

82272 U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Rebecca A. Maynard

A.

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

U.S. Department of Labor/ Employment & Training Administration

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Authors:

-

1

1

1

FF

Jennifer Schore Mathematica Policy Research

Rebecca Maynard Mathematica Policy Research

Irving Piliavin University of Wisconsin

This paper is based, in part, on research funded by and conducted on behalf of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation under its contract with MPR to carry out, with the University of Wisconsin's Institute for Research on Poverty, major aspects of the evaluation of the national demonstration of Supported Work. Funding for this national demonstration comes from a number of federal agencies, but is channeled through the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, as the lead federal agency, under Grant No. 33-36-75-01 and Contract Nos. 30-36-75-01 and 30-34-75-02. Researchers undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their professional judgments freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not. necessarily represent the official position or policy of the federal government or the sponsors of the demonstration.

NCJRS

MAN . G.T.

A Constant and the second

THE ACCURACY OF SELF-REPORTED ARREST DATA

May 15, 1979

This report was prepared as part of MPR's contract with the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation to carry out, with the University of Wisconsin's Institute for Research on Poverty, major aspects of the evaluation of the national demonstration of Supported Work. Rob Hollister is the Principal Investigator and Valerie Leach is the Project Director for the evaluation component of the demonstration.

Funding for this national demonstration comes from a number of federal agencies, but is channeled through the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, as the lead federal agency, under Grant No. 33-36-75-01 and Contract Nos. 30-36-75-01 and 30-34-75-02. Researchers undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their professional judgments freely. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the federal government or the sponsors of the demonstration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

Ι

II

III

ĪV

Appendices

А

В

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS .	7
SOURCES OF RESPONSE ERROR CONCERNING NUMBER	
OF ARRESTS	12
CONCLUSION	18

ARREST RECO	ORD	TRA	ANS(CRI	PTI	ION	S	HEET	ſS	•	•,	•	.•	•	20
ADDITIONAL	TAI	BLES	5	• •	•	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•,	24
REFERENCES	• •	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	29

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Distribution of the Sample	9
2	Characteristics of the Sample at Enrollment	11
3	Estimated Regression Coefficients	13
B-1	Allocation of Sample by Length of Follow-up Data .	25
в-2	Descriptive Statistics for Arrests \ldots \ldots	26

Figure

B-1

B-2

 Freque

Freque

LIST OF FIGURES

						Page
ency	of	Pre-Enrollment Response Error		•	•	27
ency	of	Post-Enrollment Response Error	•	•	•	28

I. INTRODUCTION

During the past decade, increasing emphasis has been placed on conducting social experiments and demonstrations to determine the economic and social effects of various public policies and programs. In such experiments, social science research has had to rely more heavily on data collected through personal interviews; consequently, it has become imperative that researchers be concerned with the veracity of such data. Furthermore, researchers must determine not only the overall accuracy of the data, but also the factors that significantly influence data quality. In particular, knowledge of the determinants of response error can be critical in evaluations of experimental programs: if participation in a program is itself a significant influence on response error, and if adjustment for this fact is not made, then the conclusions based on experimental/control comparisons may be invalid.

The causes of response error vary. In general, response error may stem from faulty recall, misunderstanding, or a desire on the part of the respondent to give the interviewer the "right" but not necessarily the true responses. When the interview involves sensitive material such as questions concerning criminal activity, the respondent might intentionally misreport information because of embarrassment, for purposes of selfaggrandizement, because he or she mistrusts the interviewers, or because he or she is concerned about the eventual destination of the interview statements. However, among individuals enrolled in an experimental program, participants, relative to controls, may be more prone to under-report criminal activity for fear of being asked to leave the program or because

1

On the other hand, participants may report more accurately because their participation in the treatment program has given them more self-confidence and a more stable life-style. While the use of official records to verify data is not a new idea, most studies have analyzed reporting errors primarily with respect to earnings, welfare receipt, or medical history, rather than with respect to the more sensitive fields of drug use or criminal behavior. In 1940 the Division of Research of the Work Projects Administration compared information from public records with interview data on relief history. They found that respondents accurately answered such general questions as whether they had been on welfare, but were much less accurate on specific items such as dates (Bancroft, 1940). In 1965, the National Center for Health Statistics compared physicians' records with interviews and found under-reporting of various aspects of medical history despite the fact that respondents seemed perfectly willing to discuss their illnesses (NCHS, 1965). A 1966 comparison of self-reported earnings data and umemployment compensation records revealed that sex, age, education, and the amount of reported earnings significantly affected response error (Borus, 1966). These examples are just a few of the many response-error studies involving earnings, welfare, and medical history. However, validity studies in the field of criminal activity are less numerous, perhaps because of the difficulties in obtaining police records and the lack of comparability among these records across different jurisdictions. The specific goals of these studies have varied, as have their results:

they have more of a sense of what responses are "expected" of them.

2

- One such study involved fifty-nine individuals who had been involuntary patients (i.e., federal prisoners) at the U.S. Public Health Hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, between 1935 and 1962. Arrest data collected during personal interviews with the patients were compared with FBI records. The results of the study showed that the sample was approximately evenly divided among accurate reports, over-reports, and under-reports of the number of times the respondent had been arrested, and that under-reporting was due primarily to the omission of minor offenses. (Ball, 1967)
- In an evaluation of a prison work-release program, criminal records for a sample of 641 ex-prisoners were compared with interview data on criminal activity. The finding was that "many of the men in the sample claimed substantially fewer contacts with the criminal justice system than they actually had." (Witte, 1975)
- To supplement an evaluation of the Wildcat Supported Work program for ex-addicts and ex-offenders, the Vera Institute of Justice compared New York City police records with self-reports on arrests for 531 individuals. They found that both participants and controls under-reported arrests by approximately 30 percent. (Vera Institute of Justice, 1975)
- Wyner (1976) analyzed response errors in self-reports of arrests by using a sample of seventy-nine individuals interviewed by the Vera Institute. He found that, on average, response error was negligible, and that most of the variation in error could be explained by the official number of arrests, which in turn contained components reflecting the time since the individual's first arrest and personal motivation to commit crimes.
- Interview and official data from a 1972 study of delinquency in Philadelphia were used to analyze possible correlations among the misreporting of nine measures of arrest history. In addition to a high degree of correlation among measurements of error, the results showed that general information (such as the total number of arrests) was reported more accurately than more specific information (such as the type of charge for an arrest). (Bridges, 1976)
- In an attempt to discover whether the disproportionately high representation of blacks in official statistics on arrest for such crimes as rape, robbery, and assault might be caused by differential involvement or by bias in the administrative practices of the judicial system, Hindelang (1978) compared official data and self-reported data on

criminal activity with a third source--the National Crime Panel, a national survey of victims of crimes. Selfreported data usually indicated equal participation of blacks and whites in crime. He found that the victimization data corroborated the official records rather than the self-reports of criminal activity.

affects response reliability.

Each of these studies identified the existence of response error in self-reports of arrest activity. However, only Wyner addressed the combined issue of the magnitude and the source of error. Further, only the Vera Institute analyzed the effect of program participation on response error, and their analysis was limited only to a simple comparison of misreporting between participants and controls. We are in the unique position of being able to confront all three problems: (1) identifying the magnitude of response error; (2) isolating significant sources of variability in response error; and (3) in particular, investigating whether participation in some type of "treatment program" significantly

The interview data used in this study are derived from the evaluation of the national Supported Work demonstration. Supported Work provides work experience under close supervision, peer-group support, and graduated performance standards, which are intended to help individuals with employment problems make the transition to an unsubsidized job after twelve to eighteen months of program experience. Further, a related goal of the program is to reduce criminal activity.

The demonstration programs enrolled individuals from four target groups (long-term female recipients of AFDC, ex-addicts, ex-offenders, and young school dropouts). In the ten sites involved in the evaluation,

eligible applicants for the program were assigned randomly to either an experimental or control group. Those assigned to the experimental group were given the opportunity to participate in Supported Work.

Using information collected in personal interviews with experimental and control-group members, the impact of Supported Work on various measures of behavior (including employment, welfare receipt, drug use, and criminal activity) is being evaluated. The tests of whether the program significantly influenced these measures may be valid even if the magnitude of the estimated effects is in error, as long as the responses of experimentals and controls contain the same percentage of error. However, in the presence of differential misreporting, the tests of program effects will be biased, and some methods to correct this bias must be used.

This study has two main objectives: to determine the accuracy of self-reported data on criminal activity, and to identify factors that may influence the accuracy of these data. Program participation is a factor of particular interest. Arrests were chosen as an indicator of criminal activity, rather than convictions, incarceration, or admitted crime commission (all of which were available in the interviews), because they can easily be verified through police records. Furthermore, while individuals may be arrested for some crimes they did not commit and may not be arrested for some they did, the number of arrests provides, on average, a reasonable lower bound for criminal activity (Blumstein, 1978). Convictions do not necessarily reflect the seriousness of the crime committed because of plea-bargaining and unsubstantiated evidence. Moreover, because of the length of time needed to adjudicate arrests (especially for se observation period are not centralize more difficult to data. Similarly, thus are not usefu The result of arrest indicate experimentals and arrested, and (2) no significant dif major factors that the number of arre was administered w the respondent.

Chapter II of this report describes the data collection techniques and sample for this study. Chapter III discusses the extent and sources of response error in reporting the total number of arrests incurred since enrollment, as well as the number of arrests for such specific types of crimes as robbery and drug-related offenses. Chapter IV contains concluding remarks. Included in the appendices are the forms used for coding the official data, as well as additional summary tables.

5

(especially for serious cases), convictions may not occur during the observation period, thus biasing the results. Incarceration records are not centralized in the same manner as arrest records and are thus more difficult to compile. They also have the same drawbacks as conviction data. Similarly, admissions of crime commission are not verifiable and thus are not useful for our purposes.

The results of this analysis of self-reports and official records of arrest indicate that, after enrolling in Supported Work, both experimentals and controls under-reported (1) whether they had been arrested, and (2) their total number of arrests. However, there was no significant difference in misreporting between the two groups. The major factors that were significantly related to response error were the number of arrests recorded on the police records, whether an interview was administered while the respondent was in prison, and the race of

II. DATA COLLECTION AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

This study uses data from two sources: interviews administered to a subsample of experimentals and controls in the national Supported Work demonstration, and their official police arrest records. The sample for this study includes 434 individuals enrolled in the ex-offender and ex-addict target groups of the Oakland and San Francisco Supported Work programs, and 340 individuals enrolled in the ex-offender target group of the Hartford program. Data from police records were collected for the Oakland and San Francisco samples in August 1977 and for the Hartford sample in October 1978.

An interview (referred to as the "baseline") was administered to experimentals and controls when they enrolled in the demonstration. $\frac{1}{}$ In this interview, respondents were asked about their employment and arrest history, their use of heroin and other drugs, and their basic demographic characteristics. Follow-up interviews were administered at nine-month intervals for up to three years after enrollment, and included questions on the number of arrests and type of charge on the three most recent arrests in the previous nine months. $\frac{2}{}$ Sixteen respondents had 27 months of post-enrollment data, 165 had 18 months, and 364 had only 9 months, yielding a total of 545 observations for analysis of postenrollment data.3/

 $\frac{1}{2}$ Only 13 of the 774 sample members did not complete the baseline interview. These 13 persons have been dropped from the analysis.

 $\frac{2}{0}$ of this sample, only eight follow-up interviews showed more than three arrests, indicating only a small loss of information on type of charge.

 $\frac{3}{\text{See}}$ Appendix Table B-1 for a distribution, by site, of the follow-up interviews used in the analysis. The distribution includes some observations deleted from analysis because of missing data.

7

 $\frac{1}{2}$ The interviewers were selected on the basis of both their interviewing skill and their ability and willingness to conduct field searches for respondents in the follow-up period.

 $\frac{2}{1}$ It is likely that these individuals were arrested outside the jurisdictions canvassed, since recent incarceration as a result of conviction was a program eligibility requirement.

In all interviews, questions about criminal activity were asked at the end of the interview, which took between thirty-five and forty-five minutes to complete. While many interviews took place in the interviewing offices, a substantial number were also administered in such other places as the respondent's home or in prison. $^{\perp/}$

The criminal records for the Oakland and San Francisco respondents were gathered by a California Department of Corrections employee who was trained and supervised by a member of the MPR Survey Division staff. The required data were coded onto forms on which the number of pre-enrollment and post-enrollment arrests, the arrest dates, and associated charges for the last eight post-enrollment arrests were recorded. In Hartford, the state police records were transcribed onto forms by two members of the MPR Survey Division staff. The Hartford coding forms were similar to those used in California, but allowed for descriptions of sixteen postenrollment arrests. (Copies of the forms appear in Appendix A.) No criminal history record could be located for forty-eight individuals; in these cases the completed form simply indicated that there were no recorded arrests for either the pre- or post-enrollment periods. $\frac{2}{}$

Table 1 shows the breakdown of the sample by target group and site. Ex-offenders comprise 89 percent of the sample. The remainder are ex-addicts, who were enrolled in Oakland. At most Supported Work sites, an equal percentage of enrollees were randomly assigned to the

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	
Sample	Total	Experimentals	Controls
Total	761	347	414
Target Group			
Ex-addict_	85	45	40
Ex-offender	676	302	374
Site			
Hartford	332	126	206
Oakland	263	135	128
San Francisco	166	86	80

 $\frac{a}{A11}$ of the ex-addicts were enrolled at the Oakland site.

9

experimental) positions.

Selected characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 2. This sample is similar to the full samples of ex-addicts and ex-offenders enrolled in the national Supported Work demonstration with respect to age, sex, and marital status. $\frac{1}{4}$ However, the percent of the sample who are black is about 15 points lower. The sample also differs from the overall ex-offender and ex-addict groups in their reported drug use and criminal histories. For example, 36 percent of this sample reported being regular users of heroin at the time of enrollment in the program, as compared with 58 percent of the larger demonstration sample. $\frac{2}{}$ Forty percent of the sample were on probation or parole at enrollment, compared with approximately 35 percent in the larger sample. These differences can be attributed, at least in part, to the higher representation of ex-offenders in this sample.

experimental or control groups. In Hartford, however, 60 percent were randomly assigned to the control group and 40 percent were randomly assigned to the experimental group, in order to accommodate an unexpectedly high application rate for a predetermined number of program (i.e.,

$\frac{1}{2}$ See, for example, Jackson et al. (1979).

 $\frac{2}{\text{Regular use}}$ is defined as having used heroin almost every day or more frequently for at least two months.

TABLE 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE AT ENROLLMENT

	1 		
Characteristic	Total	California	Hartford
Sex			
Male	92%	90%	95%
Female	8	10	5
Age			
Mean Age (in years)	26.1	26.7	25.2
Race			
White	. 15%	16%	14%
Black	64	68	58
Hispanic	20	14	27
Other	1	2	1
Marital Status			
Currently Married	15%	19%	11%
Never Married	. 64	57	73
Other	21	24	16
Parole Status			
On Parole	41%	478	34%
Not on Parole	59	53	66
Probation Status			
On Probation	38%	478	27%
Not on Probation	62	53	73
Regular Use of Heroin			
Regular User	36%	36%	36%
Not Regular User	64	64	64
Weeks in Jail Last 2 Years			
Mean Number of Weeks	50.3	49.0	52.0
Number in Sample	761	429	332

 $\frac{a}{When}$ this sample was restricted to the 545 observations that were used in the analysis of post-enrollment data, the distributions were quite similar to those above.

11

III. SOURCES OF RESPONSE ERROR CONCERNING NUMBER OF ARRESTS In order to discover specific sources of response error, ordinary least squares regression was used to estimate models which hypothesized that response error regarding arrests was a linear function of demographic characteristics, experimental status, prior criminal history, and official data on arrests. $\frac{1}{2}$ The following measures of arrest activity were constructed from the available data to aid in the analysis: the number of arrests on the police records, the number of self-reported arrests, and the difference between the two. Positive values of this difference imply under-reporting; negative values imply over-reporting. These three measures were constructed for both the pre-enrollment and post-enrollment periods. It should be noted that for the post-enrollment variable, the number of arrests from the police records includes only those arrests that occurred during the time periods covered by the post-enrollment interviews. The major regression results are summarized in Table 3. (See Appendix Table B-2 and Figures B-1 and B-2 for non-regression-adjusted arrest statistics.) We will discuss only those effects that were significant at least at the .05 level using a two-tailed test. Adjusted means and estimated coefficients will be used to interpret regression results.

 $\frac{1}{Pre-}$ and post-enrollment arrest statistics indicated that the respondents in California and Hartford might have represented two distinct populations. However, a test comparing regression models for the two separately with the model for the pooled sample suggested that pooling the samples was acceptable.

TABLE 3

ESTIMATED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS

(MEAN VALUES OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES IN PARENTHESES)

4. 			Response a	error in		
	Response en # Pre-enrollmer (Records-Int	ror 1A 11 arrests 1erviews)	Response arror in # Post-enrollment arrests (Records-Interviews)			
ndependent Variables		((6)	150	(.48)		
xperimental	057	(.40)	-,005	(.90)		
x-offender	369	(16)	093	(.35)		
Dakland	407	(.38)	.135	(.41)		
lartford	293	(26 0)	.002	(25.9)		
ge	151**	(20.0)	220	(.93)		
(ale	1.520	(15)	~.292**	(.13)		
<i>i</i> hite	903	(.12)	044	(.69)		
llack	515	(.35)	041	(.35)		
legular Use of Heroin	-2.922**	(75)	.074	(.75)		
Probation/Parole	001	(50.0)	.000	(48.7)		
Weeks in jail 2 yrs. prior	.007		- 102	(. 33)		
Two or 3 follow-up interviews			~.103	(0.2)		
# pre-enrollment arrests	, 524**	(9.4)	010	15.11		
<pre># pre-enrollment arrests: records-interviews</pre>			.003	(3.4) (1.1)		
* post-enrollment arrests: records	1/					
<pre># post-enrollment arrests with rothery main: records</pre>	_		.140*	(.12)		
<pre># post-enrollment arrests with other property main: records</pre>			020	(.19)		
<pre># post-enrollment arrests with burglary price records</pre>			161	(.07)		
# post-enrollment arrests with person main: records	1 1 1		027	(.04)		
# post- enrollment arrests with murder/			.031	(.06)		
# post-enrollment arrests with drug main: records			.295**	(.12)		
# Erasures			. 377**	(.17)		
Interview in prison			382**	(.14)		
Status Interactions		14 -	- 002	14.31		
<pre># Pre-enrollment arrests: records</pre>	.073	(4.4)	002	()		
Ex-offender	370	(10)	. 105	(.19		
Oakland	. 579	(12)	- 122	(.16)		
Hartford	. 534	(-12)	- • 1 4 min	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
Weeks in jail (2 yrs. pre-enrollment)	020	(23.3)	199	(.05		
# Erasures			• • • •	,		
Other Interactions		•				
≥ 2 follcw-up X			050	(.56		
# post-enrollment arrests: record						
Dependent variable mean	3.411	•	, 549			
Sample Size	710		545			
2 uncorrectad	.220		.724			
	.201		.709	1. I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		
X COLIZCION	11.462**	1	46.678**			

*Statistically significant at the .10 level.

**Statistically significant at the .05 level.

L'Arrests were categorized by their main (i.e., most costly) charge. In California the hierarchy from most costly to least costly was as follows: robbery, other property offense, personal offense, drug offense, and other offense. In Hartford the hierarchy was robbery, burglary, murder and aggravated assault, drug offense, and other offense.

Pre-enrollment arrest figures include all arrests between the respondent's eighteenth birthday and the date of enrollment in the Supported Work demonstration. On average, individuals tended to overreport whether they had been arrested and to under-report the number of arrests. Ninety percent had at least one arrest on their police records, but 95 percent reported at least one arrest in the interviews. This apparent over-reporting can be partially explained by respondents having been arrested outside of the police jurisdictions canvassed or having mistaken an encounter with the police for an arrest. On the other hand, the mean number of arrests on the records was approximately nine, while individuals reported an average of six arrests in the interviews. Errors in reporting the number of pre-enrollment arrests were significantly affected by the respondent's age, whether he or she used heroin regularly prior to enrollment, and the number of officially .recorded adult arrests prior to enrollment. Other things being equal, older respondents tended to report more accurately than younger respondents, and regular users of heroin under-reported only one-third as much as nonregular users. The number of official arrests was positively related to the extent of under-reporting. Experimental status, target group, site, whether the respondent was on probation or parole at the time of enrollment, race, sex, and pre-enrollment incarceration did not show any statistically significant influence on response error. During the post-enrollment period, there was general underreporting of the incidence of arrest. On average, respondents underreported the number of their post-enrollment arrests by .55, or 48 percent of the official number. The response error for post-enrollment

arrests was found to be significantly related to race, the official number of arrests (particularly arrests for drug offenses), the number of expunged arrests on a respondent's record, $\frac{1}{2}$ and whether the respondent received a follow-up interview in prison. On average, white respondents under-reported only one-half as much as black and Spanish-speaking respondents. As with pre-enrollment response error, a greater number of official arrests were associated with greater under-reporting. Those with arrests in which drug offenses were the main charge exhibited still greater under-reporting, possibly because respondents regarded drug arrests as relatively minor and, therefore, failed to report them. Similarly, respondents with a higher number of expunged arrests underreported more, suggesting that at least some erasures were excluded from self-reports. Finally, individuals to whom at least one follow-up interview was administered while they were in prison under-reported by .22 arrests, while those who received no interviews in prison underreported by .60.

Factors that had no significant impact on response error in the post-enrollment period included experimental status, $\frac{2}{2}$ age, regular

 $\frac{1}{2}$ It is possible that an arrest can be erased as the result of a successful probation period. The Connecticut police files maintained a record of whether a particular post-enrollment arrest had been erased; the California files did not. At the onset of the analysis, there was a question of whether expunged arrests should be included in the official numbers. Primarily because preliminary cross-tabulations did not suggest a clear exclusion of expunged arrests in respondents' reports, the erasures were included in the official counts. Thus, the number of erasures was included as an independent variable in post-enrollment equations.

^{2/}This estimate indicating a nonsignificant relationship between experimental status and response error is independent of any confounding influence of experimental status on the number of post-enrollment arrests. To estimate the total effect of experimental status on official arrest rates, and to compare this effect with the effect of experimental status use of heroin prior to enrollment, and pre-enrollment response error, among others. Respondents' reported feelings about the relative desirability of certain types of crimes were also considered as an explanatory variable, but were found to have no significant effect. In addition, some tests were carried out on the linearity of the effect of the number of official arrests, but the hypothesis of the simple linear relation assumed in the model could not be rejected. Finally, although there was no significant overall influence of experimental status on response error, a question still arose as to whether significant experimental effects existed within certain subpopulations of supported workers. Groups were differentially categorized according to number of arrests (as measured by official records), number of follow-up interviews, and pre-enrollment characteristics such as incarceration, job training, work experience, use of heroin, and drugtreatment participation. No significant experimental-control difference in reporting was found within any of these subgroups.

Because robbery is a costly crime to society and drug offenses were quite prevalent among Supported Work ex-offenders and ex-addicts, sources of response error in reporting these crimes are of particular interest. The overall sample under-reported robbery arrests in the postenrollment period by .05 (or 41 percent of the official number of robberies). Once again, the extent of under-reporting was positively

on self-reported arrest rates, both official arrests and self-reported arrests were regressed on status and various demographic characteristics. The results indicated that experimental status had no statistically significant effect on official arrests or self-reported arrests, nor were these nonsignificant effects different from each other.

related to the number of robberies on the record. Respondents who received a follow-up interview in prison tended to over-report the number of robbery arrests, while those who did not tended to underreport. On average, the sample under-reported drug arrests by .07 (or 57 percent). Significant influences on response error of this type were the official number of drug arrests and other nonrobbery property arrests (both of which were positively associated with under-reporting) as well as the number of pre-enrollment arrests (which was inversely related to under-reporting).

Response error was prevalent for every measure of arrest history considered in this analysis; however, in no case did experimental status contribute significantly to this error. When reporting on the period between their eighteenth birthday and their enrollment in Supported Work, interview respondents, relative to their official police records, overstated whether they had been arrested by approximately 5 percentage points, but understated the number of arrests by approximately 3 arrests-one-third of the official number. This response error can be explained in part by the length of the analysis period. Some of the over-reporting may be due to respondents having been arrested outside the jurisdictions canvassed or having mistaken an arbitrary police encounter for an arrest; some of the under-reporting may have been due to a faulty recall of the exact number of arrests, despite a willingness to admit arrest. Following enrollment in Supported Work, respondents tended to under-report both whether they had been arrested and their number of arrests (the latter by an average of .55 arrests, or 48 percent of the official number). Because experimental status was not a significant factor in explaining response error, we conclude that tests of whether Supported Work significantly influenced participants' frequency of arrest will be valid even though the estimated experimental-control differences will underestimate the true differences. Factors that significantly affected response error were the following:

IV. CONCLUSION

- The number of arrests on the police records (particularly arrests for drug offenses), which were positively related to under-reporting
- Whether the respondent received a follow-up interview in prison, which was associated with more accurate reporting
- The number of arrests that had been erased from police records, which was positively related to under-reporting
- The respondent's race (on average, whites under-reported only half as much as black and Spanish-speaking respondents)

As privacy legislation becomes more widespread and official records more difficult to obtain, researchers will have to rely increasingly on self-reported data despite their possible inaccuracies. In particular, social scientists trying to examine the effects of a treatment program will be faced with the question of whether participation in the treatment itself is a source of response error. This study has been particularly useful for the evaluation of the Supported Work demonstration, and is also of more general interest to the extent that it contributes to the limited body of knowledge about the accuracy of self-reported data on arrests.

APPENDIX A

ARREST RECORDS TRANSCRIPTION SHEETS





4 5

CALIFORNIA CODING FORM CRIMINAL HISTORY FROM OFFICIAL RECORDS MPRI # 569 SITE: CODING DATE: RECORD DATE: SWPI # 169 TARGET GROUP: MO P=2 IH C=1 DATE OF ASSIGNMENT: BIRTHDATE: (ENROLLMENT) (From MPR) MO DA YR YR MO DA BINTHDATE: (From Record) MO DΛ YR WAS FOLLOWING PROVIDED TO AGENCY BY MPR? IF YES: NOW DID AGENCY INFORMATION MATCH MPR INFORMATION PRE-ENROLLMENT DATA (CIRCLE "YES" OR "NO" FOR EACH) TOTAL # OF PRE-ENROLLMENT ARRESTS . YES NO (After 18th Birthday) a. NAME POSSIBLE MATCH 2 TOTAL # OF PRE-ENROLLMENT CONVICTIONS 1 0 NO .MATCH 1 NO AGENCY INFORMATION . . . 0 b. BIRTHDATE YES NO POSSIBLE MATCH 2 1 0 NO MATCH 1 NO AGENCY INFORMATION . . . 0 P # C. SOCIAL SECURITY YES NO MATCH 3 NUHDER POSSIBLE MATCH 2 NO MATCH 1 NO AGENCY INFORMATION . . . 0 1 0

with a the second the second second

22

the second



1 . ÷ TOTAL # OF POST-DATE OF ENROLLMENT POST-ENROLLMENT DATA ENROLLMENT ARRESTS: NC ABBESTS SHOCE LEURALAUST CHANGE CODE CONVICTION CODE GENTENCE (HANGES : (Xi FelY CONVICTION YES H YES 160 DK (Begin YES 1 I. Frison 1. Buttery i i. Robbery 1 0 1 O DK 0 with most 2. Jail 1 0 DK recent) 2. Property {Other than robbery} (Other than Lubbery) - i 0 1 0 J. YouLk Authority 1 0 UK 1 1848°T 81886. . 488 *120 10 TUTAL* 4. Prototion 1 0 DK DAY YEAR 3. Permon 1 0 3. Parson 1 0 5. Suspended Best cuto 1 O DK 4. Orug 4. prug 1 0 1 0 6. Fine t o uk 5. Othur Other {Specify} 5. Other 1 0 J O 1 O DK ----. 23 YES 1 I. Rotherry 1 0 1. Коррена 1 0 1. Prison 1 0 11 2. Jali 1 0 .04 2. Property 1 0 (Other then roldery 2. Property (Other than robbery) 10 0 1 0 3. Youth Authority 1 0 DK . 2 · • • • 1841'T KIKAL . DE 190 TO TRIALA 4. Probation 1 0 11K DAX. YEAR 1916711 3. Fernon 1 0 3. Person 1 0 5. Suspended Sentence 1 0 105 4. prug 1 0 4. Drug 1 0 . 6. Fine I D IVK 5. ather 5. Other 1 0 7. Other (Specify) 1 0 1 0 DK - (F)

ī

Blocks repeated for remaining 6 arrests

X

F

' **-** .

.....

2 5

Pa

		·
	* trice a de-	
	A CONTRACTOR OF	
13 C 4 4		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
THIAL		
YCS 1		
IK3 0		
*GO 10 NEKT		
ARBEST-		
(###*T KIX)H DK		
Allikizit*		
YES		
#9 0		
144 1 NIGH UK		
ur.e. 1		
11.5		
IN) 0		
PRIJET*		
PARTY KING DK		
ARRIST.		
1. Sec. 1. Sec		
¥6.5 I		
10 0		
1-11 ¹ 17 1 1844 (N		
age 2		
	·	۲
es a service de la sérvice de la service		

Baseline only Baseline, 9-mont Baseline, 9-mont Baseline, 9-mont 27-month Baseline, 18-mon Baseline, 27-mon Baseline, 9-mont Baseline, 18-mon Total <u>a/smaller</u> from missing data

41

T

. Ji

APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL TABLES

24

TABLE B-1

ALLOCATION OF SAMPLE BY

LENGTH OF FOLLOW-UP DATA A

	Oakland	
	San Francisco	Hartford
	98	80
th	254	97
th, 18-month	68	101
th, 18-month,		
	0	16
nth	9	29
nth	0	1
th, 27-month	• 0	2
nth, 27-month	0	6
	429	332

 \underline{a} /Smaller sample sizes on summary tables in the text result from missing data.

TABLE B-2 .

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ARRESTS

		California	Sample		Hartford Sample Total Sample				րիզ
	Experimentals	Control	Experimental-Control Differential	Experimental	Control	Experimental-Control Differential	Experimental	Control	Experimental-Control Differential
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			······································			
Prior to Enrollment									
Percent of Sample with at least one arrest on:									
Records	88.6	90.8	-2.2	93.6	91.8	1.0	90.3	91.3	-1.0
Interviews	97.7	98.1	4	90.9	92.9	-2.0	95.4	95.6	2
Records-Interviews	-9.1	-7.3	-1.8	2.7	-1.1	3.8	-5.1	-4.3	8
Mean Number of Arrest on:									
Records	8.96	8.46	50	10.09	10 63	5 Å	0.27		_
Totaryious	6.02	5 40	54	10.00	6.12	54	9.33	9.47	14
	0.02	5.48		0.33	0.13	. 20	6.12	5,79	.33
Records-Incerviews	2.54	2.98	~.04	1.75	.4.49	74	3.21	3.68	47
After Enrollment									
Percent of Sample with at least one arrest on:									
Records	43.3	48.7	-5.4	51.6	56.5	-4.9	46.2	52.6	-6.4
Interviews	32.6	46.1	-13.5**	39.2	39.0	.2	34.9	42.5	-7.6*
Records-Interviews	10.7	2.6	8.1	12.4	17.5	-5.1	11.3	10.1	1.2
Mean Number of Arrest on:									
Records	.78	.81	03	1.28	1.59	31	.96	1.20	24*
Interviews	. 48	. 60	12	.60	.67	07	. 52	.63	11
Records-Interviews	. 30	.21	.09	.68	.92	24	.43	.57	-,14
				•					









REFERENCES

- Ball, L. "The Reliability and Validity of Interview Data Obtained From 59 Narcotic Drug Addicts." <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, 1967.
- Bancroft, G. "Consistency of Information From Records and Interviews." Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 35, 1940.
- Blumstein, A. and J. Cohen. "Estimation of Individual Crime Rates From Arrest Records." National Institute of Mental Health, 1978.
- Borus, M. "Response Error in Survey Reports of Earnings Information." Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 61, 1966.
- Bridges, G. "Response Errors in the Measurement of Crime and Delinquency." Center for Studies in Criminology and Criminal Law, University of Pennsylvania (presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology), 1976.
- Hindelang, M. "Race and Involvement in Common Law Personal Crimes." American Sociological Review, February 1978.
- Jackson, R. et al. "The Supporte: Work Demonstration's Evaluation Sample: Characteristics at Enrollment." Princeton, New Jersey: Mathematica Policy Research, October 1978.
- National Center for Health Statistics. "Health Interview Responses Compared with Medical Records." Public Health Service Publication No. 1000, Series 2, No. 6, Washington, D.C., 1965.
- Vera Institute of Justice. "Third Annual Research Report on Supported Employment," 1975.
- Witte, A. "The Labor Market for Prison Inmates and Ex-offenders." University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, unpublished, 1975.
- Wyner, G. "Report on Methodological Study with Vera." MPR Internal Memorandum, 1976.



