



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

Data Resources Program

Evaluation of the Children at Risk Program in Austin, Texas; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Memphis, Tennessee; Savannah, Georgia; and Seattle, Washington; 1993–1997

Part 1: Demographic and Household Data

ICPSR 2686

Adele V. Harrell, Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan

Codebook



Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

EVALUATION OF THE CHILDREN AT RISK PROGRAM IN AUSTIN, TEXAS;
BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT; MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE; SAVANNAH, GEORGIA;
AND SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; 1993-1997

(ICPSR 2686)

Codebook for
Part 1, Demographic and Household Data

Principal Investigators

Adele V. Harrell, Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan
The Urban Institute

First ICPSR Version
October 2000

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

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

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

Harrell, Adele V., Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan. EVALUATION OF THE CHILDREN AT RISK PROGRAM IN AUSTIN, TEXAS; BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT; MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE; SAVANNAH, GEORGIA; AND SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; 1993-1997 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute [producer], 1998. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2000.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

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

DATA COLLECTION DESCRIPTION

Adele V. Harrell, Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan

EVALUATION OF THE CHILDREN AT RISK PROGRAM IN AUSTIN, TEXAS; BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT; MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE; SAVANNAH, GEORGIA; AND SEATTLE, WASHINGTON; 1993-1997 (ICPSR 2686)

SUMMARY: The Children at Risk (CAR) Program was a comprehensive, neighborhood-based strategy for preventing drug use, delinquency, and other problem behaviors among high-risk youth living in severely distressed neighborhoods. The goal of this research project was to evaluate the long-term impact of the CAR program using experimental and quasi-experimental group comparisons. Experimental comparisons of the treatment and control groups selected within target neighborhoods examined the impact of CAR services on individual youths and their families. These services included intensive case management, family services, mentoring, and incentives. Quasi-experimental comparisons were needed in each city because control group youths in the CAR sites were exposed to the effects of neighborhood interventions, such as enhanced community policing and enforcement activities and some expanded court services, and may have taken part in some of the recreational activities after school. CAR programs in five cities -- Austin, TX; Bridgeport, CT; Memphis, TN; Seattle, WA; and Savannah, GA -- took part in this evaluation. In the CAR target areas, juveniles were identified by case managers who contacted schools and the courts to identify youths known to be at risk. Random assignment to the treatment or control group was made at the level of the family so that siblings would be assigned to the same group. A quasi-experimental group of juveniles who met the CAR eligibility risk requirements, but lived in other severely distressed neighborhoods, was selected during the second year of the evaluation in cities that continued intake of new CAR participants into the second year. In these comparison neighborhoods, youths eligible for the quasi-experimental sample were identified either by CAR staff, cooperating agencies, or the staff of the middle schools they attended. Baseline interviews with youths and caretakers were conducted between January 1993 and May 1994, during the month following recruitment. The end-of-program interviews were conducted approximately two years later, between December 1994 and May 1996. The follow-up interviews with youths were conducted one year after the program period ended, between December 1995 and May 1997. Once each year, records were collected from the police, courts, and schools. Part 1 provides demographic data on each youth, including age at intake, gender, ethnicity, relationship of caretaker to youth, and youth's risk factors for poor school performance, poor school behavior, family problems, or personal problems. Additional variables provide information on household size, including number and type of children in the household, and number and type of adults in the household. Part 2 provides data from all three youth interviews (baseline, end-of-program, and follow-up). Questions were asked about the youth's attitudes toward school and amount of homework; participation in various activities (school activities, team sports, clubs or groups, other organized activities, religious services, odd jobs or household chores); curfews and bedtimes; who assisted the youth with various tasks; attitudes about the future; seriousness of various

problems the youth might have had over the past year and who he or she turned to for help; number of times the youth's household had moved; how long the youth had lived with the caretaker; various criminal activities in the neighborhood and the youth's concerns about victimization; opinions on various statements about the police; occasions of skipping school and why; if the youth thought he or she would be promoted to the next grade, would graduate from high school, or would go to college; knowledge of children engaging in various problem activities and if the youth was pressured to join them; and experiences with and attitudes toward consumption of cigarettes, alcohol, and various drugs. Three sections of the questionnaire were completed by the youths. Section A asked questions about the youth's attitudes toward various statements about self, life, the home environment, rules, and norms. Section B asked questions about the number of times that various crimes had been committed against the youth, his or her sexual activity, number of times the youth ran away from home, number of times he or she had committed various criminal acts, and what weapons he or she had carried. Items in Section C covered the youth's alcohol and drug use, and participation in drug sales. Part 3 provides data from both caretaker interviews (baseline and end-of-program). Questions elicited the caretaker's assessments of the presence of various positive and negative neighborhood characteristics; safety of the child in the neighborhood; attitudes toward and interactions with the police; if the caretaker had been arrested, had been on probation, or in jail; whether various crimes had been committed against the caretaker or others in the household in the past year; activities that the youth currently participated in, curfews set by the caretaker; if the caretaker had visited the school for various reasons; school performance or problems by the youth and the youth's siblings; amount of the caretaker's involvement with activities, clubs, and groups; the caretaker's financial, medical, and personal problems and assistance received in the past year; if he or she was not able to obtain help, why not; and information on the caretaker's education, employment, income level, income sources, and where he or she sought medical treatment for themselves or for the youth. Two sections of the data collection instruments were completed by the caretaker. Section A dealt with the youth's personal problems or problems with others, and the youth's friends. Additional questions focused on the family's interactions, rules, and norms. Section B items asked about the caretaker's alcohol and drug use, and any alcohol and drug use or criminal justice involvement by others in the household older than the youth. Part 4 consists of data from schools, police, and courts. School data include the youth's grades, grade-point average (GPA), absentee rate, reasons for absences, and whether the youth was promoted each school year. Data from police records include police contacts, detentions, violent offenses, drug-related offenses, and arrests prior to recruitment in the CAR program and in Years 1-4 after recruitment, court contacts and charges prior to recruitment and in Years 1-4 after recruitment, and how the charges were disposed.

UNIVERSE: All CAR participants in the selected cities in the school years 1992-1993 and 1993-1994.

SAMPLING: Cities were selected to achieve regional and ethnic diversity and to represent cities with strong plans for implementing the CAR model. CAR target neighborhoods were those served by the CAR program in that city. Quasi-experimental comparison neighborhoods were selected based on census tract information and then two adjacent highly distressed tracts (but not the two most distressed tracts) were selected. Youths were selected based on CAR eligibility criteria.

NOTE: (1) Per the researchers' agreement with each site, the data in this collection do not identify the individual sites. (2) The user guide, codebooks, and data collection instruments are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Website.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION: 4 data files + machine-readable documentation (PDF) + SAS data definition statements + SPSS data definition statements

EXTENT OF PROCESSING: MDATA.PR/ REFORM.DATA/ REFORM.DOC/ SCAN/ UNDOCCHK.ICPSR/ MDATA.ICPSR/ CDBK.ICPSR/ DDEF.ICPSR

DATA FORMAT: Logical Record Length with SAS and SPSS data definition statements

Part 1: Demographic and Household Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 874
Variables: 25
Record Length: 38
Records Per Case: 1

Part 2: Baseline, End-of-Program, and Follow-Up Youth Interview Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 867
Variables: 1,491
Record Length: 1,947
Records Per Case: 1

Part 3: Baseline and End-of-Program Caretaker Interview Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 865
Variables: 819
Record Length: 1,117
Records Per Case: 1

Part 4: Official Records Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 874
Variables: 110
Record Length: 227
Records Per Case: 1

RELATED PUBLICATIONS:

Harrell, Adele V., Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan. "Impact of the Children at Risk Program, Comprehensive Final Report II" (Final Report). United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, May 1998.

Harrell, Adele, Shannon E. Cavanagh, Michele A. Harmon, Christopher S. Koper, and Sanjeev Sridharan. "Impact of the Children at Risk Program, Volumes I and II." United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, March 1997.

Harrell, Adele, Shannon Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan. "Evaluation of the Children at Risk Program: Results One Year After the End of the Program" (Research in Brief). United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, November 1999.

*** ICPSR CODEBOOK NOTES ***

- (1) Per the researchers' agreement with each site, the data in this collection do not identify the individual sites.
- (2) To be eligible for CAR, youth had to be ages 11 to 13, attend the sixth or seventh grade, live in the target neighborhood, and meet school, family, or personal risk criteria. The risk requirements were any of the following: (a) at least three school risk indicators (special education, grade retention, poor academic performance, truancy, tardiness, out-of-school suspension, or disruptive behavior in school), one of which had to refer to behavioral problems; (b) at least one family risk indicator, such as history of family violence or disintegration, criminal conviction of a family member within the prior five years, or family involvement in gangs, drug use or drug dealing; or (c) at least one personal risk indicator, such as known or suspected involvement in drug use or sales, under juvenile court supervision, delinquency, mental illness, member of a gang or delinquent peer group, victim of abuse or neglect, and pregnancy or parenthood.
- (3) Part 2 contains data from the baseline, end-of-program, and follow-up questionnaires completed by youth (one record per youth). Variable names of questions asked on the baseline questionnaire begin with the letter 'Q,' variable names of questions asked on the end-of-program questionnaire begin with the letter 'Y,' and variable names of questions asked on the follow-up questionnaire begin with the letter 'K.'
- (4) Part 3 contains data from the baseline and end-of-program questionnaires completed by caregivers (one record per caregiver). Variable names of questions asked on the baseline questionnaire begin with the letter 'C' and variable names of the questions asked on the end-of-program questionnaire begin with the letter 'P.'
- (5) Part 1 provides values for GROUP and WAVE for all cases. With the principal investigator's consent, ICPSR merged these two variables into the data for Part 2 and Part 3. ICPSR also created dummy variables in both Part 2 and Part 3 to indicate which cases completed each questionnaire. For Part 2, a summary variable was also created that identifies for each case which questionnaires were completed.
- (6) Variables corresponding to the Short Blessed Scale in the caretaker questionnaire contained no responses and were dropped, with the principal investigator's consent, from the Part 3 data.

Codebook Notes (cont.)

- (7) For Part 4, Grade Point Average (GPA): Official GPA records were collected for the school year before the start of the program, the two school years during which youth were eligible for the program, and the school year following the service period. The GPA's from each city were recoded based on distribution and ranged from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest). See the Glossary in "Comprehensive Final Report II" for more information.
- (8) Year values are provided in two-digit variables. User interested in using these variables for analysis will want to convert the year values to a four-digit code. Users can use one of the following examples with the SPSS or SAS syntax files provided with this collection to perform the conversion and create a date variable. A display format is given but users can elect to use a format of their choice.

Example to convert INTYEAR (Year of Interview) to four-digits and combine with INTMON (Month of Interview) to create the new date variable INTDATE with a MMYYYY format using SPSS:

After the data list statement add the following commands.

```
compute newyr=intyear+1900.  
compute intdate=date.moyr(intmon, newyr).  
format intdate (moyr9).
```

Example to convert INTYEAR (Year of Interview) to four-digits and combine with INTMON (Month of Interview) to create the new date variable INTDATE using the MDY function in SAS:

After the input statement add the following commands. Because the MDY function requires a month, day and year argument, users must hardcode a value for the day. In this example the day value in the MDY function is hardcoded as 15.

```
newyr=intyear+1900;  
intdate=mdy(intmon,15,newyr);  
format intdate mmyys9.;
```

CODEBOOK FOR ICPSR 2686

EVALUATION OF THE CHILDREN AT RISK PROGRAM IN
AUSTIN, TEXAS, BRIDGEPORT, CONNECTICUT, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE,
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA, AND SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, 1993-1997

(PART 1: DEMOGRAPHIC AND HOUSEHOLD DATA)

PLEASE NOTE: The "M" between the code and the code label indicates
the code has been designated as a missing value.

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
QUID	QUESTIONNAIRE ID	1	4	F4
GROUP	GROUP	5	5	F1
	1 Treatment			
	2 Control			
	3 Quasi			
WAVE	1=FIRST & 2=SECOND GROUP RECRUITED	6	6	F1
	1 1st group			
	2 2nd group			
DOB	MONTH AND YEAR YOUTH WAS BORN	7	10	F4
	8888 Blanked			
AGE	YOUTHS AGE AT INTAKE	11	12	F2
YGENDER	GENDER OF YOUTH	13	13	F1
	1 Female			
	2 Male			
	9 M Not ascertained			
ETHNICIT	ETHNICITY OF YOUTH	14	16	A3
	100 White			
	200 Asian			
	300 Hispanic			
	400 African American			
	500 Misc other			
	900 M Not ascertained			
CRELATIO	RELATIONSHIP OF CAREGIVER TO YOUTH	17	18	F2
	1 Aunt			
	2 Cousin			
	3 Father			
	4 Foster mother			

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
NWCRELAT (cont.)				
	5 Godmother			
	6 Godmother/aunt			
	7 Grandfather			
	8 Grandmother			
	9 Guardian			
	10 Legal guardian			
	11 Mother			
	12 Sister			
	13 Stepfather			
	14 Stepmother			
	15 Uncle			
	99 M Not ascertained			
CREL	RELATION. OF CAREGIVER TO YOUTH-RECODED	19	19	F1
	1 Father			
	2 Mother			
	3 Other			
SCHACAD	RISK FACTOR-POOR SCHOOL PERFORMANCE	20	20	F1
	0 Risk not indicated			
	1 Risk indicated			
SCHBEHAV	RISK FACTOR-POOR SCHOOL BEHAVIOR	21	21	F1
	0 Risk not indicated			
	1 Risk indicated			
FAM	RISK FACTOR-FAMILY PROBLEMS	22	22	F1
	0 Risk not indicated			
	1 Risk indicated			
PERSONAL	RISK FACTOR-PERSONAL PROBLEM	23	23	F1
	0 Risk not indicated			
	1 Risk indicated			
HHSIZE	HOUSEHOLD SIZE	24	24	F1
HKIDS	NUMBER OF KIDS	25	25	F1
HADULTS	NUMBER OF ADULTS	26	26	F1

NAME	VARIABLE LABEL	BEG COL	END COL	FMT
DADPRES	FATHER PRESENT	27	27	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
MOMPRES	MOTHER PRESENT	28	28	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
GRAND	GRANDPARENT PRESENT	29	29	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
OTHADULT	OTHER ADULT PRESENT	30	30	F1
	0 No			
	1 Yes			
YNG_BOY	YOUNGER BROTHER IN FAMILY	31	31	F1
	0 None			
YNG_GIRL	YOUNGER SISTER IN FAMILY	32	32	F1
	0 None			
OLD_BOY	OLDER BROTHER IN FAMILY	33	33	F1
	0 None			
OLD_GIRL	OLDER SISTER IN FAMILY	34	34	F1
	0 None			
HRATIO	RATIO OF KIDS TO ADULTS	35	38	F4.2