A Statewide Assessment of Racial and Ethnic Disparities among Juvenile Arrest Cases in Idaho: 2018-2020

Prepared for the Idaho
Department of Juvenile Corrections

by

Theodore W. McDonald
Rachel P. Winter
Maycie J.D. Radcliffe

Department of Psychological Science
College of Arts and Sciences
Boise State University

December 2021

Executive Summary

Since the passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in 2002 (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, n.d.), the federal government has required participating states to maintain surveillance over the rates at which members of different racial/ethnic groups come into contact with the juvenile justice system; in instances where racial/ethnic disparities are found, participating states are required to develop plans to further monitor and address these disparities. Beginning with an assessment of a disparate rate of arrest cases between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic White juveniles in Canyon County in 2009-2010, the first author of this report and various colleagues have performed four assessments of racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile arrests in several different counties in Idaho. In each assessment, factors confounded with race (including gang affiliation, arrest offense, and prior arrest offense) were identified which at least partially explained why members of certain racial/ethnic groups were coming into contact with the juvenile justice system more often than members of other groups.

The present study involved an effort which was the first of its kind—to assess factors associated with disparities in juvenile arrest cases on a truly statewide level. Using 2018-2020 data from a repository maintained by the Idaho State Police (ISP) and provided to the researchers by administrators in the Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections (IDJC), members of the research team assessed whether proportionately disparate rates of juvenile arrest cases, particularly among Black and American Indian juveniles, could at least be partially explained as a function of arrested juveniles': 1) gender (male vs. female); 2) age (measured as a continuous variable); 3) county of arrest; 4) arrest offense (including sex crimes, crimes against persons, property crimes, and drug and alcohol offenses); 5) arrest type (including summon/cited, on view, and taken into custody); and 6) arrest outcome (handled within department vs. referred to other authority).

For this study, it is important to note specific terms defined by Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Incident-Based Reporting System policies. 'Arrest types' indicate how a juvenile arrest was handled, based on actions noted in the report from law enforcement. 'On-view' arrests indicate a juvenile was taken into custody without a warrant or previous incident report. 'Summoned/cited' indicates a juvenile was not taken into custody at the time, and 'Taken into custody' indicates a juvenile was taken into custody based on a previously submitted incident report or a warrant. 'Arrest outcomes' indicate how the case was handled at time of incident. Arrest outcomes identified as 'Handled within department' indicate the youth was released to parents or released with a warning. 'Referred to other authorities' indicates the incident report was turned over to juvenile court, a probation department, welfare agency, criminal or adult court, or another police agency (United States Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2018).

The key findings from each of the three years of study as well as the three years in aggregate are presented below.

2018

- A total of 4,935 arrest records were analyzed
    - 3,671 cases (74% of the population) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 888 (18%) involved Hispanic juveniles, 200 (4%) involved Black juveniles, and 116 (2%) involved American Indian juveniles
    - 3,453 cases (70%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 15.18 years
- The most common crime types were drug and alcohol offenses (39% of the population), crimes against persons (28%), property crimes (15%), and sex offenses (3%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 12%
- The most common type of arrest was summoned/cited (51% of the population), followed by on view arrests (44%) and arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody (5%)
- Just over 23% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 77% were Referred to Other Authority
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for all six arrest case variables: Gender, age, county of arrest, arrest offense, arrest type, and arrest outcome
    - The majority of arrest cases were accounted for by males in the Hispanic (75%), Non-Hispanic White (70%), and Black (66%) race/ethnicity groups, but not in the American Indian race/ethnicity group (49%)
    - The juveniles in the American Indian arrest cases had a significantly younger mean age than those in the Black, Non-Hispanic White, and Hispanic juveniles arrest cases
    - The single-largest category of arrest cases involved Hispanic juveniles in Gooding, Power, and Jerome counties, whereas Non-Hispanic White juveniles were the single-largest category of arrest cases in every other county. Arrest cases that involved Black juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Gem, Ada, and Kootenai counties had markedly higher percentages of cases involving Black juveniles. Similarly, American Indian juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Bingham, Nez Perce, and Bannock counties had substantially higher percentages of cases involving American Indian juveniles
    - The most common arrest offense seen in Non-Hispanic White (47%) and Hispanic (48%) juvenile arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, whereas crimes against persons was the most common arrest offense seen in Black (46%) and American Indian (42%) juvenile arrest cases
    - Regarding arrest type, the majority of Non-Hispanic White (52%) and American Indian (71%) juvenile arrests were categorized as summoned/cited, while the majority of Black arrest cases (56%) and the single-largest category of Hispanic arrest cases (47%) were categorized as on view
    - Arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often Referred to an Other Authority. This was most often true of American Indian (90%) juvenile arrest cases and least often true of Hispanic (68%) juvenile arrest cases

2019

- A total of 4,141 arrest records were analyzed
    - 3,117 cases (75% of the population) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 655 (16%) involved Hispanic juveniles, 236 (6%) involved Black juveniles, and 102 (3%) involved American Indian juveniles.
    - 2,880 cases (70% of the population) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 15.10 years
- The most common crime types were drug and alcohol offenses (38% of the population), crimes against persons (30%), property crimes (16%), and sex offenses (3%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 10% of the sample
- The most common type of arrest was summoned/cited (52%), followed by on view arrests (45%) and arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody (4%)
- Nearly 24% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 77% were Referred to Other Authority
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for five arrest case variables: Gender, county of arrest, arrest offense, arrest type, and arrest outcome
    - A larger percentage of arrest cases were accounted for by males in the Non-Hispanic White (70%), Hispanic (69%), and Black (79%) race/ethnicity groups compared to the American Indian (58%) race/ethnicity group
    - The single-largest category of arrest cases involved Hispanic juveniles in Jerome and Teton counties, whereas the single-largest category of arrest cases involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles in every other county. Arrest cases that involved Black juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Latah, Ada, and Bonner counties had markedly higher percentages of cases involving Black juveniles. Similarly, American Indian juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Bingham, Bannock, and Latah counties had substantially higher percentages of cases involving American Indian juveniles
    - The most common arrest offenses seen in Non-Hispanic White (42%), Hispanic (59%), and American Indian (43%) juvenile arrest cases were drug and alcohol offenses, whereas crimes against persons was the most common arrest offense in Black (44%) juvenile arrest cases
    - Regarding arrest type, the majority of Non-Hispanic White (52%), Hispanic (51%), and American Indian (73%) juvenile arrests were categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the majority of Black (63%) juvenile arrests were categorized as on view
    - Arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often Referred to an Other Authority. This was most often true of Black (80%) juvenile arrest cases and least often true of Hispanic (65%) juvenile arrest cases

2020

- A total of 2,510 arrest records were analyzed
    - 1,879 cases (75% of the population) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 470 (19%) involved Hispanic juveniles, 96 (4%) involved Black juveniles, and 52 (2%) involved American Indian juveniles
    - 1,792 cases (72% of the population) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 15.28 years
- The most common crime types were drug and alcohol offenses (38% of the population), crimes against persons (28%), property crimes (17%), and sex offenses (3%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 12% of the sample
- The most common type of arrest was summoned/cited (56%), followed by on view arrests (38%) and arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody (6%)
- Over 23% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 77% were Referred to Other Authority
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for four arrest case variables: Gender, county of arrest, arrest offense, and arrest type
    - A larger percentage of arrest cases were accounted for by males in the Non-Hispanic White (71%), Hispanic (71%), and Black (88%) race/ethnicity groups compared to the American Indian (52%) race/ethnicity group
    - The single-largest category of arrest cases involved Hispanic juveniles in Blaine County, whereas the single-largest category of arrest cases involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles in every other county. Arrest cases that involved Black juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Latah, Ada, and Benewah counties had markedly higher percentages of cases involving Black juveniles. Similarly, American Indian juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Bannock, Nez Perce, and Bingham counties had substantially higher percentages of cases involving American Indian juveniles
    - Although the most common arrest offense seen for all race/ethnicity groups was drug and alcohol offenses, these offenses were more common among Hispanic juvenile arrest cases (57%) than among American Indian (44%), Non-Hispanic White (42%), and Black (40%) juvenile arrest cases
    - Regarding arrest type, the majority of Non-Hispanic White (over 56%), Hispanic (56%), and American Indian (67%) juvenile arrests were categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the majority of Black (62%) juvenile arrests were categorized as on view

2018-2020: All Years in Aggregate

- A total of 11,586 arrest records were analyzed
    - 8,667 cases (75%) involved Non-Hispanic White juveniles, 2,013 (17%) involved Hispanic juveniles, 532 (5%) involved Black juveniles, and 270 (2%) involved American Indian juveniles
    - 8,127 cases (70%) involved male juveniles, and the average age of all juveniles was 15.17 years

- The most common crime types were drug and alcohol offenses (39%), crimes against persons (29%), property crimes (16%), and sex offenses (3%). Cases involving an "Other" offense accounted for 12% of the sample
- The most common type of arrest was summoned/cited (52%), followed by on view arrests (43%) and arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody (5%)
- Over 23% of cases were denoted has having been Handled within Department, and nearly 77% were Referred to Other Authority
- Statistically significant differences as a function of race/ethnicity were found for all six arrest case variables: Gender, age, county of arrest, arrest offense, arrest type, and arrest outcome
    - A higher percentage of arrest cases involved males among Black (76%), Hispanic (72%), and Non-Hispanic White (70%) juveniles compared to American Indian juveniles (53%)
    - The American Indian juvenile arrest cases had a significantly younger mean age than that of Black, Non-Hispanic White, and Hispanic juveniles
    - The single-largest category of arrest cases involved Hispanic juveniles in Gooding, Power, and Jerome counties, whereas Non-Hispanic White juveniles were the single-largest category in every other county. Arrest cases that involved Black juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, however Gem, Ada, and Latah counties had markedly higher percentages of cases involving Black juveniles. Similarly, American Indian juveniles often contributed to a very small or no percentage of total county arrest cases, but Bingham, Nez Perce, and Bannock counties had substantially higher percentages of cases involving American Indian juveniles
    - The most common arrest offense seen in Non-Hispanic White (44%) and Hispanic (54%) juvenile arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, whereas crimes against persons was the most common arrest offense for cases involving Black (43%) and American Indian (42%) juveniles
    - Regarding arrest type, the majority of Non-Hispanic White (53%), Hispanic 50%), and American Indian (71%) juvenile arrests were categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the majority of Black (61%) juvenile arrests were categorized as on view
    - Arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often referred to another authority. This was most often true of American Indian (86%) juvenile arrest cases and least often true of Hispanic (69%) juvenile arrest cases

Background

As a participating state in the Idaho Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, n.d.), Idaho is required to assess for and address racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system. IDJC is the agency responsible for this in Idaho, and it has performed appropriate duties in this capacity for nearly two decades.

Racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile arrest rates are generally identified by assessing the extent to which the proportion of juvenile arrests within a defined area (e.g., a city, county, district, or state) match with the proportion of juveniles with those specific racial and ethnic characteristics in that area. For example, if a county had a juvenile population that was 80% Non-Hispanic White, 18% Hispanic, and 2% American Indian, one would expect that approximately 80%, 18% and 2% of the juvenile arrest cases in an average year would involve Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and American Indian juveniles, respectively. In such a case, there would not be at least obvious evidence of racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system in that county. If, on the other hand, there was a clear discrepancy between the percentage of juvenile arrest cases among members of a particular racial or ethnic minority group (using the same example for illustrative purposes, say, 30% of the arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles), concerns about racial and ethnic disparities would arise and likely be investigated further to determine whether there are factors that could help explain them and efforts made to reduce them.

Researchers from Boise State University have worked with IDJC administrators to investigate the presence of racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile arrest rates on three occasions prior to the current effort. The first effort, in 2009-2010 (Lind, Miller, Carver, & McDonald, 2010), was to assess disproportionately high levels of contact with the Canyon County juvenile justice system among Hispanic youth relative to the Non-Hispanic White community. Researchers combed through paper files to collect relevant data points and subjected the data to a sophisticated analysis to understand whether factors other than race/ethnicity could explain the higher rate of juvenile justice system involvement of Hispanic youth. A logistic regression analysis, which is useful to tease apart the unique influences of confounded variables, was performed and the results showed that the reason that Hispanic juveniles had higher rates of juvenile justice system involvement was not due to their race/ethnicity, but because Hispanic juveniles had higher rates of gang affiliation. This investigation was credited with helping to guide anti-gang programming in Canyon County, which reduced gang activity among Hispanic juveniles in the following years (Howard & McDonald, 2013).

A second investigation of racial and ethnic disparities was conducted in Canyon and Twin Falls counties in 2013-2014 (Healey et al., 2014). This assessment involved both a quantitative and a qualitative approach. Relevant information from randomly-selected juvenile arrest cases was provided by law enforcement personnel in each county, and was subjected to an analysis similar to that performed in the previous Canyon County assessment. Qualitative data were gathered during several in-person focus group interviews and through an online survey of police officers and sheriff's department personnel. The results of the quantitative data analysis were very similar to the previous study—although a disparity in arrest rates was found between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic White juveniles, the difference was accounted for by the confounding factor of gang

affiliation; when the variance accounted for by gang affiliation was held constant, the disparity in arrest rates disappeared. The respondents to the online survey and participants in the focus groups were adamant that race/ethnicity was not a factor they considered when they decided whether or not a juvenile should be arrested; the factors they reported being most important in making these decisions were whether the juveniles had a history of law enforcement contact, the nature of the offense, and whether sufficient and appropriate alternatives to arrest (e.g., diversion programming, competent parents) were available.

Beginning in late 2017, a Boise State University research team again worked with IDJC administrators to assess racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile arrest rates—this time in Bingham County, which directly abuts the Fort Hall Reservation, where many members of the Shoshone-Bannock tribe live. This assessment was intended to help understand why the arrest rates of Native American, and to a lesser extent, Hispanic juveniles were higher than for Non-Hispanic White juveniles (McDonald et al., 2018). Similar to the second assessment (in Canyon and Twin Falls counties), a mixed-methodology approach was used. This time, a team of faculty, staff, and graduate students extracted relevant pieces of information from a computerized system at the City Hall in Blackfoot, which was supervised by a deputy from the Bingham County Sheriff's Department (BCSD). The pieces of information were a collection of demographic and crime-related data—some of which were identical to those used in earlier assessments in the state. Personal interviews were also conducted with law enforcement officers from BCSD and the City of Blackfoot Policy Department (CBPD), juvenile court personnel including a judge and a district attorney; focus group interviews were also held with police officers and sheriff's deputies and key tribal personnel on the Fort Hall Reservation. A major finding of the study was that American Indian juveniles appeared to have a higher level of contact with the juvenile justice system in Bingham County not so much because of their race/ethnicity, but due to the types of crimes they were arrested for and the types of crimes they had previously been arrested for. Reports from focus groups and personal interviews suggested that both law enforcement and court personnel were careful not to let race/ethnicity affect their decisions, but they believed higher American Indian juvenile arrest rates may be due in part to strong gang ties on the reservation, lack of options, resources, and activities for juveniles on the reservation, lack of intact families in the tribal community, and the lingering impacts of historical trauma.

In the late spring of 2021, IDJC again contracted with Boise State University researchers, who were now operating out of the Department of Psychological Science rather than the Center for Health Policy (where the three previous assessments had been conducted). To the extent possible using whatever quantitative information could be gathered, the research team was tasked with understanding factors associated with juvenile arrest rates among Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and Native American juveniles across the State of Idaho. The methodology and results of this assessment are described in the remainder of this report.

Methodology

The methodology for the current assessment was far less complicated than in each of the past three assessments. This was primarily true for two reasons. First, IDJC administrators, working with colleagues at ISP, were able to access most of the data points used in past assessments, in electronic format, and delivered these directly to the research team. This eliminated the need for researcher travel and the time-consuming process of extracting information from paper files or local computers. A major benefit of the administrators' ability to provide these data was that, for the first time, an assessment of racial and ethnic disparities in arrest rates was able to be conducted: 1) statewide, rather than limited to only one or two counties; and 2) in terms of an entire population of juvenile arrest cases, rather than a randomly selected sample to approximate the population parameters. The second reason this assessment's methodology was less complicated was that it did not involve (unlike the second and third assessments) the collection and analysis of qualitative information such as comments from personal or focus group interviews. The lack of qualitative information is likely a limitation of the current assessment, however it simply was not possible due to time and funding limitations.

The data points gathered included the following: 1) Arrestee ID (a randomized number that could not be used by the researchers to discover the identity of the juvenile, but which was helpful in determining whether there were multiple arrest cases for individual juveniles); 2) county of arrest; 3) arrest type (summoned/cited, on view, or taken into custody); 4) age (a continuous variable, in years); 5) sex description (male or female); 6) arrest offense (sex offense, crime again persons, property crime, drug and alcohol offense, traffic violation, weapons law violation, status offense, or other); 7) race (White, Black, American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander); 8) ethnicity (Hispanic or Non-Hispanic); 9) arrest outcome (handled within department or referred another authority); and 10) offense year (2018, 2019, or 2020). For the purposes of analysis, only the four most common arrest offenses were included; these offenses were sex offenses, crimes against persons, property crimes, and drug and alcohol offenses. Also for the purposes of analysis, race and ethnicity were combined into a race/ethnicity category that included Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and American Indian (juveniles who were listed as both American Indian and Hispanic were placed in this latter category); because there were so few arrest cases involving juveniles who were Asian or Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, these cases were removed from analyses involving the race/ethnicity variable.

The data were analyzed in the IBM SPSS statistical package, and the analyses included chi-square, independent-samples t-tests, and univariate one-way analyses of variance.

Results

2018

Of the 4,935 cases for which gender information was documented, 3,453 (70.0%) involved males and 1,482 (30.0%) involved females.

Of the 4,935 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age of arrested juveniles was 15.18 years, with a median age of 16 years. The youngest juvenile was 10 years old; 1,335 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the single-most common as well).

Of the 4,935 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 4,559 (92.4%) involved juveniles classified as White, 116 (2.4%) involved juveniles classified as American Indian, 200 (4.1%) involved juveniles classified as Black, and 60 (1.2%) involved juveniles classified as Other—with the vast majority of these being categorized as Asian or Pacific Islander. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 4,935 cases, 896 (18.2%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 4,039 (81.8%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 4,935 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 3,671 (74.4%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 888 (18.0%) involved Hispanics who were not also American Indian, 200 (4.1%) involved Blacks who were not also Hispanic, and 116 (2.4%) involved American Indians (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

The counties of the arrest cases varied. Of the 4,935 total cases, 1,672 (33.5%) of them involved juveniles arrested in Ada County, 658 (13.3%) cases were from Canyon County, 516 (10.5%) were from Kootenai Canyon, 391 (7.9%) were from Bannock County, and 274 (5.6%) were from Twin Falls County. The counties contributing the fewest juvenile arrest cases were Elmore County, accounting for eight (0.2%) of the total cases, Caribou County for 13 (0.3%) cases, Valley County for 15 (0.3%) cases, Latah County for 22 (0.4%) cases, and Idaho County for 23 (0.5%) cases. A county designation was not noted for 69 cases, or 1.4% of all cases.

Table 1: Juvenile Arrest Cases by County	
County	**Number of Arrest Cases (%)**
Ada	1,652 (33.5%)
Bannock	391 (7.9%)
Bear Lake	24 (0.5%)
Benewah	44 (0.9%)
Bingham	175 (3.5%)
Blaine	36 (0.7%)
Bonner	86 (1.7%)
Bonneville	246 (5.0%)
Canyon	658 (13.3%)
Caribou	13 (0.3%)
Elmore	8 (0.2%)
Fremont	54 (1.1%)
Gem	26 (0.5%)
Gooding	57 (1.2%)
Idaho	23 (0.5%)
Jefferson	70 (1.4%)
Jerome	92 (1.9%)
Kootenai	516 (10.5%)
Latah	22 (0.4%)
Madison	54 (1.1%)
Minidoka	48 (1.0%)
Nez Perce	116 (2.4%)
Payette	45 (0.9%)
Power	41 (0.8%)
Shoshone	34 (0.7%)
Teton	46 (0.9%)
Twin Falls	274 (5.6%)
Valley	15 (0.3%)
Unknown	69 (1.4%)
Total	4,935 (100.0)

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, which was noted in 1,946 (39.4%) of all cases. Other common crime types included crimes against persons, noted in 1,374 (27.8%) cases, and property crime, noted in 737 (14.9%) cases. Six-hundred-thirteen juvenile arrest cases (12.4%) were documented as having "Other" crime types. The least-often reported crime types included sex crimes (131 arrest cases; 2.7%), weapons law violations (73; 1.5%), status offenses (51; 1.0%), and traffic offenses (10; 0.2%).

Arrest type (whether summoned/cited, on view, or taken into custody) was documented for 4,935 juvenile arrest cases. Summoned/cited arrests were the most common and noted in 2,522 (51.1%) cases; on view arrests were noted in 2,173 (44.0%) cases, followed by arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody in 240 (4.9%) cases.

An arrest outcome was noted in 4,935 cases. Of these, 1,142 (23.1%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 3,793 (76.9%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and American Indian juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 2, statistically significant results were found with respect to all six variables tested; these included: 1) arrested juveniles' gender; 2) arrested juveniles' age; 3) county of arrest; 4) arrest offense; 5) arrest type; and 6) arrest outcome. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 2: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	**< .001**
Age	**< .001**
County of Arrest	**< .001**
Arrest Offense	**< .001**
Arrest Type	**< .001**
Arrest Outcome	**< .001**

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font.

The first statistically significant result involved an association between the gender of arrested juveniles and their race/ethnicity, χ^2 (df = 3) = 34.84, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 3, this result was accounted for by males constituting the clear majority of arrest cases among Hispanic (at nearly 75%), Non-Hispanic White (at nearly 70%), and Black (nearly 66%) juveniles, whereas among American Indian juveniles, a slight majority of arrest cases (nearly 51%) involved females.

Table 3: Gender Differences of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Gender	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Male	**69.6**	**74.5**	**65.5**	49.1
Female	30.4	25.5	34.5	**50.9**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

The second statistically significant result regarded a difference in the age of arrested juveniles as a function of race/ethnicity, F (3, 4,871) = 6.37, $p < .001$. This result was accounted for by American Indian juvenile arrest cases involving juveniles with significantly younger mean ages

(*M* = 14.52 years, *SD* = 1.57 years) than those involving Black (*M* = 15.13, *SD* = 1.66), Non-Hispanic White (*M* = 15.19, *SD* = 1.65), and Hispanic (*M* = 15.22, *SD* = 1.72) juveniles.

The third statistically significant result showed an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and county of arrest, χ^2 (df = 84) = 1,175.80, $p < .001$. Although this is a complicated association to explain due to the many contrasts involved in it, some fairly stark differences may be seen in Table 4. For example, whereas in the vast majority of counties, the single-largest category of arrest cases involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic Whites, in three counties, namely Gooding, Power, and Jerome counties, cases involving Hispanic juveniles constituted the single-largest group. Also, although arrest cases involving Black juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Gem County (nearly 14%), Ada County (nearly 7%), and Kootenai County (nearly 6%) (it is likely inadvisable to draw too strong of a conclusion about the finding in Gem County due to small numbers; there were only 22 total juvenile arrest cases in Gem County in 2018, and three of them involved a Black juvenile). Finally, although arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of juvenile arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Bingham (just over 17%), Nez Perce (over 13%), and Bannock (over 11%) counties.

Table 4: Differences in County of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
County of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Ada	**83.3**	9.7	6.9	*0.0*
Bannock	**65.8**	20.5	*2.3*	11.4
Bear Lake	**87.5**	8.3	*0.0*	4.2
Benewah	**95.5**	*0.0*	*0.0*	4.5
Bingham	**53.1**	28.6	*1.1*	17.1
Blaine	**58.3**	41.7	*0.0*	*0.0*
Bonner	**91.8**	*1.2*	*1.2*	5.9
Bonneville	**76.0**	22.4	1.2	*0.4*
Canyon	**59.8**	36.9	3.1	*0.3*
Caribou	**92.3**	7.7	*0.0*	*0.0*
Elmore	**62.5**	37.5	*0.0*	*0.0*
Fremont	**86.5**	9.6	*0.0*	3.8
Gem	**86.4**	*0.0*	13.6	*0.0*
Gooding	31.6	**68.4**	*0.0*	*0.0*
Idaho	**87.0**	12.0	*0.0*	*0.0*
Jefferson	**82.9**	14.3	2.9	*0.0*
Jerome	46.7	**52.2**	1.1	*0.0*
Kootenai	**89.4**	3.0	5.7	*2.0*
Latah	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Madison	**86.8**	13.2	*0.0*	*0.0*
Minidoka	**52.1**	47.9	*0.0*	*0.0*
Nez Perce	**80.7**	4.4	*1.8*	13.2
Payette	**75.6**	24.4	*0.0*	*0.0*
Power	36.6	**58.5**	*0.0*	4.9
Shoshone	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Teton	**84.8**	15.2	*0.0*	*0.0*
Twin Falls	**70.7**	25.2	4.1	*0.0*
Valley	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Unknown	**64.2**	26.9	6.0	*3.0*
Total	**75.3**	18.2	4.1	*2.4*

Note. The highest percentage within each row is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each row is in italics.

The fourth statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest offense (for this and remaining analyses of arrest offense, only the four Uniform Crime Reporting categories of Sex Offenses, Crimes Against Persons, Property Crimes, and Drug and Alcohol Offenses are used), χ^2 (df = 9) = 54.71, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 5, this result is largely accounted by larger percentages of arrest cases involving Hispanic (48%) and Non-Hispanic White (nearly 47%) juveniles being for drug and alcohol offenses, and larger percentages of arrest cases involving Black (46%) and American Indian (nearly 43%) juveniles being for crimes against persons. An interesting pattern of results showed Black juveniles being

the most likely of all race/ethnicity groups to be arrested for sex offenses (at over 6% of arrest cases involving Black juveniles) and the least likely to be arrested for property crimes (at under 9% of arrest cases involving Black juveniles). Another interesting result was that no American Indian juveniles were arrested for sex offenses; this was not true for any other race/ethnicity group.

Table 5: Differences in Arrest Offense as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Offense	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Sex Offenses	*3.6*	*1.1*	*6.3*	*0.0*
Crimes Against Persons	32.3	29.4	**46.0**	**42.6**
Property Crimes	17.2	21.6	8.6	19.8
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	**46.9**	**48.0**	39.1	37.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The fifth statistically significant result involved an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and arrest type, χ^2 (df = 6) = 46.03, $p < .001$. Perhaps the most noteworthy pattern of results behind this significant association involved most arrest cases involving American Indian (at nearly 72%) and Non-Hispanic White (over 52%) juveniles being categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the largest percentages of Black (nearly 57%) and Hispanic (nearly 48%) juvenile arrest cases were categorized as on view.

Table 6: Differences in Arrest Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Summoned/cited	**52.3**	46.1	40.0	**71.6**
On view	43.0	**47.5**	**56.5**	24.1
Taken into custody	*4.7*	*6.4*	*4.3*	*4.3*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The final statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 3) = 53.13, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 7, a particularly stark pattern of results shows that, although arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often referred to another authority, this was most often true among cases involving American Indian juveniles (at nearly 90%), and least often true among those involving Hispanic juveniles (68%).

Table 7: Differences in Arrest Outcome as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Outcome	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Handled Within Department	21.8	31.9	20.5	10.3
Referred to Other Authority	**78.0**	**68.1**	**79.5**	**89.7**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

2019

Of the 4,141 cases for which gender information was documented, 2,880 (69.5%) involved males and 1,261 (30.5%) involved females.

Of the 4,141 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 15.1 years, with a median age of 15.0 years. The youngest juveniles were 10 years old, and the oldest juveniles were 17 (the single-most common age; there were 1,010 cases involving 17-year-olds).

Of the 4,141 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 3,772 (91.1%) involved juveniles classified as White, 236 (5.7%) involved juveniles classified as Black,102 (2.5%) involved juveniles classified as American Indian, and 31 (0.7%) involved juveniles classified as Other (with the vast majority being categorized as Asian or Pacific Islander). Regarding ethnicity, among the same 4,141 cases, 656 (15.8%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 3,485 (84.2%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 4,141 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 3,117 (75.3%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 655 (15.8%) involved Hispanics who were not also American Indian, 236 (5.7%) involved Blacks who were not also Hispanic, and 102 (2.5%) involved American Indians (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

The counties of the arrest cases varied. Of the 4,141 cases for which the counties were noted, 1,479 (35.7%) of them were from Ada County, 546 (13.2%) were from Canyon County, 526 (12.7%) were from Kootenai County, 364 (8.8%) were from Bannock County, and 254 (6.1%) were from Twin Falls County. The counties contributing the fewest juvenile arrest cases were Valley County, accounting for eight (0.2%) of the total cases, Elmore County for 11 (0.3%) cases, Caribou County for 17 (0.4%) cases, Teton County for 19 (0.5%) cases, and Idaho County for 22 (0.5%) cases.

Table 8: Juvenile Arrest Cases by County	
County	**Number of Arrest Cases (%)**
Ada	1,479 (35.7%)
Bannock	364 (8.8%)
Benewah	35 (0.8%)
Bingham	84 (2.0%)
Blaine	34 (0.8%)
Bonner	66 (1.6%)
Bonneville	232 (5.6%)
Canyon	546 (13.2%)
Caribou	17 (0.4%)
Elmore	11 (0.3%)
Fremont	33 (0.8%)
Idaho	22 (0.5%)
Jefferson	40 (1.0%)
Jerome	100 (2.4%)
Kootenai	526 (12.7%)
Latah	22 (0.5%)
Madison	37 (0.9%)
Minidoka	27 (0.7%)
Nez Perce	104 (2.5%)
Payette	31 (0.7%)
Teton	19 (0.5%)
Twin Falls	254 (6.1%)
Valley	8 (0.2%)
Unknown	50 (1.2%)
Total	4,141 (100.0)

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, which was noted in 1,589 (38.4%) of all cases. The next most common crime type was crimes against persons, which was noted in 1,240 cases (29.9%), followed by property crimes, which were noted in 643 (15.5%) cases. Four-hundred-thirty-one (10.1%) were documented as 'Other' crime types. Sex offenses were noted in 137 cases (3.3%), and weapons law violations in 70 (1.7%) cases. Finally, 22 (0.5%) arrest cases were categorized as status offenses, and nine (0.2%) as traffic offenses.

Arrest type (whether summoned/cited, on view, or taken into custody) was documented for 4,141 juvenile arrest cases. Summoned/cited arrests were the most common and noted in 2,139 cases (51.7%); on view arrests were noted in 1,842 (44.5%) cases, followed by arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody in 160 (3.9%) cases.

An arrest outcome was noted in 4,141 cases. Of these, 972 (23.5%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 3,169 (76.5%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority".

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and American Indian juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 9, statistically significant results were found with respect to five of the six variables tested; these included: 1) arrested juveniles' gender; 2) county of arrest; 3) arrest offense; 4) arrest type; and 5) arrest outcome. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 9: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	**< .01**
Age	.50
County of Arrest	**< .001**
Arrest Offense	**< .001**
Arrest Type	**< .001**
Arrest Outcome	**< .001**

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font.

The first statistically significant result involved an association between the gender of arrested juveniles and their race/ethnicity, χ^2 (df = 3) = 17.19, $p < .01$. As seen below in Table 10, this result was accounted for by larger percentages of arrest cases involving males for Black (over 79%), Non-Hispanic White (over 69%), and Hispanic (69%) juveniles compared to American Indian (nearly 58%) juveniles.

Table 10: Gender Differences of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Gender	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Male	**69.4**	**69.0**	**79.2**	**57.8**
Female	30.6	31.0	20.8	42.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

The second statistically significant result showed an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and county of arrest, χ^2 (df = 69) = 1,205.52, $p < .001$. Although this is a complicated association to explain due to the many contrasts involved in it, some fairly stark differences may be seen in Table 11. For example, whereas in the vast majority of counties, the single-largest category of arrest cases involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic Whites, in two counties, namely Jerome and Teton counties, cases involving Hispanic juveniles constituted the single-largest group. Also, although arrest cases involving Black juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Latah County (just over 18%), Ada County (nearly 11%), and Bonner

County (nearly 8%) (it is likely inadvisable to draw too strong of a conclusion about the finding in Latah County due to small numbers; there were only 22 total juvenile arrest cases in Latah County in 2019, and four of them involved a Black juvenile). Finally, although arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of juvenile arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Bingham (just over 28%), Bannock (nearly 15%), and Latah (just over 9%) counties.

Table 11: Differences in County of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
County of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Ada	**80.8**	8.3	10.5	*0.3*
Bannock	**70.0**	12.9	*2.2*	14.9
Benewah	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Bingham	**47.4**	17.9	*6.4*	28.2
Blaine	**58.8**	38.2	2.9	*0.0*
Bonner	**87.9**	4.5	7.6	*0.0*
Bonneville	**82.7**	14.7	*1.3*	*1.3*
Canyon	**59.6**	38.2	2.0	*0.2*
Caribou	**94.1**	5.9	*0.0*	*0.0*
Elmore	**72.7**	27.3	*0.0*	*0.0*
Fremont	**69.7**	30.3	*0.0*	*0.0*
Idaho	**81.8**	13.6	4.5	*0.0*
Jefferson	**66.7**	28.2	5.1	*0.0*
Jerome	42.0	**58.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*
Kootenai	**90.0**	2.7	6.3	*1.0*
Latah	**72.7**	*0.0*	18.2	9.1
Madison	**91.7**	2.8	5.6	*0.0*
Minidoka	**66.7**	33.3	*0.0*	*0.0*
Nez Perce	**84.6**	5.8	*2.9*	6.7
Payette	**74.2**	25.8	*0.0*	*0.0*
Teton	42.1	**57.9**	*0.0*	*0.0*
Twin Falls	**69.5**	28.9	1.2	*0.4*
Valley	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Unknown	**81.3**	14.6	*0.0*	4.2
Total	**75.8**	15.9	5.7	*2.5*

Note. The highest percentage within each row is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each row is in italics.

The third statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest offense, χ^2 (df = 9) = 85.92, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 12, this result is largely accounted by larger percentages of arrest cases involving Hispanic (nearly 59%), American Indian (just over 43%), and Non-Hispanic White (over 42%) juveniles being for drug and alcohol offenses and larger percentages of arrest cases involving Black (just over 44%) juveniles being for crimes against persons. An interesting pattern of results showed Black

juveniles being the most likely of all race/ethnicity groups to be arrested for sex crimes (nearly 5% of arrest cases involving Black juveniles) and the least likely to be arrested for drug and alcohol offenses (at under 28% of arrest cases involving Black juveniles).

Table 12: Differences in Arrest Offense as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Offense	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Sex Offenses	*3.7*	*4.0*	*4.7*	*3.4*
Crimes Against Persons	34.8	28.2	**44.1**	36.4
Property Crimes	19.4	9.3	23.2	17.0
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	**42.3**	**58.5**	28.0	**43.2**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The fourth statistically significant result involved an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and arrest type, χ^2 (df = 6) = 65.45, $p < .001$. Perhaps the most noteworthy pattern of results behind this significant association involved most arrest cases involving American Indian (at nearly 74%), Non-Hispanic White (over 52%), and Hispanic (nearly 52%) juveniles being categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the largest percentage of Black (nearly 64%) juvenile arrest cases were categorized as on view. The finding that cases involving American Indian juveniles (at nearly 8%) were twice as likely to result in a juvenile being taken into custody compared to cases involving juveniles belonging to the other three racial/ethnic groups (all nearly 4%) also seems interesting and potentially important.

Table 13: Differences in Arrest Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Summoned/cited	**52.4**	**51.6**	32.6	**73.5**
On view	43.9	44.6	**63.6**	18.6
Taken into custody	*3.8*	*3.8*	*3.8*	*7.8*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The final statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 3) = 60.80, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 14, a particularly stark pattern of results shows that, although arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often referred to another authority, this was most often true among cases involving Black juveniles (at nearly 80%), and least often true among those involving Hispanic juveniles (nearly 65%).

Table 14: Differences in Arrest Outcome as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Outcome	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Handled Within Department	21.4	35.3	20.3	23.5
Referred to Other Authority	**78.6**	**64.7**	**79.7**	**76.5**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

2020

Of the 2,510 cases for which gender information was documented, 1,794 (71.5%) involved males and 716 (28.5%) involved females.

Of the 2,510 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 15.28 years, with a median age of 16 years. The youngest juvenile was 10 years old; 706 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the single-most common as well).

Of the 2,510 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 2,349 (93.6%) involved juveniles classified as White, 96 (3.8%) involved juveniles classified as Black, 52 (2.1%) involved juveniles classified as American Indian, and 13 (0.5%) classified as Other (similar to the previous two years, the vast majority were categorized as Asian or Pacific Islander). Regarding ethnicity, among the same 2,510 cases, 472 (18.8%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 2,038 (81.2%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. Of the 2,510 cases which could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, 1,879 (74.9%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 470 (18.7%) involved Hispanics who were not also American Indian, 96 (3.8%) involved Blacks who were not also Hispanic, and 52 (2.1%) involved Native Indians (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

The counties of the arrest cases varied. Of the 2,510 cases for which the counties were noted, 849 (33.8%) of them were from Ada County, 253 (10.1%) were from Bonneville, 253 (10.1%) were from Canyon County, 215 (8.6%) were from Kootenai County, and 181 (7.2%) were from Twin Falls County. The counties contributing the fewest juvenile arrest cases were Idaho County, accounting for five (0.2%) of the total cases, Caribou County for seven (0.3%) cases, Latah County for eight (0.3%) cases, and Elmore County for nine (0.4%) cases.

Table 15: Juvenile Arrest Cases by County	
County	**Number of Arrest Cases (%)**
Ada	849 (33.8%)
Bannock	152 (6.1%)
Benewah	41 (1.6%)
Bingham	92 (3.7%)
Blaine	29 (1.2%)
Bonner	34 (1.4%)
Bonneville	253 (10.1%)
Canyon	253 (10.1%)
Caribou	7 (0.3%)
Elmore	9 (0.4%)
Fremont	23 (0.9%)
Idaho	5 (0.2%)
Jefferson	25 (1.0%)
Jerome	89 (3.5%)
Kootenai	215 (8.6%)
Latah	8 (0.3%)
Madison	28 (1.1%)
Minidoka	42 (1.7%)
Nez Perce	46 (1.8%)
Payette	25 (1.0%)
Teton	22 (0.9%)
Twin Falls	181 (7.2%)
Unknown	82 (3.3%)
Total	2,510 (100.0%)

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, which was noted in 952 (37.9%) of all cases. The next most common crime type was crimes against persons, which was noted in 691 cases (27.5%), followed by property crimes, which was noted in 423 (16.9%) cases. Two hundred ninety-eight (11.9%) cases were documented as 'Other' crime types. Sex offenses were noted in 78 cases (3.1%), and weapons law violations in 41 (1.6%) cases. Finally, 18 (0.7%) arrest cases were categorized as traffic offenses, and nine (0.4%) as status offenses.

Arrest type (whether summoned/cited, on view, or taken into custody) was documented for 2,510 juvenile arrest cases. Summoned/cited arrests were the most common and noted in 1,397 cases (55.7%); on view arrests were noted in 956 (38.1%) cases, followed by arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody in 157 (6.3%) cases.

An arrest outcome was noted in 2,510 cases. Of these, 586 (23.3%) cases were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 1,924 (76.7%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and American Indian juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 16, statistically significant results were found with respect to four of the six variables tested; these included: 1) arrested juveniles' gender; 2) county of arrest; 3) arrest offense; and 4) arrest type. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 16: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	**< .001**
Age	.40
County of Arrest	**< .001**
Arrest Offense	**< .001**
Arrest Type	**< .001**
Arrest Outcome	.16

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font.

The first statistically significant result involved an association between the gender of arrested juveniles and their race/ethnicity, χ^2 (df = 3) = 21.94, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 17, this result was accounted for by larger percentages of arrest cases involving males for Black (nearly 88%), Non-Hispanic White (over 71%), and Hispanic (nearly 71%) juveniles compared to American Indian (nearly 52%) juveniles.

Table 17: Gender Differences of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Gender	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Male	**71.3**	**70.9**	**87.5**	**51.9**
Female	28.7	29.1	12.5	48.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

The second statistically significant result showed an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and county of arrest, χ^2 (df = 66) = 742.36, $p < .001$. Although this is a complicated association to explain due to the many contrasts involved in it, some fairly stark differences may be seen in Table 18. For example, whereas in the vast majority of counties, the single-largest category of arrest cases involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic White, in one county, namely Blaine (nearly 59%) County, cases involving Hispanic juveniles constituted the single-largest group. Also, although arrest cases involving Black juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Latah County (25%), Ada County (8%), and Benewah County (nearly 5%) (it is likely inadvisable to draw too strong of a conclusion about the finding in Latah

County due to small numbers; there were only eight total juvenile arrest cases in Latah County in 2020, and two of them involved a Black juvenile). Finally, although arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of juvenile arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Bannock (just over 18%), Nez Perce (13%), and Bingham (11%) counties.

Table 18: Differences in County of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
County of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Ada	**83.5**	8.4	8.0	*0.1*
Bannock	**65.1**	13.2	*3.3*	18.4
Benewah	**95.1**	*0.0*	4.9	*0.0*
Bingham	**45.1**	44.0	*0.0*	11.0
Blaine	41.1	**58.6**	*0.0*	*0.0*
Bonner	**97.1**	*0.0*	*0.0*	2.9
Bonneville	**73.9**	25.3	*0.8*	*0.0*
Canyon	**53.8**	43.5	1.6	*1.2*
Caribou	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Elmore	**88.9**	11.1	*0.0*	*0.0*
Fremont	**87.0**	8.7	4.3	*0.0*
Idaho	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Jefferson	**88.0**	12.0	*0.0*	*0.0*
Jerome	**56.2**	43.8	*0.0*	*0.0*
Kootenai	**93.0**	2.8	2.8	*1.4*
Latah	**75.0**	*0.0*	25.0	*0.0*
Madison	**96.4**	3.6	*0.0*	*0.0*
Minidoka	**54.8**	45.2	*0.0*	*0.0*
Nez Perce	**80.4**	*2.2*	4.3	13.0
Payette	**72.0**	28.0	*0.0*	*0.0*
Teton	**54.5**	45.5	*0.0*	*0.0*
Twin Falls	**74.6**	22.7	2.8	*0.0*
Unknown	**76.8**	23.2	*0.0*	*0.0*
Total	**75.3**	18.8	3.8	*2.1*

Note. The highest percentage within each row is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each row is in italics.

The third statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest offense, χ^2 (df = 9) = 49.13, $p < .001$. Because drug and alcohol offenses was the most common arrest offense among cases involving members of all four race/ethnicity groups, this finding is somewhat less straightforward than others. It is perhaps easiest to discern in terms of proportions; the proportion of juvenile arrest cases that were drug and alcohol offenses was considerably higher for Hispanic juveniles (at over 57%) than for members of the other three groups (which ranged from nearly 40% for Black juveniles to over 44% for American Indian juveniles). The proportion of juvenile arrest cases for the other three types of arrest

offenses was noticeably lower for Hispanic juveniles compared to members of the other three groups.

Table 19: Differences in Arrest Offense as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Offense	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Sex Offenses	*4.3*	*0.8*	*1.2*	*3.6*
Crimes Against Persons	33.0	26.7	36.0	32.3
Property Crimes	20.9	15.4	23.3	19.7
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	**41.8**	**57.2**	**39.5**	**44.4**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The fourth statistically significant result involved an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and arrest type, χ^2 (df = 6) = 30.30, $p < .001$. Perhaps the most noteworthy pattern of results behind this significant association involved most arrest cases involving American Indian (over 67%), Non-Hispanic White (over 56%), and Hispanic (over 56%) juveniles being categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the largest percentage of Black (nearly 63%) juvenile arrest cases were categorized as on view.

Table 20: Differences in Arrest Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Summoned/cited	**56.3**	**56.2**	34.4	**67.3**
On view	37.0	38.9	**62.5**	26.9
Taken into custody	*6.8*	*4.9*	*3.1*	*5.8*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

2018-2020: All Years in Aggregate

Of the 11,586 cases for which gender information was documented, 8,127 (70.1%) involved males and 3,459 (29.9%) involved females.

Of the 11,586 cases for which age information was noted, the mean age was 15.17 years, with a median age of 15 years. The youngest juvenile was 10 years old; 3,051 cases involved juveniles who were 17 years old (the oldest age, and the most common; the second-most common age was 16 years, with 2,603 cases).

Of the 11,586 cases for which there was information about juveniles' race, 10,680 (92.2%) involved juveniles classified as White, 532 (4.6%) involved juveniles classified as Black, 270 (2.3%) involved juveniles classified as American Indian, and 104 (0.9%) classified as Other with the vast majority being categorized as Asian or Pacific Islander. Regarding ethnicity, among the same 11,586 cases, 2,024 (17.5%) involved juveniles classified as Hispanic, and 9,562 (82.5%) involved juveniles classified as Non-Hispanic. All of the cases could be coded into a combined race and ethnicity category, and 8,667 (74.8%) involved Non-Hispanic Whites, 2,013 (17.4%) involved Hispanics who were not also American Indian, 532 (4.6%) involved Blacks who were not also Hispanic, and 270 (2.3%) involved American Indians (whether they were Hispanic or Non-Hispanic).

The counties of the arrest cases varied. Of the 11,586 cases for which the counties were noted, 3,980 (34.4%) of them were from Ada County, 1,457 (12.6%) were from Canyon County, 1,287 (10.8%) were from Kootenai County, 907 (7.8%) were from Bannock County, and 709 (6.1%) of the cases were from Twin Falls County. The counties contributing the fewest juvenile arrest cases were Gem County, accounting for 26 (0.2%) of the total cases, Elmore County for 28 (0.2%) cases, Shoshone County for 34 (0.3%) cases, Caribou County for 37 (0.3%) cases, and Power County for 41 (0.4%) cases.

Table 21: Juvenile Arrest Cases by County	
County	**Number of Arrest Cases (%)**
Ada	3,980 (34.4%)
Bannock	907 (7.8%)
Bear Lake	24 (0.2%)
Benewah	120 (1.0%)
Bingham	35 (3.0%)
Blaine	99 (0.9%)
Bonner	186 (1.6%)
Bonneville	731 (6.3%)
Canyon	1,457 (12.6%)
Caribou	37 (0.3%)
Elmore	28 (0.2%)
Fremont	110 (0.9%)
Gem	26 (0.2%)
Gooding	57 (0.5%)
Idaho	50 (0.4%)
Jefferson	135 (1.2%)
Jerome	281 (2.4%)
Kootenai	1,257 (10.8%)
Latah	52 (0.4%)
Madison	119 (1.0%)
Minidoka	117 (1.0%)
Nez Perce	266 (2.3%)
Payette	101 (0.9%)
Power	41 (0.4%)
Shoshone	34 (0.3%)
Teton	87 (0.8%)
Twin Falls	709 (6.1%)
Valley	23 (0.2%)
Unknown	201 (1.7%)
Total	11,586 (100%)

The most common crime type among the arrest cases was drug and alcohol offenses, which was noted in 4,487 (38.7%) of all cases. The next most common crime type was crimes against persons, which was noted in 3,305 cases (28.5%), followed by property crimes, which was noted in 1,803 (15.6%) cases. One thousand, three hundred eighty-two (11.6%) were documented as 'Other' crime types. Sex offenses were noted in 346 cases (3.0%), and weapons law violations in 184 (1.6%) cases. Finally, 82 (0.7%) arrest cases were categorized as status offenses, and 37 (0.3%) as traffic offenses.

Arrest type (whether summoned/cited, on view, or taken into custody) was documented for 11,586 juvenile arrest cases. Summoned/cited arrests were the most common and noted in 6,058

cases (52.3%); on view arrests were noted in 4,971 (42.9%) cases, followed by arrests in which juveniles were taken into custody in 557 (4.8%) cases.

An arrest outcome was noted in 11,586 cases. Of these, 2,700 (23.3%) were noted as having been "Handled within Department" and 8,886 (76.7%) were noted as having been "Referred to Other Authority."

As a primary function of DMC assessments is to understand whether race/ethnicity is associated with juvenile arrest patterns, we performed a series of analyses to determine whether Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Black, and American Indian juvenile arrest cases differed as a function of any demographic or situational characteristics. As seen below in Table 22, statistically significant results were found with respect to all six variables tested; these included: 1) arrested juveniles' gender; 2) arrested juveniles' age; 3) county of arrest; 4) arrest offense; 5) arrest type; and 6) arrest outcome. These results are explained further beneath the table.

Table 22: Significance of Differences in Demographic and Situational Characteristics of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

Demographic/Situational Characteristic	Significance of Result: Probability (*p*) Value
Gender	**<.001**
Age	**<.01**
County of Arrest	**<.001**
Arrest Offense	**<.001**
Arrest Type	**<.001**
Arrest Outcome	**<.001**

Note. Significant *p* values are in bold font.

The first statistically significant result involved an association between the gender of arrested juveniles and their race/ethnicity, χ^2 (df = 3) = 48.62, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 23, this result was accounted for by larger percentages of arrest cases involving males for Black (nearly 76%), Hispanic (nearly 72%), and Non-Hispanic White (nearly 70%) juveniles compared to American Indian (53%) juveniles.

Table 23: Gender Differences of Arrested Juveniles as a Function of Race/Ethnicity

	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Gender	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Male	**69.9**	**71.9**	**75.6**	**53.0**
Female	30.1	28.1	24.4	47.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

The second statistically significant result regarded a difference in the age of arrested juveniles as a function of race/ethnicity, F (3, 11,478) = 4.52, $p < .01$. This result was accounted for by American Indian juvenile arrest cases involving significantly younger mean ages (M = 14.81

years, *SD* = 1.61 years) than those of Black (*M* = 15.20, *SD* = 1.64), Non-Hispanic White (*M* = 15.16, *SD* = 1.66), and Hispanic (*M* = 15.20, *SD* = 1.60) juveniles.

The third statistically significant result showed an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and county of arrest, χ^2 (df = 84) = 2,884.17, $p < .001$. Although this is a complicated association to explain due to the many contrasts involved in it, some fairly stark differences may be seen in Table 24. For example, whereas in the vast majority of counties, the single-largest category of arrest cases involved juveniles who were Non-Hispanic Whites, in three counties, namely Gooding, Power, and Jerome counties, cases involving Hispanic juveniles constituted the single-largest group. Also, although arrest cases involving Black juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Gem County (nearly 14%), Latah County (nearly 12%), and Ada County (nearly 9%) (it is likely inadvisable to draw too strong of a conclusion about the finding in Gem County due to small numbers; there were only 22 total juvenile arrest cases in Gem County between 2018 and 2020, and three of them involved a Black juvenile). Finally, although arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles comprised only a small percentage (or often, no percentage at all) of juvenile arrest cases in most counties, the percentage was considerably higher in Bingham (18%), Bannock (14%), and Nez Perce (nearly 11%) counties.

Table 24: Differences in County of Arrest as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
County of Arrest	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Ada	**82.4**	8.9	8.5	*0.2*
Bannock	**67.4**	16.2	*2.4*	14.0
Bear Lake	**87.5**	8.3	*0.0*	4.2
Benewah	**96.7**	*0.0*	1.7	1.7
Bingham	**49.7**	30.2	*2.0*	18.0
Blaine	**53.5**	45.5	1.0	*0.0*
Bonner	**91.4**	*2.2*	3.2	3.2
Bonneville	**77.4**	20.9	1.1	*0.6*
Canyon	**58.6**	38.5	2.4	*0.4*
Caribou	**94.6**	5.4	*0.0*	*0.0*
Elmore	**75.0**	25.0	*0.0*	*0.0*
Fremont	**81.5**	15.7	*0.9*	1.9
Gem	**86.4**	*0.0*	13.6	*0.0*
Gooding	31.6	**68.4**	*0.0*	*0.0*
Idaho	**86.0**	12.0	2.0	*0.0*
Jefferson	**79.1**	17.9	3.0	*0.0*
Jerome	48.0	**51.6**	0.4	*0.0*
Kootenai	**90.3**	2.8	5.5	*1.4*
Latah	**84.6**	*0.0*	11.5	3.8
Madison	**90.6**	7.7	1.7	*0.0*
Minidoka	**56.4**	43.6	*0.0*	*0.0*
Nez Perce	**82.2**	4.5	*2.7*	10.6
Payette	**74.3**	25.7	*0.0*	*0.0*
Power	36.6	**58.5**	*0.0*	4.9
Shoshone	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Teton	**67.8**	32.2	*0.0*	*0.0*
Twin Falls	**71.3**	25.9	2.7	*0.1*
Valley	**100.0**	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
Unknown	**73.6**	22.3	2.0	*2.0*
Total	**75.5**	17.5	4.6	*2.4*

Note. The highest percentage within each row is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each row is in italics.

The fourth statistically significant result involved an association of arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest offense, χ^2 (df = 9) = 96.42, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 25, this result is largely accounted by larger percentages of arrest cases involving Hispanic (54%) and Non-Hispanic White (just over 44%) juveniles being for drug and alcohol offenses, and larger percentages of arrest cases involving Black (over 43%) and American Indian (nearly 42%) juveniles being for crimes against persons. An interesting pattern of results showed Black juveniles being the most likely of all race/ethnicity groups to be arrested for sex crimes (at almost 5% of arrest cases involving Black juveniles).

Table 25: Differences in Arrest Offense as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Offense	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Sex Offenses	*3.8*	*2.0*	*4.7*	*2.6*
Crimes Against Persons	33.3	28.4	**43.3**	**41.6**
Property Crimes	18.8	16.0	17.8	16.5
Drug and Alcohol Offenses	**44.1**	**53.7**	34.2	39.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The fifth statistically significant result involved an association between the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles and arrest type, χ^2 (df = 6) = 121.14, $p < .001$. Perhaps the most noteworthy pattern of results behind this significant association involved most arrest cases involving American Indian (at nearly 72%), Non-Hispanic White (over 53%), and Hispanic (over 50%) juveniles being categorized as summoned/cited, whereas the largest percentage of Black (nearly 61%) juvenile arrest cases were categorized as on view.

Table 26: Differences in Arrest Type as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Type	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Summoned/cited	**53.2**	**50.2**	35.7	**71.5**
On view	42.0	44.6	**60.7**	22.6
Taken into custody	*4.8*	*5.2*	*3.6*	*5.9*
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font. The lowest percentage within each column is in italics.

The final statistically significant result involved an association between arrested juveniles' race/ethnicity and arrest outcome, χ^2 (df = 3) = 99.27, $p < .001$. As seen below in Table 27, a particularly stark pattern of results shows that, although arrest cases among all race/ethnicity groups were most often referred to another authority, this was most often true among cases involving American Indian juveniles (at over 86%), and least often true among those involving Hispanic juveniles (at over 68%).

Table 27: Differences in Arrest Outcome as a Function of Race/Ethnicity				
	Percentage of Cases Within Race/Ethnicity Grouping			
Arrest Outcome	**Non-Hispanic White**	**Hispanic**	**Black**	**American Indian**
Handled Within Department	21.9	31.4	20.9	13.7
Referred to Other Authority	**78.1**	**68.6**	**79.1**	**86.3**
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note. The highest percentage within each column is in bold font.

Conclusion

The purpose of the present assessment was to understand factors associated with juvenile arrests in Idaho during the period 2018-2020. One particular area of interest was to learn whether there are pieces of information that can help explain why Black and American Indian juveniles were arrested at rates markedly higher than what would be expected given their prevalence in the juvenile population in Idaho. Using a methodology similar to what was used in past assessments of racial and ethnic disparities among juvenile arrest cases in particular areas of Idaho (i.e., Canyon County on two occasions, and Twins Falls and Bingham counties on one occasion each), data provided by IDJC were analyzed separately for each calendar year, and then for the aggregate three-year period. Because the findings for the separate years did not seem to differ in large or particularly meaningful ways, the discussion in this section will focus primarily on the findings from the three-year aggregate data.

Assessing the data for all juveniles together (i.e., not as a function of race/ethnicity), there are some potentially valuable results that paint a picture of juveniles who came into contact with the juvenile justice system between 2018 and 2020. Seventy percent of the arrest cases involved male juveniles, with an average age of 15.2 years. Drug and alcohol offenses formed a plurality of the arrest cases, followed by crimes against persons. A slight majority of the cases involved an arrest following a summons or citation, but on view arrests also constituted well over 40% of all cases. More than three-quarters of the arrest cases involved a referral to another authority.

Six demographic and arrest-related variables were tested to determine whether they were statistically significantly associated with the race/ethnicity of arrested juveniles. All six were found to be significantly associated (this was not true in each individual year, but rather in the three-year aggregate assessment). First, it was found that arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles more often involved females than was the case for any of the other race/ethnicity categories; whereas only 24% of Black, 28% of Hispanic, and 30% of Non-Hispanic White juvenile arrest cases involved females, 47% of American Indian cases did so.

The second significant result involved age; it was found that the average age of American Indian juveniles involved in arrest cases was nearly a half-year younger than the average age for juveniles in the other three race/ethnicity groups.

Third, it was found that, although arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles were the most common in the vast majority of counties in Idaho, cases involving Hispanic juveniles formed the majority or plurality of the cases in three counties, namely, Gooding, Power, and Jerome. Although arrest cases involving Black and American Indian juveniles were rare or non-existent in most counties, the former seemed overrepresented in Gem, Ada, and Latah counties and the latter seemed overrepresented in Bingham, Nez Perce, and Bannock counties.

Differences in arrest offense contributed to the fourth significant result. This result showed that whereas a majority of arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles, and a plurality of cases involving Non-Hispanic White juveniles, were for drug and alcohol offenses, a plurality of cases involving both Black and American Indian juveniles were for crimes against persons.

The fifth significant result involved arrest type. This result showed that whereas cases involving Black juveniles most often had an arrest type of on view, the majority of cases involving juveniles in the other three racial/ethnic groups had the arrest type of summoned/cited.

Differences in arrest outcome constituted the sixth and final significant result. This result showed that arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles (at over 86%) were more often referred to another authority than cases involving Hispanic juveniles (at less than 69%); considered in reverse, this would mean that arrest cases involving Hispanic juveniles (at over 31%) were more

often handled within the department than cases involving American Indian juveniles (at less than 14%). Although as researchers we do not know the intricacies of how case disposition decisions are made, it seems plausible that the higher rate of American Indian juvenile arrest cases being referred to another authority could be explained at least partially by referrals being made by arresting agencies back to tribal authorities (at least for American Indian juveniles living on a reservation).

It is important to consider these findings not as separate results, but rather as pieces to a puzzle when trying to understand what arrest rates are so much higher for Black and American Indian juveniles than one would expect given their representation in the greater population of juveniles in Idaho. As noted earlier, according to the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Idaho Kids Count (Idaho Voices for Children, n.d.) database, approximately 1% of the juveniles living in Idaho are Black. However, during the calendar years 2018-2020, 4.6% of the juvenile arrest cases involved Black juveniles. This means that the arrest rate for Black juveniles is approximately 4.6 times higher than one would expect given Black juveniles' population prevalence. Considering the 2018-2020 data, some possible explanations for why this might be the case can be seen. First, Black juveniles seem to be arrested for crimes against persons more often than White and Non-Hispanic White juveniles, who are more often arrested for drug and alcohol offenses. It might be that law enforcement officers and juvenile justice officials have less discretion in making decisions about whether to arrest a juvenile given the more serious nature of the offense. Second, Black juvenile arrest cases were found to have an arrest type of on view more often than cases involving juveniles belonging to the other three racial/ethnic groups. It might be that law enforcement officers have less discretion in making decisions about whether to arrest a juvenile when they have witnessed an offense taking place (particularly if it involved a crime against persons). This is reasoned conjecture, of course, and again we stress our role as researchers rather than experts in juvenile justice processes. However, as we will discuss further below, we believe these pieces of information are important and strongly recommend that they be further explored.

There is more information to consider in the case of the disparity in arrest rates seen for American Indian juveniles in Idaho. According to the Idaho Kids Count (Idaho Voices for Children, n.d.) database, approximately 1% of the juveniles living in Idaho are American Indian. However, during the calendar years 2018-2020, 2.3% of the juvenile arrest cases involved American Indian juveniles. Although the level of disparity is not as great as it is for Black juveniles, the arrest rate for American Indian juveniles is approximately 2.3 times higher than one would expect given American Indian juveniles' population prevalence. Again, when the data in this report are considered, there are some potential explanations for why this disparity might exist. One is similar to what was found regarding arrests involving Black juveniles—arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles also more often had an arrest type of crimes against persons than was found for Non-Hispanic White and Hispanic juveniles. As noted earlier, it may be that there is less discretion about whether or not to make an arrest with this type of crime compared to other crime types (particularly drug and alcohol offenses). Two other findings related to the disparity in arrest cases are unique to American Indians, however, and therefore they are particularly intriguing. The first is gender. Whereas the vast majority of arrest cases involving Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, and Black juveniles involved males, nearly half of the arrest cases involving American Indian juveniles involved females. The greater tendency for females to be involved with the juvenile justice system could at least partially explain the disparate high rate of arrest cases among American Indian juveniles. A similar finding involves age. The juveniles

in American Indian arrest cases were significantly younger in mean age than juveniles in the other three race/ethnicity categories. It seems possible that because American Indian juveniles appear to come into contact with the juvenile justice system earlier than other juveniles, they may have more contact overall. This could also partially explain the disparity in American Indian juvenile arrest rates.

In early December 2021, the authors of this report presented the 2018-2020 findings to IDJC administrators and members of the Idaho Juvenile Justice Commission. Excellent discussion followed the presentation, much of which involved questions about what the findings might mean in terms of education, policy, and practice. Meeting participants, who included judges, juvenile probation officers, and others, strongly encouraged IDJC, in collaboration with other system stakeholders, and the research team to further investigate factors that might explain not only the results in this assessment but more broadly why arrest rates are higher than one would expect among Black and American Indian juveniles. This makes excellent sense. Several areas of exploration in particular seem valuable, and are listed below.

In several past assessments of racial and ethnic disparities in juvenile arrest rates, arrest location was a variable that could be assessed. In the current study, due to issues associated with data systems, this information was not available for analysis. Understanding where arrests were taking place would be particularly valuable in understanding why Black juvenile arrest cases so often involved an on-view type of arrest relative to members of the other three racial/ethnicity categories. Drilling deeper into county-level data also seems valuable. Although some high rates of arrests are relatively easy to understand at the county level (e.g., it is easy to understand why unusually high rates of arrest cases of American Indian juveniles were found in counties such as Bingham, Bannock, and Nez Perce counties—as these counties are directly adjacent to large American Indian reservations), others seem perplexing (e.g., why arrest cases involving Black juveniles were as high as they were in Gem County) and would seem valuable to better understand (e.g., was it simply one Black juvenile who was repeatedly arrested in Gem County?). It is likely always the hope of researchers that their analyses can have a positive effect on the lives of those they research, and that is certainly true of our hope for juveniles coming into contact with the juvenile justice system in Idaho.

References

Coalition for Juvenile Justice (n.d.). *History of the JJDPA*. Retrieved from http://www.juvjustice.org/federal-policy/juvenile-justice-and-delinquency-prevention-act

Healey, B. J., McDonald, T. W. Gazieva, K., Begic, S., & Toussaint, L. L. (2014). *An assessment for Disproportionate Minority Contact among juveniles in Idaho 2009-2011*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Howard, E. K. M., & McDonald, T. W. (2013). *Stakeholders' perceptions of the Disproportionate Minority Contact project in Canyon County, Idaho*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

Idaho Voices for Children (n.d.). *Kids Count*. Retrieved from https://www.idahovoices.org/research/kids-count/

Lind, B. K., Miller, C. M., Carver, S. D., & McDonald, T. W. (2010). *Does race/ethnicity affect criminal case disposition of juveniles in Canyon County? Results of Disproportionate Minority Contact analysis*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

McDonald, T. W., Begic, S., MacKenzie, L. A., Marshall, J. J., Stevenson, T. J., & Hearn, M. M. (2018). *An assessment for Disproportionate Minority Contact among juveniles in Bingham County, Idaho, 2011-2015*. Boise, ID: Center for Health Policy, Boise State University.

United States Federal Bureau of Investigations. (2018). *2019.1 National Incident-Based Reporting System User Manual*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Information Services Division Uniform Crime Reporting Program.