the offender and the victim were of the same race. From 1980 through 1994, 8 in 10 offenders killed someone of the same race — 90% of white offenders killed whites; 76% of black offenders killed blacks.

Compared with white offenders, blacks were more likely to kill strangers (33% vs. 27%) and less likely to kill family members (7% vs. 15%).

Most homicides by juveniles involved a firearm

From 1980 through 1994, 7 in 10 juvenile homicide offenders killed with a firearm. Two in 10 killed with a knife or blunt object. Personal weapons (hands, fists, or feet) were used by a relatively small proportion of juvenile homicide offenders (5%).

Males were more likely to kill with a gun (72%) than were females (42%). White offenders were less likely than offenders in other race categories to kill with a firearm. Sixty-two percent of whites used a gun, compared with 76% of blacks and 65% of offenders of other races.

Older teens were more likely than younger juveniles to kill with a gun. Guns were used by 71% of homicide offenders.

Four times as many juveniles killed with a gun in 1994 than in 1984

Over the years 1980–1994, the proportion of juvenile homicide offenders using a gun to kill went from a low of 53% in 1983 to 82% in 1994.

The number of juveniles who used a weapon other than a firearm remained constant between 1980 and 1994.

offenders ages 15–17, compared with 66% of offenders ages 12–14 and 54% of offenders younger than 12.

Juvenile offenders whose victims were younger than age 12 or older than age 49 were less likely to kill with a gun than those who killed victims ages 12–49. For example, one-third of juvenile offenders whose victims were younger than 12 years old used a gun, while more than three-quarters of those who killed 15–17-year-olds or 18–24-year-old victims used a gun.

**Males and older teens were more likely than other juveniles to kill in groups**

From 1980 through 1994, half of juvenile homicide offenders acted alone and half acted with at least one other person. Nearly one-quarter of offenders acted in pairs and the remaining quarter killed as part of a group of three or more.

More than 8 in 10 juveniles who killed family members acted alone. Of those who killed acquaintances, fewer than 6 in 10 acted alone. In comparison, nearly 7 in 10 of those who killed strangers did so as part of a group.

A greater proportion of female than male offenders acted alone. Among females 65% were lone offenders. In comparison, among males 49% acted alone. Killing in groups was more likely for older than for younger offenders. For example, one-quarter of offenders ages 6–11 killed with accomplices, compared with half of offenders ages 15–17. Black and white juveniles were equally likely to have killed alone (50%), in pairs (23%), or in groups of three or more (27%).

About 7 in 10 offenders with accomplices used a firearm, the same proportion as those without accomplices. The proportion using knives or blunt objects was also about the same for those acting alone and those acting in groups (2 in 10).

Group killings were somewhat more likely to cross racial lines than single-offender homicides. Among offenders acting alone, 12% killed a victim of a different race, while 23% of those acting in groups killed someone of a different race. Mixed-race killings involving groups typically involved blacks killing whites (70% of all mixed-race group homicides).

**3 in 10 juveniles who killed had an adult accomplice**

Juveniles who had adult accomplices accounted for nearly 30% of all juvenile homicide offenders. In fact, of juveniles who killed in groups, nearly 60% had an adult accomplice.

**The proportion of juveniles who kill in groups has increased**

The number of juvenile offenders involved in multiple-offender homicides in 1994 was nearly two and a half times the number in 1980. In comparison, the number of juveniles who acted alone rose 52%. Thus, the percent of juvenile homicide offenders who had accomplices increased from 43% in 1980 to 55% in 1994.

The number of homicide victims killed by groups that included juveniles was also nearly two and a half times greater in 1994 than in 1980. The proportion of victims killed by juveniles not acting alone rose from 33% in 1980 to 43% in 1994.
Illicit drug use by juveniles declined substantially during the 1980’s, but has increased since 1992

High school seniors reported more marijuana use in 1978 than in any other year between 1975 and 1995. In 1978, 37% of 12th graders reported they had used marijuana in the previous month. In 1992 this proportion was cut to 12%, but by 1995 it had risen to 21%.

Other illicit drug use among seniors peaked in 1981. In 1981, 22% of 12th graders reported using illicit drugs other than marijuana in the previous month. In 1992 this proportion dropped to 6%, but increased to 10% in 1995.

Cocaine use among seniors peaked in 1985 at 7%, but has remained below 2% since 1990.

Reported use of alcohol in the previous month by seniors also declined from a peak in 1978 of 72% to 51% in 1995.

After years of continuous decline, there has been an upturn in reported drug use by high school seniors in some categories since 1992. While these new levels of drug use are far from the highs of earlier years, there has been an apparent change in the long-term downward trend in drug use by U.S. high school seniors. Similar increases in drug use have also been observed among 10th and 8th graders, although their levels of use are below those of 12th graders.

Note: The survey question on alcohol use was revised in 1993 to indicate that a “drink” meant “more than a few sips.” In 1993 half the sample responded to the original question and half to the revised question. In 1994 and 1995 all respondents were asked the revised question.

17% of violent juvenile crime occurs during curfew hours, while 22% happens between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. on school days

On school days juvenile violence peaks between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m.

Percent of violent crimes committed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>6AM</th>
<th>9AM</th>
<th>Noon</th>
<th>3PM</th>
<th>6PM</th>
<th>9PM</th>
<th>Midnight</th>
<th>3AM</th>
<th>6AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School days</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-school days</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School days include approximately half the total number of days in a calendar year. Non-school days are all Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and all weekdays during the months of June, July, and August.

Note: Data are from the State of South Carolina.


1 in 5 violent juvenile crimes is committed between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. on school days

Some communities have targeted after school hours in an effort to reduce violent juvenile crime. These communities have implemented after-school programs that provide adult supervision during the hours when such guidance is missing in the lives of many youth. South Carolina data show the incidence of violent juvenile crime peaks between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. and declines throughout the evening hours, with 22% of all juvenile violent crimes occurring in the 4-hour period between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. on school days.

Percent occurring from 2–6 p.m. on school days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Violent Crimes</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent sex assault</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple assault</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juvenile violence occurs with greater frequency after school than during the curfew period

A greater proportion of all violent juvenile crime occurs between 2 and 6 p.m. on those days when school is in session than during an entire year’s curfew periods. The relative level of violent behavior is even more discrepant when it is recognized that the after-school period is limited to half the number of days on which the curfew is applied and that the after-school period is 4 hours long compared to the 6–8 hour curfew period. As a result, the frequency of violent juvenile crime (crimes/hour) is about 4 times greater in the after school period than during curfew hours.
The number of juvenile transfers to criminal court has grown in recent years, but little is known about the impact of this policy.

In certain cases juveniles may be tried in criminal court

Juveniles charged with serious offenses, with lengthy records of prior offenses, or who are unreceptive to treatment in the juvenile justice system are sometimes transferred to criminal court. The methods used to move juveniles into the adult system vary. In recent years, many States modified their laws to transfer more young offenders into the criminal courts. Increasingly, young offenders are moved into the adult system by legislative or prosecutorial actions rather than by judicial waiver.

There has been a substantial increase in waived cases

Between 1989 and 1993, the number of cases judicially waived from juvenile court to criminal court increased 41%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most serious offense</th>
<th>Number of waived cases 1989</th>
<th>Number of waived cases 1993</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding. Percent change was calculated using unrounded numbers.


The large increase in the number of cases judicially waived to criminal court cannot be completely explained by an increase in the juvenile court’s caseload. For example, between 1989 and 1993 the number of person offense cases formally processed by juvenile courts increased by 58%, while there was a 115% increase in judicial transfers of these cases. The greater increase in waived cases implies other factors were involved, such as:

- An increase between 1989 and 1993 in the level of violence found in person cases.
- A general decline in the amenability of youth for treatment within the juvenile justice system.
- An increase in the willingness of juvenile courts to transfer eligible cases.
- A decline in available treatment options within the juvenile justice system.
- An expansion of the pool of juveniles eligible for judicial transfer (e.g., a reduction in the minimum age at which a youth may be transferred).

New State legislation has expanded the pool of potential transfers during this time period. There is no empirical evidence to support or refute the other possibilities.

As with person offense cases, the increase in formally processed public order cases between 1989 and 1993 (37%) was less than the increase in the number of these cases judicially transferred to criminal court (75%). In contrast, while drug cases increased 15% over the period, the number of drug cases judicially transferred declined 11%.

Fewer than 2% of all formally processed delinquency cases are judicially waived to criminal court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Percent of petitioned delinquency cases that were waived 1989</th>
<th>Percent of petitioned delinquency cases that were waived 1990</th>
<th>Percent of petitioned delinquency cases that were waived 1991</th>
<th>Percent of petitioned delinquency cases that were waived 1992</th>
<th>Percent of petitioned delinquency cases that were waived 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Judicially waived cases generally involve older males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Referral</th>
<th>Percent of waived cases 1989</th>
<th>Percent of waived cases 1990</th>
<th>Percent of waived cases 1991</th>
<th>Percent of waived cases 1992</th>
<th>Percent of waived cases 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 or younger</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or older</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding.

In 1993, 4 in 10 judicially waived cases involved a person offense

Nationally, the offense profile of judicially waived cases has run counter to the expectations of elected officials and the public. For many years, there have been more property offense cases waived to criminal court than person offense cases. In 1982, for example, a national survey of criminal court transfers found that 32% of judicial waivers involved violent offenses against persons, while 62% involved either property crimes or public order offenses.

Since then, however, many States have made changes in their waiver statutes. More and more States have enacted presumptive waiver provisions targeting violent youth, thus increasing their likelihood of waiver. Other States have adjusted their waiver decision criteria, shifting the balance between offense severity and prior offense history. At the same time, person offenses account for a greater proportion of delinquency cases handled than in the past. Together these factors have resulted in a shift in the profile of judicially waived cases. For the first time since at least 1975, Juvenile Court Statistics reported that person offense cases waived to criminal court in 1993 out-numbered property offense cases waived.

### Most serious offense of waived cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Detail may not total 100% because of rounding.


**GAO study finds data not available to determine the number of juveniles tried in criminal court nationwide**

In 1992, Congress mandated the Government Accounting Office (GAO) to conduct a study on juvenile transfers to criminal court. Congress asked GAO to determine the frequency and extent of juvenile transfers, the conditions of transferred juveniles held in adult detention and correctional facilities, and to compare the sentencing patterns of juveniles transferred to criminal court with those facing similar charges in juvenile courts.

Relatively little data were available to answer these questions. Nationally GAO found fewer than 2% of delinquency cases filed in juvenile court are judicially waived. In States allowing prosecutor discretion, cases filed directly in criminal court by prosecutors accounted for from less than 1% to 13% of juvenile cases. Not all cases eligible for direct filing go to criminal court. Case studies in two jurisdictions indicated that prosecutors direct filed less than half of the cases that were by statute eligible for criminal court processing. It’s not known how much this proportion varies.

Most prosecutors’ offices surveyed indicated that judicial waivers accounted for a greater proportion of their criminal court cases than direct filings or statutory exclusions. However, because data on the number of cases statutorily excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction nationwide were not available, GAO could not determine which of the three transfer mechanisms accounted for the greatest volume of cases nationally.

Using data from six States (Arizona, Florida, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Utah) the GAO looked at the relationship between the probability of judicial transfer and selected case characteristics. Controlling for other factors the GAO found:

- Older juveniles were more likely to be transferred than younger juveniles.
- Juvenile with more prior referrals were more likely to be transferred.
- Males were more likely to be transferred than females.
- Blacks were more likely to be transferred than whites in four of the six States.
- Little consistent differences were found between metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas.

Criminal court data from seven States studied (California, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont) found that juveniles conviction rates varied substantially across States. The conviction rates ranged from 32% to 100% for serious violent offense cases, from 26% to 97% for serious property cases, and from 27% to 100% for drug offense cases. Similarly, incarceration rates varied across States. In one State 98% of juveniles convicted of a serious violent crime in criminal court were incarcerated in either jail or prison, while incarceration occurred in just 14% of such cases in another State.

The GAO found juveniles sentenced to adult prisons were generally subject to the same policies and procedures (e.g., health services, educational, vocational, work, and recreational opportunities) as adult inmates.
Sources


Technical Note

While juvenile arrest rates reflect juvenile behavior, many other factors can affect the size of these rates.

Arrest rates are calculated by dividing the number of youth arrests made in the year by the number of youth living in the jurisdiction. Therefore, jurisdictions that arrest a relatively large number of nonresident juveniles would have a higher arrest rate than a jurisdiction whose resident youth behave in an identical manner.

Jurisdictions, especially small jurisdictions, which are vacation destinations or which are centers for economic activity in a region may have arrest rates that reflect more than the behavior of their resident youth.

Other factors that influence the magnitude of arrest rates in a given area include the attitudes of its citizens toward crime, the policies of the jurisdiction’s law enforcement agencies, and the policies of other components of the justice system. Consequently, the comparison of juvenile arrest rates across jurisdictions, while informative, should be done with caution.

In most areas not all law enforcement agencies report their arrest data to the FBI. Rates for these areas are then necessarily based on partial information. If the reporting law enforcement agencies in these jurisdictions are not representative of the complete jurisdiction, then the rates will be biased. For example, if the only agencies that report in a county are urban agencies, the county’s reported rate will only reflect activity in the urban section of the county. Reported rates for jurisdictions with less than complete reporting may not be accurate.

The FBI calculates juvenile arrest rates by dividing the number of arrests of persons under age 18 by the population ages 0 through 17. While this is consistent, the majority of the population in this age range is below 10, while few arrestees are below age 10. For this report, the FBI’s reported arrest rates were modified to make them more sensitive to changes in that part of the juvenile population that is likely to generate the arrest figures. Specifically, the reported arrest rates were recalculated using a population base of persons ages 10 through 17.


If you have the 1996 Update on Violence, but not Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report, you don't have the whole story

The 1996 Update on Violence is an addendum to the 1995 report, Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report. This landmark report has been called the most comprehensive information source on juveniles and the justice system, and a roadmap to the future. It answers questions most frequently asked by justice professionals, State and local policymakers, researchers, and the media on a range of topics — including juvenile violence.

The National Report draws from more than 50 nationally recognized data sources

Written in clear, nontechnical language and illustrated with tables, graphs, and detailed maps, the 188-page report provides readers with an understanding of the dimensions and patterns of juvenile crime and victimization.

The authors not only describe data trends, they explain in simple language how to interpret the major data sources. This benchmark report provides a baseline for analyzing trends in the growth of the juvenile population; the rates of poverty, school dropouts, unwed births, juvenile crime, arrests, homicides, suicides, maltreatment, and crime victimization; and the justice system’s response to these problems.

To order your free copy of Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report (NCJ 153569) write to the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849–6000, call 800–638–8736, or e-mail askncjrs@aspensys.com.

Free, easy-to-use, PC software gives everyone access to the arrest and juvenile court data in this 1996 Update on Violence

Much of the data used in Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1996 Update on Violence are available in two user-friendly software packages, enabling researchers, planners, and policymakers to conduct their own analyses of these important information resources quickly and easily.

Four years of arrest data at your fingertips

Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics: 1990–1993 presents county, State, and national estimates of juvenile and adult arrests for Crime Index offenses. Twenty different tables for every State and county in the U.S. can be displayed on-screen or saved to a print file for easy insertion into another document.

Analyze 5 years of juvenile court records

Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1989–1993 is a data and analysis package that enables users to analyze the large database that underlies the annual Juvenile Court Statistics reports. Nine demographic, offense, and case processing variables are included in this Easy Access database, allowing users to produce their own profiles of many different case types. All tables can be viewed on-screen or saved to an output file.

To order your free copies of Easy Access software write to the National Center for Juvenile Justice, 710 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15219–3000, call 412–227–6950, or fax 412–227–6955.
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