





# Table of Contents

---

Acknowledgments.....	i
Glossary of Terms.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Information About the Uniform Crime Reports .....	2
Limitations of the UCR and Data .....	4
Arrest Data as a Measure of Crime.....	6
Methodology.....	7
Implications, Recommendations, and Next Steps.....	9
Key Implications/Questions.....	11
Preliminary Recommendations.....	12
Next Steps.....	15



## 2008 MCJJ Members

Ms. Barbara Levin Bergman  
Dr. Arthur Carter  
Mr. Leonard Dixon  
Dr. Joan Doughty  
Honorable William Ervin  
Mr. Jeffrey Fink  
Ms. Amanda Good  
Ms. Carol Harton  
Mr. Jeriel Heard  
Ms. Marilyn Latterman  
Ms. Chiquita McKenzie  
Mr. Brian Philson  
Ms. Kenyatta Stephens  
Honorable Matthew Switalski  
Mr. Joseph Underwood  
Mr. Gary Walker  
Honorable Elizabeth Weaver  
Mr. Clarence Williams

## MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice is to advise the Governor on matters related to juvenile justice legislation and administration, to mobilize communities to develop and implement comprehensive, data driven prevention services, and to create a strategic plan that sets standards, determines priorities and allocates funds for successful delinquency prevention and rehabilitative programs that promote stronger families, healthier youth and safer communities.

## VISION STATEMENT

The vision of the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice is to be a national leader in the prevention of and treatment of juvenile delinquency. Through forward looking leadership, innovative programs and services, and commitment to comprehensive partnerships, the Bureau of Juvenile Justice will be instrumental in building safe and supportive communities.

# Acknowledgments

This project was commissioned by the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice (MCJJ) in an effort to obtain data on the activities within the State of Michigan regarding juvenile crime under the auspices of the Bureau of Juvenile Justice, Department of Human Services (BJJ/DHS). This report was supported by funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Office of Justice Programs, U. S. Department of Justice to the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS), Bureau of Juvenile Justice (BJJ), Federal Grants Unit. The findings and recommendations in this report have been developed in a joint effort with the MCJJ. The recommendations are not exclusively reflective of the Michigan Department of Human Services. The outcomes, as reflected in the research and within the recommendations section are on-going in an effort to provide enhanced and more detailed analysis of factors, data and full juvenile justice activity within the State. This report will be incorporated as part of Michigan's Comprehensive Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Plan as required in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Policy development for the implementation of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in Michigan is provided by the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice.

The project team members of Public Policy Associates, Inc. were Mr. Paul Elam, Project Manager, Dr. C. Edward Banks, Senior Research Associate, Mr. Jason Rydberg, Project-intern, and Dr. Charles Corley, Project Consultant from Michigan State University.

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of Mr. Jim Hines, Ms. Stephanie Price, Ms. Danielle Moore, Mr. Damon Daniels, and Dr. Francisco Villarruel for their time, advice, and suggestions. The authors would also like to acknowledge the contributions of the following DHS/BJJ staff: Ms. Jeanette Scroggins, Mr. Joe Jerome, and Ms. Shirley Winston.

The authors would also like to thank the members of the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice for their continued comments, suggestions, and feedback throughout this process: Ms. Barbara Bergman, Dr. Arthur M. Carter, Mr. Leonard Dixon, Dr. Joan Doughty, Hon. William Ervin, Mr. Jeffrey Fink, Ms. Diane Giddings, Ms. Amy Good, Ms. Carol Harton, Mr. Jeriel Heard, Ms. Anita Lacy, Ms. Marilyn Latterman, M. Chiquita McKenzie-Bennett, Mr. Brian Philson, Mr. Joseph Underwood, Mr. Gary Walker, Hon. Elizabeth Weaver, and Mr. Clarence Williams.

Finally, we would like to thank Ms. Wendy Easterbrook, from the Michigan State Police, for providing the 2005 UCR data set that was used to produce this report.

We hope that you find the report informative and useful for making decisions that will successfully impact juvenile delinquency in the state of Michigan and targeted communities.

For additional information, please contact Jeanette Scroggins, Grants Manager and Juvenile Justice Specialist, DHS-BJJ at 517/335-3541 or Mr. Paul Elam, Public Policy Associates, Incorporated, 119 Pere Marquette Drive, Suite 1C, Lansing, MI, 48912-1231. Phone: (517) 485-4477.



# Glossary of Terms

This report describes patterns related to both individual juveniles and juvenile offenses over the course of the 2005 calendar year and in some cases between calendar years 2000 and 2005. An explanation of key concepts used throughout this report and how they relate to one another is provided below.

**Aggravated assault:** An unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe or aggravated bodily injury. This type of assault usually is accompanied by the use of a weapon or by means likely to produce death or great bodily harm. Simple assaults are excluded.

**All other offenses:** All violations of state or local laws not specifically identified as Part I or Part II offenses, except traffic violations.

**Arrest:** For the purposes of this report, a juvenile is considered “arrested” for an offense if there is an official record of the arrest reported in the 2000–2005 UCR reports.

**Arson:** Any willful or malicious burning or attempt to burn, with or without intent to defraud, a dwelling house, public building, motor vehicle or aircraft, personal property of another, etc.

**Burglary (breaking or entering):** The unlawful entry of a structure to commit a felony or a theft. Attempted forcible entry is included.

**Criminal homicide:** a. Murder and non-negligent manslaughter: the willful (non-negligent) killing of one human being by another. Deaths caused by negligence, attempts to kill, assaults to kill, suicides, and accidental deaths are excluded. The Program classifies *justifiable homicides* separately and limits the definition to: (1) the killing of a felon by a law enforcement officer in the line of duty; or (2) the killing of a felon, during the commission of a felony, by a private citizen. b. Manslaughter by negligence: the killing of another person through gross negligence.

Deaths of persons due to their own negligence, accidental deaths not resulting from gross negligence, and traffic fatalities are not included in the category manslaughter by negligence.

**Curfew and loitering laws (persons under age 18):** Violations by juveniles of local curfew or loitering ordinances.

**Dark Figure of Crime:** The “dark figure” is a term used by criminologists to represent the difference between reports to authorities of a particular crime and the number of instances of that crime that probably go unreported. Generally, the more petty the crime, the higher the dark figure. Bicycle theft is often cited as an example of a crime with a high dark figure. Some surveys have shown that up to 80% of bicycle thefts are never reported to police. The dark figure for murder, on the other hand, is expected to be very low.

**Disorderly conduct:** Any behavior that tends to disturb the public peace or decorum, scandalize the community, or shock the public sense of morality.

**Driving under the influence:** Driving or operating a motor vehicle or common carrier while mentally or physically impaired as the result of consuming an alcoholic beverage or using a drug or narcotic.

**Drug abuse violations:** The violation of laws prohibiting the production, distribution, and/or use of certain controlled substances. The unlawful cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, purchase, use, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug or narcotic substance. Arrests for violations of state and local laws, specifically those relating to the unlawful possession, sale, use, growing, manufacturing, and making of narcotic drugs. The following drug categories are specified: opium or cocaine and their derivatives (morphine, heroin, codeine); marijuana; synthetic narcotics/manufactured narcotics that can cause true addiction (Demerol, methadone); and dangerous non-narcotic drugs (barbiturates, Benzedrine).

**Drunkennes:** To drink alcoholic beverages to the extent that one’s mental faculties and physical coordination are substantially impaired. Driving under the influence is excluded.

**Embezzlement:** The unlawful misappropriation or misapplication by an offender to his/her own use or purpose of money, property, or some other thing of value entrusted to his/her care, custody, or control.

**Forcible rape:** The carnal knowledge of a person forcibly and against their will. Rapes by force and attempts or assaults to rape, regardless of the age of the victim, are included. Statutory offenses (no force used, victim under age of consent) are excluded.

**Forgery and counterfeiting:** The altering, copying, or imitating of something, without authority or right, with the intent to deceive or defraud by passing the copy or thing altered or imitated as that which is original or genuine; or the selling, buying, or possession of an altered, copied, or imitated thing with the intent to deceive or defraud. Attempts are included.

**Fraud:** The intentional perversion of the truth for the purpose of inducing another person or other entity in reliance upon it to part with something of value or to surrender a legal right. Fraudulent conversion and obtaining of money or property by false pretenses. Confidence games and bad checks, except forgeries and counterfeiting, are included.

**Gambling:** To unlawfully bet or wager money or something else of value; assist, promote, or operate a game of chance for money or some other stake; possess or transmit wagering information; manufacture, sell, purchase, possess, or transport gambling equipment, devices, or goods; or tamper with the outcome of a sporting event or contest to gain a gambling advantage.

**Juvenile:** In Michigan, a youth under 17 years of age. For this report, offenses are only reported for youth between the ages of 11 and 16. A person under 11 years old is rarely arrested for a crime according to the Michigan State arrest information (MSP, 2005). In 2005, there were only 206 youths 10 years old or younger that were arrested in Michigan. (Table F-1 in Appendix F shows the number of youth 10 years old or younger that were arrested in 2005).

**Larceny/theft (except motor vehicle theft):** The unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. Examples are thefts of bicycles, motor vehicle parts and accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or the stealing of any property or article that is not taken by force and violence or by fraud. Attempted larcenies are included. Embezzlement, confidence games, forgery, check fraud, etc., are excluded.

**Liquor law violations:** The violation of state or local laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or use of alcoholic beverages, not including driving under the influence and drunkenness. Federal violations are excluded.

**Motor vehicle theft:** The theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle. A motor vehicle is self-propelled and runs on land surface and not on rails. Motorboats, construction equipment, airplanes, and farming equipment are specifically excluded from this category.

**Offenses against the family and children:** Unlawful non-violent acts by a family member (or legal guardian) that threaten the physical, mental, or economic well-being or morals of another family member and that are not classifiable as other offenses, such as assault or sex offenses. Attempts are included.

**Other assaults (simple):** Assaults and attempted assaults that are not of an aggravated nature and do not result in serious injury to the victim. Stalking, intimidation, coercion, and hazing are included.

**Part I offenses (also known as Index offenses):** In Part I, the UCR indexes reported incidents in two categories: violent crime arrests and property crime arrests. Aggravated assault, forcible rape, murder, and robbery are classified as violent while arson, burglary, larceny/theft, and motor vehicle theft are classified as property crimes.

**Part II offenses:** Part II offenses are “less serious” offenses and include simple assaults, forgery/counterfeiting, embezzlement/fraud, receiving stolen property, weapons violations, prostitution, sex crimes, crimes against family and child, violation of narcotic drug laws,

violation of liquor laws, drunkenness, disturbing the peace, disorderly conduct, gambling, DUI, and moving traffic violations.

**Prostitution and commercialized vice:** The unlawful promotion of or participation in sexual activities for profit, including attempts. To solicit customers or transport persons for prostitution purposes; to own, manage, or operate a dwelling or other establishment for the purpose of providing a place where prostitution is performed; or to otherwise assist or promote prostitution.

**Robbery:** The taking of or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear.

**Runaways (persons under age 18):** Limited to juveniles taken into protective custody under the provisions of local statutes.

**Sex offenses (except forcible rape, prostitution, and commercialized vice):** Offenses against chastity, common decency, morals, and the like. Incest, indecent exposure, and statutory rape are included. Attempts are included.

**Stolen property – buying, receiving, possessing:** Buying, receiving, possessing, selling, concealing, or transporting any property with the knowledge that it has been unlawfully taken, as by burglary, embezzlement, fraud, larceny, robbery, etc. Attempts are included.

**Suspicion:** Arrested for no specific offense and released without formal charges being placed.

**Uniform Crime Reports:** This program was conceived in 1929 by the International Association of Chiefs of Police to meet a need for reliable, uniform crime statistics for the nation. In 1930, the FBI was tasked with collecting, publishing, and archiving those statistics.

**Vagrancy:** The violation of a court order, regulation, ordinance, or law requiring the withdrawal of persons from the streets or other specified areas; prohibiting persons from remaining in an

area or place in an idle or aimless manner; or prohibiting persons from going from place to place without visible means of support.

**Vandalism:** To willfully or maliciously destroy, injure, disfigure, or deface any public or private property, real or personal, without the consent of the owner or person having custody or control by cutting, tearing, breaking, marking, painting, drawing, covering with filth, or any other such means as may be specified by local law. Attempts are included.

**Weapons – carrying, possessing, etc.:** The violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, concealment, or use of firearms, cutting instruments, explosives, incendiary devices, or other deadly weapons. Attempts are included.

# Introduction

Consistent media attention given to incidents involving violent crime, gangs, and youth violence in general suggests that juvenile crime continues to be a problem of huge concern in our nation. When analyzing the data, violent crime arrests among juveniles in Michigan increased by 2.25% between 2005 and 2006. Overall, juvenile *arrest rates* also increased slightly between 2000 and 2005 in Michigan.

When taking a closer look, juvenile *arrest rates* actually dropped in 52 Michigan counties during this period. While this is true, there were increases in the remaining 31 counties. Of the counties with the largest numbers of juvenile arrests in 2005, Wayne, Kent, Macomb, Genesee, and Washtenaw reported increases in *arrest rates* over the five-year period, while Oakland, Ottawa, Kalamazoo, Ingham, and Berrien reported decreases. Based on these findings it becomes clear that further analysis is needed to gain a clearer understanding of the varying arrest trends in Michigan.

This report specifically focuses on juvenile arrests throughout the state of Michigan during the 2005 calendar year (UCR data from 2006 was not included in this report because it did not become available to PPA until January 2008). While criminal or delinquent behaviors are reported, there is additional examination of juvenile arrests across Michigan. This combination of reported arrests enables a more thorough examination of these behaviors and the official responses to them. It is anticipated that this report will be used by the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice (MCJJ) and the Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS) Bureau of Juvenile Justice (BJJ) to inform policy decisions and that it will impact intervention decisions within targeted Michigan communities in reference to reported criminal or delinquent behaviors and arrests as comparisons are made between geographical locations and arrest patterns. Data for this study are primarily derived from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), U.S. Census Bureau (Census), and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). This juvenile arrest analysis is the beginning of a three-year process that will lead to a more in-depth juvenile crime analysis. Future reports may include the examination of sociodemographic information, community assessment findings, victim-witness statements, multiyear trend analyses, and

analyses of county-level prosecutorial data obtained from prosecutors' offices across the state of Michigan.

Notwithstanding, the focus of this comprehensive review of arrests will limit itself to information compiled from Michigan State Police (MSP) arrest data drawn exclusively from the UCR.

While this report is supported through funding efforts of the OJJDP, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), BJJ, and DHS; opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the authors in consultation with Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA) of Lansing, Michigan and not those of OJJDP, OJP, BJJ, or DHS.

## **Information About the Uniform Crime Reports**

The UCR was established in 1929 by the International Association of the Chiefs of Police and is currently operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), which annually collects, compiles, and publishes several reports pursuant to the known volume of criminal acts and law enforcement's response to these reported offenses. To date, there are over 17,000 police agencies reporting arrest statistics to the FBI. Of specific interest are reported Part I offenses (also known as "Index" offenses). Law enforcement agencies tabulate the number of *Part I offenses* brought to their attention based on records of all reports of crime received from victims, officers who discover infractions, or other sources, and then submit them each month to the FBI, either directly or through their state UCR Program.

*Part I offenses/Index crimes* include:

- Murder and non-negligent manslaughter
- Burglary
- Forcible rape
- Larceny/theft
- Robbery
- Motor vehicle theft
- Aggravated assault
- Arson

**Part II offenses** (as recorded by local law enforcement officers) include the following crimes:

- Disorderly conduct
- Driving under influence alcohol/narcotics
- Embezzlement
- Family and children
- Forgery/counterfeiting
- Fraud
- Gambling
- Violation of liquor laws
- Violation of narcotic laws
- Non-aggravated assault
- Prostitution and commercialized vice
- Sex offenses (except rape and prostitution)
- Stolen property
- Vandalism
- Weapons

The eight Index offenses are used as a common indicator of the nation's crime and arrest experience because of their seriousness and frequency of occurrence (MSP, 2005). In 2005, Michigan had a total of 367,396 Index offenses reported throughout the state and 56,272 persons were arrested pursuant to Index offenses (Michigan's juveniles aged 11–16, were arrested for 10,646 of these Index offenses, which accounted for 3% of Michigan's Index crimes).

The UCR Program counts one arrest for each separate instance in which a person is arrested, cited, or summoned for an offense. The Program collects arrest data on 29 offenses. Because a person may be arrested multiple times during the year, the UCR arrest figures do not reflect the number of individual people who have been arrested. Rather, the arrest data is based on the number of incidents of arrest and show the number of times that persons are arrested, as reported by law enforcement agencies to the UCR Program.

The UCR Program considers a juvenile to be an individual under 18 years of age regardless of the state definition. (NOTE: In Michigan, 17 years of age is considered an adult. Therefore, only youths who were between the ages of 11 and 16 years old were included in this analysis as "juveniles.")

### **Overview of UCR Data in 2005**

In 2005, the law enforcement agencies that submitted 12 months of UCR data reported 11,424,871 arrests nationwide for all offenses (except traffic violations), with 16% being Part I (or Index) offenses, 27% of which were for violent crimes and 73% were for property crimes. The other 84% of arrests were for Part II offenses. Nationwide, the 2005 *rate of arrests* was

estimated at 48.40 arrests per 1,000 inhabitants; for violent crime arrests, the estimate was 2.10 per 1,000 inhabitants and for property crime arrests, the estimate was 5.58 per 1,000 inhabitants (FBI, 2007). In comparison, Michigan had 33.78 arrests per 1,000 inhabitants, with a violent crime arrest rate of 1.51 per 1,000 inhabitants, and a property crime arrest rate of 3.77 per 1,000 inhabitants.

According to the FBI (2007), although the number of arrests in 2005 increased only 0.2% from the 2004 figure, arrests for murder rose from 10,247 in 2004 to 12,070 in 2005. Arrests of juveniles (under 18 years of age) for murder climbed 19.9% in 2005 compared with 2004 arrest data. For robbery, arrests of juveniles rose 11.4% over the same two-year period. In 2005, 6,261,672 males were arrested and 1,982,649 females were arrested. For 2005 in Michigan, males accounted for 72% of the 56,272 Index crime arrests. Males accounted for 87% of the murder arrests, 94% of the rape arrests, 74% of the aggravated assault arrests, 90% of the burglary arrests, 62% of the larceny arrests, 86% of the motor vehicle theft arrests, and 83% of the arson arrests (MSP, 2005).

Among the four categories of race reflected in UCR arrest data, 69.8% of all persons arrested were White, 59.0% of persons arrested for violent crime were White, and 68.8% of persons arrested for property crime were White (FBI, 2007). Black juveniles comprised 49.8%, and White juveniles accounted for 48.2% of all juveniles arrested in 2005 for violent crime in the United States. In Michigan, White male juveniles accounted for 61% of all juvenile arrests in 2005, while Black juveniles accounted for 60% of all juvenile violent crime arrests (compared to 38.4% for Whites) (MSP, 2005).

## **Limitations of the UCR and Data**

The analyses presented in this report only represent one part of a larger picture of juvenile arrests and delinquency that could actually occur within Michigan's communities. It will be important to balance these data with other data sources and insights about the community context, including other community indicators, risk factors, resources, environmental conditions, and the state of local communities. In addition, the following general limitations of the data should be considered when reviewing the findings and recommendations contained in this report.

Although there were over a million offenses reported in Michigan during 2005, it should be noted that the UCR does not represent the total volume of crimes committed. There are several types of omissions. Not all crimes are reported to the police. Not all victims and/or witnesses of criminal acts report their victimization or eyewitness accounts of criminal behavior. In attempts to assess the actual volume of crime, there exists a “Dark Figure of Crime” (Hagen, 2006) that is inclusive of unreported, undetected, and nonsanctioned deviant behavior that is not captured in criminal justice statistics.

In addition, the UCR data-collection system uses the “Hierarchy Rule” to record offenses. This means that only the most serious offenses are included in the data. While an alleged offender may violate several criminal laws in the commission of a criminal act, only the most serious offense is included in the UCR.

Moreover, victims may perceive certain criminal acts as trivial and/or embarrassing and refuse to report such incidents to the police. Thus, the UCR data does not contain information on all crimes. Rather, the UCR contains information on crimes reported to law enforcement officials, and even then may omit those responses to crime whereby law enforcement “warns” and releases alleged perpetrators. This omission may be particularly problematic when considering juvenile criminal behavior, since those law enforcement officers may not document their encounters with juveniles (FBI, 2007).

Furthermore, the collection and submission of UCR data is completely voluntary and not all police agencies across the state participate. PPA has identified that only 7% of Michigan law enforcement agencies are not listed as reporting agencies for the 2005 UCR; and all 83 Michigan counties are represented.

Local policies, practices, and other enforcement factors may contribute to skewing the data. While some variation in offense patterns is attributable to genuine differences in particular youths, other variations are just as likely or more likely to be the result of differences in local conditions, police practices, or other factors that have little or nothing to do with the youths

involved. Therefore, when examining patterns of juvenile contacts with law enforcement officials, it is important to keep in mind that the rates of documented incidents are dependent on both youth behavior and police practices. A targeted effort in a specific area, a new policy, or additional environmental occurrences can all play a role in the number, timing, and location of offenses reported over a given year (Office of Children, Youth, and Families, 2007).

Finally, it should be noted that the definition of arrest varies across jurisdictions. For instance, one county may define arrest as any form of detention whereby a youth cannot leave the presence of an officer or police precinct. Then again, a youth in another jurisdiction may be detained by the police for several minutes or hours but not formally arrested. Hence, this youth, though held by the police, would not appear among the arrest statistics.

## **Arrest Data as a Measure of Crime**

According to McCord et al. (2001), there are drawbacks to using arrest data as a measure of crime. They state that arrest statistics do not reflect the number of different people arrested each year, because an unknown number of people may be arrested more than once in a year and for some crimes, no arrests are made. Additionally, for other crimes there may be multiple arrests that occur. Furthermore, McCord et al. contend that not everyone who is arrested has committed the crime for which he or she was arrested, and that arrests depend on a number of factors other than overall crime levels, including policies of particular police agencies, the cooperation of victims, the skill of the perpetrator, and the age, sex, race, and social class of the suspect (Cook and Laub, 1998; McCord, 1997).

McCord et al. (2001) contend that arrest statistics should also not be confused with the number of crimes committed, because in some cases, the arrest of one person may account for a series of crimes, and in others several people may be arrested for one crime. This is particularly true for young people, who are more likely than adults to commit crimes in a group (McCord, 1990; Reiss, 1986; Reiss and Farrington, 1991; Zimring, 1981).

# Methodology

The data used in creating this report were from all Michigan law enforcement agencies that submitted 12 months of arrest data for 2005 to the FBI. These data represent the number of persons arrested. However, some persons may be arrested more than once during a year. Therefore, the statistics in this report could, in some cases, represent multiple arrests of the same person. Law enforcement agencies in 46 states and the District of Columbia, including the Michigan State Police (MSP, 2005), participate in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program and forward crime arrest data through their state UCR Programs. Michigan's UCR Program functions as a liaison between local agencies and the FBI. Like Michigan, many states have mandatory reporting requirements, and many state Programs collect data beyond those typically called for by the UCR Program to address crime problems specific to their particular jurisdictions

As mentioned earlier, law enforcement agencies tabulate the number of Part I (Index) offenses brought to their attention based on records of all reports of crime received from victims, officers who discover infractions, or other sources and submit them each month to the FBI, either directly or through their state UCR Programs. Part I offenses include:

- Murder and non-negligent manslaughter
- Burglary
- Forcible rape
- Larceny/theft
- Robbery
- Motor vehicle theft
- Aggravated assault
- Arson

For this report, the authors began compiling UCR, U.S. Census, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention data for the state and for each of its 83 counties. By analyzing U.S. Census data with UCR data for all 83 counties, this allowed *arrest rates* to be produced for the state and for each county. These juvenile arrest rates (per 1,000 juveniles) will allow the examination of juvenile criminal activity across varying populated counties. Additionally, an overview of the total numbers of arrested youths between the ages of 11 and 16 will provide insights into the prevalence and types of offenses committed across the state and for each county.

This statewide juvenile arrest analysis is intended to *begin the process* of providing the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice, the Bureau of Juvenile Justice, criminal justice practitioners and professionals, law enforcement agencies, and Michigan communities with information that will allow them to monitor the changing levels of crime and the correlates of crime in their communities. Additionally, this Michigan Juvenile Arrest Analysis report is intended to provide:

- Data regarding the nature and extent of juvenile arrests in Michigan.
- A better understanding of the types of arrests that are occurring in different parts of the state.
- A decision-making tool to help determine where prevention and intervention programs are needed and should be implemented.

This analysis will also examine the arrest-rate trends from 2000–2005 for many offenses including violent, property, drug, and weapons offenses, as well as provide comparisons across county types (e.g., large, medium, and small) that can yield insights into variations of crimes and arrests that may exist across counties. Specifically, this analysis will present the percentage of arrests reported for Part I and Part II offenses for each county by gender, age, race, and ethnicity.

## **Implications, Recommendations, and Next Steps**

Michigan was not the most crime-riddled state in the nation during 2005. Overall, Michigan ranked seventh in terms of reported violent crime arrests behind California, Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and New York during 2005 and twenty-sixth in relation to the violent crime *arrest rate*. Regional comparisons revealed that Illinois and Indiana led the Midwest region in violent crime *arrest rates* with Michigan ranking fourth, and Illinois and Wisconsin led the region in property crime *arrest rates*.

Examination of overall crime (for all ages) within the state of Michigan shows that a total of 341,918 arrests were made during 2005, but these arrest numbers have been produced by fewer people (the number of duplicated persons is a data element that currently is cumbersome to pull from the UCR and other arrest data records). This produced an overall *arrest rate* of 33.78 per every 1,000 persons. Most of these arrests occurred in the heavily populated counties of Wayne,

Oakland, Macomb, Kent, and Ingham; whereas the fewest arrests occurred in Keweenaw, Leelanau, Presque Isle, Baraga, and Alcona Counties.

However, it was also noted that the most populated counties (Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, Kent, and Genesee) did not produce the highest overall crime *arrest rates*. Specifically, Wexford, Roscommon, Van Buren, Manistee, and Mecosta Counties had the highest *rates of arrest* in Michigan, whereas Leelanau, Presque Isle, Keweenaw, Arenac, and Antrim Counties experienced the lowest *arrest rates* during 2005.

A similar picture emerged when juvenile arrests were examined. Specifically, there were a total of 30,593 juveniles (persons between the ages of 11 and 16) arrested in Michigan during 2005. Thus, juveniles comprised 8.9% of all persons arrested. Not surprisingly, the larger counties of Wayne, Kent, Oakland, Ottawa, Macomb, Genesee, Kalamazoo, Ingham, Berrien, and Washtenaw reported the highest numbers of juveniles experiencing arrest, whereas the lightly populated counties of Keweenaw, Leelanau, Alcona, Arenac, Montmorency, Huron, Benzie, Lake, and Baraga reported the fewest juvenile arrests during 2005.

It should be reiterated that although the numbers of youths arrested were higher in heavily populated counties, these counties did not produce the highest juvenile crime *arrest rates* throughout the state. The highest juvenile crime *arrest rates* were observed in Roscommon, Gladwin, Ottawa, Chippewa, Wexford, Luce, Mason, Mackinac, Manistee, and Ontonagon Counties, while the lowest juvenile crime *arrest rates* occurred in Leelanau, Cass, Arenac, Antrim, Alcona, Benzie, Charlevoix, Tuscola, Livingston, and Shiawassee Counties for the 2005 calendar year.

Note that the top ten offenses for which juveniles in Michigan were arrested in 2005 were all other offenses, larceny, non-aggravated assault, liquor law violations, narcotic law violations, burglary, disorderly conduct, aggravated assault, vandalism, and motor vehicle theft.

Michigan's violent juvenile crime *arrest rate* in 2005 was approximately 2 per every 1,000 juveniles. Counties with high *rates of arrests* for violent crime (aggravated assault, homicide, negligent manslaughter, rape, and robbery) included Schoolcraft, Clare, Gladwin, Saginaw, and Wayne. These counties also tended to have high numbers of youths arrested for aggravated

assaults. However, when prevalence is examined, Wayne County led, in part because of the high incidence of robbery, followed by Oakland, Kent, Macomb, and Genesee Counties. Overall, the most prevalent violent offenses committed by Michigan juveniles during 2005 were aggravated assault and robbery. Moreover, the aforementioned counties have shown an increase in violent crime arrests since 2004.

Michigan's juvenile property crime *arrest rate* in 2005 was 9.72 per every 1,000 juveniles. This category of offenses includes arson, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. It is important to note that the juvenile property crime *arrest rate* is significantly higher than the juvenile violent crime *arrest rate*. This is an important fact—juveniles historically commit more property crimes than violent crimes. Counties with high property crime *arrest rates* include Gladwin, Alger, Kent, Manistee, and Wexford. Yet, in terms of prevalence of property crime arrests Wayne, Kent, Oakland, Macomb, and Ottawa Counties reported the highest number of juvenile arrests for property-related offenses. Moreover, larceny tended to be the most frequently occurring property offense for which juveniles were arrested. In addition, the majority of juveniles arrested for these crimes were White, male, and between the ages of 15 and 16.

Thus overall, analysis shows that juvenile crime activity is not restricted to larger, urban, minority-populated areas in Michigan.

## **Key Implications/Questions**

The information presented in this summary should allow law enforcement agencies, criminal justice practitioners and professionals in the fields of juvenile justice and social work, and Michigan communities to:

- Recognize the importance of demographics in juvenile arrests.
- Become more focused on what crimes juveniles are being arrested for.
- Identify counties where the juvenile crime arrest rate is increasing.
- Identify where property crime arrests occur and what offenses are being committed.
- Identify where violent crimes and arrests are occurring and what offenses are being committed.

There are many important factors that will assist in the development of juvenile policy, including prevention programming and wrap-around parent/guardian/family programs that work toward preventing or reducing criminal activity among juveniles. Studies conducted by Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weiher (1994); Krohn et al. (2001); and Loeber and Farrington (1998 and 2001) imply that preventive interventions to reduce juvenile offending should be available at least from the beginning of elementary school for ages 7 years through 10 years and onward.

According to Loeber et al. (2003), most risk-reducing programming in juvenile justice, child welfare, and the schools currently focuses on adolescent offenders and problem children whose behaviors are already persistent or on education and behavior management programs for youths in middle and high schools (6<sup>th</sup> grade – 12<sup>th</sup> grade and 10 years to 18 years) rather than on children in elementary schools or preschools (Loeber et al., 2003). Furthermore, these interventions have usually sought to remediate disruptive behavior, substance use, child delinquency, and serious and violent offending after these behaviors have emerged. Loeber et al. (2003) concluded that prevention is a better approach to reduce youth substance use and delinquency. However, the removal of intervention programs for current middle and high school youths is not suggested as an outcome of this crime analysis.

## **Preliminary Recommendations**

This statewide analysis shows that most juvenile arrests occurred in Wayne, Kent, Oakland, Ottawa, and Macomb Counties. Counties experiencing the lowest numbers of juvenile arrests during 2005 were Keweenaw, Leelanau, Alcona, Arenac, and Montmorency. An extensive study of a selection of two or more high-arrest counties where the number of youths and population rate are similar will yield insights into county-level dynamics that will enrich crime prevention and intervention strategies.

More specifically, analysis of county-level social variables (e.g., poverty rates; numbers of homeowners, renters, transient establishments, families serviced with K-12 age children, and school suspensions; and other factors) and sociodemographic and environmental factors can yield insights into delinquency risk and prevention factors relevant on the individual, family, school, and community levels. This would assist with the development of county-specific

interventions that could identify and address the early onset of antisocial behaviors that have been associated with the development of delinquent behavior among adolescents younger than 13 years of age (c.f., Haapasalo and Tremblay, 1994). Additionally, this would potentially assist in a new model of intervention among 13- to 17-year-old youths whose cognitive and decision-making skills remain underdeveloped.

The aforementioned types of county-level analyses can then become strengthened interventions inclusive of all state youths, even before behavioral changes occur. Such interventions may actually target several domain risk factors through comprehensive school and community programs or curriculums that address such things as social competency, conflict resolution, violence prevention, mentoring, and community-level after-school programming.

The aforementioned types of interventions do not have to focus on older adolescents, as most have done in the past. Earlier interventions with children are thought to be more successful (Farrington, Loeber, and Kalb, 2001). These interventions are not institutionally bound, and are therefore more cost effective. Such programs increase family cohesiveness (Henggeler, Melton, and Smith, 1992), increase the adaptability and support of families of serious juvenile offenders (Borduin et al., 1995), and decrease father-mother and father-child conflict (Henggeler and Blaske, 1990). Treated youths were less likely to be rearrested and spent fewer days incarcerated than youths in the control group (Henggeler, Melton, and Smith, 1992).

Extensive examination of the top offenses for which juveniles were arrested throughout Michigan (i.e., all other offenses, larceny, non-aggravated assault, liquor law violations, narcotic law violations, burglary, vandalism, driving under the influence, and motor vehicle theft) and factors associated with these offenses will further inform intervention and prevention strategies.

Although juveniles generally commit more and are arrested more for property crimes than violent crimes, violent crimes are serious and warrant attention. The most common violent offenses that juveniles were arrested for were aggravated assault and robbery. Additional analysis showed that juvenile arrests for these offenses occurred most often in Wayne, Oakland, Kent, Macomb, and Genesee Counties. While these are some of Michigan's more urbanized

areas, the transference of intervention programs is not suggested in a full-scale method. Moreover, irrespective of county-level differences, effective interventions will have to be theoretically based and multisystemic in approach (Henggeler, Pickrel, and Brondino, 1999). However, to arrive at an appropriate prevention of and/or intervention strategy for at-risk and protective factors it is believed that a county-specific violent crime analysis would be a beneficial next step. Analysis derived from this study could inform policy makers as to specific multisystemic interventions encompassing family, school, and justice system components that would be most effective.

### **Crimes Committed by Females**

Although young female offenders are outnumbered significantly by young male offenders, this crime analysis reveals that there has been a rising rate of female offenders who are not just committing status offenses but violent offenses as well. Since males and females are socialized differently and confront different issues, services for girls need to be gender-specific (Morgan and Patton, 2002). Prevention and intervention programs should provide gender-specific services for girls and adequate services for their families, since the family environment is a very important element in whether or not an adolescent engages in delinquency (Kakar, Friedman, and Peck, 2002). An integrated, complex model of intervention with multiple treatment options is the key to treating delinquent females; specifically, interventions must be gender-specific and responsive to the developmental needs of young female offenders (Hartwig and Myers, 2003). It is recommended that further analysis be conducted to analyze patterns of arrests with specific focus on issues of gender.

### **Preliminary Sites Recommended for Targeted Intervention**

Though the data provided in this crime analysis report will be used to look further into enhanced or targeted interventions, the Bureau of Juvenile Justice (BJJ) and the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice (MCJJ) expect to obtain additional data for a comparison of current data with historical data. At that point, a determination will be made about whether interventions are appropriate for the counties listed below:

### Targeted Due to Increasing Juvenile Crime *Arrest Rate* Between 2000 and 2005

- Wayne
- Chippewa
- Mason
- Clare

### Targeted Due to High Prevalence of Juvenile Arrests in 2005

- Wayne
- Oakland
- Ottawa
- Kalamazoo
- Ingham

### Targeted Due to High Juvenile Crime *Arrest Rate* in 2005

- Ottawa
- Chippewa
- Wexford
- Van Buren
- Newaygo

## **Next Steps**

The MCJJ seeks to expand the Juvenile Crime Analysis during the 2008–2009 calendar year by including more detailed and timely data. Specifically, the report will seek the inclusion of:

1. 2000–2006 Uniform Crime Report (UCR) trend data.
2. Detailed arrest analysis by age, race, gender, geography, and arrest type.
3. Community-level analysis by zip codes and/or census tracts for specified counties.
4. Social and environmental factors associated with juvenile crime at the county level.
5. Qualitative-based analyses to be conducted in specified high- and low-crime counties.
6. Furtherance in the study of core police records for arrest and outcomes at each level.
7. Data vetting with major community stakeholders (e.g., schools, community leaders, neighborhood associations, and police agencies).
8. The examination of Michigan’s classification of criminal behavior as well as the same data from the UCR and prosecutorial data.

The future goal of the MCJJ in conjunction with the Bureau of Juvenile Justice is to provide an umbrella of data, outlooks, and forecasts of youth behavior to further inform policy makers and others as to the extent of crime throughout Michigan, and to discuss inhibitive factors that can strategically become integrated in county-specific interventions. It is anticipated that specific

and targeted county-level comprehensive crime intervention and prevention strategies will significantly reduce criminal behavior among Michigan's youth population. Further, the influence and balancing of enhanced family atmosphere is an area that can provide significant progress toward decreasing youth crimes.

Within this umbrella, the MCJJ will seek to expand the number of entities that can benefit from the data through the assistance of Public Policy Associates, Incorporated (PPA). These partnership efforts as well as subcommittee recommendations will ensure:

1. Police agency UCR data access.
2. Statewide compliance monitoring efforts throughout each field visit as appropriate.
3. The further comparison of agency data to the UCR data.
4. The review of the UCR data "facility submission."
5. The summarization of model programs.
6. An inclusion of data on model programs for all 83 Michigan counties to provide a comprehensive State Crime Analysis.



Prepared by:

Paul Elam  
C. Edward Banks, Ph.D.  
Jason Rydberg

Public Policy Associates, Incorporated

and

Charles Corley, Ph.D.

Michigan State University  
School of Criminal Justice