170544

C2

170544

RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE

/RTI

January 1995

Draft

Potential of NIBRS for Supporting National Studies of Non-Family Abductions of Children

Prepared by:

Pamela Messerschmidt
Molly McCalla
Karen Mead
Research Triangle Institute

Howard Snyder
National Center
for Juvenile Justice

Prepared for:

January 1995   Draft

Potential of NIBRS for Supporting National Studies of Non-Family Abductions of Children

Prepared by:

Pamela Messerschmidt	Howard Snyder
Molly McCalla	National Center
Karen Mead	for Juvenile Justice
Research Triangle Institute	

Prepared for:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531

OJJDP Cooperative Agreement No. 92-MC-CX-K002
RTI Project No. 5313-2

Acknowledgments

Contents

Exhibits

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study, "Testing Incident-Based Reporting Systems for Studying Child Abductions," is to examine the feasibility of using the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and/or State and local incident-based reporting system(s) (IBRS) that feed NIBRS, as a basis for estimating nonfamily abductions (NFAs) of children. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) awarded a cooperative agreement to Research Triangle Institute (RTI) and the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) to conduct this study in order to inform estimation studies of missing children, particularly the National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, Thrownaway Children (NISMART).

NFAs were estimated in the first NISMART by extracting information from paper records in a sample of local police agencies. This was a costly and time-consuming method. NIBRS, a national automated system currently being implemented, may provide the data to estimate NFAs more efficiently and cost-effectively. NIBRS is designed to replace the traditional summary data collected by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program, an automated system that provides insufficient information for NFA estimation for several reasons. Only the most severe crime that occurs during an incident is reported, so that if a child is abducted and murdered, only the murder would be reported to the UCR. There is no separate classification for kidnapping/abduction in the UCR summary data. Finally, these data have insufficient information on victims and offenders to distinguish any child victimization committed by a nonfamily member from other crimes. NIBRS collects more detail about incidents reported to the police, including detailed data on victims and offenders, than the summary data. NIBRS also collects information about up to 10 crimes that occur during an incident (e.g., homicide and kidnapping).

This study assesses the utility of NIBRS for studying child abductions by accomplishing the following goals:

- determine the feasibility of using NIBRS to study the incidence of attempted and completed nonfamily child abductions and related child victimizations;

- determine the validity and reliability of nonfamily child abduction estimates extracted from NIBRS;

- if the estimation potential of NIBRS is established, develop a plan and methodology for its routine use to estimate and study nonfamily child abductions; if the NIBRS potential is not adequate, suggest alternative estimation approaches; and

- cooperate with other OJJDP initiatives studying child sexual exploitation and juvenile offending and victimization.

This document reports on the activities of the first, developmental phase of the project. The primary tasks of this phase have been a definitional study of NISMART's NFA definitions, a comparison of these definitions to the Federal NIBRS specifications and existing State IBRS specifications, an examination of the status of each of the State IBRS programs, and an examination of the NIBRS data currently available from the FBI.

The first task, the study of the NISMART definitions, began with a conceptual and operational review of NISMART's NFA definitions. We reviewed the rationale developed for the conceptual definitions, methodological discussions in published project reports, training and coding manuals, and rules for counting in-scope cases to ensure a thorough understanding of the definitions and their application. We also reviewed the post-NISMART law reviews and research literature for articles discussing NFA definitional issues. The results of this review are found in Chapter 2 of this report.

The second task, a comparison of the NISMART definitions with the Federal NIBRS and existing State specifications, provided us with an idea of how well NIBRS could potentially replace the NISMART police record extraction for estimating NFAs. Each element of the NISMART definitions was analyzed to determine whether a similar element could be found in NIBRS/IBRS data. We also reviewed the State data collection specifications to identify data elements corresponding with NISMART eligibility criteria and operational measures of the NISMART definitional elements, relevant offense definitions, and whatever guidance was given in the specifications as to how these data elements and offense definitions are to be applied to cases. We examined the IBRS data collection specifications for consistent patterns of compatibility and incompatibility, as well as loss of detail as data flow from one level of the system to the next (i.e., from the local to the State to the Federal levels). We also looked for changes in meaning or content of a data element as it moved from one level of the system to another. The results of this review are reported in Chapter 3.

The third task, the examination of the status of State IBRS projects, started with semi-structured telephone interviews with appropriate personnel at the 20 State projects currently

submitting NIBRS test or production data to the FBI. In these interviews, we obtained information about program status and operations and requested data collection guidelines and other technical documentation for analysis in the definitional study. A summary of the current status of State IBRS programs is in Chapter 4.

The fourth task, an examination of the NIBRS data currently available from the FBI, provided us with an idea of how useful the NIBRS data would be. We obtained the 1991 data from the FBI to determine how easy or difficult it is to work with these data. We also determined how many abductions were reported (as either the primary or a secondary offense). The results of this analysis are found in Chapter 5.

The results of this preliminary work has helped us determine the potential for NIBRS to replace police record extraction. They also helped us make decisions about the next phases of the project—the site visits, the record extraction study replication, and the local-, State-, and Federal-level validity analysis.

2. Definitional Issues in the Study of Nonfamily Child Abductions

The incidence of NFAs was very controversial when the NISMART I work began, with estimates ranging from a few dozen to as many as 50,000 per year (Finkelhor et al., 1990). This controversy was primarily about definitions rather than numbers, however, between "a popular stereotype of stranger kidnapping" (Finkelhor, Hotaling, & Sedlak, 1990, p. 65) and a broader, more technical legal conceptualization of abduction. The former was based on notorious and tragic cases (such as the Adam Walsh murder) commonly involving taking a child from home and parents for an extended time with the purpose of extorting ransom or of committing a sexual or sadistic crime. The latter, though differing in detail from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, generally involves the coercive movement or luring of a person (even as few as 15 to 20 feet) and/or detaining the victim (even for relatively short periods). Accordingly, the NISMART I researchers developed developed three legal NFA definitions, applying to somewhat different situations, and a "stereotypical" NFA definition. Our review of the scientific and legal literature produced since the 1990 publication of the NISMART I reports for a discussion of definitional issues in the study of NFA of children revealed little work beyond that published by the NISMART I researchers themselves.

2.1 Nonfamily Abductions Defined Broadly

Forst and Blomquist (1990) provided insight into the concepts central to the legal definition of kidnapping in discussions of their historical development.

The Concept of Taking. The concept of illegally taking a person is rooted in both Roman law and English common law. In early Roman law, taking a person was considered either a theft of property or a violation of liberty rights, depending on the status of the person (taking a male head-of-household was a violation of his liberty rights; taking his wife, children, or slaves was considered theft of his property). Gradually, the concept of having liberty rights was extended to others, and taking any person today is considered a violation of their liberty rights. The terms "kidnapping" and "abduction" are used most often to describe these situations. The terms originally had distinct meanings in English common law: "Kidnapping" was defined as the "forcible abduction or stealing away of a man, woman, or child from his own country and sending him to another," while "abduction" referred to "the taking away of a woman or child for some improper purpose" (Forst & Blomquist, 1990). But today, these definitions are often used interchangeably because kidnapping has gradually required less and less movement (from out of the country, to out of the State, to out of the

4

county, to movement within a county). Abduction statutes have also been broadened to include victims of any gender.

The Concept of Detaining. The concept of detaining is based on the crime of false imprisonment, which originated in English common law and referred to unlawful detention or restriction of one's liberty or movement. This was often perpetrated by governmental agents for political reasons (Forst & Blomquist, 1990). Today, some kidnapping laws require no movement of the victim if it can be shown that the individual's liberty rights have been illegally restrained (e.g., hostage situations). Thus, the distinction between kidnapping and false imprisonment has also become blurred.

The Concept of Luring. The concept of luring as a crime developed in the United States because of cases in which a child willingly accompanied an adult who meant to do harm. Courts began to question whether the consent of a child was valid consent. In many States, the kidnapping, abduction, and false imprisonment statutes have been broadened to include situations in which a child willingly accompanies an individual who intends to harm the child. (In some States, statutes defining "enticement of a child" are categorized as sex offenses although those offenses may well include legal abductions [see Logan, Stellwagen, & Langan, 1987].) Generally, children under 10 are not considered old enough to give consent, but this age limit varies across States.

2.2   Nonfamily Abductions in Conjunction with Other Crimes

The legal definition of an NFA becomes more complicated, however, when we incorporate the fact that these offenses may occur in conjunction with other crimes.   About two-thirds of the in-scope NFAs identified by the first NISMART occurred in conjunction with a sexual offense. According to Finkelhor (1991), the common definition for child sexual abuse in North America is "sexual activity (single acts or extended contacts) involving a child that occurs (1) in a relationship where it is deemed exploitative by virtue of an age difference or caretaking relationship that exists with a child, and/or (2) as a result of force or threat" (p. 80). In their paper discussing the definitions underlying the NISMART research, Finkelhor, Hotaling, and Sedlak (1989) noted that the "most difficult ongoing debate concerning non-family abduction" (p. 12f) is how to tell when a crime such as sexual abuse involves "a separate element of abduction." This distinction is not only difficult for researchers: Even if researchers agree when a sexual offense involves an abduction, the police reporting the incident may not perceive a separate element of abduction in many cases.

5

Thus, many cases that researchers might call NFAs may not be reported as such by the police.

The NISMART researchers took movement or isolation of a child as necessary (but not sufficient) conditions for classifying another crime as having a separate element of abduction. In addition, they required one or more definitional elements:

- The use of force or threat in moving the child or in detaining the child for a substantial period, [and/or]...

- Movement (taking or luring)... done in order to facilitate a sexual or physical assault (p. 13).

2.3 NISMART Definitions of Nonfamily Abductions

The NISMART I researchers developed four definitions of NFAs. One of these definitions is a "stereotypical" definition that includes cases the general public usually considers abductions (e.g., abducted by stranger, held for ransom). The other three definitions are "legal" definitions. Within these categories, the definitions differ in characteristics of the incident and victim, such as age of victim, actions of offender, and outcome of the incident. The legal definitions, which are not mutually exclusive, are as follows (Finkelhor et al., 1989, p. 7):

- Child was taken by the use of force or threat or detained by the use of force or threat for a substantial period in a place of isolation by a non-family member without either lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian.

- Child who is 14 or younger or who is under 18 and mentally incompetent was taken by or voluntarily went with or was detained by a non-family member without either lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian and the perpetrator (1) concealed the child's whereabouts, or (2) requested ransom, goods, or services in exchange for the child's return, or (3) expressed an intention to keep the child permanently.

- Child was taken by or voluntarily went with a non-family member who, at the time s/he took or went away with the child, had the apparent purpose of physically or sexually assaulting the child.

(Each of the legal definitions also has a corresponding "attempt" definition that includes the same basic definitional elements.)

6

The stereotypical definition is as follows (Finkelhor et al., 1989, p. 7):

- An episode meeting criteria for abduction under a legal definition that has these additional components:

    1. perpetrator of the abduction is a stranger (someone child had not met or known before day of the abduction),

    2. child is detained overnight, is killed, or is transported 100 miles from the scene of the abduction; or the perpetrator requests ransom, goods or services in exchange for the child's return; or the perpetrator expressed an intention to keep the child permanently.

Each of these definitions was then broken into its component definitional elements and operationalized (e.g., and operational definition was devised to clarify how much movement constitutes "taking"). Our first task in making the NISMART-NIBRS comparison was acquiring a thorough understanding of each element of these definitions. Identifying definitional elements and their operational definitions allowed us to make thorough comparisons with the data elements collected by NIBRS. We then assessed how well the NIBRS data cover each of the definitions. The operational definitions for each element of the NISMART definitions are found in the first column of Exhibit 1 in the next chapter.

3. Summaries of Definitional Comparisons

As noted above, our task was to compare the NISMART definitional elements with the NIBRS specifications written by the FBI. This comparison allowed us to determine how well each of the NISMART definitions would be covered by NIBRS data. Second, we compared the NISMART definitional elements to the IBRS specifications for each State currently submitting test or production NIBRS data to the FBI. This comparison allowed us to determine how well State-level information would cover the NISMART definitions compared with the national-level data.

3.1 Comparison of NISMART with NIBRS

Exhibit 1 summarizes the NISMART/NIBRS comparison.

Exhibit 1: Comparison of NISMART Definitional Elements to NIBRS Data Elements and Offense Definitions

Eligibility Criteria		
NISMART	**NIBRS**	**Comments**
Residence: For abductions and sex offenses, the child (victim) must have resided in the study county at the time of the incident.	**DE 30**: A resident is a person who maintains his/her permanent home for legal purposes in the locality (i.e., town, city, or community) where the crime took place. State and county law enforcement agencies should base their determinations of residency on the town, city, or community where the crime occurred rather than their broader geographical jurisdictions.	• NISMART definition based on county; NIBRS definition based on locality. • Would miss some of the NISMART abductions by using the NIBRS residency definition. • Should possibly consider eliminating this as a criterion.
		(continued)

Exhibit 1 (continued)

Eligibility Criteria		
NISMART	**NIBRS**	**Comments**
Non-family perpetrator: Any perpetrator who failed to meet the study's definition of a family member. A family member was defined as one (1) related to the child by blood, (2) currently or formerly related by law, (3) a current or former paramour of the child's parent or guardian, (4) acting as the agent or together with a person who qualifies as a family member under (1), (2), or (3) above. Records first screened to exclude perpetrators who were father, mother, stepparent, sibling, aunt, uncle, or grandparent of victim.	**DE 34-35**: This data element identifies the victim's relationship to the offender. Can specify the following: spouse, common-law spouse, parent, sibling, child, grandparent, grandchild, in-law, stepparent, stepchild, stepsibling, other family member, acquaintance, friend, neighbor, baby-sittee, boy-/girlfriend, child of boy-/girlfriend, homosexual relationship, ex-spouse, employee, employer, otherwise known, relationship unknown, and stranger.	• NISMART specifies the perpetrator's relationship to the victim; NIBRS specifies the victim's relationship to the perpetrator. • NISMART screens out perpetrators who were aunts or uncles; NIBRS does not specify a niece/nephew as a victim relationship (this would fall into other family). • NIBRS does not identify perpetrators who were former paramours of the child's parent or guardian. • How accurately do police officers code this element?
Date of report: For inclusion, the case must have been first reported to the police between August 1, 1987, and July 31, 1988.	**DE 3**: This data element is to be used to enter the month, day, year, and hour (MM/DD/YYYY/HH) when the incident occurred or started or the beginning of the time period in which it occurred (as appropriate). If the incident date is unknown, the date of the report is to be entered with the indicator "R."	• NISMART looks for incidents first reported within study time frame; NIBRS specifies date of incident unless unknown.
Child's age: Criterion was that the child must have been under 18 years old at the time of the incident. The date of birth was compared to the date of the incident to confirm eligibility. If date of birth was not given, then the child's age (provided in the abstract) was used to assess whether the child was under 18 years old at the time of the incident. It was also possible that the child was under 18 at time of the report with no date of birth given.	**DE 26**: Age is to be entered as either an exact age, a range of days or years, or an unknown. Allowed entries include: under 24 hours, 1-6 days old, 7-364 days, 1-98 years old, over 98 years old, unknown, or an age range.	• NIBRS does not specify if age is at time of incident or time of report. We assume this is time of incident unless date is specified with an "R" (report date rather than incident date).

(continued)

Exhibit 1 (continued)		
Eligibility Criteria		
NISMART	**NIBRS**	**Comments**
For Sex Offenses Only: **Physical contact:** Sex offense must have involved direct physical contact (e.g., voyeurism and indecent exposure were excluded). Also, pornography cases were excluded.	Not directly available.	• All NIBRS sex offenses include physical contact (forcible and nonforcible). This category excludes prostitution and pornography offenses.
Location: The sex offense did not occur within a private residence.	**DE 9:** This data element is to be used to report the type of location/premises where each offense took place. Only one location can be entered for each offense. Allowable entries include air/bus/train terminal, bank/S&L, bar/night club, church/synagogue/temple, commercial/office building, construction site, convenience store, department/discount store, drug store/doctor's office/hospital, field/woods, government/public building, grocery/supermarket, highway/road/alley, hotel/motel, jail/prison, lake/waterway, liquor store, parking lot/garage, rental storage facility, residence/ home, restaurant, school/college, service/gas station, specialty store, and other/ unknown.	• NISMART excludes sex offenses taking place in private home; these are identifiable in NIBRS using offense code and by excluding those where DE 9 = "residence/home."
		(continued)

Exhibit 1 (continued)		
Eligibility Criteria		
NISMART	NIBRS	Comments
Concealment: The perpetrator must have done something to conceal the activity. Concealment was something the perpetrator did without the victim's collaboration unless there is a 5-year or greater age difference between the perpetrator and the victim, in which case the age difference is assumed to constitute a coercive factor. Concealing involved hiding the child from view, hiding the activity of taking or assaulting the child, or taking action to prevent the parents or caretakers from finding the child.	Not directly available.	• Concealment is not part of the definition of any of the NIBRS sex offenses. • Concealment could be extrapolated from location of incident (DE 9). • Age difference element of NISMART concealment definition is available by comparing the ages of the perpetrator and victim.
Definitional Elements		
NISMART	NIBRS	Comments
Child's age: Must be able to determine if child was 15 to 18 or 14 or younger.	**DE 26:** As listed in "Eligibility Criteria" section above.	• NIBRS can determine exact age, as required by NISMART, unless an age range is given (e.g., 14 to 15).
Child was detained: Detained meant that the child was prevented from leaving.	Available from offense code. Kidnapping/abduction is defined as "the unlawful seizure, transportation, and/or detention of a person against her/his will, or of a minor without the consent of his/her custodial parent(s) or legal guardian."	• Detention is included as part of NIBRS definition of kidnapping/abduction. For homicides and sex offenses, it would have to rely on fact that kidnapping/abduction was also coded if child was also detained.
(continued)		

11

Exhibit 1 (continued)

Definitional Elements

NISMART	NIBRS	Comments
Child was taken: Taken meant that there was movement of the child by some physical action of the perpetrator, usually by physical contact, but this contact could have been indirect (e.g., perpetrator pushes away a baby stroller). Movement included (a) at least 20 feet, or (b) into a vehicle or building (including apartment or house).	Available from offense code. See kidnapping/abduction definition above.	• NISMART definition defines movement as including at least 20 feet or into a vehicle or building; distance and location moved to are not specified in NIBRS.
Force or threat was used: Force or threat included strong-arm tactics, show of weapons, or explicit threat of bodily injury to anyone.	**DE 13:** This data element is to be used to enter the type(s) of weapon(s) or force used by the offender(s) in committing the offense. Up to three types of weapons/force can be entered for each offense. Allowable entries include various types of firearms, knife/cutting instrument, blunt object, motor vehicle, personal weapons (hands, feet, teeth, etc.), poison, explosives, fire/incendiary device, drugs/narcotics/sleeping pills, other, unknown, and none.	• Strong-arm tactics and show of weapons explicitly included. • "Explicit threat of bodily injury to anyone" not available.
Substantial period: Substantial period meant 1 hour or longer from time the child tried to leave. For the "public definition," the child must have been detained overnight.	Not available from NIBRS.	• NISMART requires an episode to have lasted at least 1 hour; such information is not available from NIBRS.
Place of isolation: A place of isolation was considered any place where the child was unable to leave on her or his own and from which the child had no opportunity to appeal for help or the assistance of others. For the "public definition," the child must have been transported at least 50 miles.	**DE 9:** This data element is to be used to report the type of location/premises where each offense took place. See list of allowed entries above.	• NISMART analyzes each case and determines if the location constitutes a place of isolation; NIBRS lists location type, and places of isolation may be able to be assumed from this (e.g., field/woods; highway/road/alley).

(continued)

12

Exhibit 1 (continued)

Definitional Elements

NISMART	NIBRS	Comments
No lawful authority or parental permission: The perpetrator had no lawful authority (e.g., law enforcement officer) or had no explicit parental permission to watch or care for the child and therefore no explicit or presumed permission to detain her/him. Only the parent(s) with custody of the child could authorize another person to care for the child.	Available from offense code. See definition of kidnapping/abduction above.	• Force or threat versus lack of parental permission cannot be differentiated from offense code definition. This has implications for counting the various "types" of NFAs as defined by NISMART.
Voluntarily accompanying: Voluntarily accompanying meant that the child was either lured or persuaded to go, but "got more than s/he bargained for." Movement again included (a) more than 20 feet or (b) into a vehicle or building.	Not available from NIBRS.	• NIBRS does not provide a way of differentiating between kidnappings/abductions where the child may have voluntarily accompanied someone. If parental permission was not given, then a kidnapping/abduction is assumed.
Mental incompetency of child: This included a learning, psychological, emotional, or mental disability or handicap.	Not available from NIBRS.	• This may be the case for some forcible sex offenses: definition includes "where the victim is incapable of giving consent." But such cases are not identifiable.
Concealment: Concealment was something the perpetrator did without the victim's collaboration unless there is a 5-year or greater age difference between the perpetrator and the victim, in which case the age difference is assumed to constitute a coercive factor. Concealing involved hiding the child from view, hiding the activity of taking or assaulting the child, or taking action to prevent the parents or caretakers from finding the child.	Not available from NIBRS.	• See discussion of concealment above.

(continued)

13

Exhibit 1 (continued)		
Definitional Elements		
NISMART	**NIBRS**	**Comments**
Ransom: This included money, goods, or services. It was not applicable to sex offenses.	Not available from NIBRS.	
Intention to keep: Records were examined for an indication that the perpetrator intended to keep the child. This is not applicable for attempts.	Not available from NIBRS.	
Recovery difficult: For attempts only, a determination was made about whether recovery would have been difficult if the attempt had been successful.	Not available from NIBRS.	
Purpose of assaulting the child: The perpetrator had the apparent purpose of assaulting the child. This did not require that the assault be successful. Some guidelines were: • The assault or attempt occurred within a short time after the perpetrator took/went away with the child. • The perpetrator took the child directly to the location where the assault or attempt took place. • The perpetrator made a statement indicating that she or he intended to assault the child at the time they went away together. • For attempts, the perpetrator made some gesture that indicated that she or he had the intention of assaulting the child at the time of the attempted abduction. • For "public definition," the perpetrator killed the child.	Not directly available from NIBRS.	• Could be assumed if kidnapping is coded along with homicide or assault.

3.2 Implications for NFA Definitions

As can be seen from Exhibit 1, certain NISMART definitional elements are not available from or are not as specific as the NIBRS data elements. These inconsistencies have implications for each of the four NFA definitions listed earlier.

Definition 1:

- Child was taken by the use of force or threat or detained by the use of force or threat for a substantial period in a place of isolation by a non-family member without either lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian.

Comments:

Children **under 18** can be identified.

Any coded abduction would include **detention or taking** of the child; however, the determination that taking or detention is involved is made by the police officers rather than the NISMART extractors and evaluative coders. This means that we would have to assume that police officers would make the same determination as NISMART coders; this also assumes that different officers make the same/consistent determinations. As noted earlier, these assumptions are extremely shaky.

In addition, the *20 foot or into a car* criterion for the NISMART definition of taking is not available.

Use of **force or threat** is available from NIBRS except for a threat of attack against others (e.g., against the child's parents).

There is no way of measuring a **substantial period** with NIBRS.

A **place of isolation** is possibly inferred from the location of the incident, but probably not consistently (e.g., a field might be an isolated place in one incident but not in another).

It is possible to identify **non-family member** perpetrators, although slight changes in this definitional element would be necessary.

15

The **lack of lawful authority or parental permission** is part of the NIBRS definition of kidnapping/abduction. This again assumes that NISMART coders and police officers make the same determinations.

Definition 2:

- Child who is 14 or younger or who is under 18 and mentally incompetent was taken by or voluntarily went with or was detained by a non-family member without either lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian and the perpetrator (1) concealed the child's whereabouts, or (2) requested ransom, goods, or services in exchange for the child's return, or (3) expressed an intention to keep the child permanently.

Comments:

Children **under 14** are identifiable, but children under 18 with a **mental incompetency** are not identifiable.

The **detention or taking** is part of the NIBRS abduction definition, but see discussion of the consequent assumptions above.

Children who **voluntarily went with** the perpetrator are not identifiable.

It is possible to identify **non-family member** perpetrators, although slight changes in this definitional element would be necessary.

The **lack of lawful authority or parental permission** is part of the NIBRS definition of kidnapping/abduction, but see discussion of consequent assumptions above.

Concealment, ransom, and **intention to keep** are not available from NIBRS.

Definition 3:

- Child was taken by or voluntarily went with a non-family member who, at the time she or he took or went away with the child, had the apparent purpose of physically or sexually assaulting the child.

Comments:

Children **under 18** can be identified.

Taking is part of the NIBRS abduction definition, but see discussion of the consequent assumptions above.

Children who **voluntarily went with** the perpetrator are not identifiable.

It is possible to identify **non-family member** perpetrators, although slight changes in this definitional element would be necessary.

The perpetrator's apparent **purpose of physically or sexually assaulting** the child is not directly available from NIBRS; however, if a sex offense is coded along with the abduction, this assumption could probably be made. This relies on accurate coding of multiple offenses by police officers.

<u>Definition 4:</u>

- An episode meeting the criteria for abduction under a legal definition that has these additional components:

    1. perpetrator of the abduction is a stranger (someone child had not met or known before day of the abduction),

    2. child is detained overnight, is killed, or is transported 100 miles from the scene of the abduction; or the perpetrator requests ransom, goods, or services in exchange for the child's return; or the perpetrator expressed an intention to keep the child permanently.

<u>Comments:</u>

NIBRS can identify perpetrators who are **strangers**.

Detention overnight is not identifiable.

Children who are **killed** are identifiable if both homicide and abduction are coded for the incident. This relies on accurate reporting of multiple offenses by police officers, which may differ from determinations made by NISMART coders.

Children who are **transported 100 miles** from the scene of the abduction are not identifiable.

The perpetrator's request for **ransom** is not available.

- A perpetrator's **intention to keep** the child is not available.

3.3 NISMART Information Provided by NIBRS/IBRS

As we can see, none of the definitions is completely available from the NIBRS data. Exhibit 2 summarizes the elements of each definition that are directly or indirectly available or are unavailable.

Exhibit 2: NISMART Data Elements Available from NIBRS Data

	Directly Available	Indirectly Available	Not Available
Definition 1	• Child under 18 • Use of force or threat (not threat of harm to others) • Non-family perpetrator (not aunt/uncle or former paramour)	• Detained or taken (assume police report abductions when they should) • Place of isolation (may be inconsistent) • No lawful authority or parental permission	• Substantial period of time
Definition 2	• Child under 14 • Non-family perpetrator (same limitations as above)	• Detained or taken (same limitations as above) • No lawful authority or parental permission	• Child under 18 with a mental incompetency • Voluntarily accompanied • Concealment • Ransom • Intention to keep
Definition 3	• Child under 18 • Non-family perpetrator (same limitations as above)	• Taken (same limitations as above) • Physical or sexual assault (as long as all offenses are reported)	• Voluntarily accompanied
Definition 4	• Stranger perpetrator	• Child killed (as long as all offenses are reported)	• Detained overnight • Transported 100 miles • Ransom • Intention to keep

Definition 1—the most basic definition—is closest to being completely covered by NIBRS; nonetheless, certain assumptions have to be made, which have implications for comparability with NISMART I estimates. Also, this definition would have to be relaxed slightly if NIBRS data were to be used to make an estimate. The other definitions are probably not adequately supported by NIBRS data.

We also compared the NISMART definitional elements with each State's IBRS. Given that NIBRS does not adequately cover much of the NISMART definitions, we thought that using State-level data (which in some cases is more detailed than the national-level data) might yield a better comparison. As the following shows, the potential utility of State-level files is not much greater than the usefulness of the NIBRS file. Exhibit 3 compares the NISMART definitional elements with both NIBRS and State-level IBRS, highlighting the added detail provided by some States.

Some States do provide additional data for some of the NISMART data elements; however, there is no consistency in this information across States. The most helpful State-level information comes from those States that include State-level offense codes in addition to NIBRS offense codes. Such codes often provide more information than may be available from the NIBRS data elements. The following States provide such additional offense codes:

- Alabama: Kidnap minor for ransom
  Kidnap minor to sexually assault
  Homicide—non-family—gun, knife, strong arm, or other weapon
  Rape or sodomy—boy or girl—gun, knife, strong arm, or other weapon

- Delaware: Kidnap minor for ransom
  Kidnap minor to sexually assault

- Michigan: Kidnap minor for ransom
  Kidnap minor to sexually assault
  Kidnap minor under 14 years old

- New York: Kidnap with intent to collect ransom
  Kidnap: death—individual in abduction
  Sodomy: with other under 11
  Sex abuse: sexual contact—with other under 11 or under 14

- Ohio: Kidnap to engage in sexual activity
  Kidnap to terrorize or seriously harm
  Kidnap to remove from place found
  Kidnap to restrain liberty

In summary, the State-level files provide some additional information on

- combinations of offenses,

- whether ransom was requested,

- age of victim,

Exhibit 3: NISMART Definitions Compared with NIBRS and State-Level IBRS

NISMART Definition	NIBRS Data	State-Level Data
Residence based on county.	Residence based on locality.	Residence based on locality in most States. SC, DE, and MI allow one to identify residence based on county.
Non-family perpetrator as defined earlier.	Non-family perpetrator defined almost as in NISMART.	AL does not require a victim-offender relationship for kidnappings and excludes some of the relationship codes included in NIBRS.
Date of report.	Adequately identified.	Nothing additional at State level.
Child's age.	Adequately identified.	Nothing additional at State level.
Physical contact for sex offenses.	Included in all NIBRS sex offense definitions.	Varies across States.
Location of sex offense not in private residence.	Adequately identified.	Nothing additional at State level.
Concealment of sex offenses.	Not directly available.	Nothing additional at State level.
Child was detained.	Available from offense code.	Nothing additional at State level.
Child was taken.	Available from offense code.	Directly available in States where more than one location per offense can be coded (SC and OH). (This needs to be used with care because OH uses the example of an incident occurring at a restaurant on a college campus; this could then have two location codes, but does not imply any movement.) Also, in AL additional rape location codes include car of victim or offender.
		(continued)

Exhibit 3 (continued)		
NISMART Definition	**NIBRS Data**	**State-Level Data**
Force or threat was used.	Adequately identified.	**AL** does not require this data element for kidnappings.
Substantial period of time.	Not available.	**SC** and **ME** code incident starting and ending dates and times.
Place of isolation.	Adequately identified.	Nothing additional at State level.
No lawful authority or parental permission.	Available from offense code.	Nothing additional at State level.
Voluntarily accompanying.	Not available.	Nothing additional at State level.
Mental incompetency of child.	Not available.	In **ND**, one can identify victims with mental handicaps.
Concealment.	Not available.	Nothing additional at State level.
Ransom.	Not available.	In **NY, DE, MI,** and **AL,** there are specific identifiable kidnapping offenses for ransom.
Intention to keep.	Not available.	Nothing additional at State level.
Recovery difficult.	Not available.	Nothing additional at State level.
Purpose of assaulting the child.	Not directly available.	**AL** has an additional homicide offense code of "kidnap/ murder."

AL = Alabama
DE = Delaware
ME = Maine
MI = Michigan
ND = North Dakota
NY = New York
OH = Ohio
SC = South Carolina

- whether force was used/type of force used, and

- whether harm was intended.

However, most of this information should be available from NIBRS if implemented as intended. Only the request for ransom or the intent to harm are added elements that would not otherwise be available from NIBRS.

3.4 Suggested Alterations to Definitions

After examining the NISMART definitions and comparing them with NIBRS and State-level IBRS documentation, we conclude that NIBRS has the potential for estimating NFAs with some alteration to the definitions. Specifically, this would mean

- dropping the *substantial period of time* requirement from definition 1;

- dropping definition 2 altogether or limiting definition 2 to a subset of definition 1 consisting of children under 14 only;

- making definition 3 a subset of definition 1 consisting only of those NFAs that include physical or sexual assault; and

- making definition 4 a subset of definition 1 consisting of NFAs in which the perpetrator is a stranger and/or in which the child is killed.

These definitions would be substantially different from the original NISMART definitions and would limit the comparability from NISMART I to subsequent editions of NISMART. However, NIBRS does have the potential to estimate NFAs at a significantly lower cost than the NISMART Police Records Study (PRS). The benefit of a lower cost would have to be weighed against the loss of comparability.

4. State NIBRS/IBRS Programs

During this developmental phase of the project, we collected information about the characteristics and practices of State NIBRS programs that bear on both the quality and availability of their data. Most of this information was obtained in open-ended telephone interviews with staff members at the State UCR programs primarily responsible for the NIBRS work. Additional information was gathered in a less structured way at the annual conference of State UCR program directors and the corresponding conference of State Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) directors both held in September 1992.

Our purpose in doing this work was not to conduct a detailed process evaluation of the current planning and/or implementation status of State and local programs participating in NIBRS. Such work is beyond the scope of the present research. Our purpose in examining the implementation status of these programs was to obtain information to assist our judgments regarding data availability as well as data quality. This section of the report presents the results of this work.

4.1 Telephone Survey of State UCR/NIBRS Personnel

The purpose of the telephone survey was threefold:

- introduce this study to NIBRS sites currently collecting data;

- gather basic information about program status and operations, especially that related to our proposed selection criteria for case study sites; and

- obtain data collection guidelines, automated file specifications, and other technical documentation for use in the definitional and validation analyses.

In June 1992, staff of the FBI's UCR section provided us with a list of State programs that are implementing NIBRS programs arranged according to their implementation status: preplanning (11 States), testing (17 States), and FBI approved (3 States). (A copy of this list appears in Appendix A.) FBI-approved States that had achieved a sufficiently low error rate (2% or less) were submitting "production" data that would be maintained by the FBI. "Testing" States were submitting data files that the FBI tested for errors.

We prepared a protocol to guide the telephone interview (shown in Appendix B). The protocol included open-ended questions and probes on

- local agency participation in the State program;

- standardization of reporting forms and software;

- processes for converting local data to the State and FBI formats, handling errors in records returned by the FBI, and updating data files;

- length of time they had been submitting testing or production data to the FBI;

- if not yet submitting production data, when they expected to be approved;

- the approximate number of nonfamily child abduction, homicide, and sexual abuse cases there were in the State last year;

- whether the State program analyzed IBRS data for its own purposes;

- how things were going generally with their NIBRS program; and

- whether their program would be able and willing to participate in the case study phase of the current research.

We also asked for copies of their program's specifications for data collection and file production.

Interviews were conducted by professional level staff at the NCJJ and RTI in the fall of 1992. Respondents included State NIBRS program staff in the 20 States listed by the FBI as submitting testing or production data. Early in the interviewing process, the RTI co-principal investigator on this project attended the annual conference of the Association of State UCR Program Directors to give a presentation about the current project, its purposes and planned activities (especially those that would involve State and local program staff), and to meet informally with conference attendees.

4.2 Implementing NIBRS at the State Level

Some State and local jurisdictions have used incident-based reporting since the 1970s. Others have not. In either case, joining the program designed by the FBI has required that jurisdictions adapt existing record-keeping systems to NIBRS specifications. In general, this process of adaptation has involved several steps. States have had to develop new reporting

forms. Many State (and probably local) agencies have been collecting more data elements than NIBRS requires, but not exactly the same ones. Most States, then, have found that they were required to collect at least a few new data elements. Software has had to be developed or adapted. States do some preliminary pilot testing of the new forms and software with one or more local agencies. In many States, including those where local agencies are required by statute to report data on crime to State agencies, it has been necessary to recruit their participation in the NIBRS program. At some point, States have begun sending data tapes in NIBRS format to the FBI for testing. The FBI returns tested records found to include one or more errors. The participating programs correct their software and, sometimes, the data files.

Although the State programs have had to take each of the steps mentioned above, they have not necessarily taken them in the same way or in the same order. The result is considerable variation among the programs as they have been implemented thus far. For example, programs differ in how elaborate they are. A few (Delaware, Oklahoma, and Oregon) have planned systems linking data on-line from law enforcement, courts, and corrections. We were told that local police in Delaware routinely use on-line data from neighboring agencies in their investigative work. The Delaware State program staff uses the on-line data for quality control, by checking for the existence of court records, for example, for individuals for whom police have not entered arrest reports.

There appears to be little standardization of reporting forms or software. The most common model appears to be one by which specifications for data collection and file submission are developed at the State level and provided to local agency staff. Local agencies, then, develop or purchase software that allows them to produce data files meeting the State specifications. Model reporting forms have been developed in many NIBRS States that agencies may use if they choose. No State program performs all the data entry required to construct these files, but most enter data from paper records for the smaller agencies in their jurisdiction while the larger local agencies enter their own data.

There are also differences among State programs in the way errors are handled and in the degree to which State programs exercise quality control over local data generally. At least two States (New York and Washington) certify local agencies in some manner before admitting them to the State program. Several States perform error checks compatible with those done at the FBI before submitting local data to the national program. Others do little error checking. The State programs commonly return records in which they or the FBI find errors to the local agencies for correction. Most errors are the result of bugs in software.

States commonly correct their software and many correct their files as well. State programs also differ in their requirements regarding updating of information for individual incidents. In some States, little updating is required beyond filing corrected records and arrest reports. Other programs require that information on "critical" data elements be filed when obtained. (Victim-offender relationship, which may not be known when an initial incident report is filed, is such a data element.)

A summary of each States' implementation is found in Exhibit 4.

4.3 Characteristics of State UCR/NIBRS Programs

Exhibits 5 and 6 present data on selected characteristics of the State programs listed by the FBI as "testing" or "approved." These characteristics include population size, UCR program authority, local agency participation in UCR/NIBRS, and experience submitting data to the FBI. Four programs had been approved for production of 1991 data, and the Iowa program was approved during the summer of 1992. These are shown in Exhibit 4 as FBI certified. Telephone survey responses indicated that seven of the State programs were actively implementing their programs beyond the pilot stage and submitting test data to the FBI—those in Delaware, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin. (Exhibit 5 presents data for programs that had not progressed beyond a pilot test of their State system, which is discussed later.)

The four FBI-approved States have relatively small populations. Taken together, they account for less than 5% of the total U.S. population. In three of the four States, local agencies are required to submit crime data in some form (incident based or summary) to their State UCR program. UCR participation is voluntary only in North Dakota. All four State programs had achieved high levels of local participation. Only one Alabama UCR agency was not reporting NIBRS data, the Mobile County Sheriff's Office. About 80% of Iowa's UCR agencies were reporting NIBRS data, including some of their larger jurisdictions. A similarly high proportion of North Dakota's UCR agencies were submitting NIBRS data, although the Bismark Police Department had yet to join. In South Carolina, all of the agencies were participating. As mentioned earlier, the Iowa program began submitting NIBRS production data in the summer of 1992. They were to eventually submit a corrected NIBRS file for the entire year. The other three State programs had data on file at the FBI beginning January 1, 1991.

Exhibit 4: NIBRS Implementation by State: 1992

Program Status & State	Standard Report Form	Standard Software	Data Entry at State Level	Local Data Submitted in NIBRS Format	State Converts Local Data to NIBRS	Errors Corrected by State
FBI Certified						
Alabama	No	No	For some agencies	No	Yes	No
Iowa	Yes	No	For some agencies	No	Yes	Not for 1991
North Dakota	Yes	No	For some agencies	No	Yes	D/K
South Carolina	Yes	Yes	For most agencies	No	Yes	Yes
Implementing/ Submitting Test Data						
DE	Yes	Yes	For most agencies	No	Yes	No locals do it
IL	D/K	Developed— d/k if used	D/K	D/K	D/K	D/K
MA	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
NY	Yes - not man- datory, piloting it	No	D/K	No	Yes	No
UT	No	No	D/K yet	No	Yes	D/K yet
WA	No	No	No	D/K	D/K	D/K
WI	No	No	D/K yet	No	Yes	No
Piloting Near Implementation						
KS	Yes	No	D/K	No	Yes	No
ME	No	No	D/K yet	No	Yes	No
NE	Yes	No	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
OH	No	No	D/K net	No	Yes	No
VA	D/K	No	D/K yet	No	Yes.	No

(continued)

Program Status & State	Standard Report Form	Standard Software	Data Entry at State Level	Local Data Submitted in NIBRS Format	State Converts Local Data to NIBRS	Errors Corrected by State
Exhibit 4 (continued)						
Planning						
AR	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	D/K yet
MI	No	D/K yet	D/K yet	No	Yes	D/K yet
MN	D/K yet	No	Some	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
OR	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
						(continued)

		Exhibit 4 (continued)		
Program Status & State	Errors Corrected by Local Agencies	Follow-Up Information Entered (by Locals)	FBI Definitions Used	Training by State
FBI Certified				
Alabama	Probably not	Only some offenses	yes	Yes
Iowa	Not for 1991 (d/k who resp)	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Dakota	D/K	Yes	D/K	Yes
South Carolina	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Implementing/ Submitting Test Data				
DE	Yes	Yes (for most part)	-?	-?
IL	?			Yes
MA	Yes (their resp., d/k if done)	Yes (their resp., d/k if done)	Yes (?) St. doesn't have control over training	No (just sent FBI manuals to locals)
NY	Yes	Yes (?)		
UT	D/K yet	Yes	D/K yet	Yes
WA	D/K	Yes	D/K	D/K
WI	Yes	Yes	D/K	Yes
				(continued)

Program Status & State	Errors Corrected by Local Agencies	Follow-Up Information Entered (by Locals)	FBI Definitions Used	Training by State
Exhibit 4 (continued)				
Piloting Near Implementation				
KS	Yes	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
ME	Yes	Yes	D/K yet	D/K yet
NE	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
OH	Yes	D/K yet	D/K yet	Yes (but there are still inconsistencies)
VA	Yes	Yes	D/K yet	D/K yet
Planning				
AR	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
MI	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
MN	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet
OR	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet	D/K yet

30

Exhibit 5: State UCR/NIBRS Program Characteristics: Implementing/Implemented Programs

| Program Status & State | 1990 Population | | UCR Program Authority[1] | No. Local Police Agencies | | | Began Submitting to FBI[2] | Current Error Rate |
	Number (in 1,000s)	Rank		Total	In UCR	In NIBRS		
FBI Certified								
Alabama	4,041	22	S	398	~350	~349	1991	NA
Iowa	2,777	30	S	500	225	~180	1992	NA
North Dakota	639	47	V	115	99	88	1991	NA
South Carolina	3,487	25	S	250+	250+	250+	1991	NA
Implementing/ Submitting Test Data								
Delaware	666	46	S	100	100	100	1991	50%
Illinois	11,431	6	S	1,007	1,007	~50	?	<5%
Massachusetts	6,016	13	V	310	220	~20	1991	~15%
New York	17,990	2	S	535	535	46-66	5/92	13%
Utah	1,723	35	V	150	130	6	?	<1%
Washington	4,867	18	V	237	200	0	1991	49%
Wisconsin	4,892	16	S	320	320	5	8/91	"minimal"

[1] S = statutory, V = voluntary.

[2] For FBI-certified programs, the year shown is the year the State began submitting production data. For all others, it is the year the State began submitting test data.

31

Exhibit 6: State UCR/NIBRS Program Characteristics: Planning/Piloting Programs

Program Status & State	1990 Population		UCR Program Authority[1]	No. Local Police Agencies			Began Submitting to FBI[2]	Current Error Rate
	Number (in 1,000s)	Rank		Total	In UCR	In NIBRS		
Piloting Near Implementation								
Kansas	2,478	32	S	330	329	330	NA	--
Maine	1,228	38	S	150	150	0	NA	--
Nebraska	1,578	36	S	163	163	0	2/92	<1%
Ohio	10,847	7	V	936	420	2	NA	--
Virginia	6,187	12	S	272	272	~5	1992?	"expected"[3]
Planning								
Arkansas	2,351	33	S	300	195	5	NA	--
Michigan	9,295	8	S	620	595	0	NA	--
Minnesota	4,375	20	S	565	288	0	NA	--
Oregon	2,842	29	S	170	168	0	NA	--

[1] S = statutory, V = voluntary.

[2] For FBI-certified programs, the year shown is the year the State began submitting production data. For all others, it is the year the State began submitting test data.

[3] Virginia sent one test tape to test the FBI that did not contain "live" data. They put deliberate errors on the tape to test both their system and the FBI. The FBI found the errors that the Virginia program expected to be found.

The seven State programs that were testing data varied a good deal in situation and implementation progress. This group includes some larger States, notably Illinois and New York. The Illinois program was converting an older IBRS to one compatible with NIBRS. Their conversion software and resulting data had been approved for accuracy by the FBI but had not been certified because of the small number of local agencies participating. About 200 to 250 agencies were participating in the State's training and testing programs. The State program staff hoped to begin submitting production data to the FBI within 2 years when they expect to have much larger participation. They expected that it would be "many years" before the Chicago Police Department joined the NIBRS program; that agency's IBRS is compatible neither with the State system nor with NIBRS. The New York program staff was implementing the State system and submitting test data to the FBI. The Buffalo Police Department was the largest jurisdiction participating. The New York City Police Department wanted to join but could not then afford the cost of conversion. The New York NIBRS program supervisor estimated that it would be about 5 years before New York City could join the program. The New York program was certifying the local software before bringing agencies into the program. It appears that most of the local agencies then in New York's NIBRS program had organized themselves as regional networks sharing software. When their software was certified, they joined the program 10 to 20 agencies at a time, rather than one by one.

The program in the smallest State in this group may have been closest to FBI approval. The Delaware program had found several bugs in their software after examining their latest set of errors. The supervisor there thought their error rate would drop steeply at their next submission of test data, but she was unwilling to hope for FBI approval in less than 6 months. The Utah program had begun submitting testing data to the FBI only recently and from only one jurisdiction (Provo). The program supervisor there was encouraged by the very low error rate. She planned to submit another test tape in November 1992, with data from six "urban areas." These six areas had purchased software from five different commercial vendors, so it was not clear that they would maintain their initial low error rate.

The Washington State program was just beginning implementation. Its supervisor estimated that it would take about 2 years to convert all 200 agencies to their NIBRS program. They had been testing their software for a year by submitting fake data to the FBI. The supervisor said they had found three software problems as a result of their most recent test, and she believed those problems had been remedied. The local agencies there had been organizing themselves into regional networks sharing software, and the local networks were

working with 13 or 14 vendors. The State program had tested and certified one vendor's software (a vendor that worked with about 40 agencies). The 50 large jurisdictions that account for about 80% of the State's crime were cooperating with the NIBRS program.

The two remaining States in this group, Massachusetts and Wisconsin, had relatively low error rates and relatively small numbers of agencies, all small and medium-sized, participating. In neither State did the NIBRS program supervisor expect to have large jurisdictions participating in the near future. The Wisconsin program was in the early stages of implementation. Its supervisor thought that they might have enough agencies participating to be representative of the State population in about a year. Lack of available Federal or State funding would make further program development in Massachusetts difficult.

Exhibit 5 presents the same data for State programs that were beginning in 1992 to pilot/implement their systems or were in the planning stage. The Kansas and Virginia programs planned to begin data collection and testing in January 1993—Virginia as a pilot test of their system with five cooperating agencies and Kansas as an implementation with all UCR agencies cooperating. The Ohio program was piloting its NIBRS with two agencies and had not begun submitting test tapes to the FBI. (About half of the local agencies in Ohio report directly to the FBI. The State UCR program, with 420 cooperating agencies, had not reported to the FBI since 1981.) The Nebraska program had successfully tested its system with the FBI, but had no funding for implementation.

4.4   Additional Information

The cost of converting to incident-based reporting seems to have been a significant worry to State program supervisors. The cost of converting existing IBRS to NIBRS-compatible systems was especially high. This appears to be the primary reason that large jurisdictions (and some States) had been slow to participate in NIBRS.

At the time of the State UCR directors conference (Labor Day weekend 1992), the FBI had recently returned test tapes to State programs with "new errors" (data returned as errors that had not been flagged as errors before). This development was a source of considerable unhappiness all round. Two well-attended conference sessions were devoted to discussion by FBI personnel and State program staff on how to deal with the problem. Some State program staff, while acquiescing to following the new coding rules in the future, were reluctant to correct earlier tapes.

5. Status of NIBRS Data Currently Available from FBI

The NCJJ obtained the 1991 NIBRS file from the FBI and conducted preliminary analyses to determine how easy or difficult it was to work with the data. We also wanted to determine whether there were sufficient reported child NFAs in potential case study sites to support replication of the NISMART PRS and the degree to which such abductions appeared on the file in conjunction with other offenses.

5.1 Technical Information Related to Working with the NIBRS Data File

The NIBRS data file is a hierarchical file. Each incident report is comprised of six record types or "segments":

- administrative segment (used for administrative data applicable to the entire incident report, such as identifying numbers assigned to the agency and incident, date and time the incident occurred, and clearance information),

- offense segment (used for data identifying and describing the types of offenses occurring in the incident),

- property segment (used for data describing property stolen/lost/damaged/seized/ etc. in the incident),

- victim segment (used to describe victims involved in the incident and to identify offenses of which they were victims),

- offender (used to identify and describe offenders involved in the incident), and

- arrestee (used to report arrests of persons involved in the incident).

An incident may have multiples of each segment (up to 10 offense records, 10 property records, 999 victim records, and 99 offender and/or arrestee records). NCJJ wrote computer programs to read these data and found a number of problems. One such problem was the inability to link offenders to offenses. As the system stands, it must be assumed that all offenders committed all of the offenses in an incident. Another problem is the large size of the data file. The 1991 file included only data from three small States, yet NCJJ received 16 data tapes from the FBI that had 3.1 million records on 570,502 incidents. Any organization that would analyze NIBRS data for NISMART would require access to a large mainframe computer system capable of holding all the data.

5.2   Analysis of Cases Relevant to NISMART

NCJJ extracted from this large data set the cases that were most likely relevant to NISMART. They were cases that fit the following NISMART eligibility criteria:

- the incident occurred in 1991,

- there was at least one victim under 18 years of age,

- the offender was a nonfamily member, and

- the incident included a homicide (NIBRS offense code 09A, 09B), kidnapping/abduction (offense code 100), or forcible sex offense (offense codes 11A, 11B, 11C, 11D).

Relatively few of the NIBRS cases fit these criteria (1,719 of the 570,502 incidents). This enabled NCJJ to reduce the size of the data set dramatically, but we must remember that only three small States—with no large cities—were represented. The NIBRS file structure, with frequencies for NISMART-eligible cases, is presented in Appendix C.

For each State, NCJJ analyzed the numbers and types of offenses contained in eligible incidents. The results are presented in Exhibit 7. Two of the three States seemed to be coding multiple offenses; a number of the kidnappings, for example, had a forcible sex offense coded as well. The third State seemed to be coding one offense only. There were no second offenses for any of the extracted cases. As NISMART results showed, because a large proportion of child NFAs occur in conjunction with other offenses, it is likely that this State was underreporting the number of kidnappings/abductions by a large number.

Exhibit 7: Numbers of NISMART-Eligible Incidents on the 1991 NIBRS File, by Type of Offense and State

First Offense	Second Offense					Total
	None	Murder	Kidnap	Forcible Sex Offense	Other	
Alabama						
Murder	435	0	0	0	0	435
Kidnap	185	0	0	0	0	185
Forcible Sex Offense	1,495	0	0	0	0	1,495
Other	247,734	0	0	0	8,086	255,820
Total	249,849	0	0	0	8,086	257,935
N. Dakota						
Murder	5	0	0	0	0	5
Kidnap	18	0	0	2	1	21
Forcible Sex Offense	224	0	0	0	5	229
Other	17,217	0	0	2	1,295	18,514
Total	17,464	0	0	4	1,301	18,769
S. Carolina						
Murder	311	0	0	11	37	359
Kidnap	234	0	0	23	66	323
Forcible Sex Offense	2,784	0	29	93	253	3,159
Other	284,391	2	217	71	17,222	301,903
Total	287,720	2	246	198	17,578	305,744
All Eligible Incidents						
Murder	751	0	0	11	37	799
Kidnap	437	0	0	25	67	529
Forcible Sex Offense	4,503	0	29	93	258	4,883
Other	549,342	2	217	73	26,603	576,237
Total	555,033	2	246	202	26,965	582,448

6. Summary

Considering definitions only, NIBRS could potentially be an adequate substitute for the PRS to estimate NFAs. The offense definition for kidnapping/abduction, not surprisingly, includes the main definitional elements of taking and/or detaining a victim, although these are not further defined as they are in NISMART. Reliance on the NIBRS offense definition would require making assumptions about how consistently it is used by investigative officers in various jurisdictions and how consistent officers' use is with NISMART researchers. The required NIBRS data fields cover a good number of the NISMART definitional elements. Some alteration to the NISMART definitions would be required, but using NIBRS would still allow for the major distinctions between the "stereotypical" and legal definitions set up by NISMART I.

The question is whether NIBRS is being implemented as it should be in an adequate number of States. Our interviews showed that a number of States are on their way to full implementation. Including more of these States would make NIBRS data more representative of the Nation than it is now. Still, full implementation by a majority of States—especially States with big cities—is probably a long way off.

Some additional questions about the implementation of NIBRS must be addressed before knowing whether NIBRS would be adequate in reality. In our site visits and in more detailed analysis of NIBRS files at the Federal, State, and local levels, we hope to answer some of the questions dealing with the completeness and the consistency of the data. We will want to know:

- Within and across agencies, do officers make similar decisions about coding offenses within an incident?

- To what extent is information subsequent to the original report handled by the IBRS program?

- How well are the NIBRS data fields of interest covered in actuality? What is the extent of missing data?

- What training and quality control procedures are in place to ensure accurate and consistent data?

- How adequately do the agencies participating in a State's IBRS represent the population and crime in that State?

In addition, the number of States currently participating and the status of States in the process of implementing will have an impact on the ability of NIBRS to replace the PRS (at least in part) in NISMART II or subsequent NISMARTs.

References

Finkelhor, D. (1991). Child sexual abuse. In <u>Violence in America</u> (pp. 79-94). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., & Sedlak, A. (1989, November). <u>National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART) definitions</u>. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G., & Sedlak, A. (1990, May). <u>Missing, abducted, runaway and thrownaway children in America, first report: Numbers and characteristics, national incidence studies</u>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Forst, M.L., & Blomquist, M. (1990). <u>Missing children: Rhetoric and reality</u>. New York: Lexington Books.

Logan, W., Stellwagen, L.S., & Langan, P.A. (1987). <u>Felony laws of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, 1986</u> (NCJ-105066). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Appendix A

States with NIBRS/IBRS Programs
(List Received from the FBI)

NIBRS IMPLEMENTATION

Pre-Planning

California
Connecticut
Florida
Indiana
Louisiana
Montana
New Mexico
New Jersey
North Carolina
~~South Carolina~~ ✗
South Dakota
Texas

Testing

Arkansas
Delaware
Illinois
Iowa
Kansas
Maine
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Nebraska
New York
Ohio
Oregon
Utah
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin

FBI Approved

	Total Number of Agencies	Number of Agencies Submitting Data
Alabama	398	254
North Dakota	105	69
South ~~Dakota~~ *CAROLINA*	380	282

Appendix B

Protocol for Telephone Interviews with State NIBRS Program Personnel

Protocol for Telephone Interviews with State NIBRS Program Personnel

I.   We'd like some basic information about your NIBRS/IBR system.

    A.   How many local departments participate in UCR program? How many of these participate in IBR? What are the characteristics of those participating in IBR (big cities, smaller jurisdictions, a mix)? Does there appear to be systematic differences between participants and nonparticipants?

    B.   Are incident report forms standard across all reporting agencies or do different agencies use different forms?

    C.   How about the software? Do the local agencies use the same software?

    D.   How does the file conversion process work?

        1.   Do local agencies send you files in local format or do they convert files to state format before sending them?

        2.   What do you do with the local data you receive to prepare it for the FBI?

II. We understand your program is submitting (test/production) data to the FBI. Is that true?

    A.   How long have you been submitting?

    B.   1.   (If production data) How long did you submit test data? Describe the process.

        or

        2.   (If still testing data) When do you think/hope you'll begin submitting production data?

    C.   What kind of error rates have you had? What kind of errors?

    D.   Have old files been corrected? For what period of time do you have corrected IBR data?

    E.   Do you enter data from detective follow-up investigative reports? How does that work?

III. Approximately how many child abduction cases are there in your state? Child homicide? Child sexual abuse?

    A. Are there state-level specifications for defining these types of cases and other data elements on the file? Could we have two (2) copies of these specifications?

IV. Does the state program analyze the IBR data for their own purposes? What kinds of analyses? Could we have copies of these?

V. How is it going with NIBRS? What kinds of difficulties are involved with implementing it?

VI. Is your program able and willing to participate in a replication of NISMART's Police Records Study? (Briefly describe what this would involve.) If willing to participate, the PRS replication would be preceded by a sight visit, probably in October or November or December. (The PRS will probably take place in March or April.)

VII. Just to repeat, we've asked you to send us the following:

    A. A listing of the local agencies participating in your IBR system (or the largest participating agencies if there are too many).

    B. Two (2) copies of state-level specifications for defining offenses and other data elements in your system, i.e. for coding and automating data in your system.

    C. Copies of any analyses you have done of the IBR data.

Appendix C

**NISMART-Type Incidents in
1991 NIBRS File**

National Juvenile Court Data Archive
National Center for Juvenile Justice
701 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

NISMART-Type

Incidents in

1991 NIBRS File

Sample Selection Criteria for NIBRS Incidents

o   Incident occurred in 1991

o   At least one victim under 18 years of age

o   Offender is a non-family member

o   Incident with one of the following offenses:

    Homicide (09A, 09B)
    Kidnapping/abduction (100)
    Forcible sex offense (11A,11B,11C,11D)

NIBRS Record Structure[*]

Administrative Record (570,502/1,719)

Offense Record (604,002/1,882)

Property Record (633,532/181)

Victim Record (585,291/1,914)

Offender Record (693,395/2,168)

Arrestee Record (30,796/156)

[*] (Records on Master file/in NISMART Incidents)

NIBRS Administrative data: NISMART sample frequencies, 1,719 cases.

(1)	R1001	Record type	2	1 - 2
	R1002	ORI number	9	3 - 11
	R1003	Incident number	12	12 - 23
	R1004	Total number of offenses for the incident	2	24 - 25
	R1005	Total number of victims for the incident	3	26 - 28
	R1006	Total number of offenders for the incident	2	29 - 30
	R1007	Total number of arrestees for the incident	3	31 - 33
(1)	R1008	Year of incident	4	34 - 37
(12)	R1009	Month of incident	2	38 - 39
(31)	R1010	Date of incident	2	40 - 41
	R1011	Incident flag	1	42 - 42
	R1012	Incident hour	2	43 - 44
	R1013	City code	4	45 - 48
	R1014	Exceptional clearance code	1	49 - 49
(2)	R1015	Year of exceptional clearance	4	50 - 53
(13)	R1016	Month of exceptional clearance	2	54 - 55
(32)	R1017	Date of exceptional clearance	2	56 - 57
	R1028	State numeric code	2	88 - 89

```
************************************************************************
     R1001       Record type

      1719       (01) Administrative data
************************************************************************
     R1002       ORI number
************************************************************************
     R1003       Incident number
************************************************************************
     R1004       Total number of offenses for the incident

      1578       (01)
       124       (02)
        12       (03)
         5       (04)
************************************************************************
     R1005       Total number of victims for the incident

      1576       (001)
       106       (002)
        25       (003)
        10       (004)
         1       (005)
         1       (006)
************************************************************************
     R1006       Total number of offenders for the incident

      1376       (01)
       290       (02)
        37       (03)
         6       (04)
         5       (05)
         3       (06)
         1       (16)
         1       (18)
************************************************************************
     R1007       Total number of arrestees for the incident

      1586       (000)
       123       (001)
         7       (002)
         2       (003)
         1       (005)
************************************************************************
     R1008       Year of incident

      1715       (1991) 1991
         4       (1992) 1992
************************************************************************
     R1009       Month of incident
************************************************************************
     R1010       Date of incident
************************************************************************
     R1011       Incident flag
```

```
     1629     ( ) Incident date
       90     (R) Report date
******************************************************************
     R1012    Incident hour
******************************************************************
     R1013    City code

     1719     (    )
******************************************************************
     R1014    Exceptional clearance code

        1     (A) Death of offender
       56     (B) Prosecution declined
        1     (C) Extradiction denied
      130     (D) Victim refused to cooperate
       14     (E) Juvenile/No custody
     1517     (N) Not applicable
******************************************************************
     R1015    Year of exceptional clearance

     1517     (0000) Zero fill
      202     (1991) 1991.
******************************************************************
     R1016    Month of exceptional clearance
******************************************************************
     R1017    Date of exceptional clearance
******************************************************************
     R1028    State numeric code

      484     (01)
       96     (33)
     1139     (39)
******************************************************************
```

NIBRS Offense data: NISMART sample frequencies, 1,882 cases.

```
     (1) R2001 Record type                              2   1 -   2
         R2002 ORI number                               9   3 -  11
         R2003 Incident number                         12  12 -  23
    (57) R2004 UCR offense code                         3  24 -  26
     (1) R2005 Year of incident                         4  27 -  30

    (12) R2006 Month of incident                        2  31 -  32
    (31) R2007 Date of incident                         2  33 -  34
     (2) R2008 Attempted/completed code                 1  35 -  35
     (4) R2009 Offender suspected of using 1            1  36 -  36
     (5) R2010 Offender suspected of using 2            1  37 -  37

     (5) R2011 Offender suspected of using 3            1  38 -  38
    (25) R2012 Location of offense                      2  39 -  40
     (1) R2013 Number of premises entered               2  41 -  42
     (3) R2014 Method of entry                          1  43 -  43
     (9) R2015 Criminal activity code 1                 1  44 -  44

     (9) R2016 Criminal activity code 2                 1  45 -  45
     (9) R2017 Criminal activity code 3                 1  46 -  46
    (16) R2018 Type of weapon code 1                    3  47 -  49
    (16) R2019 Type of weapon code 2                    3  50 -  52
    (16) R2020 Type of weapon code 3                    3  53 -  55

         R2021 State numeric code                       2  56 -  57
         R2022 Bias crime code                          2  58 -  59
```

```
******************************************************************
    R2001      Record type

    1883       (02) Offense data
******************************************************************
    R2002      ORI number
******************************************************************
    R2003      Incident number
******************************************************************
    R2004      UCR offense code

    37         (09A) Murder/nonnegligent manslaughter
    2          (09B) Negligent manslaughter
               (09C) Justifiable homicide
    131        (100) Kidnapping/abduction
    885        (11A) Forcible rape
    197        (11B) Forcible sodomy
    38         (11C) Sexual assault with an object
    484        (11D) Forcible fondling (indec liberties/child molesting
    14         (120) Robbery
    27         (13A) Aggravated assault
    15         (13B) Simple assault
    11         (13C) Intimidation
    1          (200) Arson
               (210) Extortion/blackmail
    21         (220) Burglary/breaking and entering
    3          (23H) All other larceny
    1          (240) Motor vehicle theft
    1          (26A) False pretenses/swindle/confidence game
    3          (290) Destruction/damage/vandalism of property
    4          (35A) Drug/narcotic violations
               (36A) Incest
    3          (36B) Statutory rape
    2          (370) Pornography/obscene material
    1          (40A) Prostitution
    1          (520) Weapon law violations
******************************************************************
    R2005      Year of incident

    1877       (1991) 1991
    5          (1992) 1992
******************************************************************
    R2006      Month of incident
******************************************************************
    R2007      Date of incident
******************************************************************
    R2008      Attempted/completed code

    151        (A) Attempted
    1731       (C) Completed
******************************************************************
    R2009      Offender suspected of using 1

    147        (A) Alcohol
```

```
                (C) Computer equipment
        7       (D) Drugs/narcotics
     1728       (N) Not applicable
*****************************************************************
    R2010    Offender suspected of using 2

     1870       ( ) No entry
                (A) Alcohol
                (C) Computer equipment
       12       (D) Drugs/narcotics
                (N) Not applicable
*****************************************************************
    R2011    Offender suspected of using 3

     1882       ( ) No entry
*****************************************************************
    R2012    Location of offense

        3       (01)  Air/bus/train terminal
                (02)  Bank/savings and loan
        3       (03)  Bar/nightclub
        6       (04)  Church/synagogue/temple
       24       (05)  Commercial/office building
        1       (06)  Construction site
        9       (07)  Convenience store
       10       (08)  Departement/discount store
        3       (09)  Drug store/dr.'s office/hospital
       64       (10)  Field/woods
        5       (11)  Government/public building
        1       (12)  Grocery/supermarket
      218       (13)  Highway/road/alley
       41       (14)  Hotel/motel/etc.
        2       (15)  Jail/prison
        3       (16)  Lake/waterway
                (17)  Liquor store
       27       (18)  Parking lot/garage
                (19)  Rental storage facility
     1113       (20)  Residence/home
        5       (21)  Restaurant
       21       (22)  School/college
        3       (23)  Service/gas station
        2       (24)  Speciality store (tv, fur, etc.)
      318       (25)  Other/unknown
*****************************************************************
    R2013    Number of premises entered

     1882       (00) Zero fill
*****************************************************************
    R2014    Method of entry

     1861       ( ) No entry
       16       (F) Force
        5       (N) No force
*****************************************************************
```

```
R2015     Criminal activity code 1

1875     ( )  No entry
         (B)  Buying/receiving
         (C)  Cultivating/manufacturing/publishing
         (D)  Distributing/selling
   2     (E)  Exploiting children
         (O)  Operating/promoting/assisting
   5     (P)  Possessing/concealing
         (T)  Transporting/transmitting/importing
         (U)  Using/consuming
*************************************************************************
R2016     Criminal activity code 2

1880     ( )  No entry
   1     (D)  Distributing/selling
   1     (T)  Transporting/transmitting/importing
*************************************************************************
R2017     Criminal activity code 3

1882     ( )  No entry
*************************************************************************
R2018     Type of weapon code 1

  51     (  )  No entry
   9     (11 )  Firearm (type not stated)
  79     (12 )  Handgun
   4     (13 )  Rifle
   5     (14 )  Shotgun
   1     (15 )  Other firearm
  51     (20 )  Knife/cutting instrument
  17     (30 )  Blunt object (club, hammer, etc.)
         (35 )  Motor vehicle
1452     (40 )  Personal weapons (hands, feet, teeth, etc.)
         (50 )  Poison (including gas)
         (60 )  Explosives
   1     (65 )  Fire/incendiary device
         (70 )  Drugs/narcotics/sleeping pills
  49     (90 )  Other
  37     (95 )  Unknown
 126     (99 )  None
*************************************************************************
R2019     Type of weapon code 2

1863     (  )  No entry
   1     (14 )  Shotgun
   3     (20 )  Knife/cutting instrument
   1     (30 )  Blunt object (club, hammer, etc.)
   2     (35 )  Motor vehcile
  11     (40 )  Personal weapons (hands, feet, teeth, etc.)
   1     (90 )  Other
*************************************************************************
R2020     Type of weapon code 3
```

```
  1882      (   ) No entry
**********************************************************************
  R2021        State numeric code

   484      (01)
   100      (33)
  1298      (39)
**********************************************************************
  R2022        Bias crime code

  1882      (   )
**********************************************************************
```

NIBRS Property data: NISMART sample frequencies, 181 cases.

```
    (1) R3001 Record type                          2   1 -   2
        R3002 ORI number                           9   3 -  11
        R3003 Incident number                     12  12 -  23
    (8) R3004 Property loss code                    1  24 -  24
   (43) R3005 Property description code             2  25 -  26

    (1) R3006 Year of incident                      4  27 -  30
   (12) R3007 Month of incident                     2  31 -  32
   (31) R3008 Date of incident                      2  33 -  34
        R3009 Property value                        9  35 -  43
    (2) R3010 Year recovered                        4  44 -  47

   (13) R3011 Month recovered                       2  48 -  49
   (32) R3012 Date recovered                        2  50 -  51
        R3013 Number of stolen vehicles             2  52 -  53
        R3014 Number of recovered vehicles          2  54 -  55

   (19) R3026 Drug type 1                           1  87 -  87
        R3027 Drug quantity 1                      12  88 -  99
   (11) R3028 Drug measurement 1                     2 100 - 101
        R3029 Converted to milligrams 1            12 102 - 113
   (19) R3030 Drug type 2                            1 114 - 114

        R3031 Drug quantity 2                       12 115 - 126
   (11) R3032 Drug measurement 2                     2 127 - 128
        R3033 Converted to milligrams 2            12 129 - 140
   (19) R3034 Drug type 3                            1 141 - 141
        R3035 Drug quantity 3                       12 142 - 153

   (11) R3036 Drug measurement 3                     2 154 - 155
        R3037 Converted to milligrams 3            12 156 - 167
        R3038 State numeric code                     2 168 - 169
```

```
************************************************************************
    R3001        Record type

       181        (03) Property data
************************************************************************
    R3002        ORI number
************************************************************************
    R3003        Incident number
************************************************************************
    R3004        Property loss code

        95        (1)  None
         1        (2)  Burned
                   (3)  Conterfeited/forged
         3        (4)  Destroyed/damaged/vandalized
         7        (5)  Recovered
         5        (6)  Seized
        69        (7)  Stolen/etc. (incl bribed, defrauded, embezzled...)
         1        (8)  Unknown
************************************************************************
    R3005        Property description code

        96        (  ) No entry
         5        (03) Automobiles
         1        (04) Bicycles
        10        (06) Clothes/furs
         3        (10) Drugs/narcotics
         3        (13) Firearms
         8        (17) Jewelry/precious goods
         8        (20) Money
         1        (25) Purses/handbags/wallets
         1        (26) Radios/tvs/vcrs
         1        (27) Recordings-audio/visual
         2        (29) Structures-single occupancy dwellings
         2        (30) Structures-other dwellings
         1        (37) Trucks
        17        (77) Other
        22        (88) Pending inventory (of property)
************************************************************************
    R3006        Year of incident

       181        (1991) 1991
************************************************************************
    R3007        Month of incident
************************************************************************
    R3008        Date of incident
************************************************************************
    R3009        Property value
************************************************************************
    R3010        Year recovered

       174        (0000) Zero fill
         7        (1991) 1991
************************************************************************
```

```
R3011      Month recovered
*****************************************************************************

R3012      Date recovered
*****************************************************************************

R3013      Number of stolen vehicles

   180     (00)
     1     (01)
*****************************************************************************

R3014      Number of recovered vehicles

   180     (00)
     1     (01)
*****************************************************************************

R3026      Drug type 1

   176     ( ) No entry
     3     (A) 'Crack' cocaine
     2     (E) Narijuana
*****************************************************************************

R3027      Drug quantity 1
*****************************************************************************

R3028      Drug measurement 1
*****************************************************************************

R3029      Converted to milligrams 1
*****************************************************************************

R3030      Drug type 2
*****************************************************************************

R3031      Drug quantity 2
*****************************************************************************

R3032      Drug measurement 2
*****************************************************************************

R3033      Converted to milligrams 2
*****************************************************************************

R3034      Drug type 3
*****************************************************************************

R3035      Drug quantity 3
*****************************************************************************

R3036      Drug measurement 3
*****************************************************************************

R3037      Converted to milligrams 3
*****************************************************************************

R3038      State numeric code

    23     (01)
    10     (33)
   148     (39)
*****************************************************************************
```

NIBRS Victim data: NISMART sample frequencies, 1,914 cases.

(1)	R4001	Record type	2	1	-	2
	R4002	ORI number	9	3	-	11
	R4003	Incident number	12	12	-	23
(1)	R4004	Victim number	3	24	-	26
(1)	R4005	Year of incident	4	27	-	30
(12)	R4006	Month of incident	2	31	-	32
(31)	R4007	Date of incident	2	33	-	34
(57)	R4008	Connected to offense code 01	3	35	-	37
(58)	R4009	Connected to offense code 02	3	38	-	40
(58)	R4010	Connected to offense code 03	3	41	-	43
(58)	R4011	Connected to offense code 04	3	44	-	46
(58)	R4012	Connected to offense code 05	3	47	-	49
(58)	R4013	Connected to offense code 06	3	50	-	52
(58)	R4014	Connected to offense code 07	3	53	-	55
(58)	R4015	Connected to offense code 08	3	56	-	58
(58)	R4016	Connected to offense code 09	3	59	-	61
(58)	R4017	Connected to offense code 10	3	62	-	64
(8)	R4018	Type of victim	1	65	-	65
(101)	R4019	Age of victim	2	66	-	67
(4)	R4020	Sex of victim	1	68	-	68
(6)	R4021	Race of victim	1	69	-	69
(4)	R4022	Ethnicity of victim	1	70	-	70
(4)	R4023	Resident status of victim	1	71	-	71
(18)	R4024	Aggravated assault/homicide circumstance 1	2	72	-	73
(18)	R4025	Aggravated assault/homicide circumstance 2	2	74	-	75
(8)	R4026	Justifiable homicide circumstance	1	76	-	76
(9)	R4027	Injury code 1	1	77	-	77
(9)	R4028	Injury code 2	1	78	-	78
(9)	R4029	Injury code 3	1	79	-	79
(9)	R4030	Injury code 4	1	80	-	80
(9)	R4031	Injury code 5	1	81	-	81
(1)	R4032	Related to offender (offender number) 01	2	82	-	83
(25)	R4033	Relationship victim to offender code 01	2	84	-	85
(1)	R4034	Related to offender (offender number) 02	2	86	-	87
(26)	R4035	Relationship victim to offender code 02	2	88	-	89
(1)	R4036	Related to offender (offender number) 03	2	90	-	91
(26)	R4037	Relationship victim to offender code 03	2	92	-	93
(1)	R4038	Related to offender (offender number) 04	2	94	-	95
(26)	R4039	Relationship victim to offender code 04	2	96	-	97
(1)	R4040	Related to offender (offender number) 05	2	98	-	99
(26)	R4041	Relationship victim to offender code 05	2	100	-	101
(1)	R4042	Related to offender (offender number) 06	2	102	-	103
(26)	R4043	Relationship victim to offender code 06	2	104	-	105

```
     (1) R4044 Related to offender (offender number) 07          2 106 - 107
    (26) R4045 Relationship victim to offender code  07          2 108 - 109

     (1) R4046 Related to offender (offender number) 08          2 110 - 111
    (26) R4047 Relationship victim to offender code  08          2 112 - 113
     (1) R4048 Related to offender (offender number) 09          2 114 - 115
    (26) R4049 Relationship victim to offender code  09          2 116 - 117
     (1) R4050 Related to offender (offender number) 10          2 118 - 119

    (26) R4051 Relationship victim to offender code  10          2 120 - 121
         R4052 State numeric code                                2 122 - 123
```

```
************************************************************************
    R4001      Record type

    1916       (04) Victim data
************************************************************************
    R4002      ORI number
************************************************************************
    R4003      Incident number
************************************************************************
    R4004      Victim number

    1719       (001)
     143       (002)
      37       (003)
      12       (004)
       2       (005)
       1       (006)
************************************************************************
    R4005      Year of incident

    1909       (1991) 1991
       5       (1992) 1992
************************************************************************
    R4006      Month of incident
************************************************************************
    R4007      Date of incident
************************************************************************
    R4008      Connected to offense code 01

      39       (09A) Murder/nonnegligent manslaughter
       2       (09B) Negligent manslaughter
     113       (100) Kidnapping/abduction
     903       (11A) Forcible rape
     202       (11B) Forcible sodomy
      35       (11C) Sexual assault with an object
     534       (11D) Forcible fondling (indec liberties/child molesting
      11       (120) Robbery
      25       (13A) Aggravated assault
      10       (13B) Simple assault
       3       (13C) Intimidation
      22       (220) Burglary/breaking and entering
       2       (290) Destruction/damage/vandalism of property
       5       (35A) Drug/narcotic violations
       5       (36B) Statutory rape
       2       (370) Pornography/obscene material
       1       (40A) Prostitution
************************************************************************
    R4009      Connected to offense code 02

    1779       (   ) No entry
      38       (100) Kidnapping/abduction
      10       (11A) Forcible rape
      10       (11B) Forcible sodomy
       4       (11C) Sexual assault with an object
```

```
      21     (11D) Forcible fondling (indec liberties/child molesting
       4     (120) Robbery
      11     (13A) Aggravated assault
       6     (13B) Simple assault
      14     (13C) Intimidation
       9     (220) Burglary/breaking and entering
       3     (23H) All other larceny
       1     (240) Motor vehicle theft
       1     (26A) False pretenses/swindle/confidence game
       1     (290) Destruction/damage/vandalism of property
       2     (520) Weapon law violations
**************************************************************************
    R4010 .  Connected to offense code 03

    1907     (   ) No entry
       2     (100) Kidnapping/abduction
       1     (11D) Forcible fondling (indec liberties/child molesting
       1     (13C) Intimidation
       1     (200) Arson
       1     (220) Burglary/breaking and entering
       1     (290) Destruction/damage/vandalism of property
**************************************************************************
    R4011    Connected to offense code 04

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4012    Connected to offense code 05

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4013    Connected to offense code 06

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4014    Connected to offense code 07

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4015    Connected to offense code 08

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4016    Connected to offense code 09

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4017    Connected to offense code 10

    1914     (   ) No entry
**************************************************************************
    R4018    Type of victim

    1891     (I) Individual
       8     (S) Society/public
```

```
            1         (O) Other
           14         (U) Unknown
**************************************************************
     R4019      Age of victim

           23         (   ) No entry
            5         (00) Zero fill
            7         (BB) 7 - 364 days old
            1         (NB) 1 - 6 days old
           22         (01) One
           43         (02) Two
           59         (03) Three
           77         (04) Four
           54         (05) Five
           73         (06) Six
           72         (07) Seven
           74         (08) Eight
           81         (09) Nine
           76         (10) Ten
           89         (11) Eleven
          146         (12) Twelve
          214         (13) Thirteen
          204         (14) Fourteen
          222         (15) Fifteen
          185         (16) Sixteen
          157         (17) Seventeen
            3         (18) Eighteen
            5         (19) Nineteen
            2         (20) Twenty
            1         (21) Twenty-one
            1         (22) Twenty-two
            4         (24) Twenty-four
            1         (26) Twenty-six
            4         (27) Twenty-seven
            1         (31) Thirty-one
            1         (34) Thirty-four
            2         (35) Thirty-five
            1         (39) Thirty-nine
            1         (45) Forty-five
            1         (48) Forty-eight
            1         (50) Fifty
            1         (65) Sixty-five
**************************************************************
     R4020      Sex of victim

           23         ( ) No entry
          331         (M) Male
         1559         (F) Female
            1         (U) Unknown
**************************************************************
     R4021      Race of victim

           23         ( ) No entry
         1056         (W) White
```

```
   819      (B) Black
     6      (I) American indian/alaskan native
     1      (A) Asian/pacific islander
     9      (U) Unknown
****************************************************************************
   R4022    Ethnicity of victim

    32      ( ) No entry
     1      (H) Hispanic origin
  1091      (N) Not of hispanic origin
   790      (U) Unknown
****************************************************************************
   R4023    Resident status of victim

    34      ( ) No entry
  1573      (R) Resident
   102      (N) Nonresident
   205      (U) Unknown
****************************************************************************
   R4024    Aggravated assault/homicide circumstance 1

  1837      (00) Zero fill
    15      (01) Argument
     1      (02) Assault on law enforcement officer(s)
     4      (03) Drug dealing
    17      (08) Other felony involved
    11      (09) Other circumstances
    24      (10) Unknown circumstances
     1      (30) Neglignet, child playing with weapon
     4      (33) Other negligent weapon handling
****************************************************************************
   R4025    Aggravated assault/homicide circumstance 2
****************************************************************************
   R4026    Justifiable homicide circumstance

  1914      ( ) No entry
****************************************************************************
   R4027    Injury code 1

    71      ( ) No entry
  1413      (N) None
     1      (B) Apparent broken bones
    12      (I) Possible internal injury
    13      (L) Severe laceration
   377      (M) Apparent minor injury
    20      (O) Other major injury
           (T) Loss of teeth
     7      (U) Unconsciousness
****************************************************************************
   R4028    Injury code 2

  1909      ( ) No entry
     1      (I) Possible internal injury
     2      (M) Apparent minor injury
```

```
        2       (O) Other major injury
********************************************************************
     R4029      Injury code 3

     1914       ( ) No entry
********************************************************************
     R4030      Injury code 4

     1914       ( ) No entry
********************************************************************
     R4031      Injury code 5

     1914       ( ) No entry
********************************************************************
     R4032      Related to offender (offender number) 01

      153       (00) Zero fill
     1760       (01)
        1       (02)
********************************************************************
     R4033      Relationship victim to offender code   01

                (SE) Victim was spouse
                (CS) Victim was common-law spouse
                (PA) Victim was PARENT
        2       (SB) Victim was sibling
        4       (CH) Victim was child
                (GP) Victim was grandparent
                (GC) Victim was grandchild
                (IL) Victim was in-law
        1       (SP) Victim was stepparent
        2       (SC) Victim was stepchild
                (SS) Victim was stepsibling
        2       (OF) Victim was other family member
     1010       (AQ) Victim was acquaintance
      221       (FR) Victim was friend
       81       (NE) Victim was neighbor
       24       (BE) Victim was babysittee (the baby)
       40       (BG) Victim was boyfriend/girlfriend
       15       (CF) Victim was child of boyfriend/girlfriend
                (HR) Homosexual relationship
        1       (XS) Victim was ex-spouse
        2       (EE) Victim was employee
                (ER) Victim was employer
       53       (OK) Victim was otherwise known
                (RU) Relationship unknown
      303       (ST) Victim was stranger

      153       ( ) _____
********************************************************************
     R4034      Related to offender (offender number) 02

     1546       (00) Zero fill
        1       (01)
```

```
     367        (02)
*********************************************************************
    R4035      Relationship victim to offender code   02

    1546       (  ) No entry
       1       (OF) Victim was other family member
     171       (AQ) Victim was acquaintance
      74       (FR) Victim was friend
      21       (NE) Victim was neighbor
       3       (BE) Victim was babysittee (the baby)
       5       (BG) Victim was boyfriend/girlfriend
       1       (CF) Victim was child of boyfriend/girlfriend
       7       (OK) Victim was otherwise known
      85       (ST) Victim was stranger
*********************************************************************
    R4036      Related to offender (offender number) 03

    1854       (00) Zero fill
      60       (03)
*********************************************************************
    R4037      Relationship victim to offender code   03

    1854       (  ) No entry
      36       (AQ) Victim was acquaintance
       3       (FR) Victim was friend
       3       (OK) Victim was otherwise known
      18       (ST) Victim was stranger
*********************************************************************
    R4038      Related to offender (offender number) 04
*********************************************************************
    R4039      Relationship victim to offender code   04
*********************************************************************
    R4040      Related to offender (offender number) 05
*********************************************************************
    R4041      Relationship victim to offender code   05
*********************************************************************
    R4042      Related to offender (offender number) 06
*********************************************************************
    R4043      Relationship victim to offender code   06
*********************************************************************
    R4044      Related to offender (offender number) 07
*********************************************************************
    R4045      Relationship victim to offender code   07
*********************************************************************
    R4046      Related to offender (offender number) 08
*********************************************************************
    R4047      Relationship victim to offender code   08
*********************************************************************
    R4048      Related to offender (offender number) 09
*********************************************************************
    R4049      Relationship victim to offender code   09
*********************************************************************
    R4050      Related to offender (offender number) 10
*********************************************************************
```

R4051   Relationship victim to offender code   10
****
R4052   State numeric code

484   (01)
104   (33)
1326   (39)
****

NIBRS Offender data: NISMART sample frequencies, 2,168 cases.

(1)	R5001	Record type	2	1 -	2
	R5002	ORI number	9	3 -	11
	R5003	Incident number	12	12 -	23
	R5004	Offender number	2	24 -	25
(1)	R5005	Year of incident	4	26 -	29
(12)	R5006	Month of incident	2	30 -	31
(31)	R5007	Date of incident	2	32 -	33
	R5008	Offender age	2	34 -	35
(3)	R5009	Offender sex	1	36 -	36
(5)	R5010	Offender race	1	37 -	37
	R5011	State numeric code	2	38 -	39

```
************************************************************************
    R5001      Record type

    2170       (05) Offender data
************************************************************************
    R5002      ORI number
************************************************************************
    R5003      Incident number
************************************************************************
    R5004      Offender number

     107       (00)
    1612       (01)
     343       (02)
      53       (03)
      16       (04)
      10       (05)
       5       (06)
       2       (07)
       2       (08)
       2       (09)
       2       (10)
       2       (11)
       2       (12)
       2       (13)
       2       (14)
       2       (15)
       2       (16)
       1       (17)
       1       (18)
************************************************************************
    R5005      Year of incident

    2163       (1991) 1991
       5       (1992) 1992
************************************************************************
    R5006      Month of incident
************************************************************************
    R5007      Date of incident
************************************************************************
    R5008      Offender age

     107       (  )
     376       (00)
       1       (04)
       2       (05)
       2       (06)
      13       (07)
       8       (08)
      17       (09)
      21       (10)
      31       (11)
      37       (12)
      87       (13)
```

90	(14)
75	(15)
118	(16)
129	(17)
110	(18)
91	(19)
72	(20)
46	(21)
65	(22)
32	(23)
34	(24)
42	(25)
27	(26)
44	(27)
23	(28)
26	(29)
41	(30)
22	(31)
40	(32)
19	(33)
22	(34)
27	(35)
41	(36)
20	(37)
11	(38)
15	(39)
17	(40)
3	(41)
13	(42)
7	(43)
6	(44)
13	(45)
10	(46)
13	(47)
7	(48)
7	(49)
9	(50)
3	(51)
5	(52)
6	(53)
7	(54)
13	(55)
5	(56)
1	(57)
3	(58)
1	(59)
6	(60)
1	(61)
4	(62)
1	(63)
2	(64)
4	(65)
3	(66)
3	(67)

```
        1     (69)
        2     (71)
        2     (72)
        1     (75)
        1     (76)
        2     (77)
        1     (79)
        1     (87)
*******************************************************************
    R5009     Offender sex

     1767     (M) Male
       62     (F) Female
      232     (U) Unknown

      107     ( ) _____
*******************************************************************
    R5010     Offender race

      823     (W) White
      981     (B) Black
        8     (I) American indian/alaskan native
        3     (A) Asian/pacific islander
      246     (U) Unknown

      107     ( ) _____
*******************************************************************
    R5011     State numeric code

      694     (01)
      110     (33)
     1364     (39)


*******************************************************************
```

NIBRS Arrestee data: NISMART sample frequencies, 156 cases.

```
 (1) R6001 Record type                          2   1 -   2
     R6002 ORI number                           9   3 -  11
     R6003 Incident number                     12  12 -  23
     R6004 Arrestee number                      2  24 -  25
 (1) R6005 Year of incident                     4  26 -  29

(12) R6006 Month of incident                    2  30 -  31
(31) R6007 Date of incident                     2  32 -  33
     R6008 Arrest transaction number           12  34 -  45
 (1) R6009 Year of arrest                       4  46 -  49
(12) R6010 Month of arrest                      2  50 -  51

(31) R6011 Date of arrest                       2  52 -  53
 (3) R6012 Type of arrest                       1  54 -  54
 (3) R6013 Multiple clearance indicator         1  55 -  55
(57) R6014 Arrest offense code                  3  56 -  58
 (8) R6015 Arrestee armed with 1                3  59 -  61

 (9) R6016 Arrestee armed with 2                3  62 -  64
     R6017 Arrestee age                         2  65 -  66
 (3) R6018 Arrestee sex                         1  67 -  67
 (5) R6019 Arrestee race                        1  68 -  68
 (3) R6020 Arrestee ethnicity                   1  69 -  69

 (3) R6021 Arrestee resident status             1  70 -  70
 (3) R6022 Juvenile disposition                 1  71 -  71
     R6035 State numeric code                   2 104 - 105
```

```
**************************************************************
    R6001      Record type

     156       (06) Arrestee data
**************************************************************
    R6002      ORI number
**************************************************************
    R6003      Incident number
**************************************************************
    R6004      Arrestee number

     141       (01)
      10       (02)
       3       (03)
       1       (04)
       1       (05)
**************************************************************
    R6005      Year of incident

     155       (1991) 1991
       1       (1992) 1992
**************************************************************
    R6006      Month of incident
**************************************************************
    R6007      Date of incident
**************************************************************
    R6008      Arrest transaction number
**************************************************************
    R6009      Year of arrest
     152       (1991) 1991
       4       (1992) 1992
**************************************************************
    R6010      Month of arrest
**************************************************************
    R6011      Date of arrest
**************************************************************
    R6012      Type of arrest

      29       (O) On-view arrest
      18       (S) Summoned/cited (not taken into custody)
     109       (T) Taken into custody (based on warrant and/or prev)
**************************************************************
    R6013      Multiple clearance indicator

       2       (M) Multiple
       1       (C) Count arrestee
     153       (N) Not applicable
**************************************************************
    R6014      Arrest offense code

       6       (09A) Murder/nonnegligent manslaughter
               (09B) Negligent manslaughter
               (09C) Justifiable homicide
      10       (100) Kidnapping/abduction
```

76	(11A)	Forcible rape
3	(11B)	Forcible sodomy
5	(11C)	Sexual assault with an object
34	(11D)	Forcible fondling (indec liberties/child molesting
	(120)	Robbery
9	(13A)	Aggravated assault
8	(13B)	Simple assault
1	(13C)	Intimidation
	(200)	Arson
	(210)	Extortion/blackmail
1	(220)	Burglary/breaking and entering
	(23A)	Pocket-picking
	(23B)	Purse-snatching
	(23C)	Shoplifting
	(23D)	Theft from building
	(23E)	Theft from coin-operated machine or device
	(23F)	Theft from motor vehicle
	(23G)	Theft of motor vehicle parts/accessories
	(23H)	All other larceny
	(240)	Motor vehicle theft
	(250)	Counterfeiting/forgery
	(26A)	False pretenses/swindle/confidence game
	(26B)	Credit card/automatic teller machine fraud
	(26C)	Impersonation
	(26D)	Welfare fraud
	(26E)	Wire fraud
	(270)	Embezzlement
	(280)	Stolen property offenses (receiving, selling, etc)
	(290)	Destruction/damage/vandalism of property
	(35A)	Drug/narcotic violations
	(35B)	Drug equipment violations
	(36A)	Incest
2	(36B)	Statutory rape
	(370)	Pornography/obscene material
	(39A)	Betting/wagering
	(39B)	Operating/promoting/assisting gambling
	(39C)	Gambling equipment violations
	(39D)	Sports tampering
	(40A)	Prostitution
	(40B)	Assisting or promoting prostitution
	(510)	Bribery
	(520)	Weapon law violations
	(90A)	Bad checks
	(90B)	Curfew/loitering/vagrancy violations
	(90C)	Disorderly conduct
	(90D)	Driving under the influence
	(90E)	Drunkenness
	(90F)	Family offenses, nonviolent
	(90G)	Liquor law violations
	(90H)	Peeping tom
	(90I)	Runaway
	(90J)	Trespass of real property
1	(90Z)	All other group B offenses

****

R6015   Arrestee armed with 1

155   (01) Unarmed
         (11) Firearm (type not stated)
         (12) Handgun
         (13) Rifle
         (14) Shotgun
         (15) Other firearm
  1   (16) Lethal cutting instrument
         (17) Club/blackjack/brass knuckles
****
R6016   Arrestee armed with 2

156   (   ) No entry
****
R6017   Arrestee age

  1   (10)
  3   (11)
  3   (12)
  3   (13)
 12   (14)
  7   (15)
  9   (16)
  9   (17)
  7   (18)
 11   (19)
  4   (20)
  5   (21)
 11   (22)
  6   (23)
  2   (24)
  4   (25)
  5   (26)
  1   (27)
  2   (28)
  8   (29)
  2   (30)
  5   (31)
  1   (33)
  1   (34)
  3   (35)
  3   (36)
  1   (37)
  1   (39)
  2   (40)
  3   (42)
  1   (44)
  4   (46)
  3   (47)
  2   (48)
  2   (49)
  1   (54)
  2   (55)

```
          1       (56)
          1       (57)
          1       (58)
          1       (62)
          1       (64)
          1       (87)
****************************************************************
      R6018       Arrestee sex

        151       (M)  Male
          5       (F)  Female
                  (U)  Unknown
****************************************************************
      R6019       Arrestee race

         74       (W)  White
         79       (B)  Black
          1       (I)  American indian/alaskan native
          2       (A)  Asian/pacific islander
                  (U)  Unknown
****************************************************************
      R6020       Arrestee ethnicity

                  (H)  Hispanic origin
         55       (N)  Not of hispanic origin
        100       (U)  Unknown

          1       ( ) _____
****************************************************************
      R6021       Arrestee resident status

        126       (R)  Resident
          7       (N)  Nonresident
         22       (U)  Unknown

          1       ( ) _____
****************************************************************
      R6022       Juvenile disposition

        109       ( )  No entry
          5       (H)  Handled within department
         42       (R)  Referred to other authorities
****************************************************************
      R6035       State numeric code

         13       (01)
         13       (33)
        130       (39)
****************************************************************
```