

TASK 1.1 DELINQUENCY, VICTIMIZATION, AND INTERACTIONS WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM CONTENT PANEL REPORT FINAL

MAY 23, 2023

Contract Deliverable

Presented by: Roxanne Wallace, PMP, NORC

Authored by:

Steven Raphael (Panel Chair)

Amanda Agan

Jennifer Doleac

Keith Finlay

Hedwig Lee

Emily Owens

William Sabol

Melissa Sickmund

Bryan Sykes

Michael Walker



Document Change Log

Published Date	Document Version No.	Pages Affected	Description of Revision	Author
5/17/2023	v1.0	All	Changed “panels” to “cohorts” throughout the document. Changed comments provided by BLS on pgs 2, 9, 10,	Steven Raphael, Katheryn Meagher, Mithuna Srinivasan

1. Introduction

The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) are a significant, long-running program of the United States (U.S.) Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), designed to support research into how Americans navigate changes in the economy and transition through various life course stages. As the youngest NLS cohort members are now entering their 40s, the BLS seeks to begin a new cohort of adolescents, targeted for fielding in 2026. This NLSY26 cohort will enable researchers to understand new trends in labor market experiences, education, and other factors that are affecting this new generation.

BLS contracted with NORC at the University of Chicago (NORC) and CHRR at The Ohio State University on NLSY26 Content Panels to provide BLS with topical content and methodological inputs that a future design team can use to create an NLSY26 survey responsive to key research goals. As part of these NLSY26 Content Panels, NORC convened a content panel on **Delinquency, Victimization, and Interactions with the Criminal Justice System**, comprised of federal and non-federal subject matter experts, to provide BLS with high-level recommendations that highlight emerging research themes, social trends, and policy changes relevant to consider for future data collection; alternative data sources that might supplement a new survey; and methodological issues that may impact data collection for the NLSY26. **The content panel met multiple times between November 2022 and March 2023, to discuss recommendations and tradeoffs around content and survey design for BLS to consider for the new cohort.**

The past NLSY cohorts have been central to understanding offending trajectories over the early life course ([Murphy et. al. 2012](#); [Brame et al. 2014](#)). The past cohorts have also aided in the understanding of the intersection between involvement with the criminal justice system and concurrent labor market outcomes ([Western 2002](#)), cumulative disadvantage in the labor market ([Bushway et. al. 2022](#)), key markers of transitions to adulthood ([Raphael 2007](#)), adult wages ([Apel and Powell 2019](#)), wealth outcomes and accumulation ([Maroto and Sykes 2020](#)), and racial disparities in lifetime risk of incarceration ([Western and Petit 2010](#), [Western 2007](#)). This research was facilitated by several questions in the prior NLSY cohorts pertaining to arrest and conviction, broad measures of criminal offending, the measurement of where an interview take place (e.g., whether it occurs in an institutional setting), and detailed timelines pertaining to incarceration history that parallels the constructed weekly employment outcomes used by many social scientists studying the labor market with the NLSY.

Since the initiation of the last NLSY cohorts, there has been an explosion of research into the intertwined relationships between criminal victimization, criminal offending, involvement with the U.S. criminal justice system and common metrics of socioeconomic wellbeing including but not limited to employment, earnings, and poverty ([Lofstrom and Raphael 2016](#),). There has also been heightened attention to the enormous racial disparities in victimization and criminal justice involvement and consequences for racial inequality for those directly and indirectly affected ([Bruns and Lee 2019](#), [2020](#); [National Academies of Sciences 2022](#)). There is increasing focus on differential treatment by police officers and the relative frequency with which racial minorities are stopped, searched, and treated severely by law enforcement ([California Racial Identity and Profiling Board 2023](#), [Tapp and Davis 2022](#)). The past two decades have

also witnessed enormous policy variation and reform, with several states and the federal government implementing legislation intended to dial back the severity of criminal sanctions and explore alternative interventions designed to address underlying causes of interaction with the criminal justice system. Researchers have increasingly made use of these policy reforms to both evaluate the effects of these reforms as well as to learn more generally about human behavior as it pertains to criminal offending, formal involvement with the criminal justice system, and key socioeconomic outcomes (see for example, work on pretrial detention by [Dobbie and Yang 2022](#), as well as work on the effects of Ban-the Box laws, (see [Agan and Starr 2018](#), [Doleac and Hanson 2020](#), for two examples).

The panel on Delinquency, Victimization, and Interactions with the Criminal Justice System focused on evaluating prior NLSY content and suggesting new survey items pertaining to criminal victimization, offending, and criminal justice involvement keeping in mind the research and policy developments of the past few decades. Specifically, the panel focused on assessing needed changes to existing content and generating proposals for additional survey items/outcome domains that reflect developments in our understanding of the importance of crime, offending, and society's response. The panel also focused on opportunities for linkages between the new NLSY cohort and administrative data sources in the criminal justice realm. Specifically, the panel organized its efforts around the following topical areas:

- Criminal justice sanctions and surveillance
- Victimization and police-citizen interactions
- Protective and risk factors
- Alternative data sources that may be linked to a future NLSY cohort.

The panel noted that many of these topics are addressed in question domains included in prior NLSY survey instruments. However, many of the questions are limited in scope, miss important categories of victimization and criminal offending, and likely require updating to reflect the greater role of social media in all aspects of modern life, and victimization resulting from cybercrime. Moreover, while youth arrests have declined steadily in recent decades and correctional populations have receded from their historic highs, there is increasing concern and research attention surrounding questions of problematic interactions with the police, gun violence, and racial inequality. Accordingly, the panel offers suggestions for expanding the battery of questions in this domain to reflect how the world has changed since the last NLSY and to facilitate longitudinal research on cutting edge research questions.

Social science research in the criminal justice realm increasingly relies on administrative data from courts, state criminal history repositories, and correctional institutions. These data are of value in that they are directly generated by criminal justice events (e.g., arrests, bookings, case dispositions, sentences, admission and release dates from prisons and jails) and unlike self-reported survey or other responses, are generally not compromised by poor recall. However, these data often have limited information on personal characteristics, often cannot be tied to past personal experiences and key early-life phenomena, such as experiencing a parental incarceration, and can be difficult to link to labor market outcomes and other important outcomes outside the criminal justice system. Despite these limitations, the potential gains from linking administrative records from officially recorded interactions with the criminal justice

system to longitudinal survey data are immense. Hence, the panel devoted considerable attention to thinking about alternative data sources that may be linkable to a future cohort of NLSY youth and the logistics of doing so.

The rest of the report is organized as follows. Section 2 and Section 3 describe the panel's recommendations related to topical content and survey design considerations. Section 2 describes content/topic-related considerations for future data collection with the new cohort, including (1) emerging research themes, social trends and policy changes that are relevant to consider, (2) foundational data important for studying later life labor market and non-labor market outcomes, and (3) key areas of disparities and inequalities that may be important to measure. Section 3 describes survey design-related considerations relevant for the new cohort, including (1) the extent to which recommended topics are covered in existing NLSY questionnaires used for the 1979 and 1997 cohorts, (2) methodological issues that may impact future data collection on the recommended topics, and (3) relevant alternative data sources that might supplement a new survey. Section 4 concludes with a prioritization of the panel's recommendations (including the methodology used to arrive at that prioritization), and a description of the tradeoffs considered for this prioritization.

2. Topic-Related Recommendations for the New Cohort

Emerging research themes, social trends and policy changes that are relevant for the content area

Social trends and policy changes

Since the fielding of the first wave of the NLSY97, there have been several important criminal justice trends as well as broader societal changes that are relevant to the portion of the new NLSY that pertains to criminal activity, victimization, and system involvement. **First, juvenile arrest rates have declined ([OJJDP 2022](#)) as have the rates at which youth engage in risky behaviors, such as drug and alcohol use and unprotected sexual activity ([CDC 2022](#)).** While violent victimization has remained flat or trended down slightly since 2011, an increasing minority of youth indicated that they had missed school due to personal safety concerns, with the proportions higher and trending upwards for females and black and Hispanic students. **Second, youth as well as adults spend considerably more time online and interact with one another with greater frequency and intensity via social media ([Vogels et al, 2022](#)).** Correspondingly, a sizable minority of youth (16 percent) indicate that they have been bullied online, with the percentage higher for females (20 percent) and particularly high for LGBTQ+ youth (27 percent, see [CDC 2022](#), page 49). **Third, gun violence in K-12 is an unfortunate and salient reality in the U.S., with high-profile incidents occurring with regularity across the country.** While incidents of firearm violence at school are relatively rare events (for example, the [National Center for Education Statistics](#) records 93 incidents involving firearms at school between school year 2000-01 and 2020-21), they occur with greater frequency today relative to thirty years ago, and receive greater attention in the press and on social media. **Finally, with the ubiquity of cellphone video cameras, we are reminded**

daily of adverse interactions between young people and police that sometimes result in grave injury and even the death of the involved citizen. Moreover, there is ample evidence of large racial disparities in the rates at which citizens are stopped by the police, searched, and subjected to being removed from a vehicle, forced to sit on a curb, or handcuffed and placed in the back of a police vehicle pending the resolution of a stop. While these racial disparities in police interactions are not new, the greater availability of administrative data on police stops and use of force have highlighted the importance of this differential experience with policing and beg the questions concerning potential short- and long-term consequences of these differential impacts.

Beyond these trends impacting youth, the nature of criminal victimization has shifted to some degree with the declining use of cash and the importance of online transactions and payment apps in everyday life ([Wright et al. 2017](#)). Robbery and motor vehicle theft rates have declined while fraud perpetuated through online transactions and through identity theft is likely a greater threat now than in the past. In addition, there is a sizable population of undocumented immigrants who may be reluctant to report a victimization to the police or abuse of other forms to relevant authorities and may be at heightened risk of being abused as a result. While this might impact common street crimes (for example, robbing undocumented people who won't go to the police), this may also create opportunities for employers to pay workers less than they otherwise would or in some instances not at all for work performed (commonly referred to as wage-theft ([Mangundayao 2021](#))).

The past three decades has also been a period of active reform in criminal justice institutions and practices that has impacted the lives of both youth and adults involved with the criminal justice system. The period from 1990 through the mid-2000s capped the latter half of a period of policy reforms aimed at stiffening penalties for criminal offending (felony offenses in particular) that drove the massive increases in correctional populations both overall and relative to the national population ([National Research Council 2014](#)). Beginning around 2010, several states as well as the federal government began enacting legislation to moderate criminal sentences, redraw the lines between felony and misdemeanor offending (usually contracting the set of offenses classified as the former while expanding the set classified as the latter), and enable retractive resentencing for people who committed serious offenses as youth or who were convicted in the past for offenses that were redefined as misdemeanors. Local criminal justice systems across the country have increasingly active and broadening-in-scope diversion programming involving everything from behavioral health courts and veteran's courts in the adult system to various forms of restorative justice programming in juvenile systems. Reforms to juvenile justice system began earlier, with counties implementing reforms beginning in the late 1990s that emphasize developmental approaches to adjudicating juvenile criminal cases and that seek alternative to custodial responses ([National Academies of Sciences 2013](#)).

Emerging research themes

Key research themes pertaining to the intersection between crime and socioeconomic inequality have evolved alongside these broad trends. A large body of research investigates the **collateral consequences of criminal justice involvement for future employment outcomes and offending**. Researchers have

also studied the indirect effects of being impacted by the criminal justice system through the incarceration of family members, such as parents and siblings.

A growing body of research has focused on **factors that either mitigate or aggravate the risks of being victimized, of offending, and of becoming involved with the criminal justice system.** For example, access to health care (measured by health insurance and access to a primary care physician and mental health care) can serve as protective factors against criminal involvement and recidivism ([Jácome 2021](#)). School Resource Officers are debated in research and policy spaces as either being a protective resource for school safety and child development or proxies for police and harmful for schools and child development ([Owens 2016](#); [Weisburst 2018](#)). Parental criminal justice contact has been shown to have important implications for child's own criminal justice contact as well as a host of other social, behavioral, and health outcomes ([Wakefield and Wildeman 2016](#)). Other areas of active research pertaining to protective and risk factors include but are not limited to the effects of foster care ([Baron and Gross 2022](#)) and school discipline ([Rose, Shellenberg, and Shem-Tov 2022](#)).

There has been an explosion of **research on police citizen interactions**, ranging in topic area focus from theoretical and empirical research on racial profiling by law enforcement (see the literature review in [NAS 2018](#)), behavioral interventions with police officers aimed at mitigating the negative consequences of police stops ([Owens et al. 2018](#)), to the effects of experience with police on race-disparities in vigilant behaviors that harm health outcomes ([Lee and Hicken 2016](#)).

Finally, researchers have been actively engaged in policy evaluations, sometimes in coordination with criminal justice partners and sometimes independently. The list of **criminal justice policy evaluations** occurring over the past two decades is too long to list here. Nonetheless, academic and government research increasingly focuses on evaluating the impacts of alternatives to standard criminal case processing, including diversion programs, decriminalization, and preventive interventions targeted at augmenting human capital especially among youth. **Longitudinal outcome data are central to such evaluation efforts, which would be greatly facilitated by linking the NLSY with administrative records**, which are likely to provide more accurate information about the specific government entity the respondent interacted with.

Important research questions for which evidence is needed

Research on the determinants of offending, victimization, criminal justice involvement and the impacts of all three phenomena on socioeconomic outcomes is an active and burgeoning research area across the social sciences. Being able to link solid information on early experiences and behaviors to later experiences as well as to socioeconomic outcomes such as employment, earnings, marriage, and childbearing will create many opportunities for researchers to answer important questions. While we cannot anticipate how the crime and criminal justice content of the new NLSY will be used, we can suggest important research questions where evidence is needed and where creative researchers would likely be able to make use of enhanced crime-related questions in longitudinal data.

Take for example the long-term effects of criminal victimization. Criminal victimization causes both immediate as well as potentially long-term harms. In the short term, victimization deprives people of their property, may cause physical and psychological harm, and may generate costs for medical care or to replace stolen property. Long-term consequences may be direct as well as indirect. For example, if someone suffers a permanent, mobility-limiting injury, this may impact long-term employment outcomes. In terms of indirect causal channels, a youth who is bullied online may be reluctant to attend school, encounter difficulties concentrating, and experience reduced mental health -- effects that may impact school performance and ultimately labor market outcomes.

The NLSY surveys are uniquely designed to study long-term education and labor market consequences of early life events given the detailed questions pertaining to employment and income that are asked in every wave. They could be used to study several important research questions pertaining to **early life victimization and early interactions with the police** including (but not limited to):

- How do early police contacts impact later life outcomes? For example, do they beget or reduce future police contacts, limit or encourage reporting of victimization as an adult?
- To what extent are youth harassed online (e.g., by bullying, stalking)? Does online harassment go hand-in-hand with in-person conflict either at school or in some other setting?
- What are the effects of (violent crime, sexual violence, domestic violence) victimization on labor-market outcomes (labor force participation, employment, earnings)? Does injury from victimization have labor-market consequences? Do community-level characteristics (e.g., robustness of the labor market) mitigate any such effects? (This question could be addressed using geo-identified NLSY data that are linked to small area ACS, BEA, and other data sources.)
- Are the long-term impacts of victimization (for example, on labor market outcomes, educational attainment, mental health) amplified when social media is involved (for example, when an assault is filmed and shared online)? Are they mitigated by victims' use of formal services, such as medical, mental health, or other professionals or victim serving organizations?
- To what extent does victimization and offending overlap? Are there different protective and risk factors for these two outcomes?
- Do employers discriminate against victims (either directly, or statistically)?
- What determines the likelihood that a victimization is reported to the police?
- Which law violating behaviors are most likely to lead to justice system involvement? What is the relative frequency with which law-violating behavior leads to criminal justice involvement and how does this vary across groups?

Beyond victimization, one could certainly imagine a wealth of research with the first few waves of the new NLSY investigating the **relative efficacy of various protective factors and the relative risks created by various risk factors**. Possible areas of inquiry include:

- Should school resource officers (SROs) be considered as risk or protective factors? How do youth perceive their contact with SRO? What factors modify or impact the role of SRO as risks or protective factors (e.g., arresting power, perceptions of students of SRO)? Do these things vary for different racial, ethnic, or sexual orientation, gender identify, and gender expression groups?

- How is contact with the police perceived (helping or hurting) by youth from different racial, gender, gender identity groups?
- How do social networks of trusted individuals, or lack thereof, serve as protective or risk factors?
- Do perceptions of contact with police serve as protective or risk factors?

One might also imagine research using the new NLSY to study **cross-system interactions** (e.g., the link between schools, school resource officers, and early criminal justice involvement, foster care and the criminal justice system), and **evaluating the impact of policy variation at the state level** (changes in sentencing, decriminalization policy). Finally, the ability to link to administrative criminal justice data from either national data sources or a subset of states would permit research combining the complete information of the NLSY with very precisely measured criminal justice outcomes. Such links would open the door for a host of basic scientific behavioral questions.

Selected topics considered for data collection with the new cohort

Our panel focused our efforts on the following topic areas:

- Juvenile/criminal justice sanctions and surveillance
- Victimization and police-citizen interactions
- Protective and risk factors
- Alternative data sources that may be linked to a future NLSY cohort.

For the first three topics, we systematically assessed existing questions in the prior NLSY surveys, identified possible revisions when we felt they were needed, and suggest some new questions in each domain with an eye on facilitating research on short, medium, and long-term socioeconomic outcomes. The fourth topic area pertains to potential alternative data sources that one may link to the NLSY and is discussed in detail in a separate section below. Our specific recommendations are summarized in Exhibits 1 and 2 (at the end of this document). Here we provide a broad overview of the panel's deliberations pertaining to the first three topic areas.

Topic 1: Juvenile/criminal justice sanctions and surveillance

Justice system involvement is a major barrier to labor force participation. Justice system reforms (both juvenile justice and criminal justice) are trying to change that narrative, largely by keeping people out of the system or limiting the degree to which they penetrate the system. The big question is whether or not these efforts are working in terms of recidivism, employment, and other gauges of desistance and socioeconomic health.

Past NLSY surveys have collected information on self-reported offending, prior arrests, and prior incarceration spells. Because of the criminal justice reform movement, we propose additional follow up questions to capture the increased range of ways that people interact with law enforcement and the legal system. These questions will provide new insight into the frequency with which diversion and legal financial obligations/financial penalties are used, as well as variation in reentry preparedness across

individuals. These additional questions may also provide new insight into the prevalence and impact of criminal justice reform efforts.

The proposed questions in Exhibit 1 for this topic fall within the following broad categories:

- Experiences with police during arrest
- Experience with adjudication of criminal cases
- Experience with punishment

Topic 2: Victimization and police-citizen interactions

The NLSY97 includes limited questions pertaining to criminal victimization and to our knowledge, no questions pertaining to interaction with police officers. Respondents were asked (1) whether their houses or apartments were broken into, (2) whether they were the victims of repeated bullying, and (3) whether they have seen someone shot or shot at. These questions are quite narrow and may miss many forms of victimization. For example, there is nothing pertaining to fraud, theft beyond a home break-in, and exposure to violent victimizations other than having been shot. In addition, the questions likely need to be updated to account for the greater role of social media in the victimization of young people, the increasing importance of cybercrime and identity theft. Technological advances have both facilitated data collection and data sharing by law enforcement which could increase the consequences of police interaction, even in the absence of arrests ([Brayne 2020](#), [Muñiz 2022](#)). Further, social media has directly led to increasing concern and attention to adverse interactions with police officers.

We recommend that in designing the next round of the NLSY, BLS consult the screener questions from the [National Criminal Victimization Survey](#) (NCVS) to fashion a limited set of victimization questions that will more broadly capture property and violent victimizations that fall outside of the three areas of inquiry in the past NLSY. In general, the questions pertaining to victimization should aim to incorporate the potential role of social media and internet usage in victimizations, as well as in falling prey to consumer fraud. Finally, we recommend that the new NLSY incorporate questions pertaining to interactions with the police (both voluntary as well as involuntary), to assess the degree to which people report criminal incidents as well as the incidence of involuntary interactions with the police that fall short of an arrest.

We specifically recommend the following:

- The NLSY make use of the screener questions from the NCVS with the aim of broadly identifying (1) property crime, and (2) crimes against one's person. While exploring the detail of incidents as is done in the NCVS is not practical, the NLSY could inquire about injury severity and the value of lost property. Questions could also be included pertaining to reporting behavior and questions about formal help-seeking behaviors.
- The NLSY should include questions pertaining to online and social-media harassment. Being able to tie such activity to specific in-person incidents would be preferable. The CDC has compiled some helpful assessment tools that may be useful and more recent work validating

measures of cyber bullying and victimization (e.g., [Murray et al. 2021](#)). Additionally, a recent [report](#) from the Pew Research Center described the results from a survey they conducted on teens and cyberbullying.

- The Federal Trade Commission has fielded a consumer fraud survey several times that provides clear definitions of consumer fraud categories that often take-place online. Asking these questions (or perhaps just their screener) in all waves would facilitate analysis of who is at risk of consumer fraud.
- We recommend that the NLSY incorporate a question or series of questions pertaining to the perceived threat of victimization, the perceived threat of exposure to gun violence or the threat of gun violence at school, in the workplace, and in one's neighborhood of residence.

Topic 3: Protective and risk factors

Protective factors mitigate the risk of victimization and offending. **Risk factors** elevate the likelihood of both. Protective/risk factors encompass a broad array of institutional factors (access to health insurance, presence of school resource officers), family contributors (household composition, parental criminal justice experiences), cross-system interactions (foster care, school disciplinary issues that spill into criminal justice), and personal history (historical housing instability, frequent moves). Other sections of the NLSY that do not fall under the purview of the Justice Panel serve as important protective (e.g., health insurance, health care access) and risk (e.g., housing and family instability) factors. The sub-committee focused our recommendations on CJ-related factors (e.g., school resource officers) and factors that are currently not included in NLSY and may overlap with the work of other panels. Below we discuss measures and integrate emerging research themes, research evidence, social trends and policy changes that inform our recommendations.

- Individual Interactions with Law Enforcement
- Family members/friends stopped by the police
- Perceptions of Victimization Risk
- Social Support/Networks

Related foundational data important for studying labor market outcomes

Victimization, early offending, and criminal justice involvement can impact employment prospects and earnings through both direct as well as indirect channels. In terms of direct channels, an arrest and short detention may lead to job loss in the short-term. For example, an arrest, pre-trial detention, and the adjudication process for a criminal case (e.g., having to attend hearings) clearly prevents someone from showing up to work and even short, unanticipated, and unexcused absences from work can lead to job loss. This is consistent with the common finding in event studies that earnings tend to decline up to four quarters preceding a conviction ([Kling 2006](#)), suggesting that pretrial adjudication often reduces earnings and employment. Employers express reluctance to hire people with criminal histories ([Holzer, Raphael, and Stoll 2006](#), [Pager 2003](#)) and sometimes are legally prevented from doing so. Even arrests for relatively minor offenses such as disorderly conduct may lower the likelihood of receiving a job offer in

audit studies ([Uggen et. al. 2014](#)), and the prevalence of criminal histories in the United States has been shown to induce statistical discrimination against men from groups with high likelihood of having a criminal history ([Doleac and Hanson 2020](#), [Agan and Starr 2018](#)). Encounters with law enforcement may have particularly large effects on non-Citizens ([Muniz 2022](#)).

Criminal offending and criminal justice involvement may also indirectly impact labor market prospects through an impact on human capital accumulation. Offending and criminal justice involvement may adversely impact educational attainment through either disrupting attendance, stigmatizing students in applying for university admissions, and other such channels. This has clear implications for future earnings and employment, given the strong relationship between education and employment prospects. People fail to accumulate work experience while incarcerated, creating gaps in one's employment histories that make securing employment upon release more difficult. There is some evidence that incarceration in institutional settings that are primarily rehabilitative (most from Scandinavian countries) can improve long-term employment prospects ([Bhuller et. al. 2020](#)). There is less evidence of such positive effects in the U.S., though great research efforts have been devoted to understanding whether incarceration specifically deters future offending or enhances criminal offending through degradation of skills, stigma, broadening criminal networks, and perhaps engendering anti-social attitudes (a series of pathways commonly referred to as the potential criminogenic impacts of incarceration on offending, see [Nagin, Cullen, and Lero-Johnson 2009](#), [Bayer, Hjalmarsson, and Pozen 2009](#)).

A large body of research has identified own victimization and vicarious or bystander victimization (witnessing an assault) as an important adverse/stressful life event that may impact physical and mental wellbeing in the short and long term. We know that physical and mental health are important determinants of success in school and success in the workplace. Being able to study the long-term consequences of victimization in a panel data setting would open many fruitful lines of research inquiry. For example, we know from research using the AddHealth survey that violence and abuse are correlated with poorer labor market outcomes. With longitudinal data, one could study whether this relationship is causal as well as the dynamic path of the impacts of a victimization on labor markets over time. We also know that there is substantial overlap between people who become the victim of a crime and people who are more likely to commit crime ([NIJ 2021](#)). Having both victimization and offending questions in the NLSY would permit studying this overlap, assessing the independent effects of each on labor market and educational outcomes, and permit a more thorough study of how these risks vary over the life course.

Finally, we know that criminal justice contacts matter for labor market outcomes, but we also need to identify factors that moderate or amplify this relationship. The questions we propose allow for these kinds of critical research questions to inform policy and practice.

Related foundational data important for studying other later life outcomes

Victimization, early offending, and criminal justice involvement may causally impact many non-labor market life outcomes, including family formation, community connection (connectedness with community institutions, positive peers, contributing to community wellbeing, voting/civic engagement,

etc.), future risky behavior, future arrest and incarceration, health, and housing stability. Including direct measures of proposed policy alternatives to incarceration would provide critical insight into how these alternatives to incarceration impact these important outcomes.

Key areas of disparities and inequalities that should be measurable

Victimization, offending, and criminal justice involvement are not equally distributed risks. Men, young men in particular, are more likely to become involved with the criminal justice system with important interactions between race and gender. There is a strong relationship between socioeconomic status (as measured by education, income, housing status), victimization, and criminal justice involvement with important and salient intersectional aspects. Victimization risk varies geographically, with very different levels of violent and property crime in different neighborhoods of the same city. Immigration status may be linked to the likelihood of being targeted for specific types of offenses (targeted robberies, wage theft, human trafficking) and likely impacts willingness to report victimizations to the police and cooperate with investigations. Finally, individual sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression is an important predictor of victimization risk, with particularly high victimization risks for gay, lesbian and gender nonconforming persons ([Truman and Morgan 2022](#)).

With this in mind, we anticipate researchers using the NLSY would likely be interested in performing subgroup analysis along the following dimensions.

- Race/Ethnicity
- Educational Attainment and Disruption
- Gender Identity & Expression
- Sexual Orientation
- Skin Tone
- Immigrant Status
- Disability Status
- Region/neighborhood of residence

Of course, there are important interactions between these dimensions that will likely be the focus of analysis (for example, gender and race). We believe that prior NLSY surveys contain information for all of these questions (though neighborhood of residence requires access to the restricted use files in previous waves of the NLSY). To be sure, some of the groups defined by the intersection of these dimensions are likely to be proportionally small among the general population and as a result generate few observations in the data. We suggest these groups given our assessment of areas of inquiry that are of increasing interest to researchers and policymakers,

3. Survey Design-Related Recommendations for the New Cohort

Inclusion in previous NLSY surveys and methodological issues to consider on recommended topics

The earlier NLSY cohorts included questions pertaining to criminal offending, victimization, arrests, and incarceration. The publicly available data also included constructed timeline variables marking incarceration spells based on the annual retrospective responses pertaining to the period since the last interview questions pertaining to risky behaviors and factors that one might consider protective.

We recommend that several of the existing questions be updated to more broadly cover the outcome domain and to reflect societal developments since the beginning of the last NLSY cohort. In addition, we suggest additional questions that are not on the previous NLSY, mostly pertaining to interactions with law enforcement and criminal justice case processing experiences, but also with respect to victimization, perception of victimization risk, and queries pertaining to key protective and risk factors. Many of the additional questions that we propose are follow-up questions to existing NLSY survey questions. The fact that these are mainly follow-up questions should limit the cost of including them in the survey, as only a subset of respondents will need to answer them.

Exhibits 1 and 2 list a series of questions domains that we recommend expanding upon, with some sample language in some instances and references to existing federal survey instruments in others. The question domains are organized in the order in which people experience crime, victimization, and experience with the criminal justice system. We specifically recommend adding additional questions in the following areas:

- **Social networks and support:** We recommend a series of questions designed to gauge the social support network that youth can draw upon and the likely web of protective adults that may prevent victimization, offending, and criminal justice involvement.
- **Interactions with law enforcement:** We recommend expanding the set of questions asked of people who report interaction with law enforcement and adding questions about contact between family members /friends and law enforcement. For the former, the BLS should consider consulting the Police-Public Contact Survey supplement to the NCVS as well as questions in the NCVS pertaining to whether victimization incidents were reported to the police. These questions should include information on evidence gathering by law enforcement.
- **Victimization anticipation and experience:** we recommend that BLS make use of the screener questions in the NCVS and the questions pertaining to consumer fraud in surveys conducted by the Federal Trade Commission to inquire broadly about victimization experiences. We also recommend that the BLS incorporate questions pertaining to threats/harassment that identify if the incident occurred via social media. We also recommend the addition of general questions about how respondents anticipate victimization and perceive their victimization risk, with a specific focus on the threat of gun violence.

- **Experience with punishment:** we recommend a comprehensive set of questions designed to measure traditional criminal justice dispositions as well as alternative sanctions (fines, fees, diversion requirements) that are increasingly used and that are increasingly important areas of inquiry among researchers.
- **Experience with incarceration and the criminal legal system:** We recommend a series of questions on official interactions with the criminal justice system. The questions in this battery are fairly self-explanatory. They would permit better distinctions between prison and jail experiences and provide more context regarding programming during any incarceration spell.

In addition to these larger suggestions pertaining to domains, we would like to offer a series of additional, more specific suggestions regarding the existing content and questions design in the NLSY.

Specific recommendations pertaining to self-reported criminal activity and gang membership

- We suggest revising the question regarding theft to allow categorization into mutually exclusive groupings. We also recommend deleting the \$50 threshold, as this carries no legal bearing and appears to be arbitrary.
- We recommend adding questions regarding whether the youth has threatened someone, distinguishing between online and in-person threats.
- We recommend incorporating questions into the self-reporting criminal behavior section pertaining to gun access, whether the person ever carries a firearm, and whether a gun was used in any crime. The BLS may consider consulting the Bureau of Justice Statistics Survey of Prison Inmates 2016 for questions about how and where the gun was obtained.
- The concept of a gang needs clarifying. Prior question asked “...belonged to a gang that does illegal activity.” This can include a small group of kids who hang around together and commit minor crimes as well as people who are involved in named and organized gangs, with membership legally sufficient to trigger enhanced sanctions.
- Questions about gang-related activity in neighborhoods certainly are independent of whether one considers oneself a member of a gang. To measure ecological exposure to crime, the NLSY can ask respondents if events occurred that they considered to be gang-related events; this is independent of whether respondent is affiliate with a gang.
- Questions pertaining to substance use should be revised to include opioids.

Questions about event history of interactions with the criminal justice system

- Juvenile and adult criminal cases are processed and often sanctioned quite differently. While the participants are under 18, questions pertaining to criminal justice involvement should reflect the nature of juvenile case processing and allow for the sanctions/alternatives that are common in juvenile court. These questions should transition towards language reflective of the adult system after they turn 18. Youth who are transferred to adult court (relatively small proportion of all youth) may require special attention.

- The NLSY97 questions about incarceration do not distinguish structurally distinct incarceration types. Inquiring about (1) whether the incarceration spell preceded a conviction, (2) whether the institution was county operated (perhaps mention the Sheriff) or state run, and (3) whether the person was incarcerated near their home as opposed to in another region or city in their state may be sufficient for researchers to infer the type of institution. Information about sentence length may also be useful in this regard (for example, conviction charge, whether the offense was a felony or misdemeanor, sentence length, and if sentenced to incarceration, facility type).
- The rehabilitation services questions focus on services while incarcerated but over the past decade there has been expansion of reentry services that are delivered after release from (especially) prison. We recommend that the questions include inquiries about post-release services.
- Past surveys include questions pertaining to parole restrictions, and community corrections restrictions more generally. The term parole has become less well defined over time. It used to mean that a board made a decision to release someone and then an agency supervised them post release. However, many state agencies now combine probation and parole into community supervision. The simple point is to avoid using the term parole and ask about post-custody supervision in the community (i.e., query about community corrections more generally being cognizant of the variation in language used across the country). Rather than asking about “restrictions” ask about “conditions” imposed while on post-custody community supervision.

Relevant alternative data sources to capture recommended topics

Over the past two decades, there has been rapid growth in the body of social science research relying on administrative data. This is especially the case when it comes to criminal justice research, where scholars increasingly rely on administrative data from court records ([Agan, Doleac, and Harvey 2023](#)), correctional systems ([Bird et. al. 2022](#)), state criminal history repositories ([Mueller-Smith, Pyle, and Walker 2023](#)), and in some instances quite complex merges between criminal justice administrative data and centralized earnings records collected by states and in some instances federal agencies ([Finlay and Muller-Smith 2021](#), [Finlay, Mueller-Smith, and Street 2023](#)). The use of administrative data is particularly important for studies of the effects of involvement with the criminal justice system, where case processing and outcomes can be quite complex, involving pre- and post-trial detention, multiple arrests associated with a given case, and an increasing variety of potential dispositions and alternatives to prosecution. Much of this detail is likely difficult to recall when one is asked to recount arrests, convictions, diversion experiences, and formal sanctions retrospectively, particularly when the interaction occurred outside of the respondent’s home jurisdiction. Hence, researchers increasingly favor the use of administrative data when studying formal criminal justice system involvement.

There are however several challenges and limitations in using administrative data. First, these data sets often require complex data use agreements with agencies and technical safeguards to ensure the confidentiality and secure storage of administrative records. Second, administrative data are generally restricted to events measured through officially recorded incidents and often contain very few covariates (e.g., personal characteristics, individual demographics, historical and future measures of important socioeconomic outcomes in domains outside the purview of the agency) that are often central to defining

outcomes and for including adequate statistical controls in multivariate research. Being able to link administrative data to rich longitudinal data (such as the content of the NLSY) would greatly increase the quality and scope of criminal justice research with administrative records.

Beyond case-level linkages to administrative data, there are likely many potential uses of alternative data sources that would link sub-national estimates of various important ecological outcomes from alternative data sources to geocoded observations from the NLSY (whether at the state, city or more detailed level of geography such as Census tracts). For example, the CDC's FASTER Data could be merged with geocodes to get information on area-level firearm injuries and how this impacts perception of safety at school and elsewhere.

In this section, we first discuss administrative data that might be individually linked to NLSY records for the purpose of studying the effects of victimization, criminal offending, and criminal justice involvement on future socioeconomic outcomes. We then discuss other data sources that could be combined with the geocoded NLSY data to measure ecological determinants of outcomes that can be observed in the NLSY.

Potential alternative data sources that May be individually linked to a future NLSY cohort

Given the national coverage of the NLSY, the sample size, and the fact that there are likely to be relatively few observations within a given jurisdictional boundary (court records often are collected by counties, criminal histories by states), projects aiming to link the future NLSY to administrative data would need to either use federal collected administrative data or individual research efforts that aim to be multistate and broad in their coverage. Fortunately, there are several federal administrative databases as well as individual research efforts that fit this description. Here we provide a description of each, and the content of the administrative data collections.

Criminal Justice Administrative Records System (CJARS): CJARS is a data infrastructure project developed by the University of Michigan and the Census Bureau. The University of Michigan collects and harmonizes criminal justice administrative records from state and local agencies. At the Census Bureau, these data can be linked with the survey and administrative data available in the Federal Statistics Research Data Center (FSRDC) network.

The administrative data in CJARS cover several criminal justice domains including arrests, bookings, court filings, dispositions, sentencing, incarceration spells, and periods on probation and parole. While coverage is not yet national, the project currently collects data from multiple state systems and in some instances partial coverage of counties within select states. Much of the data covers adult criminal cases with limited information on minors with the exception of criminal cases that are transferred to criminal (adult) court. While coverage is not national, the number of states is likely sufficient to cover a large proportion of observations in a future NLSY cohort. The CJARS data to date have been used for a wide variety of policy evaluations, thick descriptive research that would otherwise not be possible, and basic social science questions pertaining to the determinants of offending and the consequences of criminal justice involvement. For a list of completed projects, see <https://cjars.org/research/>.

The Jail Data Initiative: The Jail Data Initiative is a data infrastructure project at New York University. Rosters of detainees held in jails are scraped from jail websites. The data basically cover periods of jail confinement, with admissions and release dates for individuals who are booked and held pretrial as well as individuals who are sentenced to jail spells. Over 450 counties are included in the dataset. Data can be acquired directly from the Jail Data Initiative, as the information is scraped from publicly available sources. Juveniles booked into juvenile detention facilities are not included in the data, though there may be coverage for minors jailed in adult facilities.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Interstate Identification Index (III): The FBI III is a national index of state and federal criminal histories (or rap sheets), maintained by the FBI at the National Crime Information Center (NCIC). The program is designed to facilitate the interstate exchange of criminal history records among state justice agencies. Its primary purpose is for law enforcement queries rather than research. This, however, is also the case for the contributing state criminal history repositories that have been used in many research projects. The III database records arrests, bookings, court filings, dispositions, sentencing, and periods of incarceration, probation, and parole for all states and for all counties within states. The database is legally and logistically difficult to access and link with other data. The Bureau of Justice Statistics however have successfully used these data in multistate recidivism studies (see for example, [Durose and Antenangel 2021](#)), though data were deleted following the completion of the project. As with the other administration data sets discussed above, there is limited coverage of juvenile justice events.

Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Prison Roster Data: The IRS collects prison rosters from state departments of corrections as part of its statutory tax administration responsibilities. The data in theory can be used to measure incarceration in state prison and covers all states since 2012, although the data quality and the ability to construct longitudinal records varies by state. Data from the IRS is protected under Title 26 of the U.S. Code, which adds complexity to data acquisition and use. If an attempt were made by BLS to acquire these records and append them to the research file, the research file would become Title 26 protected and that would limit where and how data could be accessed by researchers. If the Census Bureau were to acquire these records from the IRS, applications to use these data would involve a more complex process involving IRS permission. Juvenile incarceration events are not covered, except presumably for minors incarcerated in adult prison facilities.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Firearm Surveillance Through Emergency Room (FASTER) Data: The CDC FASTER data currently collects data on firearm injuries from emergency rooms in 10 states. The data collection effort is part of a larger syndromic surveillance system that represents a collaboration between the CDC and local and state public health departments. Publicly available data is currently reported at the summary level, though one can imagine microdata linkages. We anticipate that the incidence of firearm injuries coupled with the likely NLSY sample size would result in few linkages between an emergency room visit for a firearm injury and an NLSY observation.

Potential alternative data sources that may be usable for ecological measures at sub-national geographic levels

There are a number of data sources (both surveys as well as archives of anonymized administrative data) that may be used to provide summary measures at sub-national geographies for key criminal justice outcomes as well as crime rates, victimizations, and broad gauges of risk and protective factors. **We recommend that the new NLSY incorporate protocols for permitting researchers access to NLSY data with relatively detailed geographic identifiers (i.e., county, zip code, census tract) to permit such matching and the research questions that may be answered with summary measures from alternative data sources.** The following data sources may be used for such purposes:

- National Court Juvenile Data Archive (OJJDP) <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/njcda/>
- Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (OJJDP) <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezacjrp/>
- National Survey of Youth in Custody (BJS, part of PREA collections) <https://bjs.ojp.gov/data-collection/national-survey-youth-custody-nsyc>
- Performance-based Standards Learning Institute (CQI process for facilities in 35 states) <https://pbstandards.org/>
- National Incidence-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), the FBI's replacement for the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) system
- Summary measures of laws pertaining to transfer to criminal court (Statistical Briefing Book) https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/structure_process/faqs.asp
- FBI arrest data (UCR/NIBRS) state & county (police department) arrest rates (juveniles especially)
- Adolescent Health Survey (researchers have linked data to NCVS at least on a community level).
- National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP) data on prisoner movements include county of sentencing (for most states) that could be used to generate measures of adult risk of incarceration and how that affects youth outcomes.
- The National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/data-research/ncands>

How alternative data sources could be used with the NLSY

Since none of the alternative data sources have complete national coverage, with the exception of the FBI III, we do not recommend that any items be replaced with data from alternative sources. Even with regard to the FBI III, we cannot currently recommend it as a replacement option because linkage requirements are infeasibly restrictive.

The features and availability of alternative criminal justice data sources are rapidly evolving. New projects are collecting and linking criminal justice administrative records, and existing projects are growing toward national coverage. We recommend that BLS reassesses regularly the coverage and availability of alternative data sources that measure criminal justice and related topics.

In our discussion of the administrative datasets above, we noted the limited coverage of juvenile justice interactions. In light of this fact, the best time to do a complete assessment might be a year or two before respondents' transition to adulthood. An assessment of available administrative data in the late 2020s could provide an opportunity for item replacement of some criminal justice questions asked of adult respondents.

Regarding the use of alternative data sources to generate summary ecological variables at sub-national geographies, we recommend that BLS do an assessment of "community context" variables that could be added to the research files based on respondent geography. These variables would generally be sourced from public aggregate statistics, so they would not increase researcher access burden as will likely occur with the more restrictive person-level linkages discussed above.

For a general description of alternative data sources (not necessarily specific to this content panel), please see the report entitled [Alternative Data Sources Final Report](#). That report describes alternative data sources that could be integrated into a new NLS cohort as a way to improve the accuracy of survey data collected, reduce respondent burden, or expand the scope of the survey content.

Logistical considerations

Linking to administrative data would likely require approved consent beyond the content of the protocol used for the previous NLSY surveys. **We recommend that consent for linkage should be asked of all respondents and all parents/caregivers, including linkage at the BLS and within the Federal Statistical Research Data Centers (FSRDCs) and the National Secure Data Service (NSDS).**

Linkage consent should highlight that researchers only have access to anonymized data at the FSRDCs and the NSDS, that these linkages are only done for a statistical purpose, and that federal law prohibits disclosure of a respondent's identity or characteristics. We also recommend that the BLS make some effort to anticipate other future linkage environments/services beyond the datasets discussed above.

Many of the linkage opportunities discussed above will impose a burden on researchers. For example, many datasets are available to link in the FSRDC system, but the proposal and background check processes will impose a burden on researchers and precludes researchers with felony convictions from accessing the data. There may also be direct monetary costs to access the FSRDC system. There is a growing "virtual" FSRDC program that could broaden access. **Absent the BLS providing research support to researchers from institutions not affiliated with the FSRDC network, we recommend that BLS explore partnerships with public funding agencies such as the National Science Foundation or private agencies such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation to develop such a program.** Such an effort would address important questions pertaining to equity in access to data, the representativeness of the researchers who work with NLSY data, and the types of research questions that get asked.

4. Top Ranked Topic- and Survey Design-Related Recommendations

Prioritized recommendations

In arriving at our recommendations, we narrowed down a larger set of suggested questions that dug deep into the experience with the criminal justice system and covered our entire range of domains from risk/protective factors, to front-end interactions with the criminal justice system, to carceral experiences. In trimming down the set of suggestions, we generally prioritized:

- Questions/domains where existing validated survey instruments exist that the NLSY can borrow from,
- Questions/domains inquiring about outcomes/interactions that are likely to be materially important for labor market prospects and other socioeconomic outcomes,
- Questions/domains where recall bias would not compromise response validity, and
- Questions/domains pertaining to experiences that occur with sufficient relative frequency that the experience could be accurately measured in the NLSY.

The panel feels that the final set of questions/domains are all high priority and to various degrees build on content that is already contained within the prior NLSY cohorts.

That being said, there are some suggestions that are “low-lying-fruit,” so to speak. The prior NLSY cohorts already inquired about **self-reported offending and victimization**. Our recommendations in this domain simply suggest that these questions be revised to be more comprehensive in the behaviors/experiences that they are meant to capture and to better reflect the current state of the world rather than the world of the 1990s.

The questions pertaining to **arrest, criminal adjudication, and punishment** are unlikely to add substantial time to the average survey given that most youth and adults (when the sample ages) will not answer these questions in a given survey year. However, the additional questions will provide important measurements of both early explanatory contributors to future socioeconomic outcomes as well as potential later life outcomes to be studied in and of themselves.

5. Reference List

Agan, A. Y., Doleac, J. L., & Harvey, A. (2021). *Misdemeanor prosecution* (No. w28600). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://academic.oup.com/qje/advance-article-abstract/doi/10.1093/qje/qjad005/6998589?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>

- Agan, A., & Starr, S. (2018). Ban the box, criminal records, and racial discrimination: A field experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(1), 191-235. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx028>
- Apel, R., & Powell, K. (2019). Level of criminal justice contact and early adult wage inequality. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 5(1), 198-222. <https://www.rsfjournal.org/content/5/1/198.abstract>
- Baron, E. J., & Gross, M. (2022). *Is There a Foster Care-To-Prison Pipeline? Evidence from Quasi-Randomly Assigned Investigators* (No. w29922). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w29922#:~:text=E.%20Jason%20Baron%20%26%20Max%20Gross%20Working%20Paper,little%20evidence%20on%20whether%20this%20relationship%20is%20causal.>
- Bayer, P., Hjalmarsson, R., & Pozen, D. (2009). Building criminal capital behind bars: Peer effects in juvenile corrections. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(1), 105-147. <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/124/1/105/1890328?redirectedFrom=fulltext&login=false>
- Bhuller, M., Dahl, G. B., Løken, K. V., & Mogstad, M. (2020). Incarceration, recidivism, and employment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 128(4), 1269-1324. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/705330?journalCode=jpe>
- Bird, M., Gill, O., Laco, J., Pickard, M., Raphael, S., & Skog, A. (2022). Three Strikes in California. *California Policy Lab*, <https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Three-Strikes-in-California.pdf>
- Brame, R., Bushway, S. D., Paternoster, R., & Turner, M. G. (2014). Demographic patterns of cumulative arrest prevalence by ages 18 and 23. *Crime & Delinquency*, 60(3), 471-486. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0011128713514801?journalCode=cadc>
- Brayne, S. (2020). *Predict and surveil: Data, discretion, and the future of policing*. Oxford University Press, USA. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/predict-and-surveil-9780190684099?cc=us&lang=en&>
- Bruns, A., & Lee, H. (2019). Racial/ethnic disparities. *Handbook on Children with Incarcerated Parents: Research, Policy, and Practice*, 37-52. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-16707-3_4
- Bruns, A. and Hedwig Lee. (January 2020). "Partner Incarceration and Women's Substance Use." *Journal of Family and Medicine*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12659>

- Bushway, S., Cabrerros, I., Paige, J. W., Schwam, D., & Wenger, J. B. (2022). Barred from employment: More than half of unemployed men in their 30s had a criminal history of arrest. *Science Advances*, 8(7), eabj6992. DOI:10.1126/sciadv.abj6992
<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abj6992>
- California Racial and Identity Profiling Advisory Board. (1 January 2023). "RECOMMENDATIONS AND BEST PRACTICES, 2023 RIPA REPORT." *Office of the Attorney General of California*, <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/2023-ripa-report-best-practices.pdf#:~:text=The%202023%20Annual%20RIPA%20Report%20provides%20recommendations%20and,next%20practices%20geared%20toward%20safe%20and%20equitable%20policing>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (Accessed 2 May 2023). "YRBS Data Summary & Trends." https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/yrbs_data_summary_and_trends.htm
- Dobbie, W. and Yang, C.S. (March 24, 2021). "The economic costs of pretrial detention." *Brookings Institution*, <https://www.brookings.edu/bpea-articles/the-economic-costs-of-pretrial-detention/>
- Doleac, J. L., & Hansen, B. (2020). The unintended consequences of "ban the box": Statistical discrimination and employment outcomes when criminal histories are hidden. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 38(2), 321-374. <https://doi.org/10.1086/705880>
- Durose, M. R., & Antenangeli, L. (2021). Recidivism of prisoners released in 34 states in 2012: A 5-year follow-up period (2012–2017). Washington, DC: *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
<https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/recidivism-prisoners-released-34-states-2012-5-year-follow-period-2012-2017>
- Finlay, K., & Mueller-Smith, M. (2021). Justice-involved individuals in the labor market since the Great Recession. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 695(1), 107-122. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00027162211024532?journalCode=anna>
- Finlay, K., Mueller-Smith, M., & Street, B. (2023). Criminal Justice Involvement, Self-Employment, and Barriers in Recent Public Policy. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 42(1), 11-34.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pam.22438>
- Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. A. (2006). Perceived criminality, criminal background checks, and the racial hiring practices of employers. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 49(2), 451-480.
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/501089>
- Jácome, E. (2021). "How better access to mental health care can reduce crime." *Age*, 17(19), 21.
<https://siepr.stanford.edu/publications/policy-brief/how-better-access-mental-health-care-can-reduce-crime>

- Kling, Jeffrey, R. (2006). "Incarceration Length, Employment, and Earnings." *American Economic Review*, 96 (3): 863-876. DOI: 10.1257/aer.96.3.863
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.96.3.863>
- Lee, H., & Hicken, M. T. (2016). Death by a thousand cuts: The health implications of black respectability politics. *Souls*, 18(2-4), 421-445. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29187782/>
- Lofstrom, Magnus, and Steven Raphael. 2016. "Crime, the Criminal Justice System, and Socioeconomic Inequality." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30 (2): 103-26.
<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.30.2.103#:~:text=Hence%2C%20the%20growth%20in%20criminal%20justice%20populations%20since,%22Crime%2C%20the%20Criminal%20Justice%20System%2C%20and%20Socioeconomic%20Inequality.%22>
- Mangundayao, I., McNicholas, C., Poydock, M., and Sait, A. (December 22, 2021). "More than \$3 billion in stolen wages recovered for workers between 2017 and 2020 Report." *Economic Policy Institute*, <https://www.epi.org/publication/wage-theft-2021/>
- Maroto, M., & Sykes, B. L. (2020). The varying effects of incarceration, conviction, and arrest on wealth outcomes among young adults. *Social Problems*, 67(4), 698-718.
<https://academic.oup.com/socpro/article-abstract/67/4/698/5538627>
- Mueller-Smith, M., Pyle, B., & Walker, C. (2023). *Estimating the Impact of the Age of Criminal Majority: Decomposing Multiple Treatments in a Regression Discontinuity Framework* (No. 23-01). https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/mgms/wp-content/uploads/sites/283/2023/01/CJARS_AoM_20230116.pdf
- Muñiz, A. (2022). *Borderland Circuitry: Immigration Surveillance in the United States and Beyond*. Univ of California Press. <https://www.ucpress.edu/book/9780520379497/borderland-circuitry>
- Murphy DA, Brecht ML, Huang D, Herbeck DM. (2012 March). Trajectories of Delinquency from Age 14 to 23 in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Sample. *Int J Adolesc Youth*, 1;17(1):47-62. doi: 10.1080/02673843.2011.649401. Epub 2012 Jan 31. PMID: 23105164; PMCID: PMC3478785. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23105164/>
- Murray, A. L., Eisner, M., Ribeaud, D., Kaiser, D., McKenzie, K., & Murray, G. (2021). Validation of a brief self-report measure of adolescent bullying perpetration and victimization. *Assessment*, 28(1), 128-140. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1073191119858406>
- Nagin, D. S., Cullen, F. T., & Jonson, C. L. (2009). Imprisonment and reoffending. *Crime and justice*, 38(1), 115-200. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/599202?journalCode=cj>

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities*. National Academies Press.

<https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/24928/proactive-policing-effects-on-crime-and-communities>

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *Reducing Racial Inequality in Crime and Justice: Science, Practice, and Policy*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26705>.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022). Violent Deaths at School and Away From School and School Shootings. Condition of Education. *U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences*. Retrieved April 2023, from <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/a01>.

National Institute of Justice. (11 March 2021). "The Overlap Between Those Committing Offenses Who Also Are Victims: One Class of Crime Victim Rarely Seeks or Receives Available Services," *nij.ojp.gov*: <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/overlap-between-those-committing-offenses-who-also-are-victims-one-class-crime>

National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming juvenile justice: A developmental approach*. National Academies Press. <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/14685/chapter/1>

National Research Council. 2014. *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18613>.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). (July 2022). "Arrests of Youth Declined Through 2020." <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/library/publications/arrests-youth-declined-through-2020>

Owens, E. G. (2017). Testing the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 36(1), 11-37. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pam.21954>

Owens, E., Weisburd, D., Amendola, K. L., & Alpert, G. P. (2018). Can you build a better cop? Experimental evidence on supervision, training, and policing in the community. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 41-87. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/1745-9133.12337>

Pager, Devah. (2003). "The Mark of a Criminal Record". *American Journal of Sociology*, 108 (5):937-975. <https://scholar.harvard.edu/pager/publications/mark-criminal-record>

Raphael, Steven (2007) "Early Incarceration Spells and the Transition to Adulthood," in Danziger, Sheldon and Cecilia Elena Rouse (eds) *The Price of Independence: The Economics of Early*

- Adulthood, *Russell Sage Foundation*: New York pp. 278-306. <https://gspp.berkeley.edu/research-and-impact/publications/early-incarceration-spells-and-the-transition-to-adulthood>
- Rose, E. K., Schellenberg, J. T., & Shem-Tov, Y. (2022). *The Effects of Teacher Quality on Adult Criminal Justice Contact* (No. w30274). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://ekrose.github.io/files/rss_teachers_cjc.pdf
- Tapp, S.N., Davis, E. (November 2022). “Contacts Between Police and the Public, 2020.” *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/contacts-between-police-and-public-2020>
- “Task 1.3.4 Alternative Data Sources Final Report.” (27 May 2022). *NORC at the University of Chicago and CHRR at the Ohio State University*, https://www.bls.gov/nls/pdf/NLSY26_ads.pdf
- Truman, J. L., & Morgan, R. E. (2022). *Violent Victimization by Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity, 2017-2020*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/vvsogi1720.pdf>
- Uggen, C., Vuolo, M., Lageson, S., Ruhland, E., & K. Whitham, H. (2014). The edge of stigma: An experimental audit of the effects of low-level criminal records on employment. *Criminology*, 52(4), 627-654. http://users.soc.umn.edu/~uggen/Uggen_Vuolo_Lageson_Whitham_Ruhland_Crim_14.pdf
- Vogels, E.A., Gelles-Watnick, R. and Massarat, N. (10 August 2022). “Teens, Social Media and Technology 2022.” *PEW Research Center*, <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2022/08/10/teens-social-media-and-technology-2022/>
- Vogels, E.A. (15 December 2022). “Teens and Cyberbullying 2022.” *PEW Research Center*, <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2022/12/15/teens-and-cyberbullying-2022/>
- Wakefield, S., & Wildeman, C. (2013). *Children of the prison boom: Mass incarceration and the future of American inequality*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/children-of-the-prison-boom-9780190624590?cc=us&lang=en&>
- Weisburst, E. K. (2019). Patrolling public schools: The impact of funding for school police on student discipline and long-term education outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 38(2), 338-365. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pam.22116>
- Western, B. (2002). The Impact of Incarceration on Wage Mobility and Inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 67(4), 526–546. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3088944>

Western, B. (2007). Punishment and Inequality in America. *Russell Sage Foundation*, https://www.thriftbooks.com/w/punishment-and-inequality-in-america_bruce-western/1690282/item/54861304/

Western, B., & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration & social inequality. *Daedalus*, 139(3), 8-19. <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/brucewestern/files/westernpettit10.pdf>

Wright, R., Tekin, E., Topalli, V., McClellan, C., Dickinson, T., and Rosenfeld, R. (May 2017). “Less Cash, Less Crime: Evidence from the Electronic Benefit Transfer Program.” *The Journal of Law and Economics*, Volume 60, Number 2, <https://doi.org/10.1086/693745>

Exhibit 1: Suggested Topics, Sub-Topics and Example Survey Questions

Topic	Sub-Topic	Example Survey Questions
Victimization and Police-Citizen Interactions	Questions Pertaining to Actual Victimization	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the victimization questions with the aim of broadly identifying (1) property crime, and (2) crimes against one's person, (3) consumer fraud victimization, and (4) online harassment, bullying via social media, identity theft, and other forms of victimization experiences that reflect the increasing role of social media in modern life. Draw upon survey questions (when available) from tested and fielded surveys such as the NCVS and the Consumer Fraud Survey fielded by the Federal Trade Commission.
Juvenile/Criminal Justice Sanctions and Surveillance	Details of Experience with Police During an Arrest	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the following things happened to you during or immediately after the encounter? (<i>Response options [select all that apply]: Handcuffed, Arrested, DNA Collected, Fingerprinted, Picture Taken, Place in a cell (either by yourself or with others)</i>)
	Experience with Adjudication	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were you charged with a crime? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did you have to go to court / meet with a judge? Were you offered an alternative program to avoid a criminal conviction on your permanent record (for example, community service, family therapy, individual therapy, restorative justice)? Where you convicted of the offense?
	Experience with Punishment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did you serve any time in either jail, prison, or a juvenile detention facility? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were you ordered to complete a behavioral or educational rehabilitation program by the courts? Were you ordered to check in regularly with a parole or probation officer? Did you have to pay any fines, fees, or restitution payments?
Protective and Risk Factors	Social Networks and Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> If you had an emergency or personal crisis, is there an adult who you would reach out to for support? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Among the following, who might you reach out to? (<i>Add comprehensive list of possible adults that would accommodate youth no longer in school, e.g. SRO, teacher, principal, coach, neighbors, family member (parent or other), school counselor, other school administrator, other adult</i>) If you had an emergency, who would you not want to be contacted? (<i>Add similar list of adults</i>)
	Individual Interactions with Law Enforcement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did you have a face-to-face interaction with a police officer? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were you alone or with someone else when the interaction began? Who initiated the interaction? (<i>Response options: the officer, you, someone else you were with</i>) Are there police officers stationed at your school? Are there school resource officers present at your school?

	Family Members/Friends Stopped by the Police	1. To the best of your knowledge, over the past year have any of the following members of your family and social circles been stopped by the police? (<i>Response options: a parent or grandparent, a sibling, an aunt or uncle, a friend</i>)
	Perceptions of Victimization Risk	2. Indicate strength of agreement with the following statements: a) I am very worried about crime. b) In my day-to-day life, I try to prepare to defend myself or my friends. c) I try to avoid certain social situations and places so that I can stay safe. d) The threat of gun violence is a problem in my neighborhood. e) The threat of gun violence is a problem in my school. f) The threat of gun violence is a problem in my workplace.

Exhibit 2: Suggested Sub-Topics and Notes to Consider for the New Cohort

Topic	Sub-Topic	Whether Included in NLSY79	Whether Included in NLSY97	Useful for Cross-Cohort Analysis (yes, no)	Topic Priority (high, medium, low)	Data Collection Method	Recommended Ages/Stage in Life Course	Recommended Frequency of Data Collection	Other Recommendations and Notes
Victimization and Police-Citizen Interactions	Questions Pertaining to Actual Victimization	Incomplete victimization experiences included	Incomplete victimization experiences included	Yes	High	Survey Response	Across the life course	Annually	
Juvenile/Criminal Justice Sanctions and Surveillance	Details of Experience with Police During an Arrest	No	Yes	Yes	High	Survey Response	Follow up to existing questions for those who indicated that they were arrested	Follow up to existing questions on arrests; ask at each wave	Questions should change with the life course: for example, question about parent should be dropped once the respondent turns 18.
	Experience with Adjudication	No	Yes	Yes	High	Survey Response	Follow up to existing questions on charging and conviction;	Follow up to existing questions on charging and conviction;	See paragraph below about legal representation question as we may want to capture this at

							Ask at each wave	Ask at each wave	more than one stage.
	Experience with Punishment	No	Yes	Yes	High	Survey Response	Follow up to existing questions on conviction; Ask at each wave	Follow up to existing questions on conviction; Ask at each wave	Many of these measures are in the Survey of Inmates (prior to 2016) and the Survey of Prisoners (2016). This will allow a direct comparison of juvenile and adult experiences. Also, we will capture the total amount spent in these categories, unlike the Survey of Inmates/Prisoners, and these measures will help us to understand the life-course dynamics of financial punishments for wealth accumulation, labor market participation, and household income dynamics.
Protective and Risk Factors	Social Networks and Support	No	No	No	High	Survey response	While in school	One off – perhaps at baseline	
	Individual Interactions with Law Enforcement	No	No	No	High	Survey response	Across the life course, but sub-questions 1(c) and 1(d)	Baseline and every wave	Link with questions on arrests and stops by the police

							from Exhibit 1 while in school		
	Family Members/Friends Stopped by the Police	No	No	No	Medium	Survey response	Across the life course	Baseline, every 5 years	These may not be characteristics that change rapidly over time
	Perceptions of Victimization Risk	No	No	No	High	Survey response (Likert Scale)	Across the life course	Baseline, every 5 years	These may not be characteristics that change rapidly over time