

104615

104615
Pre-assignment
104615

Bureau of Justice Statistics
Technical Report
DATA BASE

Series Crimes: Report of a Field Test

by Richard W. Dodge, Ph.D.
BJS Statistician

April 1987

Series crimes are defined in the National Crime Survey (NCS) as three or more incidents that are similar in nature, in which the victim is unable to furnish details of each incident separately. These crimes constitute a problem for victimization surveys because it is not obvious how or whether they should be combined with the vast majority of crime incidents that are separately reported. As a result, series crimes have generally been excluded from the annual victimization estimates prepared from the National Crime Survey.

An experiment was conducted in conjunction with the NCS from January through June of 1985 to obtain more detailed information on the nature of series crimes. Persons who had reported a series crime in their original NCS interview were recontacted with a specially designed followup questionnaire. This report presents the results of that experiment. In addition, an alternative system for classifying series crimes containing multiple incidents is presented.

General findings

- In about 60% of the series incidents, respondents were able to recall the details of each incident during the re-interview so that separate incident reports were obtained.
- In nearly half of the cases the number of incidents in the series between the original and followup interviews did not change. Among those cases where the

number did change, decreases outnumbered increases.

- Series cases involving 11 or more incidents exhibited, on average, substantial shifts in the numbers reported between the original interview and the reinterview, with a slight net decrease.
- In more than 75% of the series incidents, all of the incidents fell into the same specific crime category. The remaining cases were about equally divided between those that were in the same general category (for example, various kinds of assault) and those that were divided between two or more categories (such as a mixture of robbery and assault).
- Violent crimes, which made up somewhat more than a fourth of all series crimes, comprised over half of those with 11 or more incidents at the time of reinterview.
- Violent series crimes that occurred in connection with a person's job were usually committed by different offenders who were generally complete strangers. On the other hand, crimes involving violence between spouses, neighbors, or friends and those occurring in school settings were almost always perpetrated by the same person who was well known to the victim.

The issue of series crimes

Series crimes comprise only about 4% of all crimes reported in the

National Crime Survey. This figure, however, understates the relative importance of the volume of series crimes because each series is counted only once, although it consists of a minimum of three incidents. The majority of series crimes reported to the NCS in 1984 consisted of 3 or 4 incidents, but about 13% contained 11 or more.

Series crimes arise out of the nature of victimization surveys, which ask victims about their experiences with crime over a period of time (the NCS asks about the previous 6 months). Police statistics might capture some episodes in a series of domestic violence incidents, for example, but a particular event must trigger the report to the police. It would be recorded as a single victimization in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting system even if it were preceded by several unreported incidents of a similar nature.

There are a number of reasons why series crimes have not been included in NCS estimates. Interviewers collect detailed information about the most recent incident in the series, but it is not clear whether the most recent incident adequately reflects the entire series or whether, in some cases, the series designation may include a mixture of types of crime. Also, certain kinds of series crimes resemble continuous processes rather than discrete events, for example, domestic violence or crimes that occur as a function of one's occupation, such as law enforcement. In addition, the estimate of the number of incidents in a series is known

**Table 1. Distribution of series crimes by type of crime and type of report
January-June, 1985**

Type of crime	Percent of reports			Number of cases
	Total	Separate	Consolidated	
Total	100.0%	61.1%	38.9%	185
Robbery	100.0	50.0	50.0	6
Aggravated assault	100.0	62.5	37.5	8
Simple assault	100.0	48.7	51.3	39
Personal larceny without contact	100.0	73.5	26.5	34
Burglary	100.0	56.7	43.3	30
Household larceny	100.0	64.5	35.5	62
Motor vehicle theft	100.0	66.7	33.3	6

to vary during the course of an interview, especially when large numbers are involved. Even when a good estimate of the number of incidents in these situations is obtainable, it must be determined if the data should be included with the regular crimes or presented separately.

Description of the field test

Two questionnaires were developed for this experiment, both shortened versions of the regular NCS incident report. Respondents in the test were asked how many incidents there were in the series of crimes they reported without being reminded of their answers in the original interview. The response to this question determined which test questionnaire would be administered. One version (the separate report) was administered to those who reported five or fewer incidents on reinterview. Its main purpose was to encourage as many respondents as possible to try to separate the incidents so that a single report could be obtained for each incident. The other version of the questionnaire (the consolidated report), for persons with six or more incidents, compared the details of the most recent incident with the others in the series. The goal was to discover if respondents were reporting incidents that were mixtures of NCS crime types. Both test questionnaires were limited for the most part to questions that were needed to classify the incident according to crime type.

In most cases respondents who reported series of three to five incidents at the time of reinterview were able to provide details about each incident separately. If they could not do so, the interviewers were permitted to switch to the other questionnaire as a last resort. In addition some interviewers incorrectly filled out the separate form even though the respondent was unable to provide details of each incident. These cases were also considered as consolidated reports, although they might more properly be labeled as "unable to complete separate reports."

Results of the field test

The most important finding from the field test was that 61% of the victims of series crimes who were unable to complete separate reports on the original interview were able to do so when reinterviewed with the special questionnaire and with the minimum number of incidents raised from three to six (table 1). Also, the distribution

Table 2. Number and percent of cases, by number of incidents reported in original interview and type of report completed in reinterview, January-June, 1985

	Number of cases	Percent of cases
Total	183*	100.0%
Cases in original interview with:		
3-5 incidents	122	66.7%
Separate reports	100	54.6
Consolidated reports	22	12.0
6 or more incidents	61	33.3%
Separate reports	13	7.1
Consolidated reports	48	26.2

*This table excludes 2 cases for which the number of incidents in the original interview was not ascertained.

of series crimes by the type of report completed differed for the major types of crime. Victims of personal larceny without contact and, to a lesser extent, victims of household larceny were particularly successful in reporting the details of each incident during the re-interview. Approximately three-fourths of the former were able to fill out separate reports. On the other hand, only about half of simple assault victims could recall the details of each incident when interviewed a second time.

Number of incidents in the series

Of the 185 cases identified as series crimes in the original interview for which completed test questionnaires were obtained, about two-thirds reported that the series contained from three to five incidents (table 2). At the time of reinterview, 82% of these respondents were able to provide details of each incident separately. On the other hand, approximately 21% of those who had originally reported six or more incidents reduced their estimate sufficiently so that individual incident reports could be completed.

Among those reinterviewed there were both increases and decreases in the number of incidents reported originally compared to the number reported on reinterview. About 19% of those who could differentiate among the series incidents at the time of reinterview claimed, in effect, that no series existed—that there were fewer than three incidents involved (table 3). In a number of cases, it was determined that the additional events had occurred before the 6-month reference period.

Table 3. Number of incidents reported in original interview and in reinterview, by type of report, January-June, 1985

Number of incidents in series	Percent of reports					
	Total		Separate		Consolidated	
	Original	Reinterview	Original	Reinterview	Original	Reinterview
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
0-2 incidents		12.4		18.6		2.8*
3	41.1	31.9	59.3	49.6	12.5	4.2
4	15.7	11.4	18.6	17.7	11.1	1.4
5	8.1	9.7	10.6	14.2	4.2	2.8
6	9.7	8.1	7.1	0	13.9	20.8
7	1.1	2.2	0	0	2.8	5.6
8	1.6	1.6	.9	0	2.8	4.2
9	1.1	1.6	0	0	2.8	4.2
10	3.8	3.8	0	0	9.7	9.7
11-50	13.5	12.4	2.7	0	30.6	31.9
51+	3.2	2.2	.9	0	6.9	5.6
Not ascertained	1.1	2.7	0	0	2.8	6.9
Number of cases	185	185	113	113	72	72

* In two instances two sets of series incidents involving the same victim were reported as one series by the reinterviewer. The number of incidents for two series was therefore classified as zero in the reinterview.

Not all respondents with three to five incidents in the series could recall the details sufficiently to complete separate incident reports, so in a few instances a consolidated report was taken. More than a third of the victims who completed a consolidated report claimed that there were 11 or more incidents in the series.

In close to 50% of the cases, respondents reported the same number of incidents on reinterview as they did originally (table 4). Those who could report the details of each incident on the reinterview had a higher proportion of identical responses (56%). Most of the remaining victims who could report incidents separately reduced the number when reinterviewed.

There was more shifting among those who completed consolidated reports. About 56% changed their original responses; 37% reported an increased number of incidents on reinterview, while about 19% reported a decrease.

Multiple series incidents

Perhaps the thorniest problem of studying series crimes is multiple series incidents, here defined as 11 or more cases on reinterview. Although these cases comprise about 15% of all series crimes in this test, their share would be much greater if they were weighted according to the actual number of cases they represent.

Aside from the substantial number of incidents involved per series, this test revealed major shifts in the reported numbers of incidents between the first and second interviews. In the 33 cases that reported 11 or more incidents on at least one of the interviews, there was an average change of 11, disregarding the direction of change. The extremes ranged from an increase of 44 in one case to a decline of 77 in another. Such volatility in the numbers of incidents between one interview time and the next becomes important when it is realized that if these cases were counted according to the actual number of incidents reported on reinterview, they would total to approximately one-third more than all the other series cases combined.

Mixtures of types of crime

One of the principal objectives of this test was to examine the extent to which respondents (and interviewers) reported mixtures of different types of crime within a series even though one of the stated criteria was that all the

crimes had to be "similar." In about three-fourths of the cases, all the crimes in a series were of the same specific type, for example, attempted assault without a weapon (table 5). There was essentially no difference between those who could report events separately and those who could not.

The remaining 23% were about equally divided between those situations where the crimes were all in the same general crime category (various kinds of assault) and those that combined elements of different crimes (robbery and assault). Some of the latter are noted as being due to interviewer error.

In one sense, all 23% of the reports that combined different crime types violated the definition of a true series crime and therefore involved some kind of error, either an obvious failure to complete the questionnaire properly or more subtle definitional differences that can cause apparently similar events to be classified as different crimes. Examples of the former were those in which two completely different crimes were combined as a series, such as household larceny and simple assault,

or those in which the reinterviewer marked a different place of occurrence category for the earlier crimes in the series (detached building on own property) from that marked by the original interviewer for the most recent crime (near own home), which resulted in a mixture of crime types when, in fact, they were all the same specific crime.

More subtle definitional differences, which result in mixtures of crime types, are more difficult to detect and eliminate. For example, if gasoline is stolen from a truck parked in a driveway, the crime is classified as household larceny; if the truck is in an unlocked garage, the incident becomes a burglary. These two crimes understandably appear to be similar to the victim. In addition, interviewers are not currently provided with sufficient information about how crimes are classified to enable them to recognize that this series is a mixture of crime types.

Table 4. Change in number of incidents between original interview and reinterview, by type of report, January-June, 1985

Change between original and reinterview	Percent of reports		
	Total	Separate	Consolidated
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No change	47.5%	55.8%	34.3%
Decreased by:	29.0%	35.4%	18.6%
1-2 incidents	18.0	24.8	7.1
3-5	6.6	7.1	5.7
6 or more	4.4	3.5	5.7
Increased by:	19.7%	8.8%	37.1%
1-2 incidents	11.5	8.8	15.7
3-5	3.3	0	8.6
6 or more	4.9	0	12.9
Not ascertained	3.8%	.9%	10.0%
Number of cases	183	113	70*

*In two instances, two sets of series incidents involving the same victim were reported as one series by the reinterviewer. In this and subsequent tables, each of these cases has been considered as one series. The net change is therefore the difference between the sum of the incidents in the two series in the original interview and the number of incidents reported in the one series in the reinterview.

Table 5. Extent of mixture of crimes within a series by type of report, January-June, 1985

Crime category	Percent of reports		
	Total	Separate	Consolidated
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Same category			
Specific	77.0	78.8	74.3
General	12.0	10.6	14.3
Different category	10.9	10.6 ^a	11.4 ^b
Number of cases	183	113	70

^aIncludes 4 cases (out of 12) where the difference is apparently due to interviewer error.

^bIncludes 2 cases (out of 8) where the difference is apparently due to interviewer error.

An alternative crime classification

An alternative classification of crimes, which departs from the traditional definitions employed by the NCS, provides additional insight into the nature of series crimes. This alternative classification may suggest strategies for dealing with the various problems of series victimizations, such as the mixture of crime types.

Violent crimes, which involve confrontation or contact between victim(s) and offenders(s), can be divided as follows:

- crimes occurring in the line of duty (resulting from the nature of a job, as in law enforcement);
- domestic violence (among persons well known to one another);
- school violence (usually between schoolmates); and
- a residual category of other violence.

Contact crimes as a whole make up about a fourth of series crimes with separate reports but slightly over half of those series with consolidated reports that contain 11 or more incidents at the time of reinterview (table 6).

Line-of-duty events are the most common kind of contact series crime, comprising 44% of all such crimes. This type of series generally involves different offenders who are usually strangers to the victim. Domestic violence and school violence victims, on the other hand, almost always know their offenders, who tend to be the same individuals in each incident.

The alternative classification of noncontact crimes (personal and household thefts and illegal entry) does not differ as radically as that of contact crimes from the regular NCS classification. Illegal entry (burglary) and motor vehicle theft are defined in the traditional way. Domestic theft is defined as those household larcenies where the offender, usually a roommate, maid, babysitter, or friend, was known to the victim, even though the latter was not present during the commission of the crime.

Among noncontact crimes, series events that involve thefts of car parts or the contents of motor vehicles occur more often, especially among those with three to five incidents on reinterview. Together with school theft and illegal entry, they account for about two-thirds of noncontact crimes where separate reports were completed and about half of those where consolidated reports were completed. Among cases

Table 6. Alternative classification of series crimes by type of report, January-June, 1985

Alternative classification of series crimes	Percent of reports			
	Total	Separate	Consolidated	
			Total	11 or more incidents on reinterview
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Contact crimes	28.4%	23.9%	35.7%	51.9%
Line of duty	12.6	10.6	15.7	22.2
Domestic violence	5.5	4.4	7.1	7.4
School violence	7.1	4.4	11.4	18.5
Other violence	3.3	4.4	1.4	3.7
Noncontact Crimes	71.6%	76.1%	64.3%	48.1%
Illegal entry	15.8	15.0	17.1	18.5
Motor vehicle theft	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.7
Theft of motor vehicle parts or contents	17.5	21.2	11.4	3.7
School theft	10.9	14.2	5.7	0
Domestic theft	10.4	8.8	12.9	14.8
Household theft	9.3	8.8	10.0	3.7
Other theft	4.4	4.4	4.3	3.7
Number of cases	183	113	70	27

Note: Crime classification is based on the most recent incident in cases where incidents fall into more than one category.

where 11 or more incidents were reported on reinterview, illegal entry and domestic theft predominate over the other categories of noncontact crime.

A major advantage of this alternative classification is that it minimizes problems caused by situations where two or more conventional crime categories are present in one series. When a series contains many incidents, such as 11 or more, it is almost impossible to ascertain the exact mix of specific crime types and is not worth having the interviewer try to do so. For example, it is probably less important to know that a contact series of five incidents involved two aggravated assaults and three simple assaults than that it occurred in the line of duty. In the example above of gasoline stolen from a truck, whether the truck was in a garage or parked in the driveway seems less important than the common characteristic of theft of the gasoline.

Conclusions and recommendations

- The minimum number of incidents needed to qualify as a series should be raised to six.

It appears from this test that the minimum of three cases for a series has been too often used as a device to simplify data collection. When respondents (and interviewers) are pushed to complete separate incident reports for as many as five incidents, the great majority are able to do so. Since over 60% of all series fall into this range, raising the minimum to six should dramatically reduce the number of series crimes. As is the case now, with three as the minimum, there will be a tendency for

series crimes to cluster around whatever minimum number is selected.

- Interviewers should be more thoroughly trained on what series crimes are, recognizing that some mixing of crime types is inevitable.

By definition, series crimes are supposed to be "similar," and the test showed that the vast majority did indeed fall into the same specific crime category. If one expands the definition of similar to include crimes within the same general category, then 89% of the reported series qualified as containing similar crimes. Even among the remaining 11%, the evidence from the test suggests that some of the mixing of crime types is due to interviewer error in marking such key items as place of occurrence or in applying the basic series rules concerning what incidents can legitimately be grouped together.

The National Crime Survey Interviewer's Manual contains a very brief discussion of the meaning of "similar" in the series crime context. Expansion of that material, buttressed by home study exercises, should eliminate some of these "pseudo"-mixtures. Interviewers should not be expected to be conversant with all of the subtle distinctions that separate one crime from another. To the extent that series of three, four, and five incidents can be reported separately and accurately, however, the appropriate specific crime classifications will be made.

● More study is needed of the multiple series problem and how such cases should be treated in relation to the regular NCS crimes.

The most difficult aspect of series crimes are the cases at the high end of the spectrum, those consisting of 11 or more incidents. It is unrealistic to require separate incident reports in such instances and difficult to determine how, or even whether, these incidents should be added to the vast majority of crimes that can be reported separately. In some cases the number of incidents in a series fluctuated widely in the few weeks between the two interviews. Can one be certain that the later figure is more accurate?

A basic assumption of the NCS is that a crime incident is a discrete event with a recognizable (and reportable) beginning and end. Many of these multi-incident series, however, do not fit so neatly into separate compartments; rather, they resemble ongoing conditions of existence, such as spouse abuse, harassment by schoolmates, or job-related provocation. Should these cases be added into NCS estimates with a weight appropriate to the number of incidents reported? If, for example, a policeman reports that he is subject to verbal abuse every working day for 6 months, should this number of incidents, 130 (26 weeks, 5 days a week), be included in the crime total? There is also some evidence that two respondents in similar situations might report very differently in the NCS interview. One might claim a daily victimization, while another might filter out most of these events and report a few of the more noteworthy incidents.

Aside from raising the minimum number of incidents permitted for a series report, there are no other obvious solutions to the series issue. However, a number of approaches should be considered for the remaining series cases. One would be to adopt a maximum cutoff on the number of events in a series. This would have the effect of reducing the impact of the conditions-of-existence type of series, which tend to be composed of multiple incidents. Alternatively, these kinds of series (domestic violence, line of duty) or any series containing more than a certain number of incidents could be presented separately with more detail than is shown now. Consideration should be given to developing a supplemental questionnaire that would be administered to victims of series crimes, somewhat along the lines of the questionnaire used in the test for those series with six or more incidents. The

additional information would permit more accurate classification of series as to type of crime, whether they were reported separately in publications or combined in some fashion with the non-series incidents. It could also be used to develop an alternative crime classification system along the lines discussed earlier.

It is not known whether the data obtained in this test were better because of the time interval between the original and followup interviews. Even if this could be demonstrated to be true, using the reinterview approach runs the risk of not obtaining any more information in certain cases, depending upon the ground rules adopted (such as restricting interviewing to the telephone). It also complicates the data collection effort, by lengthening it in some instances, and necessitates additional procedures to incorporate the information into the data processing system. Administering a few additional questions at the time of the original interview would avoid these problems.

The National Crime Survey has been undergoing extensive scrutiny by a panel of experts with the goal of improving the quality and utility of the data products. One result will be a redesigned NCS questionnaire. Proposals for resolving the issue of series crimes will be included in the testing program for this new questionnaire.

Methodology

The sample for this experiment consisted of series crimes reported in the NCS during the interview months of January through June of 1985 in all but the outgoing rotation groups. These groups were eliminated because they received a supplemental inquiry on another subject. It was originally thought that 3 months of data collection would provide enough cases, based on the known incidence of series crimes, but returns substantially below this level necessitated extending the data collection period.

Contributing to the lower than expected results was the requirement that all reinterviews be done by telephone with the original respondent. In addition to respondents who had no telephone or preferred to be interviewed in person, there were a few cases where the respondent could not be located or declined to be reinterviewed. About 26% of the expected sample fell into these noninterview categories. In addition, a number of valid series incidents were not assigned for reinterview, were lost in transit, or were otherwise not

accounted for. In all, about 46% of the eligible crimes were successfully followed up. A comparison was made between the valid cases from the test and all series incidents reported during the initial interview by type of crime and number of incidents in the series. The relatively close correspondence between the data sets on these two variables indicated that the incidents obtained during the reinterview were representative of the total.

Selection of series incidents for reinterview involved a clerical review of questionnaires completed during the course of the regular NCS enumeration. Eligible cases were photocopied and set aside for reinterview by a supervisor or senior interviewer. The reinterview was generally completed within 2 to 3 weeks of the initial interview.

During the analysis of the test cases, certain decisions were made that modified the number of cases ultimately included in the analysis and, in a few instances, changed the type of crime classification. Seven cases that were eligible series crimes were not included with the series crimes processed on the original interview. They were successfully reinterviewed and included in the analysis. Eliminated was a series incident obtained from an underage respondent, one with only two incidents on the original interview, and another involving an out-of-scope crime. Two other incidents were deleted (both with the same respondent) because the interview was terminated before any usable data could be obtained.

Since motor vehicle theft and personal larceny with contact (purse snatching and pocket picking) are seldom reported as series crimes, the specific questions needed to classify incidents as these crimes did not appear on either of the test questionnaires. However, among the completed reinterviews, there were six reported series involving theft of motor vehicles and two instances of theft in schools that appeared to be mixtures of personal larceny with and without contact.

The type of crime classification based on the information supplied during the original interview was not changed even though the reinterview produced a different result. However, there were four cases where the photocopy of the original incident report indicated that the computer classification of these crimes was incorrect. For the analysis, these codes were changed to conform with the evidence from the initial interview.

This field test was devised as a more intensive exploration of the nature of series crimes with the goal of suggesting fruitful avenues for further study. Because of this orientation, no tests for significant differences between statistical findings were performed.

New releases from BJS

- Robbery victims, BJS Bulletin, NCJ-104638, 4/87
- Automated fingerprint identification systems: Technology and policy issues, NCJ-104342, 4/87
- Lifetime likelihood of victimization, BJS Technical Report, NCJ-104274, 3/87
- Imprisonment in four countries, BJS Special Report, NCJ-103967, 2/87
- Violent crime by strangers and non-strangers, BJS Special Report, NCJ-103702, 1/87
- 1986 directory of automated criminal justice information systems, NCJ-102260, 1,000 pp., 1/87
- Probation and parole, BJS Bulletin, NCJ-103683, 1/87
- Criminal justice "hot" files: Criminal justice information policy series, 75 pp., NCJ-101850, 1/87
- Population density in State prisons, BJS Special Report, NCJ-103204, 12/86
- State and Federal prisoners, 1925-85, BJS Bulletin, NCJ-102494, 12/86
- BJS telephone contacts '87, BJS Bulletin, NCJ-102909, 12/86
- Data quality policies and procedures: Proceedings of a BJS/SEARCH conference, 82 pp., NCJ-101849, 12/86
- Teenage victims, 16 pp., NCJ-103138, 11/86

Bureau of Justice Statistics technical reports are prepared principally by BJS staff. This report was written by Richard W. Dodge, Ph.D., and edited by Frank D. Balog. Marianne Zawitz provided assistance in data presentation. Report production was administered by Marilyn Marbrook, assisted by June Maynard, Jeanne Harris, and Arlene F. James.

April 1987, NCJ-104615

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics



Crime and Justice Facts, 1985

Crime

- The volume of crime 1
- Crime trends 2
- Victims of crime 4
- The location of crime 6
- The economic cost of crime 7
- The relationship between victim and offender 8
- Crime profiles 9
 - Rape 9
 - Household burglary 10
 - Bank robbery 11
 - Automated teller machine loss or theft 12

The criminal justice response

- Reporting crime 13
- Criminal justice processing 14
- Indigent defense 16
- Pretrial release 17
- Appeals 18
- The cost of criminal justice 19

Sentencing and corrections

- Sentencing practices 20
- Sentencing outcomes 22
- Time served in prison 24
- Correctional populations 25
- Prison crowding 26
- Capital punishment 27
- Recidivism 28
- Prisoners, drugs, and alcohol 29

Sources 30

Crime and Justice Facts, 1985 summarizes much of what BJS has learned about crime and justice in the United States since December 31, 1985. It is intended to bridge the gap between the first and second editions of the Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice, a comprehensive statistical portrait of crime and justice in the United States, first published in October 1983.

Crime and Justice Facts, 1985 may be ordered (NCJ-100757) from the Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, NCJRS, P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850, toll-free 800-732-3277 (local number 301-251-5500). Postage and handling are charged for bulk orders.

Bureau of Justice Statistics reports

(revised April 1987)

Call toll-free 800-732-3277 (local 251-5500) to order BJS reports, to be added to one of the BJS mailing lists, or to speak to a reference specialist in statistics at the Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850. Single copies of reports are free; use NCJ number to order. Postage and handling are charged for bulk orders of single reports. For single copies of multiple titles, up to 10 titles are free; 11-40 titles \$10; more than 40, \$20; libraries call for special rates.

Public-use tapes of BJS data sets and other criminal justice data are available from the Criminal Justice Archive and Information Network, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (313-763-5010).

National Crime Survey

Criminal victimization in the U.S.:

- 1984 (final report), NCJ-100435, 5/86
- 1983 (final report), NCJ-96459, 10/85
- 1982 (final report), NCJ-92820, 11/84
- 1973-82 trends, NCJ-90541, 9/83
- 1980 (final report), NCJ-84015, 4/83
- 1979 (final report), NCJ-76710, 12/81

BJS special reports:

- Violent crime by strangers and nonstrangers, NCJ-103702, 1/87
- Preventing domestic violence against women, NCJ-102037, 8/86
- Crime prevention measures, NCJ-100438, 3/86
- The use of weapons in committing crimes, NCJ-99643, 1/86
- Reporting crimes to the police, NCJ-99432, 12/85
- Locating city, suburban, and rural crime, NCJ-99535, 12/85
- The risk of violent crime, NCJ-97119, 5/85
- The economic cost of crime to victims, NCJ-93450, 4/84
- Family violence, NCJ-93449, 4/84

BJS bulletins:

- Households touched by crime, 1985, NCJ-101685, 6/86
- Criminal victimization, 1984, NCJ-98904, 10/85
- The crime of rape, NCJ-96777, 3/85
- Household burglary, NCJ-96021, 1/85
- Criminal victimization, 1983, NCJ-93869, 6/84
- Violent crime by strangers, NCJ-80829, 4/82
- Crime and the elderly, NCJ-79614, 1/82
- Measuring crime, NCJ-75710, 2/81
- Teenage victims, NCJ-103138, 12/86

Lifetime likelihood of victimization, (BJS technical report), NCJ-104274, 3/87

Response to screening questions in the National Crime Survey (BJS technical report), NCJ-97624, 7/85

Victimization and fear of crime: World perspectives, NCJ-93872, 1/85

The National Crime Survey: Working papers, vol. I: Current and historical perspectives, NCJ-75374, 8/82

vol. II: Methodological studies, NCJ-90307, 12/84

Issues in the measurement of victimization, NCJ-74682, 10/81

The cost of negligence: Losses from preventable household burglaries, NCJ-53527, 12/79

Rape victimization in 26 American cities, NCJ-55878, 8/79

Criminal victimization in urban schools, NCJ-56396, 8/79

An introduction to the National Crime Survey, NCJ-43732, 4/78

Local victim surveys: A review of the issues, NCJ-39973, 8/77

Expenditure and employment

BJS Bulletins:

- Justice expenditure and employment: 1983, NCJ-101776, 7/86
- 1982, NCJ-98327, 8/85
- Justice expenditure and employment in the U.S.: 1980 and 1981 extracts, NCJ-96007, 6/85
- 1971-79, NCJ-92596, 11/84

Corrections

BJS bulletins and special reports:

- Imprisonment in four countries, NCJ-103967, 2/87
- Probation and parole, NCJ-103683, 1/87
- Population density in State prisons, NCJ-103204, 12/86
- Capital punishment, 1985, NCJ-102742, 11/86
- State and Federal prisoners, 1925-85, NCJ-102494, 11/86
- Prisoners in 1985, NCJ-101384, 6/86
- Prison admission and releases, 1983, NCJ-100582, 3/86
- Capital punishment 1984, NCJ-98399, 8/85
- Examining recidivism, NCJ-96501, 2/85
- Returning to prison, NCJ-95700, 11/84
- Time served in prison, NCJ-93924, 6/84
- Historical corrections statistics in the U.S., 1850-1984, NCJ-102529, 4/87
- Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions on Dec. 31, 1984, NCJ-103768, 3/87
- Capital punishment 1984 (final), NCJ-99562, 5/86
- Capital punishment 1983 (final), NCJ-99561, 4/86
- 1979 survey of inmates of State correctional facilities and 1979 census of State correctional facilities:

BJS special reports:

- The prevalence of imprisonment, NCJ-93657, 7/85
- Career patterns in crime, NCJ-88672, 5/83

BJS bulletins:

- Prisoners and drugs, NCJ-87575, 3/83
- Prisoners and alcohol, NCJ-86223, 1/83
- Prisons and prisoners, NCJ-80697, 2/82
- Veterans in prison, NCJ-79232, 11/81
- Census of jails and survey of jail inmates: Jail inmates, 1984, NCJ-101094, 5/86
- Jail inmates, 1983 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-99175, 11/85
- The 1983 jail census (BJS bulletin), NCJ-95536, 11/84
- Census of jails, 1978: Data for individual jails, vols. I-IV, Northeast, North Central, South, West, NCJ-72279-72282, 12/81
- Profile of jail inmates, 1978, NCJ-65412, 2/81

Parole and probation

BJS bulletins:

- Probation and parole 1984, NCJ-100181, 2/86
- Setting prison terms, NCJ-76218, 8/83
- Parole in the U.S., 1980 and 1981, NCJ-87387, 3/86
- Characteristics of persons entering parole during 1978 and 1979, NCJ-87243, 5/83
- Characteristics of the parole population, 1978, NCJ-66479, 4/81
- Parole in the U.S., 1979, NCJ-69562, 3/81

Children in custody:

- Public juvenile facilities, 1985 (bulletin), NCJ-102457, 10/86
- 1982-83 census of juvenile detention and correctional facilities, NCJ-101686, 9/86

Courts

BJS bulletins:

- The growth of appeals: 1973-83 trends, NCJ-96381, 2/85
- Case filings in State courts 1983, NCJ-95111, 10/84

BJS special reports:

- Felony case-processing time, NCJ-101985, 8/86
- Felony sentencing in 18 local jurisdictions, NCJ-97881, 6/85
- The prevalence of guilty pleas, NCJ-96018, 12/84
- Sentencing practices in 13 States, NCJ-95399, 10/84
- Criminal defense systems: A national survey, NCJ-94630, 8/84
- Habeas corpus, NCJ-92948, 3/84
- State court caseload statistics, 1977 and 1981, NCJ-87587, 2/83

National Criminal Defense Systems Study, NCJ-94702, 10/86

The prosecution of felony arrests:

- 1981, NCJ-101380, 9/83, \$7.60 domestic/\$9.20 Canadian/\$12.20 foreign
- 1980, NCJ-97684, 10/85
- 1975, NCJ-86482, 5/84

State court model statistical dictionary,

- Supplement, NCJ-98326, 9/85
- 1st edition, NCJ-62320, 9/80
- State court organization 1980, NCJ-76711, 7/82
- A cross-city comparison of felony case processing, NCJ-55171, 7/79

Privacy and security

Computer crime:

BJS special reports:

- Electronic fund transfer fraud, NCJ-96666, 3/85
- Electronic fund transfer and crime, NCJ-92650, 2/84
- Electronic fund transfer fraud, NCJ-100461, 4/86
- Computer security techniques, NCJ-84049, 9/82
- Electronic fund transfer systems and crime, NCJ-83736, 9/82
- Expert witness manual, NCJ-77927, 9/81
- Criminal justice resource manual, NCJ-61550, 12/79

Privacy and security of criminal history information:

- Compendium of State legislation, 1984 overview, NCJ-98077, 9/85

Criminal justice information policy:

- Automated fingerprint identification systems: Technology and policy issues, NCJ-104342, 4/87
- Criminal justice "hot" files, NCJ-101850, 12/86
- Data quality policies and procedures: Proceedings of a BJS/SEARCH conference, NCJ-101849, 12/86
- Crime control and criminal records (BJS special report), NCJ-99176, 10/85
- State criminal records repositories (BJS technical report), NCJ-99017, 10/85
- Data quality of criminal history records, NCJ-98079, 10/85
- Intelligence and investigative records, NCJ-95787, 4/85
- Victim/witness legislation: An overview, NCJ-94365, 12/84
- Information policy and crime control strategies (SEARCH/BJS conference), NCJ-93926, 10/84
- Research access to criminal justice data, NCJ-84154, 2/83
- Privacy and juvenile justice records, NCJ-84152, 1/83
- Survey of State laws (BJS bulletin), NCJ-80836, 6/82
- Privacy and the private employer, NCJ-79651, 11/81

Federal offenses and offenders

BJS special reports:

- Pretrial release and misconduct, NCJ-96132, 1/85

BJS bulletins:

- Bank robbery, NCJ-94463, 8/84
- Federal drug law violators, NCJ-92692, 2/84
- Federal justice statistics, NCJ-80814, 3/82

General

BJS bulletins and special reports:

- BJS telephone contacts '87, NCJ-102909, 12/86
- Tracking offenders: White-collar crime, NCJ-102867, 11/86
- Police employment and expenditure, NCJ-100117, 2/86
- Tracking offenders: The child victim, NCJ-95785, 12/84
- The severity of crime, NCJ-92326, 1/84
- The American response to crime: An overview of criminal justice systems, NCJ-91936, 12/83
- Tracking offenders, NCJ-91572, 11/83
- Victim and witness assistance: New State laws and the system's response, NCJ-87934, 5/83
- 1986 directory of automated criminal justice information systems, NCJ-102260, 1/87, \$20 domestic
- Crime and justice facts, 1985, NCJ-100757, 5/86
- National survey of crime severity, NCJ-96017, 10/85
- Criminal victimization of District of Columbia residents and Capitol Hill employees, 1982-83, NCJ-97982, Summary, NCJ-98567, 9/85
- The DC crime victimization study implementation, NCJ-98595, 9/85, \$7.60 domestic/\$9.20 Canadian/\$12.80 foreign
- The DC household victimization survey data base: Documentation, NCJ-98596, \$6.40/\$8.40/\$11.00 User manual, NCJ-98597, \$8.20/\$9.80/\$12.80
- How to gain access to BJS data (brochure), BC-000022, 9/84
- Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on law and justice statistics, 1984, NCJ-93310, 8/84
- Report to the nation on crime and justice: The data, NCJ-87068, 10/83
- Dictionary of criminal justice data terminology: 2nd ed., NCJ-76939, 2/82
- Technical standards for machine-readable data supplied to BJS, NCJ-75318, 6/81

See order form
on last page

To be added to any **BJS mailing list**, copy or cut out this page, fill it in and mail it to:

National Criminal Justice Reference Service
User Services Dept. 2
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850

If the name and address on the mailing label attached are correct, check here and don't fill them in again. If your address does not show your organizational affiliation (or criminal justice interest) please add it below. If your name and address are different from the label, please fill them in:

Name:

Title:

Organization:

Street or box:

City, State, Zip:

Telephone: ()

Interest in criminal justice:

Please add me to the following list(s):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Justice expenditure and employment reports
Annual spending and staffing by Federal, State, and local governments and by function (police, courts, corrections, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Courts reports
State court caseload surveys, model annual State reports, State court organization surveys |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer crime reports
Electronic fund transfer system crimes | <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections reports
Results of sample surveys and censuses of jails, prisons, parole, probation, and other data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Privacy and security of criminal history information and information policy
New legislation; maintaining and releasing intelligence and investigative records | <input type="checkbox"/> National Crime Survey reports
The only regular national survey of crime victims |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Federal statistics
Data describing Federal case processing, from investigation through prosecution, adjudication, and corrections | <input type="checkbox"/> Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics
Annual data from 153 sources in an easy-to-use, comprehensive format (400+ tables, sources, index) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BJS Bulletins and Special Reports
Timely reports of the most current justice data | <input type="checkbox"/> Send me a registration form for NIJ Reports (issued 6 times a year), which abstracts both private and government documents published in criminal justice. |

You will be asked each year if you wish to stay on the mailing list.
If you do not reply, we are required by law to remove your name.

U.S. Department of Justice
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJS
Permit No. G-91

Washington, D.C. 20531

Technical
Report