



ICPSR 3976

Prosecuting Adolescents in Juvenile and Criminal Jurisdictions in Selected Counties in New Jersey and New York, 1992-1993

Aaron Kupchik
*New York University, Department of
Sociology*

User Guide

First ICPSR Version
July 2004



National Institute of Justice
Data Resources Program



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

Terms of Use

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

Kupchik, Aaron. PROSECUTING ADOLESCENTS IN JUVENILE AND CRIMINAL JURISDICTIONS IN SELECTED COUNTIES IN NEW JERSEY AND NEW YORK, 1992-1993 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. New York, NY: New York University, Department of Sociology [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2004.

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

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary.....	1
General Study Overview.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Methods.....	3
Study Design.....	3
Sources of Information.....	4
Sample.....	4
Response Rates.....	5
Date(s) of Data Collection.....	5
Summary of Contents.....	5
Description of Variables.....	5
Presence of Common Scales.....	5
Unit of Observation.....	5
Geographic Unit.....	5
Extent of Processing.....	5
Extent of Collection.....	5
Data Collection Notes.....	5
File Specifications.....	5
Publications.....	6
Related Publications.....	6
Final Reports and Other Publications.....	6
NIJ Data Resources Program.....	6
About the DRP.....	6
Data Completeness Report(s).....	9

Summary

A different model of justice is assumed to be reflected in the prosecution of adolescents in juvenile jurisdictions compared to criminal jurisdictions, with a juvenile justice model in the juvenile jurisdiction and a criminal justice model in the criminal jurisdiction. These two models of justice are believed to be very different from one another across three dimensions: formality of case processing, evaluation of defendants, and punishment. This research project compared the prosecution and punishment of adolescent felony offenders in the New Jersey juvenile jurisdiction and the New York criminal jurisdiction to determine whether these two models of justice varied across the two jurisdiction types. Data from this collection were used by the researcher only to examine the dimension of punishment severity across jurisdiction types and across courts within each jurisdiction type. Data were collected on comparable cases of adolescent felony offenders from counties in New Jersey and New York. Due to the very different boundaries between juvenile and criminal jurisdictions in these adjacent states, the data include cases (matched by offense and offender age) in New Jersey's juvenile jurisdiction and New York's criminal jurisdiction. Cases of 15- and 16-year-old defendants who had been charged with aggravated assault, robbery, or burglary in three counties of New Jersey and three counties of New York City in 1992 and 1993 were sampled. Variables include offender characteristics, such as age at offense, sex, race, and ethnicity, offense characteristics, court action and sentencing information, state, and county.

General Study Overview

- Title:** Prosecuting Adolescents in Juvenile and Criminal Jurisdictions in Selected Counties in New Jersey and New York, 1992-1993
- Principal Investigator(s):** Aaron Kupchik
- Grant Number:** 2001-IJ-CX-0005
- Purpose of the Study:** An important shift in the prosecution and punishment of adolescents is the increasingly frequent transfer of youth from the juvenile jurisdiction to the criminal jurisdiction previously reserved primarily for adults. A different model of justice is assumed to be reflected in the prosecution of adolescents in each of these two legal forums, with a juvenile justice model in the juvenile jurisdiction and a criminal justice model in the criminal jurisdiction. These two models of justice are believed to be very different from one another across three dimensions: formality of case processing, evaluation of defendants, and punishment. This research project compared the prosecution and punishment of adolescent felony offenders in the New Jersey juvenile jurisdiction and the New York criminal jurisdiction to determine whether these two models of justice varied across the two jurisdiction types. The researcher examined whether both jurisdiction types actually practiced juvenile justice, both practiced criminal justice, or one practiced juvenile justice and the other criminal justice. Additionally, the researcher examined whether the two models of justice varied along only one or two of the dimensions, while maintaining similarity along other dimensions. The project also investigated court-level variation within jurisdiction. Data from this collection were used by the researcher only to examine the dimension of punishment severity across jurisdiction types and across courts within each jurisdiction type for three punishment outcomes -- pretrial detention, final case disposition, and length of custodial sentence. The central questions in regard to these data were: (1) Does jurisdiction type affect punishment severity when controlling for other relevant factors? and (2) Does court context affect punishment severity when controlling for jurisdiction type?

Methods

- Study Design:** In order to compare case processing across juvenile and criminal jurisdictions, data were collected on comparable cases of adolescent felony offenders from counties in New Jersey and New York. Due to the very different boundaries between juvenile and criminal jurisdictions in these adjacent states, the data include cases (matched by offense and offender age) in New Jersey's juvenile jurisdiction and New York's criminal jurisdiction. Cases of 15- and 16-year-old defendants were sampled who had been charged with aggravated assault, robbery, or burglary in three counties of New Jersey and three

counties of New York City in 1992 and 1993. These three offense types were chosen because they are all serious felony charges and are among the most common offenses from the list of juvenile offender (JO) eligible offenses and thus provided a large sample. The age range includes both adolescents excluded from the juvenile jurisdiction by the JO Law in New York (15-year-olds) and individuals who are above New York's general age of criminal majority (16-year-olds). Thus the New York data are able to show how adolescents fare in the criminal jurisdiction regardless of the legal method by which they arrived there (both exclusion from the juvenile jurisdiction and surpassing the general age of majority).

Sources of Information: The New Jersey Administrative Office of Courts provided data for one of the three New Jersey juvenile jurisdiction courts in automated format. For the other two New Jersey courts, data were collected manually at the county courthouses from case files of sampled individuals. The New York City Criminal Justice Agency provided the New York criminal jurisdiction data, which were supplemented by data from the New York Department of Criminal Justice Services. These data were provided as part of a separate project funded by OJJDP (97-FN-FX-01, PI: Jeffrey Fagan).

Sample: In order to reduce the likelihood of disparate environmental and organizational influences, the sample included two states within a single social and criminal justice milieu. Within Northeastern New Jersey, juvenile jurisdictions in three counties that border the Hudson River were studied. These counties (Essex, Hudson, and Passaic) are among the most populous in the state and each includes large urban areas. Within New York criminal jurisdictions were examined in three boroughs (Brooklyn, Queens, Bronx), each of which is an independent county of New York City. These six counties border one another, separated only by the Hudson River. They were matched along a variety of dimensions. They have similar rates of unemployment, poverty, female-headed households, and residential mobility. And, they are each leaders in their respective states regarding homicides and rates of imprisonment. Cases of 15- and 16-year-old defendants who were charged with aggravated assault (1st and 2nd), robbery (1st and 2nd), or burglary (1st) in the above six counties of New Jersey and New York in 1992 or 1993 were sampled. Precautions were taken to help ensure that the cases in both states involved offenses of equal severity: (1) Sampling was done after an initial screening process in each system. In New Jersey cases were sampled at court filing and after having passed an initial screening by a prosecutor. In New York cases were sampled at arraignment and after screening by prosecutors for legal sufficiency and appropriate charging. (2) The sample includes only the most serious sub-charges within each offense type. This sampling method includes the most serious 15- and 16-year-old offenders in each state other than adolescents arrested for homicide or sexual assault.

Date(s) of Data Collection: 1998-2000

Summary of Contents

- Description of Variables:** Variables include offender characteristics such as age at offense, sex, race, and ethnicity. Offense characteristics include offense type at case filing (robbery, aggravated assault, burglary), whether offense was committed with a weapon, imposition of pretrial detention, number of prior arrests, number of arrests during case processing, whether the defendant had been previously incarcerated, and whether an arrest warrant for the defendant was ordered during case processing. Court action and sentencing variables include total number of charges at arraignment, number of days from arrest to final disposition, whether incarcerated, type of adjudication, final disposition/sentence, and number of months served (in New Jersey) or sentenced (in New York) in prison. Variables also include state and county.
- Presence of Common Scales:** None
- Unit of Observation:** Individuals
- Geographic Unit:** county
- Extent of Processing:** ICPSR standardized missing data codes, checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, and reformatted the data.
- Extent of Collection:** This data collection consists of one data file, a user guide and a codebook in PDF files, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.
- Data Collection Notes:** (1) The qualitative data collected as part of this grant and extensively described in the project's final report and the quantitative data described in Appendix A of the final report are not available from ICPSR. (2) The user guide and codebook are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Data file	rectangular	2,223	29	50	1

Publications

Related Publications: Kupchik, Aaron, "Prosecuting Adolescents in Criminal Courts: Criminal or Juvenile Justice?" NCJ 202275. SOCIAL PROBLEMS 50,3 (August 2003), 439-460.

Kupchik, Aaron, "Children in an Adult World: Prosecuting Adolescents in Criminal and Juvenile Jurisdictions" (Final Report). Ph.D. dissertation, New York University. NCJ 204014. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, September 2003. <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/204014.pdf>

Kupchik, Aaron, "Youthfulness, Responsibility and Punishment: Admonishing Adolescents in Criminal Court." PUNISHMENT & SOCIETY 6,3 (April 2004), 149-173.

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

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

NIJ Data Resources Program

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

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

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

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3976

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

=====

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=2223)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
---	---

86.2% (25 of 29 variables) have 0% Missing Values

10.3% (3 of 29 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 29 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 29 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 29 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 29 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 29 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

3.4% (1 of 29 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

INCARC	INCARC	42.2%
--------	--------	-------

=====

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 The variable SENTENCE has 42% of the cases coded as 97 and labeled as
 "Missing" but the principal investigator did not designate code 97 as
 a missing value. Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns
 are not reflected in the data as coded.