

#86

NATIONAL STATISTICS ON CHILDREN AS VICTIMS
AND OFFENDERS: A GUIDE TO FEDERAL DATA PROGRAMS

Compiled by

James L. Peterson, Ph.D.*
Nancy Snyder, M.A.
Brian Ault, M.A.
Kristin Moore, Ph.D.
Nicholas Zill, Ph.D.

September, 1986

Prepared for the Juvenile Justice Data Collection Workshop
sponsored jointly by the Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention and the Bureau of Justice Statistics,
Washington, D.C.,
May 13-14, 1986

The preparation of this compendium was supported by funds
from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

*The authors are on the staff of:
Child Trends, Inc.,
2100 M Street, N.W.,
Washington, DC 20037

CONTENTS

Page

NATIONAL SURVEYS

National Crime Survey	1
National Survey on Drug Abuse	6
National Youth Survey	10
National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market Experience of Youth	16
Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth	21
High School and Beyond (HS & B)	25
The Safe School Study	32
National Family Violence Survey	38
Youth Information Form (Formerly, ICARE)	43
National Survey of Children	48
Decennial Census of Population and Housing	53

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD SYSTEMS

Uniform Crime Reports	59
Vital Statistics of the United States -- Mortality	65
National Juvenile Justice Archive	70
Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process (CODAP)	77
Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN)	81
National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth	86
National Study of Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting	91

SURVEYS OF ORGANIZATIONS/FACILITIES

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth	95
National Survey of Non-residential Agencies and Programs for Children and Youth	100
National Jail Census	105
Survey of Inmates of Local Jails	109
Census of State Correctional Facilities	114
Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities	118
Children in Custody: Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities	123

TITLE National Crime Survey (NCS)

PURPOSE The purpose of the survey is to assess the character and extent of the criminal offenses that can be reported by victims of crimes; to ascertain the characteristics of the victims and the circumstances surrounding the incidents; the characteristics of the offenders; and the consequences of the crimes for the victims. The offenses covered for individuals are: rape, robbery, assault, and personal larceny; for households: burglary, household larceny, and motor vehicle theft.

SPONSORSHIP The survey was originally planned and designed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. When that agency was dissolved, the survey was transferred to the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The survey is funded by the Department of Justice. The data are collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

DESIGN The survey is designed to collect data regarding persons age 12 and over living in households in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. A three-stage stratified probability sample has been used. First, 376 geographically defined primary sampling units have been selected; then enumeration districts within sampling units have been chosen; finally, segments of about four housing units each have been chosen to be contacted within enumeration districts.

Each person age 14 or over is interviewed regarding his or her experience as a victim of crime. Proxy respondents are used for persons 12 and 13. Information about crimes against victims age 11 or younger is not obtained in the NCS.

The sample of households is divided into 6 rotation groups, each interviewed every 6 months for 3 years (a total of 7 interviews). The first interview is done in person. Subsequent interviews may be done by telephone. Altogether, in 1980 information was gathered on 123 thousand individuals in 57 thousand households. Early surveys also included a sample of business establishments (14,000 in 1975) to gather data on crimes committed against businesses. This aspect of the survey was dropped in 1977 because it measured only robbery and burglary and did not provide comprehensive commercial data.

While the first of the seven interviews does collect data about victimization incidents in the recent past,

National Crime Survey (NCS)

its primary purpose is to establish a boundary for the next interview. The inter-interview time periods then serve as a reference period for reports of victimization.

Longitudinal data are available for the household. To the extent that the same family or individual occupied the household during the three year period, longitudinal data are available for the family or individual as well.

The NCS is currently being redesigned. The new instrument will measure a larger number of crimes and obtain more comprehensive information about victim characteristics. New crimes to be covered include vandalism and may include arson. The longitudinal design may also be modified so that the family, rather than the dwelling unit, is followed. This would allow better estimates of the victimization of movers.

PERIODICITY

The survey was begun in 1973 and data have been collected regularly since then. Households are interviewed twice a year for three years. New households come into the survey at each interview period, while one-sixth of the others are completing their three-year stints.

CONTENT

Information is collected both about the household as a whole and about individual members of the household age 12 or over. On a household basis, data are gathered on the type of structure, tenure, household size and composition, family income, and incidents of victimizations against the household (such as larceny, illegal entry, etc.).

On an individual basis, information is gathered on basic personal demographic characteristics and on each incident of victimization against persons (age 12 or over) in the household. The victimization data include information on the nature of the incident, the circumstances surrounding it, when it took place, the use of threats, force, or violence, damage or injury inflicted, the number and characteristics of offenders, the relationship of victim to offender, and whether the incident was reported to the police.

LIMITATIONS

The survey currently does not collect any victimization data on persons under 12 (age, sex, race, and origin are the only data available on children under 12). The

National Crime Survey (NCS)

identification of each child's mother and father is not clearly made in all cases. Some factors may lead to biases in estimates of victimization. For example, using proxy respondents for 12 and 13 year-olds may undercount victimization events, as may the fact that children of this age never act as household respondents (being a respondent for the household as a whole tends to elicit more reports of personal victimizations as well). On the other hand, over-reporting may occur among 14 year-olds in their first interview as the interview is unbounded, making the time reference less clear.

The data can be used to assess the age and other characteristics of offenders. In this way, information about juveniles as offenders may be obtained. But these data are subject to the errors in the judgement of victims about the ages of their assailants.

AVAILABILITY

Basic tabulations of results are published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics for each survey year in a report titled Criminal Victimization in the United States. The most recent report, for calendar year 1984, is to be released soon. Public use tapes are available through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Files are available which are structured by victims, and by household members (whether victims or not). Longitudinal files are also available. Data are also available on microfilm from the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Contact: Patsy Klaus of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20531 or 202/724-7774.

National Crime Survey (NCS)

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect*
- sexual abuse*
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

*These incidents are likely to be underreported, especially for 12 and 13-year olds, for whom responses are provided only by proxies.

National Crime Survey (NCS)

Children as Offenders**

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

**In the survey, victims are asked to estimate the age of offenders if the offender was seen by the victim. Data on children as offenders are based on these reports and are subject to two major sources of error: misjudgements of age by the respondent; crimes committed in which the offender was not seen (as in some burglary, some theft, etc.).

TITLE National Survey on Drug Abuse

PURPOSE The National Survey on Drug Abuse is a series of surveys designed to provide estimates of the prevalence of illicit drug use over time. Use of a number of drugs is estimated for individuals of different ages. Since content and question wording have been reasonably comparable across successive waves of the study, this series of surveys provides information on trends in illicit drug use over more than a decade.

SPONSORSHIP The National Survey on Drug Abuse is sponsored by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. The Division of Epidemiology and Statistical Analysis within NIDA has oversight.

DESIGN The survey covers individuals age 12 and over who live in households in the contiguous United States. Youth aged 12-17 are sampled independently of adults 18 and older and are over-sampled. Among adults, those aged 18-25 are over-sampled. Data are weighted to compensate for the over-sampling, and weighted data are nationally representative. All states except Alaska and Hawaii are covered.

In-person interviews are administered. For sensitive questions, the respondent fills out confidential answer sheets to reduce the tendency to underreport. This is a cross-sectional survey; no respondents are followed over time..

In 1985, the sample included about 2,000 youth 12-17, 2,000 young adults 18-25, 2,000 adults 26-34 and 2,000 adults 35 and older.

PERIODICITY Surveys were conducted in 1971, 1972, 1974, 1976, 1977, 1979, 1982, and 1985. The next survey is planned for 1987 or 1988, depending on the availability of funds.

CONTENT Information on lifetime and current use of several illicit drugs is obtained, including marijuana, hallucinogens, cocaine, heroin, and non-medical use of barbiturates, tranquilizers, stimulants and analgesics. The content covers frequency of use and concomitant use of more than one drug. Some correlates of use are obtained, including age, sex, race, educational level, and region. Dating behavior was covered in the 1982 survey. Little information on parents or on the family context is obtained.

National Survey on Drug Abuse

LIMITATIONS

Data are collected only for household residents. Those institutionalized are not sampled. To date, little information about the respondent's family has been collected. There are no questions pertaining to a young person's victimization status or to offenses other than drug use.

AVAILABILITY

A number of standard publications are issued for each survey: "Main Findings," "Population Projections," "Highlights" and occasional special reports. These publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. Data from the most recent survey are summarized in "Highlights from the National Survey on Drug Abuse: 1982". Information about the 1982 tape and the future availability of the 1985 tape (currently in the editing stage) can be obtained from:

Dr. Beatrice Rouse
NIDA, Division of Epidemiology and Statistical Analysis
Parklawn Building, Room 11A56
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
301/443-2974

National Survey on Drug Abuse

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Survey on Drug Abuse

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE National Youth Survey

PURPOSE The National Youth Survey is a longitudinal study of delinquent behavior, alcohol and drug use, and problem-related substance use. Goals of the project include providing data on the incidence, geographical distribution, patterns and styles of delinquent behavior and drug use; exploring the relationship between delinquent behaviors and substance abuse; investigating factors associated with changes in patterns of delinquent behavior and drug use over time; and testing a theoretical model developed to explain delinquent behavior and drug use.

SPONSORSHIP The Survey has been jointly funded by the National Institute of Mental Health, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the National Institute of Justice. The design of the survey has been the responsibility of the Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado.

DESIGN Data have been collected by survey interviews conducted with a national probability sample of youth who were aged 11 to 17 in 1976, the reference period of the initial interview. The sample selected for interview included 2,360 eligible youth, of whom 1,725 or 73 percent were located and completed the first interview. Additional attrition over the next four waves reduced the sample by another 13 percent. However, attrition does not seem to have been higher among groups differentiated by age, sex, class, ethnicity, place of residence or reported delinquency.

Respondents were personally interviewed annually between 1977 and 1981 and in 1984 about delinquent behaviors, alcohol use, and drug abuse during the prior calendar year. In 1980 and again in 1985, a search of police records was completed for each respondent who gave permission to contact the police in his or her locality during the period of the study. In each search, 88 percent of the youth gave this permission. In the most recent and largest search, most respondents required multiple-agency searches, and these searches covered the entire 11-to 24-year-old age span. Searches were conducted in approximately 2,700 juvenile and 3,300 adult jurisdictions. Of the more than 47,800 individual searches, over 90 percent have been completed.

PERIODICITY Annual interviews were conducted in the years 1977 to 1981, and again in 1984. In 1986, a methodological study is being conducted on a sub-sample of the

National Youth Survey

respondents to explore the effect of using telephone interviews to collect data. In each case questions pertain to activity in the previous calendar year.

CONTENT

Self-report methods are used to elicit reports of varied types of delinquent behaviors, substance abuse, alcohol use, and related behaviors, as well as background and demographic information. The self-reported delinquency measure includes 40 offenses which are representative of the full range of offenses reported in the Uniform Crime Reports. All behaviors involving more than 1 percent of the juvenile arrests in the Uniform Crime Code Reports are included. Except for homicide, all Part I offenses (the most serious offenses, as defined by the Uniform Reporting System) are included, as are many of the Part II (less serious) offenses, plus a number of status offenses. Drug use questions were also asked. The reference period for these behaviors is the previous calendar year.

In 1977, parents were interviewed about their own attitudes and values; their children's behavior; their disciplinary methods; their familiarity with their children's friends; and their opinion of their children's friends. Children were interviewed in turn regarding their own attitudes toward what constitutes right and wrong behavior; perceptions of the attitudes of their parents and friends regarding appropriate behavior; aspirations and expectations; feelings of social isolation; feelings about family closeness, trust, and support; time spent with family, friends, work, school and other activities; the importance of family, peer activities and acceptance; and a number of behaviors.

Among the behaviors about which the youth were questioned are acts of destruction, stealing, cheating, selling stolen goods or drugs, helping, hitting, and rowdiness. Youth were also asked whether they had been victims of a theft, a beating, a sexual assault, or a beating with a weapon. In addition, youth were asked how often they used alcoholic beverages, marijuana, barbiturates, heroin, and cocaine during the past year and when they first used each substance. Information on these topics was updated in the subsequent waves of interviewing. Questions on new topics, such as sex role attitudes, were also asked. More detailed questions were asked on a variety of types of drugs, on problems due to drug or alcohol use, and on involvement in sexual assault.

National Youth Survey

In 1984, retrospective data were collected to create a birth history for females and a marriage history for all respondents. Questions about the timing and circumstances under which first sexual intercourse occurred were also asked, as were questions about pregnancy, prostitution, forced sex, and homosexuality. Educational progress and job experiences were also ascertained; and information on family and peer interaction patterns, importance, and influences were updated. If specific types of delinquent behaviors were reported, considerable detail was obtained regarding the circumstances surrounding the behavior, such as whether it was done alone or in a group and whether drinking was involved. Use of drugs during the previous year was measured, as well as whether any problems associated with use of these had occurred. Drugs asked about included alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, hallucinogens, tranquilizers, amphetamines, barbiturates, codeine, heroin, cocaine, and inhalants. A retrospective history of delinquent behaviors and drug use in 1981 and 1982 was also obtained in 1984; and information on arrests and questioning by the police was obtained. Finally, questions about spells of depression, about problems and help with problems, and about marriage relationships were asked.

In early 1986, a sub-sample of the larger sample is being interviewed by telephone, to explore the efficacy of telephone interviews to collect data on delinquent activities and substance use.

LIMITATIONS

The kinds of information sought in this survey involve extremely personal, sensitive, and often illegal behaviors. However, it appears to be the case that respondents do report considerable amounts of delinquent and deviant activities. There is no really firm way to validate the data, since other forms of data collection have similar shortcomings. In fact, this methodology was developed in order to address known problems of sample bias when studies are based on clinic or police samples.

The longitudinal nature of the survey permits the study of aging effects -- changes in delinquent behavior as a function of increasing age. Also because the study includes several birth cohorts, period effects (changes in rates of delinquency over time for a given age) can be examined for some age groups. The lack of complete replication, however, limits the ability to study period effects for many age groups of interest.

National Youth Survey

The researchers have taken considerable care to obtain information about serious as well as more frequent types of delinquent and deviant behavior, noting that most earlier work focused upon relatively trivial forms of misbehavior. In addition, the researchers have not truncated the response distributions on questions about frequent offenses, as is frequently done. Thus the exact number of offenses is coded, and means and ranges can be computed.

AVAILABILITY

Interview forms and reports are available from the National Youth Survey, Institute of Behavioral Science, Campus Box 483, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0483 (303-492-1266).

Interview forms, the data tape and tape documentation can also be obtained from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

National Youth Survey

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Youth Survey

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market
Experience of Youth

PURPOSE

Longitudinal surveys of national samples of young women, mature women, young men and older men were initiated by the Department of Labor in the late 1960s. The project was carried out by the Center for Human Resource Research of Ohio State University. In 1977, it was decided both to continue these existing panels for the immediate future and also to initiate a new survey of young men and women.

This new panel survey, the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, was designed to replicate much of the information obtained in the earlier surveys of young people in order to document changes in the labor force experiences of youth. Also, new data would enable researchers to evaluate the expanding youth employment and training programs established under the 1977 amendments to CETA (the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act). In addition, a supplementary sample of 1,300 youth serving in the military was interviewed to enable researchers to study recruitment and military experiences among young persons serving in the Armed Forces. The data have been collected on a longitudinal basis, and over the years a number of other government agencies have paid to include variables on topics of interest to their agency to facilitate analyses of issues such as adolescent fertility, child care, drug use, and delinquent activities.

SPONSORSHIP

The Department of Labor initiated this Survey and has provided much of the funding for it. However, the National Institute on Alcohol and Alcohol Abuse, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the Department of Defense, among others, have all sponsored the collection of data of particular interest to their agencies. Instrument design, data checking, and data dissemination activities are conducted by the Center for Human Resource Research. The National Opinion Research Center in Chicago does the field work.

DESIGN

The Youth sample of the NLS comprises, when weighted, a nationally-representative probability sample of 12,686 youth aged 14-21 as of January 1, 1979, including a sample of 1,300 young persons serving in the Armed Forces. Blacks, Hispanics, and economically disadvantaged whites were all over-sampled to enable researchers to conduct separate analyses within each of these population groups. Individuals were considered to

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market
Experience of Youth

be eligible for the sample if they lived within the 50 states and were not institutionalized, or if they were on active military duty outside the United States. Non-military respondents were selected using a multi-stage, stratified, area probability sample of dwelling units and group quarters. A screening interview was administered at approximately 75,000 dwelling units and group quarters from 202 primary sampling units. Respondents were eligible if the dwelling was their usual place of residence or if they stayed there occasionally and had no other usual place of residence. Military respondents were sampled from rosters provided by the Department of Defense. A total of 12,868 persons were interviewed, and 92 percent of these were still being followed for in-person or telephone interviews as of the completion of the eighth wave in 1986.

PERIODICITY

Interviews with Youth cohort respondents have been conducted annually since 1979. At present, additional waves are planned at least through 1987.

CONTENT

Since the National Longitudinal Surveys were initiated by the Department of Labor, labor force experience, training, and attitudes are emphasized. Considerable information is also collected about educational progress and goals and school experiences, since this information is highly relevant to labor force status. In addition, considerable information is obtained on transition events important to youth as they pass through the high school years and begin to experiment with drugs, engage in delinquent behaviors, form marriages, bear children, and experience divorce.

Questions on drug use were asked in 1980 and 1984. In 1980, respondents were asked about drug use along with about twenty other types of deviant behaviors, including whether they had run away, skipped school for an entire day, damaged or destroyed something intentionally, gotten into a fight at school or work, sold marijuana or hashish, or attacked someone intending to harm or kill them. In 1984, questions were asked about use of cigarettes, marijuana or hashish recently and since 1979, use of hard drugs recently and ever, and use of drugs while on the job.

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market
Experience of Youth

In 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, and 1986, respondents were asked about their consumption of alcohol in the last 7 days and in the last 30 days. Whether drinking has ever interfered with school work or work on a job was also asked.

In 1980, a number of questions were also asked about any income respondents had from illegal activities during the last year, the number of times they had been stopped by the police and arrested in the past 12 months or ever, the number of times they had been convicted, and the number of times they had been incarcerated. The first time the youth was stopped, arrested, and convicted was ascertained, and the youth's age at his most recent arrest and conviction was also obtained. In addition, data on conviction in an adult court and referral to a court-related counseling or diversion program were obtained. Whether the youth had ever been on probation, the number of times, and the date when the most recent probation ended were also ascertained.

LIMITATIONS

The data on substance use and contact with the police are all obtained by self-report, creating the possibility of under-reporting. Questions on delinquency and drugs were asked with the use of a direct interview, and youth were asked to skip items rather than answer questions inaccurately. Nevertheless, it appears that some under-reporting occurs, in the estimation of Dr. Denise Kandel, who is analyzing the data. As she notes, though, it is difficult to validate the data, since the actual level of drug use in the United States is not definitively known.

Another problem with the data is that information on delinquency and substance use are obtained only occasionally. Hence it is not possible to explore patterns of drug abuse from one year to the next in conjunction with labor force, schooling, and family events that are surveyed annually.

AVAILABILITY

Public use tapes and tape documentation as well as a list of publications based on the NLS data bases can be obtained from the Center for Human Resource Research.

Contact: Ken Wolpin, Principal Investigator
Center for Human Resource Research
650 Ackerman Road, Suite A
Columbus, Ohio 43202
(614) 422-1064

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market
Experience of Youth

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth (1980)
- drug use (1980)
- alcohol use (1982, 1983)
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape

National Longitudinal Survey of the Labor Market
Experience of Youth

- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police
 suspended/expelled

Disposition

- arrests (1980)
 in detention (1980)
 in jails/prisons (1980)
 on probation (1980)
 receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
 sex
 race/origin
 geographic residence
 family structure
 family socio-economic status

TITLE Monitoring The Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth

PURPOSE The survey is designed to describe and explain changes in many important values, behaviors and lifestyle orientations of American youth. Drug use and related attitudes receive the most extensive coverage, but the study aims to cover a broad array of other topics as well.

SPONSORSHIP The study has been designed and carried out by The Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, at the University of Michigan. Funding for the study has been provided primarily by the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

DESIGN The study is based on a national sample of seniors enrolled in high schools in the coterminous United States in the spring of each year. A three stage probability sample is used, involving the selection of geographically defined primary sampling units, the selection of high schools within units and the selection of seniors within high schools. The final sample includes over 17 thousand seniors from about 130 public and private high schools. The data are collected through self-administered questionnaires completed in a supervised classroom setting. A subsample of 2,400 students from each class has been randomly selected and followed longitudinally for up to ten years. One-half this group was followed-up in the first year after graduation and every two years after that. The other half was resurveyed in the second year after graduation and every two years after that.

Because many questions are needed to cover all of the topic areas, five different questionnaire forms are used and distributed in such a way as to produce five virtually identical subsamples. About one-third of each form consists of core questions which are common to all forms.

PERIODICITY The study was first conducted in the spring of 1975 and has been conducted annually since then. Follow-ups have also been conducted annually, but those from the classes of 1976 and, especially, 1975 are subject to problems of missing data and low response rates. Changes in procedures in 1978 have put the response rates over 80% on follow-ups of the class of 1977 and subsequent classes.

Monitoring The Future: A Continuing Study of the
Lifestyles and Values of Youth

CONTENT

In addition to drug use and related attitudes, the survey includes questions in which the students are asked to report on their own delinquent behavior during the last year, including: conflict with parents, participation in gang fights, fighting at school, assault, larceny, shoplifting, car theft, trespassing, arson, vandalism, and getting into trouble with the police. Questions on victimization experiences also refer to the previous 12 months, and cover incidents of theft, property damage, and assault. There are questions in other sections of the survey about: driving violations and accidents; violations and accidents under the influence of drugs; and risk-taking propensities. Other subject areas on which Monitoring the Future gathers data are: education, work and leisure, sex roles, family plans, religion, politics, social change, social problems, social institutions, military service, interpersonal relationships, race relations, personality, values, and demographic background.

LIMITATIONS

Since the sample is based on high school seniors, those who have dropped out of school by the spring of the senior year (about 15-20%) are not included. Very few data are gathered on parent background characteristics. Data about earlier years of schooling or younger ages are not included. Furthermore, though the sample is large, only the core set of questions are asked of all respondents. For the preponderance of questions, data are available on only one-fifth of the sample. Thus, questions on delinquent behavior and criminal victimization are asked of only about 3,500 students.

AVAILABILITY

Published descriptive data on each variable by sex, race, region, college plans, and drug use are available in annual volumes published by The Survey Research Center. Trend data on drug use and related attitudes are available from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. A listing of other available articles, chapters, and occasional papers is available from the principal investigators. Micro-data tapes are available through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research, Institute for Survey Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248.

Contacts: Jerald Bachman, Lloyd Johnston, or Patrick O'Malley, Institute for Social Research,
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
313/763-5043.

Monitoring The Future: A Continuing Study of
the Lifestyles and Values of Youth

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization (in last 12 months)

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- property vandalized

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts (dropouts are not included in the sample)
- motor vehicle accidents

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense (in last 12 months)

- truancy
- other status offenses (fights with parents)
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault

Monitoring The Future: A Continuing Study of
the Lifestyles and Values of Youth

- contact with police
- motor vehicle offenses

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence (where youth grew up)
- family structure (partial, as reported by youth)
- family socio-economic status (parent education level, as reported by youth)
- religious preference and involvement
- political orientation and party affiliation
- current employment and earnings of youth

TITLE High School and Beyond

PURPOSE High School and Beyond is a study of the transition from secondary school attendance to early adulthood. It includes data on educational factors related to events in the years following high school graduation: post high school education, marriage, work, and family formation.

SPONSORSHIP The study is sponsored by the Center for Statistics, Department of Education. The data are collected by the National Opinion Research Center under a contract to the Center.

DESIGN The study is based on a national probability sample of 30,030 high school sophomores and 28,240 seniors enrolled in 1,015 public and private schools in the fall of 1980. Students were selected through a two-stage stratified sampling plan. In the first stage, schools were stratified by type and several strata were over-sampled. These over-sampled school types were: alternative, Hispanic, high-performance private, other non-Catholic private, and black Catholic schools. Catholic and public schools were in regular strata which were not over-sampled. With the exception of over-sampled strata, schools were selected with probability proportional to estimated enrollment. Within each school 36 seniors and 36 sophomores were randomly selected. (In schools with fewer than these numbers, all were selected into the sample.) The design resulted in a sample which (with the exception of the special strata) is approximately self-weighting. Nevertheless weights have been developed to take account of the over-sampled strata, and differential cooperation rates at the school and student level, as well as other minor sources of sampling error.

Data were collected directly from the students using self-administered questionnaires. In addition, the principal of each school completed a questionnaire providing information about the school. Teachers also filled out forms concerning their knowledge about and evaluations of students in the sample. A subsample of about 3,400 students in each cohort was selected, and information was gathered from their parents.

PERIODICITY High School and Beyond is a longitudinal study in which the first wave of data was collected in 1980. The first follow-up was conducted in 1982, the second took place

High School and Beyond

in 1984, and the third is currently in the field (1986). Additional waves are planned every two years through 1990.

A new and related study, The National Educational Longitudinal Study, is planned to begin in 1988. It will be based on a sample of 28 thousand 8th graders to be followed every two years for ten years. Students will be followed even if they move to different schools. Also, the sample will be freshened in 1990 by the addition of 10th graders not previously in the sample. A longitudinal study of post-secondary school students may begin in 1990, to be conducted every two years for 10 years. This survey is part of a larger program of data collection which also includes the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. (The 1972 survey was based on a national sample of seniors. Four waves of data have been collected from 1972 to 1979 and a fifth and final wave is in the field in 1986.) The questionnaires for the High School and Beyond survey were based largely on those of this earlier study so comparisons between the senior cohorts of 1972 and 1980 are possible.

CONTENT

The student questionnaires focus primarily on educational topics but also contain questions on social and demographic characteristics, personality characteristics, political and social attitudes and family environment. Educational topics include coursework, performance (including test scores), plans and aspirations for college, the influence of peers, parents, and teachers on educational goals, school-related activities, and attitudes toward school.

A number of different files are available for secondary analysis. These are described below.

School-File. The School File contains base-year school questionnaire responses that were provided by administrators in 988 public, Catholic, and other private schools. Each record has a total of 237 variables. The questionnaire focused on a number of school characteristics, including: type and organization, enrollment, faculty composition, instructional programs, course offerings, specialized programs, participation in Federal programs, faculty characteristics, funding sources, discipline problems, teacher organizations (e.g., unions), and grading systems.

High School and Beyond

Language File. The Language File contains information on each student who reported some non-English language experience either during childhood or at the time of the survey. This file contains 11,303 records (sophomores and seniors combined), with 42 variables for each student.

Parent File. The Parent File contains questionnaire responses from the parents of about 3,600 sophomores and 3,600 seniors who are on the Student File. Each record on the Parent File contains a total of 307 variables. Data on this file include parents' aspirations and plans for their children's post-secondary education.

Twin and Sibling File. The Twin and Sibling File contains responses from sampled twins and triplets; augmented data on twins and triplets of sample members; and from siblings in the sample. This file (2,718 records) includes all of the variables that are on the student file, plus two additional variables (family ID and type of twin or sibling).

Teachers' Comments File. The Sophomore Teacher File contains responses from 14,103 teachers on 18,291 students from 616 schools. The Senior Teacher File contains responses from 13,683 teachers on 17,056 students from 611 schools. At each grade level, teachers had the opportunity to answer questions about sampled students who had been in their classes. The typical student in the sample was rated by an average of four different teachers.

Friends' File. The Friends' File contains identification numbers of students in the sample who were named as friends of other sampled students. Each record contains the ID of sampled students and ID's of up to three friends. Linkages among friends can be used to investigate the sociometry of friendship structures, including reciprocity of choices among students in the sample, and for tracing friendship networks.

Sophomore File. The Sophomore File contains responses from 28,737 students in the first follow-up and 14,825 in the second follow-up. It includes base-year, first follow-up, and second follow-up data. This file includes information on school, family, work experiences, educational and occupational aspirations, personal values, and test scores of sample participants. Students are also classified as to high school status as of 1982 (i.e., dropouts, same school, transfer, or early graduate). The second follow-up includes further data

High School and Beyond

on subsequent educational, occupational, and family experiences, military experience, unemployment, income, voting and television habits, and personal values.

Senior File. The Senior File contains responses from 11,995 individuals in the first follow-up and the same number in the second follow-up. It includes base-year, first follow-up, and second follow-up data. This file includes information from respondents concerning their high school and post-secondary experiences and their employment experiences, as well as data on their personal beliefs, their reported voting behavior, and military service. It includes data on spouse and children, if any.

Transcripts File. Complete high school transcripts (9th-12th grade) were collected in 1982 for a subsample (16 thousand) of the sophomore cohort. In addition to grades and courses taken, this file contains data on absences, suspensions, and, for students who left school, when and why they left.

LIMITATIONS

The family background data provided by students (such as family income, and parent education and occupation) have been found to be subject to some error when compared with the same information as provided by the parents themselves. For nearly 90% of the sample, students are the only source of these data. Family size is also poorly measured. Furthermore, in 1980 many of the demographic variables were located near the end of the student questionnaires. Slow students who were unable to complete the questionnaires in the allotted time were thus unable to provide this basic descriptive information.

The senior base year sample, based as it was on school children, did not cover the population of school-aged children who would have been no longer attending school. To a large extent, this problem has been resolved as the sophomore cohort has been followed and reinterviewed.

Because the focus of the survey is educational attainment and the transition to work, few data are available on children as victims or offenders. Questions on parental involvement and interest in the student's educational progress and plans could be used to construct a measure of educational "neglect," but the measure would be too broad to identify neglect so serious as to be legally actionable. Through follow-ups of the sophomore cohort it is possible to identify drop-outs between the sophomore and senior years.

High School and Beyond

Truancy cannot be precisely defined, but a proxy measure would be the days of absence for non-medical reasons. Finally, measures of school disciplinary problems, including suspensions, are available. For this limited number of measures, a rich and broad array of family, school, educational, and employment data is available for analytic study.

AVAILABILITY

The documentation and data tapes for the 1980, 1982, and 1984 waves of the survey are available directly from the Center for Statistics. Subsequent waves are expected to be made available in a timely fashion as the data are collected.

Contact: Jeffrey Owings or Carl Schmitt
Center for Statistics
U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20208
202/357-6770 and 202/357-6772

High School and Beyond

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect (lack of parental supervision or interest, lack of study aids at home)

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts (sophomore cohort)

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy (absences not due to illness; tardiness)
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

High School and Beyond

- "in trouble with the law"
- school disciplinary problems; suspension

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence (type, size of place: follow-up waves)
- family structure
- family socio-economic status (parent education, occupation, income)

TITLE The Safe School Study

PURPOSE The Safe School Study was conducted in response to the request of Congress, as part of the Education Ammendments of 1974, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare determine the number and location of schools affected by crime and violence: the type and seriousness of those crimes, the costs of school crime, and how school crime can be prevented. The congressional request came as a result of increased public concern about the levels of serious crime in schools, and some evidence that those levels may have been rising.

SPONSORSHIP The study was designed and funded by The National Institute of Education, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Through administrative reorganization, this agency has now become a part of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in The Department of Education.) Data were collected by Research Triangle Institute. A smaller companion study, also in response to the Congressional mandate, was carried out by The National Center for Education Statistics.

DESIGN The study was conducted in three phases of varying breadth and depth. In Phase I, data on the extent of crime were gathered by mail from a representative sample of public schools in the United States. The sample was based on a stratified, one-stage design with schools as the sampling unit. Strata were defined by enrollment size, location, (large central cities of SMSAs; smaller central cities; other urban areas; and rural areas); and school level (primary, junior high and senior high). Two data collection instruments were used in Phase I: The Principal's Report Sheet, to record information about actual disruptive or illegal incidents; and the Principal's Questionnaire, to provide related data about the school. Data were collected over nine one-month reporting periods between February 1976 and January 1977 (excluding summer months). Completed forms were received from 4,014 schools or 72% of the sample.

In Phase II, a smaller sample of schools was used to gather more detailed crime data as well as community and school data that might explain variations in crime. In this phase 642 junior and senior high schools (76% of those sampled) participated. Location strata were again employed. Data were collected on-site by field representatives. Five instruments were used: a Principal's Report Sheet (identical to that used in Phase I); a Principal's Questionnaire (an expanded

The Safe School Study

version of the Phase I questionnaire); a Teacher's Questionnaire; a Student Questionnaire; and Student Interviews. In all, 23 thousand teachers and 31 thousand students completed questionnaires. Student interviews were conducted with a subsample of students in each school; 6,283 students were interviewed in all.

Phase III was an intensive, qualitative case study of ten schools, most of which had had serious problems with crime and violence in the past but had changed dramatically for the better in a short time. Phase III focused on the ways each school had dealt with crime.

PERIODICITY

The Safe School Study was conducted in 1976-1977. It was not a longitudinal study; no plans exist to repeat the study.

CONTENT

The study focused on specific incidents of seriously disruptive or illegal behavior occurring in schools, and the individual, school, and community factors that might explain variations in problem behavior. The content of each of the data collection instruments used in Phases I and II is as follows:

Principal Reporting Sheet. For each offense: type of offense; use of force; amount and nature of loss; extent of injury; time and place of offense; characteristics of offender and victim; and actions taken by school.

Principal's Questionnaire. Phase I collected the following: school characteristics (such as size, location, staffing); use of security measures; general experience with crime and student misbehavior; community involvement in responding to school crime; recommendations for security. The Phase II questionnaire collected more detailed data on these same topics.

Teacher Questionnaire. Data from this questionnaire concerned teacher characteristics, perceptions of school crime; victimization experiences; class characteristics, and student behavior; administrative policies and disciplinary procedures; and instructional practices.

Student Questionnaire. This questionnaire covered the following topics: student characteristics; perceptions of school crime; victimization experiences in the last month; family characteristics; own misbehavior and discipline; school performance; and aspirations.

The Safe School Study

Student Interview. The personal interview with students focused on detailed reports of specific victimization experiences falling in three broad categories: robbery, assault, and theft. Unlike the student questionnaire, the interview covered experiences over the prior two months and included incidents occurring to students traveling to or from school or attending school-sponsored activities away from school.

LIMITATIONS

The Safe School Study has a number of strengths and weaknesses from the point of view of studying children as victims and offenders. Based on a school sampling frame, it is a large national sample of school-age children. Phase II, which collects detailed data, is based on those schools -- junior and senior high schools -- in which children are of an especially susceptible age for being a victim or offender.

However, the study is now nearly ten years old. It was a one-time study so no data on trends since then are available. The study is strong in the area of children as victims, but data on children as offenders is based on the reports by victims of the characteristics of their assailants. For incidents such as theft, the victim may not know who the offender is.

The study was designed to measure crime in schools, which it does quite well. With the student interview, which covers crime occurring on the way to or from school or in school-related activities, much of children's experiences with crime, where the child is the principal victim, may be covered. Nevertheless, crimes against the child's household, in which the child shares as a victim, or crimes directly against the child but having nothing to do with school, are not covered.

Furthermore, because the study is built on a school-based sample, an important segment of high-risk children are not covered -- older children who have dropped out of school. These are more likely than others to be either victims or offenders.

By restricting reporting of events to the past month (two months in the case of student interviews), problems of forgetfulness, faulty recall, or incorrect reporting of the timing of criminal events should be minimized by this study. Nevertheless, it is possible that in this, as in other studies that have a reporting period, respondents may report incidents during the period that actually happened before the period began.

The Safe School Study

Analysts may want the flexibility to move among several possible units of analysis: The child as victim; the child as offender; and the disruptive or criminal incident. The files of this study are structured so as to make the first of these units relatively easy to use. Through the Principal Reporting Sheet, or the Student Interviews, it would not be too difficult to construct and use files with the incident as the unit of analysis. It would be difficult, if even possible, to construct an offender-based file, except for some broad questions on being suspended from school and attitudes toward school and the acceptability of various offenses.

AVAILABILITY

The data files and documentation for The Safe School Study are available through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research. Separate files are available for each data collection instrument. Write to ICPSR, PO Box 12-48, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48106. Phone: 313-764-5199.

The main report of the study was published in three volumes by the National Institute of Education under the titles Violent Schools - Safe Schools: The Safe School Study-Report to Congress, Vol. 1; The Safe School Study, Vol. 2, Methodology; The Safe School Study, Vol. 3, Data Files-Documentation. These reports may be obtained from the ICPSR or from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402.

For information about the substance of the study, contact Oliver Moles, Office of Research, OERI, U.S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Ave., NW., Washington, D.C., 20208. Telephone: 202/357-6223.

The Safe School Study

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization *

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization.

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders *

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape (assault only)
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police
- suspended, expelled from school

*Limited to incidents occurring at school, going to or from school, or at school-sponsored activities.

The Safe School Study

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence (state; region; urban/rural location)
- family structure (whether one or two parents)
- family socio-economic status (parent education)

TITLE National Family Violence Survey

PURPOSE The study, also known as Physical Violence in American Families, set out to ascertain methods of conflict resolution within the family, specifically those tactics used to resolve conflicts between spouses, between children, and between parents and children. One goal was to measure the means employed in conflict resolution via a "Conflict Tactics Scale" (Straus, 1979). This scale defines a continuum from the use of reasoning and rational discussion at one end, to violence and the use of physical force at the other.

SPONSORSHIP The study was conducted in 1975 at the University of New Hampshire by Murray A. Straus and Richard Gelles, under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Interviews were conducted by Response Analysis, Inc. of Princeton, New Jersey. It was partially replicated in 1985.

DESIGN The 1975 study was based on a multistage, stratified, national probability sample. The sequence of steps in selecting this sample were:

- 1) Selection of 103 primary areas stratified by geographic region, type of community, and other population characteristics.
- 2) Selection of 300 interviewing locations, or secondary areas within the primary sampling units.
- 3) Field counts by trained interviewers to divide interviewing locations into sample segments of 10-25 housing units.
- 4) Selection of specific sample segments in each interviewing location for field administration of the survey.
- 5) Random selection of the eligible person to be interviewed using a specific scheme assigned for each sample household.

Eligible families were those couples identifying themselves as being married or being a "couple" (man or woman living together as a conjugal unit). Only one respondent was interviewed in each household. A random procedure was used so that respondents would be approximately half female and half male. Compared with census data this sample was judged representative in terms of the major demographic attributes of American families.

National Family Violence Survey

All together, 2,143 respondents were interviewed (960 males and 1,183 females). The file consists of approximately 481 variables and 450 derived measures for each respondent.

The shorter 1985 resurvey was a national probability sample composed of 6,002 households in all, with child abuse data collected for 1,428 households including children aged 3-17 with two caretakers present.

PERIODICITY

This study was conducted in 1975, and large parts of the study were replicated in 1985.

CONTENT

Questions were asked to assess the use of reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical violence in resolution of conflicts between spouses, between children, and between parents and children, including information on the development of conflicts resulting in violence; the type and frequency of conflicts; resolution of conflicts in respondent's childhood family; family power structure and power norms; marital closeness and stability; and, personality and stress factors. The Conflict Tactics Scale, developed by Murray Straus, is composed of 19 items designed to measure intrafamily conflict by way of the means employed in resolving conflicts. Three factors are encompassed and measured by this scale: 1)reasoning - rational discussion, 2)verbal aggression - insults or threats, and 3)violence sub-scale containing eight items ranging from "pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one" to "used a knife or gun."

Demographic data were also generated: sex, age, race, occupation, education, marital status, income, residential information, and religion. Marginal totals for each code category of every variable were provided with the codebook.

LIMITATIONS

The 1975 and 1985 surveys utilize different samples, although both are national probability samples. The 1985 survey was a 35-minute telephone interview, whereas the 1975 survey lasted approximately an hour.

The surveys yield detailed data on children as victims. There are six questions on acts of verbal aggression and eight on specific acts of violence directed at children. The physical violence questions are used to compute a measure of "minor violence" (e.g., slapping) and a

National Family Violence Survey

measure of "severe violence" (e.g. kicking, punching). The Severe Violence Index is held to be an indicator of physical abuse. Although the questions used to measure use of reasoning, verbal aggressions, and physical violence are highly specific, they are based on self-reports of sensitive and personal phenomena, and may therefore be subject to under-reporting or other biases.

AVAILABILITY

Data files are available from the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research in two formats: card image and OSIRIS.

The Consortium has also published a document that briefly describes the study and presents the codebook, with marginal totals. This document is available through:

ICPSR
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family, 1980. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Anchor Press, contains a more detailed discussion of the methodology of collecting data on conflict tactics.

For more detailed information on both the 1975 and 1985 surveys, contact Dr. Murray Straus, one of the original researchers, through the Family Research Laboratory, at the University of New Hampshire:

Dr. Murray Straus
Family Research Laboratory
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824
(603) 862-1888

National Family Violence Survey

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Family Violence Survey

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE Youth Information Form (Formerly, ICARE: Information Collection and Research Evaluation)

PURPOSE The Youth Information Form is designed to enable Congress to monitor services for runaway and homeless youth. The data system focuses on measuring program effectiveness in several areas: reuniting such youth with their families; solving family problems through counseling; strengthening family relationships; encouraging stable living conditions for children; and helping youth make decisions regarding their future. Agencies receiving grants from the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (TITLE III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act) are required to submit annual reports to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who in turn makes an annual report to Congress on the status and accomplishments of runaway centers.

SPONSORSHIP This data system is designed and carried out under the direction of the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

DESIGN All programs that receive federal funding for services to homeless and runaway youth are encouraged to voluntarily complete a 4-page federally-designed form on each youth served. The director of each grant-receiving facility is sent a package of forms upon agreement to participate (about 80% used these forms). Otherwise, they could meet the reporting requirements of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) via an instrument of own their design, if it meets the reporting criteria of ACYF. One form is completed for each youth served. These forms are mailed in monthly by the participating agencies. ACYF then compiles the data on these forms and issues quarterly and annual summary reports that are made available to the reporting agencies.

PERIODICITY The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was passed in 1974. Data on services to homeless and runaway youth have been collected continually since then, at first through an Information Service Summary form, then by ICARE, and most recently by the Youth Information Form. Reporting requirements are expected to continue for the duration of federal grants to programs serving runaway and homeless youth.

CONTENT The questionnaire for each youth covers school status, age, the child's family living situation, whether the

Youth Information Form

the child's parent(s) is employed and whether they receive public assistance, runaway and homeless status and history of the child, and referral source (often the National Runaway Switchboard, also a grant recipient). Those factors, primary and secondary, that led to the youth's running away or being homeless are recorded on the form. Finally, a summary of services provided for the child, together with the type of placement selected or other disposition of the case is recorded.

The Youth Information Form differs from the ICARE form in that it drops response categories on questions that yielded very low numbers of responses; Also, "other" and "not applicable" responses were dropped to reduce the frequency with which these categories were used.

LIMITATIONS

The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that there are over 1,000,000 runaway youth in the nation between the ages of 10 and 17. Only those children receiving services on more than a one-time, drop-in basis, or getting temporary shelter, or otherwise receiving services on an intensive basis from one of the approximately 300 governmentally funded shelters will appear in the data. There were 60,500 youth being provided such shelter services in 1984. Not included are those children receiving one-time help, drop-in services, or help over the telephone, although their inclusion is being considered for future surveys. The survey is not completed for an individual until he or she leaves the shelter or the specific crisis is otherwise resolved. Since the length of time in a shelter may vary, this data system is not well suited to measuring the incidence of new cases of homelessness or running away.

The data are further limited by the voluntary use of the questionnaire by funded shelters, although the provision of quarterly reports would appear to be an attractive inducement for completion of the instrument. There would not be a state of origin for those children using a facility outside their home state. Runaways not using a shelter or its services will not be counted. Likewise, those using more than one shelter will be counted twice.

AVAILABILITY

Data are available about a year after completion of the forms by the participating agencies. ACYF is also printing their own reports and analyses. Contact Don Swicord, Program Operations Division, Administration on

Youth Information Form

Children, Youth, and Families, 400 Sixth Street, S.W.,
Washington, D. C. 20013, phone (202) 755-7750. Or
write to: The YIF Coordinator, Management Information
Systems Branch, Management Support Division, ACYF, Post
Office Box 1182, Washington, D. C. 20013. Telephone:
(202)755-7750.

Youth Information Form

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual prostitution
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Youth Information Form

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE The National Survey of Children

PURPOSE The National Survey was designed to be a broad assessment of the physical, social, and psychological characteristics of U.S. children, and of the family and neighborhood circumstances in which they were growing up. A follow-up assessment, conducted 5 years after the first survey, continued these goals and also focused on the effects of marital disruption on children.

SPONSORSHIP The study was supported by the Foundation for Child Development and (for the second wave only) the National Institute of Mental Health. Data were collected in both waves by Temple University's Institute for Survey Research. The first wave was designed and directed by Nicholas Zill, who was then at the Foundation, and the second by Nicholas Zill and James L. Peterson of Child Trends, Inc., and by Frank Furstenberg of the University of Pennsylvania.

DESIGN The first wave of the survey was based on a multi-stage stratified probability sample of 7-11 year old children in the U.S. in 1976. Up to two children per household were eligible to be in the survey. In all, data were gathered on 2,301 children from 1,747 households. Black households were oversampled to produce approximately 500 black participants. The data were weighted to correct for this oversampling and other minor differences between sample and census estimates by age, sex, and place of residence. Data were collected by personal interviews with the children themselves, the parent most knowledgeable about the child (usually the mother) and by self-administered questionnaires completed by the children's teachers. Teacher-provided data were obtained for 1,682 children.

The second wave, carried out in 1981 followed a subsample of the children: all those from disrupted or high conflict families as of 1976, and a subsample of the rest. At that time the children were 12-16 years old. Data were gathered from 1,423 children. Again, data were collected through interviews (by telephone this time) with the children and a parent and through self-administered questionnaires sent to teachers. Weights were developed to correct for differential subsampling rates and differential completion rates.

PERIODICITY The first wave was conducted in 1976-77; the second in 1981. Funding has been obtained from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for a

National Survey of Children

third wave of the survey, to be conducted in 1987, when the young people will be 18-22 years of age.

CONTENT

The surveys cover a wide range of child and family characteristics. Broadly, these include physical health, social development, educational performance and participation, use of special school resources, psychological health and functioning, parent-child relationships, attitudes and self-esteem, behavior problems, family size and composition, family income and education, marital and residential histories, and plans and aspirations. The second wave covered much the same material as the first, with an added emphasis on circumstances surrounding and effects of marital disruption.

The first wave of the survey included questions to the 7-11 year olds about their victimization experiences in the neighborhood and their fears about attacks on the street and break-ins at home. Parents were asked whether they perceived crime to be a problem in their neighborhoods. More limited sets of questions about victimization and fears were asked of the 12-17 year olds in the second wave of the survey.

Data on children as offenders in the first wave of the survey included: questions to the children about their own misbehavior (fighting at school, lying to parents, etc.); questions to parents about bullying, lying, stealing, destructiveness, running away from home, and discipline problems at school; and questions to teachers about cheating, fighting, displays of temper in class, and need for disciplinary action.

Data on offending in the second wave included: a more extensive set of questions to the teens about their own misconduct and contact with the police; questions to parents about antisocial behavior and school discipline problems; and questions to teachers similar to those used in the first wave.

LIMITATIONS

The relatively modest size of the survey sample limits the analytical uses of the data, especially in regard to the number of young people showing extreme forms of antisocial and delinquent behavior. Despite this limitation, the survey is a rich source of information on children's fears and self-reported victimization experiences, and on young people's misconduct as reported by themselves, their parents, and their

National Survey of Children

teachers. Moreover, crime-related characteristics can be linked to an extensive set of family and neighborhood descriptors.

AVAILABILITY Public use data tapes from both the 1976 and 1981 surveys are available from:

Child Trends, Inc.
2100 M Street, NW, #411
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 223-6288

National Survey of Children

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Fear of Crime

- attack on street
- break-in of home

Children-at Risk

- runaways
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropout

National Survey of Children

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE Decennial Census of Population and Housing

PURPOSE The census is designed to be a complete enumeration of the population and the housing stock of the U.S., and to provide additional demographic, social, and economic data pertaining to the population. The data are used to apportion seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as in State and local legislative districts. They also are used in the allocation of revenue-sharing and of other Federal and State funds among some 39,000 governmental units; and in marketing studies; academic research; Federal, State, and local planning; affirmative action programs; and many other activities.

SPONSORSHIP The census is designed, conducted, and funded by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.

DESIGN The most recent census (1980) employed two types of questionnaires: (1) the short form with a limited number of basic population and housing questions (100-percent questions; that is, questions asked of everyone), and (2) the long form containing the 100-percent questions plus additional questions on population and housing. The short form contains 19 questions. The long form contains all of the questions found on the short form, as well as 20 additional questions about the housing unit and a maximum of 26 additional questions for each household member. The questionnaires were designed to be understood and completed without enumerator assistance, to accommodate up to seven respondents, and to be suitable for computer processing.

The percentage of households receiving the long form depended upon the size of the locality. The sampling arrangement was as follows:

- o 50-percent sample (one-in-two) -- in governmental jurisdictions which were eligible for Federal revenue sharing funds (such as counties, some townships, and places) and had fewer than 2,500 people as estimated by the Census Bureau for July 1, 1977, one out of every two households received the long form. The 50-percent sampling rate was used in areas including approximately one-tenth of the Nation's population.
- o 17-percent (one-in-six) sample -- in the remainder of the country, one out of every six households received the long form.

Decennial Census of Population and Housing

The 50-percent sampling rate for small jurisdictions was adopted to ensure that accurate income data can be prepared for use in the allocation formula for general revenue sharing funds. In larger jurisdictions, the smaller sample size is adequate for the preparation of accurate data.

PERIODICITY

As mandated by the U.S. Constitution, a census has been conducted for every decade since 1790. No two censuses have been conducted exactly alike, and the decade-to-decade changes in the census content reflect the attendant changes in our society, economy, and technology. Planning for the 1990 Census is well underway and pretesting of questions is taking place. However, the content of the next census has not been completely determined as yet.

CONTENT

The 100-percent population questions include: name, household relationship; sex; race; age; marital status; and Spanish origin. The sample questions pertain to: education; place of birth; citizenship and year of immigration; current language and ability to speak English; ancestry; residence 5 years ago; activity 5 years ago; veteran status and period of service; disability; children ever born; marital history; employment status; place of work and journey to work; year last worked; industry, occupation, and class of worker; work experience; and income by type.

The 100-percent housing questions pertain to: number of living quarters at address; access to unit; completeness of plumbing facilities; number of rooms; tenure; condominiums; acreage and commercial establishment status; value; contract rent; and vacancy status. The sample questions pertain to: units in structure; stories in structure and presence of elevator; farm status; source of water and sewage disposal; year structure built; year householder moved into unit; heating equipment; fuels used for house heating, water heating, and cooking; cost of utilities and fuels; completeness of kitchen facilities; bedrooms; bathrooms; telephone; air conditioning; automobiles, vans, and light trucks; and selected shelter costs for homeowners.

LIMITATIONS

The decennial census provides no information on children's experiences as victims or offenders. Its primary use in the production of statistics on these

Decennial Census of Population and Housing

topics is to provide the denominators for measures of victimization or offending that are expressed as rates or other ratios. For this purpose the census has the advantage of providing reliable counts of youth and of their social, economic, and demographic characteristics for relatively small geographic areas, even down to the census tract level. Such data are of use in constructing ratios for any appropriate aggregation of areas from the census tract or above, or for any population subgroups of interest for which numerator data are available.

The main disadvantage of the decennial census is that it is decennial. Counts are soon outdated. Although national estimates of population are made by updating census figures based on vital statistics and immigration data, estimates for smaller areas are harder to produce and less accurate, due to internal migration. Moreover, the publication of census data, especially local area data, is not as timely as would be desirable.

Two issues that are not substantive also should be noted. First, public-use micro-data samples are presently organized in terms of the household and the householder. New studies of children could be conducted more easily if a computer tape organized in terms of children were also available. Second, the census is conducted only once every ten years. A more closely spaced cycle, for example a five-year cycle, would considerably enhance the value of the census for current research and policy analysis.

AVAILABILITY

Six major types of 1980 census data products are prepared by the Census Bureau (Customer Services Branch, Data User Services Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233).

Printed reports and other printed products -- The Bureau produces many reports, often separately bound for each State or Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

Microfiche -- Microfiche records are used to disseminate certain reports not available in printed form. Data from selected computer summary tapes are also available on microfiche.

Summary data on computer tapes -- The Bureau provides statistical information on computer tape, similar to data found in reports, but often more detailed and sometimes for types of areas not covered in the reports.

Decennial Census of Population and Housing

Microdata on tape -- Public-use microdata samples provide the responses from a sample of long-form questionnaires (with names, addresses, and detailed geography deleted to protect confidentiality) which can be tabulated by users to meet their particular statistical needs.

Maps -- In addition to maps which mainly show census functional boundaries, the Bureau produces maps that display data -- income for example -- by geographic area.

Special tabulations -- Statistical information is also specially prepared by the Bureau at the request and expense of the user. The data are furnished on computer tape, printouts, or microfiche.

Contact: For data products, contact The Data User Services Division. Telephone: (301)763-4100

For information about content, contact Adolfo Paez, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 20233. Telephone: 202/763-5987.

Decennial Census of Population and Housing

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Decennial Census of Population and Housing

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE Uniform Crime Reports

PURPOSE The Uniform Crime Reporting Program provides annual assessments of crime in the United States as measured by offenses coming to the attention of the law enforcement community. Its objectives are to produce a reliable set of criminal statistics for use in law enforcement administration, operation, and management, and to provide the general public with a statistical picture of criminal activity in the United States.

SPONSORSHIP The Federal Bureau of Investigation collates and publishes data provided on a voluntary basis by state and local authorities. Common definitions of terms and standards for reporting are set by the Bureau with the advice of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Sheriffs' Association.

DESIGN The FBI receives information either directly from local law enforcement agencies or through state-level Uniform Crime Reporting Programs to which local agencies report. State-level programs are now in effect in 41 states. During 1984 the jurisdictions of law enforcement agencies active in the program encompassed approximately 227 million persons in the United States, or 96 percent of the total population. Information is compiled at the local level according to guidelines and definitions established by the FBI. Two levels of offenses are defined by the Bureau. Part I, or Index offenses are the violent crimes of murder and non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault, and the property crimes of burglary, larceny theft, and motor vehicle theft. Since 1979, arson has also been included in Index crimes. Part II offenses are all other crimes and are divided into 21 categories. The FBI collects data on all reports of Part I crimes, and on all Part II crimes for which an arrest was made. When reports of crime are found through investigation to be false, they are not included in the counts.

The capabilities of law enforcement agencies to supply crime information have expanded greatly and data from the program are being used for more diversified purposes. Because of these developments, a comprehensive evaluation of the program has just been completed. The evaluation has led to several recommendations for expanding and improving the system. The proposed new program makes two fundamental changes. First, state or local agencies will submit individual-level records (rather than aggregate counts) for each incident and arrest. Second, two levels of reporting will be used.

Uniform Crime Reports

The first level will include information similar in scope and content to the current system. The second level -- to be used by all large agencies and a nationally representative sample of smaller agencies -- will report in much greater detail. In particular, offense data will be collected for all offenses -- not just Index offenses. Detailed data about each incident will include such information as victim type, victim characteristics, victim-offender relationship, use of force, type of weapon used, nature and extent of injury, time and place of the incident, and resident status of the victim. Moreover, the Part II (non-Index) offense classification system will be revised, yielding a more useful and detailed taxonomy. These recommendations have all been accepted by the FBI and will be phased in over the next several years as quickly as the cooperation of the state and local agencies can be obtained.

PERIODICITY The reporting program began in 1930. Data are now collected monthly and reported annually. The most recent report covers calendar year 1984.

CONTENT The reporting unit for the Uniform Crime reporting Program is a crime, not a victim or offender. It should be noted that one crime may involve multiple offenders and victims, and that the arrest of one offender may clear several crimes. Part I (Index) crimes are reported whether an arrest is made or not. Additional information reported includes detailed type of crime (within the major reporting category), type of weapons used, amount of property loss, urban/rural location, city, county and state in which the crime occurred, characteristics of victims of murders, and characteristics of persons arrested where an arrest was made.

LIMITATIONS Since the Uniform Crime reporting Program is oriented around reports on criminal incidents rather than victims or offenders, data about the persons involved are limited. With regard to victims, information is currently available only for murder victims. Even here, only a few individual demographic characteristics are reported (age, sex, race, ethnic origin). However, victim data from Level II reporting agencies will be greatly expanded under the proposed revisions of the Uniform Crime Reports. Moreover, under the proposed revisions all offenses for each victim involved in a

Uniform Crime Reports

criminal incident will be reported. (Currently only the most serious offense is recorded.) This practice together with individual-level reporting of data, will allow greater flexibility and accuracy in the tabulating of characteristics of victims and offenders. For example, any of the following could be used as the unit of analysis: the victim, the offender, the offense, or the incident.

Data on offenders are currently available only in cases where an arrest is made or the offense is officially attributed to a suspect in some other way. In such cases the same individual characteristics (age, sex, race, ethnic origin, etc.) are available by type of offense. These data provide estimates of juvenile arrest rates and the kinds of offenses in which juveniles become involved. Under the proposed revisions, offender data will be available for all offenses from reports from Level II agencies. Furthermore, this information will include data on the relationship between the victim and the offender. However, such data will be subject to the limitation of being based on victim reports unless an arrest is made. Victims' estimates of age and, to a lesser extent, origin are likely to be subject to error.

An arrest is counted on each separate occasion a person is taken into custody, notified, or cited. These annual arrest figures do not measure the number of individuals arrested since one person may be arrested several times during the year for separate crimes. Consequently the data provide no precise information on the number of offenders or the prevalence of multiple offenders or their characteristics. However, this problem will be mitigated under the revised program.

AVAILABILITY

The data are published annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in a volume entitled Crime in the United States. The most recent volume, covering 1985, was released in July, 1986. Furthermore, public use tapes are available at moderate cost from the FBI. Tapes can be created, upon request, to meet the needs of specific users. Currently these tapes do not include individual-level data. But it can be anticipated that

Uniform Crime Reports

such micro-data tapes will be available once the revisions in the program are in place. For further information, contact:

Paul Zolbe, Chief
Uniform Crime Reports Section
Federal Bureau of Investigation
9th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20535
202/324-2820.

Uniform Crime Reports

TOPICS COVERED *

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders (if an arrestee under current system; if an offender observed by victim, in addition, under revised system)

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses (curfew, loitering violations; running away)
- drug abuse (when violations of law)
- alcohol abuse (drunkenness, driving while intoxicated, liquor law violations)
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery

Uniform Crime Reports

- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

*The items checked are gathered for victims of murders and for offenders arrested for crimes. These same data are gathered for victims and offenders of any age. Data about the victim's or offender's family are not collected.

*Topics marked by "x" are available under the current program. Those marked by "R" will be available under the revised system.

TITLE Vital Statistics of the United States -- Mortality

PURPOSE The primary purpose of the vital registration system is to provide legal proof of the relevant events. The system also provides statistical information on births and deaths in the United States needed by federal, state, and local government agencies, particularly health departments, to plan and evaluate their programs. Vital statistics are frequently used in public health research and administration to analyze rates of population growth and changes in population composition, to measure various social problems, and to assess the need for specific services.

SPONSORSHIP The Public Health Service issues recommended standard certificates of death and fetal death. The states collect much or all of the recommended information on their own forms. The National Center for Health Statistics compiles, analyzes, and publishes the mortality data from all states and territories of the U.S.

DESIGN Mortality statistics are based on information obtained directly from copies of original death certificates received from the state registration offices, and from data provided to NCHS through the Vital Statistics Cooperative Program. In 1983, 44 states participated in this program. For these states, part or all of the mortality data were coded from the original certificates and provided on computer tape to NCHS. For those states that did not participate in the program, NCHS coded information from copies of the original death certificates.

All deaths, including fetal deaths past (typically) 20 weeks gestation, are to be reported. Up-to-date quantitative data on the completeness with which deaths are registered are not available, but it is believed that death registration in the U.S. is at least 99 percent complete. However, overall reporting completeness is not as good for fetal deaths as for deaths.

Provisional data include non-residents. Final data generally do not. Since 1933, the entire U.S. has been included in the death registration area. Death statistics for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are reported separately.

Vital Statistics of the United States -- Mortality

PERIODICITY Mortality statistics were first published by the federal government in 1850 based on Census data. Vital data on mortality were first collected in 1880 for two states and several cities. The death registration area expanded steadily and has included all states since 1933. Data are collected continually. Annual and monthly summaries are now produced.

CONTENT Data are collected on various demographic characteristics and cause of death. For the purpose of national mortality statistics, every death is attributed to one underlying condition, based on information reported on the death certificate and using the international rules for selecting the underlying cause of death from the reported conditions. Since data year 1979, the International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision is used for coding. Earlier data used the then-current revision of the International Classification of Diseases.

Vital Statistics of the United States contains a section on general mortality, infant mortality, fetal deaths, perinatal mortality, accidents, life tables, geographic detail (including deaths from 72 selected causes, tabulated by 10-year age groups, race, and sex, for each state), deaths in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam, and a technical appendix.

LIMITATIONS The family information collected (marital status, spouse's name) is generally inapplicable to children, other than parents' names for deceased children. States and localities vary in how completely and accurately information is recorded, particularly with regard to cause of death. Use of successive revisions for classification of diseases may introduce discontinuities in the comparability of cause-of-death statistics over time. Deaths originally classified as accidental that are later found to be homicides or suicides are not reclassified in the mortality statistics system. All identifiers are removed from the death certificate before the data are processed. Although the cause-of-death classification includes categories for accidental poisonings by drugs or alcohol, as well as drug dependence and alcohol dependence syndromes, and alcoholic and drug psychoses, these categories probably do not cover all drug-related or alcohol-related deaths.

Deaths to U.S. residents that occur outside the United States (including war deaths) are excluded.

Vital Statistics of the United States -- Mortality

AVAILABILITY Provisional death rates by cause, age, race, and sex are estimated from the Current Mortality Sample. The Current Mortality Sample is a 10-percent systematic sample of death certificates received each month in the vital statistics offices in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the independent registration area of New York City. All death certificates received during the 1-month period are sampled regardless of the month or year in which the death occurred.

Final data are published in Vital Statistics of the United States, Volume II: Mortality, and are available in Federal Depository Libraries. The National Center for Health Statistics will respond to requests for unpublished data whenever possible. Requests should be sent to the Statistical Resources Branch at the address below.

Data tapes may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161; 703/487-4780. For information on tape specifications, price, and stock numbers, contact Kathy Santini of the Scientific and Technical Information Branch, National Center for Health Statistics, 3700 East-West Highway, Hyattsville, Maryland 20782; 301/436-8500.

For specific mortality data, contact: Richard Klein, Statistical Resources Branch, National Center for Health Statistics, (address as above), 301/436-8979.

For information about the mortality registration system, contact: the Mortality Statistics Branch, National Center for Health Statistics (address as above), 301/436-8884.

Vital Statistics of the United States - Mortality

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use (drug-related deaths)
- alcohol use (alcohol-related deaths)
- school dropouts

- motor vehicle deaths

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Vital Statistics of the United States - Mortality

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE National Juvenile Justice Archive

PURPOSE The National Juvenile Justice Archive is designed to make available to policy makers and researchers juvenile court data that are routinely collected by juvenile courts throughout the country. The data are intended to describe both the volume and characteristics of juvenile cases disposed by courts in the states and their constituent counties. The data are useful for three kinds of research: descriptive analyses of the trends in the characteristics of the juvenile court system at the local, state, and national level; basic research on the causes and consequences of the characteristics of the juvenile court system; and applied research that aims to investigate the effects of different court systems or of specific legislation and practice. Monitoring progress under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 is included in the kinds of applied research for which the archive data can be used; however, thorough and effective monitoring must rely on other data sources as well.

SPONSORSHIP Working under the provisions of a grant awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) in 1975, and subsequent grants of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) has been responsible for collecting and disseminating all available juvenile court statistical information. The Archive is an expansion of the earlier National Juvenile Court Statistical Reporting System, operated for many years by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

DESIGN The National Center for Juvenile Justice seeks to obtain data from all state and county agencies in the U.S. that are responsible for the collection and dissemination of information on the processing of youth through the juvenile justice system. Information sent in by cooperating agencies ranges from annual reports to copies of computerized case records from courts with automated information systems. While the Center seeks to elicit the cooperation of as many agencies as possible, it has not built the archive on a probability sample of state and county courts.

Most of the data in the archive falls into one of two categories: automated case-level data and nonautomated court-level statistics. Case-level data from automated systems describe in varying detail the characteristics of each individual case handled by the court. The nonautomated court-level statistics, which are

National Juvenile Justice Archive

abstracted from annual reports or are received on data collection forms supplied to agencies, provide information only on the volume of cases handled and some aggregate characteristics.

Each contributed data set is documented and archived in the form in which it was received. It is then studied to determine its characteristics and its consistency with previously supplied data from the same source. Those data sets meeting certain criteria are then transformed to a standard format to permit aggregation and analysis across jurisdictions. These criteria are: the unit of analysis must be disposed cases (that is, court cases in which a definite action has been taken or a treatment plan has been decided upon or begun); and the cases must represent the complete reporting of delinquency and status offense cases handled by the juvenile justice system in the calendar year. To illustrate the level of coverage: in 1982, 2,188 of a possible total of 3,097 counties nationally provided data on delinquency cases. However, due to inconsistencies in reporting, data from only 1,401 counties were used to generate national estimates of petitioned cases, and from only 1,219 counties to produce estimates of nonpetitioned cases. All together, in 1982, jurisdictions containing 38 percent of the nation's juvenile population provide case-level data meeting the criteria, and those containing 53 percent provide consistent court-level statistics. By 1985, case-level coverage had increased to 60 percent of the juvenile population.

Transformed data at the case-level are used to produce an annual report, Delinquency in the United States; court-level data contribute to another series, Juvenile Court Statistics.

Because the contributing agencies do not constitute a probability sample, the Center uses a special estimating procedure to develop national statistics on the volume and rates of cases. This procedure involves clustering counties by the size of their youthful populations, and then adjusting for differential response rates among counties in these clusters, of which there are 10. The use of the size of the youthful population for clustering is based on evidence that this variable is an important determinant of the characteristics of the juvenile justice systems at the county level.

PERIODICITY

The archive is an expansion of a reporting system for juvenile court data that was inaugurated in 1926 by the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of

National Juvenile Justice Archive

Labor. The series of reports, Juvenile Court Statistics, which is the product of this original system, is produced annually and is the oldest continuous source of information on juvenile courts' processing of delinquent and dependent youth. When the National Center for Juvenile Justice took over the operation of the reporting system in 1975, it was with the understanding that the Juvenile Court Statistics series would continue, at least for some time. Since that time, however, the system has been expanded to include the automated case-level statistics, a far richer source of data on the juvenile justice system (though one with less complete coverage of jurisdictions). This more complete data reporting system has led to a new annual series, Delinquency in the United States. The most recent edition of each series is for calendar year 1982. The delinquency reports for 1983 and 1984 are in draft form at the Center, and statistical tables from them can be made available to researchers by Center staff.

CONTENT

Juvenile Court Statistics. This series contains the tabulations of children's cases disposed in those courts having jurisdiction over juvenile matters, delinquency status, and dependency/neglect. Data are reported and tables presented by sex, age and region (state and county). Thus, this summary information captures the demographic characteristics of these juveniles as well as case outcomes.

Delinquency in the United States. This series reports on cases of delinquency and status offenses handled by the juvenile justice system in a given year. These reports provide greater detail and elaboration than the summary statistics found in Juvenile Court Statistics. Data are reported on the age at referral, sex, race, and recidivism status of the juvenile involved in the delinquency case, and on the source of referral, the specific reason for referral, the FBI offense code, whether secure detention was used, whether a petition was filed, the adjudication status of the case, and the use of out-of-home placement or secure confinement. The reason for referral denotes the specific type of criminal or status offense for which the youth is being processed.

Within the National Juvenile Justice Archive, there exist useful data on dependency and neglect. Comparisons could be made between abuse cases, neglect cases, and status offense cases regarding certain quantitative/qualitative differences in the manner in which these types of cases were disposed.

National Juvenile Justice Archive

LIMITATIONS

The age of children covered by the juvenile court system varies from state to state. The archives staff has translated each available county's data set to a common format.

The major unit of analysis, the case, is somewhat variable and can lead to inappropriate interpretations. The case is defined as a referral disposed by the court. Within a single referral, a child can be charged with a number of offenses. Also, one child can be involved in a number of cases within a calendar year. As a result, data are not interpretable as: 1) number of children processed; or 2) number of offenses charged. Many delinquent or dependent children never come to the courts' attention or if they do, they are diverted outside of the juvenile court system.

The automated data system must rely on counties willing and able to provide these data. States that do offer acceptable data provide almost total state coverage. However, national estimates are subject to problems that may exist due to dissimilarities between counties that report and those that do not. Income and surveillance differences are not taken into account, nor are differences in state laws regarding appropriate dependency/neglect case disposition. While the archives staff have provided national estimates based on reporting counties, these estimates cannot fully overcome problems of jurisdictional differences in both laws and reporting abilities.

AVAILABILITY

NCJJ maintains the National Juvenile Justice Archive, which collects, stores, analyzes upon request, and makes accessible all available summary and automated case-level data collected by the nation's juvenile courts. Summary data files are provided to the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan for general dissemination. The automated data file is available to use with permission of the jurisdictions involved from the National Juvenile Justice Archive.

The U.S. Department of Justice, through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, publishes the annual report entitled, Juvenile Court Statistics 19 - . This report is also available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research at:

National Juvenile Justice Archive

ICPSR
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

The principal investigator, Howard Snyder, can be
contacted at:

National Center for Juvenile Justice
701 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
412/227-6950

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect.

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Juvenile Justice Archive

Disposition

Y — arrests
Y — in detention
Y — in jails/prisons
Y — on probation
Y — receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

Y X age
Y X sex
Y — race/origin
Y X geographic residence
 — family structure
 — family socio-economic status

Y = included in Automated Case-level File

TITLE Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process (CODAP)

PURPOSE This report provides statistical information on clients admitted to, and discharged from, governmentally funded drug abuse treatment programs (clinics) in the U.S. and outlying areas.

SPONSORSHIP The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), under the aegis of the Department of Health and Human Services, has overseen CODAP since 1973.

DESIGN CODAP was originally a required reporting process for all drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation units receiving federal funds for the provision of those services. CODAP admission and discharge forms were completed for each client admitted to and discharged from these clinics, regardless of source of funding for any one client. In addition, a third form, the CODAP client flow summary form, was completed each month by every clinic funded. This form provided a summary of monthly admission and discharge activity. Data gleaned from these forms were aggregated over all reporting units. Since 1981, submission of data has been voluntary. Data received by NIDA from participating states are collated and converted to a common format where necessary.

PERIODICITY Data are collected monthly and compiled on an annual basis. The CODAP program had full, 50-state participation and reporting up until 1981. With the implementation of block grants, many states dropped CODAP, rendering the last 4 reporting years incomplete, relative to the earlier annual reports. For example, the 1983 report contained reports from only 24 volunteering states. As states develop their own data systems, they have discontinued CODAP reporting. Currently, 15 states still report. CODAP could well be defunct in a few years.

CONTENT Data are compiled on drug users classified by primary drug type (usage), secondary and tertiary drugs of abuse at admission, source of referral, arrests within 24 months prior to admission, reason for discharge, type of health insurance, frequency of use of primary drug, route of drug administration, number of prior treatment experiences, years between first use and admission, modality/environment at admission/discharge, skill development status at admission/discharge, and weeks in treatment. Admitted clients are described using a

Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process (CODAP)

variety of demographic variables: sex, age at admission, age at first use, employment status, marital status, highest grade level completed, and race/ethnicity. Data were aggregated at the national, state, and SMSA levels. Currently, aggregation is restricted to national and state levels.

LIMITATIONS

Data are limited to drug users admitted to those clinics receiving federal funding support and reported via CODAP. The number of clients on which related tables are based varies from table to table due to varying criteria of exclusion, such as incomplete or invalid information on CODAP forms, multiple admissions to CODAP clinics, or missing admission forms for discharged clients. Multiple counting is reduced but not eliminated by excluding transfer admissions between CODAP clinics. The unit of analysis is the "client", which is not wholly synonymous with the "individual", and could lead to possible misinterpretations or misuses of the data. Also, the CODAP process fails to identify those clients in treatment all year, not subject to admission or discharge.

AVAILABILITY

Currently, these data are published annually by NIDA, through DHHS, in a report entitled Annual Data 198 . Data From the Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process. The old reports are identified by series numbers such as Series D of the NIDA Statistical Series, providing CODAP quarterly reports, while Series E presented the annual reports and trend reports, analyzing several years of data. There are no public use data tapes available, and many of the old CODAP reports, through 1981, are out of print.

For more information contact:

Lorraine Ferguson, Program Analyst
Division of Epidemiology and Statistical Analysis
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 11A-55
Rockville, Maryland 20857
301/443-6637.

Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process (CODAP)

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Client Oriented Data Acquisition Process (CODAP)

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status
- education
- marital status

TITLE Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN)

PURPOSE This data network is designed to give health care providers in federal, state, and local governmental agencies up-to-date information concerning those drugs whose abuse threatens public health. This system is designed as an early warning indicator of the severity, scope, and nature of the nation's drug abuse problem. "Drug abuse" is defined as the nonmedical use of a substance for psychic effect, dependence, or for a suicide attempt or gesture.

SPONSORSHIP The DAWN project, implemented in 1972, is managed by the Department of Health and Human Services, through the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). The Department of Justice, through its Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the Food and Drug Administration, are also participating agencies. NIDA collects, collates, and reports on this data.

DESIGN Data are collected weekly from two basic sources:

- 1) A sample of emergency rooms that are open 24 hours per day with at least 1,000 visits per year and located in non-federal, short-term general hospitals in the continental United States.
- 2) A sample of medical examiners/coroners in the continental United States.

An episode report is submitted for each drug abuse patient that visits a DAWN emergency room and each drug abuse death encountered by a DAWN medical examiner. Each report includes demographic information about the patient or deceased person and information about the circumstances of drug abuse episodes. These data are collected from a non-random sample of emergency rooms and medical facilities in 27 metropolitan areas that cover approximately 1/3 of the U.S. population. In addition, DAWN includes a national panel of emergency rooms sampled from locations outside the 27 areas. Reports from sampled emergency rooms do not represent 100% of all possible drug episodes due to their exclusion of episodes involving children under the age of six.

Within each facility, a designated DAWN reporter is responsible for the reporting of the data. Usually, a member of the emergency room or medical records staff identifies and records drug-related episodes on DAWN forms, which are submitted to NIDA weekly.

PERIODICITY Data are collected weekly and are compiled and reported semi-annually and annually. Also, periodic reabstracting studies of the records of participating facilities are performed to ensure accurate and methodologically consistent data.

CONTENT Data are gathered on the users' sex, race, and age; on the concomitant use of multiple drugs; drug-use motive; the reason for emergency room contact (or cause of death); the disposition of the emergency room patient; the source of the drug (emergency room reports only); the form in which the drug was acquired or found; the route of drug administration; and the location of the facility within the metropolitan area (emergency room reports only). A delineation is made between central cities and surrounding areas.

LIMITATIONS These data are from a non-random sample relying on self-reporting by the emergency room patient and subsequent identification as a viable "episode" by official medical personnel. Methods of reporting vary from facility to facility, and particularly among medical examiners. Some examiners include cases involving circumstantial evidence, while others will await confirmed toxicological analyses before issuing a DAWN report.

Since there are multiple drug mentions, not every reported substance is, by itself, necessarily a cause of the medical emergency and is not considered an abused drug. Substances which contributed to an abuse episode may occasionally go unreported or undetected. The number of episodes does not equal the number of individuals -- there are no personal identifiers. Other limitations include the following: medical examiner data for homicide-related drug abuse deaths are not included; reports do not pick up drug use or drug use changes not related to medical emergencies; reporting delays, especially with the medical examiners data, render the semi-annual reports provisional, at best; episodes involving children under six are excluded.

AVAILABILITY The data are published via the NIDA Statistical Series, specifically series G, H, and I. The DAWN semi-annual reports comprise Series G. Statistics are presented on drugs associated with drug abuse episodes reported by

Drug Abuse Warning Network (DAWN)

emergency rooms and medical examiners affiliated with DAWN. Data are aggregated at the metropolitan area level. Series H reports focus on acute drug abuse episodes and trends. Series I is composed of DAWN annual reports, which are general reports on individuals, circumstances, and substances. Data are aggregated on both the metropolitan area and national levels. There are no public use tapes available.

For more information, or to obtain copies of these reports, contact:

Lorraine Ferguson, Program Analyst
Division of Epidemiology and Statistical Analysis
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 11A-55
Rockville, Maryland 20857
301/443-6637

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE

National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth

PURPOSE

The goal of this 1976 survey was to provide a comprehensive statistical survey to define the major characteristics of the runaway youth population. More specifically, the aims were to:

-- measure the incidence and prevalence of running away among youth living in households;

-- obtain preliminary descriptive information about the households of runaways, the number of runaway youth, and the number of runaway events; and

-- identify households in which runaway incidents occurred in the past year for the purpose of conducting in-depth interviews with the runaway youth and a parent in each household.

SPONSORSHIP

The "Runaway Youth Act," Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, Public Law 93-415, mandates the carrying out of a comprehensive statistical survey to define major characteristics of the runaway youth population to better determine those areas that are most affected in the nation. Responsibility for this survey was assigned to the Office of Youth development within what was then the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, New Jersey was awarded the contract to execute this survey.

DESIGN

Interviews were conducted by telephone during January and February, 1976, with a nationwide probability sample of 13,942 households containing youth aged 10-17. Respondents were male or female household heads. Due to the necessity to screen more than 60,000 households to locate sufficient numbers of runaways for subsequent study, no method other than the use of the telephone was considered feasible. Telephone numbers were selected randomly from telephone directories using skip intervals. This sample was used in Part I of the final report. A runaway was defined as a youth between 10-17 years old who had been absent from home without parental permission for at least overnight.

Part II of the report dealt with a description of runaway youths and their families, schools, and community environments. The report included a detailed description of what it was like to run away, and an assessment of services to runaway youth and their families. Interviews were conducted in person with 224

youths who had left home in 1975; 224 parents of those youth; 202 comparison youths; and 411 youths still away from home (nonreturners). The 224 youths and their parents, as well as the comparison youth, were derived from another probability sample. The 411 youth still absent from home were obtained through purposive sampling to provide breadth of coverage by geographic region and city size.

Part III of the report was primarily designed to develop a classification system for runaway youth to be used to improve the delivery of services to these youth. Using the existing data from parts I and II of the report, regression analyses, analysis of variance, and discriminant analyses were employed to develop this classificatory scheme.

PERIODICITY

This national data base was compiled only for those runaway events actually occurring in 1975, and has not been duplicated since.

CONTENT

The incidence of running away was calculated in two ways: the proportion of youth 10-17 who ran away during 1975; and the proportion of youth households with youth that experienced a runaway event during 1975. Prevalence was calculated as the proportion of youth households "ever" having experienced a runaway event. These incidence and prevalence statistics were presented in Part I of the report, tabulated by HEW region, census region, community characteristics (metro county, non-metro county, city, suburb, small town, rural area), and by household characteristics (number of persons in household, race, income, occupation).

Part II presented the personal interview data tabulated by demographic characteristics (HEW regions, Census regions, community characteristics, race, income, occupation, sex, age). The data were further delineated by other variables such as academic aspirations, family composition and structure, delinquency status as adjudicated by the juvenile court system, perceptions of home dynamics, truancy, distribution of average school grades, and activity in youth organizations. Tables presented were bivariate cross-tabulations of these selected variables.

National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth

LIMITATIONS

The use of telephone directories to generate the sample leads to some shortcomings. Because directories quickly become out of date, and do not contain unpublished numbers, the sample will underrepresent certain segments of the population, such as recent movers, and those at both ends of the income scale. In addition, this sample is based on self-reports of an event that is rather sensitive, both to the child and to the family. Thus the number of reported runaways may well underestimate the actual figures. Also, runaways younger than 10 or older than 17 are excluded.

AVAILABILITY

The only known accessibility to this survey's results and final report is through the one copy on file at the:

Program Operations Division
Administration on Children, Youth, and Families
Room 3030
400 6th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC
202/755-7800

The address given on the final report for Opinion Research Corporation is:

Opinion Research Corporation
North Harrison Street
Princeton, New Jersey 08540

National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Statistical Survey on Runaway Youth

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE National Study of Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting

PURPOSE The purpose of the study is to provide statistical information on official reports of child abuse and neglect, submitted by state agencies. Specifically, it seeks to collect, summarize, and disseminate data on such official reports; to assist participating reporting agencies in improving their recording and reporting of abuse and neglect cases; and to collect (to the extent possible) consistent and comparable nationwide data.

SPONSORSHIP The study is designed and carried out by the American Association for Protecting Children, Inc. (formerly the American Humane Association) with funding from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

DESIGN Data are collected annually through reports submitted by state agencies. Currently all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and four territories participate. Each jurisdiction provides data on all officially recorded reports of abuse and neglect. Thus no sampling is involved. Two levels of participation are used. In 1984, for Level I (28 states, 1 territory, and the District of Columbia), individual level data are provided for all cases, either using a state-specific form designed by the Association, or on magnetic tape. For Level II (22 states and three territories), aggregate data are provided in varying formats with varying degrees of information. There is no longitudinal component in the design, nor is there the capability to link two separate cases which may be different reports of abuse or neglect involving the same child.

PERIODICITY Data are collected annually; the first year of collection was 1974. All states were included in the system starting with 1976. The 1985 child maltreatment data will be collected and analyzed during calendar year 1986 by the American Association for Protecting Children, Inc. Options to support future data collection efforts are currently being explored by the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.

CONTENT The standard form used by Level I participants provides data from which the Association can compile the following information: the number and characteristics of the families, perpetrators, and victims involved in official reports of abuse and neglect; the type and severity of abuse and neglect; the source of referral;

National Study of Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting

the follow-up actions of child protective service agencies; and the trends in official reporting statistics for the nation.

LIMITATIONS

Data are limited to official reports of abuse or neglect. Many such reports are not substantiated upon investigation. Furthermore, many cases of abuse or neglect are not officially reported. Consequently, estimates of the actual incidence of abuse and neglect cannot be determined directly from these data. Nor is it necessarily the case that trends in reporting reflect trends in actual incidence, since many other factors are involved, especially the propensity to report. To check on some of these errors a large study was conducted during 1979-1980. This National Study of the Incidence and Severity of Child Abuse and Neglect provides estimates for that period of the magnitude of various components of abuse and neglect incidents, and of the extent to which abuse and neglect incidents are captured by the official reporting system. A second incidence study will be conducted during calendar year 1986 with results available in mid-1987.

Some data on institutional abuse and neglect are available, but only through reports of perpetrators employed by institutions. Data are reported for child care workers, teachers, and institutional staff.

AVAILABILITY

The data are published annually by the American Association for Protecting Children, Inc., P. O. Box 1266, Denver, CO 80201, in a report titled Highlights of Official Neglect and Abuse Reporting. The report for 1984 is just now being issued. Public use tapes are also available from the Association. A trend report covering the years 1976-1982, titled "Trends in Officially Reported Child Neglect and Abuse in the United States" is available from the American Association for Protecting Children, Inc.

Contact: Patricia L. Campiglia, Child Welfare Program
Specialist
National Center on Child Abuse & Neglect
U.S. Children's Bureau, HHS
P.O. Box 1182
Washington, DC 20013
202/245-2856

National Study of Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- Homicide
- Suicide

Abduction

- Parental kidnapping
- Other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- Physical abuse or neglect
- Sexual abuse
- Emotional abuse or neglect
- Educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- Sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- Institutional abuse, neglect
- Assault
- Robbery
- Burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- Runaways, homeless youth
- Drug use
- Alcohol use
- School dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- Truancy
- Other status offenses
- Drug abuse
- Alcohol abuse
- Property damage, vandalism
- Robbery
- Burglary, larceny, theft
- Assault, rape
- History of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Study of Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting

Disposition

- Arrests
- In detention
- In jails/prisons
- On probation
- Receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- Age
- Sex
- Race/origin
- Geographic residence
- Family structure
- Family socio-economic status

TITLE

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth

PURPOSE

The purpose of this survey, conducted in 1966 and in 1981, was to monitor changes in out-of-home group care for children and youth. The 1966 study was designed to find out what institutional life was like for the children in residence. The second survey was expected to provide a comparison with the first, illustrating the effects of the deinstitutionalization movement.

Comparisons are possible between 1966 and 1981 regarding kinds of facilities being used for residential care of juveniles resulting from changes in the treatment of status offenders, the use of federal funds for non-AFDC foster care, the attempts to normalize the environments of disabled children, and the increased emphasis on long-term foster placement.

SPONSORSHIP

Sponsored by the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the studies were conducted by the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago.

DESIGN

The first step in the research design was to compile a Master List of facilities. Letters to state child-caring agencies requested lists of facilities licensed to provide residential care in that state. The lists so obtained were cross-checked with all available directories of residential facilities, revised, and sent back to the individual states for a final check by the cooperating state agencies. This process was the same for both the 1966 and 1981 surveys. A master list of 4,814 residential group care facilities for children and youth was compiled in 1981. The 1966 list contained 2,598 institutions. For the 1966 survey, the list was divided by type of care offered by the facility and the needs of children served there. The residential facilities for the 1981 survey were more diversified and were categorized as belonging to the Child Welfare Stream (for those facilities treating dependent, neglected, or abused children), the Juvenile Justice Stream (for those considered in need of detention, delinquents, or status offenders), and the Mental Health Stream (those facilities providing residential care to the emotionally disturbed or mentally ill). In addition, separate streams for facilities serving pregnant adolescents and for drug and alcohol treatment facilities were identified. Facilities serving multiple functions were categorized in the manner they had been

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth

in 1966, in order to retain comparability between the data sets. This results in a slight overestimate for the Child Welfare Stream and a slight underestimate of the Juvenile Justice Stream.

The lists only included facilities serving children or youth who were neglected, abused, delinquent, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill, or pregnant or those who were status offenders, or were abusing drugs or alcohol.

Survey forms were mailed to facility directors. Directors themselves were specifically directed to complete Section 1 pertaining to the administration of the facility.

After compilation of the master list, eligibility for the study was determined by the type of children served. Excluded were facilities for the mentally retarded, physically handicapped, and the chronically ill, as well as those caring for six or fewer children.

There were 58 nonrespondents in 1966. It is not known whether any institutions which were eligible in 1981 failed to respond.

PERIODICITY

The survey was conducted in 1966 and 1981; there are no present plans for replication.

CONTENT

Included in the 70-page survey form are questions about the clientele of the facility, its original and current primary functions and additional functions, its founding era, services provided, ages and sexes of children served, their distance to their residence, their ethnicity (numbers of each), referral sources, numbers in specific legal custody arrangements, frequencies of problem types, percentages with specific emotional problems, rated residential capacity, number admitted during the past twelve months, presence of a waiting list, number of applications per opening, admission requirements, programming details of daily life, discipline methods used, grievance procedures, staff contact frequency, visitation policy, family involvement, scheduled evaluation frequency and persons involved, schools attended or provided, recreational activities, medical services provision, religious activity provisions, average length of stay, exit decision making, post-discharge care provisions,

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth

staff characteristics and duties, use of volunteers, financial and management structure of the facility, and board of directors or citizens' advisory committee makeup. Numbers of children per living unit and sleeping room are included, as is information about security arrangements, neighborhood, community activities, and the strengths and weaknesses of the facility.

LIMITATIONS

Different classification schemes are used for this survey and the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Censuses, causing differences in inclusion of a number of facilities. Smaller facilities (fewer than 7 children) are excluded except for those included in 1966 due to unknown size at that time. A trend toward smaller size facilities was a notable result of the comparison between the first and second surveys. There was a problem in classification of mental health facilities under the category of child welfare facilities, leading to an overestimate of changes that have taken place in the mental health category between surveys. Neither survey included facilities for the mentally retarded, the chronically ill, or the physically handicapped, although they did appear in the listing process in the first stage of the design.

AVAILABILITY

Contact Donnell M. Pappenfort, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, 969 East 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, phone number 312-962-1122, chief investigator for answers to substantive questions. Data tapes and codebook are not currently available. The publication, Residential Group Care Facilities for Children and Youth in the United States, 1965 and 1981: An Analysis of Change Over Time, by Martha Dore, Thomas Young, and Donnell Pappenfort, is available through the Department of Justice (contact Barbara Allen-Hagen at 202-724-7560).

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities
for Children and Youth

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Survey of Residential Group Care Facilities
for Children and Youth

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions *

Child Characteristics *

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

* Aggregate level data

TITLE National Survey of Non-residential Agencies and Programs for Children and Youth

PURPOSE A movement to deinstitutionalize persons of all ages caused a large increase in non-residential services during the seventies. The purpose of this survey was to characterize the programs and the agencies that manage them. It examined a representative national sample of 9,157 agencies with about 13,147 programs providing non-residential community-based services to children and youth.

SPONSORSHIP Sponsored by the National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the survey was undertaken by the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago. Sampling was done by Westat, a research corporation.

DESIGN The sample of non-residential agencies was drawn using a two-stage design. In the first stage, a sampling frame, composed of 49 geographical areas (primary sampling units) that represent a cross-section of the population of the U.S. was used.

The 49 primary sampling units were divided into their constituent counties. An initial contact person for each county was located using the National Directory of Youth Serving Agencies. These persons were asked to provide a list of all local service directories and names of contact persons. Each contact person was further asked to provide names of other agencies, in a "networking" approach, until no new agencies were identified. Finally, state and local governmental bodies were contacted and asked for the names of relevant agencies with which they contracted to provide services. All agencies that could be thus located were added to the list for sampling.

A weighted sample of 5,000 agencies was drawn from the final list of 8,549: this list represented an estimated 28,574 agencies nationwide. This sample was then further screened for eligibility by telephone. To be included, agencies must have had programs specifically designed to provide non-residential services to persons under 21 with specific problems or conditions. All agencies in most primary sampling units were selected; in the largest primary sampling units, agencies were sampled from the lists. All together 1,916 agencies with 2,686 nonresidential programs were included in the final sample that received the mailed questionnaire. The total response rate among these agencies was 97.6 percent.

National Survey of Non-residential Agencies and Programs
for Children and Youth

PERIODICITY This survey has been done only once, in 1981. There are no current plans for its replication.

CONTENT The survey, in three sections, gathered information first on the agency itself: this included the major focus of the agency, funding sources, founding era, operating budget, the board of directors and citizens' advisory committee, minority ownership/operation, personnel number and training, and agency location.

Secondly, information was collected on types of services provided by the agency as a whole, such as counseling/therapy services, therapy approaches, education services, vocational services, health and recreation services, and in-home services.

The last portion of the survey applied to specific agency programs. Primary needs addressed by the program and services provided were included, as were number of children served during the past year, or currently being served; the approximate age range served; sex; usual number of hours per week of participation by each child served; data on the program as an alternative to institutionalization; and probable courses of action to be taken given different financial circumstances.

LIMITATIONS The unit of analysis is the agency. There are no trend data available as this is the only such survey. To be eligible, a program had to be specifically designed to provide at least one direct service to children and youth under the age of 21. Moreover, these children had to have one or more of the following problems or conditions: being neglected, abused, delinquent, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill, or pregnant, or being a status offender, or runaway, or one who is abusing drugs or alcohol. A child might be counted at more than one location.

The study was designed to represent the nation as a whole. Consequently, the number of primary sampling units in the sample is not large enough to support state-level estimates, and even regional estimates may not be feasible. For example, there are no primary sampling units in the Pacific Northwest states of Washington, Oregon, or Idaho.

National Survey of Non-residential Agencies and Programs
for Children and Youth

AVAILABILITY

A report entitled Agencies and Programs Providing Nonresidential Services to Children and Youth with Special Problems and Conditions is available from the Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 633 Indiana Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C. 20531. Its primary author, Martha Morrison Dore, of The School of Social Work, Columbia University, 622 W 113 Street, New York, New York, 10025 (telephone: 212-280-4088) can provide help with substantive questions. Data tapes and codebooks are not yet available.

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Survey of Nonresidential Agencies

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

TITLE National Jail Census

PURPOSE This census is designed to provide information on population and facility characteristics of locally administered jails on the county and municipal level.

SPONSORSHIP Sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, this census is conducted by the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

DESIGN This census includes all locally administered county and municipal institutions in 45 states and the District of Columbia. Specifically excluded are 48-hour lock-ups, federally administered jails, state-administered jails, and the combined jail-prison systems in Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

PERIODICITY The National Jail Census has been conducted in 1970, 1972, 1978, and 1983 and is planned for 1988. Between these periods, the "Annual Survey of Jails" provides population counts and movements. Data tapes are not made available for these intercensal surveys, but annual tabulations are produced by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

CONTENT For the 3,338 jails included in the 1983 census there are 452 variables. The unit of analysis is the institution. The data cover the jail population by legal status, age and sex, maximum sentence, and employment; institutional variables include admissions and releases, available services, structure and capacity, confinement space, expenditures, and personnel.

LIMITATIONS Juveniles comprise one percent or less of the jail population, especially since 1972. The number of juveniles in jails decreased from nearly 4,000 in 1970 to fewer than 1,800 in 1983, due to a national emphasis on separating juvenile from adult offenders. Young persons are overrepresented in jails overall, however. About 40% of the inmates of jails are between 18 and 24. (See BJS Bulletin: Jail Inmates 1983, November 1985.)

The National Jail Census focuses on the institution, not the individual, as the unit of analysis. Therefore, only summary counts of individuals are available. The 1970 jail census provided counts of juveniles not yet arraigned, arraigned and awaiting trial, serving

National Jail Census

sentences of one year or less, and serving sentences of more than one year. In addition, data were obtained on whether juvenile offenders were housed separately from adults, counts of juveniles confined on May 15, 1969, August 15, 1969, and March 15, 1970. In 1972, data included whether juveniles were kept apart from other inmates, but no separate counts were requested. In 1978 and 1983, counts of male and female juveniles were obtained. A juvenile was defined as a person subject to juvenile court jurisdiction based on age and offense limitations as defined by state law. Persons above the statutory age limit who are held under special 'youth' statutes, such as 'youthful offenders' in California, 'adolescents' or 'minors' in New York, etc., are considered as adults. Numbers of juveniles dying in jails and cause of death are also provided in the 1978 and 1983 censuses. Among the 1,611 juveniles counted in jail in 1978 there were 9 deaths, 6 of them suicides. In 1983, all 7 juvenile deaths were suicides.

AVAILABILITY

The codebook and public use tapes are available from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106. Phone 313-763-5010 and speak with Janet Vavara for prices. Victoria Schneider is a contact for coding information. At the Bureau of Justice Statistics, call James Stephan, 202-724-6100, or Phyllis Jo Baunach, 202-724-7755, for answers to substantive questions. Published analyses include The 1983 Jail Census, November, 1984, NCJ-95536; and Census of Jails, 1978, volumes I-IV, Northeast, North Central, South, West; December, 1981, NCJ-72279-72282.

National Jail Census

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

National Jail Census

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons *
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics *

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

* Aggregate data.

TITLE

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails

PURPOSE

The Survey of Inmates of Local Jails is one of a series of data-gathering efforts undertaken during the 1970s to help policy makers assess and overcome deficiencies in the nation's correctional institutions. (The related data collection efforts include The National Jail Census, The Census of State Correctional Facilities, and the Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, described elsewhere in this compendium.) Growth in the prison and jail population in the 1970s and the perception of deteriorations in the living conditions of inmates helped provide the impetus for these efforts.

The Survey of Inmates, collected every five years, is designed to complement the National Jail Census, which is undertaken simultaneously. The surveys provide baseline and trend data describing the jail population in terms of sociodemographic characteristics, criminal history, and adjudication experience.

SPONSORSHIP

The survey is sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U. S. Department of Justice, and data are collected by the U. S. Bureau of the Census.

DESIGN

The data are collected through personal interviews with a probability sample of inmates of local jails. Generally speaking, jails are locally administered confinement facilities authorized to hold persons arrested, awaiting arraignment, awaiting or standing trial, convicted persons awaiting sentencing and those committed to serve sentences usually of one year or less. Temporary holding facilities designed to keep persons less than 48 hours are excluded. The samples for the surveys are selected using a two-stage selection procedure. In the first stage, facilities are selected with probabilities proportional to size. The companion National Jail Censuses have been used to provide the sampling frame for this stage. In the second stage, inmates are selected from rosters of sampled facilities. The sampling ratio within facilities is determined to produce an equal probability of selection of inmates overall. (For females, the sample is not entirely self-weighting across all strata; but adjustments to the weights take care of this difference.)

For each survey, weights are developed so that weighted tabulations of the data yield national estimates of the characteristics for all inmates in local jails.

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails

For the 1983 survey, the number of respondents was 5785, and the number of facilities, 407; the overall response rate was 92%. The size of the 1978 survey was comparable.

PERIODICITY

Surveys of jail inmates were completed in 1972, 1978, and 1983, or about every five years. Surveys use the National Jail Census in their design. The next survey is planned for 1989.

CONTENT

The survey covers the following topics: social and demographic characteristics; the current period of incarceration, including reason for incarceration (if not convicted), type of offenses, sentences, and conviction status; prior criminal and adjudication history; medical services received in jail; military service; and history of drug and alcohol use. The current and prior criminal history sections identify whether the inmate was incarcerated as a juvenile or as an adult.

LIMITATIONS

The number of children (persons under age 18) in jails is fairly small (less than 1% of the jail population in 1983). In fact, the number of juveniles in jails declined sharply in the 1970s reflecting a national policy of separating juvenile delinquents from adult criminals. As a consequence of these small numbers, the numbers sampled in the surveys are also small. While the numbers should be adequate for the purpose of estimating the numbers of children in jails nationally, and even for describing their basic characteristics more detailed multivariate analyses would be inappropriate given the small sample of juveniles. On the other hand, information about the prior criminal history of incarcerated adults, which includes their juvenile delinquent and criminal histories, would be useful for analyses of children as offenders. However, such data cannot be used to construct estimates of the numbers of juvenile offenders in past years, because the sample is confined to those currently in local jails. In addition, such retrospective data are subject to the usual caveats about faulty recall (especially as to timing) and outright omissions.

The sampling design precludes the possibility of using the survey for state or regional estimates.

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails

AVAILABILITY

Magnetic tape is available in card-image or OSIRIS format including documentation. Publications are available through the Bureau of Justice Statistics. Public use tapes and tape documentation are available from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, telephone 313-763-5010 (speak with Janet Vavara for prices or Victoria Schneider for answers to questions regarding coding). At the Bureau of Justice Statistics, help with substantive questions may be obtained from Phyllis Jo Baunach at 202-724-7755.

Several Bureau of Justice Statistics bulletins and special reports based on this series of surveys are available. Among these are the following:

Jail Inmates, 1983, November, 1985 (BJS order # NCJ-99175)

Profile of Jail Inmates, 1978, February, 1981 (#NCJ-65412)

Census of Jails and Survey of Jail Inmates, 1978, May, 1979 (#NCJ-55172). This publication combines data from the census and survey.

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse (jail sentences for drunkenness)
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior jail admissions for previously sentenced offenses offense/arrest/contact with police

Survey of Inmates of Local Jails

Disposition

- arrests (history of prior sentences: does not include
arrests not leading to sentences)
- in detention
- in jails/prisons (prior history, including time served as a
juvenile)
- on probation (prior history)
- receiving other services or interventions (medical only)

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure (of the family the juvenile grew up with)
- family socio-economic status

TITLE Census of State Correctional Facilities

PURPOSE The census of state correctional facilities is designed to provide information on the characteristics of people confined to state prisons.

SPONSORSHIP The Census is sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. Data are collected by the U. S. Bureau of the Census. Questionnaires are completed by authorities within each state prison or state-operated community-based correctional facility.

DESIGN As this is a complete enumeration, all state-operated secure and community facilities are included.

 Nonrespondents are sent additional questionnaires and followed up by telephone.

 The census is used in selecting the sample for the survey of inmates in state correctional facilities, which is described next in this compendium.

PERIODICITY Conducted about every five years, the census is not yet published for 1984. Data from 1979 are the most recent available.

CONTENT This census collects data on both facility and inmate population characteristics. Data include the population of state correctional facilities, tabulated by sex, race, and ethnicity, population movement, inmates by custody level, capacity, confinement, programs, health and safety conditions, employment, incidents, facilities under court order, inmate deaths, and special inmate counts.

LIMITATIONS There are no separate counts of juveniles. Youthful offenders who have entered through adult courts are included in the institutional counts, but are not counted separately.

AVAILABILITY Publications, including Prisons and Prisoners, February, 1982, NCJ-80697, are available through National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Public use tapes and tape documentation are available from Inter-university

Census of State Correctional Facilities

Consortium for Political and Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106, telephone 313-763-5010 (speak with Janet Vavara for prices or Victoria Schneider for answers to questions on coding). Speak with Jim Stephan (202-724-6100) or Phyllis Jo Baunach (202-724-7755) at the Bureau of Justice Statistics for answers to questions about the contents of the census.

Census of State Correctional Facilities

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Census of State Correctional Facilities

(Institution is unit of analysis)

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics*

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

*Aggregate data. Note: Data on age are not gathered, so sex and race/origin refer to all inmates.

TITLE Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities

PURPOSE The Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities is one of a series of data-gathering efforts undertaken during the 1970s to help policy makers assess and overcome deficiencies in the nation's correctional institutions. (The related data collection efforts include the Census of State Correctional Facilities, the National Jail Census, and the Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, described elsewhere in this compendium.) Growth in the prison population in the 1970s and the perception of a deterioration in the living conditions of inmates helped provide the impetus for these efforts.

The Survey of Inmates is designed to complement the Census of State Correctional Facilities, which is undertaken simultaneously. The Survey describes the population confined to state correctional facilities in terms of socio-demographic characteristics, reason for incarceration, prior criminal and adjudication history and prison routine, and identifies the career patterns of offenders.

SPONSORSHIP The survey is sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice and data are collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

DESIGN The data are collected through personal interviews with a probability sample of inmates. The samples for each of the surveys conducted to date (1974, 1979, and 1986) were selected using a stratified two-stage selection procedure. In the first stage facilities were selected with probabilities proportional to size. In the second stage, inmates were selected from rosters of sampled facilities. The sampling ratio within facilities was determined to produce an equal probability of selection of inmates overall. In 1979, separate sampling frames were used for males and females.

In 1974 interviewing was done in January and February. All together, 9,030 inmates from 190 facilities were interviewed. In 1979 the interviewing was conducted in October and November. The design called for 12,000 interviews: 9,500 with males; 2,500 with females. The actual number of interviews was 11,397; and the number of facilities, 215. Females were oversampled to make possible reliable estimates and meaningful comparisons with males. About 15,000 interviews have been conducted for the 1986 survey.

Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities

For each survey, weights are developed so that weighted tabulations of the data yield national estimates of the characteristics for all prisoners in state correctional facilities.

PERIODICITY

The survey is intended to be conducted about every five years. Two surveys, in 1974 and 1979, have already been completed; each used the Census of State Correctional Facilities of the same year as a sampling frame. A third is now underway in 1986. This survey has been delayed beyond the 5-year interval to permit the more accurate use of the Census of Facilities (in this case the 1984 census) as a sampling frame. The next survey may take place in 1991.

CONTENT

The survey covers the following topics: social and demographic characteristics; the current period of incarceration, including types of offenses, sentences, disciplinary actions, grievances (not in 1986), and parole hearings (not in 1986); prior criminal and adjudication history; communication with persons outside prison (not in 1986); prison activities; services received in prisons (not in 1986); military service; inmate's perception of the victim (1986); and history of drug and alcohol use. The current offense and prior criminal history sections identify whether the inmate was incarcerated as a juvenile or as an adult, and separately identifies juvenile offenses.

LIMITATIONS

The number of children (persons under age 18) in state correctional facilities is very small. As a consequence the numbers sampled in the surveys are also small. While the numbers should be adequate for the purpose of estimating the numbers of children incarcerated nationally, and even for describing their basic characteristics, more detailed multivariate analyses would be inappropriate given the small samples of children. On the other hand, information about the prior criminal history of incarcerated adults, which includes their juvenile delinquent and criminal histories, would be useful for some analyses of children as offenders. However, such data cannot be used to construct estimates of the numbers of juvenile offenders in past years, because the sample is restricted to those currently in prisons. In addition, such retrospective data are subject to the usual caveats about faulty recall (especially as to timing) and outright omissions.

Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities

The sampling design precludes the possibility of using the survey for state or regional estimates.

As with all surveys based on samples, estimates are subject to both sampling and non-sampling error. To estimate the magnitude of the sampling error, standard errors have been calculated and should be used.

AVAILABILITY

The codebooks, containing frequencies, and public use tapes are available in either card-image or OSIRIS format in a single file with 1,642 characters per 1979 record from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Phone 313-763-5010 (speak with Janet Vavara for prices or Victoria Schneider for further details on coding). At the Bureau of Justice Statistics, Phyllis Jo Baunach at 202-724-7755 provides assistance with the survey content.

Several Bureau of Justice Statistics bulletins and special reports based on this series of surveys are available. Among these are the following:

Career Patterns in Crime, June 1983 (BJS order #NCJ-88672)

Prisoners and Drugs, March, 1983 (#NCJ-87575)

Prisoners and Alcohol, January, 1983 (#NCJ-86223)

Prisons and Prisoners, January, 1982 (#NCJ-80697). This report combines information from the survey and census.

Veterans in Prisons, October, 1981 (#NCJ-79232)

Profile of State Prison Inmates, August, 1979 (based on the 1974 survey).

Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders

Type of Offense

- truancy
 - other status offenses
 - drug abuse
 - alcohol abuse
 - property damage, vandalism
 - robbery
 - burglary, larceny, theft
 - assault, rape
 - history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police
- treated as a single category:
juvenile offense

Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities

Disposition

- arrests (history of prior sentences: does not include arrests not leading to sentences)
- in detention
- in jails/prisons (prior history, including times served as a juvenile)
- on probation (prior history)
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure (marital status only in 1974 survey)
- family socio-economic status

TITLE Children in Custody: Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities

PURPOSE This census is designed to gather biennial nationwide data on residential facilities that hold juveniles in custody. To the extent possible, characteristics of the juveniles residing in these programs are included. Facilities include: detention centers; shelters; reception or diagnostic centers; training schools; ranches, forestry camps and farms; and halfway homes and group houses. Facilities are classified as short-term, or detention facilities or as long-term, or correctional facilities. They are also categorized according to open versus institutional environments.

SPONSORSHIP The census of facilities is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and administered by the U. S. Bureau of the Census. In 1971, this census replaced the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's annual survey of public facilities holding adjudicated youth. Currently, the Bureau of the Census collects the data and the Bureau of Justice Statistics provides the analysis.

DESIGN A mail questionnaire is sent to each private and state or local government-administered institution where juveniles comprise more than 50% of the total population. Excluded are juvenile detention facilities operated as part of a jail and institutions with an offender population of less than ten percent (prior to 1977) or less than one percent (from 1977 on). Also excluded are non-residential facilities and facilities exclusively for drug/alcohol abusers or nonoffenders and federal juvenile correctional facilities. In 1983 there were 1,023 such public institutions, compared with 722 in 1971. There were 2,169 private facilities included in 1974; this number had declined to 1,879 in 1983. Names of the private facilities came from the Survey to Identify Private Facilities for Delinquent Juveniles, sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and conducted by the Bureau of the Census.

There is one record for every facility. Separate data collection forms are used for the private and public institutions. The response rate for public facilities has been 100 percent; and for private facilities, over 95 percent.

Children in Custody: Census of Juvenile Detention
and Correctional Facilities

PERIODICITY Considered biennial, the censuses have been conducted in 1971 and 1973 in public facilities, with private institutions added for the censuses of 1974, 1975, 1977, 1979, and 1983. Currently the censuses occur in odd years, with annual statistics reported for the preceding calendar year. Thus, the annual statistics from the 1983 census are for 1982. The latest census was taken in 1985.

CONTENT Information is collected on the resident population by sex and age (in the 1983 census); the adjudication status; the reason for admission (diagnosis, detention, commitment, probation, or voluntary admission); the type, age and capacity of the facility; the reason the largest group of juveniles is held; the average length of stay; admissions and departures of the population; and programs and services available. In 1982/1983, the type of delinquent offense was added as a variable. Additional data cover the identity of the state, county and city in which the facility is located, and the level of government and type of agency responsible for the facility. Because a number of closely similar surveys have been completed, this is becoming a good source for institutional trend data. Changes in types of offenses and lengths of stay, staff to population ratio, sex ratio, and age range may be of interest to researchers.

LIMITATIONS While these data are useful for policy evaluation purposes and examination of trends over the last decade, the institutional unit of analysis is a major limitation from the point of view of describing the juvenile offender population. State-by-state variation among juvenile justice systems makes comparisons difficult. For example, in most states juveniles are persons age 17 or under, but this top age ranges as low as 15 or as high as 18. The Bureau of Justice Statistics takes these differences into account in calculating rates, but this does not completely solve the problem of comparability. The questionnaire has undergone changes over the years, although since 1977 it has remained fairly stable.

There have been changes over time in the reference period used for the one-day population counts, making cross-time comparisons difficult. For example, at first the one-day counts were based on June 30, and the annual count based on the 12 months prior to that date. For

Children in Custody: Census of Juvenile Detention
and Correctional Facilities

1977-1979, the one-day counts were based on December 31, and the annual count, on the calendar year. Because of the holiday season, December 31 appears to have been atypical for one-day counts. Therefore February 1 is now used for the one-day count, and the preceding calendar year, for the annual figures. Record keeping practices at some institutions do not lend themselves to the specific time periods requested by the survey instrument. Estimation was necessary at the few facilities where summary data are not maintained.

AVAILABILITY

The public facilities portion of the Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities is available through the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Telephone number: 313-763-5010. The series of reports, Children in Custody, for the years 1971-1979, is available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850. Their toll-free number is 800-638-8736. The Clearinghouse has available full census reports (for public and private facilities) for the 1973 and 1975 censuses. The full report for the 1977 and 1979 censuses is available on microfiche only. Advance reports for 1977, 1979, (public and private) and 1982/83 (public only) are also available.

Contact Barbara Allen-Hagen (202-774-7560) at the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20531, for juvenile justice issues. For answers to questions of content, data analysis, or regarding the availability of unpublished tabulations, contact Phyllis Jo Baunach at The Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 20531. Her telephone number is 202-724-7755.

Children in Custody: Census of Juvenile Detention
and Correctional Facilities

TOPICS COVERED

Victimization

Non-accidental death of juveniles

- homicide
- suicide

Abduction

- parental kidnapping
- other abduction

Abuse and Neglect by Family

- physical abuse or neglect
- sexual abuse
- emotional abuse or neglect
- educational neglect

Other Forms of Victimization

- sexual exploitation, prostitution, rape
- institutional abuse, neglect
- assault
- robbery
- burglary, larceny, theft

Children at Risk

- runaways, homeless youth
- drug use
- alcohol use
- school dropouts

Children as Offenders*

Type of Offense

- truancy
- other status offenses
- drug abuse
- alcohol abuse
- property damage, vandalism
- burglary, larceny, theft
- robbery
- assault, rape
- history of prior offense/arrest/contact with police

Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census

Disposition

- arrests
- in detention
- in jails/prisons
- on probation
- receiving other services or interventions

Child Characteristics*

- age
- sex
- race/origin
- geographic residence
- family structure
- family socio-economic status

*The data are aggregated by facility. The classification scheme uses the distinction of the Uniform Crime Reports system of more serious (Part I) and less serious (Part II) offenses, and of property versus personal offenses.