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INTRODUCTION

In 1978 the U.S. Department of Justice published an interesting and informative booklet entitled Myths and Realities About Crime. From it came the idea for Fact and Fiction About Crime in Oregon, and like its predecessor, Fact and Fiction is designed to dispel the stereotyped notions that many people hold about crime, its victims, and the criminal justice system.

Some who read this booklet may not recognize the fictional statements as fiction, and some of those statements may be obvious falsehoods to others. The objective, however, is to present selected findings on the nature of crime in Oregon in a simple, non-technical manner. The facts included in Fact and Fiction are taken from sources available to us at this point in time. We realize, however, that other studies on similar subjects may reflect different findings according to individual methods of research. Additionally, the facts may change at some point in the future. For those interested in more detail, sources for the data are listed on each fact/fiction page and correspond to the source numbers listed on page 43.
Part I offenses (or Index crimes) are considered the most serious. They are crimes against persons* or property.**

Part II offenses are also criminal in nature but are deemed less serious.

Part III activities, generally, do not involve criminal offenses, but consist of response to calls for public service.

**Robbery:** Definition - the taking or attempting to take anything of value from a person by force or threat of force or violence.

**Burglary:** Definition - the unlawful entry of a residence, business, or other building with intent to commit a crime (usually the taking of property).

**Larceny:** Definition - the unlawful taking of property from the possession of another.

*Person crime:* An offense committed against a person. Examples are robbery, assault, and forcible rape.

**Property crime:** An offense committed against property. Examples are theft, burglary, and vandalism.
Part I or Index Offense

Murder & Non-negligent Manslaughter
Forcible Rape
Robbery
Aggravated Assault
Burglary
Larceny - Theft
Motor Vehicle Theft

Part II Offenses

Other Assaults
Arson*
Forgery/Counterfeiting
Fraud
Embezzlement
Stolen Property
Vandalism
Weapons Offenses
Prostitution
Other Sex Offenses
Drug Abuse
Gambling
Offenses Against Family
Driving Under the Influence
of Intoxicants (DUII)
Liquor Laws
Disorderly Conduct
All Other Offenses
Curfew/Loitering
Juvenile Runaway

Part III Activities

Traffic Crime (Serious Traffic)
Traffic Accidents
Illegal Alien Problems
Custody of Persons
Receiving Warrants
Stolen Motor Vehicles Recovered
Stolen Property Recovered
Fugitive Search/Apprehension
Missing Person
Sudden Death/Bodies Found
Suicide
Other Accidents (Not Traffic)
Animal Problems
Property (Lost/Found)
Abandoned Auto Investigation
Locate Missing Auto
Impounding Autos
Rendering Assistance
Domestic Problems (Family)
Insure Premises/Security
Suspicious Persons/Circumstances
Public Safety Problems
Disturbances Involving Noise
Assistance to Sick or Injured
Marine Problems
Traffic Roads (Parking, etc.)
Civil Complaints
Disposition of Vehicles in Custody
Responding to Alarms
Assaults Against Police Officers
Other (Miscellaneous Calls)

*As of January 1, 1979, Arson is being recorded as an Index offense.
Crime Rates

FICTION
CRIME IS CONSTANTLY ON THE INCREASE BOTH IN OREGON AND IN THE UNITED STATES.

FACT
Although Oregon's Index Crime rate (offenses per 100,000 population) exceeds the national rate, it has reached a relative degree of stability within the last four years, as has the national rate.

Information Sources:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
2. Crime in the U.S.
**CIME RATES**

1975-1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Oregon Rate</th>
<th>U.S. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OFFENSES PER 100,000 POPULATION*
Perception Of Crime

FICTION

COMPARSED TO OTHER ISSUES, OREGONIANS DON'T PERCEIVE CRIME AS A SERIOUS PROBLEM IN THEIR COMMUNITIES.

FACT

A 1978 survey of serious crime in Oregon asked respondents to place 14 social issues in rank order of seriousness in their communities. Three crime-related problems were rated among the first five issues. They were Drug and Alcohol Abuse (ranked second), Juvenile Delinquency (ranked fourth), and Property Crime (ranked fifth).

Information Source:
4. Survey of Serious Crime

RANK ORDER OF COMMUNITY ISSUES

1. PROPERTY TAX
2. ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE
3. COST OF LIVING
4. JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
5. PROPERTY CRIME
6. LAND USE/ZONING
7. QUALITY OF EDUCATION
8. UNEMPLOYMENT
9. POLLUTION/ENVIRONMENT
10. VIOLENT CRIME
11. POVERTY
12. WHITE COLLAR CRIME
13. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
14. RACE RELATIONS
The vast majority of criminal offenses reported to Oregon enforcement agencies are Property crimes. Larceny, Burglary, and Motor Vehicle Theft represent 92% of Oregon Index crime reported in 1977. The Violent crimes (Murder, Forcible Rape, Robbery, and Aggravated Assault) represent 7.5% of reported Oregon Index Crime while Violent crime comprises 9.2% of Index crime and .5% of total reported crime for the U.S.

Information Sources:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
2. Crime in the U.S.
VIOLENT CRIME

- Murder: 0.08%
- Forcible Rape: 0.66%
- Robbery: 2.1%
- Aggravated Assault: 4.7%
- Total Violent Crime: 7.5%

Larceny: 58.5%
Burglary: 27.3%
Motor Vehicle Theft: 6.56%

OREGON

Burglary: 28%
Larceny: 54%
Motor Vehicle Theft: 8.8%

UNITED STATES

Burglary: 9.25%
Larceny: 54%
Motor Vehicle Theft: 4.8%

TOTAL:

Violent Crime: 9.25%
Larceny: 58.5%
Burglary: 27.3%
Motor Vehicle Theft: 6.56%

-9-
Motor Vehicle Theft

FACT
A sample taken in May, August, and October of 1977 revealed that 56.3% of stolen automobiles were 1969 models or older.

Of the Automobile Thefts in this sample, 41.4% were General Motors products; 21.9% Ford Motor Company; 16.9% Imports; 9.2% Chrysler Corporation; and 1% American Motors.


Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests

MODEL YEAR OF STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES
(May, August, October 1977)

-10-

-11-
Armed Violence

FICTION
A weapon is used in nearly all rapes, assaults, and robberies.

FACT
On the average, a weapon was used in about half of the violent crimes reported in Oregon. Of these crimes, robbery and assault were most likely to be committed with a weapon. Rape was the least likely crime to be carried out using a weapon.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
ARF ED VIOLENCE

rape

- no weapon used: 83%
- weapon used: 17%

assault

- no weapon used: 55%
- weapon used: 45%

personal robbery

- no weapon used: 44%
- weapon used: 56%

commercial robbery

- no weapon used: 37%
- weapon used: 63%
Drugs And
Juveniles

FACT

Arrest data suggests that drug abuse is more a problem with adults than juveniles and that hard drug use is particularly concentrated among adults. Of the 10,848 arrests for drug abuse in 1977, 25.5% were juvenile offenders and 74.5% were adults. The vast majority of the juveniles were arrested for possession of Marijuana or Hashish, and only 4% were arrested for possession of narcotics. In fact, there were 10 times as many adults arrested for Narcotics as juveniles.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
## ARRESTS FOR DRUG ABUSE

**1977**

### Pie Chart

- **Adult Arrests**: 74.5%
- **Juvenile Arrests**: 25.5%

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Drug</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
<th>Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics (Opium, Cocaine, Heroin, Morphine, etc.)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana (Hashish)</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>6598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetics (Demerol, Methadone, etc.)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Dangerous Drugs (Barbiturates, Amphetamines, Hallucinogens, etc.)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2677</strong></td>
<td><strong>7807</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost all cases of Arson involve adult professionals.

Although all arsonists are never caught, the data on arrests suggests that juveniles—and particularly young juveniles—are more heavily involved in this crime than adults. Of all Arson arrests in 1977, 67.6% were for juveniles. Of these juvenile arrests, 81.8% involved youngsters 15 years old and younger and 22% involved children 10 years old and under.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
ARRESTS FOR ARSON

Juvenile/Adult

- Adult: 32.4%
- Juvenile: 67.6%

Juvenile

- 16-17 yrs. old: 18.2%
- 15 yrs. & under: 81.8%
Women & Crime

**FICTION**

Because of the Women's Rights Movement female involvement in crime has greatly increased in recent years.

**FACT**

The percentage of women arrested for criminal offenses has not changed substantially over the past six years. Women continue to constitute only one-fifth of all arrests, and their involvement is primarily in less serious, non-violent crimes such as shoplifting.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
### Proportion of Arrestees That Are Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1978 Female Arrests

- **Larceny**: 26%
- **DUII**: 14.4%
- **Liquor Laws**: 9.3%
- **Drug Abuse**: 7%
- **Other Part I Offenses**: 4.4%
- **Other Part II Offenses**: 38.9%
The Criminal Justice System is not concerned about victims of crime.

Victim Compensation & Assistance

FACT

In October 1977, the Oregon Legislature created a program to assist victims of crime. It is administered by the Crime Victims' Compensation Division (CVCD) of the Department of Justice in Salem.

CVCD began receiving claims in January, 1978 and as of April, 1979, received 334 claims. Of those filed, 105 were accepted, 84 were denied and 145 were pending. Approximately $600,000 was budgeted for payment of claims in the first 18 months of operation.

Information about the program is distributed by enforcement agencies, major hospitals, and the Crime Victims' Compensation Division. In addition to the state program, local programs operate in some communities to provide services such as emergency assistance and counseling for rape victims, transportation to court, etc.

Information Source:
10. Crime Victim's Compensation Division
Notice to Victims of Crime

If you are an injured victim of crime you might qualify for financial compensation.

To apply for compensation you must file an application with the Crime Victims' Compensation Division of the Department of Justice.

For assistance contact:

Crime Victims' Compensation Division
Department of Justice
100 State Office Bldg., 2nd Fl.
Salem, Oregon 97310
Phone: (503) 378-5348

Checkpoints

You may qualify for benefits if:

2. Your out-of-pocket medical expenses and actual loss of earnings exceed $250.
3. You cooperated fully with law enforcement officials in the apprehension and prosecution of the assailant.
4. You were not related to the assailant.
5. You were not sharing the same household with the assailant.
6. Your injury was not substantially attributable to your wrongful act or substantial provocation of the assailant.
7. You notified law enforcement officials of the crime within 72 hours of the injury.
8. You filed a claim for benefits within six months from the date of the injury.

Now there's help

Other Assistance Programs for Victims & Witnesses

Marilyn Culp
Multnomah Co. D.A.'s Office
600 Multnomah Co. Courthouse
1021 S.W. Fourth Ave.
Portland, OR 97204
248-3222

Roi Hokinson
Clackamas Co. D.A.'s Office
Clackamas Co. Courthouse
Oregon City, OR 97045
655-8616

Kathy Hall
Washington Co. D.A.'s Office
Administration Building
150 N. 1st Ave.
Hillsboro, OR 97128
648-8868

Geoff Alpert
Lane Co. D.A.'s Office
Lane Co. Courthouse
Eugene, OR 97401
687-4261

Bob Galvin
Josephine Co. D.A.'s Office
Josephine Co. Courthouse
Grants Pass, OR 97526
474-5200
Crime Against the Elderly

FACT

A 1978 survey of Oregon residents, as well as several other national studies, have all found that persons over age sixty-five are the least victimized age group in all major crime categories. However, these data ignore the greater trauma and economic burden that likely befalls an elderly victim. Additionally, data from the Oregon survey showed that older people were more likely to use crime prevention measures and remain inside, reducing potential for victimization. This may account for part of their low victimization rate.

Information Source:
Survey of Victimization by Age & Type of Crime

- Property Crime Only
  - 15-29: 32.1%
  - 30-44: 30.4%
  - 45-64: 29.0%
  - 65 & Up: 18.2%

- Person Crime Only
  - 15-29: 4.3%
  - 30-44: 0.5%
  - 45-64: 0.5%

- Person & Property Crime
  - 15-29: 8.4%
  - 30-44: 2.0%
  - 45-64: 0.7%

- Non-Victim
  - 15-29: 55.1%
  - 30-44: 67.1%
  - 45-64: 69.8%

*Definitions on Page 2.
Residential Burglar

Fiction
All household burglaries are committed by breaking into the premises.

Fact
In 1978, 40% of residential burglaries were committed by entering through unlocked doors or windows or by using keys. Of the 26,469 burglaries and attempted burglaries that took place in Oregon, about 10,650 involved no forcible entry. Since burglary is often an act of opportunity, closer attention to household security is the best preventive measure.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
Fiction

Many people don't report crimes because they don't want to get involved.

Fact

The 1978 Survey of Serious Crime in Oregon asked Oregon residents what their main reasons were for not reporting crimes to the police. Almost half said they did not report because they felt nothing could or would be done. About 35% felt the crime was not important enough to report.

Information Source:
4. Survey of Serious Crime
Beasons For Not Reporting Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FELT IT WAS USELESS BECAUSE NOTHING COULD/WOULD BE DONE</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRAID OF RETALIATION</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELT THE CRIME WASN'T IMPORTANT ENOUGH TO REPORT</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DID NOT GET AROUND TO IT - TOO BUSY WITH OTHER MATTERS</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACT

Although data on juveniles who were never apprehended for crimes they committed does not exist, data on those who were suggests that involvement in criminal activity decreases substantially once a juvenile becomes an adult. The volume of arrests by age peaks for the 15-19 age group and decreases from there on. This pattern has not changed over the past four years. Therefore, juveniles arrested in 1975, who are now adults, have not maintained their high level of involvement in criminal activity.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
A - RESTS BY AGE
1975 to 1978

AGE AT ARREST

Number of Arrests

1,000
5,000
10,000
15,000
20,000
25,000
30,000
35,000
40,000

14 & Under
15-19
20-24
25-29
30-34
35-39

1978
1977
1976
1975
MOST PERSONS ARRESTED FOR SERIOUS CRIMES (FELONIES) GO TO TRIAL AND ARE SENT TO PRISON FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR.

FACT

A survey conducted in 1976 took a sample of 1,047 Felony arrests from eleven Oregon counties (this was about 68% of Oregon Part I arrests for that year). Of this number, 52% were convicted, including only 14% sent to prison for more than a year. The remaining 48% included 2% acquitted, 2% pending verdict, 27% never filed in circuit court, and the rest dismissed.

Information Source:
3. What Happens After Arrest in Oregon?
WHAT HAPPENS AFTER ARREST?

PART I FELONY ARRESTS

1047 FELONY ARRESTS IN SAMPLE SURVEY

CIRCUIT COURT FILING

764

CIRCUIT COURT CONVICTION

544

SOME INCARCERATION

28%

293

OVER 1 YR

14%

147

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>Sample Survey Arrests</th>
<th>Circuit Court Filing</th>
<th>Circuit Court Conviction</th>
<th>Some Incarceration</th>
<th>Over One Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny-Theft</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A large portion of convicted offenders have their convictions reversed or their sentences reduced by appealing to the Oregon Supreme Court.

FACT
In January, 1978, an Oregon law took effect saying that all cases appealed following conviction in a district or circuit court must go to the Court of Appeals before going to the Oregon Supreme Court. This law has reduced the number of cases appealed in the Supreme Court. However, even prior to 1978, very few cases reached the Supreme Court. Of all verdicts in Oregon Circuit or District Courts, less than one half of one percent were appealed, and of the small number which were appealed, only 13% made it to the Supreme Court.

Information Sources:
5. Judicial Administration
9. Report on the Criminal Justice System

How Many Cases Get To The Oregon Supreme Court? (1977)

Supreme Court
39 Granted Review
11 Petitions For Review

Oral Arguments Heard on 1,451 Cases

Court of Appeals
2,348 Appeals Filed

592,471 Cases Terminated

Circuit and District Courts
606,587 Cases Filed
Parole Decisions

FICTION
Parole eligibility is determined in large part by the personal reaction of the parole board.

FACT
For many years, parole decisions have been viewed as arbitrary and the parole board characterized as lacking in public accountability. In 1977, administrative rules were adopted as directed by the legislature. These rules now govern parole decisions. The major component of the rules is a decision-making "Matrix." From this matrix, each inmate is given a history/risk assessment score which considers various aspects of prior criminal behavior. The history/risk score and the severity of the crime considered with either aggravating circumstances (e.g., threat of violence towards the victim) or mitigating circumstances (e.g., cooperation with criminal justice agencies in resolution of other criminal activities) determines the length of stay.

Information Sources:
6. Administrative Rules
7. "Parole Matrix"
HOW PAROLE DECISIONS ARE MADE

**OFFENSE SEVERITY RATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIMINAL HISTORY/RISK ASSESSMENT SCORE</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-9</td>
<td>6 or 6 or</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>12-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-6</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>(4-8)**</td>
<td>(8-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>(4-8)</td>
<td>(8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-0</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>less</td>
<td>(4-8)</td>
<td>(8-14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Category 1**
- Criminal Mischief, Welfare Fraud, & Fraudulent Use of a Credit Card
- Poaching, Perjury & Theft by Receiving
- Bribery; Burglary II & Manslaughter II
- Criminal Activity in Drugs
- Burglary I & Escape I
- Assault I, Robbery I, Rape I
- Kidnapping I
- Murder

**Subcategory 2 - All other cases**
- 8-10 yrs 10-13 yrs 13-16 yrs 16-20 yrs
- 10-14 yrs 14-19 yrs 19-24 yrs 24-Life

**Subcategory 1 - Stranger to stranger, extreme cruelty, prior conviction for murder or manslaughter, significant planning/preparation**

**Treason**

*Examples of crimes in each category

**Months in parentheses represent ranges for youthful offenders (21 years or younger at time of conviction).**

SOURCE: 6, 7
Parole Patterns

FICTION

MOST PAROLED OREGON INMATES END UP RETURNING TO PRISON.

FACT

The federal government has set a standard of three years of exposure to the community as the basis for determining return rates of paroled prisoners (recidivism). The accompanying diagram represents the period 1975-1978.

Of the 747 inmates released on parole from Oregon correctional institutions in 1975, 62% were not returned to further supervision within the three-year period. Violation of parole rules or new crimes landed 33.5% back in prison and 4.4% back on probation by the end of 1978.

Information Source:
8. Corrections Division
WHAT HAPPENS WITHIN THREE YEARS AFTER PAROLE?

OREGON CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

747 Released On Parole (1975)

Not Returned to Oregon Supervision

62%

10.2% 23.3% Rule Violation New Crime

4.4% PROBATION
Community Corrections

FICTION
MOST PEOPLE DON'T WANT CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS IN THEIR COMMUNITIES.

FACT
The Community Corrections Act, passed in 1977, authorizes funds to counties for developing local alternatives to state penal institutions. A survey of 931 Oregon residents was conducted in 1978 to determine the level of public support for programs like halfway houses, restitution and work-release centers, and community service projects. As illustrated, the majority supported community corrections for first-time juvenile and adult offenders convicted of Property crimes (Burglary, Theft, etc.) or Violent crimes (Robbery, Assault, etc.). Statistics show a limited tolerance for community programs for repeat offenders or those convicted of violent Sexual crimes.

Information Source:
4. Survey of Serious Crime
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL PROGRAMS

- Violent Crime
  - Oppose: 30%
  - Support: 70%
  - First Time Juvenile Offenders
  - First Time Adult Offenders
  - Repeat Juvenile Offenders
  - Repeat Adult Offenders

- Violent Sex Crime
  - Oppose: 40%
  - Support: 60%
  - First Time Juvenile Offenders
  - First Time Adult Offenders
  - Repeat Juvenile Offenders
  - Repeat Adult Offenders

- Property Crime
  - Oppose: 70%
  - Support: 30%
  - First Time Juvenile Offenders
  - First Time Adult Offenders
  - Repeat Juvenile Offenders
  - Repeat Adult Offenders

- Oppose: 80%
  - Support: 20%
  - First Time Juvenile Offenders
  - First Time Adult Offenders
  - Repeat Juvenile Offenders
  - Repeat Adult Offenders
Calls For Police Service

FICTION

THE MAJORITY OF CALLS RECEIVED BY OREGON ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES INVOLVE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES.

FACT

In 1977, about 60% of the calls received by enforcement agencies were requests for assistance from other enforcement and government agencies or reports of suspicious persons or circumstances, family disturbances, animal problems, traffic accidents, and traffic/road complaints.

Information Source:
1. Analysis of Offenses and Arrests
30.1% selected agencies:
- Sheriff's Departments (45,000 to 125,000 population): 6
- Police Departments (10,000 to 83,000 population): 7
- Police Departments (4,000 to 10,500 population): 9

*The largest percentage of "ALL OTHER" offenses are harassment and trespassing.

**CALLS FOR SERVICE**

**PART I** 18.7%
- Traffic/roads (complaints) 4.35%
- Traffic/roads (crashes) 2.3%
- Other Part III Calls for Service 30.1%
- Burglary 11.2%
- Larceny 11.2%
- Rape Part I 7.5%
- Robberies 9.7%
- Assaults 7.4%
- Other Law 5.1%
- Juvenile runaway 4.6%
- Domestic offenses 3.6%
- DUI 3.6%
- Other Part II 1.4%
- Other Part I 0.3%
- Other Law 0.3%
- Other Part II 0.3%

**PART II** 21.5%

**PART III** 11.2%
- Suspicious person 7.3%
- Rendering service 11.2%

**SOURCES**
8. Oregon State Corrections Division.
10. Crime Victim's Compensation Division, Department of Justice, Salem, Oregon.
COMMON BELEFS ABOUT CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM THAT REQUIRE FURTHER RESEARCH

In our effort to research and solicit fictitious statements we encountered several which we would have liked to address. Unfortunately, the data we sought was unavailable to prove or disprove statements such as the ones listed below. Still, our wish was to include them as a means of showing the need for continued efforts in research, data collection and statistical analysis.

RECIDIVISM
The longer a convicted felon stays in prison the less likely they are to return to a life of crime.

RAPE
Most women who are victims of rape have brought it upon themselves in some way or another.

CRIME PREVENTION
Crime prevention efforts by police and citizens are ineffective in reducing crime.

DEFENSE
People only get the kind of justice that they can pay for.

REHABILITATION
Rehabilitation of convicted offenders is a realistic objective of incarceration.

SENTENCING DISPARITY
Persons with similar criminal backgrounds convicted of the same crime will not always receive the same sentence because some judges are more lenient than others and some offenders can afford better attorneys than others.