

THE FIRST NATIONAL JUVENILE ONLINE VICTIMIZATION INCIDENCE STUDY (N-JOV-1)

NDACAN Dataset Number 135 USER'S GUIDE



National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York 14850

607-255-7799

ndacan@cornell.edu

www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov

Initial release: 12/2/2009

Last Revision: 1/13/2021

The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Incidence Study (N-JOV-1)

Data Collected by

David Finkelhor, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Janis Wolak, J.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Kimberly J. Mitchell, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Funded by

National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Distributed by

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN)

User's Guide Written by

Diane Wach Miller, MSED

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

in collaboration with

Kimberly J. Mitchell, Ph.D. University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

©2009 National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

CONTENTS

- [TITLE PAGE](#)
- [PREFACE](#)
- [ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE](#)
- [PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT](#)
- [ABSTRACT](#)
- [STUDY OVERVIEW](#)
 - [Study Identification](#)
 - [Purpose of the Study](#)
 - [Study Design](#)
 - [Date\(s\)of Data Collection](#)
 - [Geographic Area](#)
 - [Unit of Observation](#)
 - [Sample](#)
 - [Data Collection Procedures](#)
 - [Response Rates](#)
 - [Sources of Information](#)
 - [Type of Data Collected](#)
 - [Measures](#)
 - [Related Publications & Reports](#)
 - [Analytic Considerations](#)
 - [Confidentiality Protection](#)
 - [Extent of Collection](#)
 - [Extent of Processing](#)
- [DATA FILE INFORMATION](#)
 - [File Specifications](#)
 - [Data File Notes](#)
 - [Acronyms and Abbreviations](#)

PREFACE

The data for *The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Incidence Study (N-JOV-1)* have been given to the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) for public distribution by David Finkelhor. Funding for the project was provided by National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Award Number(s): 98-MC-CX-K002, 98-JN-FX-0012).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SOURCE

Authors should acknowledge the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) and the original collector(s) of the data when publishing manuscripts that use data provided by the Archive. Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the statement below.

The data used in this publication were made available by the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, and have been used with permission. Data from *The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Incidence Study (N-JOV-1)* were originally collected by: David Finkelhor. Funding for the project was provided by National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Award Number(s): 98-MC-CX-K002, 98-JN-FX-0012). The collector(s) of the original data, the funder(s), NDACAN, Cornell University and their agents or employees bear no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Finkelhor, D., Mitchell, K., & Wolak, J. (2009). *National Juvenile Online Victimization Incidence Study (N-JOV-1)* [Dataset]. National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect. <https://doi.org/10.34681/YH08-3G86>

PUBLICATION SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT

In accordance with the terms of the *Data License* for this dataset, users of these data are required to notify the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect of any published work or report based wholly or in part on these data. A copy of any completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint should be emailed to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu. Such copies will be used to provide our funding agency with essential information about the use of NDACAN resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about research activities among data users and contributors.

ABSTRACT

The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Study (N-JOV) examines the incidence and characteristics of juvenile online victimization cases, including sexual exploitation and child pornography cases, in the criminal justice system. The specific goals were to:

1. provide sound national estimates of the number of juvenile online victimization cases ending in arrest during a one-year time period (July 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001);
2. define categories and subcategories of juvenile online victimizations and describe case, offender and victim characteristics;
3. make policy recommendations to increase reporting of these crimes and improve prevention measures and provision of victim services.

First, a national sample of 2,574 state, county, and local law enforcement agencies were surveyed by mail asking if they had made arrests in Internet-related child pornography or sexual exploitation cases. Then, detailed telephone interviews were conducted with investigators who had such cases. A stratified sample of law enforcement agencies was created to get information from agencies that specialized in Internet sex crimes against minors while still allowing every agency in the U.S. to be selected at random for the sample.

Eighty-eight percent of the agencies (n = 2,270) that received mail surveys responded. Seventeen percent of the agencies (n = 383) that responded reported 1,723 arrests. Interviews were conducted on all eligible cases that had identified victims or came from agencies reporting three or fewer cases. When agencies reported four or more cases, a random sample of cases was selected for interviews. A total of 612 unique interviews were completed. Data was weighted to estimate annual numbers of arrests. The procedure took into account sampling procedures and non-response, allowing use of the data to project estimated annual arrest totals with 95% confidence that the accurate number would fall within a specific range.

Law enforcement made an estimated 2,577 arrests during the 12 months starting July 1, 2000, for Internet sex crimes against minors. These Internet sex crimes against minors can be categorized into three mutually exclusive types:

1. Internet crimes against identified victims involving Internet-related sexual assaults and other sex crimes such as the production of child pornography committed against identified victims (39% of arrests);
2. Internet solicitations to undercover law enforcement posing as minors that involved no identified victims (25% of arrests);
3. the possession, distribution, or trading of Internet child pornography by offenders who did not use the Internet to sexually exploit identified victims or solicit undercover investigators (36% of arrests).

Two-thirds (67%) of offenders who committed any of the types of Internet sex crimes against minors possessed child pornography. The vast majority of offenders were non-Hispanic White males older than 25 who were acting alone. Most investigations (79%) involved more than one law enforcement agency.

STUDY OVERVIEW

Study Identification

The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Incidence Study (N-JOV-1)

Principal Investigator(s):

David Finkelhor, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Janis Wolak, J.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Kimberly J. Mitchell, Ph.D.
University of New Hampshire Durham, NH

Funded By:

National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Award Number(s):

98-MC-CX-K002, 98-JN-FX-0012

Purpose of the Study

The National Juvenile Online Victimization (N-JOV) Study was undertaken to get a sense of the scope and types of law-enforcement activity regarding internet sex crimes against minors and to serve as a baseline for monitoring the growth of these crimes and related law-enforcement activities. Because Internet sex crimes against minors are a recent phenomenon, data about them have not been gathered in a national study. The N-JOV Study is the first national research to systematically collect data about the number and characteristics of arrests for Internet sex crimes against minors. The N-JOV Study had the three goals of:

1. Estimating a baseline number of arrests during a one-year period so that the growth of these cases in the criminal-justice system can be measured in the future
2. Providing a statistical portrait of the characteristics of Internet sex crimes against minors and description of how they are handled within the criminal justice system
3. Organizing the variety of cases into a typology useful for tracking and analysis.

Study Design

The study is a complex sample design requiring the use of weights for the analysis. See the Analysis section of this User's Guide for further information.

The study used a two-phase methodology of a mail survey followed by telephone interviews. The data collection strategy was adapted from a similar methodology developed to investigate the incidence and characteristics of stereotypical child abduction cases. See the references listed below for the studies employing this methodology.

Finkelhor, D., Hammer, H., & Sedlak, A. J. (2002). *Non-Family Abducted Children: National Estimates and Characteristics* (NCJ196467). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency.

Sedlak, A. J, Finkelhor, D., Hammer, H., & Schultz, D. J. (2002). *National Estimates of Missing Children: An Overview* (NCJ196466). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

An adapted version of the Dillman "Total Design Method" was used for the mail-survey portion of the study, to maximize response-rate. The researchers used first class mail to send surveys, personalized cover letters, and business reply envelopes to the heads of the agencies in the sample. Then, at intervals of between 2 and 4 weeks, reminder postcards were sent, followed by second and third mailings of the survey to the heads of agencies that had not responded. See the reference listed below for information about the Total Design Method.

Dillman DA. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: Wiley.

Date(s) of Data Collection

September 1, 2001 to February 1, 2003

Geographic Area

United States

Unit of Observation

Cases involving arrests in the criminal justice system.

Sample

The first phase mail survey was sent to a national sample of 2,574 state, county, and local law enforcement agencies asking them if they had made arrests in Internet-related child pornography or sexual-exploitation cases. A stratified sample of law-enforcement agencies was created to get information from agencies that specialized in Internet sex crimes against minors and still allow every agency a chance to be selected in the sample. To do this the agencies were divided into three frames.

Frame one consists of 79 agencies that specialize in investigating Internet sex crimes against minors. These include including 32 state and local agencies comprising 30 federally funded

Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) regional Task Forces, 43 federally funded ICAC satellites and four federal agencies, two of which ultimately participated. The researchers took a census of this frame, rather than sample.

The second frame is comprised of a random sample of 833 agencies known to have sent staff members to training classes addressing Internet sex crimes against minors drawn from lists provided by training organizations. The sample was selected from among 1668 trained agencies.

The third frame consists of all other local, county, and state law enforcement agencies across the United States, a total of 13,586 agencies. The sample (n=1,666) was drawn using an annually updated database of local, county, and state law enforcement agencies included in the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports files or the Bureau of Justice Statistics' Directory of Law Enforcement Agencies. The agencies in the first and second frames were cross-referenced in the database to avoid duplication.

100% of the first frame agencies, 50% of the second frame, and 12% of the third frame agencies were included in the sample. Decisions about sample construction were based on the number of agencies in the population of each frame, expectations that many of the first and second frame agencies and few of the third frame agencies would have eligible cases to report, and practical considerations such as cost and processing time that limited overall sample size.

Interviews were conducted on all eligible cases that had identified victims or came from agencies reporting three or fewer cases. When agencies reported four or more cases, a random subsample of cases was selected for interviews. To be eligible, cases had to:

1. Have victims younger than 18.
2. Involve arrests between July 1, 2000, and June 30, 2001.
3. Be Internet-related.

Cases were considered to be Internet-related if any of the criteria noted below were met:

1. An offender-victim relationship was initiated online
2. An offender who was a family member or prior acquaintance of a victim used the Internet to communicate with a victim to further a sexual victimization, or otherwise exploit the victim
3. A case involved an Internet-related undercover investigation
4. Child pornography was received or distributed online, or arrangements for receiving or distributing were made online
5. Child pornography was found on a computer, on removable media such as floppy and compact disks, as computer printouts, or in a digital format.

The second phase consisted of follow-up telephone interviews with law enforcement investigators to gather information about case, offender, and victim characteristics. The 2,205 agencies that responded to the mail survey, plus the two federal agencies that participated, reported a total of 1,723 cases involving Internet sex crimes against minors, with 50 first frame specialized agencies (consisting of ICAC Task Forces, ICAC satellites, and federal agencies)

reporting 999 cases, 226 second frame trained agencies reporting 545 cases and 109 third frame other agencies reporting 179 cases.

The researchers designed a sampling procedure that took into account the number of cases reported by an agency, so as to not unduly burden respondents in agencies with many cases. If an agency reported between one and three Internet-related cases, follow-up interviews were conducted for every case. Eighty-five percent of the agencies that had cases fell within this group. For agencies that reported more than three cases, interviews were conducted for all cases that involved identified victims (victims who were located and contacted during the investigation), and other cases were sampled. For agencies with between four and fifteen cases, half of the cases that did not have identified victims were randomly selected for follow-up interviews. In agencies that reported more than fifteen cases, cases with no identified victims were divided into two samples, using random selection, and then half of one sample was randomly selected for follow-up interviews. In some agencies, the researchers could not discover which cases had identified victims, so sampling was done from among all cases, using the sampling procedure described above.

Of the 796 eligible cases in the final sample, interviews were completed for 79% (n = 630). Of the 21% that were not completed, 13% involved agencies that did not respond to requests for interviews, 3% involved respondents who refused to be interviewed, and 5% involved duplicate cases or cases that could not be identified. The archived dataset has 612 cases because 18 of the n=630 were identified as duplicates.

***READ THE METHODOLOGY REPORT FOR A MORE DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF FRAMES, SAMPLING, AND RESPONSE RATES.**

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2003). *National juvenile online victimization study (N-JOV): Methodology report*. Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire. Retrieved from <http://unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/NJOV1%20Meth%20Rpt.pdf>

Data Collection Procedures

Mail surveys to law enforcement agencies in the U.S.

Follow-up telephone interviews with key investigators on specific cases.

For more detailed information on Methodology and Procedures, please read the Methodology Report.

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2003). *National juvenile online victimization study (N-JOV): Methodology report*. Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center, University of New Hampshire. Retrieved from <http://unh.edu/ccrc/pdf/NJOV1%20Meth%20Rpt.pdf>

Response Rates

Mail survey - 88%

Telephone interview - 79%

Sources of Information

Mail and telephone interviews.

Type of Data Collected

Mail-in and telephone surveys. Only the telephone survey data is archived.

Measures

Finkelhor Juvenile Online Victimization Telephone Survey

Finkelhor, D., Wolak, J., & Mitchell, K. (2001). *Finkelhor Juvenile Online Victimization Telephone Survey*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.

Finkelhor Juvenile Online Victimization Mail Survey

Finkelhor, D., Wolak, J., & Mitchell, K. (2001). *Finkelhor Juvenile Online Victimization Mail Survey*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire.

Related Publications and Final Reports

Users are strongly encouraged to review published works, based upon these data, before doing analyses. To view a complete list of publications for this dataset, please visit our online citations collection called “canDL” at:

<https://www.zotero.org/groups/421939/candl/tags/135-NJOV1/library> or go to the [child abuse and neglect Digital Library \(canDL\) NDACAN webpage](#).

Analytic Considerations

Missing data is coded as such on a variable by variable basis within the value labels field:

- 97 = DK = responder indicated that he or she didn't know
- 98 = Na/Ref = respondent may have been asked but the response was not ascertainable or respondent refused to answer
- 99 = Not APP = not applicable, not asked due to skip logic.

Some missing data is coded as system missing.

Because of the two-stage cluster sampling design of this study, the dataset should be analyzed using complex samples survey procedures, which are available in most major statistical analysis

software. Analyzing the data without accounting for the cluster design will lead to inaccurate results.

You **MUST** use survey procedures when analyzing these data. The weight variable is needed to derive appropriate point statistics (means, frequencies, etc.) and the stratum and psu variables are needed to compute proper standard errors.

Within SPSS use the complex samples add-on module. The csaplan file for SPSS has been included with the dataset. For SAS, use the survey procedures (e.g., SURVEYFREQ and SURVEYMEANS). Stata users should use the svy commands.

The following three variables from the dataset should be indicated when specifying the survey parameters for your analyses:

- FINWT – Each case has an analysis weight to account for the probability of selection to both the mail survey and telephone interview samples. The analysis weights were adjusted for agency non-response, case level non-response, duplication of cases among agencies and for arrests by one federal agency that did not participate in case level interviews.
- VARPSU – The primary sampling unit variable was created to account for clustering within each of the three sampling frames.
- VARSTRAT – The stratification variable was computed based on the different sampling strategies for each frame.

The contributors used sampling without replacement (WOR) estimation method in their analyses. WOR incorporates the finite population correction factor. In the dataset, the finite population correction factor is provided in variable FPC.

Confidentiality Protection

The contributor has removed all identifiers from the data.

Some data was removed due to its narrative elements, to retain case confidentiality.

Extent of Collection

The collection consists of the NDACAN User's Guide, the NDACAN Codebook, one data file DS_135 provided in SPSS (.sav), SAS(.sas7bdat), and Stata(.dta) native formats, import statements for reading the text data file (.dat) into SPSS(.sps), Stata(.do), and SAS(.sas), tab-delimited data file (.tab), the complex samples weighting plan (.csaplan), mail survey, and telephone interview survey document.

Extent of Processing

NDACAN produced the User's Guide and Codebook. Modifications were made to some labels in the data file. Two variables were removed. One case was edited to remove details in order to preserve confidentiality.

DATA FILE INFORMATION

File Specifications

The data file, DS_135, has 612 records and 902 variables. There is one record per respondent.

Data File Notes

Variables typically follow the numbering system of the instrument, Telephone.Interview.pdf. An exception to this rule includes variables f45-f47c2, where the questions follow the federal, state, and local, subcategories rather than the exact question numbering.

Groups of variables will have the same prefix, with different numbered or lettered suffixes. Often these naming conventions indicate multiple choice responses to one interview question are coded in multiple dichotomous variables. At other times, these variables together account for multiple responses to one interview question. For example, in variables, ase30a1f, ase30a2f, ase30a3f where the question is, "Where did they go together", the first response (location) is listed in the first of the variables, and in cases where the respondent provided more than one answer, the others are listed in subsequent variables. Thus, you will need to look across several variables for the full response to the question.

Variables ending in "r" were recoded by the investigators. Those ending in "f" are typically recodes of verbal free-response questions. In some cases, the raw data from which the recode was derived is provided; in other cases it is not part of the archived data set.

See the sample section of this User's Guide for a description of the frame variable.

Many of the variable labels are derivations of the interview question and are quite long. Stata, and some older versions of other software packages, will truncate the text. Full text is available in the codebook.

In many cases when an interview question required a free-response, e.g. "describe" or "specify", the response is recorded in the variables that follow. In some cases, the free-response was not archived and is not provided.

The term "identified victim" means that a victim was located and contacted as part of the investigation. Minors depicted in child pornography are also victims, but many remain unidentified; hence the differentiation between identified and unidentified victims.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronyms and abbreviations used in this dataset, including documentation files and the data file:

Acronym/abbreviation	Definition/meaning
APRI	Operation Avalanche (United States police child pornography crackdown)
CP	Child Pornography
CPS	Child Protective Services
DCF	Department of Children and Families (Department of Health and Human Services)
DK	Don't Know
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
DOJ	United States Department of Justice
DSS	Department of Social Services
DUI	Driving under the influence
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
Fserv	File server
HD	Hard drive
HH	Household
HTCIA	International High Technology Crime Investigation Association
IACIS	International Association of Computer Investigative Specialists
ICAC	Internet Crimes Against Children
ICQ	AOL instant messaging program (Acronym is a homophone for "I seek you")
IRC	Internet Relay Chat
JAZ drive	Removable disk storage drive
LEA	Law Enforcement Agency
NA/ref	Not ascertainable/refused
Ncase	Software that creates a log of internet surfing activity
NDACAN	National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
NCMEC	National Center for Missing and Exploited Children
NJOV	National Juvenile Online Victimization Study
NJOV-1	The First National Juvenile Online Victimization Study
Not app	Not applicable
NYM	Anonymous Internet Mailing List
O	Offender

Acronym/abbreviation	Definition/meaning
OJJDP	Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
PSU	Primary sampling unit
SAS	SAS statistical software program
S/he	She or he
SEARCH	SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics
SEM	Sexually Exploited Minors
SPSS	IBM SPSS Statistics - software program
Stata	Stata statistical software program
UA	Undercover Agent
UC	Undercover
V	Victim
WOR	Sampling without replacement
ZIP drive	Removeable disk storage drive

Technical support for this dataset is provided by NDACAN.

Please send your inquiries to NDACANSUPPORT@cornell.edu

Visit the User Support page of the NDACAN website for help documents and videos (<https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/user-support/user-support.cfm>).