U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

ICPSR 3988

Measuring Perceptions of Appropriate Prison Sentences in the United States, 2000

Mark A. Cohen
Roland T. Rust
Sara Steen
Vanderbilt University. Owen Graduate School of Management

User Guide

First ICPSR Version
September 2004

National Institute of Justice
Data Resources Program

ICPSR

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Terms of Use

Bibliographic Citation: Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

> Cohen, Mark A., Roland T. Rust, and Sara Steen. MEASURING PERCEPTIONS OF APPROPRIATE PRISON SENTENCES IN THE UNITED STATES, 2000 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University [producer], 2000. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources: To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

Data Disclaimer: The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

Responsible Use Statement: In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution: ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Table of Contents

Summary

This study examined the public's preferences regarding sentencing and parole of criminal offenders. It also investigated the public's willingness to pay for particular crime prevention and control strategies and tested new methods for gathering this kind of information from the public. This involved asking the public to respond to a series of crime vignettes that involved constrained choice. The study consisted of a telephone survey of 1,300 adult respondents conducted in 2000 in the United States. Following a review by a panel of experts and extensive pretesting, the final instrument was programmed for computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI). The questionnaire specifically focused on: (1) the attitudes of the public on issues such as the number of police on the street, civil rights of minority groups, and the legal rights of people accused of serious crimes, (2) the randomized evaluation of preferred sentencing alternatives for eight different crime scenarios, (3) making parole decisions in a constrained choice setting by assuming that there is only enough space for one of two offenders, (4) the underlying factors that motivate the public's parole decisions, and (5) respondents' willingness to pay for various crime prevention strategies.

General Study Overview

Title: Measuring Perceptions of Appropriate Prison Sentences in the United States, 2000

Principal Investigator(s): Mark A. Cohen, Roland T. Rust, Sara Steen

Grant Number: 99-CE-VX-0001

Purpose of the Study: This study examined the public's preferences regarding sentencing and parole of criminal offenders. It also investigated the public's willingness to pay for particular crime prevention and control strategies and tested new methods for gathering this kind of information from the public. The study's methodology was based on that used by Wolfgang et al. (1985) and others, in which a sample of the United States public was asked to react to a series of crime vignettes. However, this study made a number of modifications to those vignettes. With regards to gathering information on the public's preferences toward sentencing and parole of criminal offenders, these changes were to: (1) focus on crimes normally encountered by local criminal justice agencies, such as burglary, robbery, and assault and (2) place the parole decision in a constrained choice setting by asking respondents to assume that there was only enough space for one of two offenders and one had to be let go. With regards to collecting information on the public's willingness to pay for crime prevention and control, the study's changes were to: (1) use paired comparisons in a constrained choice setting where, for example, respondents were asked to choose between the expansion of alternative crime prevention programs and a tax rebate and (2) elicit information on respondents' willingness to pay out of their own pockets for crime reduction strategies.

Methods

Study Design: The study consisted of a telephone survey of 1,300 adult respondents conducted from May 16, 2000, to August 8, 2000, in the United States. After conducting a literature review, an initial draft questionnaire was prepared and sent to a panel of experts. The questionnaire was also subjected to a thorough pretest, which included focus groups and cognitive testing. Three focus groups were held to observe participants' reactions to the first draft of the questionnaire and to obtain feedback on how to create a more effective interview. Focus group participants were screened to obtain a cross-section of the general population. Participants were asked questions that assessed their ability to comprehend the crime scenarios included in the instrument and their ability to make an informed judgment about sanctions. After extensive revisions of the instrument based on the feedback from the focus groups, 11 cognitive interviews were conducted. These interviews allowed researchers to test the structure and content of the questionnaire on a one-on-one basis with respondents. During a

cognitive interview respondents were asked to "think aloud" while determining how to answer questions. This allowed researchers to uncover how respondents interpreted questions. The final stage of survey development was to pretest the revised instrument with live telephone interviews. A total of 11 interviews were completed with an average length of 27.5 minutes. Modifications were then made, primarily to shorten the length of the interview. The final survey was programmed for computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI). This approach allowed for complex branches, single and multiple responses, open-ended text answers, and random rotation of text insertions for the vignettes. It also reduced the frequency of invalid data by not permitting answers that were outside the scope of the options provided in the question. The interviews were conducted by the Social and Policy Division of Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc. Training sessions were held to familiarize the interviewers with the study and to teach refusal avoidance techniques. A number of quality control measures were in place during the interviewing process to ensure the accuracy of the data. These measures included the CATI system, issuing daily production reports, reviewing interim frequencies, floor supervision, and monitoring interviews.

Sources of Information: Data were obtained through computer-assisted telephone interviews.

Sample: A random-digit dial (RDD) sample, Type B, of 4,966 phone numbers in the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii, was obtained from Survey Sampling, Inc. The sample was produced by selecting randomly generated telephone numbers in proportion to the number of listed telephone numbers in each working telephone block. A block is a contiguous set of 100 telephone numbers within an active telephone area code and exchange combination, such as 555-555-3300 to 555-555-3399. This type of sample yields high efficiency, with the chance of selecting working numbers ranging between 55 percent and 75 percent, in contrast to the 24-percent chance of selecting a working number with a pure random-digit sample. Although a potential for bias could exist with the Random Digit B sample, no actual bias has been encountered. In an effort to select a representative sample of adults within each household, the last birthday method of screening was used. Upon contacting a potential respondent, interviewers asked to speak with the adult in the household over 18 who had had the most recent birthday. If the selected person was not available, the interviewer arranged a callback, for a specific date and time if possible, to speak with the eligible person. Once an eligible respondent had been identified in a specific household, there could never be a substitution.

Response Rates: Out of the random-digit dial sample of 4,966 phone numbers, a total of 1,300 interviews were completed, a 43 percent response rate.

Date of Collection: May 16, 2000-August 8, 2000

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables: All seven parts of the dataset include a case identification variable that can be used to link the different parts. Part 1 and Parts 3-7 contain a weight variable. Variables in Part 1 include the actual responses to all of the items on the questionnaire. Additional variables are also provided that indicate which of several possible scenarios were read to the respondent in certain sections of the survey. In Section A, Preliminary Background Information, respondents were asked about their views on issues such as the number of police on the street, availability of programs designed to get people off drugs, civil rights of minority groups in the United States, and legal rights of people accused of serious crimes. In Section B, Test Screener, respondents were presented with two randomly-selected scenarios describing an individual convicted of certain crimes and were asked what the man's sentence should be in both scenarios. In Part 1, Imprisonment Decisions, respondents were presented with three sets of two scenarios out of a stock of eight possible scenarios. Each scenario described an individual who was convicted of certain crimes and received a specified prison sentence. Respondents were asked to compare the individuals described in each pair of scenarios and decide which of the two should be released from prison based on certain budget and prison capacity constraints. In Part 2, Criminal Response Decisions, respondents were presented with two more scenarios out of the main stock of eight and were asked what they considered appropriate punishments to be for the individuals in the scenarios, including type of sentence, length of sentence, whether a fine should be paid, how large the fine should be, whether the sentence should be reduced if a fine were paid and by how much, and who should receive the fine. In Part 3, Crime Prevention Decisions, respondents were asked to put themselves in the shoes of their local mayor and asked to suppose that the federal government had just given their city either 100 or 1,000 dollars per household. Respondents were given the option of giving it to local residents or spending it on more prisons, more drug and alcohol treatment programs for offenders convicted of nonviolent crimes, more police on the street, or more prevention programs to help keep youth out of trouble. Respondents were allowed to divide the money in any way they wanted among these five options. In Part 4, How Much Would You Be Willing to Pay?, respondents were asked a series of questions on whether they would be willing to pay certain randomly selected amounts of money out of their own pockets to reduce certain crimes. Respondents were then asked a series of questions on their own history of victimization and experiences with the criminal justice system. Respondents also supplied demographic information. Parts 2-7 of the dataset contain variables that were derived from the variables in Part 1. The primary difference between the data in Parts 2-7 and Part 1 is that Parts 2-7 do not contain a variable for every question that was asked. Instead, Parts 2-7 contain

one variable for every possible scenario, which means that for every question in the survey instrument there could be several corresponding variables in Parts 2-7. Part 8 contains verbatim responses to open-ended survey items.

Presence of Common Scales: None.

Unit of Observation: Individuals

Geographic Unit: state

Extent of Processing: ICPSR produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, and reformatted the data and documentation.

Extent of Collection: This data collection consists of eight data files, a user guide, codebook, and data collection instrument in separate PDF files, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

Data Collection Notes: The user guide, codebook, and data collection instrument are provided by ICPSR as separate Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

File Specifications

Part No.	*Part Name*	*File Structure*	*Case Count*	*Variable Count*	*LRECL*	*Records Per Case*
1	Data From Survey	rectangular	1,300	302	519	1
2	Created Variables - Section B Data	rectangular	1,300	11	26	1
3	Created Variables -- Part 1 Data	rectangular	1,300	24	34	1
4	Created Variables -- Part 2 Data	rectangular	1,300	338	768	1
5	Created Variables -- Part 3 Data	rectangular	1,300	15	85	1
6	Created Variables -- Part 4 Data	rectangular	1,300	25	47	1
7	Created Variables -- Demographic Data	rectangular	1,300	44	60	1
8	Verbatim Responses	-	-	-	-	-

Publications

Related Publications: Cohen, Mark A., Roland T. Rust, and Sara Steen. "Measuring Public Perceptions of Appropriate Prison Sentences" (Executive Summary). NCJ 199364. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, October 2002.

Cohen, Mark A., Roland T. Rust, and Sara Steen. "Measuring Public Perceptions of Appropriate Prison Sentences" (Final Report). NCJ 199365. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, October 2002.

Cohen, Mark A., Roland T. Rust, Sara Steen, and Simon T. Tidd. "Willingness-To-Pay for Crime Control Programs." CRIMINOLOGY 42,1 (February 2004), 89-109.

Steen, Sara, and Mark A. Cohen. "Assessing the Public's Demand for Hate Crime Penalties." JUSTICE QUARTERLY 21,1 (March 2004), 91-124.

Final Reports and Other Publications:

The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

http://www.ncjrs.org/

NIJ Data Resources Program

About the DRP:

The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
23.2% (70 of 302 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 302 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 302 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
0.7% (2 of 302 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
0.3% (1 of 302 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
Q12CONT	9.6%
0.3% (1 of 302 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
B1BYR	17.5%
2.6% (8 of 302 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
B1BMO	37.7%
Q17	38.6%
Q17CXM1	38.6%
Q22	38.8%
Q21	39.1%
Q21CXM1	39.1%
Q19	39.5%
Q19CXM1	39.5%
72.8% (220 of 302 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
Q44A	40.2%
Q20	40.2%
Q20CXM1	40.2%
B2CXM1	41.1%
Q5PYRR2	41.8%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q18	42.6%
Q18CXM1	42.6%
PERCDOLL	45.3%
Q5PMOR2	46.4%
Q15	47.4%
Q5PYRR1	49.4%
Q1AR1	50.0%
Q1BR1	50.0%
Q2AR1	50.0%
Q2BR1	50.0%
Q1AR2	50.0%
Q1BR2	50.0%
Q2AR2	50.0%
Q2BR2	50.0%
Q1AR3	50.0%
Q1BR3	50.0%
Q2AR3	50.0%
Q2BR3	50.0%
Q5PMOR1	53.2%
Q5BPR2	55.8%
Q5BPR1	57.2%
Q13	57.5%
B2BYR	58.9%
Q41B	59.3%
Q14	62.3%
Q21A	62.3%
Q20A	63.4%
B2BMO	63.7%
Q28	66.4%
Q15PRE	66.7%
Q24	68.1%
Q19B	68.3%
Q17A	68.5%
Q18A	69.9%
Q17B	70.2%
Q19A	71.2%
Q18B	72.7%
Q44B	73.5%
Q4M2R2	76.7%
Q21B	76.8%
Q20B	76.8%
Q16	79.7%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q16PRE	79.8%
Q1CR3	80.8%
B1CXM1	82.5%
Q1CR2	82.5%
Q1CR1	82.6%
Q5MYRR1	82.8%
Q2CR2	83.2%
Q2CR3	83.3%
Q5MMOR1	83.8%
Q12	84.2%
Q26	85.3%
Q6AM1R1	85.8%
Q6BR1	85.8%
Q4M2R1	85.9%
Q2CR1	86.2%
Q33	86.4%
Q43A	86.6%
Q5BMR1	87.1%
Q5CPYRR1	87.3%
Q5DPM1R1	87.3%
Q5EPR1	87.3%
Q5MYRR2	87.9%
Q6AM1R2	88.0%
Q6BR2	88.0%
Q5CPMOR1	88.2%
Q5CPYRR2	88.3%
Q5DPM1R2	88.3%
Q5EPR2	88.3%
Q5MMOR2	88.4%
Q5CPMOR2	89.7%
Q5FR2	89.9%
Q5BMR2	91.5%
Q19CXM2	94.5%
Q5CMYRR1	94.8%
Q5DMM1R1	94.8%
Q5EMR1	94.8%
Q5CMMOR1	95.0%
Q20CXM2	95.1%
Q5FR1	95.2%
Q5DPR1	95.2%
Q21CXM2	95.2%
Q5GYRR2	95.5%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q6AR1	95.6%
Q5GMOR2	95.6%
Q5DPR2	95.7%
Q39M2	95.8%
Q18CXM2	96.2%
Q5CMYRR2	96.5%
Q5DMM1R2	96.5%
Q5EMR2	96.5%
Q6AR2	96.5%
Q17CXM2	96.5%
Q2DR2	96.7%
B2CXM2	96.8%
Q5CMMOR2	96.8%
Q1DR1	97.3%
Q1DR2	97.5%
Q1DR3	97.5%
Q6AZR1M1	97.5%
Q2DR1	97.5%
Q2DR3	97.8%
Q5DMR1	97.8%
Q5GYRR1	97.9%
Q5GMOR1	98.0%
Q5DPZ1M1	98.1%
Q6AZR2M1	98.3%
Q16D	98.5%
Q5EPGR1	98.5%
Q5EPVR1	98.5%
Q4ZR2M1	98.5%
Q16C	98.6%
Q5DMR2	98.7%
Q16B	98.7%
Q14PRE	98.8%
Q4ZR1M1	98.8%
Q6AZR1M2	98.9%
Q4M3R1	99.1%
Q6BGR1	99.1%
Q6BVR1	99.1%
Q16E	99.1%
Q5DPZ2M1	99.1%
Q5EPGR2	99.2%
Q5EPVR2	99.2%
Q4M3R2	99.2%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q6AZR2M2	99.2%
Q5DPM2R1	99.3%
Q6BGR2	99.3%
Q6BVR2	99.3%
Q16A	99.3%
Q5DPZ1M2	99.3%
Q5DMZ1M1	99.3%
Q6BZR2M1	99.3%
Q6BZR1M1	99.4%
Q4ZR1M2	99.5%
Q5DPM2R2	99.5%
Q5EMGR1	99.6%
Q5EMVR1	99.6%
Q5DAPZR1	99.6%
Q5DMZ2M1	99.6%
Q6AM2R1	99.7%
Q20CXM3	99.7%
Q5DPZ2M2	99.7%
Q5EZP1M1	99.7%
Q4M4R1	99.8%
Q17CXM3	99.8%
Q18CXM3	99.8%
Q19CXM3	99.8%
Q21CXM3	99.8%
Q4ZR2M2	99.8%
Q5EZP2M1	99.8%
Q5DMM2R2	99.8%
Q5EMGR2	99.8%
Q5EMVR2	99.8%
B2CXM3	99.8%
Q5DAPZR2	99.8%
Q5DMZ1M2	99.8%
Q5EZM2M1	99.8%
Q6AZR1M3	99.8%
Q6AZAR1	99.8%
Q6AZAR2	99.8%
Q5DPM3R1	99.9%
Q4M4R2	99.9%
Q5DPM3R2	99.9%
Q5DMM3R2	99.9%
Q6AM2R2	99.9%
Q39M3	99.9%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
B1CXM2	99.9%
Q4ZR2M3	99.9%
Q5DPZ1M3	99.9%
Q5DPZ2M3	99.9%
Q5DMZ1M3	99.9%
Q5DAMZR1	99.9%
Q5EZP2M2	99.9%
Q5EZM1M1	99.9%
Q6BZR2M2	99.9%
Q4M5R1	100.0%
Q5DPM4R1	100.0%
Q5DPM5R1	100.0%
Q5DMM2R1	100.0%
Q5DMM3R1	100.0%
Q5DMM4R1	100.0%
Q5DMM5R1	100.0%
Q6AM3R1	100.0%
Q6AM4R1	100.0%
Q6AM5R1	100.0%
Q4M5R2	100.0%
Q5DPM4R2	100.0%
Q5DPM5R2	100.0%
Q5DMM4R2	100.0%
Q5DMM5R2	100.0%
Q6AM3R2	100.0%
Q6AM4R2	100.0%
Q6AM5R2	100.0%
Q13PRE	100.0%
Q39M4	100.0%
Q39M5	100.0%
Q39M6	100.0%
B1CXM3	100.0%
Q4ZR1M3	100.0%
Q5DMZ2M2	100.0%
Q5DMZ2M3	100.0%
Q5DAMZR2	100.0%
Q5EZP1M2	100.0%
Q5EZP1M3	100.0%
Q5EZP2M3	100.0%
Q5EZM1M2	100.0%
Q5EZM1M3	100.0%
Q5EZM2M2	100.0%

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q5EZM2M3	100.0%
Q6AZR2M3	100.0%
Q6BZR1M2	100.0%
Q6BZR1M3	100.0%
Q6BZR2M3	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values

100% (11 of 11 variables) have 0% Missing Values

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P3

Table 3: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values

100% (24 of 24 variables) have 0% Missing Values

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P4

Table 4: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

62.7% (212 of 338 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 338 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

37.3% (126 of 338 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
FAMT_7	92.2%
VPER_7	95.5%
GPER_7	95.7%
FAMT_8N	96.7%
VPER_8N	96.8%
FNW_7	96.9%
FNW_8P	97.2%
FNPV_8P	97.3%
FNW_6P	97.4%
FNPV_6P	97.5%
FNPV_7	97.8%
FAMT_1N	97.8%
VPER_1N	97.8%
FAMT_6N	97.9%
VPER_6N	98.0%
FAMT_8P	98.1%
FNW_1N	98.1%
FNW_5P	98.1%

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
FNPV_5P	98.1%
FNPV_1N	98.2%
VPER_8P	98.2%
FNW_3P	98.2%
FNW_8N	98.3%
FNPV_8N	98.4%
FAMT_6P	98.5%
VPER_6P	98.5%
FNW_4P	98.5%
FNW_5N	98.5%
FNPV_5N	98.5%
FAMT_2N	98.5%
FAMT_4N	98.6%
FNW_4N	98.6%
FNPV_4N	98.6%
GPER_2N	98.7%
VPER_4N	98.7%
FNW_1P	98.7%
FNPV_4P	98.7%
FNPG_3P	98.8%
FNW_2P	99.0%
FAMT_1P	99.1%
FAMT_5N	99.1%
VPER_1P	99.1%
FNPG_6P	99.1%
FNPG_7	99.1%
FAMT_2P	99.2%
VPER_5N	99.2%
FNW_3N	99.2%
FNPV_3P	99.2%
FNW_5PC	99.2%
FNPG_3N	99.2%
FNPV_1P	99.2%
FNPV_5PC	99.2%
FNW_5NC	99.3%
FNPG_2P	99.3%
FNPV_5NC	99.3%
FAMT_3P	99.4%
GPER_2P	99.4%
FNW_6N	99.4%
FNW_5PA	99.4%
FNPV_2P	99.4%

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
FNPV_5PA	99.4%
FAMT_3N	99.5%
VPER_2N	99.5%
FNW_5PB	99.5%
FNPV_5PB	99.5%
FAMT_4P	99.5%
FAMT_5NC	99.5%
GPER_8N	99.5%
FNW_5NB	99.5%
FNPV_5NB	99.5%
GPER_3N	99.6%
GPER_8P	99.6%
VPER_3P	99.6%
VPER_4P	99.6%
VPER_5NC	99.6%
FNW_5NA	99.6%
FNPG_4P	99.6%
FNPG_5P	99.6%
FNPV_6N	99.6%
FNPV_5NA	99.6%
FAMT_5NB	99.7%
GPER_3P	99.7%
GPER_4N	99.7%
GPER_6N	99.7%
VPER_2P	99.7%
VPER_5NB	99.7%
FNPG_5N	99.7%
FNPG_8P	99.7%
FAMT_5P	99.8%
GPER_5N	99.8%
VPER_3N	99.8%
VPER_5P	99.8%
FNW_2N	99.8%
FNPG_1N	99.8%
FNPG_6N	99.8%
FNPG_8N	99.8%
FNPV_3N	99.8%
FAMT_5NA	99.8%
FAMT_5PC	99.8%
GPER_1N	99.8%
GPER_6P	99.8%
GPER_5NC	99.8%

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
VPER_5NA	99.8%
VPER_5PC	99.8%
FNPG_1P	99.8%
FNPG_2N	99.8%
FNPG_5PA	99.8%
FNPG_5NC	99.8%
FNPG_5PC	99.8%
FAMT_5PA	99.9%
GPER_1P	99.9%
GPER_4P	99.9%
GPER_5NB	99.9%
VPER_5PA	99.9%
FNPG_4N	99.9%
FNPG_5NA	99.9%
FNPG_5NB	99.9%
FNPG_5PB	99.9%
FNPV_2N	99.9%
FAMT_5PB	100.0%
GPER_5P	100.0%
GPER_5NA	100.0%
GPER_5PA	100.0%
GPER_5PB	100.0%
GPER_5PC	100.0%
VPER_5PB	100.0%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P5

Table 5: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
20.0% (3 of 15 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 15 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 15 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 15 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
80.0% (12 of 15 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
P_PRISON	5.1%
P_TREAT	5.1%
P_POLICE	5.1%
P_PREVEN	5.1%
P_REBATE	5.1%
P_TOTAL	5.1%
D_PRISON	5.4%
D_TREAT	5.4%
D_POLICE	5.4%
D_PREVEN	5.4%
D_REBATE	5.4%
D_TOTAL	5.4%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P6

Table 6: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
32.0% (8 of 25 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 25 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 25 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 25 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 25 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
4.0% (1 of 25 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
Q22NEW	12.2%
16.0% (4 of 25 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
Q17	38.6%
Q22	38.8%
Q21	39.1%
Q19	39.5%
48.0% (12 of 25 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
Q20	40.2%
Q18	42.6%
Q21A	62.3%
Q20A	63.4%
Q19B	68.3%
Q17A	68.5%
Q18A	69.9%
Q17B	70.2%
Q19A	71.2%
Q18B	72.7%
Q21B	76.8%

Table 6 (continued)

Variable Name and Label	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
Q20B	76.8%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3988.P7

Table 7: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=1300)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
63.6% (28 of 44 variables) have 0% Missing Values	
2.3% (1 of 44 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values	
11.4% (5 of 44 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 44 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values	
0.0% (0 of 44 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values	
18.2% (8 of 44 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values	
LOW_INC	15.5%
HIGH_INC	17.6%
INCOME	19.4%
INC15	19.4%
INC1535	19.4%
INC3550	19.4%
INC5075	19.4%
INC75	19.4%
0.0% (0 of 44 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values	
4.5% (2 of 44 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values	
VICT_O2	87.7%
JAIL	96.1%

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values. Values labeled as "Don't know," "Refused," "Don't Know/Refused," and "Not Applicable" are not declared missing values, so values coded as such are not reflected in the above table. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected in the data as coded.