THE NEW ORLEANS OFFENDER STUDY: PHASE I

VOLUME I

DESCRIPTION OF OFFICIAL RECORD DATA AND CODING PROCESS

A REPORT TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

DECEMBER, 1988

MICHAEL R. GEERKEN, PH.D.

Chief Administrative Officer
Orleans Parish Criminal Sheriff

Visiting Associate Professor of Sociology
Tulane University

This research was supported by the National Institute of Justice, United States Department of Justice, Grant number 86-IJ-CX-0021. Contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the National Institute of Justice or the U. S. Department of Justice.

PREFACE

This report describes the development of that part of the database for the New Orleans Offender Study which is based on official records of arrest, custody, and supervision. The study database is unique because it combines five separate official record sets containing jail and penitentiary custody information, probation and parole supervision data, and local, state, and national arrest histories. The complex process of combining these data sets is described in Section II of this report. The decisions that shaped this process were based on research into the problems inherent in all official criminal history data and on specific analyses of New Orleans offender data. Section I describes this analysis and includes a discussion of the particular problems that errors and biases in official criminal justice databases present for research.

I would like to thank Sheriff Charles C. Foti, Jr. for his assistance and support. I would also like to thank Dr. Peggy Sullivan for her comments on earlier drafts of this report, and Gary Lagarde and James Miller for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the study data. I am also grateful to John Nipper, Evita Key, Rex McDonald, and Lt. Earl Kilbride for their assistance in obtaining the study databases.

SECTION I

CRIMINAL HISTORY DATABASES

INTRODUCTION

Researchers interested in measuring criminal behavior face a measurement problem common to all forms of deviance research: the subject has an interest in concealing the behavior to be studied. Three major approaches have been taken to the measurement of criminal activity. The first approach depends on official records of criminal behavior, which use records maintained by police or other "detection level" agency, by agencies related to the court process, or by agencies concerned with supervision or punishment, such as a probation, parole, and correctional agencies.

The two other approaches were developed in part to account for biases deemed inherent in official records. One, participant observation, requires that the researcher become involved in the day to day activity of offenders, observing behavior in the spirit of an anthropologist studying primitive cultures. The second, self-reports of criminal behavior, takes two forms: 1) autobiographies of individuals engaged in criminal activities, and 2) surveys. Surveys may be administered to some group identified as criminal because of a particular condition (arrestees or prison inmates, clients of drug detoxification clinics, etc) or a general population group expected to include some offenders

(school groups, birth cohort groups). Self report surveys of prison inmates completed by RAND fall into the identified offender group and the cohort studies of the Gluecks (Glueck & Glueck, 1937,1940) and of Marvin Wolfgang and his associates (Wolfgang et al. 1972) are general population studies.

Each of these three broad approaches brings its own set both of advantages and problems. Participant observation studies face problems of representativeness and of observer effects. Self-report research faces problems of misunderstanding, non-representativeness of the sample, and deception. Also, self-reports of offending behavior are considered reliable only for time periods within the recent memories of offenders. Both approaches, however, offer unique advantages. Participant observation yields a depth and richness of information and, some would argue, an understanding not otherwise available. Self-report studies may yield respectable sample sizes (though generally at significant expense) while providing information on criminal behavior not detected by public officials.

Official criminal history databases do not, by definition, include undetected criminal behavior. They are, however, often the only available record of criminal careers over periods of time greater than a few years. With the widespread introduction of computers into all types of criminal justice agencies since the late 1960's, data has become available for much larger sample sizes than are obtainable through self-reports, both because of the expense of administering such instruments and because access is, for practical purposes, limited to offenders currently under

supervision or to cohorts of individuals tracked through time at great expense. Official criminal histories are especially valuable in validation of self-reports of prior arrests, convictions, and periods of supervision and are, in fact, often the only data source available external to the survey. Reliability studies of some self-report surveys have indicated marked discrepancies between official and self-report measures. A survey recently completed of New Orleans inmates, for example, indicates respondents are often ignorant even of the present charge for which they are incarcerated. (Miranne and Geerken, 1988.)

It is probable, then, that official records of criminal activity, may often be better indicators of the level of criminal activity than self-report measures. Greenwood and Turner (1987) argue that low correlations found between arrest rates and self-reported offense rates are explained by varying levels of competency among offenders, which leads to different probabilities of arrest. Yet the correlation may very well be low because one - or both - of the measures of offending are afflicted with severe error. Wymer (1976), Bridges (1979), and Fox and Tracy (1981) found that respondents systematically underreport arrests. Marquis (1981), however, argues that the best validation studies find overreporting of arrests by respondents. Findings of overreporting, however, must be examined in the light of the probable undercounting of arrests in official databases. In a similar vein, it is now widely known from studies comparing urinalysis results with the questionnaire

responses of arrestees that inmates engage in extensive denial concerning the extent of their recent drug use even when they know their urine is to be tested for the presence of these drugs. Conscious deception among inmate respondents remains a serious problem for self-report measures of criminality.

General population studies do not necessarily avoid the problem of deception. False denial of criminal activity may be more of a problem among individuals who have committed offenses but have never been apprehended. We also expect that deception increases with seriousness of the offense in self-report interviews. Official data tends to work in the opposite direction: the probability of an offense resulting in a recorded arrest increases with the seriousness of the offense.

Official histories of individual criminal activity continue to be important data sources for estimating the nature of individual criminal activities. Yet the "rap sheet" is among the most poorly examined and understood of any data source used by criminologists. Understanding it is, however, an essential prerequisite to the proper interpretation, coding, and analysis of official criminal history data. Researchers tend to be sensitive to the types of error that plague surveys, and attempts have been made to identify and control for the types of error that might affect the results of self-report studies of criminal behavior. These efforts have by no means been completely successful, especially in the measurement of intentional deception, but there is an awareness of the problem. In contrast, rap sheets are generally accepted at face value by researchers.

Indeed, the source and scope of rap sheet data (FBI database, state fingerprint depository, or local rap sheet) are not clearly identified in many studies. Even when the source is clearly identified, the only problems recognized are 1) missing rap sheets, 2) conflicts between rapsheets from different sources, and 3) incompleteness - the absence of final disposition or term of incarceration data.

The most pernicious forms of error found in rap sheet data are almost completely unknown to most criminologists. This ignorance on the part of researchers is founded on inattention to the "rap sheet production process" which is related to local police department booking and fingerprint procedures and to state criminal history system policies and actual procedures. Criminal justice practitioners are familiar with many of these problems but are unaware of, or unconcerned with, their implications for criminological research.

OFFICIAL CRIMINAL HISTORY DATA

There are about 195 million criminal history records in the U.S.: 35 million maintained by state governments (usually state police or public safety agencies), 25 million by the FBI, and an estimated 135 million by local law enforcement agencies (Laudon, 1986: 11). Thirty-four states have computerized at least part of their criminal history records and about half of the criminal fingerprint files maintained by the FBI have been placed on computer. There is at this time no estimate available of the extent to which local law enforcement agencies have automated

their criminal records, although most large metropolitan jurisdictions do have computerized criminal history (CCH) systems.

In state, federal, and most local record systems, rap sheets are ideally designed to be records of arrests and the disposition of those arrests (conviction and sentence or dismissal). Sometimes institutional records (date of entry and release) are also linked to the arrest. It is widely known that many of these arrest records are, in fact, "incomplete" in the sense that court dispositions and incarceration records are often not available in the same database. Blumstein and Cohen (1979) found in a sample of Washington, D.C. offenders for whom the FBI supplied rap sheets that there was no recorded disposition beyond arrest in 59% of the cases. Data on the time served by offenders was even less complete. More recently, in a study of FBI and state criminal history systems by Laudon (1986 :140) FBI arrest records were very conservatively estimated to be from 28.5 to 43.2 % incomplete and state records from 29 to 70% incomplete. "Completeness", as the term is used both by researchers and criminal justice professionals who are responsible for maintenance of these databases, means the presence of final disposition data. Completeness almost never refers the comprehensiveness of the list of arrests. As we shall see, this focus on dispositions is a symptom of an overwhelming bias in the concern for false positive error common among CCH administrators. We will see that it is important also to investigate the extent, causes, and consequences for research of false negative error -

the failure to record all arrests - as well as the misinterpretation of arrests as indicators of criminal events. An investigation of these types of error requires an examination of the arrest process itself and the process by which arrests find their way onto a rap sheet.

FALSE NEGATIVE ERROR ON RAP SHEETS

False negative error on rap sheets is caused primarily by the misidentification of offenders and by the failure of local agencies to submit usable reports of arrests (generally, fingerprint cards) to state repositories and the FBI.

Identification of an offender is made by a local law enforcement agency at time of booking through verbal responses of the arrestee to questions and through documents (driver's license, etc) carried by the arrestee. In larger agencies, the offender's prints will be checked against a local fingerprint file as well. This check often reveals deception on the part of the arrestee. An analysis done of arrestees' booking records in the New Orleans Central Lockup during 1985 indicated that approximately 10% of arrestees lied about their names and were identified through a check of the local fingerprint depository. The deception was only caught in cases in which the individual had been arrested and fingerprinted in New Orleans before and the fingerprint clerk was sufficiently diligent in searching for matches. In general, smaller jurisdictions must rely on state repositories to identify arrestees (almost always long after the offender has been released). Often, local records are not changed even after the error has been discovered because

a long chain of paperwork in prosecutors' and court files already carries the incorrect name.

Experience in the New Orleans system indicates that a "new" individual is often created in a CCH records system not only because of deception but because of an inadequate search for a match on the part of the booking officer. The same individual may appear in the system with a misspelled first or last name, a different race (Hispanics may be coded as black or white) but with identical social security numbers. In the study described in Section II of this report, an attempt was made to correct for these problems through a series of matching procedures.

Another serious source of false negative error in state national fingerprint depositories is the failure to submit fingerprint cards or the failure to submit usable cards. An Office of Technology Assessment report (OTA, 1982) found that in 1982, 18% of local arrests were not reported to state central depositories. Further, arrests reported to central repositories may not be reported to the FBI. An eight-week audit of arrests reported to the Illinois repository found that 26% of those arrests had not been reported by local agencies to the FBI (Belair, 1985: 26). Even when cards are submitted, they may be rejected by the FBI and the arrests not recorded if one or more prints are not usable. The FBI rejects 11% of cards submitted for this reason (Belair, 1985). Rejection rates even for large cities vary greatly. A phone survey of nine large southern cities done by the Orleans Parish Criminal Sheriff's Office in 1984 indicated that rejection rates ranged from 6% to as high as 40% (Hunter,

1984).

CHARGES, ARRESTS AND INCIDENTS: DEFINITIONAL PROBLEMS

The bulk of all arrests, even for serious crimes, are made by local law enforcement agencies, usually a police agency or a county sheriff who generally maintain some record of these arrests. A person is arrested for one or more offenses related to one or more criminal incidents. An arrest may be made on a warrant requested from a court by the arresting agency or some other local or state criminal justice agency, it may be made without a warrant on probable cause, or an arrest may be made at the direction of a court for some offense related to the court process such as failure to pay a fine or to appear in court Finally, an individual may be arrested because a warrant for his arrest has been issued by some other jurisdiction.

An "arrest" is technically the seizure of a suspected offender to answer for a crime. However, the definition of an arrest within a law enforcement record system may vary. A single "seizure" for multiple criminal incidents may in fact be recorded as multiple arrests all occurring on the same date or as a single arrest. Charges listed under an arrest in a local criminal history system may be associated with an "incident identifier" which corresponds to a written incident report and/or a call for assistance logged in a computer aided dispatch system. Some systems record a separate arrest for each incident, and thus multiple "arrests" may be recorded during a single continuous

booking session. This is rarely the case, however, outside the larger urban police jurisdictions. In short, an "arrest" may or may not have a one to one correspondence with a criminal incident and, therefore, charges listed under an arrest identifier may refer to one or many incidents. This mixing of criminal events within an arrest is very common among state "fingerprint-driven" record systems and occurs within the FBI system as well. This is the case because arrests in these systems are identified by an arrest date, so that all charges recorded during a booking event are necessarily combined under that date.

An "arrest" may also include charges that are the product of the seizure process itself. This is obvious in the case of charges such as "resisting arrest", "flight to elude" and, usually, "battery on a police officer". A researcher interested in arrest charges as indicators of offenses committed while free should ignore such charges. But this is not possible when a battery on a police officer is recorded simply as "assault and battery", which might then be coded by the researcher as the Index crime "aggravated assault". Law enforcement agency records do not distinguish "seizure process" crimes from other crimes.

Detention and correctional agencies record their own set of "process" offenses as arrests, even when a seizure has not actually been made because the offender is already in custody when he commits the crime. While some of these crimes can by definition only be committed by the incarcerated (contraband offenses and escape), virtually the full range of street crimes, from murder to theft, can also be committed while incarcerated.

The extent to which these offenses result in official arrests is a function of their seriousness and the policy of the correctional agency. An incarceration crime can only be identified as such by the researcher if the correctional institution is recorded as the arresting agency. But this is not always the case. Most state penitentiary system officers are not commissioned law enforcement officers (the local sheriff or the state police generally serve as arresting agents) and local detention officers who are commissioned cannot be distinguished from patrol officers from the same department. One suggested solution to this problem treats any charge filed during an offender's known term of incarceration as an incarceration process crime. Unfortunately, individuals incarcerated may also be charged with crimes committed before their incarceration when their connection to an earlier crime is established in the course of a criminal investigation.

ARRESTS VS CHARGES: THE SERIOUSNESS CRITERION

Researchers realize, of course, that there are often multiple charges included in a single arrest reported on a rap sheet. They often incorrectly assume, however, that all the listed charges are related to a single incident. Even when this is obviously not the case - when there are, for example, multiple counts of an offense not likely to occur multiple times during the same criminal event (such as burglary) - the researcher may choose to treat the arrest event as having a one to one correspondence with a criminal event or incident.

Even when all charges are related to a single event, it is

generally considered necessary for purposes of analysis to "characterize" that arrest as to type. One charge is selected to characterize the criminal event, and the criteria for selection is almost always some measure of "seriousness". Selecting among charges on the basis of seriousness is a very problematic enterprise. If the researcher declines to use his own opinions concerning the relative seriousness of offenses, his ranking of crimes by seriousness requires assigning weights on some empirical basis. The most defensible method involves the use of general population surveys in which citizens' ranking of crimes by seriousness is determined.

The best survey of crime severity available is the 1977 National Survey of Crime Severity directed by Marvin Wolfgang and others (1985). This survey of 51,623 individuals scored a total of 204 criminal events. These events were described in such detail as: "A person intentionally sets fire to a building causing $100,000 worth of damage." Though the method for determination of weights even for these detailed incidents has been questioned (Collins, 1988), there are a range of these incidents for each of the FBI Part I (or Index) crime categories. Table 1 provides a listing of the FBI categories in the "hierarchy" order the FBI uses (and instructs local agencies to use) in classifying criminal incidents and arrests. For each category, the Wolfgang et al. mean and median seriousness weights for all the detailed items in that category are given, and the categories are ranked on the basis of these summary scores. A score and rank were also assigned for the "most typical" or

"garden variety" incident for each category. Two facts become immediately obvious: 1) the FBI's "hierarchy" method of ranking crimes is completely inadequate, 2) the mean, the median, and the "typical" method of assigning seriousness weights each lead to a different ranking scheme.

REDUCTION OF THE ARREST TO A SINGLE CHARGE

Table 1 prompts us to reconsider the ranking enterprise itself, for in practice the reduction of arrest to a single charge is often done unnecessarily and is generally done without adequate discussion or justification.

The official record of arrests is used in criminological research primarily in one of three ways: 1) as an independent variable indicating level of past criminal activity ("prior arrests"), 2) as a source of dependent variables indicating offense rate, 3) as a measure recidivism after some treatment or event.

Past criminal activity is generally measured in one of two ways. The first approach involves counting prior arrests, when each arrest is characterized by its most serious charge, however defined. The second approach counts prior convictions or incarcerations. As pointed out above, official databases are generally very deficient in conviction and incarceration information. To the extent that conviction data is reasonably complete, the researcher faces the problems of properly characterizing any arrest which resulted in convictions on multiple charges - the same problem faced in classifying a multi-

charge arrest. But convictions present additional problems when used as indicators of criminal events. As has frequently been pointed out elsewhere (see, for example, Blumstein and Cohen, 1979: fn 18) the reasons for failure to convict rarely include a positive finding of innocence, but generally involve rejection of illegally seized evidence and refusal of victims or witnesses to testify. An even more frequent reason for failure to convict is plea bargaining tactics of the prosecutor. He might nolle prose some charges, sometimes involving multiple events, in exchange for guilty pleas to others. Tactical dismissals are, obviously, more likely when there are multiple charges and cases available for compromise and are thus not randomly distributed among defendants but will be concentrated on high frequency offenders with multiple cases and multiple arrests.

Counting terms of incarceration is a poor indicator of criminal behavior, though extent of prior incarceration may have theoretical importance for other reasons, since complete incarceration data is very rare in criminal history databases. Among those with multiple convictions, sentences may be imposed either consecutively or concurrently with other sentences. As with convictions, double-counted (consecutive) sentences are not randomly distributed among defendants, but occur more often among those frequently convicted.

Convictions and incarcerations, then, are clearly inadequate measures of criminal history. But it is not immediately clear whether the number of arrests (however characterized) is preferable to the number of charges as an indicator of the

seriousness of prior criminal history. For example, the number of armed robberies recorded rather than the number of arrests involving at least one armed robbery is a better indicator of the depth of involvement of the offender in the crime of armed robbery and a better proxy for the armed robbery offense rate. An indicator that is even worse is the number of arrests for which armed robbery is the most "serious" crime recorded.

The choice between charges and arrests is not as clear if the charges are related to the same criminal event. An arrest for burglary plus possession of stolen property probably should be treated as having the same weight and meaning as a burglary arrest, since the two arrests probably refer to similar events and the charge combination is primarily a result of the way the most serious crime was linked to the offender. But the "single event" rule is not as acceptable for other combinations, such as that of "murder/rape" contrasted with "murder". Here the combination of charges is not an artifact of the apprehension process but signifies a qualitatively different act. In the end some approach must be selected, and usually the database will not include an event identifier. (The study database does include an event indicator, but only for some arrests.) In such cases the choice between charge-based and arrest-based measures must be made on empirical grounds; both criminal history constructs should be compared for their predictive power in a particular model.

The problem is stickier when charge vs arrest based decisions must be made in the selection of a dependent variable proxy for

the offending rate. Here also the choice must be made on an empirical basis, but this time the criterion is the construct's correlation to the actual offending rate, which is not directly measurable. Self-report measures offer an independent, though flawed, measure of actual offending rate. I know of no researcher to date who has attempted to compare the predictive power of arrest vs charge based measures on self-report rates. This study will include such an analysis in a subsequent report.

FREQUENCY OF THE MULTI-EVENT ARREST

In a preliminary analysis of the study data, the frequency of multi-charge and multi-event arrests was determined. Table 2 gives the distribution of a sample of the New Orleans arrests of 22,404 offenders arrested at least once for burglary or armed robbery in New Orleans between January 1, 1973 and December 31, 1986. (A detailed description of this sample is provided in Section II of this report.) These offenders were arrested 177,549 times in New Orleans. On the average, each arrest consisted of 1.76 charges. As Table 2 indicates, about 39% of all arrests consisted of more than one charge. If all charges other than index charges (FBI Part I Crimes) are removed from the analysis, about 18.4% of index arrests (arrests where at least one charge was for an index crime) include more than one index charge. Clearly, the characterization of the multiple charge arrest is not a trivial problem.

Table 3 indicates that the multi-event arrest presents a significant problem. A multi-event arrest is defined as any

booking session during which an offender is booked for more than one crime, i.e., for criminal acts which occurred on two separate occasions. Such booking sessions result in the production of a single fingerprint card covering more than one criminal event. This booking will appear as a multi-charge arrest on the offender's state or national rap sheet. Multi-event arrests were identified for this analysis by use of the event identifier known as the "item number" which is recorded for each charge and refers to a the dispatch of a patrol car on a complaint. Two different item numbers, therefore, indicate two separate events. If only Part I Index charges are considered, about 7% of all arrests cover more than one event. Yet 18% of all offenders in the study had at least one multi-event arrest among their index arrests. Since only New Orleans arrests could be checked for multi-event arrests, and only portions of the criminal careers of some offenders are included in the study period, it is certain that the actual percentage of offenders with multi-event arrests is higher.

The distribution as well as the number of multi-event arrests is important. If these arrests are randomly distributed across all arrests, the problem would not bias the results of multivariate analyses. Table 4 provides a breakdown of the frequency of multi-event arrests by number of index arrests in a career. If multi-event index arrests are distributed randomly across all index arrests for all the offenders in the sample, then the probability of an offender having at least one multi-event arrest (M) in his career would be a simple function of the

number of index arrests in his career: $M = 1 - (1 - P)^A$, where P = the probability of a multi-event arrest and A = the number of the offender's arrests. Table 4 compares this probability to the observed percentage of offenders in each arrest number group who actually have multi-event arrests. It was anticipated that the rap sheet of the more frequent arrestee would be more likely to include a multi-event arrest than would be expected by chance, because his high level of criminal activity would increase the likelihood that evidence would tie him to more than one crime when an arrest was made. Just the opposite, however, proved to be the case. The less frequently arrested offender had a higher than expected occurrence of this type of error. This indicates that frequency distributions of index arrests in a criminal career somewhat overestimate the variance of the number of criminal acts for which offenders are apprehended.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NEW ORLEANS OFFENDER STUDY

A careful consideration of the problems of "rap sheet" data led to certain general conclusions:

1) The methods by which official criminal histories are built and maintained are likely to produce a predominance of false negative error over false positive error. On the average, offenders' arrests will be undercounted in any official criminal history, particularly if the records system relies on fingerprint submissions of other agencies.

The problem of false negative error stems primarily from two sources: the problem of identification and the problem of nonsubmission/rejection of fingerprint cards. In this study the

problem of identification was in part addressed by actively searching for duplications - the same individual treated as more than one individual - in all databases. The problem of incompleteness in the list of arrests because of nonsubmission/rejection can only be addressed by combining databases from different sources. As the following section describes, three arrest and three incarceration/supervision databases were merged in part to remedy this problem.

2) Rap sheets are also very deficient in final disposition and incarceration information. The disposition data that does exist is frequently confusing and sometimes completely useless.

The lack of disposition data on the rap sheets and the difficulty in interpreting the data that does exist led to a decision to measure incarceration directly rather than to deduce the time incarcerated from sentences. Louisiana follows complex rules for the calculation of normal release date, with goodtime, work or education credits, and a variety of other factors applied differentially depending on the criminal history and conviction charge. Of greater importance is parole, which is typically awarded after one third a sentence has been served, and pardon which can be awarded at any time. Furlough, and work release, since they involve unsupervised street time further complicate the picture. We were able to obtain, however, three databases which covered actual dates spent incarcaerated and in probation or parole supervision, which removed the need to estimate incarceration time from sentence data.

3) About 18% of arrests for serious crimes in the study

sample include more than one serious charge. There is no straightforward or widely accepted method of ranking charges on the basis of seriousness, and the reduction of a multi-charge arrest to a single charge for purposes of analysis should only be done when the analysis absolutely requires it.

Also, about 7% of serious arrests include serious charges for more than one criminal event. A multi-event arrest, however, can only be identified for the subset of the arrests that include an event identifier. (There is no way to make such an identification in fingerprint based systems.) These multi-event arrests are not randomly distributed among all the subset arrests but occur more frequently among offenders with few recorded arrests.

These multi-charge and multi-event analyses confirmed the decision to use, whenever possible, charges rather than arrests as the unit of analysis. The dependent variables in this study - burglary charges and armed robbery charges - are particularly appropriate for this treatment, since multiple charges will almost always mean multiple events in these cases. particularly in the case of burglary and armed robbery.

5) Certain crimes recorded on rap sheets refer not to criminal acts committed while free but to arrest or correctional process behavior. These should be ignored if charges are to be used as a proxy for offense rate while free. It is not always possible, however, to distinguish process crimes from street crimes.

The course taken in coding possible correctional crimes in

this study is a compromise between counting all possible correctional process charges and counting none. If a charge is submitted by a correctional institution or is an arrest or correctional process type offense (battery on a police officer, contraband, escape), it is removed from the analysis; however, other charges that occur during a period of incarceration are assumed to apply to an offense prior to that incarceration term and are retained in the data.

SECTION II

DATABASES FOR THE NEW ORLEANS OFFENDER STUDY: DEFINITION AND DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

This study focuses on the effect of the criminal justice system on the crimes of burglary and armed robbery committed in New Orleans, and specifically on the incapacitative effect of incarceration on these offenses. Our population is all offenders arrested at least once for burglary or armed robbery in New Orleans during the 14 year period 1973-1986. The computerized information systems available to us provide information on arrests and incarceration for New Orleans offenders which is as complete as any other large-scale official records study and more complete than most. The inclusion of local custody data provides information heretofore unavailable to researchers.

THE DATABASES

The official record data for the New Orleans Offender Study include information taken directly from a total of five criminal justice databases and indirectly from a sixth. These databases are 1) the New Orleans jail information management system (STARS) covering the years 1981-1986, maintained by the Orleans Parish (county) Criminal Sheriff; 2) the New Orleans Police Department's arrest history system (MOTION), years 1973-1986; 3) the adult penitentiary and probation/parole information system (CAJUN), maintained by the Louisiana Department of Corrections (LADOC),

years 1974-1986; 4) the juvenile corrections information system (JIRMS) maintained by the Juvenile Division of LADOC (1974-1986); and 5) the Louisiana criminal history system (FINDEX) maintained by the Louisiana Department of Public Safety, years 1974-1986. The FINDEX database also includes arrests maintained by the FBI on individuals arrested for serious offenses in Louisiana, since fingerprint cards on arrestees submitted either by the State Police or by local jurisdictions result in a copy of that individuals FBI rap sheet being forwarded to the State Police, and these arrests are then added to FINDEX. FINDEX, therefore, also contains 6) FBI rap sheet information on out-of-state arrests.

Complete adult incarceration data - that is, information on local as well as state penitentiary incarceration - is available only for the 6 year period 1981-1986, since the Criminal Sheriff's records (STARS) have only been automated since 1981. Juvenile incarceration data is available only for state custody incarceration. These five databases, merged together, provide the following information on offenders included in the study (22,561 offenders):

A) Demographic and other descriptive information

1) Date of birth
2) Race
3) Sex
4) Birth state
5) Employed/unemployed (at time of New Orleans Arrest)
6) City/state employed "

7) Occupation "

8) Possession of driver's license "

9) Number of Scars "

10) Number of (needle) track marks "

11) Number of aliases

12) Number of nicknames

13) Number of tattoos "

For those offenders who were in state juvenile custody, the following information is also available:

14) Educational Test Scores: CAT-R,CAT-M,CAT-L,WRAT-R,WRAT-S,WRAT-A

15) School level: school month & year, frequency of attendance

16) IQ test scores: PPV and Wisconsin-V,P, and F

17) Vision test

18) Hearing test

19) Prior drug experience (yes or no)

20) Parish of Residence

B) Arrest Information - all coded at charge level

1) Date of arrest

2) Charge. New Orleans charges available at statute level. All charges have been coded into modified FBI categories. (See appendix A.)

3) Attempt/Conspiracy/Principal/Accessory indicator. (This code indicates whether the crime was attempted, or the offender is charged with conspiracy or is a principal or

accessory to the crime.)

4) Arresting or submitting agency

5) Arresting or submitting agency type (ex. police dept., sheriff, state police, federal agency, correctional agency, military, etc.)

6) Arrest location: if in Louisiana, the parish; if outside LA, the state.

C) Custody Information

1) Date custody or supervision begins

2) Date custody or supervision ends

3) Custody or supervision type. Type of custody of supervision is recorded, with start and end dates of each type. Type of supervision, such as probation or parole is recorded, as are other changes of status if change occurred while offender was under LADOC custody or supervision: escape, abscond (flight from probation or parole supervision), and death.

Institutional custody is recorded by type. Custody status in the New Orleans jail system is coded into seven categories including pretrial and sentenced statuses. (See text and appendix B for complete discussion.)

4) Custody or supervision location. Parish or probation/parole district, or state, if outside Louisiana.

DISCUSSION

Time and Contact Dependent Demographic Variables

As in any database drawn solely from criminal justice system records, the information is gathered only at the time of contact with the criminal justice system or during a custody or supervision period. This presents no problems for charge or custody data, but can present difficulties for demographic data that changes over time and might change between periods of system contact. Race, sex, date of birth, and similar variables that stay constant are no problem. But other variables such as employment, occupation, the presence of scars (indicating a violent lifestyle), track marks (indicating intravenous drug use), and number of aliases (possibly indicating commitment to a criminal lifestyle) change and may accumulate over time. As a result such information tends to be updated throughout the offender's career only if he is arrested fairly frequently. For years during which the offender has no system contacts, we have no way of knowing, for example, if he has been employed. Since the number of arrests during some time period (usually one year) will be a key dependent variable and employment a predictor variable during certain stages of the study, this limitation on time-dependent variables require certain assumptions. For practical purposes, we assume that employment status and occupation for a year with no recorded New Orleans arrests is the same as that of the last recorded arrest. A related problem

exists for juvenile data, which is available only for the small number of offenders who have been incarcerated in the state juvenile system (722 of 22561 individuals) and can thus only be used to generate predictor models for this special subset.

Arrest Information

Arrest information is drawn from the MOTION system, FINDEX, the FBI rap sheet data added to FINDEX, and, to a very limited extent, from JIRMS.

MOTION is an on-line booking system used by New Orleans Central Lockup personnel (staffed by NOPD prior to 1983 and OPSCO 1983-present) to record all non-federal arrests made in New Orleans. These arrests may have been made by any of five non-federal agencies legally empowered to make arrests in New Orleans. This system has been in full operation in New Orleans since September 1973, though it includes many earlier arrests since manually maintained rapsheets were entered into the system in 1973-74 on offenders "known to be active" at the time the system was implemented. Pre-1973 arrests will be used only to construct prior arrest independent variables. NOPD juvenile division also enters all juvenile arrests into the MOTION system.

Since 1973, many of the parishes surrounding New Orleans have established communications links with the MOTION system and use it to record their own arrests on the system. Jefferson Parish Sheriff began using the system in January of 1975, and entered arrests as old as 1916 into the system. St. Bernard Parish began somewhat later but also entered many old arrests. St. Tammany Parish has used the system only sporadically, as has

Plaquemines, and St. Charles. Together, these parishes make up the entire New Orleans metropolitan area, with Jefferson and St. Bernard representing a continuation of the New Orleans urban area. In Orleans and Jefferson parishes an attempt at fingerprint identification is made on new arrestees against locally maintained manual fingerprint files. MOTION, however, is not a fingerprint driven system in the sense that most state criminal history systems and FBI files are, since an arrest is always recorded in the system even if the individual is not fingerprinted and no cards are forwarded to the state depository or the FBI. Identification is made by the booking officer based on verbal responses from the arrestee or from identification carried by the arrestee. On the basis of such information, the booking officer decides to add the arrest to an already existing rap sheet, or treat the individual as a virgin arrest (at least in MOTION). In New Orleans and Jefferson, this identification is confirmed (for felonies and state misdemeanors, as well as selected municipal code violations) by comparison of prints with those on file, and the original booking record is corrected if necessary.

In addition to the date of arrest and other descriptive information about the charge (see appendix C), most New Orleans charge records also include an event identifier known as an "item number" (described in Section I). If an individual is arrested (booked) at the same time for three burglaries, each burglary will have a different item number. If he is booked for two charges related to the same criminal incident (for example,

burglary and possession of stolen property, or murder and rape) each charge will carry the same item number. If two individuals are arrested for committing a crime together, each individual will carry the same item number. The analysis in Section I indicated that about 7% of all NOPD arrests are related to more than one criminal event.

FINDEX is the record of all arrests made in Louisiana for which a fingerprint card has been submitted and accepted, and includes arrests recorded by the FBI. As in most states, not all local jurisdictions consistently submit fingerprint cards to the State Police (who maintain FINDEX) and some do not submit cards to the FBI. Most large urban areas, however, do fingerprint and submit cards regularly. Neither the FBI nor FINDEX maintain arrest data for juveniles.

FINDEX and FBI arrest histories have no criminal event identifier similar to NOPD's item number. This means that it is not possible to determine if a multi-charge arrest refers to one or more than one criminal event. The treatment of this problem is better described in the report on the analysis itself, since the treatment of charges is use-specific.

In addition to FINDEX/FBI and MOTION, a small number of juvenile arrests were added from the JIRMS database. Juvenile arrests appear in the MOTION system for New Orleans only. However, since committment charges are available for juveniles in other parishes from the JIRMS system, these charges are used in lieu of arrest data. Juvenile arrest data, therefore, can only be considered complete for New Orleans.

Most MOTION arrests were entered as statute numbers from the state criminal code or the municipal code. These were coded into modified FBI categories via a table. Though FINDEX has offense codes which could also be converted to FBI codes via a table, many of the Louisiana charges and all the out-of-state (FBI) charges were recorded as uncoded text in description fields. For this study, thousands of charges therefore had to be hand coded, and for the sake of consistency, all hand coding was done by the grant consultant (the author).

The charges were coded by the categories used by the FBI UCR reporting forms, with the following exceptions:

1) Certain charges of particular interest for the study or of particular seriousness not captured by UCR codes were coded in separate categories. Armed robberies were coded separately from other robberies. Kidnaping (which the FBI records under its "all others" category) was coded separately because of its seriousness. Trespassing/prowling (also coded in UCR under "all others") was distinguished because of its relationship to burglary.

2) Drug charges - especially for FINDEX/FBI but even for MOTION, can not be identified in the detailed categories required by UCR. Possession often cannot be distinguished from sale, even with state statute numbers (largely because of the complexity and ever-changing nature of the Louisiana narcotics statutes) and though marijuana usually can be distinguished from other drugs, the cocaine, heroin, and synthetic drugs cannot. Drug charges are therefore classified into two categories: Marijuana and Other

drugs.

3) Many items entered as charges in both the MOTION and FINDEX/FBI systems have no UCR equivalent. These include military charges (AWOL, etc), traffic charges, court warrant arrests, habitual offender charges, and technical probation violations. Also, we wished to code separately charges that are related to the arrest or incarceration process, such as escape, possession of contraband in an institution, and fugitive warrants. Though many of these are be excluded from the analysis as charges, they are useful in establishing the location of an individual, especially if in another state. These locations (or "contacts" as I will refer to non-charge criminal justice records) serve to further define free time at risk in the measurement area (New Orleans and Louisiana) since we have no data on incarcerations outside Louisiana. (See appendix A for a complete listing of charge codes.)

Custody Information

Custody information is drawn from three sources: STARS, CAJUN, and JIRMS. Each of these systems structures its information in a completely unique way, codes similar information differently, and uses different identifiers. CAJUN at one time maintained a separate set of records for each incarceration/supervision period for each individual, and a "penitentiary number" was assigned to each of these periods. At some time within the last ten years, multiple incarceration terms began to be combined under a single number. Individuals in CAJUN

are also be identified by "SID number" (state identification number) which is an index number to the FINDEX system. Identification information (name, race, sex, date of birth, and so forth) in CAJUN is maintained in one or more master records. Information on changes of inmate custody status (see appendix C) - including probation/parole as well as institutional location - are contained in "transfer records" maintained in a separate file. These transfer records contain "from" code groups and "to" code groups, which may refer to parish jails, LADOC institutions, other states, probation/parole districts, and special codes such as "ESC" - meaning escape. Sometimes the "from" or "to" code groups are blank. In addition to the codes there are a date and a three digit description code which gives the nature of the transfer. Ninety-three description codes are used. They may indicate an actual change of custody but sometimes indicate an event, such as a parole hearing or the issue of a warrant.

In a detailed analysis of individual records, it became clear that the meaning of a description code depends on agency or special status coded in the "from" and "to" records. These agency or status codes were first converted to simplified types (one letter codes) then combined with the description code to yield a five digit code. The five digit code was then translated into a custody status (parish prison, LADOC facility, escaped, etc) that could be more easily interpreted.

Each individual's custody history was then be expressed as a series of dated 5-digit codes. A number of complex algorithms were developed to check these series for logical consistency. (A

simple example: a custody code on a date later than a DB250 code is an error because DB250 means the individual died in a LADOC institution.) Most records passed the consistency test, but many gave indications that the 5-digit codes took on different meanings in different situations. More algorithms had to be designed to handle these contextual affects until all the records passed the logical consistency test.

The STARS database presented fewer problems of interpretation. STARS maintains records at the incarceration event level, so that each record represents a single term of jail incarceration. STARS includes a TYPE field which indicates the incarceration status of the individual at the time of release. The resulting custody status codes require some interpretation. The important TYPE codes are "UNS", "PARS", "MUN", "MUNS", "DOC", and "FED". "UNS", or "unsentenced" indicates that an individual left custody as an inmate charged with a state offense (usually a felony) but sentenced to a term of incarceration. The individual may have been convicted and sentenced to probation, found not guilty, had his charges dismissed (refused or nolle prosed), or simply made bond. The time period coded as "UNS", therefore, is treated as "pretrial". "MUN" has the same interpretation, but the type indicates the individual was held on municipal (city code violation) charges only. "FED" means that the individual was held for federal authorities - always an unsentenced status. (We have no information on time actually incarcerated in the federal system.)

"DOC", "PARS", and "MUNS" are sentenced statuses. They

indicate that an individual was sentenced to incarceration at the LADOC, the parish jail under state statutes, or the parish jail under the municipal code, respectively. In the case of PARS and MUNS types, the individual was released after serving his sentence. "DOC" either indicates that the individual was released after serving a sentence to the penitentiary, his sentenced term having ended before he could be transferred to LADOC, or it indicates that he was in fact transferred to the penitentiary. If an individual was unable to make bond and was held prior to trial, then convicted and sentenced to incarceration, this pretrial time is included in the period coded as sentenced, even though was not originally sentenced time. This is done because it is a virtually universal sentencing practice to grant "credit for time served" when sentencing an individual who has been held in jail pretrial. Therefore pretrial time in this study is treated as sentenced time for those individuals eventually sentenced to incarceration.

THE PROBLEM OF IDENTIFICATION

A critical problem rarely discussed in official record studies is identifying all criminal history records belonging to an individual offender. The extremely diverse and uncoordinated nature of the criminal justice system in the United States, (especially the independence of very small law enforcement agencies), means that an individual can generate criminal records in many different jurisdictions within a relatively short period of time. Some attempt is made to assemble indices to these records - particularly arrest records - in state and FBI

fingerprint depositories, but the results are very inadequate.

The more research draws criminal history data from multiple sources, the more the problem of identification presents itself. The use of aliases, the misspelling of names, the misentry of identifying information, and other factors lead to a situation in which the assembly of an offender's complete history requires more than a simple search for a name, race, sex, and date of birth in each database. The failure to proceed beyond such simplistic search methods leads to an undercounting of criminal justice contacts, and, consequently an undercounting of more active offenders.

An important step in developing the database for the New Orleans Offender Study involved a series of procedures aimed at creating an arrest history database and a custody database that maintain some balance between false positive and false negative error. The intention was to match records that could be expected to apply to a single individual with a high, but not perfect, degree of probability. A series of procedures were performed to link databases, to identify all criminal justice contacts for an individual, and to reduce false negative errors while holding false positive errors to a minimum. (A detailed description of these procedures can be found on appendix D.)

These procedures produced a sample of 22,561 individuals. A descriptive breakdown of their characteristics is given in tables 5 and 6. There were 17,751 burglars and 7,588 armed robbers, with 2,778 individuals falling into both categories. These offenders are predominantly black (burglars, 76%, armed robbers, 87%) and

overwhelmingly male (burglars, 95%, armed robbers, 94%). Birth cohorts are unevenly represented because of the sampling frame and the typical age distribution of arrests. Frequencies peak both for burglars and armed robbers for cohorts 1957-60.

Merging the Databases and Sample Selection

Limited resources did not allow for analysis of the entire study population in Phase I. Though standing alone, each database passed tests for logical consistency and accuracy, the merger of the databases created certain inconsistencies in the coding format. One example: STARS records coded "DOC" contain a date of release. This date of release is coded as the start of custody status "free". In some cases, however, the inmate was not actually released but simply transferred to a LADOC institution. This can only be determined from the merged file when an appropriate code from CAJUN ("transfer from parish prison") occurs on "about" the same date. (Dates often do not match exactly because of different coding conventions in the two organizations.) There are many other types of inconsistencies. Most are not actually errors but simply points of confusion which require data from more than one database to resolve. Unfortunately, this final resolution of inconsistencies could only be done record by record - manually. Since there were more than a quarter million custody records alone, a sample had to be drawn for the first phase analysis.

This study focuses on the determination of the criminal justice system's incapacitation effect on burglary and armed robbery. Complete custody data, including jail custody, is

available only for the years 1981-1986. Individuals are defined as active in their criminal careers only during the time period between their first and last known arrests. The sample was drawn, then, only from individuals who had some "arrest bracketed" time during the period 1981-1986: 15,139 individuals met this criterion. White and black males (population n=14,335) were chosen. A disproportionately stratified sample of males was chosen randomly within race, age cohort, and estimated incapacitation groups. Approximate incapacitation level was roughly estimated from the study population, since the final manual check for inconsistencies could not be performed on the population. Weights, however, were assigned to the sample cases so that generalizations can be made to the study population.

The race and age cohort distribution of the sample is shown in table 7. Despite the disproportionate sampling methods used to maximize variation in race, sex, and bracketed incarceration time, the very low number of white armed robbers (see Table 2) in the offender population meant that even 100% samples led to low N's in some cells. Overall, however, analysis of the sample should lead to useful results even when subdivided into race, age, and incarceration experience subgroups.

After sample selection, the merged sample custody records (about 36,147) were examined one at a time by the author. The following general rules were followed:

1) Confusion on length of incarceration was always resolved to minimize time incarcerated. For example, if a start date for incarceration was missing, it was set equal to the release date

(i.e., incarcerated one day).

2) In three cases, overlapping custody records indicated that two individuals may have been identified as one. These cases were removed from the analysis.

3) Whenever a case had a missing date for an index arrest, the entire case was removed.

4) Some CAJUN records indicated a transfer to a parish jail other than Orleans or to OPSCO prior to 1981. Since the length of jail incarceration could not be determined, the transfer was treated as a release to "free".

5) Some out-of-state FINDEX records indicated sentences to incarceration in other states. Since the actual length of incarceration could not be determined, however, these incarceration periods were removed. After these procedures, the sample consisted of 1,972 burglars and 1,550 armed robbers. In all, adjustments were made to 1,783 of 36,147 custody records. (Each custody record represented the beginning of a new status type.) These individuals had a total of 87,778 charges. From these the following types were removed: traffic, juvenile status offenses, escape, charge unknown, incarceration-related charge (contraband, for example), probation violations, military charges (AWOL,etc), non-criminal entries (such as license applications), warrants, attachments, capiases, contempt, habitual offender charges, and fugitive arrests. In all, 19,214 of these charges were removed. Finally, <u>any</u> charge submitted by a correctional institution was removed. (4022 charges.) This left 64542 charges for conversion to the final study database.

Location of Arrests

As table 8 shows, about 80% of charges were from arrests made in the city of New Orleans, 14.3% occurred in other Louisiana parishes, and 5.1% were found in other states. More than two-thirds of the other parish arrests occurred in the two parishes - Jefferson and St. Bernard - adjacent to the city. (The city of New Orleans is exactly coterminous with the parish.) This seems to indicate a relatively low rate of transiency, a least among New Orleans burglars and armed robbers.

These figures may exaggerate the residential stability of this population, however. The MOTION system is much more inclusive in its recording of arrests than FINDEX and the FBI arrest record system. Specifically, MOTION includes minor and juvenile arrests, whereas FINDEX and FBI do not. The analysis was therefore rerun to include only adult index charges in the study sample. In this case 77% of the charges occurred in New Orleans, 16% in other parishes, and 7% out-of-state. The results still indicate a relatively stable population of offenders. The presence of non-New Orleans arrests, however, does indicate that some incarceration time will not be counted for offenders in the study: jail incarceration time outside New Orleans and penitentiary incarceration time outside Louisiana and in the Federal system.

The pattern of arrests in other states is somewhat surprising. First, the arrests are concentrated in the following five states: California, Florida, New York, Texas, and Georgia.

These states account for almost two-thirds of all out-of-state criminal charges. Mississippi, the state closest to New Orleans (Hancock county is less than an hour's drive from downtown and the Mississippi Gulf Coast is heavily frequented by city residents), records only 83 arrests, ranking eighth among all states. These patterns in part reflect the migration patterns of those demographic groups most likely to be arrested, especially in the cases of Florida and Texas.

But it is likely that the quality and reliability of fingerprint submissions to the FBI are more important. Each of the top five states are among the fifteen states chosen by the FBI for Phase II testing of the Interstate Identification Index, both because of the better than average quality of these states' computerized criminal history systems and because of their high rates of fingerprint submission. This confirms that the charges included in this database do not represent 100% of individuals' career arrests, though it is likely that the records are much more complete than most - if not all - criminal history research databases.

Conversion to Manyears

The final step in preparation of the sample for analysis was conversion of the sample to manyears. A manyear is defined as a birthday year (birthday to birthday) so that each manyear corresponds exactly to an age. Only adult manyears (17 and above) were created, since the completeness both of arrest and incarceration data is lower for juveniles and not directly comparable to adult year measurements. (In phase II - which will

cover the entire study population - juveniles will be present in sufficient numbers for special separate analysis.) As described above, only manyears bracketed by arrests in preceding and succeeding manyears were created. This means that the manyear in which an individual's first and last arrests occur is not created, and those arrests - as well as any others occurring in those manyears - are not counted. Counting these arrests, as Blumstein and Cohen (1979) pointed out in a similar analysis, would upwardly bias the charge counts. It is probably the case, however, that eliminating these arrests biases the results in an opposite direction. For phase I, at least, the conservative course has been chosen.

TABLE 1

FBI INDEX CRIMES RANKED BY SURVEY

SERIOUNESS SCORES

	NATIONAL SURVEY ITEMS			RANKINGS			
Offense	Mean	Median	Typical	FBI	Mean	Med	Typ
PART I							
Murder	40.31	39.20	35.70	1	1	1	1
Negligent Manslaughter	19.50	19.50	19.50		5	5	5
Forcible Rape	25.30	25.80	22.80	2	2	2	2
Robbery (Armed)	12.95	13.50	9.70	3	7	7	9
(Unarmed)	8.76	8.00	8.00	3	10	10	11
Aggravated Assault	14.24	16.40	18.00	4	6	6	6
Burglary	6.37	5.60	9.60	5	15	15	10
Larceny - Theft	4.86	4.00	4.90	6	19	20	17
Motor Vehicle Theft	6.70	8.00	10.80	7	13	10	8
Arson	19.97	22.30	22.30	8	4	4	4
PART II							
Other Assaults	12.19	11.30	11.80	9	9	8	7
Forgery & Counterfeit.	7.20	7.20	7.20	10	12	12	13
Fraud	7.33	6.75	7.40	11	11	13	12
Embezzlement	5.83	6.20	6.20	12	16	14	15
Stolen Property	5.00	5.00	5.00	13	18	16	16
Vandalism	-	-	-	14	-	-	-
Weapons	3.03	3.50	4.60	15	21	21	19
Prostitution	4.05	4.01	2.10	16	20	19	20
Other Sex Offenses	6.50	4.70	4.70	17	14	18	18
Drugs (Non- marijuana)	12.83	8.40	6.50	18	8	9	14
(Marijuana)	5.43	4.95	1.40		17	17	21
Gambling	1.10	1.10	1.10	19	23	23	23
Offenses - Family	-	-	-	20	-	-	-
D. U. I.	(1.26	(1.26)	(1.26	)21	22	22	22
Disorderly Conduct	1.10	1.10	1.10	22	23	23	23
Vagrancy	.30	.30	.30	23	27	27	27
All Other	-	-	-	24	-	-	-
(Kidnaping)	22.8	22.85	22.8	24	3	3	3
(Trespassing/Prowl.)	.7	.70	.6	24	26	26	26
Suspicion	-	-	-	25	-	-	-
Juvenile Status	.75	.75	.8	26	25	25	25

Source: FBI and National Survey of Crime Severity, (Wolfgang et. al., 1985)

Note: Crimes in parentheses are not separately classified by the FBI but are in the New Orleans Offender Study.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARGES AMONG ARRESTS

ALL CHARGES			INDEX ONLY		
# Arrests	# Charges	%	# Arrests	#Charges	%
108190	1	60.94	58909	1	81.82
40154	2	22.62	9265	2	12.87
15101	3	8.51	2046	3	2.84
6951	4	3.91	781	4	1.08
2997	5	1.69	357	5	0.50
4156	6+	2.31	640	6+	1.08
177549			71998		

Total Charges All 312130 Avg per arrest 1.76
INDEX 95648 1.33

Charges Not Counted If Arrests Are Reduced to a Single Charge:

ALL 43.12%
INDEX 32.85%

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF CRIMINAL EVENTS AMONG ARRESTS

ALL CHARGES			INDEX ONLY		
# Arrests	# Events	%	# Arrests	# Events	%
162970	1	91.79	67216	1	93.36
10980	2	6.18	3209	2	4.46
2038	3	1.15	744	3	1.03
626	4	0.35	287	4	0.40
312	5	0.18	169	5	0.23
623	6+	0.34	373	6+	0.49
177549			71998		

Total Events All 201281 Avg per arrest 1.13
INDEX 81796 1.14

Events Not Counted If Arrests Are Reduced to a Single Charge: All 11.79%
INDEX 11.98%

Persons Arrested 22404

Persons With At One Least Multi-Event Arrest: All 9082 40.54%
INDEX 3947 17.62%

TABLE 4

PERSONS WITH AT LEAST ONE EVENT NOT COUNTED

BY NUMBER OF ARRESTS 1973-1986

Number of Arrests in Period	Number of Persons	% Persons with at least One Multi-Event Arrest	Percent Expected by Chance	Difference (Actual - Expected)
1	8136	8.35	6.64	1.71
2	4402	13.83	12.84	0.99
3	2877	19.15	18.63	0.52
4	2037	22.83	24.03	-0.68
5	1401	26.05	29.07	-3.02
6	994	32.09	33.78	-1.69
7	706	31.87	38.17	-6.30
8	488	34.02	42.28	-8.26
9	348	39.94	46.11	-6.17
10	258	42.64	49.69	-7.05

TABLE 5

ARRESTED FOR BURGLARY IN NEW ORLEANS: 1973-1986

BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N
BLACK FEMALES					
1921	1	1947	9	1964	30
1926	1	1948	11	1965	23
1927	1	1949	7	1966	30
1932	1	1950	17	1967	17
1933	1	1951	14	1968	15
1935	2	1952	24	1969	3
1936	5	1953	27	1970	7
1937	1	1954	26	1971	3
1938	3	1955	22	1972	3
1939	3	1956	34	1973	5
1940	4	1957	44	1974	2
1941	6	1958	35	1975	5
1942	6	1959	39	1978	1
1943	7	1960	30	1979	1
1944	6	1961	27		
1945	7	1962	25		
1946	6	1963	24	TOTAL	621
ORIENTAL FEMALES					
1942	1			TOTAL	1
SPANISH FEMALES					
1970	1			TOTAL	1
WHITE FEMALES					
1900	1	1945	1	1961	10
1920	1	1946	5	1962	13
1923	1	1947	3	1963	8
1925	1	1948	5	1964	8
1927	1	1949	1	1965	10
1930	1	1950	3	1966	6
1931	2	1951	5	1967	5
1932	1	1952	4	1968	4
1936	1	1953	11	1969	1
1938	1	1954	10	1970	5
1939	4	1955	17	1971	7
1940	3	1956	16	1972	1
1941	1	1957	24	1974	2
1942	2	1958	18		
1943	4	1959	17		
1944	2	1960	17	TOTAL	264
				TOTAL FEMALE	887

TABLE 5 (Cont.)

ARRESTED FOR BURGLARY IN NEW ORLEANS: 1971-1986

BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N
BLACK MALES					
1904	1	1936	35	1960	766
1907	1	1937	44	1961	708
1908	1	1938	47	1962	699
1910	2	1939	50	1963	597
1915	2	1940	73	1964	580
1916	1	1941	84	1965	448
1917	3	1942	91	1966	466
1919	5	1943	94	1967	401
1920	8	1944	108	1968	294
1921	3	1945	130	1969	263
1922	7	1946	151	1970	256
1923	5	1947	198	1971	179
1924	6	1948	207	1972	134
1925	11	1949	228	1973	92
1926	8	1950	298	1974	52
1927	19	1951	351	1975	37
1928	13	1952	391	1976	16
1929	22	1953	390	1977	13
1930	17	1954	482	1978	3
1931	20	1955	474	1979	4
1932	40	1956	577	1980	1
1933	31	1957	704	1981	1
1934	28	1958	690		
1935	41	1959	694	TOTAL	12896
ORIENTAL MALES					
1937	1	1956	2	1965	7
1939	1	1957	3	1966	9
1945	1	1958	3	1967	2
1947	1	1959	1	1968	3
1950	1	1960	2	1970	2
1951	1	1961	1		
1952	1	1962	3		
1955	2	1964	5	TOTAL	52
SPANISH MALES					
1929	1	1953	6	1964	3
1931	1	1954	4	1965	3
1937	1	1955	6	1966	6
1940	1	1956	1	1967	9
1943	1	1957	3	1968	2
1944	3	1958	8	1969	4
1945	5	1959	2	1970	3
1947	2	1960	4	1972	2
1950	3	1961	5	1973	2
1951	4	1962	7	1975	1
1952	4	1963	4		
				TOTAL	111
WHITE MALES					
1902	1	1935	18	1956	201
1911	3	1936	17	1957	258
1912	1	1937	20	1958	248
1916	4	1938	17	1959	256
1918	2	1939	20	1960	219
1919	2	1940	31	1961	208
1920	4	1941	26	1962	186
1921	3	1942	35	1963	137
1922	3	1943	32	1964	126
1923	8	1944	35	1965	109
1924	6	1945	55	1966	84
1925	5	1946	56	1967	63
1926	10	1947	63	1968	62
1927	4	1948	71	1969	43
1928	18	1949	92	1970	25
1929	8	1950	92	1971	11
1930	11	1951	104	1972	8
1931	7	1952	110	1973	3
1932	11	1953	143	1974	1
1933	18	1954	172	1975	1
1934	19	1955	199		
				TOTAL	3805
				TOTAL MALES	16864

TABLE 6

ARRESTED FOR ARMED ROBBERY IN NEW ORLEANS: 1973-1986

BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N
BLACK FEMALES					
1923	1	1944	3	1959	24
1925	1	1945	4	1960	18
1929	1	1946	6	1961	19
1931	1	1947	4	1962	18
1932	1	1948	5	1963	12
1933	1	1949	13	1964	15
1935	1	1950	15	1965	11
1936	2	1951	10	1966	11
1937	1	1952	15	1967	3
1938	2	1953	13	1968	5
1939	2	1954	13	1969	1
1940	4	1955	20	1971	2
1941	1	1956	24	1972	1
1942	4	1957	16		
1943	2	1958	21	TOTAL	347
ORIENTAL FEMALES					
1956	1			TOTAL	1
SPANISH FEMALES					
None					
WHITE FEMALES					
1927	1	1949	3	1960	1
1930	1	1950	2	1961	4
1934	1	1951	4	1962	4
1936	1	1952	3	1963	5
1942	1	1953	5	1964	5
1943	1	1954	3	1966	3
1944	1	1955	6	1967	4
1945	2	1956	8	1968	1
1946	1	1957	9		
1947	1	1958	8	TOTAL	98
1948	4	1959	5		
				TOTAL FEMALES	446

TABLE 6 (Cont.)

ARRESTED FOR ARMED ROBBERY IN NEW ORLEANS: 1973-1986

BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N	BIRTH COHORT	N
BLACK MALES					
1908	1	1939	30	1960	373
1912	1	1940	32	1961	325
1915	1	1941	41	1962	293
1918	1	1942	45	1963	298
1920	2	1943	49	1964	281
1923	3	1944	46	1965	218
1924	5	1945	70	1966	207
1925	2	1946	90	1967	154
1926	1	1947	97	1968	121
1927	3	1948	119	1969	75
1928	2	1949	143	1970	46
1929	7	1950	166	1971	39
1930	7	1951	200	1972	20
1931	4	1952	235	1973	11
1932	10	1953	226	1974	3
1933	8	1954	285	1975	3
1934	16	1955	298	1976	1
1935	11	1956	331		
1936	15	1957	389		
1937	15	1958	368	TOTAL	6230
1938	24	1959	363		
ORIENTAL MALES					
1950	1	1958	1	1966	2
1956	1	1962	1		
				TOTAL	6
SPANISH MALES					
1949	1	1959	3	1964	2
1950	2	1960	2	1965	2
1951	1	1961	3	1966	1
1956	2	1962	2		
1958	2	1963	1	TOTAL	24
WHITE MALES					
1911	1	1939	4	1958	52
1918	1	1940	6	1959	32
1919	1	1941	6	1960	35
1920	1	1942	8	1961	32
1921	2	1943	15	1962	33
1922	3	1944	20	1963	17
1924	2	1945	25	1964	15
1925	4	1946	22	1965	11
1927	3	1947	24	1966	16
1928	2	1948	21	1967	8
1930	5	1949	22	1968	4
1931	9	1950	27	1969	3
1932	2	1951	47	1970	5
1933	4	1952	36	1971	3
1934	5	1953	57	1972	1
1935	6	1954	45	1973	1
1936	5	1955	45		
1937	7	1956	59		
1938	8	1957	54	TOTAL	882
				TOTAL MALES	7142

TABLE 7

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Birth Cohorts	Black Males	White Males
Burglars:		
< 1940	142	110
1941-1944	154	75
1945-1949	222	130
1950-1954	235	143
1955-1959	237	148
1960-1963	237	138
Armed Robbers:		
< 1940	109	21
1941-1944	109	23
1945-1949	215	56
1950-1954	224	103
1955-1959	235	124
1960-1963	236	95

TABLE 8

ARREST LOCATIONS FOR NEW ORLEANS

BURGLARY/ARMED ROBBERY OFFENDERS

Location	# Charges	Percent
New Orleans	51345	80.6
Other Louisiana Parishes	9116	14.3
Other States (Order of Freq.)		
California	716	
Florida	549	
New York	354	
Texas	228	
Georgia	188	
All Others	1230	
TOTAL	3265	5.1
TOTAL CHARGES	63726	100.0

APPENDIX A

CHARGE CODES

CODE	CLASSIFICATION
01	MURDER & NON-NEG HOMICIDE
02	MANSLAUGHTER BY NEGLIGENCE
03	FORCIBLE RAPE
04	ROBBERY (UNARMED)
A4	ARMED ROBBERY
05	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT
06	BURGLARY
07	LARCENY THEFT
08	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT (INCL UNAUTH USE)
09	OTHER ASSAULTS
10	ARSON
11	FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING
12	FRAUD
13	EMBEZZLEMENT
14	STOLEN PROPERTY
15	VANDALISM (INL CRIM MISCH, CRIM DAMAGE)
16	WEAPONS
17	PROSTITUTION
18	OTHER SEX OFFENSES
19	DRUGS (OTHER THAN MARIJUANA)
21	MARIJUANA
24	BOOKMAKING
25	NUMBERS AND LOTTERY

26	ALL OTHER GAMBLING
27	OFFENSES AGAINST THE FAMILY
28	DUI
29	LIQUOR LAWS
30	DRUNKENNESS
31	DISORDERLY CONDUCT
32	VAGRANCY
33	OTHER
35*	TRAFFIC
36*	JUVENILE STATUS OFFENSES
37*	ESCAPE
39*	INCARCERATION RELATED CHARGE
40*	TECHNICAL PROBATION OR BOND VIOLATION
41*	MILITARY CODE VIOLATION (AWOL, ETC)
42*	HABITUAL OFFENDER
43	KIDNAPING
44	TRESPASSING/PROWLING
97*	WARRANT/ATTACHMENT/CAPIAS/CONTEMPT
99*	FUGITIVE

* Not treated as a charge. "Contact" only.

APPENDIX B

CUSTODY STATUS CODES

CODE	CUSTODY TYPE
1	Unsentenced on state statute charges. Type "UNS" in STARS.
2	Unsentenced on federal charges. Type "FED" in STARS.
3	Sentenced to parish jail for violation of state statutes. Type "PARS" in STARS.
4	Other incarceration in parish jail. (STARS)
5	Sentenced to LADOC but held in parish jail. Source may be STARS or CAJUN.
6	Incarcerated in LADOC adult facility.
7	Incarcerated in LADOC juvenile facility.
8	On probation in Louisiana. (CAJUN)
9	On parole in Louisiana. (CAJUN)
10	Out of state after transfer from LADOC institution or supervision. Status (custody or supervision) is unknown. (CAJUN)
11	Escape. (CAJUN)
12	Abscond (flight from probation or parole supervision. CAJUN)
13	Free. Under no recorded form of supervision and not dead.
14	In federal custody or supervision after transfer from LADOC. (CAJUN)
15	Furloughed. (CAJUN)
16	Work release. Assigned to a LADOC work release facility. (CAJUN)
17	Dead. Known only if death occurred under LADOC supervision or custody. (CAJUN)
18	Unsentenced on violations of city ordinances. STARS type "MUN".

20 Out-of-state assumed incarcerated. Transferred from LADOC custody to out-of-state institution then received back into LADOC custody. (CAJUN)

22 Out-of-state on parole. Transferred to out-of-state supervision from LADOC parole then later received back into LADOC parole. (CAJUN)

23 Out-of-state on probation. Same criteria as #22 but for LADOC probation. (CAJUN)

24 Sentenced to parish jail for violation of a city ordinance. "MUNS" type in STARS.

Note: Codes 19 and 21 were statuses for which no cases were found, though codes for them existed in CAJUN documentation.

APPENDIX C

CAJUN TRANSFER RECORD CODES

CODE	DESCRIPTION
101	NEW COMMITMENT TO DOC
102	SENTENCED TO DOC BUT HELD IN LOCAL JAIL
104	RECOMMITMENT TO DOC FROM APPEAL OR BOND OUT
126	COMMITMENT TO DOC AFTER TRANSFER FROM ANOTHER STATE
201	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON COURT ORDER
202	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON FULLTERM SENTENCE EXPIRATION
203	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE
204	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON GOODTIME
205	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON PARDON
206	DEATH IN INSTITUTION - CAUSE UNKNOWN
207	DEATH BY EXECUTION
208	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION AFTER CONVICTION REVERSED
209	TRANSFER TO OUT OF STATE INSTITUTION - TIME CC OR CS
210	COMMITMENT TO INSTITUTION AFTER RETURN FROM OUT OF STATE
212	RELEASE TO DETAINER
213	TRANSFER TO PARISH PRISON UNDER DOC JURISDICTION
214	OTHER RELEASE
215	PAROLED
216	PAROLED FROM A PARISH PRISON (NON-DOC)
225	ANY WITHIN-STATE TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION
226	TRANSFER TO CLASS. CENTER FOR REVALUATION &

REASSIGNMENT

234	PAROLED TO DETAINER - IN OR OUT OF STATE
237	RELEASE TO APPEAL OR BOND OUT
238	RELEASE FROM INSTITUTION ON GOODTIME OR PAROLE SUPERVISION
239	RELEASE FROM INSTIT ON GT OR PAROLE SUPERVISION (DETAINER)
250	DEATH IN INSTITUTION - RESULT OF CRIMINAL ACT
251	DEATH IN INSTITUTION - RESULT OF NONCRIMINAL ACT
305	TRANSFER TO LA PAROLE FROM OUT OF STATE (NON-LA CASE)
310	RETURN TO LA PAROLE FROM OUT OF STATE (LA CASE)
311	RETURN TO LA PAROLE AFTER REPRIMAND
312	PAROLE SUPERVISION SUSPENDED (NON REPORTING STATUS)
313	MULTIPLE SENTENCE CASE. PAROLE ON SINGLE SENTENCE STARTS
314	MULTIPLE SENTENCE CASE. PAROLE ON SINGLE SENTENCE ENDS
402	EXPIRATION OF PAROLE
403	END OF PAROLE THROUGH SENTENCE COMMUTATION
405	END OF PAROLE - NEW SENTENCE ON NON-LA CASE
406	REVOCATION OF PAROLE & RECOMMITMENT: NEW FELONY CONVICTION
407	REVOCATION OF PAROLE & RECOMMITMENT: TECHNICAL VIOLATION
409	LA PAROLE ENDED OR INTERRUPTED:TRANSFER TO ANOTHER STATE
410	NON-LA CASE ON PAROLE RETURNED TO OTHER STATE
411	PAROLE EXPIRED: TERMINATION UNSATISFACTORY
412	DEATH WHILE ON PAROLE: RESULT OF A CRIMINAL ACT
413	DEATH WHILE ON PAROLE: RESULT OF A NONCRIMINAL ACT
414	DEATH WHILE ON PAROLE: CAUSE UNKNOWN

416	OTHER RELEASE FROM PAROLE
426	PAROLE OR GOODTIME REVOCATION & RECOMMITMENT: NEW FELONY
427	PAROLE OR GOODTIME REVOCATION & RECOMMITMENT: TECHNICAL
456	TRANSFER OF IN-STATE INSTITUTIONAL CUSTODY
501	PROBATION ON NEW CONVICTION
503	REINSTATED ON NEW CONVICTION
506	PROBATION TRANSFERRED TO LA ON NON-LA CASE
510	PROBATION RETURNED TO LA FROM ANOTHER STATE ON LA CASE
511	PROBATION EXTENDED
512	PROBATION SUPERVISION SUSPENDED (NONREPORTING STATUS)
513	MULTIPLE SENTENCE CASE: SINGLE PROBATION SENTENCE STARTS
514	MULTIPLE SENTENCE CASE: SINGLE PROBATION SENTENCE ENDS
601	PROBATION ENDS ON COURT ORDER
602	PROBATION EXPIRES
606	REVOCATION OF PROBATION & COMMITMENT: NEW FELONY
607	REVOCATION OF PROBATION & COMMITMENT: TECHNICAL
608	REVOCATION OF PROBATION & COMMITMENT UNDER PARISH CUSTODY
609	TRANSFER OF PROBATION TO ANOTHER STATE (NON-LA CASE)
610	RETURN OF PROBATION TO ANOTHER STATE (NON-LA CASE)
611	PROBATION EXPIRES: TERMINATION UNSATISFACTORY
612	DEATH WHILE ON PROBATION: RESULT OF A CRIMINAL ACT
613	DEATH WHILE ON PROBATION: RESULT OF A NON CRIMINAL ACT
614	DEATH WHILE ON PROBATION: CAUSE UNKNOWN
615	END OF PROBATION: ILLEGAL SENTENCE

616	OTHER RELEASE FROM PROBATION
700	FIRST OFFENDER PARDON STATUS
712	PAROLE REVOCATION - NOT REVOKED ?
720	PAROLE HEARING - GRANTED
721	PAROLE HEARING - DENIED
722	PAROLE HEARING - WITHDRAWN
723	PAROLE HEARING - CONTINUED
724	PAROLE - ORDER RESCINDED
731	WORK RELEASE DENIED
732	WORK RELEASE WITHDRAWN
800	COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE (TIME CUT)
888	ADMINISTRATIVE MOVEMENTS
900	ABSCOND
902	WARRANT ISSUED
910	RETURN FROM ABSCOND
912	WARRANT RECALLED
920	ESCAPE
930	ESCAPEE RETURNED
940	INTRA-INSTITUTION TRANSFER
950	INTER-DISTRICT TRANSFER (PROBATION OR PAROLE)
960	SUPERVISORY DATA CHANGE (INACTIVE)
970	ADMINISTRATIVE TRANSFER TO PARISH PRISON
980	ADMINISTRATIVE TRANSFER TO OUT OF STATE PROB OR PAR SUPERVISION
981	INTER-STATE TRANSFER OF PROBATION OR PAROLE SUPERVISION
990	ADMINISTRATIVE TRANSFER TO OUT OF STATE PROB OR PAR SUPERVISION

APPENDIX D

RECORD MATCHING PROCEDURES

1) STARS records were first matched to MOTION identified individuals. First criteria set: last name, first name, middle initial, race, sex, date of birth, and CCN# (a MOTION index number often added to STARS records at booking) had to be exactly the same in both records.

2) STARS to MOTION. Second criteria set : last name, first, mi, race, sex, and date of birth.

3) STARS to MOTION. Third criteria set: CCN#, sex, date of birth.

4) STARS to MOTION. Fourth criteria set: CCN#, sex, and last name.

5) STARS to MOTION. Fifth criteria set: Arrest Register # (a unique booking number assigned by the MOTION system and re-entered into STARS), sex, and last name.

6) STARS to MOTION. Sixth criteria set: Bureau of Identification # (B of I# :the local ID assigned by NOPD's fingerprint analysts), last name, and date of birth.

7) STARS to MOTION. Seventh criteria set: Social security number, last name, and date of birth.

8) MOTION records were then searched to identify duplicates. First criteria set: records maintained on two individuals who had identical name, race. sex, and date of birth.

9) MOTION duplicate search. Second criteria set: last name,

first three characters of first name, Social security number, ORI (booking agency ID), and not matched in prior run.

10) MOTION duplicate search. Third criteria set: last name, first three characters of first, FBI# (fingerprint number assigned by the FBI), ORI, and not matched in prior run.

11) Study population extraction. A unique "grant number" is assigned to each individual identified through the matching procedures. A separate grant file was then created for all offenders with at least one burglary or armed robbery arrest in New Orleans during the years 1973-1986.

12) CAJUN master records are matched to MOTION records containing grant ID number. First criteria set: complete name, race, sex and date of birth. Rerun without middle initial, then rerun without race.

13) CAJUN to MOTION. Second criteria set: social security number and last name, first name, and date of birth.

14) CAJUN to MOTION, Third criteria set: driver's license number and name.

15) CAJUN to MOTION. Fourth criteria set: B of I# (called LID# in CAJUN) and first name, last name, and date of birth.

16) Study database to FINDEX. The key to the FINDEX system is SID#, which is recorded both in the CAJUN and MOTION databases. Both these databases are searched for SID's, and these numbers are added to the study database. A program then uses these numbers to access appropriate FINDEX records and link them to the study database.

Further matches are attempted using the combinations of FBI#,

SSN#, B of I#, name, race sex, and date of birth, used in the MOTION to STARS matching process.

17) JIRMS to FINDEX and Study database. Juvenile records are matched both to FINDEX and the study identifier file using name, race, sex, and date of birth. (Since there are fewer identifiers available in the JIRMS database, fewer separate matching procedures were possible.)

18) Arrests in the study database reported from multiple sources (duplicated primarily because they were both in FINDEX and MOTION) were corrected by removing all but one.

19) Transitional charge and custody files were created, merging the five databases based on the links established by the matching procedures. Of the final sample of 22,561 offenders, 18,734 had FINDEX records, 11,203 had CAJUN records, and 722 had JIRMS records.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1984 Belair, R. "Legal Rules and Policy Initiatives in the Use of Criminal Justice Information." In Information Policy and Crime Control Stategies.Proceedings of a BJS/SEARCH Conference. SEARCH Group, Inc. Sacramento, California.

1985 Belair, R. Data Quality of Criminal History Records. U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, D.C.

1979 Blumstein, A. and J. Cohen. "Estimation of Individual Crime Rates from Arrest Records", Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. 70 No. 4

1979 Bridges, G. S. Levels and Effects of Response Error in Self-Reports of Crime and Delinquency. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

1988 Collins, M. F. "Some Cautionary Notes on the Use of the Sellin-Wolfgang Index of Crime Seriousness", Journal of Quantitative Criminology, Vol. 4, No. 4.

1978 Colton, K. W., ed. Police Computer Technology. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

1984 Cooper, G. R. "New Initiatives and the Criminal Justice Environment: a Case Study of the Interstate Indentification Index." In Information Policy and Crime Control Stategies. Proceedings of a BJS/SEARCH Conference. SEARCH Group, Inc. Sacramento, California.

1981 Fox, J. A. and P. E. Tracy. "A Field Validation of a Quantitative Randomized Response Model." In 1980 Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods. Washington, D.C., American Statistical Association.

1937 Gluek, S. and E. Gluek. Later Criminal Careers.

1940 Gluek, S. and E. Gluek. Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up.

1987 Greenwood, P. and S. Turner. Selective Incapacitation Revisited: Why the High-Rate Offenders Are Hard to Predict. Rand Corp.

1984 Hunter, W. "Fingerprint rejection rates in New Orleans and other southern cities." Unpublished report.

1986 Laudon, K. C. Dossier Society: Value Choices in the Design of National Information Systems. Columbia University Press, New York

1981 Marquis, K. H. Quality of Prisoner Self-Reports. Arrest and Conviction Response Errors. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

1988 Miranne, A. and M. Geerken. "The New Orleans Inmate Survey: Inmate Self-Reports of Criminal Offenses." A Report to the National Institute of Justice

1982 Office of Technology Assesment, An Assessment of Alternatives for a National Computerized Criminal History System. Washington, D.C.

1972 Wolfgang, M., R. Figlio and T. Sellin, Delinquency in a Birth Cohort.

1985 Wolfgang, M. E., R. Figlio, P. E. Tracy and S. I. Singer. The National Survey of Crime Severity, U.S. Dept. of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington D.C.

1976 Wyner, G. "Response Errors in Self-Reports of Arrest Histories", in Mathematica Policy Research, Princeton, N.J.