152210

National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART)

POLICE RECORDS STUDY
METHODOLOGY

Andrea J. Sedlak, Ph.D.,

Leyla Mohadjer, Ph.D.,

JoAnne McFarland, M.S.W.,

&

Valerie Hudock

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Blvd.
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 251-4211

JAN 5 1995

August 7, 1990

152210

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1. INTRODUCTION

This report documents the methodology used in the **Police Records Study**. This chapter presents the background of the study and study design. Subsequent chapters discuss the county and agency selection techniques, detail the types of records examined and the criteria for records included, explain the data collection and processing procedures, and, provide all the technical information about how the data were weighted and how variances were estimated.

1.1 Background

The National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART)[1] was mandated by Congress under the Missing Children's Assistance Act, Title IV of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (1984). The purpose of the studies was to provide reliable national estimates of the number of children taken and recovered during the course of a year. As detailed elsewhere in the reports on this project, five categories of missing child cases were developed: family abductions, non-family abductions, thrownaways, runaways, and children who were lost or missing for other reasons.

The Police Records Study (PRS) was one of several studies and methodologies used in this project; the others are detailed in other methodology volumes.

1.2 Overview of Study Design and Methodology

The PRS involved a survey of police records and was designed to provide a national estimate of non-family abductions known to law enforcement agencies. The PRS was developed because it was thought that non-family abduction might occur too rarely for its incidence to be reliably assessed through the principal methodology of the household survey. At the same time, it seemed that non-family abductions would have a fairly high probability of being reported to law

---

[1]Originally funded under the title, National Studies of the Incidence of Missing Children, this project was renamed for reasons explained in the *First Report: Numbers and Characteristics*.

enforcement agencies, so that a survey of the records of these agencies could serve as an efficient alternative method of gathering incidence data on this problem. Episodes of non-family abduction could thus be identified where they would tend to be fairly concentrated and numerous, relative to their dispersed occurrence in the general population.

The PRS was carried out in a nationally representative sample of 21 counties, which reflected 20 primary sampling units (PSUs), as detailed in Chapter 2. State, county, and municipal law enforcement agencies participated in the study, and records were selected based on whether or not they fit a carefully-framed set of study criteria. On-site coordinators and abstractors reviewed the selected records and extracted data important to the study onto specially designed case record abstract forms. Chapter 4 details the data collection procedures that were used. Next, the data on each case were evaluated against the study's definitional criteria for non-family abduction, and its countability was determined. These countability criteria are elaborated in Chapter 5, which also includes details about other, more technical aspects of data processing. Then, as described in Chapter 6, well-established methods of weighting and estimation were applied. The cases were assigned weights, and these were used to generate estimates of the national total of countable cases. The variances associated with these national estimates were then calculated, providing an indication of the reliability or confidence associated with each estimate. Also, as detailed in the final chapter, special attention was given to a subset of four of the study counties, where an enlarged set of record types were examined. Although these four counties cannot be used to develop national estimates with known precision that rely on this enlarged record base, they did provide important information about how much of an impact on estimates broadening the database might have.

2. SELECTION OF COUNTIES AND AGENCIES

The counties selected for the PRS were a subsample of those selected for another recent Westat study, **The National Incidence Study of the and Prevalence of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-2).**[1] The primary reasons for subsampling from this sample for the PRS were twofold: (1) the measure of size for counties (child population) used in the NIS-2 was also appropriate for the PRS, and (2) project staff had worked with police agency staff in NIS-2, and had, therefore, gathered information regarding the police agencies in each of the counties and developed working relationships with the staff in a number of these agencies.

The NIS-2 study counties were selected by procedures that are detailed in a report on that study.[2] The main features of these procedures are given in the initial section below. After counties were identified, the agencies within the counties were chosen by methods delineated in Section 2.2. These processes are detailed in the following sections.

2.1   County Selection for NIS-2

The county sample for the NIS-2 consisted of 29 counties which represented 28 Primary Sampling Units (PSUs). Two separate sampling procedures were applied. One procedure used a listing of all but the smallest counties and randomly sampled 27 counties with probability proportionate to the measure of size; the other procedure reflected a special effort to represent rural counties. It used simple random sampling to identify a single grouping of two geographically proximate smaller counties.

---

[1]Sedlak, A. J. (1988). *Study Findings: Study of the National Incidence and Prevalence of Child Abuse and Neglect.* DHHS (OHDS), Washington, DC 20201.

[2]Sedlak, A. J. & Alldredge, E.-E. *Study of the National Incidence and Prevalence of Child Abuse and Neglect: Report on Data Collection.* Technical Report, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, DHHS, Washington, DC 20201 (1987). [See Appendix A: Report on County Sample Selection Process].

2.1.1 Selecting Counties with Probability Proportionate to Size in the NIS-2

First, all U.S. counties in the contiguous 48 states were divided into four major geographic regions, as defined by the Office of Business Economics. In contrast to the Census regions, this breakdown of the U.S. provides a more equitable distribution of population across the regions. Second, counties were categorized into three levels of urbanization within each region:[3]

(1) Those within very large Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs);[4]

(2) Those within SMSAs not meeting the size requirement in (1); and,

(3) Those not within any SMSA.

The measure of size used was the number of children in school in the county. Counties having fewer than 2,800 children in school were excluded from this sampling frame and sampled separately (see next section). This measure of size was used to draw a sample of 27 counties with probability proportionate to size (PPS). Thus, counties with larger populations had higher probabilities of being sampled.

2.1.2 Selecting Rural Counties in the NIS-2

Rural counties were specially represented by separately treating those counties with less than 2,800 children in school. In this method, counties were first sorted by state in order to insure the integrity of state boundaries. Next, within each state, the counties were sorted according to urbanization level (as described above). Within each of the urbanization stratum, counties were sequenced based on their location from northeast to southwest, thus ordering the counties by their geographic proximity.

---

[3] Based on information from the County and City Data Book, 1983 (10th Edition). U.S. Department of COmmerce, Bureau of the Census.

[4] The Bureau of the Census uses the SMSA classification to denote areas with a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities which have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. (From U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1982-83 (103rd edition), Washington, D.C., 1982). Twenty-six SMSAs were classified as "very large," using a classification system developed for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Year 17.

Proceeding from the beginning of the listing, adjacent counties within the same state were joined into larger groupings such that the combined total of children in school in each grouping reached or exceeded 2,800. A single county grouping was selected from this listing by simple random sampling.

2.1.3   Sample Design for the Police Records Study

The sample design for the PRS was a multi-stage, stratified sample, with stages being geographic area, police departments, and case records. The sample of geographic areas for the first stage comprised selection of 21 nationally representative counties. The 21 counties for the Police Records Study were selected from the NIS-2 sample of 29 counties. Specifically, the one rural PSU (constituted of two adjacent counties) in the NIS-2 sample was selected with certainty for the PRS (i.e., it was automatically selected to ensure that low population counties were represented in the PRS). Then, 19 of the remaining PSUs were subsampled with equal probability. It should be noted that this approach preserved the PPS properties of the original 27-county listing. Table 2-1 provides descriptive information on the 20 PSUs included in the Police Records Study. Table 2-2 provides the sampling information (measure of size, and stratifiers) for the sampled counties.

2.2   Selecting State, County, and Municipal Police Agencies

In each selected PSU, municipal, county, and State police agencies were requested to participate in the study. Municipal police agencies, which generally cover incorporated areas of the county, were sampled when a given county had more than five of these agencies. If a county had fewer than five municipal police agencies, all of the agencies were selected for participation and sampling was not necessary.

2.2.1   Selecting State and County Agencies

State and county police agencies were automatically selected to participate in order to include in the study all areas of the counties that may not have been represented by municipal

Table 2-1. Descriptive Characteristics of the Counties Sampled for the Police Records Study

PSU COUNTY/STATE	DISTRIBUTION		RACE/ETHNICITY		CHILDREN		SOCIOECONOMIC INDICATORS			
	% Urban	% Farm	% Black	% Hispanic	% < 5 Years	% 5 to 17 Years	% Families Below Poverty	Unemployment Rate	Median Income	Violent Crime
1	82.0	1.7	5.2	21.6	9.0	21.9	10.2	12.2	6,990	3,252
2	98.9	0.0	12.6	27.6	7.4	19.7	10.5	9.3	8,303	99,392
3	96.0	.5	7.5	9.4	7.2	19.6	8.9	11.0	7,950	6,365
4	87.4	.1	8.2	5.6	5.7	21.2	5.9	5.9	10,408	2,969
5	92.8	.1	13.7	4.9	5.2	16.2	6.7	7.8	8,903	6,933
6	99.7	0.0	25.6	9.5	7.2	20.7	10.8	10.8	8,229	32,321
7	100.0	0.0	20.3	.9	7.5	20.8	8.4	10.2	7,677	5,456
8		29.1	0.0	.3	6.9	20.2	9.6	10.9	6,214	1
8		19.4	0.0	1.3	8.1	22.7	8.9	5.9	6,606	4
9	33.4	27.5	.2	.4	8.2	22.0	9.1	5.7	6,714	14
10	61.9	.2	1.9	1.0	7.2	24.3	6.8	8.9	6,978	1,604
11	60.1	2.4	41.8	1.3	8.4	24.1	18.6	15.3	5,035	51
12	99.7	0.0	3.9	3.4	5.0	18.6	3.1	6.9	10,188	1,710
13	100.0	0.0	21.8	23.5	4.8	12.9	18.7	10.4	10,776	*
14	10.9	15.1	1.1	.4	8.3	23.9	12.3	15.6	5,641	8
15	41.0	3.2	1.4	.3	7.7	21.7	7.5	12.9	6,402	58
16	88.4	0.2	4.7	0.9	5.6	19.8	3.3	7.8	9,734	1,707
17	22.8	1.2	24.2	.7	7.4	23.8	8.6	14.9	5,798	371
18	96.1	.1	41.7	.9	7.8	21.9	15.3	9.6	6,697	7,624
19	96.4	0.0	19.6	15.3	8.4	21.7	8.1	6.5	9,062	14,309
20	66.9	.9	.9	.9	7.2	21.5	8.3	12.1	6,805	220

*Data not available for this county separately from the other four boroughs in New York City.

2-4

Table 2-2. Sampling Information About Counties in the Police Record Study.

COUNTY/STATE	REGION[a] / URBANI-ZATION	CHILDREN IN SCHOOL[b]	1980 POPULATION	CENTRAL (ADJACENT) CITY[c]
County selected with Probability Proportionate to Size:				
16.	1 A	128,600	643,621	
13.	1 A	189,483	1,428,285	
10.	1 A	99,284	405,437	
12.	1 B	159,978	845,385	
4.	1 B	173,911	807,143	
18.	2 A	171,747	771,113	
5.	2 B	93,086	576,863	
20.	2 B	20,250	93,648	
11.	2 C	4,935	21,043	
17.	2 C	12,697	53,361	
6.	3 A	1,093,265	5,253,655	
	3 B	156,778	765,233	
15.	3 B	14,163	64,266	
14.	3 C	7,523	31,920	
9.	3 C	5,525	24,743	
19.	4 A	510,802	2,409,547	
2.	4 A	1,476,167	7,477,503	
1.	4 B	86,822	403,089	
3.	4 B	154,198	783,381	
Separately Sampled Grouping of Small, Rural Counties:				
Louisa, IA	3 C	2,664	12,055	Wapello
Keokuk, IA	3 C	2,629	12,921	Sigourney

[a] Regions are numbered 1 to 4 and correspond to the regions given in Table 1; urbanization codes are lettered A to C and refer to counties in large SMSAs (A), in other SMSAs (B), and non-SMSA counties.

[b] Taken from the 1983 County and City Data Book, reflecting the in-school population according to the 1980 Census data.

[c] Any city within the county is given without parentheses. When a county is in the SMSA but does not contain the city in question, the city is parenthesized.

police agencies. (State and county the law enforcement needs of agencies usually cover unincorporated areas of the county and some smaller incorporated areas that do not have their own police departments and do not contract police services with a nearby municipal police department.)

In cases where a county or state police department did not have primary investigative responsibilities for the types of cases targeted by this study (see Chapter 3), the agency was classified as "out-of-scope." In this way, those police agencies whose responsibilities were limited to operating highway patrols, running correctional facilities, etc. and who refer the types of cases under study to another agency for investigation, were considered ineligible for participation in the study. Even though such agencies may take the initial report, they typically would not have records for the cases of interest to this study.[5] Sixteen (of 21) county agencies and six (of 16) state agencies were in-scope by this criterion.

2.2.2   Selecting Municipal Agencies

The **1986 Population and 1985 Per Capita Income Estimates for Counties and Incorporated Places**[6] was used to identify (1) the incorporated areas within each county, (2) the size of the population residing in each incorporated area, and (3) (for those areas where an incorporated area spanned multiple counties), the portion of the population in the incorporated area residing inside the study county. Phone calls were made to each sampled county to verify that each incorporated area had its own police agency, and if not, to ascertain the name of the agency providing law enforcement services to that area. These calls were usually to the State or county law enforcement agency, although the municipal agencies themselves were sometimes contacted to clarify matters.

---

[5] If two agencies were involved in an investigation (e.g., a municipal police agency being assisted by a county sheriff's office), the agency with primary investigative responsibility was the one considered to "have" the case. The case record in any "assisting" agency was considered out-of-scope. This strategy both bypassed records that contained only initial reports (as noted in the text) and helped to avoid collecting duplicate data about the same case (should two participating agencies happen to have records on the same case). (cf. the PRS Coordinator's Manual, which documents procedures for selecting and abstracting records.)

[6] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-26, No. 86-ENC-SC, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1988.

Each municipal police agency was associated with a figure reflecting the total population it served. For those agencies that provided services to more than one incorporated area, the total population in all areas served by each agency was identified. When an agency served an area that overlapped with a bordering county, only the proportion of the area's population residing in the study county was used in this summation. Conversely, if an agency that was actually located in a non-study county had the responsibility for serving some portion of the population residing in a study county, that agency, along with the size of the population it served in the study county, was included in the sampling frame for that PSU.

In this way, the sampling frame of municipal agencies for a study county was "hand crafted" to accurately reflect the agencies that actually served portions of the county population, and each agency in the listing was associated with the number of county residents it served.[7]

In PSUs with five or fewer municipal police agencies, all agencies were selected to participate. In PSUs with more than five agencies, an average of five agencies were sampled, and agencies serving fewer than 2,500 people were considered ineligible for participation because these small agencies were thought to be very unlikely to have cases of interest to the study.[8] In order to draw the sample of municipal agencies, the agencies were placed into one of four strata based on the size of the population served.[9] Very large agencies were taken with certainty; that is, all of these agencies were selected. Agencies in the other three strata were sampled using a probability proportionate to size (PPS) sampling strategy.

A total of 61 municipal police agencies were selected for participation in the study. Tables 2-3 and 2-4 show the number of selected municipal departments, in-scope county sheriff's departments, and in-scope state police agencies, categorized by geographic region and by county urbanization category, respectively.

---

[7] It should be noted that this degree of elaboration represents a substantial refinement of the methods of selecting law enforcement agencies that were used in the NIS-2.

[8] It was also found that the very small agencies were likely to refer criminal cases to the county or State police departments. Some small agencies even operated during limited hours (e.g, they patrolled from 6 A.M. until 6 P.M., after which time all reports were referred to a county, State, or contracted municipal agency).

[9] The strata and corresponding population were: (Small) 2,500-29,999; (Medium) 30,000-99,999; (Large) 100,000-499,999; and (Very large) 500,000 and over.

Table 2-3. In-Scope Police Agencies by Region

REGION	AGENCY TYPE			TOTALS
	Municipal	County	State	
West	12	3	0	15
Central	14	7	1	22
Northeast	17	0	4	21
Southeast	18	6	1	25
TOTALS	61	16	6	83

Table 2-4.   In-Scope Police Agencies by County Size (Urbanization)

COUNTY URBANIZATION	AGENCY TYPE			TOTALS
	Municipal	County	State	
Very Large Metropolitan	28	4	2	34
Metropolitan	28	6	4	38
Non-Metropolitan	5	6	0	11
TOTALS	61	16	6	83

Table 2-5 provides the distribution of agencies within the selected counties. Specifically, it gives the number of agencies in both the frame and the sample in each size stratum in each PSU.

Table 2-5. The distribution of number of Police Agencies for the counties in the sample.

| | Population served by Agency (in thousands) | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2.5 - 29 | | 30 - 99 | | 100 - 499 | | 500+ | | Total | |
	Number in frame	Number in sample	Number in frame	Number in sample	Number in frame	Number in sample	Population size	Sample size	Population size	Sample size
1.	8	3			1	1			9	4
2.	11	1	29	1	4	.2	1	1	44	4
3.	2	2			1	1			3	3
4.	11	1	7	1	2	2			20	4
5.	16	2	4	2					20	4
6.	93	2	19	2			1	1	113	5
7.	3	3					1	1	4	4
8.							1	1	1	1
8.							1	1	1	1
9.	1	1					1	1	2	2
10.	24	2	2	2					26	4
11.	1	1							1	1
12.	62	2	4	2					66	4
13.							1	1	1	1
14.	1	1							1	1
15.	2	2							2	2
16.	42	2	4	2					46	4
17.	1	1							1	1
18.	4	3					1	1	5	4
19.	20	2	1	1	1	1·	1	1	22	4
20.	2	2	1	1					3	3

3. ELIGIBLE RECORDS

Abductions occur as part of many different types of crimes. The PRS examined some of the crimes thought most likely to involve the abduction of persons under 18 years old. Three types of records were included in the full (nationally representative) sample of counties: abduction (or kidnapping), homicide, and missing person records where it was unknown what happened to the child (i.e., unknown whether the child was taken or ran away).[1] "Attempts" for homicides and abductions were also included in the study because, although the actual crime may have been unsuccessful, it was possible for such attempts to include all the necessary elements of the definition used to decide whether to "count" a case in the NISMART project.[2]

The findings of earlier, exploratory studies[3] had indicated that technically-countable abductions might also be found in sex offense records. The resources of NISMART proved insufficient to support examining these records in all study counties. However, because of their potential importance, and in order to lay the methodological ground work for systematically including them in future work, sex offense records were examined in a purposively-selected subset of four study counties (two very large metropolitan, one metropolitan, and one non-metropolitan). As with homicides and abductions, attempts were also considered in-scope for data collection when sex offenses were examined.

---

[1]These missing person records were included in the study because of the possibility that these files contained cases of children who may have been taken. It was found that in many agencies, if the circumstances surrounding a child's disappearance are unknown, the child is assumed to have been abducted, unless there is strong evidence that the child left of her/his own volition, because abductions are generally investigated more aggressively than missing person cases. The missing person category is usually reserved for cases where it appears that the person left of her or his own accord. This is probably the reason why, after screening the missing person records, just one in-scope record was found and abstracted for the study.

[2]For example, consider a situation where a perpetrator grabs the victim on the sidewalk and carries her inside a nearby apartment building where he attempts to sexually assault her, but the assault is foiled because a tenant hears the victim scream and goes to her aid. The taking and detaining of the victim, though relatively brief events, are important definitional criteria for purposes of the study, as is her movement — albeit not too great a distance. These features of the situation would probably make this case countable, although the assault was unsuccessful.

[3]National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (1986). *An evaluation of the crime of kidnapping as it is committed against children by non-family members.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

This chapter documents the study's eligibility criteria for homicide, abduction, missing person, and (where applicable) sex offense records and discusses case-level record sampling.

3.1   Eligibility Criteria

A record was considered eligible if it was classified as one of the record types specified above and met certain study criteria. These criteria were: (1) the date of report was between August 1, 1987 and July 31, 1988, (2) the victim was under 18 years old at the time of the incident, (3) the perpetrator was not the father, mother, stepparent, sibling, aunt, uncle, or grandparent of the victim, and (4) (abductions, missing persons cases, and sex offenses only) the victim resided in the study county at the time of the incident. Homicide records were not screened according to the victim's residence, because the jurisdiction where a given crime occurs is the one responsible for investigating that crime. It was considered essential to include in the PRS those cases where a youth ran away from home to another city (and consequently was technically not a resident of this other city) and subsequently became a homicide victim in that locale. Therefore, all homicide cases within the investigative jurisdiction of the selected agencies were considered eligible. All unfounded reports in all categories of offenses were excluded from the study.

Sex offenses that clearly involved no direct physical contact with the child, such as voyeurism and indecent exposure, were excluded on the grounds that such cases were very unlikely to involve any movement of the child. Child pornography cases were also excluded because the nature and investigation of these cases are different than that of the other sex offenses included in the study. Not surprisingly, child pornography records focus on the perpetrator and not the victims, and information about the child is only sporadically available and it tends to be unsystematic. For example, if one perpetrator is involved in the pornographic exploitation of ten children, there would be one case file with detailed information on the perpetrator and varying amounts of information on the different children, depending on which information is deemed most useful in prosecuting the perpetrator. Moreover, pornography cases are usually handled by vice units, which are administered by different divisions than those involved in the types of cases examined in the PRS. Thus, including them in the PRS would have required substantial additional effort in coordinating the participation of an entirely separate division and in searching the records in another location in many agencies.

Police agencies sometimes use idiosyncratic file names and subdivisions, and this fact complicated our efforts to include all those files that would likely contain in-scope cases. Table 3-1 presents a listing of the file names that we included in this study. Note that it is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of all the possible file names under which in-scope cases might be found, as it only applied to the files in agencies participating in this study.

Table 3-1. File Names for Eligible Records

Sex Offense

Rape/forcible rape
Child sexual abuse
Sex assault (or offense)
Child abuse
Indecent liberties
Buggery
Sodomy (or crime against nature)
Crimes against children
Attempts to commit any of the above

Abduction

Child abduction
Kidnapping
Stranger abduction
Nonfamily abduction
Unlawful restraint
Unlawful detainment
Missing persons - juvenile
Missing persons - adult (if age cutoff is under 18)
Missing persons - involuntary
Missing persons - unknown (unknown whether voluntary or involuntary)

Homicide

Murder
Nonnegligent manslaughter
Manslaughter by negligence
Feticide
Unknown dead

The concealment and the movement of the child were important factors in assessing the countability of each case. Because the sex offense files often contained many cases that were not of interest to the study, it was necessary to design a screening system for the sex offenses that would be carefully tailored to find all the cases that were likely to be countable, while at the same time efficiently screening-out most of the cases that were obviously not within the scope of the study. Therefore, sex offenses were screened on two additional questions; these were whether or not the:

- Incident occurred within a private residence; and

- Perpetrator did something to conceal the activity.

If the police record indicated that the entire incident occurred in a private residence or that the perpetrator did nothing that served to conceal the assault, then the case was screened-out.[4] The pretests revealed that many sex offenses were perpetrated by someone the victim knew, and that these offenses often occurred in a private residence. In these cases, the victim was usually not moved or the movement of the victim, as well as other important definitional criteria, were simply not documented in the police record. Also, for those cases that involved no movement of the victim, the perpetrator generally did not do anything that concealed the activity. If there was any doubt as to whether or not a case fit either of these criteria, the abstractor was instructed to choose code "2" (unclear), and the cases were left in the study to be more critically assessed during evaluative coding.

3.2   Record Sampling

Very large files were sampled due to time and resource constraints. Case-level sampling was used in the abduction and missing person files in the Chicago and Los Angeles Police Departments and in the sex offense files in the New York, Indianapolis, and Los Angeles Police Departments and in the Marion and Los Angeles County Sheriff's Departments. Files were

---

[4]Note that if the incident began somewhere other than a private residence, but the perpetrator took (or forced) the victim to a private residence, the case was not screened-out here. For example, if the perpetrator forced the victim into a house from the sidewalk, the incident was considered to have begun on the sidewalk and therefore, the case was not screened-out. In fact, forcing the victim into a house, in this case, counted as evidence of concealment.

sampled at a rate designed to result in 100 in-scope records per file (e.g., 100 in-scope sex offenses).

In order to make incidence estimates reflecting the number of children who were abducted by non-family members, it was necessary to collect child-level data.[5] Some agencies were able to produce a list of eligible *children*. In these cases, particular children were sampled and whenever a specific record contained information on more than one victim, only the information that pertained to the sampled child was abstracted. Other agencies could only produce a list of eligible *records*. In these instances, it was only possible to sample records, and when a record contained information on more than one victim, information on all of the victims in the selected record was abstracted. When this occurred, the abstractor added an identifier to the case record ID number to show which abstracts were from the same police record. This procedure was necessary in order to appropriately weight the data.

Computer systems in the large agencies were used to identify the eligible records, and project staff worked with the agency information system staff to identify the variables that could be used to sort and identify the records. The agencies provided listings of the cases numbers of eligible records, and records were sampled whenever a given file contained over 100 records.

The agencies were able identify eligible records with varying degrees of match with the study criteria. For example, one agency was able to sort sex offense records by date of report, child's age, and child's residence, but not the perpetrator's relationship to the child. In this case, the agency staff were asked to provide a "best guess" as to the percentage of records that would fit the study's definition of non-family perpetrator. The number of records to sample was then determined based on the expected number of ineligible records in the file.[6]

---

[5] That is, one abstract form was completed for each child that screened-in to the study.

[6] For example, if 50 percent of the records were expected to be ineligible, then 200 records were actually sampled, in order to achieve the desired 100 in-scope records.

4. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Data collection was carried out on-site by specially trained coordinators and abstractors and over the telephone in those PSUs with only a few eligible cases. The data collection phase of the study encompassed several activities; these included recruiting the agencies and gathering preliminary information, hiring and training the coordinators, collecting the data, and monitoring data collection activities. Each of these tasks is discussed below.

4.1 Recruiting the Agencies and Gathering Preliminary Information

A recruitment letter was mailed to the chief of police, county sheriff, or commander of each police agency. This letter was followed by a phone call to this person's office to discuss any concerns regarding participation, to confirm the agency's participation, and to obtain the name of an agency contact person. This phone call and subsequent calls to the contact person were used to obtain information about the police agency, such as its size, structure, documentation procedures for incoming reports, recordkeeping practices affecting data collection, and estimated number of cases relevant to the study. A 100 percent participation rate was achieved.

The preliminary phone calls revealed that study resources would be insufficient to adequately address the difficulties that would need to be confronted to examine sex offense records in all counties. Sex offense cases in many jurisdictions were handled by more than one division, and the files were often very large and included many records that were not of interest to the study (e.g., offenses perpetrated by family members, unfounded reports, etc.). Thus, it was clear that, for many of the files considered, a great deal of search and screening effort would need to be expended to identify and abstract the few cases that would be in-scope. Due to time and budget constraints, it was decided to conduct a pilot test in which sex offense records were abstracted in four counties.[1] The preliminary phone calls also revealed that several agencies had few or no eligible records in the homicide, missing person, and abduction files. These included

---

[1]The counties involved in the sex offense pilot test, and their corresponding sizes, were: Wood, WV (small), Marion, IN (medium), and Los Angeles, CA and New York, NY (large).

agencies in small and medium PSUs that were not selected for inclusion in the sex offense pilot study. For those ten PSUs where all the agencies had six or fewer records to be abstracted, telephone interviewers collected the abstract data on the identified records.[2] In PSUs where it was necessary to send a coordinator to collect data for at least one agency, the coordinator collected data from all agencies in that PSU, regardless of the number of cases in each agency in that PSU.

4.2 Developing the Abstract Forms

Three abstract forms were developed, one geared to each type of case under examination: 1) Homicide, 2) Abduction/Missing Person, and 3) Sex Offense. These case record abstract forms are provided in Appendix A. Although the forms collected essentially the same data, different forms were needed to accommodate the different skip patterns and to insert certain questions that were only applicable to a specific type of case. The abstract forms, as well as the data collection procedures were pretested in three police agencies prior to data collection, and revised on the basis of those experiences to the forms given here.[3]

4.3 Hiring and Training the Coordinators

Five Westat survey field supervisors were hired as Local Coordinators to oversee data collection in those ten PSUs where at least one agency reported having more than six eligible records. The Coordinators were senior-level field staff, each with at least two years of field supervisory experience. Four of these Coordinators were based in the four largest counties included in the study; the fifth Coordinator traveled to six counties where small numbers of cases were reported and data collection could be completed within a few days. The Coordinators traveled to Westat's home office for two days of training, which focused on the study definitions and sampling and abstracting records. During training, the Coordinators were also provided written information about the agencies for which they were responsible and were briefed on all of the previous contacts Westat had with agency staff.

---

[2] All records, except one, that these agencies reported as eligible during the preliminary phone calls were found to be out-of-scope.

[3] The PRS Pretest Report discussed these pretests and their results.

4.4   Data Collection

After training, the Coordinators made final data collection arrangements with each agency in their assigned county(ies), completed any necessary record sampling, and began abstracting records. The Coordinators arranged the most suitable procedures for collecting the data (e.g., reviewing logs, retrieving and returning the records, etc.) with the police agency staff. In two large PSUs, the Coordinators hired and supervised local record abstractors to assist in data collection.

The Coordinators and abstractors transcribed data from the police records onto the case record abstract forms. The abstracts were edited in the field by the Coordinators and again underwent an edit when they arrived at the home office. A computerized tracking system was developed to chart the progress of data collection in each study county and to document and control receipt of the abstract forms.

Identification labels were pre-printed and the coordinators and abstractors placed a label on each form that was completed (as either a screener or fully abstracted case). The form ID indicated the PSU, agency, and a sequential form number. Each type of form was assigned a unique, pre-printed "last-digit" identification number to indicate the file from which it came. In cases where one type of record (e.g., sex offense) was drawn from more than one file (e.g., the agency had one file for victims under 14 and one for victims 14 and older), the last digit was re-assigned in order to properly identify from which file each case was taken; this procedure was necessary for weighting purposes.

Westat's Field Director monitored data collection activities from the home office. This included maintaining weekly telephone contact with each of the Coordinators, and reviewing a sample of the abstracts as they were returned to the home office. The computerized monitoring system was used throughout recruitment and data collection to document field activities, including the results of data collection, and to and produce progress reports.

Results of data collection, including the number of records screened and abstracted are reported in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1.   Number of Eligible, Screened, and In-Scope Records by Case Type

	Eligible	Screened	In-Scope
Homicide[a]	410	410	183
Abduction/Missing Person[b]			
-in PSUs w/sampling	2,011	447	152
-in PSUs w/no sampling	447	447	176
Total	2,458	894	328
Sex Offense[c]			
-in PSUs w/sampling	4,765	1,269	259
-in PSUs w/no sampling	297	297	54
Total	5,062	1,566	313
TOTALS	7,930	2,870	824

[a]Not sampled in any PSU or file.

[b]Sampled in Los Angeles and Chicago Police Departments.

[c]Sampled in three of the four counties--Los Angeles, New York, and Marion, IN.

The table reveals that case sampling was necessary for far more of the Sex Offense files that were examined than for the Abduction/Missing Person files. In three of the four counties included in the Sex Offense data collection, all but one of the files examined required case sampling for the data collection effort to be constrained to manageable proportions. This contrasts sharply with the fact that it was only necessary to sample Abduction/Homicide cases in two of the twenty study PSUs. At the same time, Homicide files provided the highest yield of in-scope cases--44 percent of the cases selected and screened from those files (i.e., 183/410) proved to be in-scope and were fully abstracted. For the Abduction/Missing Person, 37 percent (i.e., 328/894) of the cases screened were in-scope. The lowest in-scope yield rate was associated with the Sex Offense files, where only 19 percent of the cases screened were in-scope (i.e., 313/1,566). Taken together, these results underscore what had been suggested by the early pretest effort: that

the study of Sex Offenses using this methodology is not very cost-efficient. It is labor intensive[4] (and therefore expensive) and affords only a relatively low yield of cases within the scope of the screening of the guidelines.

---

[4]The added labor involves identifying all relevant files, constructing the case listings to serve as sampling frames, drawing the case samples, and accurately tracking different sampling rates in different files and locales.

5. DATA PROCESSING PROCEDURES

This chapter documents the procedures used to manage, track, and process the abstract forms once they were received at the home office. The processing was handled by a core team of data preparation, coding, and editing staff. The forms were batched in order to control and handle them more efficiently. After passing an initial scan edit, each batch underwent basic and evaluative coding, during which the forms were prepared for data entry and evaluated according to study criteria. Next, the data from the forms were entered into the computer file and edited; any necessary re-coding was then completed and the countability of each case was determined. These processes are further discussed in the ensuing sections.

5.1 Receipt Control, Initial Edits, and Batching

Upon receipt at the home office, the forms were batched in groups of 25 by type of form (Homicide, Abduction/Missing Person, or Sex Offense). Forms that screened-in (which were completely abstracted and referred to as "abstracts") were treated separately from forms that screened-out (which were only completed to the point of screen-out and were referred to as "screeners"), so two series of batches were established. The batch number to which a given form was assigned was written on the front of the form. The form identification numbers for the forms in each batch were written on a **Batch Control Sheet**, which was kept in each batch, and a copy of which was put into a master batch control log book.

The **Receipt Control Log** listed all ID numbers for which labels were produced. It had columns for whether or not the ID number was used, the type of form to which the ID number was assigned, the date on which the form was received at the home office, whether the form was a screener or an abstract, and whether or not the form passed the scan edit or needed clarification from the agency. The scan edit consisted of checking each form for completeness and legibility and to verify that skip patterns were accurately followed. All forms passed the scan edits, making data retrieval unnecessary.

5.2 Coding

After the data forms went through the receipt control, scan edit, and batching process, they were ready for the coding process. Only abstracts were coded (i.e., processing of screeners stopped with batching and logging). The coding process actually consisted of two sub-processes, basic coding and evaluative coding, each of which had a number of activities associated with it. The coders completed both types of coding at the same time.

Project staff developed a coding reference manual for the coders to use. This manual, the Police Records Study Coding Manual, contained background material on the study as well as specific guidelines to be used during basic and evaluative coding. The coders used these guidelines and the codebook[1] to code the data forms.

5.2.1 Coder Training and Selection

Five coders were hired and successfully completed coder training. Training included procedures for basic and evaluative coding, with special attention to the components of the study's definition of non-family abduction. Training was specifically designed to teach the coders to:

- Consistently evaluate the degree of "fit" for each case with the definitional criteria;

- Use the transcription sheets properly; and

- Become familiar with all reference materials.

Formal training of the coders lasted one week (40 hours). However, the Coding Supervisor and all the coders continued to meet to discuss problems and to assess the reliability of decisions made throughout the coding process. The primary purpose of the problem meetings was to resolve the coding of difficult cases and to clarify any questions concerning coding procedures or instructions. Reliability meetings will be discussed later in Section 5.2.5.

---

[1] The codebook is the product of a computer program which was written in order to provide the format into which the data were entered into the computer. The codebook specified the acceptable responses or range of responses for each question, as well as skip patterns and other coding specifications.

The abstracts for one type of case were coded before the coding for the next type of case was begun. Training was held prior to beginning to code a new type of case to point out the differences between the abstract forms and to practice coding the new type of cases.

The Coding Supervisor assigned coding batches to each of the coders based on coder availability. After a given batch was evaluatively coded, the batch underwent reliability coding to ensure that the forms were being consistently evaluated. Reliability batches were assigned in "round robin" fashion so that a coder was reliability coder for each of the other coders batches at least twice. Basic, evaluative, and reliability coding, as well as re-coding are discussed in the next sections.

5.2.2 Overview of Basic Coding

Basic coding prepared the abstracts for data entry. This process involved:

- Standardizing responses not made in accordance with the established codes or format (e.g., transforming dates into numeric form, inserting leading zeros where needed, inserting codes for any missing data); and

- Ensuring the legibility of all responses.

Whenever a coder encountered a problem or had a question about how to code a data form, she completed a Coding Problem Sheet. These problems were then brought to problem meetings, which were held with all of the coders and the Coding Supervisor. The problems were resolved at the meetings, and a copy of each problem sheet along with its resolution was filed for reference.

5.2.3 Overview of Evaluative Coding

After completing the basic coding for a given form, the coder completed the evaluative coding for that form. All of the information provided on the abstract was used in evaluating the case against the study's definitions. The purpose of the evaluative coding procedure

was to characterize the details of each episode in terms of a standardized set of attributes and to reflect the degree to which the episode "fit" each of the attributes involved in the definitions.

To create the evaluative coding system, each of the study's non-family abduction definitions was broken down into components. Then codes were derived for the assessment of each of the components. Thus, the evaluative coding system was a numerical system which included a series of codes for assessing the "fit" or "nonfit" of each attribute, or definitional criterion. These definitional attributes are described in subsequent sections.

Given the complexity of the coding system, the guidelines for its use were rather elaborate. Also as a result of its complexity, the guidelines were expanded and refined throughout the course of the coding process. This was important in clarifying the appropriate way to code complex missing child scenarios which could not be anticipated before coding began. By design, the coding system remained constant but the rules for implementing it became more clearly specified as new coding situations arose. As coding problems were resolved, they were used to further specify the guidelines. Thus, the guidelines summarized in the sub-sections below are the final product in a sequence of revisions, each progressively incorporating further refinements and explanatory detail.

To ensure that the guidelines were applied in a standard way across the whole database several precautions were taken. First, decisions affecting the guidelines were made in meetings attended by all of the coders and the Coding Supervisor; therefore, everyone was aware of new guidelines as they were established. Second, all of the decisions made during these meetings were written up and placed in a Decision Log to which the coders could refer to if they had any questions. As a final check, before the data forms and their accompanying transcription sheets were sent to Data Entry, they were reviewed by the Coding Supervisor (see Section 5..2.6).

Four major response categories were developed to evaluate each of the definitional components. Each response category contained a key word (or words) that denoted its level of certainty. These key words were:

Very probable   The overall likelihood that the criterion was met was over 80 percent.

Probable	The overall likelihood that the criterion was met was 51-80 percent. It was more likely than not, but not at the level associated with a rating of very probable.
Unlikely	The overall likelihood that the criterion was met was 49 percent or less. It was possible, but unlikely, that the criterion met the study's requirements.
Insufficient evidence	No other code applied; the overall likelihood that the criterion was met was 50 percent. The information in the record was too incomplete or questionable to permit an "up-or-down" decision about whether the criterion was actually met.

Two additional parallel response categories were developed for those definitional attributes which incorporated the concept of "attempt" (e.g., perpetrator attempted to take the child). These two additional categories paralleled the "very probable" and "probable" response categories given above. The "attempt" response categories were as follows:

Very probable attempt	The overall likelihood that an attempt was made was over 80 percent.
Probable attempt	The overall likelihood that an attempt was made was 51-80 percent. It was more likely than not, but not at the level associated with a rating of very probable.

Whenever it was likely that a particular criterion was met, but some piece of evidence in the abstract casted a shadow of a doubt on that likelihood, the evaluation was downgraded from a "very probable" to a "probable." In all cases, the response category that could be chosen with confidence, based on the percentages associated with each code, was selected. If a case did not fit a certain criterion (e.g., "detaining"), it was evaluated whether or not an attempt was made (e.g., "attempting to detain").

Coders recorded their evaluations on the PRS Transcription Sheet, which is given as Exhibit 5-1. In the pre-evaluative section of the transcription sheet, the coder determined whether or not a given case fell within the general framework of the study (i.e., met the study criteria). If a case passed the pre-evaluative criteria, the coder completed the evaluative coding section of the transcription sheet.

EXHIBIT 5-1

PRS TRANSCRIPTION SHEET

Coder's Initials ____

PRE-EVALUATIVE

A. FORM ID |_|_|-|_|_|_|-|_|_|_|-|_| B. Batch |_|_|_|_|

C. Residence |_| D. Non-Family   E. Date of   F. Child's   G. Non-Family
                         Perpetrator |_| Report |_| Age |_| E-Coding   1 = Yes
                                                                                           needed   2 = No

---

EVALUATIVE

I.

A1.	Detained/ attempt made	|_|
A2.	By force or threat	|_|
B1.	For substantial period	|_|
C1.	Isolated place	|_|
D1.	No authority or permission to detain	|_|

II.

A1.	Taken/ attempt made	|_|
A2.	By force or threat	|_|
B1.	Went voluntarily/ attempt made	|_|
C1.	No authority or permission to take or have child voluntarily accompany	|_|
D1.	14 or younger	|_|
E1.	Mentally incompetent	|_|
F1.	Concealed whereabouts/ would have	|_|
G1.	Requested ransom goods, services	|_|

H1.	Intent to keep	|_|
I1.	Difficult recovery	|_|
J1.	Apparent purpose of assault	|_|

5-6

Exhibit 5-1

MISSING CHILDREN TRANSCRIPTION SHEET
PRS

Exhibit 5-1 (page 2)

PRE-EVALUATIVE

A.   FORM ID |_|_|-|_|_|_|-|_|_|_|-|_| B.   Batch |_|_|_|

EVALUATIVE
III.

A1.	Detained/ attempt made	|_|
B1.	No authority or permission to detain	|_|
C1.	14 or younger	|_|
D1.	_ Mentally incompetent	|_|

E1.	Concealed whereabouts/ would have	|_|
F1.	Requested ransom goods, services	|_|
G1.	Intent to keep	|_|
H1.	Difficult recovery	|_|
I1.	Apparent purpose of assault	|_|

5.2.4   Evaluative Coding Decision Criteria

The definitions encompassed both "successful" and "attempted" non-family abductions. There were three definitions for successful (or countable) abductions and three parallel definitions for attempts; these were:

Broad Scope and Policy Focal

NFA1   Child was taken by the use of force or threat or detained by the use of force or threat for a substantial period and in a place of isolation by a non-family member without either lawful authority or parental permission.

NFA2   Child who is 14 or younger or who is under 18 and mentally incompetent was taken or detained by or voluntarily went with a non-family member without either the 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, or (3) expressed an intention to keep child permanently.

NFA3   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.

Attempted non-family abductions

ANFA1   Attempt was made to take child by the use of force or threat or to detain child by the use of force or threat in a place of isolation by a non-family member without either the lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian.

ANFA2   Attempt was made to take or detain child who is 14 or younger or who is under 18 and mentally incompetent or to have such child voluntarily go with a non-family member without either the lawful authority or the permission of a parent/guardian and there was reason to believe that if the perpetrator had succeeded in the attempt, the child's whereabouts would have been concealed or recovery would have been difficult.

ANFA3   Attempt was made to take child or to have child voluntarily go with a non-family member and there was reason to believe that the perpetrator had the apparent purpose of physically or sexually assaulting the child.

All information contained in the abstract was taken into consideration during evaluative coding, although the coders were also referred to a particular response in the abstract form when it directly applied to a certain evaluative coding item. The evaluative coding guidelines

are presented in the following sub-sections; each lettered item corresponds to the same item on the transcription sheet.[2]

5.2.4.1 Pre-evaluative Coding Guidelines

In the pre-evaluative section, coders copied the necessary case identifiers and evaluated whether or not each case met the study's eligibility criteria. The eligibility determination was necessary to confirm that each case met the criteria and because any "borderline" cases (e.g., cases where it was uncertain whether or not the victim was over 18 years old at the time of the incident) were left in the study during data collection to be more closely analyzed during coding.

A. Form ID

The Form ID was either printed on a label affixed in the upper left-hand corner of the front page of the abstract or handwritten in this space. The numbers had the following significance:

XX - XXX - XXX - X

(1)   (2)   (3)   (4)

(1)   Two-digit PSU number;

(2)   Three-digit agency number;

(3)   Three-digit sequential form ID number (each agency's form IDs began with 001); and

(4)   One digit abstract form type ID.

---

[2] The guidelines given here are condensed to eliminate redundancy (e.g., the possible codes for each of the coding items were very similar and are not repeated for each item). The expanded version of the guidelines, as well as the codebook are available from . . .

B.   Batch number

This three-digit number was copied from the upper right corner of the abstract form. The first digit of the batch number denoted the type of abstract form contained in the batch, and the remaining two digits identified the sequential order of the batches.

C.   Residence (Not Applicable for Homicides)

The question here was whether or not the child was a resident of the study county at the time of the incident. For abductions and sex offenses, the child (victim) must have resided in the study county **at the time of the incident**. If the abstractor circled "1" in A-1 (victim resided in (sampled) county at time of incident), then this criterion was coded as "very probable" unless other evidence in the abstract called into question the child's residence in the study county. Residence was not a criterion used to identify and screen homicide records, and therefore, this item was coded as inapplicable for all homicide cases.

D.   Non-family perpetrator

A non-family perpetrator, for purposes of the study, was any perpetrator who **failed to meet** the study's definition of a family member. In cases where there was more than one perpetrator, **all** perpetrators had to qualify as non-family in order for the case to remain in-scope. A family member was defined as a person who is:

(1)   Related to the child by blood;

(2)   Currently or formerly related to the child by law;

(3)   A current or former paramour of the child's parent or guardian; or

(4)   Acting as the agent of or together with a person who qualifies as a family member under (1), (2), or (3) above.

A person could be related to a child by law in a number of ways, including marriage to a blood relative of the child, adoption, or foster care placement. Note that the legal relationships

that qualified here are the kinds that established a family-like relationship between the perpetrator and the child. There are many other kinds of legal relationships which did not qualify as "family" under the study's definition (e.g., the child's insurance adjuster, attorney, etc.).

E.   Date of report

In order to be eligible for inclusion in the PRS, a case must have been first reported to the police between August 1, 1987 and July 31, 1988. Any police reports clearly outside this time frame were screened-out during data collection, but any cases with an unclear date of report were left in the database until they could be more closely examined during coding. The date of report was clearly given in virtually all records examined.

F.   Child's age

One of the study's criteria 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 incident to confirm that the child was under 18 years old at the time of the incident. If the date of birth was not given, then the child's age (also provided on the abstract) was used to assess whether or not the child was under 18 years old at the time of the incident.

G.   Non-family E-coding needed

If any of the pre-evaluative items (C - F) were coded as "unlikely that case fits this criterion," then the abstract was considered out-of-scope and evaluative coding was not completed. Otherwise, the coder continued to the evaluative coding section.

5.2.4.2   Evaluative Coding Guidelines

The three primary evaluative components of the definitions were whether or not the child: (1) was detained, (2) was taken, or (3) voluntarily went with the perpetrator. Evaluative

coding skip patterns were based on the responses to these three coding items, and the transcription sheet was divided into three sections to accommodate these necessary skip patterns and to streamline coding.

Section I

This section of the transcription sheet dealt with children who were either detained or an attempt was made to detain them. Five criteria were used to evaluate these situations; these criteria were: "Detaining/attempting to detain," "Detaining by force or threat," "Detaining for substantial period," "Detaining in place of isolation," and "Lawful authority or parental permission to detain the child." These criteria are explained in detail below.

A1.   Detaining/attempting to detain

Here the coder evaluated whether or not the child was held against his or her will or made to stay in a place where s/he did not want to stay. For purposes of this study, "detaining" meant that the child was prevented from leaving or proceeding subsequent to being taken. The perpetrator could do this by some very obvious means (e.g., tying child to a chair) or by more subtle means (e.g., preventing the child from leaving or implying that s/he would stop the child from leaving if the child tried to do so). If the child was detained for **any** amount of time, the case was coded to indicate that the child was "very probably" or "probably" detained. The following are examples of detainment, even though the detainment was for a very brief time:

- Perpetrator was school janitor who blocked the child's exit from a school room. Perpetrator closed the door and began walking toward the child; the child was able to push him away and run out of the room.

- Perpetrator forcibly took the child to his (perpetrator's) apartment and made the child sit in a kitchen chair. When the perpetrator turned his back to get some water, the child ran from the apartment.

An attempt to detain was considered the perpetrator trying to prevent the child from leaving or stating that s/he would do so if the child tried to leave, but the perpetrator either did not follow through with the threat to stop the child from leaving or the child left the perpetrator

without the perpetrator actually trying to stop the child. Following are examples of attempts to detain:

- The perpetrator lured a 3 year old neighborhood child to his house, where he engaged her in pornographic activity. When she said she was tired of this "game" and wanted to leave now, the perpetrator said "No, stay for a while longer." The child began to cry, and the perpetrator immediately released her.

- The perpetrator was child's acquaintance from school. After riding around for a while in perpetrator's car, child told perpetrator she needed to go home. He said he would not let her out, but she jumped out soon thereafter while he was stopped at a stop light.

This criterion was always evaluated, that is, it was never coded as inapplicable. If this criterion was coded to indicate that a detainment or an attempted detainment took place, then the next criterion (Detaining by force or threat) was evaluatively coded. If it was unlikely or there was insufficient evidence that a detainment/attempted detainment took place, then the next criterion (as well as items B1, C1, and D1) were coded as inapplicable.

A2.   Detaining by force or threat

If the child was detained or an attempt to detain the child was made, then the next assessment was whether or not the detaining or attempt to detain was with the use of force or threat. Force was defined as the:

(1) Use of strong arm tactics (tying, holding, or otherwise restraining the movement of the child); or

(2) Show of weapons (blade, gun, stick, etc); or

(3) Explicit threat of bodily injury to anyone (Note: threats of action other than bodily injury (e.g., damage to property) **did not** count as "threats" for purposes of the study). Threat of injury could be to anyone, including the child, or her or his parents, family, or friends.

The only time this criterion was coded as inapplicable was when no detainment or attempted detainment occurred. The next item evaluated was "Detaining for substantial period."

The babysitter has the parents' instructions to pick up the child from school, which she does, in spite of the child's strong protest. Here, "perpetrator" had parental permission.

Only a parent who effectively had custody of the child at the time of the incident was considered to be in the position to grant such permission. Therefore, where the parents were divorced, and one had primary custody of the child, the other parent could not authorize someone to take the child, unless at the time of the taking the child was visiting, or otherwise entrusted to the care of, this--usually noncustodial--parent).

This criterion was evaluated for all successful and attempted detainments. Regardless of how this criterion was coded, the next criterion which was evaluated was Section II, A1 (Taking/attempting to take).

Section II

This section of the transcription sheet determined whether the child was taken by and/or voluntarily accompanied the perpetrator. There were eleven criteria in this section of the transcription sheet: "Taking/attempting to take," "Taking by force or threat," "Went voluntarily/attempt made," "No authority or permission to take or have the child voluntarily accompany," "14 years or younger," "Mentally incompetent," "Concealed whereabouts/would have," "Requested ransom, goods, services," "Intent to keep," "Difficult recovery," and "Apparent purpose of assault." These eleven criteria are described below.

A1.   Taking or attempting to take

Non-family abductions were evaluated as to whether or not the child was "taken by" or "voluntarily accompanied" the perpetrator. A key issue in "taking" was the 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 a baby away in a stroller). Whereas, in "voluntarily accompanying" the child willingly agreed to go with the perpetrator (although there may have been luring involved). Note that a perpetrator may attempt to get the child to "voluntarily accompany" her or him and then, when this fails, "take" the child. In this case, the "taking" would have been

coded here in A1 as having happened, while the attempt to get the child to voluntarily go with the perpetrator was coded later.

For purposes of the study, "taken" meant that the child was either **moved or transported (1) at least 20 feet or (2) into a vehicle or building (including an apartment or house).** The "taking" could have been accomplished with or without the use of force. Some examples of "taking" include:

- A high school acquaintance of the child's knocks on the door of her house and asks her to join him for a drive; when she declines, he grabs her and carries her to his car.

- A two-year old is playing in his front yard when a neighbor, whom the child has seen before, walks up and carries the child away.

Attempting to take meant that the perpetrator made some efforts or remarks that indicated s/he was trying to take child away, but the "taking" was unsuccessful. Some examples included:

- While child was walking down the hall to her apartment, perpetrator grabbed child by the arm and began to pull her toward another apartment. Perpetrator heard someone coming, released the child, and ran out of the building.

- Perpetrator was on the outside edge of the playground and trying to get a five year old girl to come toward him. When she got close to him, the perpetrator leaned over the fence and picked up the child. Just then the child's mother saw what was happening and began screaming. The perpetrator put the child back down and absconded.

This criterion was always evaluated; it was never coded as inapplicable. If this criterion was coded to indicate that a taking or attempted taking took place, then the next criterion, Question A2 (Taking by force or threat), was evaluated. If it was unlikely or there was insufficient evidence that the child was taken (or an attempt was made), then Question A2 was coded as inapplicable.

permission was defined as having the explicit permission of the parent to have the child go with the perpetrator. For example:

- A mother asks her new neighbor to meet her child at the bus stop and take the child home with him (the neighbor) until the mother returns from the store; even though the neighbor assaults the child, the mother entrusted the care of the child to the perpetrator (neighbor), so he, therefore, had parental permission to take the child to his (the neighbor's) home from the bus stop. Here, perpetrator had parental permission

This criterion was evaluated if the child experienced any successful or attempted abduction (taking/voluntary accompanying). If the child was not taken nor voluntarily accompanied the perpetrator, then this criterion was coded as inapplicable. Question D1 was evaluated next.

D1. Child's age (14 or younger)

Here, the coder determined whether or not the child was 14 years old or younger at the time of the episode. "At the time of the episode" meant when the incident (i.e., the sex offense, abduction, or homicide) took place. The child's date of birth was compared to the date of the episode (not report date), to determine whether or not the child was 14 years old or younger at the time of the episode.

As with the previous criterion, this criterion was evaluated if the child experienced any successful or attempted taking or voluntary accompanying. Regardless of how this criterion was coded, the next item assessed was the child's mental competence.

E1. Child's mental incompetence

For this item, the coder assessed whether or not the child had any mental incompetency, whatsoever. Such a handicap would render the child less able to avoid or escape a lure or recognize a potentially exploitative situation. "Mental incompetency" was defined as any learning, psychological, emotional, or mental disability or handicap. Note that only the child's mental incompetencies, and not physical ones, were assessed.

This criterion was evaluated for all successful and attempted takings and voluntary accompaniments. Question F1 was the next criterion evaluated.

F1.   **Concealing or attempting to conceal**

Here, the coder determined whether or not the perpetrator took some action to conceal or try to conceal the child. Evidence of concealing the child encompassed:

- 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.

Some examples included:

- Taking child to an unfamiliar place where parents were unlikely to look for child;

- Taking child to a place of isolation (e.g., inside an abandoned building or to an empty classroom).

- Making child lie down in the back seat of a car;

- Flight from town;

- Preventing child from engaging in her or his normal activities; or

- Burying or otherwise hiding the child's body.

For **attempting to conceal**, the coder determined whether or not the perpetrator was trying to conceal the child, but, for some reason, the attempt to conceal failed. Evidence of an attempt to conceal would include the perpetrator trying to carry child behind some trees or force child into a deserted building.

It is important to note that concealment was taken to mean something that the perpetrator did without the victim's collaboration unless there is a five year or greater age

difference between the victim and the perpetrator, in which case the age difference is assumed to constitute a coercive factor and the "collaboration" of victim was regarded as nonconsensual.

An example of a case where there is some degree of collusion on the part of the child to conceal the activity is a 14 year old who engages in consensual sex with her 18 year old boyfriend. Such cases were downgraded here on the concealment criterion, unless the perpetrator was at least five years older than the victim.

Again, this criterion was evaluated for all successful and attempted abductions (takings or voluntary accompaniments). The next assessment was whether ransom was requested.

G1.   Ransom (Not Applicable for Attempts and Sex Offenses)

If the child was taken or voluntarily went with the perpetrator, then whether or not any ransom was requested for the child's return or safekeeping was coded here. This item did not apply to sex offense cases because the nature of these cases was not for the perpetrator to keep, or demand ransom for, the child; therefore, this item was always skipped for sex offenses. The ransom question was always skipped for attempts because the perpetrator never had control of the child, and was, therefore, never in a position to demand ransom.

The next item which was evaluated was Question H1 (Intent to keep the child).

H1.   Intent to keep the child (Not Applicable for Attempts)

Here, the coder looked for an indication in the abstract form that the perpetrator expressed some intention to keep the child; logically, this only applied to cases where the perpetrator successfully took the child or got the child to voluntarily accompany her or him. Some examples of "intent to keep the child" included:

- A childless woman removes a child from the hospital and, when apprehended, stated that she wanted to keep the child for her own;

- A husband and wife steal a baby and then represent the child as their own, telling neighbors and friends "the adoption agency finally came through"; and

- Another childless woman takes a child from local daycare center, and when apprehended, tells the police she only intended to take child for a walk; upon searching her home and further questioning, however, the police find that she had furnished a nursery, subscribed to Parents magazine, arranged for maternity leave at work, and employed a diaper service.

As with the previous criterion, this criterion did not apply to attempted abductions. The next criterion "Difficult recovery," on the other hand, did not apply to cases of successful abductions.

I1.   Difficult recovery had the attempt been successful (Attempts Only)

For attempted abductions, the coder assessed whether or not, given all the circumstances presented in the abstract form, it seemed likely that recovery of the child would have been difficult had the attempt to get the child succeeded. Examples of this included:

- Upon apprehension, the perpetrator stated that s/he intended to keep the child or prevent the parents from getting the child back;

- The police find that the perpetrator, who is childless, had airplane reservations for one adult and one child to Brazil, leaving the day the perpetrator took the child;

- The perpetrator is a complete stranger who tried to walk off with an infant in a public place. There would have been a difficult investigation to identify and locate the perpetrator had the attempt succeeded; and

- A stranger drives up to child in a car and tries to get child to get into the car.

This criterion was only evaluated in cases of attempted abductions. Regardless of whether this criterion was evaluated or coded as inapplicable, the next item was assessed.

J1.   Perpetrator had apparent purpose of assaulting child

For this question, the coder evaluated whether or not the perpetrator apparently intended to assault the child when s/he went away with the child or tried to do so. Note that the response to this question did not depend on whether or not the physical or sexual assault was

the perpetrator either did not follow through with the threat to keep the child from the parent or the child escaped from the perpetrator. Following is an example of an attempt to detain:

> Child was left in the perpetrator's care and when the child's mother came to pick up the child, the perpetrator told the mother that she could not have the child back. The child began to cry, and the perpetrator immediately gave the child to her mother.

If this criterion was evaluated as either a successful or attempted detainment, then the coders proceeded on to evaluate the next criterion. If it was unlikely that the child was detained against his/her parents' will or there was insufficient evidence to say whether or not detainment occurred, then the rest of the criteria in this section were coded as inapplicable.

B1.   No authority to detain

However the perpetrator wound up in the child's company (whether by taking the child or having the child voluntarily go with him/her), s/he may have detained the child legitimately. That is, there were instances where the child was detained, but the person(s) who detained the child had the right by law to do so. Refer to Section I, D1, for examples of lawful authority.

This criterion was evaluated in cases of both successful and attempted detainments. If this criterion was evaluatively coded, then the next item (C1. Child's age) was evaluatively coded. If this criterion was coded as inapplicable, then item C1 was coded as inapplicable.

C1.   Child's age (14 or younger)

This criterion assessed whether or not the child was 14 years or younger **at the time of the episode.** "At the time of the episode" meant when the detainment or attempted detainment took place. A complication arose when the interview indicated that the child's age was 15 at the time of the interview. Refer to Section II, D1, for a discussion of this complication and its resolution.

Again, this criterion was evaluated in cases of both successful and attempted detainments. If this criterion was evaluatively coded, then Question D1 (Child's mental incompetence) was evaluatively coded. If this criterion was coded as inapplicable, then Question D1 was coded as inapplicable.

D1.   Child's mental incompetence

This criterion assessed whether or not the child had any mental incompetency. Such a handicap would render the child less able to avoid or escape a lure or recognize a potentially exploitative situation. "Mental incompetency" was considered to be any learning, psychological, emotional, or mental disability or handicap. Note that only **mental** incompetencies were assessed and not physical ones.

This criterion was evaluated in cases of both successful and attempted detainments. If this criterion was evaluatively coded, then the next item (E1. Concealing/attempting to conceal) was evaluatively coded. If this criterion was coded as inapplicable, then Question E1 was coded as inapplicable.

E1.   Concealing/attempting to conceal

This criterion evaluated whether the perpetrator took some action to conceal or tried to conceal the child at sometime during the detainment/attempted detainment. Refer to Section II, F1, for examples and evidence of concealment.

For **attempting to conceal**, it was assessed whether or not the perpetrator tried to conceal the child, but for some reason, the attempt to conceal was foiled. Again, refer to Section II, F1, for examples of attempting to conceal.

This criterion was evaluated in cases of both successful and attempted detainments. The next item which was assessed was whether the perpetrator requested ransom.

F1.   Requested ransom, goods, or services (Not applicable for attempts)

This criterion determined whether or not any ransom was requested for the child's return or safekeeping. Ransom included money, goods, or services.

This criterion was only evaluated in cases of successful abductions (child was detained). If this criterion was evaluatively coded, then the next item (G1. Intent to keep the child) was evaluatively coded. If this criterion was coded as inapplicable, then item G1 was coded as inapplicable also.

G1.   Intent to keep the child (Not applicable for attempts)

Here, the coders looked for an indication in the in-depth interview that the perpetrator expressed some intention to keep the child. The following is an example of intent to keep the child:

> The perpetrator was asked to watch the child while the child's mother recuperated after an illness, when the mother went to get her child, the perpetrator would not give the child back. The perpetrator told the mother that she would never see the child again because she was not a "good mother."

Again, this criterion was only evaluated in cases of successful abductions (child was detained). If this item was evaluatively coded, then the next item (H1. Difficult recovery if attempt would have been successful) was coded as inapplicable. If this criterion was coded as inapplicable, then item H1 was evaluatively coded.

H1.   Difficult recovery if the attempt had been successful (Attempts only)

In cases of attempted detainment, the coders assessed whether or not, given all the circumstances presented in the in-depth interview, it seemed likely that recovery of the child would have been difficult had the attempt to detain the child succeeded. Refer to Section II, I1, for examples of difficult recovery.

This criterion was only coded in cases of attempted detainment. Regardless of how this criterion was coded, the next item was assessed.

I1.   Perpetrator had apparent purpose of assaulting child

This last criterion of the transcription sheet evaluated whether or not the perpetrator had the apparent purpose of physically or sexually assaulting the child at the time s/he detained or tried to detain the child. Note that the evaluation of this criterion did **not** depend on whether or not the physical or sexual assault was successful. Refer to Section II, J1, for examples of apparent purpose to assault.

This criterion was evaluated regardless of whether the case was a successful or attempted detainment.

5.2.5   Overview of Reliability Coding

Inter-coder reliability was assessed throughout evaluative coding. This assessment provided important information concerning the quality of the coding operation and keep the coders alert to the need to apply the study criteria evenhandedly across all cases. Inter-coder reliability was assessed for a random 15 percent of all evaluatively coded data forms.

Each batch of data forms was assigned to a primary evaluative coder for complete coding and to a reliability coder for reliability assessment and checking. The following procedures were used in completing reliability coding:

- After the evaluative coder completed the batch, a random 15 percent of the cases was drawn for the reliability sample;

- The reliability coder evaluatively coded the sampled cases and checked all other abstracts in the batch for mistakes and oversights, circling any items on the forms or transcription sheets thought to be in error;

- The Coding Supervisor, evaluative coder, and reliability coder met to record the number of agreements and disagreements and to resolve any disagreements; and

- The evaluative coder for a given batch made any necessary changes to the abstracts or transcription sheets based on the decisions resulting from the reliability meeting.

Reliability Calculation Method. Each item in Sections I and II on the transcription sheet was considered in the reliability calculation. Each item was recorded as "agree" or "disagree" based on whether or not the two coders concurred. If a given disagreement concerning a code was a function of a previous disagreement in the coding sequence, the first disagreement was recorded as a basic disagreement, and the second as a "consequence" disagreement.

In the "raw" reliability calculations, "consequence" disagreements were entered as actual disagreements. Whereas in "general" reliability calculations the "consequence" disagreements were not considered true disagreements. This avoided penalizing coders for appropriately following the rules concerning the interdependencies in the coding system. The overall general inter-coder percent agreement was 88.6%.

Refer to Appendix B of this volume for a detailed report on the extent of inter-coder agreement on individual coding items.

5.2.6 Validation of Evaluative Coding

Before the data forms were sent to be keypunched, each of them underwent a final review by the Coding Supervisor or Field Director. Although the basic coding on each of the data forms was reviewed, the main focus of the review was on the evaluative coding. This reviewing procedure had several purposes including:

- Providing a final evaluation of whether the evaluative codes assigned to the case accurately reflected the description of the episode; and

- Ensuring that the coding guidelines were applied in a standard manner;

5.3   Keying, Editing and Cleaning the Database

When the data forms finished going through the coding process, they were sent to Data Entry to be keyed. After the forms were keyed, they were subjected to a process of edit and range checks. These keying and editing processes are described in the following sections.

5.3.1   Keying

The batches of data forms were sent as they were amended so that the forms could flow from one stage of processing to the next and, therefore, alleviate any backlog in any of the various processing stages.

Two coding batches (50 abstracts) formed one keying batch, and all batches for a given type of case (e.g, sex offense) were entered into the computer system before the next type of case was sent to Data Entry. This eliminated any confusion in keying the data, due to each type of form having a slightly different keying format.

5.3.2   Editing and Cleaning

The program that produced the computer file format for data entry and the codebook also generated edits (referred to as "machine" edits), which were used to uncover any miscoded or miskeyed responses. In addition to the machine edits, project staff wrote "user" logics to define acceptable relationships between codes (e.g., if there were two perpetrators coded in Section A, then Section D had to contain appropriate demographic codes for two perpetrators).

The keying batches were run against the edits and any errors were printed. Editors reviewed the printouts, compared them to the information on the abstract forms, and documented the needed corrections on the Edit Update Form. These forms were then inputted and the updates were made. The edits were then run again, and this cycling process was repeated until all of the data passed the edits.

5.4　　　　　Coding Stereotypical Kidnapping Cases

In spite of the publicity and policy changes regarding missing children in recent years, many people continue to think of child abduction in a very strict sense. It was decided to apply a "popular" or stereotypical definition of missing children to the PRS cases in order to estimate the number of cases fitting this strict definition. This definition included all cases that were countable under the NFA1, NFA2, or NFA3 definitions (see Section 5.2.4 for the definitions) and where: (1) the perpetrator was a stranger, and (2) the child was detained overnight, or killed, or transported at least 50 miles, or where the perpetrator had held the child for ransom or evidenced an intent to keep the child permanently.

The database was sorted to narrow down the number of eligible cases to the extent possible, and then the identified cases were re-examined. These cases were coded using the same response categories which were used to evaluate the other definitional criteria (i.e., very probable, probable, unlikely, and insufficient evidence). Each of the cases was evaluated as to whether the child was:

1.)　　detained overnight;

2.)　　transported at least 50 miles;　or

3.)　　killed.

Subsequently, those cases which fit one of the overall NFA1, NFA2, or NFA3 definitions but which were not included as Stereotypical Kidnappings by the above coding were evaluated to determine whether or not the perpetrator had:

4.)　　held the child for ransom;　or

5.)　　evidenced an intent to keep the child permanently.

After these evaluations were made for each case, they were input into a computer file and merged into the main data file.

6. WEIGHTING AND ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the procedures used to assign base weights to the records in the PRS database, to generate the estimated total numbers of Nonfamily Abducted children for the NISMART project, and to develop estimates of the variance associated with each of these estimated totals.

6.1 Sample Weighting

The sample of police records for the PRS was selected through a multi-stage stratified sample, as described in Chapters 2 (for counties and agencies) and 4 (for records within agencies). It was, therefore, necessary to assign appropriate sampling weights to cases to derive unbiased estimates relating to the national population represented by this sample of cases.

Sample weighting was accomplished in three steps. The steps involved computation of weights to compensate for unequal probabilities of selection for the counties, the agencies within the counties, and the case records within the agencies.

PSU Weights. The PSU (or county-level) weights took into account the PPS selection of the 29 counties in the NIS-2 sample, and the equal probability subsampling of the 21 counties (20 PSU's) in the PRS study.

Agency Weights. For county sheriff departments and State police agencies, which were always selected with certainty when they were in-scope, agency weights were always set equal to 1.0. For municipal police departments, agencies in each PSU had been stratified by size and an average of five agencies were selected. Sixty-one of these were determined to be in-scope. Their agency-level weights (which include their county-level or PSU-level weights) are shown in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1.   Agency-level Weights for Municipal Police Departments

PSU	Agency ID	Agency Weight
Kern, CA	001	27.524
	002	73.398
	003	73.398
	004	73.398
Los Angeles, CA	001	1.619
	002	3.238
	004	3.238
	033	46.947
	040	17.807
Sacramento, CA	001	15.498
	002	15.498
	003	15.498
Fairfield, CT	001	13.741
	002	96.187
	006	·13.741
	010	151.151
Palm Beach, FL	002	205.376
	004	51.344
	007	51.344
	015	205.376
Cook, IL	001	2.186
	010	20.766
	020	20.766
	050	101.642
	097	101.642
Marion, IN	001	15.243
	002	15.243
	003	15.243
	004	15.243
Keokuk & Louisa, IA	001	293.314
Plymouth, IA	001	432.526

Table 6-1. (continued)

PSU	Agency ID	Agency Weight
Plymouth, MA	001	24.069
	002	288.832
	004	288.832
	016	24.069
Bergen, NJ	001	29.875
	003	463.068
	006	463.068
	037	29.875
New York, NY	001	12.612
Brown, OH	001	317.654
Washington, OH	001	168.729
	002	168.729
Montgomery, PA	002	37.165
	004	390.233
	014	390.233
	035	37.165
Lancaster, SC	001	188.210
Shelby, TN	001	13.914
	002	18.552
	004	18.552
	005	18.552
Harris, TX	001	4.678
	002	4.678
	003	4.678
	007	46.783
	017	46.783
Wood, WV	001	118.010
	002	118.010
	003	118.010

Case-level Weights. Case record weights were computed whenever subsampling was carried out at the level of cases within an agency. For homicides, no case-level sampling was used, so the case-level weights for that record type were set equal to 1.0. Missing persons and abduction cases were sampled in only two police departments (see Chapter 4), Chicago and Los Angeles. In Los Angeles, none of the cases sampled from the abduction-reports file screened-in as within the scope of the study, so case-level weights were only needed for cases sampled in Chicago. For those cases, the case-level weight was equal to 2.6865.

Sex offenses were sampled in three PSUs, and the case-level weights assigned to those cases are given in Table 6-2.

Table 6-2.   **Case-level Weights for Sex Offense Cases**

PSU	Agency ID	Case-level Weight
Los Angeles, CA	201	4.7772
	001	4.6147
Marion, IN	201	1.5887
	001	5.4434
New York, NY	001	4.5545

Final Case Weights. For homicide, missing persons, and abduction cases, the three weights, (PSU, agency-level and case-level) were then multiplied to provide the final weight for each PRS case. Case-level weights for the sex offense records did not include any PSU-level multiplier, since only four counties were chosen with certainty for data collection of this type of record. Thus, for the sex offense records, final case weights were equal to the agency-level weight multiplied by the case-level weight. No nonresponse occurred during these three stages of sampling and, thus, no nonresponse adjustment was computed for these weights. Furthermore, no other source of information was available for ratio estimation or poststratification purposes. As a result, the final case weights for the PRS cases were equal to the base weight of the records.

6.2   Estimation of Numbers of Abducted Children

National estimates of the total numbers of children abducted by nonfamily members were made for the two main definitional standards set forth in the NISMART *First Report*:

1   Children countable according to NFA1, NFA2, or NFA3, and

2   Children countable according to the more stringent, Stereotypical Kidnapping standard (where additional requirements were imposed, as described in Chapter 5).

These estimates were developed in two stages. First, a "core estimate" for each definitional category was developed by summing the final weights for cases reported on Homicide or Missing Person/Abduction case record abstract forms. These "core" estimates represented the nation with a precision that could be determined because they were derived from a nationally-representative sample of counties. The approach used to determine their precision is described below in Section 6.3 ("Variance Estimation").

Second, a range for the "total estimate" for each definitional category was developed by using the sex offense data to calculate within-PSU "multipliers," and then applying these to the national core estimates. It must be emphasized that these within-PSU "multipliers" were only calculable in the few counties where Sex Offense records were studied, and so they are not necessarily representative of the appropriate national multiplier. However, they were the only available index of the degree to which the national core estimates would need to be adjusted to incorporate abductions that would be found among sex offense records. They were developed and applied as follows:

- Within the four PSUs where sex offense records were studied, two different methods were used to generate within-PSU estimates were developed for each definitional category:

    a   Based solely on Homicide and Missing Person/Abduction case record abstract forms, and

    b   Based on all three types of case record abstract forms (i.e., including the Sex Offense forms).

- Within-PSU multipliers were calculated, by dividing the b-estimate by the a-estimate in each PSU.

■ The lowest and highest of these multipliers were used to calculate two alternative "total" estimates for each definitional category, to provide a best-available approximation of the relative sizes of these categories nationwide.

The within-PSU a-estimates, b-estimates, and multipliers are shown in Table 6-3. As can be seen in that table, it was not possible to calculate a multiplier for the smallest of the four Sex Offense counties, so the highest and lowest of the multipliers found in the remaining three PSUs were used for the estimates given in the *First Report*.

Table 6-3. Within-PSU Multipliers to Incorporate Sex Offense Cases.

PSU	Estimate based on Abductions & Homicides ONLY	Estimate based on Abductions, Homicides, & Sex Offenses	Muliplier
Los Angeles, CA	214	713	3.33
Marion, IN	61	151	2.48
New York, NY	88	206	2.34
Wood, WV	0	5	*a

[a]Because there were no countable cases in these records from this PSU, a multiplier could not be calculated.

6.3 Variance Estimation

The Jackknife method of replication was used to arrive at estimates of sampling errors for the "core estimates" of Nonfamily Abducted missing children. The replication design used for the Police Record study was similar to the design used for the NIS-2 data set. The 21 selected counties were grouped into 5 strata of 4 counties. As discussed for the NIS-2 design, the method of forming the PSU's into five groups of four, rather than ten groups of two, was used to give more stability to the variance estimates. The objective in grouping was to group PSU's which were as similar as possible, on the basis of the information available at the time of design but not related to the particular sample selected. As suggested in the NIS-2 replication design grouping similar PSU's maintained a low positive bias of variance estimation, but using selection or sample information for grouping will result in negative bias. The group of large counties reflected the initial ordering of the systematic list. The rural counties were placed in the stratum that included counties from the same region of the country and the same level of urbanization as the rural counties. Table 6-4 provides the county groups for the Police Record study.

The estimates of sampling errors were derived by using option JK2 of the Westat's SAS procedure WESVAR, using a factor of 3/4 to account for the special replication design described above.

The Jacknife method of replication was used to derive variance estimates for abduction and Missing children cases. The variance of an estimated p was estimated by the quantity s_p^2 as indicated in the following paragraph

$$s_p^2 = 3/4 \sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{j=1}^{4} (p_{ij} - p)^2 \,,$$

where

p_{ij} Denotes the estimate of the percentage from replicate j in stratum i, and

p Denotes the estimate of the percentage based on the full sample.

The "core estimates" for the two definitional categories (Legal Abduction and Stereotypical Kidnapping) and their standard errors are given in Table 6-5.

Table 6-4. County Grouping for Variance Estimation for the Police Record Study.

Group	Counties	Region	Urban	Children	City
1	Plymouth, MA	1	A	99,284	(Boston)[a]
	New York, NY	1	A	189,483	New York
	Montgomery, PA	1	A	128,600	(Philadelphia)
	Fairfield, CT	1	B	173,911	Bridgeport
2	Bergen, NJ	1	B	159,978	(New York)
	Shelby, TN	2	A	171,747	Memphis
	Wood, WV	2	B	20,250	Parkersburg
	Palm Beach, FL	2	B	93,086	W. Palm Beach
3	Lancaster, SC	2	C	12,697	Lancaster
	Granada, MS	2	C	4,925	Grenada
	Cook, IL	3	A	1,093,265	Chicago
	Marion, IN	3	B	156,778	Indianapolis
4	Washington, OH	3	B	14,163	(Parkersburg, WV)
	Brown OH	3	C	7,513	Georgetown
	Plymouth, IA	3	C	5,525	Le Mars
	Louisa, IA	3	C	2,664	Wapello
	Keokuk, IA	3	C	2,629	Sigourney
5	Harris, TX	4	A	510,802	Houston
	Los Angeles, CA	4	A	1,476,167	Los Angeles
	Sacramento, CA	4	B	154,198	Sacramento
	Kern, CA	4	B	86,822	Bakersfield

[a]Parentheses around city name indicate that city is adjacent to county, not contained in it.

Table 6-5.   Estimated Incidence of Countable Nonfamily Abducted Children under Different Definitions.

| Definition | "Core" Estimate[a] | S.E. | 95% Confidence Interval[b] | | C.V. (%)[c] |
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Legal Abductions	1,400	400	500	2,200	32.4
Stereotypical Kidnappings	200	107	0	400	45.7

[a]Estimates rounded to the nearest hundred. Based solely on Homicide and Missing Person/Abduction cases.
[b]Rounded to nearest hundred.
[c]Coefficient of variation.

APPENDIX A

ABDUCTION/MISSING PERSON

NATIONAL STUDIES OF THE INCIDENCE OF MISSING CHILDREN

POLICE RECORD ABSTRACT FORM

- 2

Abstractor ID |__|__|

Police Record ID |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|—|__|

PART A. SCREENING INFORMATION

A-1.   VICTIM RESIDED IN (SAMPLED) COUNTY AT TIME OF INCIDENT
   1   =   Yes   (A-3)
   2   =   No

A-2.   VICTIM RESIDED IN _____ AT TIME OF INCIDENT (STOP)
   (CITY & STATE/COUNTY)

A-3.   a.   A KNOWN, ALLEGED, OR SUSPECTED ABDUCTOR WAS THOUGHT TO BE INVOLVED
   1   =   Yes
   2   =   No, child ran away or left of his/her own accord (STOP)
   3   =   No, other explanation (SPECIFY): _____
   9   =   Record does not specify

   b.   NUMBER OF KNOWN, ALLEGED OR SUSPECTED PERPETRATORS INVOLVED IN INCIDENT

   |__|__|
   98   =   Number of perpetrators unknown to police
   99   =   Record does not specify

A-4.   PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP(S) TO VICTIM (Enter codes from list below.)

   a.   Perpetrator 1 |__|__| (A-4.b)

   b.   Perpetrator 2 |__|__| (A-4.c)

   c.   Perpetrator 3 |__|__| (A-4.d)

01 = Parent	11 = Other "step" relative (e.g., step brother)
02 = Stepparent	12 = Parent's boyfriend/girlfriend
03 = Sibling	13 = Family friend
04 = Aunt/Uncle	14 = Victim's babysitter
05 = Grandparent	15 = Victim's acquaintance/friend
	16 = Victim's employer
	17 = Stranger-known by sight to victim
	18 = Other stranger
	19 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
	20 = No second or third perpetrator
	98 = Perpetrator unknown to police
	99 = Record does not specify relationship

   d.   ONE OR MORE PERPETRATORS ARE CODED 11-19, 98 OR 99 in A-4.a, A-4.b, OR A-4.c
   1   =   Yes
   2   =   No (STOP)

1

A-5. a. DATE OF (FIRST) REPORT

|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
  M M   D D   Y Y

b. DATE BETWEEN 08-01-87 AND 07-31-88, INCLUSIVE
1 = Yes
2 = No (STOP)

A-6. VICTIM'S AGE

a. DATE OF BIRTH

|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
  M M   D D   Y Y
98 = Year of birth unknown
99 = Year of birth not in records

b. AGE RECORDED IN RECORD

|__|__| (Circle one number below to describe this age.)

1 = Age at time of incident
2 = Age at time of report
4 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

c. YEAR OF BIRTH IS 1969 OR LATER

1 = Yes (B-1)
2 = No (STOP)
3 = Year of birth not entered in A-6.a

d. AGE IN RECORD IS 18 OR LESS

1 = Yes (B-1)
2 = No (STOP)
3 = Age not entered in record

e. THERE IS REASON TO BELIEVE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 18 AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT/EPISODE

1 = Yes
2 = No (STOP)

f. EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER A-6.e

_____

_____

_____

_____

2

PART B. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR VICTIM

B-1. RACE

    1 = White, Not Hispanic
    2 = American Indian/Alaskan Native
    3 = Asian/Pacific Islander
    4 = Black, Not Hispanic
    5 = Hispanic
    6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
    8 = Unknown
    9 = Not specified in record

B-2. SEX

    1 = Male
    2 = Female
    9 = Not specified in record

B-3. DISABLING CONDITIONS

    a. Check here ☐ if record makes no reference to any disability (B-4)

        RECORD SPECIFIES A DISABILITY (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
        YES   NO
        1   2   a. Developmental disability
        1   2   b. Emotional disturbance
        1   2   c. Learning disability
        1   2   d. Hearing, speech, or sight impairment
        1   2   e. Physical disability
        1   2   f. Other (SPECIFY): _____
        1   2   g. Nature of disabling condition unknown to police
        1   2   h. Nature of disabling condition not specified

    b. PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF DISABLING CONDITION AS IT IS RECORDED IN RECORD

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

B-4. CHILD WAS A RUNAWAY AT TIME OF INCIDENT

    1 = Yes
    2 = No
    3 = Record indicates child may have been a runaway
    9 = Cannot be determined from record

B-5. a. RECORD SPECIFIES CHILD HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

        1 = Yes
        2 = No (B-6)

    b. TYPE OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY SPECIFIED IN RECORD (Circle one.)

        1 = Prostitution
        2 = Drug dealing
        3 = Gang activity
        4 = Burglary/theft ring
        5 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

    c. TIME OF INVOLVEMENT IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

        Check here ☐ if record does not specify when (B-6)

        RECORD SPECIFIES INVOLVEMENT (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
        YES   NO
        1   2   a. Prior to the incident/episode
        1   2   b. At the time of the incident/episode
        1   2   c. Subsequent to the incident/episode

3

B-6.   CHILD WAS INSTITUTIONALIZED AT TIME OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
1   =   Yes
2   =   No
9   =   Cannot be determined from record

PART C. CRIME INFORMATION

C-1.   a.   DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (If single extended episode enter date began. If multiple incidents over time, enter date of most recent incident.)

|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (C-2)
  M M   D D   Y Y

98 =   Month and year unknown
99 =   Month and year not specified in record

b.   APPROXIMATE DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (If single extended episode, enter when it began. If multiple incidents over time, enter date of most recent incident. Circle one.)

1   =   Summer 1987
2   =   Fall 1987
3   =   Winter 87/88
4   =   Spring 1988
5   =   Summer 1988
6   =   None of the above/date cannot be approximated

C-2.   a.·   TIME INCIDENT/EPISODE BEGAN

|__|__|:|__|__| am/pm (Circle one.)   (C-3)

98 =   Unknown
99 =   Not specified in record

b.   EXACT TIME UNKNOWN, BUT RECORD INDICATES THAT INCIDENT/EPISODE OCCURRED IN (Circle one.)
1   =   Morning
2   =   Afternoon
3   =   Evening
4   =   Night
8   =   Unknown
9   =   Not specified

C-3.   REPORTED TO POLICE BY

Check here ☐ if record does not specify (C-4)

RECORD SPECIFIES (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
YES   NO
 1   2   a. Child's mother
 1   2   b. Child's father
 1   2   c. Babysitter
 1   2   d. Neighbor
 1   2   e. Other relative
 1   2   f. Victim
 1   2   g. Passerby
 1   2   h. Other (SPECIFY): _____

4

C4. NARRATIVE DESCRIBING THE CIRCUMSTANCES PERTAINING TO THE INCIDENT/EPISODE. (Include (1) any events leading up to the incident(s). Describe (2) how the abduction was accomplished and how the child was treated while in the custody of the abductor. Also include (3) how the incident ended.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-5.   a.   MOVEMENT OF THE CHILD (Circle the one that best describes movement of the child, at any time during the course of the incident, that was due to the will and/or plan of the perpetrator.)

    1   =   Definitely, there was movement of the child
    2   =   Possibly, there was movement of the child
    3   =   Definitely, there was no movement of the child (C-6.a)
    9   =   The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-6.a)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-5.a (Include (1) where victim was moved from and to and (2) when the movement occurred during the course of the incident. If victim moved more than once, describe each movement. If record indicates exact or approximate distance, enter that information in the space provided at C-5.c.)

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    c.   DISTANCE (State exact or approximate distance in feet or yards or miles if in record.)

        |__|__|__| or |__|__|__| or |__|__|__|
             FT   YDS   .   MILES

        999 = Not specified in record

C-6.   a.   LURING THE CHILD (Circle the one that best describes whether, at any time during the incident, the perpetrator offered promises or enticements to the victim under false pretenses as a means to impose his/her will on the victim.)

    1   =   Definitely, there was luring
    2   =   Possibly, there was luring
    3   =   Definitely, there was not luring (C-7.a)
    9   =   The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-7.a)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-6.a (Include (1) what was promised or offered and/or what the victim expected and (2) what the perpetrator accomplished through luring, e.g., movement, concealment, detention, etc.)

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    c.   THE LURE (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
    YES   NO
    1   2   a.   Falsehood/lies
    1   2   b.   Money
    1   2   c.   Candy/toys
    1   2   d.   Other (SPECIFY): _____
    1   2   e.   Unknown to the police
    1   2   f.   Not specified in the record

6

C-7.   a. USE OF FORCE OR THREAT (Circle the one that best describes whether physical or verbal force or threat was used against the victim in order to achieve the will/plan of the perpetrator.)

        1 = Definitely, there was force or threat
        2 = Possibly, there was force or threat
        3 = Definitely, there was not force or threat (C-8)
        9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-8)

    b. EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-7.a (Describe (1) the force or threat that was used. Include (2) whether or not it was used to move, conceal, or detain the victim. If there were multiple or extended events involving force or threat (3) describe each event.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

    c. MEANS USED TO FORCE OR THREATEN (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES	NO		
1	2	a.	Gun (rifle, pistol, etc.)
1	2	b.	Knife (or blade)
1	2	c.	Other instrument (stick, tree branch, pipe, etc.)
1	2	d.	Strong-arm (fists, hands, feet, etc.)
1	2	e.	Other (SPECIFY): _____

C-8. LOCATION VICTIM WAS MOVED, LURED, OR FORCED FROM (Circle one location.)

  01 = Street (as pedestrian) (C-9)
  02 = Child's own home (includes yard) (C-10)
  03 = Other home where child was living (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
  04 = Other home where child was visiting (e.g., friend, babysitter, relative) (C-10)
  05 = Institutional setting (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
  06 = Vehicle/car (C-10)
  07 = School/day care center (including playground)   (C-10)
  08 = Shopping area/mall/office building (C-10)
  09 = Hotel/boarding house/dormitory (C-10)
  10 = Park/amusement area/beach (C-10)
  11 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
  96 = Victim was not moved, lured, or forced (C-12.a)
  98 = Location unknown (C-10)
  99 = Record does not specify location (C-10)

C-9. CHILD'S ACTIVITY WHILE ON STREET

  01 = Playing
  02 = Walking to or from school/store/friend's
  03 = Hitchhiking
  04 = Prostitution
  05 = Drug dealing
  06 = Gang activity
  07 = Other activity (SPECIFY): _____
  98 = Activity not known to police
  99 = Activity not specified in record

C-10.   LOCATION CHILD WAS MOVED, LURED OR FORCED TO (Circle one.)

    01 =   Perpetrator's home

    02 =   Isolated wooded area or field

    03 =   Park/amusement area/beach

    04 =   Deserted building

    05 =   Parking lot or structure

    06 =   Highway/road (child was driven around in vehicle)

    07 =   Vehicle (vehicle was not moved)

    08 =   Different room in same building where incident began

    09 =   Other (SPECIFY): _____

    98 =   Unknown

    99 =   Record does not specify

C-11.   a.   CONCEALMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether the change in the child's location was for the purpose of concealment.

    1   =   Definitely, concealment was the purpose

    2   =   Possibly, concealment was the purpose

    3   =   Definitely, concealment was not the purpose (C-12.a)

    9   =   The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-12.a)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-11.a (Include (1) how concealment was achieved, (2) any evidence regarding purpose, and (3) when it occurred during the course of the incident.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-12.   a.   DETAINMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether, at any time during the incident, the victim was confined, kept in custody, or prevented from proceeding by the perpetrator.)

    1   =   Definitely, there was detainment

    2   =   Possibly, there was detainment

    3   =   Definitely, there was not detainment (C-13)

    9   =   The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-13)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-12.a (Include (1) the form or means of detainment and (2) when it occurred during the course of the incident.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-13.   FORMS OF MALTREATMENT (Circle 1 for all forms of maltreatment the child experienced during the incident.)

Physical abuse:
1   a.   Slapped, pushed, kicked
1   b.   Tied, bound, gagged, locked in small space
1   c.   Beaten/shot/knifed
1   d.   Carried/dragged
1   e.   Other physical abuse (SPECIFY): _____

Physical neglect:
1   f.   Abandoned (left in woods or on street/road)
1   g.   Medical neglect of obvious or known condition
1   h.   Food/water withheld
1   i.   Other physical neglect (SPECIFY): _____

Sexual assault/exploitation:
1   j.   Penetration
1   k.   Genital molestation
1   l.   Unspecified sexual maltreatment
1   m.   Photographed for pornography
1   n.   Other sexual maltreatment (SPECIFY): _____

Emotional abuse/threats:
1   o.   Verbally threatened harm to child
1   p.   Displayed weapons to threaten harm to child
1   q.   Threatened to harm parents without child's cooperation
1   r.   Direct threats to parents (letters, phone calls, etc.)
1   s.   Other emotional abuse/threats (SPECIFY): _____

Other maltreatment:
1   t.   Physically forced to walk from one location to another
1   u.   Moved more than once
1   v.   Other maltreatment not previously specified: _____

Other Crimes: Child was
1   w.   Drugged
1   x.   Robbed
1   y.   Other crime (SPECIFY): _____

Unknown
1   z.   Record does not specify form of maltreatment (C-15)

C-14.   DESCRIBE THE FORMS OF MALTREATMENT CIRCLED ABOVE. (Also include (1) the number of times each form of maltreatment occurred and (2) who was involved or present each time.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9

C-15.   a.   INTENT WAS SHOWN TO RANSOM CHILD FOR MONEY, SERVICES, OR GOODS
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (C-16)
        8   =   Unknown to police if ransom demanded (C-16)
        9   =   Not specified in record (C-16)

        b.   RANSOM DEMANDS Describe demands as they appear verbatim in record.)

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

C-16.   a.   CHILD RECEIVED INJURIES AS RESULT OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (C-17)
        8   =   Unknown to police
        9   =   Record does not specify

        b.   NATURE OF INJURIES (Describe nature of injuries as they are documented in the record.)

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

C-17.   CHILD IS STILL MISSING
        1   =   Yes (C-23)
        2   =   No
        8   =   Unknown to police (C-23)
        9   =   Record does not specify (C-23)

C-18.   CHILD WAS TAKEN TO THE HOSPITAL, CLINIC, ETC. AS RESULT OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (C-20)
        8   =   Unknown (C-20)
        9   =   Record does not specify (C-20)

C-19.   RESULTS OF HOSPITAL, CLINIC, ETC. VISIT (Circle one.)
        1   =   Child was examined and released (received no treatment)
        2   =   Child received outpatient treatment only
        3   =   Child was admitted to hospital
        8   =   Unknown
        9   =   Record does not specify

C-20.   AMOUNT OF TIME ELAPSED. (Record evidence to describe the amount of time from when the incident began until the time of the victim's release/abandonment by the perpetrator. Indicate (1) what you consider to be the start of the incident and the event you consider to be the end of the incident. Provide (2) description of sequence of events that can be used to approximate time. If the record provides total elapsed time in minutes or hours or days, (3) enter that below.)

|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_|
   MIN   HR   DAYS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-21.   INCIDENT/EPISODE TERMINATED WHEN (Circle one.)
1   =   Child escaped from perpetrator
2   =   Perpetrator released child into custody of authority/guardian
3   =   Perpetrator left location where child was (includes fleeing scene)
5   =   Other (SPECIFY): _____

_____

8   =   Unknown how incident ended
9   =   Record does not specify

C-22.   DATE OF CHILD'S RELEASE

|_|_|-|_|_|-|_|_| (D-1)
  M M   D D   Y Y
98   =   Unknown to police (D-1)
99   =   Record does not specify (D-1)

C-23.   POLICE SUSPECT THAT (Circle one.)
1   =   Child still being held by abductor
2   =   Child has been killed
3   =   Child was released and has chosen not to return home
4   =   Child has returned to parents/caretaker and no one has reported child found
5   =   Other (SPECIFY): _____
9   =   Record does not specify what police suspect

11

ANSWER QUES-TIONS FOR EACH PERPETRATOR RECORDED IN A-4.	Perpetrator 1	Perpetrator 2	Perpetrator 3
D-1. DATE OF BIRTH	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 2 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 3 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)
D-2. AGE	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified
D-3. RACE	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-4. SEX	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-5. RESIDENT IN VICTIM'S HOUSEHOLD	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-6. NON RELATIVE ACTED ON BEHALF OF VICTIM'S RELATIVE	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 1 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 2)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 2 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 3)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp.3 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO E-1)

E-1.   PERPETRATOR 1 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED

       1 = Yes
       2 = No (E-4)
       9 = Not specified in record (E-4)

E-2.   CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 FOR THIS CRIME

       1 = Yes
       2 = No (E-4)
       9 = Not specified in record (E-4)

E-3.   CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 AS A RESULT OF THE
       INCIDENT DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-3.a, E-3.b, E-3.c and E-3.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges (E-4)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-4)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-4)
b.	OUTCOME	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-3c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-4) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-4) 9 = Not specified (E-4)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-4.   PERPETRATOR 1 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

       1 = Yes
       2 = No (E-6)
       8 = Unknown (E-6)
       9 = Not specified in record (E-6)

E-5.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 1 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

    a. _____

    b. _____

    c. _____

E-6.   PERPETRATOR 2 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED
    1 = Yes
    2 = No (E-9)
    3 = No second perpetrator involved (STOP)
    9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-7.   CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 2 FOR THIS CRIME
    1 = Yes
    2 = No (E-9)
    9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-8.   CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 2 AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT
    DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-8.a, E-8.b, E-8.c and E-8.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges	_____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-9)	_____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-9)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not Specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-9) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-9) 9 = Not specified (E-9)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-9.   PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (E-11)
        8   =   Unknown (E-11)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-11)

E-10.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

        a. _____

        b. _____

        c. _____

E-11.   PERPETRATOR 3 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (E-14)
        3   =   No third perpetrator involved (STOP)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-14)

E-12.   CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 FOR THIS CRIME
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (E-14)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-14)

E-13.   CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT
        DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-13.a, E-13.b, E-13.c, and E-13.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-14)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-14)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-14) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-14) 9 = Not specified (E-14)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-14.   PERPETRATOR 3 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

    1   =   Yes
    2   =   No (END)
    8   =   Unknown (END)
    9   =   Not specified in record (END)

E-15.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 3 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

END

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

SEXUAL OFFENSE/RAPE

NATIONAL STUDIES OF THE INCIDENCE OF MISSING CHILDREN

POLICE RECORD ABSTRACT FORM

```
┌─────────────────────────────┐
│                             │          - 3
│                             │
└─────────────────────────────┘
```

Abstractor ID |__|__|

Police Record ID |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|—|__|

PART A. SCREENING INFORMATION

A-1.   VICTIM RESIDED IN (SAMPLED) COUNTY AT TIME OF INCIDENT
       1   =   Yes   (A-3)
       2   =   No

A-2.   VICTIM RESIDED IN _____ AT TIME OF INCIDENT (STOP)
                        (CITY & STATE/COUNTY)

A-3.   a.   NUMBER OF KNOWN, ALLEGED OR SUSPECTED PERPETRATORS INVOLVED IN INCIDENT

            |__|__|
            98   =   Number of perpetrators unknown to police
            99   =   Record does not specify

A-4.   PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP(S) TO VICTIM (Enter codes from list below.)

       a.   Perpetrator 1 |__|__| (A-4.b)

       b.   Perpetrator 2 |__|__| (A-4.c)

       c.   Perpetrator 3 |__|__| (A-4.d)

       ┌──┐
       │ 01 = Parent   11 = Other "step" relative (e.g., step brother) │
       │ 02 = Stepparent   12 = Parent's boyfriend/girlfriend   │
       │ 03 = Sibling   13 = Family friend   │
       │ 04 = Aunt/Uncle   14 = Victim's babysitter   │
       │ 05 = Grandparent   15 = Victim's acquaintance/friend   │
       │   16 = Victim's employer   │
       │   17 = Stranger-known by sight to victim   │
       │   18 = Other stranger   │
       │   19 = Other (SPECIFY):_____ │
       │   20 = No second or third perpetrator   │
       │   98 = Perpetrator unknown to police   │
       │   99 = Record does not specify relationship   │
       └──┘

       d.   ONE OR MORE PERPETRATORS ARE CODED 11-19, 98 OR 99 in A-4.a, A-4.b, OR A-4.c.
            1   =   Yes
            2   =   No (STOP)

1

A-5. a. DATE OF (FIRST) REPORT

|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
M M   D D   Y Y

b. DATE BETWEEN 08-01-87 AND 07-31-88, INCLUSIVE
1 = Yes
2 = No (STOP)

A-6. VICTIM'S AGE

a. DATE OF BIRTH

|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
M M   D D   Y Y
98 = Year of birth unknown
99 = Year of birth not in records

b. AGE RECORDED IN RECORD

|__|__| (Circle one number below to describe this age.)

1 = Age at time of incident
2 = Age at time of report
4 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

c. YEAR OF BIRTH IS 1969 OR LATER -

1 = Yes (A-7)
2 = No (STOP)
3 = Year of birth not entered in A-6.a

d. AGE IN RECORD IS 18 OR LESS

1 = Yes (A-7)
2 = No (STOP)
3 = Age not entered in record

e. THERE IS REASON TO BELIEVE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 18 AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT/EPISODE

1 = Yes
2 = No (STOP)

f. EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER A-6.e

_____

_____

_____

_____

A-7. CASE CLASSIFIED AS INDECENT EXPOSURE, PEEPING TOM, INDECENT PHONE CALL, OR SOME OTHER
SEX-RELATED OFFENSE THAT DID NOT INVOLVE PHYSICAL CONTACT OR ATTEMPTED PHYSICAL CONTACT
WITH THE CHILD (Circle one.)

1 = Yes, case is classified as described above (STOP)
2 = Unclear whether or not case is classified as described above
3 = No, case is not classified as described above

A-8.   CHILD WAS HITCHHIKING WHEN INCIDENT BEGAN

        1 = Yes (B-1)
        2 = Unclear from record
        3 = No

A-9.   THE ENTIRE INCIDENT OCCURRED IN THE CHILD'S HOME OR SOME OTHER PRIVATE (NONINSTITUTIONAL) RESIDENCE

        1 = Yes (STOP)
        2 = Unclear from record
        3 = No

A-10.   THE PERPETRATOR DID SOMETHING TO CONCEAL THE ACTIVITY

        1 = Yes
        2 = Unclear from record
        3 = No (STOP)

PART B. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR VICTIM

B-1.   RACE
        1 = White, Not Hispanic
        2 = American Indian/Alaskan Native
        3 = Asian/Pacific Islander
        4 = Black, Not Hispanic
        5 = Hispanic
        6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
        8 = Unknown
        9 = Not specified in record

B-2.   SEX
        1 = Male
        2 = Female
        9 = Not specified in record

B-3.   DISABLING CONDITIONS

    a.   **Check here** ☐ if record makes no reference to any disability (B-4)

        RECORD SPECIFIES A DISABILITY (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES	NO		
1	2	a.	Developmental disability
1	2	b.	Emotional disturbance
1	2	c.	Learning disability
1	2	d.	Hearing, speech, or sight impairment
1	2	e.	Physical disability
1	2	f.	Other (SPECIFY): _____
1	2	g.	Nature of disabling condition unknown to police
1	2	h.	Nature of disabling condition not specified

    b.   PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF DISABLING CONDITION AS IT IS RECORDED IN RECORD

        _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

B-4.   CHILD WAS A RUNAWAY AT TIME OF INCIDENT
        1 = Yes
        2 = No
        3 = Record indicates child may have been a runaway
        9 = Cannot be determined from record

B-5.   a.   RECORD SPECIFIES CHILD HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
       1   =   Yes
       2   =   No   (B-6)

       b.   TYPE OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY SPECIFIED IN RECORD
       1   =   Prostitution
       2   =   Drug dealing
       3   =   Gang activity
       4   =   Burglary/theft ring
       5   =   Other (SPECIFY): _____

       c.   TIME OF INVOLVEMENT IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
       Check here ☐ if record does not specify when (B-6)

       RECORD SPECIFIES INVOLVEMENT (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
       YES   NO
        1   2   a.   Prior to the incident/episode
        1   2   b.   At the time of the incident/episode
        1   2   c.   Subsequent to the incident/episode

B-6.   CHILD WAS INSTITUTIONALIZED AT TIME OF INCIDENT/EPISODE.
       1   =   Yes
       2   =   No
       9   =   Cannot be determined from record

PART C.   CRIME INFORMATION

C-1.   a.   DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (if single extended episode enter date began. If multiple incidents over time, enter date of most recent incident.)

       |__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (C.1.b.)
         M M   D D   Y Y

       98   =   Unknown
       99   =   Not specified in record

       b.   APPROXIMATE DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (If single extended episode, enter when it began. If multiple incidents over time, enter date of most recent incident. Circle one)
       1   =   Summer 1987
       2   =   Fall 1987
       3   =   Winter 87/88
       4   =   Spring 1988
       5   =   Summer 1988
       6   =   None of the above/date cannot be approximated

C-2.   a.   TIME INCIDENT/EPISODE BEGAN

       |__|__|:|__|__| am/pm (Circle one.)   (C-3)

       98   =   Unknown
       99   =   Not specified in record

       b.   EXACT TIME UNKNOWN, BUT RECORD INDICATES THAT INCIDENT/EPISODE OCCURRED IN (Circle one.)
       1   =   Morning
       2   =   Afternoon
       3   =   Evening
       4   =   Night
       8   =   Unknown
       9   =   Not specified

4

C-3.   REPORTED TO POLICE BY

Check here ☐ if record does not specify (C-4)

RECORD SPECIFIES (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES   NO
  1   2   a. Child's mother
  1   2   b. Child's father
  1   2   c. Babysitter
  1   2   d. Neighbor
  1   2   e. Other relative
  1   2   f. Victim
  1   2   g. Passerby
  1   2   h. Other (SPECIFY): _____

C4.   NARRATIVE DESCRIBING THE CIRCUMSTANCES PERTAINING TO THE INCIDENT/EPISODE. (Include (1) any events leading up to the incident(s). Describe (2) w the abduction was accomplished and how the child was treated while in the custody of the abductor. Also include (3) how the incident ended.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-5. a. MOVEMENT OF THE CHILD (Circle the one that best describes movement of the child, at any time during the course of the incident, that was due to the will and/or plan of the perpetrator.)

1 = Definitely, there was movement of the child
2 = Possibly, there was movement of the child
3 = Definitely, there was no movement of the child (C-6.a)
9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-6.a)

b. EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-5.a (Include (1) where victim was moved from and to and (2) when the movement occurred during the course of the incident. If victim moved more than once, describe each movement. If record indicates exact or approximate distance, enter that information in the space provided at C-5.c.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. DISTANCE (State exact or approximate distance in feet or yards or miles if in record.)

|_|_|_| or |_|_|_| or |_|_|_|
  FT   YDS   MILES

999 = Not specified in record

C-6. a. LURING THE CHILD (Circle the one that best describes whether, at any time during the incident, the perpetrator offered promises or enticements to the victim under false pretenses as a means to impose his/her will on the victim.)

1 = Definitely, there was luring
2 = Possibly, there was luring
3 = Definitely, there was not luring (C-7.a)
9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-7.a)

b. EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-6.a (Include (1) what was promised or offered and/or what the victim expected and (2) what the perpetrator accomplished through luring, e.g., movement, concealment, detention, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. THE LURE (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES	NO	
1	2	a. Falsehood/lies
1	2	b. Money
1	2	c. Candy/toys
1	2	d. Other (SPECIFY): _____
1	2	e. Unknown to the police
1	2	f. Not specified in the record

C-7.　a.　USE OF FORCE OR THREAT (Circle the one that best describes whether physical or verbal force or threat was used against the victim in order to achieve the will/plan of the perpetrator.)

　　　　1　=　Definitely, there was force or threat
　　　　2　=　Possibly, there was force or threat
　　　　3　=　Definitely, there was not force or threat (C-8)
　　　　9　=　The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-8)

　　b.　EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-7.a (Describe (1) the force or threat that was used. Include (2) whether or not it was used to move, conceal, or detain the victim. If there were multiple or extended events involving force or threat (3) describe each event.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

　　c.　MEANS USED TO FORCE OR THREATEN (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES	NO		
1	2	a.	Gun (rifle, pistol, etc.)
1	2	b.	Knife (or blade)
1	2	c.	Other instrument (stick, tree branch, pipe, etc.)
1	2	d.	Strong-arm (fists, hands, feet, etc.)
1	2	e.	Other (SPECIFY): _____

C-8.　LOCATION VICTIM WAS MOVED, LURED, OR FORCED FROM (Circle one location.)

　　01　=　Street (as pedestrian) (C-9)
　　02　=　Child's own home (includes yard) (C-10)
　　03　=　Other home where child was living (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
　　04　=　Other home where child was visiting (e.g., friend, babysitter, relative) (C-10)
　　05　=　Institutional setting (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
　　06　=　Vehicle/car (C-10)
　　07　=　School/day care center (including playground) (C-10)
　　08　=　Shopping area/mall/office building (C-10)
　　09　=　Hotel/boarding house/dormitory (C-10)
　　10　=　Park/amusement area/beach (C-10)
　　11　=　Other (SPECIFY): _____ (C-10)
　　96　=　Victim was not moved, lured, or forced (C-12.a)
　　98　=　Location unknown (C-10)
　　99　=　Record does not specify location (C-10)

C-9.　CHILD'S ACTIVITY WHILE ON STREET

　　01　=　Playing
　　02　=　Walking to or from school/store/friend's
　　03　=　Hitchhiking
　　04　=　Prostitution
　　05　=　Drug dealing
　　06　=　Gang activity
　　07　=　Other activity (SPECIFY): _____
　　98　=　Activity not known to police
　　99　=　Activity not specified in record

C-10.   LOCATION CHILD WAS MOVED, LURED OR FORCED TO (Circle one.)
         01 = Perpetrator's home
         02 = Isolated wooded area or field
         03 = Park/amusement area/beach
         04 = Deserted building
         05 = Parking lot or structure
         06 = Highway/road (child was driven around in vehicle)
         07 = Vehicle (vehicle was not moved)
         08 = Different room in same building where incident began
         09 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
         98 = Unknown
         99 = Record does not specify

C-11.   a.   CONCEALMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether the change in the child's location was for the purpose
              of concealment.

              1 = Definitely, concealment was the purpose
              2 = Possibly, concealment was the purpose
              3 = Definitely, concealment was not the purpose (C-12.a)
              9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-12.a)

         b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-11.a (Include (1) how concealment was achieved, (2) any
              evidence regarding purpose, and (3) when it occurred during the course of the incident.)

              _____

              _____

              _____

              _____

              _____

C-12.   a.   DETAINMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether, at any time during the incident, the victim was confined,
              kept in custody, or prevented from proceeding by the perpetrator.)

              1 = Definitely, there was detainment
              2 = Possibly, there was detainment
              3 = Definitely, there was not detainment (C-13)
              9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-13)

         b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-12.a (Include (1) the form or means of detainment and (2) when
              it occurred during the course of the incident.)

              _____

              _____

              _____

              _____

              _____

              _____

C-13. FORMS OF MALTREATMENT (Circle 1 for all forms of maltreatment the child experienced during the incident.)

Physical abuse:
1   a.   Slapped, pushed, kicked
1   b.   Tied, bound, gagged, locked in small space
1   c.   Beaten/shot/knifed
1   d.   Carried/dragged
1   e.   Other physical abuse (SPECIFY): _____

Physical neglect:
1   f.   Abandoned (left in woods or on street/road)
1   g.   Medical neglect of obvious or known condition
1   h.   Food/water withheld
1   I.   Other physical neglect (SPECIFY): _____

Sexual assault/exploitation:
1   j.   Penetration
1   k.   Genital molestation
1   l.   Unspecified sexual maltreatment
1   m.   Photographed for pornography
1   n.   Other sexual maltreatment (SPECIFY): _____

Emotional abuse/threats:
1   o.   Verbally threatened harm to child
1   p.   Displayed weapons to threaten harm to child
1   q.   Threatened to harm parents without child's cooperation
1   r.   Direct threats to parents (letters, phone calls, etc.)
1   s.   Other emotional abuse/threats (SPECIFY): _____

Other maltreatment:
1   t.   Physically forced to walk from one location to another
1   u.   Moved more than once
1   v.   Other maltreatment not previously specified: _____

Other Crimes: Child was
1   w.   Drugged
1   x.   Robbed
1   y.   Other crime (SPECIFY): _____

Unknown
1   z.   Record does not specify form of maltreatment (C-15)

C-14. DESCRIBE THE FORMS OF MALTREATMENT CIRCLED ABOVE. (Also include (1) the number of times each form of maltreatment occurred and (2) who was involved or present each time.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-15.   a.   CHILD RECEIVED INJURIES AS RESULT OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
            1   =   Yes
            2   =   No (C-16)
            8   =   Unknown to police
            9   =   Record does not specify

      b.   NATURE OF INJURIES (Describe nature of injuries as they are documented in the record.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-16.   CHILD WAS TAKEN TO THE HOSPITAL, CLINIC, ETC. AS RESULT OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
            1   =   Yes
            2   =   No (C-18)
            8   =   Unknown (C-18)
            9   =   Record does not specify (C-18)

C-17.   RESULTS OF HOSPITAL, CLINIC, ETC. VISIT (Circle one.)
            1   =   Child was examined and released (received no treatment)
            2   =   Child received outpatient treatment only
            3   =   Child was admitted to hospital
            8   =   Unknown
            9   =   Record does not specify

C-18. AMOUNT OF TIME ELAPSED. (Record evidence to describe the amount of time from when the incident began until the time of the victim's release/abandonment by the perpetrator. Indicate (1) what you consider to be the start of the incident <u>and</u> the event you consider to be the end of the incident. Provide (2) description of sequence of events that can be used to approximate time. If case involves multiple incidents over an extended time, indicate when the first incident occurred (3). If the record provides total elapsed time in minutes or hours or days, (4) enter that below.)

|_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_|
  MIN   HR   DAYS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-19. INCIDENT/EPISODE TERMINATED WHEN (Circle one.)
1 = Child escaped from perpetrator
2 = Perpetrator released child into custody of authority/guardian
3 = Perpetrator left location where child was (includes fleeing scene)
5 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

_____

8 = Unknown how incident ended
9 = Record does not specify

PART D. DEMOGRAPHICS FOR PERPETRATOR

ANSWER QUES-TIONS FOR EACH PERPETRATOR RECORDED IN A-4.	Perpetrator 1	Perpetrator 2	Perpetrator 3
D-1. DATE OF BIRTH	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 2 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 3 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)
D-2. AGE	|__|__| 98 = Unknown . 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified
D-3. RACE	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-4. SEX	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-5. RESIDENT IN VICTIM'S HOUSEHOLD	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-6. NON RELATIVE ACTED ON BEHALF OF VICTIM'S RELATIVE	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 1 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 2)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 2 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 3)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp.3 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO E-1)

E-1. PERPETRATOR 1 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED.
- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No (E-4)
- 9 = Not specified in record (E-4)

E-2. CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 FOR THIS CRIME.
- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No (E-4)
- 9 = Not specified in record (E-4)

E-3. CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-3.a, E-3.b, E-3.c and E-3.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges (E-4)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-4)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-4)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-3c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-4) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-4) 9 = Not specified (E-4)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-4. PERPETRATOR 1 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED.
- 1 = Yes
- 2 = No (E-6)
- 8 = Unknown (E-6)
- 9 = Not specified in record (E-6)

E-5.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH **PERPETRATOR 1** WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

E-6.   **PERPETRATOR 2** WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED.
1 = Yes
2 = No (E-9)
3 = No second perpetrator involved (STOP)
9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-7.   CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST **PERPETRATOR 2** FOR THIS CRIME.
1 = Yes
2 = No (E-9)
9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-8.   CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST **PERPETRATOR 2** AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT
DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-8.a, E-8.b, E-8.c and E-8.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-9)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-9)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-9) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-9) 9 = Not specified (E-9)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-9.   PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED.
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (E-11)
        8   =   Unknown (E-11)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-11)

E-10.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

        a. _____

        b. _____

        c. _____

E-11.   PERPETRATOR 3 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED (Circle one.)
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (E-14)
        3   =   No third perpetrator involved (STOP)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-14)

E-12.   CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 FOR THIS CRIME (Circle one.)
        1   =   Yes
        2· =   No (E-14)
        9   =   Not specified in record (E-14)

E-13.   CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT
        DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-13.a, E-13.b, E-13.c, and E-13.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-14)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-14)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-14) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-14) 9 = Not specified (E-14)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-14.   PERPETRATOR 3 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED (Circle one.)

   1 = Yes
   2 = No (END)
   8 = Unknown (END)
   9 = Not specified in record (END)

E-15.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 3 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

   a. _____

   b. _____

   c. _____

<div align="center">END</div>

COMMENTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

HOMICIDE

NATIONAL STUDIES OF THE INCIDENCE OF MISSING CHILDREN
POLICE RECORD ABSTRACT FORM

- 1

Abstractor ID |__|__|

Police Record ID |__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|__|—|__|

PART A. SCREENING INFORMATION

A-1.   VICTIM RESIDED IN _____ AT TIME OF INCIDENT
        (CITY & STATE/COUNTY)
        8   =   Residence unknown to police
        9   =   Residence not specified in record

A-2.   NUMBER OF KNOWN, ALLEGED OR SUSPECTED PERPETRATORS INVOLVED IN INCIDENT

        |__|__|
        98   =   Number of perpetrators unknown to police
        99   =   Record does not specify

A-3.   PERPETRATOR'S RELATIONSHIP(S) TO VICTIM (Enter codes from list below.)

        a.   Perpetrator 1 |__|__| (A-3.b)

        b.   Perpetrator 2 |__|__| (A-3.c)

        c.   Perpetrator 3 |__|__| (A-3.d)

01 = Parent	11 = Other "step" relative (e.g., step brother)
02 = Stepparent	12 = Parent's boyfriend/girlfriend
03 = Sibling	13 = Family friend
04 = Aunt/Uncle	14 = Victim's babysitter
05 = Grandparent	15 = Victim's acquaintance/friend
	16 = Victim's employer
	17 = Stranger-known by sight to victim
	18 = Other stranger
	19 = Other (SPECIFY):_____
	20 = No second or third perpetrator
	98 = Perpetrator unknown to police
	99 = Record does not specify relationship

        d.   ONE OR MORE PERPETRATORS ARE CODED 11-19, 98 OR 99 IN A-3.a, A-3.b, OR A-3.c.
             1   =   Yes
             2   =   No (STOP)

A-4.   DATE OF (FIRST) REPORT

a. |__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
      M M   D D   Y Y

b.   DATE BETWEEN 08-01-87 AND 07-31-88, INCLUSIVE
      1 = Yes
      2 = No (STOP)

A-5.   VICTIM'S AGE

a.   DATE OF BIRTH

      |__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__|
      M M   D D   Y Y
      98 = Year of birth unknown
      99 = Year of birth not in records

b.   AGE RECORDED IN RECORD

      |__|__| (Circle one number below to describe this age.)

      1 = Actual age at time of incident
      2 = Actual age at time of report
      3 = Approximate age of victim at time of death
      4 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

c.   YEAR OF BIRTH IS 1969 OR LATER

      1 = Yes (B-1)
      2 = No (STOP)
      3 = Year of birth not entered in A-5.a

d.   AGE IN RECORD IS 18 OR LESS

      1 = Yes (B-1)
      2 = No (STOP)
      3 = Age not entered in record

e.   THERE IS REASON TO BELIEVE THE VICTIM WAS UNDER 18 AT THE TIME OF THE INCIDENT/EPISODE

      1 = Yes
      2 = No (STOP)

f.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER A-5.e

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

      _____

PART B. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR VICTIM

B-1. RACE
1 = White, Not Hispanic
2 = American Indian/Alaskan Native
3 = Asian/Pacific Islander
4 = Black, Not Hispanic
5 = Hispanic
6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
8 = Unknown
9 = Not specified in record

B-2. SEX
1 = Male
2 = Female
9 = Not specified in record

B-3. DISABLING CONDITIONS

a. **Check here** ☐ if record makes no reference to any disability (B-4)

RECORD SPECIFIES A DISABILITY (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)

YES	NO		
1	2	a.	Developmental disability
1	2	b.	Emotional disturbance
1	2	c.	Learning disability
1	2	d.	Hearing, speech, or sight impairment
1	2	e.	Physical disability
1	2	f.	Other (SPECIFY): _____
1	2	g.	Nature of disabling condition unknown to police
1	2	h.	Nature of disabling condition not specified

b. PROVIDE EVIDENCE OF DISABLING CONDITION AS IT IS RECORDED IN RECORD

_____

_____

_____

_____

B-4. CHILD WAS A RUNAWAY AT TIME OF INCIDENT
1 = Yes
2 = No
3 = Record indicates child may have been a runaway
9 = Cannot be determined from record

B-5. a. RECORD SPECIFIES CHILD HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
1 = Yes
2 = No (B-6)

b. TYPE OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY SPECIFIED IN RECORD (Circle one.)
1 = Prostitution
2 = Drug dealing
3 = Gang activity
4 = Burglary/theft ring
5 = Other (SPECIFY): _____

c. TIME OF INVOLVEMENT IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

Check here ☐ if record does not specify when (B-6)

RECORD SPECIFIES INVOLVEMENT WAS (Circle 1 or 2 for each item)

YES	NO		
1	2	a.	Prior to the incident/episode
1	2	b.	At the time of the incident/episode

3

B-6.   CHILD WAS INSTITUTIONALIZED AT TIME OF INCIDENT/EPISODE
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No
        9   =   Cannot be determined from record

PART C. CRIME INFORMATION

C-1.   a. DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (if single extended episode enter date began. If multiple incidents over
            time, enter date of incident resulting in child's death.)

            |__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (C-2)
             M M   D D   Y Y
            98 =   Month and year unknown
            99 =   Month and year not specified in record

        b. APPROXIMATE DATE OF INCIDENT/EPISODE (If single extended episode, enter when it began. If
            multiple incidents over time, enter date of incident resulting in child's death. Circle one)
            1   =   Summer 1987
            2   =   Fall 1987
            3   =   Winter 87/88
            4   =   Spring 1988
            5   =   Summer 1988
            6   =   None of the above/date cannot be approximated

C-2.   a. TIME INCIDENT/EPISODE BEGAN

            |__|__|:|__|__| am/pm (Circle one.)   (C-3)

            98 =   Unknown
            99 =   Not specified in record

        b. EXACT TIME UNKNOWN, BUT RECORD INDICATES THAT INCIDENT/EPISODE OCCURRED IN (Circle one.)
            1   =   Morning
            2   =   Afternoon
            3   =   Evening
            4   =   Night
            8   =   Unknown
            9   =   Not specified

C-3.   REPORTED TO POLICE BY

        Check here [ ] if record does not specify (C-4)
        RECORD SPECIFIES (Circle 1 or 2 for each item.)
        YES   NO
         1   2   a. Child's mother
         1   2   b. Child's father
         1   2   c. Babysitter
         1   2   d. Neighbor
         1   2   e. Other relative
         1   2   f. Victim
         1   2   g. Passerby
         1   2   h. Other (SPECIFY): _____

.4

C-4. PROVIDE A NARRATIVE DESCRIBING THE CIRCUMSTANCES PERTAINING TO THE INCIDENT/EPISODE. (Include (1) any events leading up to the child receiving fatal injuries and the death of the child. Describe (2) how fatal injuries were received. Also include (3) what happened from the time fatal injuries were received until the child was no longer in the custody of the perpetrator.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-10.   LOCATION CHILD WAS MOVED, LURED, OR FORCED TO (Circle one.)

    01 = Perpetrator's home
    02 = Isolated wooded area or field
    03 = Park/amusement area/beach
    04 = Deserted building
    05 = Parking lot or structure
    06 = Highway/road (child was driven around in vehicle)
    07 = Vehicle (vehicle was not moved)
    08 = Different room in same building where incident began
    09 = Other (SPECIFY): _____
    98 = Unknown
    99 = Record does not specify

C-11.   a.   CONCEALMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether the change in the child's location was for the purpose of concealment.)

    1 = Definitely, concealment was the purpose
    2 = Possibly, concealment was the purpose
    3 = Definitely, concealment was not the purpose (C-12.a)
    9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-12.a)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-11.a (Include (1) how concealment was achieved, (2) any evidence regarding purpose, and (3) when it occurred during the course of the incident.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-12.   a.   DETAINMENT (Circle the one that best describes whether, at any time during the incident, the victim was confined, kept in custody, or prevented from proceeding by the perpetrator.)

    1 = Definitely, there was detainment
    2 = Possibly, there was detainment
    3 = Definitely, there was not detainment (C-13)
    9 = The record does not provide sufficient evidence to select one of the above (C-13)

    b.   EVIDENCE FROM RECORD USED TO ANSWER C-12.a (Include (1) the form or means of detainment and (2) when it occurred during the course of the incident.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-13. FORMS OF MALTREATMENT (Circle 1 for all forms of maltreatment the child experienced during the incident, including that causing fatal injuries.)

Physical abuse:
1 a. Slapped, pushed, kicked
1 b. Tied, bound, gagged, locked in small space
1 c. Beaten/shot/knifed
1 d. Carried, dragged
1 e. Other physical abuse (SPECIFY): _____

Physical neglect:
1 f. Abandoned (left in woods or on street/road)
1 g. Medical neglect of obvious or known condition
1 h. Food/water withheld
1 i. Other physical neglect (SPECIFY): _____

Sexual assault/exploitation:
1 j. Penetration
1 k. Genital molestation
1 l. Unspecified sexual maltreatment
1 m. Photographed for pornography
1 n. Other sexual maltreatment (SPECIFY): _____

Emotional abuse/threats:
1 o. Verbally threatened harm to child
1 p. Displayed weapons to threaten harm to child
1 q. Threatened to harm parents without child's cooperation
1 r. Direct threats to parents (letters, phone calls, etc.)
1 s. Other emotional abuse/threats (SPECIFY): _____

Other maltreatment:
1 t. Physically forced to walk from one location to another
1 u. Moved more than once
1 v. Other maltreatment not previously specified: _____

Other Crimes: Child was
1 w. Drugged
1 x. Robbed
1 y. Other crime (SPECIFY): _____

Unknown
1 z. Record does not specify form of maltreatment (C-15)

C-14. DESCRIBE THE FORMS OF MALTREATMENT CIRCLED ABOVE. (Also include (1) the number of times each form of maltreatment occurred and (2) who was involved or present each time.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-15.   a.   INTENT WAS SHOWN TO RANSOM CHILD FOR MONEY, SERVICES, OR GOODS

        1   =   Yes

        2   =   No (C-16)

        8   =   Unknown to police if ransom demanded (C-16)

        9   =   Record does not specify (C-16)

    b.   RANSOM DEMANDS (Describe ransom demands as they appear verbatim in record.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-16.   AMOUNT OF TIME ELAPSED (Record evidence to describe the amount of time from when the incident began until the time of the victim's release/abandonment by the perpetrator. Indicate (1) what you consider to be the start of the incident <u>and</u> the event you consider to be the end of the incident. Provide (2) description of sequence of events that can be used to approximate time. If the record provides total elapsed time in minutes or hours or days, (3) enter that below.)

      |_|_| or |_|_| or |_|_|

       MIN   HR   DAYS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C-17.   INCIDENT/EPISODE TERMINATED WHEN (Circle one.)

        1   =   Child escaped from perpetrator

        2   =   Perpetrator released child into custody of authority/guardian

        3   =   Perpetrator left location where child was (includes fleeing the scene)

        4   =   Child died while in perpetrator's custody (murdered or died as a result of neglect or injuries).

        5   =   Other (SPECIFY): _____

_____

        8   =   Unknown how incident ended

        9   =   Record does not specify

ANSWER QUES-TIONS FOR EACH PERPETRATOR RECORDED IN A-3.	Perpetrator 1	Perpetrator 2	Perpetrator 3
D-1. DATE OF BIRTH	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 2 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)	|__|__|-|__|__|-|__|__| (D-3) MM DD YY 96 = No Perpetrator 3 (E-1) 98 = Year unknown (D-2) 99 = Year not specified (D-2)
D-2. AGE	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified	|__|__| 98 = Unknown 99 = Not specified
D-3. RACE	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = White, Not Hispanic 2 = Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Nat. 3 = Asian/Pacific Islander 4 = Black, Not Hispanic 5 = Hispanic 6 = Other (SPECIFY): _____ 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-4. SEX	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Male 2 = Female 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-5. RESIDENT IN VICTIM'S HOUSEHOLD	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified	1 = Yes 2 = No 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified
D-6. NON RELATIVE ACTED ON BEHALF OF VICTIM'S RELATIVE	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 1 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 2)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp. 2 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO D-1 FOR PERPETRATOR 3)	1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Perp.3 is relative 8 = Unknown 9 = Not specified (GO TO E-1)

PART E. OUTCOMES FOR PERPETRATOR

E-1.   **PERPETRATOR 1 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED** (Circle one.)
    1   =   Yes
    2   =   No (E-4)
    9   =   Not specified in record (E-4)

E-2.   **CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 FOR THIS CRIME** (Circle one.)
    1   =   Yes
    2   =   No (E-4)
    9   =   Not specified in record (E-4)

E-3.   **CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 1 AS A RESULT OF THE
    INCIDENT DESCRIBED** (List charges and answer E-3.a, E-3.b, E-3.c and E-3.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	99 = Record does not specify any charges (E-4)	99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-4)	99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-4)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-3.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-4) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: (E-4) 9 = Not specified (E-4)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM . DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__|or|__|__|or|__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-4.   **PERPETRATOR 1 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED.**
    1   =   Yes
    2   =   No (E-6)
    8   =   Unknown (E-6)
    9   =   Not specified in record (E-6)

E-5. LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH **PERPETRATOR 1** WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

E-6. **PERPETRATOR 2** WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED.
1 = Yes
2 = No (E-9)
3 = No second perpetrator involved **(STOP)**.
9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-7. CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST **PERPETRATOR 2** FOR THIS CRIME (Circle one.)
1 = Yes
2 = No (E-9)
9 = Not specified in record (E-9)

E-8. CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST **PERPETRATOR 2** AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT
DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-8.a, E-8.b, E-8.c and E-8.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify any charges	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-9)	_____ _____ _____ 99 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-9)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one.)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-8.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-9) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-9) 9 = Not specified (E-9)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

E-9.   **PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED.**
      1 = Yes
      2 = No (E-11)
      8 = Unknown (E-11)
      9 = Not specified in record (E-11)

E-10.   **LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH PERPETRATOR 2 WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED**
      a. _____
      b. _____
      c. _____

E-11.   **PERPETRATOR 3 WAS ARRESTED/APPREHENDED.**
      1 = Yes
      2 = No (E-14)
      3 = No third perpetrator involved **(STOP)**
      9 = Not specified in record (E-14)

E-12.   **CHARGES WERE BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 FOR THIS CRIME.**
      1 = Yes
      2 = No (E-14)
      9 = Not specified in record (E-14)

E-13.   **CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST PERPETRATOR 3 AS A RESULT OF THE INCIDENT**
      DESCRIBED (List charges and answer E-13.a, E-13.b, E-13.c, and E-13.d for each charge.)

		Charge 1	Charge 2	Charge 3
a.	DESCRIPTION (Specify)	_____ _____ _____ 98 = Record does not specify any charges (E-14)	_____ _____ _____ 98 = Record does not specify a second charge (E-14)	_____ _____ _____ 98 = Record does not specify a third charge (E-14)
b.	OUTCOME (Circle one)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 2) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 2) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 2)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (CHARGE 3) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (CHARGE 3) 9 = Not specified (CHARGE 3)	1 = Found guilty (E-13.c) 2 = Found not guilty (E-14) 3 = Charge dropped; specify reason: _____ (E-14) 9 = Not specified (E-14)
c.	LENGTH OF SENTENCE	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified
d.	TIME SERVED	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified	|__|__| or |__|__| or |__|__| MM DD YY 99 = Not specified

14

E-14.   **PERPETRATOR 3** WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED.
        1   =   Yes
        2   =   No (END)
        8   =   Unknown (END)
        9   =   Not specified in record (END)

E-15.   LIST ANY CRIMES FOR WHICH **PERPETRATOR 3** WAS PREVIOUSLY CONVICTED

        a. _____

        b. _____

        c. _____

                                    END

        COMMENTS: _____

        _____

        _____

        _____

APPENDIX B

SUM OF BATCHES   Overall of PRS Abstracts

Batch Tot:	865		Raw Rel:	0.80
R-Sample:	138		Gen Rel:	0.89

Pre evaluative Codes: Transcription Sheet--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
FormID	138	0	0	138	1.00	1.00
Residence	137	1	0	138	0.99	0.99
NF Perp	129	9	0	138	0.93	0.93
Rep. Date	137	1	0	138	0.99	0.99
Age	134	2	2	138	0.97	0.99
E-coding	132	3	3	138	0.96	0.98
T-Sheet TOTALS	807	16	5	828	0.97	0.98

Evaluative Codes: Nonfamily Abductions (SA)--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
Detain/attempt	105	28	5	138	0.76	0.79
Force/threat	100	15	23	138	0.72	0.87
Sub. period	98	17	23	138	0.71	0.85
Isolated place	99	16	23	138	0.72	0.86
Authority/perm.	114	1	23	138	0.83	0.99
Taken/attempt	106	26	6	138	0.77	0.80
Force/threat	122	6	10	138	0.88	0.95
Voluntarily	113	20	5	138	0.82	0.85
Authority/perm.	122	7	9	138	0.88	0.95
14 or younger	123	4	11	138	0.89	0.97
Ment. incomp.	126	1	11	138	0.91	0.99
Concealed	87	40	11	138	0.63	0.69
Ransom	114	13	11	138	0.83	0.90
Intent to keep	112	12	14	138	0.81	0.90
Diff. recovery	122	5	11	138	0.88	0.96
Purpose assault	110	17	11	138	0.80	0.87
SA TOTALS	1773	228	207	2208	0.80	0.89

SUM OF BATCHES   Homicide Abstracts

Batch Tot: 202   Raw Rel: 0.87
R-Sample: 32   Gen Rel: 0.95

Pre-evaluative Codes: Transcription Sheet--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
FormID	32	0	0	32	1.00	1.00
Residence	31	1	0	32	0.97	0.97
NF Perp	30	2	0	32	0.94	0.94
Rep. Date	32	0	0	32	1.00	1.00
Age	30	0	2	32	0.94	1.00
E-coding	30	0	2	32	0.94	1.00
T-Sheet TOTALS	185	3	4	192	0.96	0.98

Evaluative Codes: Nonfamily Abductions (SA)--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
Detain/attempt	26	4	2	32	0.81	0.87
Force/threat	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Sub. period	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Isolated place	28	1	3	32	0.88	0.97
Authority/perm.	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Taken/attempt	25	5	2	32	0.78	0.83
Force/threat	28	1	3	32	0.88	0.97
Voluntarily	25	5	2	32	0.78	0.83
Authority/perm.	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
14 or younger	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Ment. incomp.	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Concealed	26	3	3	32	0.81	0.90
Ransom	29	0	3	32	0.91	1.00
Intent to keep	28	1	3	32	0.88	0.97
Diff. recovery	29	1	2	32	0.91	0.97
Purpose assault	27	2	3	32	0.84	0.93
SA TOTALS	445	23	44	512	0.87	0.95

SUM OF BATCHES   Abduction/Missing Person Abstracts
Batch Tot: 366   Raw Rel: 0.76
R-Sample: 59   Gen Rel: 0.84

Pre-evaluative Codes: Transcription Sheet--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
FormID	59	0	0	59	1.00	1.00
Residence	59	0	0	59	1.00	1.00
NF Perp	57	2	0	59	0.97	0.97
Rep. Date	59	0	0	59	1.00	1.00
Age	59	0	0	59	1.00	1.00
E-coding	58	1	0	59	0.98	0.98
T-Sheet TOTALS	351	3	0	354	0.99	0.99

Evaluative Codes: Nonfamily Abductions (SA)--

	#A	#D	#C	Total	Raw Rel	Gen Rel
Detain/attempt	43	15	1	59	0.73	0.74
Force/threat	37	10	12	59	0.63	0.79
Sub. period	43	4	12	59	0.73	0.91
Isolated place	41	6	12	59	0.69	0.87
Authority/perm.	47	0	12	59	0.80	1.00
Taken/attempt	42	15	2	59	0.71	0.74
Force/threat	51	3	5	59	0.86	0.94
Voluntarily	50	8	1	59	0.85	0.86
Authority/perm.	52	4	3	59	0.88	0.93
14 or younger	53	3	3	59	0.90	0.95
Ment. incomp.	55	1	3	59	0.93	0.98
Concealed	24	32	3	59	0.41	0.43
Ransom	43	10	6	59	0.73	0.81
Intent to keep	43	10	6	59	0.73	0.81
Diff. recovery	49	3	7	59	0.83	0.94
Purpose assault	42	14	3	59	0.71	0.75
SA TOTALS	715	138	91	944	0.76	0.84

Countability Rules for Non-family Abduction Definitions

NFA1 -- Broad Scope and Policy Focal

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1)
- Child was taken by a non-family member

  AND

- Perpetrator used force or threat to take child

  AND

- Perpetrator took child without lawful authority or parental permission

OR

(2)
- Child was detained by a non-family member

  AND

- Perpetrator used force or threat to detain child

  AND

- Perpetrator detained child for a substantial period

  AND

- Perpetrator detained child in an isolated place,

  AND

- Perpetrator detained child without lawful authority or parental permission

<u>NFA2</u> -- Broad Scope and Policy Focal

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1)
- Child was 14 years old or younger

  OR

- Child was under 18 years old and child was mentally incompetent

AND

(2)
- Child was taken by a non-family member

  OR

- Child voluntarily accompanied a non-family member

  OR

- Child was detained against the parents will by a non-family member

AND

(3) Child was taken/went away with/detained without lawful authority or parental permission

AND

(4)
- Perpetrator concealed child's whereabouts

  OR

- Perpetrator requested ransom, goods, or services

  OR

- Perpetrator expressed an intention to keep child permanently

<u>NFA3</u> -- Broad Scope and Policy Focal

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1) { Child was taken by a non-family member

OR

Child voluntarily accompanied a non-family member

AND

(2) Perpetrator had the apparent purpose of assaulting the child

<u>NFAPUB</u> -- "Public" Definition

To be countable under this definition, the case must:

(1) { Count under definition NFA1

OR

Count under definition NFA2

OR

Count under definition NFA3

AND

(2) { Perpetrator detained child overnight

OR

Perpetrator transported child at least 50 miles

OR

Perpetrator killed child

ANFA1 -- Attempted Abduction

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1)
- Non-family member tried to take child

  AND

- Perpetrator used force or threat to try to take child

  AND

- Perpetrator tried to take child without lawful authority or parental permission

OR

(2)
- Non-family member tried to detain child

  AND

- Perpetrator used force or threat to try to detain child

  AND

- Perpetrator tried to detain child in an isolated place

  AND

- Perpetrator tried to detain child without lawful authority or parental permission

ANFA2 -- Attempted Abduction

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1) { Child was 14 years old or younger

OR

Child was under 18 years old and child was mentally incompetent }

AND

(2) { Non-family member tried to take child

OR

Non-family member tried to get child to voluntarily accompany him/her

OR

Non-family member tried to detain child against the parents' will }

AND

(3) Perpetrator tried to take/go away with/detain child without lawful authority or parental permission

AND

(4) { Perpetrator concealed or tried to conceal child's whereabouts

OR

Recovery of the child would have been difficult }

<u>ANFA3</u> -- Attempted Abduction

It is "very probable" or "probable" that:

(1)
    Non-family member tried to take child

    OR

    Non-family member tried to get child to voluntarily accompany him/her

AND

(2)
    Perpetrator attempted to conceal the taking or whereabouts of the child

    OR

    Perpetrator had the apparent purpose of assaulting the child