NATIONAL JUVENILE PROSTITUTION STUDY

METHODOLOGY REPORT

Kimberly J. Mitchell, PhD., Janis Wolak, JD., & David Finkelhor, PhD.
Crimes against Children Research Center
Family Research Lab
University of New Hampshire

Please address all correspondence regarding this report to:

Kimberly J. Mitchell, PhD.
Crimes against Children Research Center
Family Research Lab
University of New Hampshire
10 West Edge Drive, Ste. 106
Durham, NH 03824
Ph: (603) 862-4533
Fax: (603) 862-2899
E-mail: Kimberly.Mitchell@unh.edu
Web: www.unh.edu/ccrc

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1. SUMMARY

The National Juvenile Prostitution Study (JPS) was conducted by the Crimes against Children Research Center located at the University of New Hampshire. JPS was fully funded through grants from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice. This study collected information from a national sample of law enforcement agencies about the prevalence of arrests for and characteristics of juvenile prostitution cases in the criminal justice system during the year 2005. The goal of this methodology was 1) to design a representative national sample of law enforcement agencies that would give us an overall picture of these crimes in the United States, 2) to understand how these cases emerged and were handled in a diverse group of agencies, and 3) to get detailed data about the characteristics of these crimes from well-informed, reliable sources.

We used a three-phase process to collect data from a national sample of local, county, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. In Phase 1, we conducted telephone interviews with individuals in law enforcement agencies knowledgeable about juvenile prostitution. The final data set includes data from 175 agency-level interviews. In Phase 2 we sent a mail survey to a national sample of law enforcement agencies asking if they had made arrests or detentions in juvenile prostitution cases in the year 2005. In Phase 3, we conducted telephone interviews with law enforcement investigators about a sample of the cases reported in the mail survey. The final data set, weighted to account for sampling procedures and other factors, includes data from 138 completed case-level interviews.

SECTION 2. SAMPLE SELECTION

Section 2.1. Phase 1 agency-level telephone interview sample

The first phase agency-level telephone inter views consisted of telephone calls with a sample of 230 state, county, and local law enforcement agencies, including all 80 agencies with 1000 or more sworn, full-time officers (i.e., law enforcement agencies in all the largest cities in the U.S.); 50 agencies randomly selected from the 6,401 agencies with 10 – 49 full-time officers; 50 agencies randomly selected from the 1,112 agencies with 50 – 99 full-time officers; and 50 agencies randomly selected from the 965 agencies with 100 – 999 full-time officers. Interviews were completed with 175 agencies (76%).

Section 2.2. Phase 2 national mail survey sample

The second phase mail survey was sent to a national sample of 2,598 state, county, and local law enforcement agencies. We created a stratified sample, dividing law enforcement agencies into three sampling frames based on the number of full-time

officers in order to capture juvenile prostitution cases in a variety of types of agencies across the U.S.

The first frame consisted of 81 agencies, including all 80 agencies in the U.S. with 1000 or more sworn, full-time officers and one federal agency. Additionally, the BJA Human Trafficking Task Forces were included but they were all located in agencies already in this frame. We did not sample this frame. A total of 137 agencies met the criteria for this frame. Of these, there was one agency without jurisdiction to investigate crimes involving juvenile prostitution and 56 agencies that were either duplicates, reflected multiple units within one agency, or multiple districts within one agency. Of the 81 eligible agencies in the first frame, 81% completed and returned surveys and 44% reported one or more cases involving juvenile prostitution. See Table 1 for a description of the disposition of the first frame mail survey sample.

Table 1. Description and details of stratified national sample and disposition of the mail survey

Sampling Frames	Agencies in Population N	Agencies in Sample n (% pop.)	Eligible Agencies n (% pop.)*	Agencies that Responded n (% eligible agencies)	Agencies with Juvenile Prostitution Cases n (% eligible agencies)
First frame: 1000+ officers	137	137 (100%)	81 (59%)	66 (81%)	36 (44%)
Second frame: 50-999 officers	2,077	1,072 (52%)	1,006 (48%)	942 (94%)	83 (8%)
Third frame: 1-49 officers	12,954	1,389 (11%)	1,311 (10%)	1,273 (97%)	13 (1%)
Total	15,168	2,598 (17%)	2,398 (16%)	2,281 (95%)	132 (5%)

* 1st frame: 56 agencies were duplicates, represented multiple units within one agency (e.g., child abuse unit and vice unit), multiple districts within one agency, or had no jurisdiction. 2nd frame: 66 agencies with no jurisdiction or a duplicate of an agency in the first frame (i.e., counted in the first frame only). 3rd frame: 67 agencies with no jurisdiction and 11 agencies that did not exist anymore by the time of the mailing.

The second frame consisted of law enforcement agencies with 50 – 999 full-time, sworn officers. A total of 2,077 agencies fell into this category. Of these agencies, 52% were randomly selected to participate in the study (n = 1,072). Of these, 64 agencies did not have jurisdiction to investigate crimes involving juvenile prostitution and one was a duplicate of an agency already counted in the first frame. Of the 1,006 eligible agencies in the second frame, 94% completed and returned surveys and 8% reported one or more cases involving juvenile prostitution. See Table 1 for a description of the disposition of the second frame mail survey sample.

The third frame consisted of law enforcement agencies with 1 – 49 full-time, sword officers. A total of 12,168 agencies fell into this category. Of these agencies, 11% were

randomly selected to participate in the study (n = 1,389). Of these, 67 agencies did not have jurisdiction to investigate crimes involving juvenile prostitution and 11 agencies did not exist by the time of the mailing. Of the 1,311 eligible agencies in the third frame, 97% completed and returned surveys and 1% reported one or more cases involving juvenile prostitution. See Table 1 for a description of the disposition of the third frame mail survey sample.

Section 2.3. Phase 3 case-level telephone interview sample

Third phase of this study consisted of follow-up telephone interviews with law enforcement investigators to gather information about case, offender, and victim characteristics. The 2,281 eligible agencies that responded to the mail survey reported a total of 877 cases involving juvenile prostitution, with 36 first frame agencies reporting 618 cases, 83 second frame agencies reporting 238 cases, and 13 third frame agencies reporting 21 cases.

We designed a sampling procedure that took into account the number of cases reported by an agency, so that we would not unduly burden respondents in agencies with many cases. If an agency reported between one and three juvenile prostitution cases, we conducted interviews for every case. Sixty-seven percent of the agencies that had cases fell into this group (28% of 1st frame agencies, 83% of 2nd frame agencies, and 92% of 3rd frame agencies with cases). For agencies with between four and fifteen cases, 50% were randomly selected for interviews. For agencies with 16 to 50 cases, we conducted interviews on a randomly selected 25% of cases. Finally, for agencies with 51 or more cases, we conducted interviews on a randomly selected 10% - 50% of cases, depending on the agencies time availability.

SECTION 3. CONFIDENTIALITY

The National Juvenile Prostitution Study: the Criminal Justice System Response was conducted with the approval of the University of New Hampshire's Institutional Review Board and complied with confidentiality regulations mandated for research funded by the U.S. Department of Justice.

SECTION 4. INSTRUMENT DESIGN

Section 4.1. Phase 1 agency-level telephone interview

The Phase 1 agency-level telephone interview instrument consisted of questions about the types of juvenile prostitution cases agencies may have handled including pimps with juvenile prostitutes, businesses or other places fronting for prostitution, gang-related juvenile prostitution, trafficking of juveniles from foreign countries or whoa re U.S. citizens for sexual purposes, juveniles working on their own, those prostituted by family members or other people they know, and sex tourism. Questions included the

approximate number of these cases investigated in the past year, as well as whether any arrests had been made. Additionally, agencies were asked about the involvement of child pornography and the Internet in juvenile prostitution cases. Finally, agencies were asked about their involvement in any special initiative, targeted approaches, alternatives to arrest, and special programs involving juvenile prostitution. All agency-level telephone interviews were conducted using a computer-assisted interviewing program.

Section 4.2. Phase 2 national mail survey

Full mail survey. The full mail survey was modeled after another survey developed by the authors, the First National Juvenile Online Victimization Study (Wolak, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2003), which surveyed law enforcement agencies about the incidence and characteristics of Internet-related sex crimes against minors. This, as well as the current mail survey instrument, was a multi-page booklet, formatted so respondents could follow it easily. It included a "Frequently Asked Questions" section and a glossary of study terms, along with a toll-free telephone number so that respondents could contact the researchers if they had questions.

The mail survey asked four primary questions:

1. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or arrest any juveniles for crimes involving prostitution? If yes, respondents were asked if any of the cases involved:
    a. Pimps with juvenile prostitutes
    b. Businesses or other places fronting for prostitution (e.g., massage parlors, escort services)
    c. Organized crime or gang-related juvenile prostitution
    d. Juveniles who were not U.S. citizens
    e. Juveniles from out-of-state
    f. Juveniles acting on their own who used prostitution to get money or goods – boys and girls
    g. Sexual abuse where juveniles were prostituted by family members or acquaintances
    h. Sex tourism (a U.S. citizen traveling internationally to have sex with a minor in a foreign country)
    i. Other (specify)

2. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or arrest any adults for crimes involving juvenile prostitution? If yes, respondents were asked if any of the cases involved:
    a. Pimps with juvenile prostitutes
    b. Businesses or other places fronting for prostitution (e.g., massage parlors, escort services)
    c. Organized crime or gang-related juvenile prostitution

d. Juveniles who were not U.S. citizens
e. Juveniles from out-of-state
f. Juveniles acting on their own who used prostitution to get money or goods – boys and girls
g. Sexual abuse where juveniles were prostituted by family members or acquaintances
h. Sex tourism (a U.S. citizen traveling internationally to have sex with a minor in a foreign country)
i. Other (specify)

3. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or make any arrests where someone who produced or wanted to produce child pornography paid money (or something of monetary value) to use a juvenile in sexually explicit pictures? (The payment could have been to the juvenile or to someone else.)

4. In 2005, did your agency detain or make any arrests where someone sold child pornography for monetary gain?

If respondents answered "Yes" to any of these questions, we asked them to list the case number, or other reference, and the name of the key investigating officer or most knowledgeable person for each case they reported. Also, we emphasized that agencies should return surveys, even if they had no cases to report.

Shortened mail survey. A shortened version of the full mail survey was created and sent to agencies who had not returned the full version after two copies and a postcard reminder were sent (see Section 6.2 below for data collection procedures). Since most of the agencies who had not responded at this point were in the third frame (i.e., the smallest agencies), we surmised that most had not returned the mail survey because they did not have cases. The shortened version of the mail survey was designed in an attempt to facilitate the participation of these agencies, even if they did not have any cases.

The shortened version of the mail survey asked three main questions:

1. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or arrest any juveniles (age 17 or younger) for crimes involving prostitution?
2. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or arrest any adults (age 18 or older) for crimes involving juvenile prostitution?
3. In the calendar year 2005, did your agency detain or make any arrests where someone who produced or wanted to produce child pornography paid money (or something of monetary value) to use a juvenile in sexually explicit pictures? (The payment could have been to the juvenile or to someone else.)

If the respondent responded positively to any of these questions, s/he was asked to indicate the total number of cases in which their agency made arrests or detentions in 2005 that involved the crimes listed above. They were also asked to include their contact information to interviewers to contact them for follow-up interviews.

Section 4.3. Phase 3 case-level telephone interview

The Phase 3 telephone interview instrument consisted of the following sections, some of which were used in each interview and others depending on the facts of the case. All case-level telephone interviews were conducted using a computer-assisted interviewing program.

1. Preliminary information. The Preliminary information section served as a screening device to establish whether a case was eligible for the study. It was used in all interviews. It asked respondents to describe the case and then queried them about whether and when an arrest or detention was made, whether the case involved the exchange or money or something of monetary value, and whether there was a juvenile involved.
    a. If a case involved more than one offender, this section identified a primary offender. Later questions about the characteristics of the crime, and offender referred to the primary offender. Primary offenders were chosen based on the following hierarchy: *1) pimp or other person who controlled the prostitution, then 2) other offender who committed a crime against the juvenile (could be child pornography producer, client, etc..), then 3) the offender who committed the most serious crime, then 4) the youngest*.
    b. If a case involved more than one juvenile involved in prostitution, this section identified a primary juvenile. Later questions about the characteristics of the crime and juvenile referred to the primary juvenile. Primary juveniles were chosen based on the following hierarchy: *1) the one who was most directly involved in the prostitution, then 2) the one you have the most information about, then 3) the youngest*.

2. Juveniles acting alone. The juveniles acting alone section was used in cases where a juvenile was arrested or detained for prostituting his- or herself (and no type of controlling person was involved, such as a pimp). This section collected information about what types of sex acts the juvenile did and what s/he received in payment; clients; and traveling for the purposes of prostitution.

3. Crimes involving controlling persons. The crimes involving controlling persons section was asked in cases where there was a pimp, madam, business owner, parent, or some other individual who was controlling or in charge of the prostitution of a juvenile. This section collected information about the types of sex acts the juvenile did and what the controlling person received in payment; clients; traveling

for the purposes of prostitution (both domestically and internationally); use of businesses fronting for prostitution; gang involvement; and how the juvenile was recruited into prostitution.

4. Sex tourism. The sex tourism section was used in cases where a U.S. citizen traveled to a foreign country and paid for sex acts with a minor in that country. Information collected in this section included the places the offender traveled; whether sex with a minor was the main purpose of travel; and previous trips for the same purpose; and amount of money spent.

5. Child pornography production. The child pornography production section was used in cases where the offender either paid a juvenile for sexual pictures, or some other commercial purpose of the images, such as a means of advertising a juvenile for prostitution. Information collected in this section included the format the images were on (e.g., computers, removable media such as CDs; photo albums); the type of images portrayed (e.g., graphic images, inclusion of adults); age and gender of juveniles depicted; payment of juveniles for posing; distribution of images by the offender; and receipt of money for images.

6. Selling child pornography. The selling child pornography section was used in cases where an offender received money or something else of monetary value for child pornography; or was attempting to sell images. The information collected in this section included the format the images were on (e.g., computers, removable media such as CDs; photo albums); the type of images portrayed (e.g., graphic images, inclusion of adults); age and gender of juveniles depicted; and how the child pornography was sold (e.g., on the Internet, by mail).

7. The police investigation. The police investigations section was asked in all cases and gathered information about how the investigation began; involvement of other jurisdictions; types of investigative tools utilized (e.g., search warrants); and items seized.

8. The offender. The offender section collected information about the demographic, family, emotional, and behavioral characteristics of the offender in each case. For cases with multiple offenders, information was collected about the primary offender. This section also captured information about arrests, charges and outcomes of criminal cases.

9. The juvenile. The juvenile section was used in all cases. It collected information about the demographic, family, emotional, and behavioral characteristics of the juvenile. For cases with multiple juveniles involved, information was collected about the primary juvenile. Since juvenile prostitutes acting on their own are treated differently across jurisdictions (i.e., as a victim or an offender), the information on juveniles in these cases was always captured in this section. The

only time information about a juvenile would be captured in the offender section would be if the juvenile was pimping or otherwise controlling the prostitution of another juvenile in some way.

10. Conclusion. The conclusion section was used in all cases and served to finalize the interview, to capture other important information about the case that was not covered in the survey, and to record whether the respondent wanted a copy of the results upon completion of the study.

SECTION 5. CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY

To be included in the JP Study, cases had to involve juveniles younger than 18; end in an arrest or detention (of either the juvenile prostitute or an adult prostituting the juvenile) in the calendar year 2005; and involve the exchange of money or something of monetary value for sex acts with a juvenile or sexual images of a juvenile.

1. Juveniles younger than 18. We chose this definition of a juvenile because 18 is the age of majority for most purposes in most jurisdictions. We did not want to rely on state or federal statutes that define "age of consent,: because these statutes vary. Eighteen is the upper age limit for any statutes defining age of consent. Also, federal and many state statutes define child pornography as images of minors younger than 18.

2. End in arrest or detention. We limited the study to cases ending in arrests or detentions, rather than crime reports or open investigations because cases ending in arrests or detentions: 1) were more likely to involve actual crimes, 2) had more complete information about the crimes, offenders and victims, 3) gave us a clear standard for counting cases, and 4) helped us to avoid interviewing multiple agencies about the same case. We decided to include cases that ended in detentions (in addition to arrests) since many juvenile prostitutes are taken into custody and detain instead of being officially arrested and we wanted to be sure to capture these cases in our study.

3. Calendar year 2005. We chose a discrete one-year period so that we could estimate the number of annual arrests and detentions.

4. Exchange of money or something of monetary value. We set this criterion in order to establish cases that involved the commercial sexual exploitation of juveniles (as opposed to sexual assault and abuse more broadly). These could be cases where juveniles – either boys or girls – exchanged sex acts for money (or something of monetary value) or cases that involved pimps, organized crime, or other situations where one person made money or gained financially in other ways from selling a juvenile for sex acts or to produce child pornography. We also included sex tourism

cases where a U.S. citizen traveled internationally to have sex with a minor in a foreign country.

SECTION 6. DATA COLLECTION

Section 6.1. Phase 2 national mail survey procedures

To maximize response rates to the Phase 2 mail survey, we followed an adapted version of the "total design" mail survey methodology (Dillman, 2007), and similar to one we used in N-JOV1. Specifically:

1. We used first class mail to send surveys, personalized cover letters, and business reply envelopes to the heads of the local, county, and state law enforcement agencies in the sample.
2. Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing, we sent reminder postcards to all agency heads, asking them to complete and return the survey if they had not done so, and thanking them if they had.
3. Approximately six weeks after the initial mailing, we sent copies to the survey, personalized cover letters, and business reply envelopes to the heads of agencies who had not responded to date.
4. Approximately nine weeks after the initial mailing, we sent a shortened version of the mail survey (see Section 4.2 for more details of this shortened version) that could be folded and returned as a stand-alone pre-paid business reply envelope and personalized cover letters to agency heads that still had not responded.
5. Finally, telephone interviewers called the agencies that had not responded and, when possible, filled out the survey instrument over the telephone.

The overall response rate for the mail survey was 95% of eligible agencies. The mail survey portion of this study took place between June and September of 2006. See Table 1 for a detailed description of the disposition of the mail survey sample.

Section 6.2. Phases 1 and 3 telephone interview procedures

We interviewed law enforcement investigators because they have been in the forefront of identifying and combating juvenile prostitution and are one of the best sources of accessible, in-depth information about their this type of crime. Three trained interviewers conducted the telephone interviews for the first and third phases using computer-assisted interviewing software. The interviewers attended a two-day training session led by the lead researchers that provided extensive details about the background, purpose, and instrumentation of the study. They also all participated in a series of practice, mock interviews with each other and the lead researchers until they were sufficiently familiar and comfortable with the interview. The Phase 1 agency-level telephone interviews were conducted between September of 2005 and February of 2006. The Phase 3 telephone interviews were conducted between October, 2006 and May of 2007.

Table 2 depicts the final disposition of the Phase 3 telephone interviews. The 132 agencies reporting cases in the mail survey reported a total of 877 cases. Of these, 142 (16%) were not selected for the sample due to the sampling procedures described above and 23 (3%) were ineligible. Of the 712 cases in the sample, we completed interviews for 19% (n = 139) - 36% (n = 257) involved agencies that did not respond to requests for interviews, 44% (n = 313) respondents who refused to be interviewed, and <1% (n = 3) were duplicate cases or cases that could not be identified. Sampled cases that were ineligible were not replaced in the sample.

Table 2. Responses to case-level telephone interviews in all agencies

	1st frame agencies	2nd frame agencies	3rd frame agencies	Total
Cases reported in mail surveys	618	238	21	877
Not selected for sample	112	30	0	142
Ineligible cases*	13	10	1	24
Number of cases in sample	493	198	21	711
Non-responders**	125	121	11	257
Refusals	303	10	0	313
Other (duplicate and invalid)	3	0	0	3
Completed cases	**62**	**67**	**9**	**138**
Duplicate cases deleted	0	0	0	0
Final number	**62**	**67**	**9**	**138**

Note. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.
* Case did not meet eligibility requirement for study. (In most cases, the arrest or detention did not occur in the timeframe of the study or no money or anything of monetary value was exchanged).
** Could not schedule interviews for various reasons.

SECTION 7. DATA CLEANING AND CODING

Section 7.1. Case descriptions

Interviewers wrote brief summaries of the facts of each case. These summaries were used by the lead researchers for descriptive purposes in presentations and publications. Any salient details of a case that had the potential to make the case identifiable were either excluded for publication and presentation purposes or slightly altered.

Section 7.2. Quantitative data

Data from the computer-assisted interviewing program were downloaded into SPSS 15.0 (SPSS, 2006), a statistical analysis program. The two lead researchers devised lists of codes for open-ended responses, coded the open-ended responses individually, compared the coded response for discrepancies, and reviewed and resolved these discrepancies.

SECTION 8. WEIGHTING AND VARIANCE ESTIMATES

8.1 Weighting

The National Juvenile Prostitution Study (JPS) data were collected in three Phases. In Phase I, agency-level telephone interviews were conducted from a convenience sample of state, county and local law enforcement agencies. Since Phase I was based on a non-probability sample design, no weights were calculated for the Phase I data. In Phase II, agency-level mail interviews were obtained from a nationally representative stratified, single stage probability sample of law enforcement agencies. In Phase III, telephone interviews were conducted with law enforcement investigators regarding the case, offender and victim characteristics of a random sample of juvenile prostitution cases within their agency. Variance estimation stratum, primary sampling unit (PSU), base weight and non-response adjusted weight variables were created for each of the Phase II and III data sets in order to support unbiased estimation and variance estimation for the JPS data. The sections below discuss the Phase II and III data weighting and variance estimation in more detail.

8.1.1 Phase II

Agencies were selected with equal probability within stratum in Phase II. See table 1 for the sampling rates by stratum. The Phase II variance estimation stratum variable (STRAT2) was set equal to the Phase II sampling stratum for an agency, and the Phase II PSU variable (PSU2) was set equal to the agency ID.

An agency base weight (BWGT2) was calculated for each sampled agency as the reciprocal of its probability of selection. These agency base weights were then adjusted for nonresponse in two steps. First, nonresponse adjustment cells (NRCELL2) were defined by sampling stratum and agency size (i.e., count of officers), as follows:

NRCELL2	STRAT2	OFFICERS
1	1	< 2,000
2	1	2,000 <= X < 4,000
3	1	X >= 4,000
4	2	50 <= X < 100
5	2	100 <= X < 150
6	2	150 <= X < 200
7	2	200 <= X < 250
8	2	250 <= X < 300
9	2	300 <= X < 400
10	2	400 <= X < 500
11	2	500 <= X < 750

12	2	750 <= X < 1,000
13	3	X < 5
14	3	5 <= X < 10
15	3	10 <= X < 20
16	3	20 <= X < 30
17	3	30 <= X < 40
18	3	40 <= X < 50

Second, a nonresponse adjustment factor (NRFACT2) was calculated within each nonresponse adjustment cell and applied to the base weight in order to produce a nonresponse adjusted weight (NRWGT2). The nonresponse adjustment factor within a cell was calculated as the ratio of the sum of base weights for all eligible sampled units in the cell to the sum of base weights for all eligible, sampled and responding units in the cell.

8.1.2 Phase III

Cases were selected with equal probability within agency in Phase III, depending on the number of cases reported by an agency (see section 2.3). The Phase III variance estimation stratum variable (STRAT3) was set equal to the Phase II variance estimation stratum variable, and the Phase III PSU variable (PSU3) was set equal to the case ID if the agency was selected with probability = 1.0, and equal to the agency ID otherwise.

A case-specific base weight (BWGT3) was calculated for each sampled case as the reciprocal of its overall probability of selection. The overall probability of selection for a case was calculated as the product of the inverse of its Phase II nonresponse adjusted weight and the within-agency case sampling rate (1/ WNAGYWGT). The case-specific base weights were then adjusted for nonresponse in two steps. First, nonresponse adjustment cells (NRCELL3) were defined by collapsing the Phase II nonresponse adjustment cells as follows:

NRCELL3	NRCELL2
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10
11	11

12	12
13	13
14	13
15	13
16	13
17	13
18	13

Second, a nonresponse adjustment factor ($NRFACT_3$) was calculated within each nonresponse adjustment cell and applied to the corresponding case-specific base weight for a case in order to produce a nonresponse adjusted case weight ($NRWGT_3$). The nonresponse adjustment factor within a cell was calculated as the ratio of the sum of case-specific base weights for all eligible sampled cases in the cell to the sum of case-specific base weights for all eligible, sampled and responding cases in the cell.

8.2 Variance estimation

Variance estimation for Phase III estimates was conducted using SPSS-complex samples and the two-stage sample design option. The following design parameters and variables were used:

Stage 1

Strata: $STRAT_2$
Cluster: PSU_2
Weight: $NRWGT_3$
Inclusion probability: 1 / $BWGT_2$

Stage 2

Strata: $STRAT_3$
Cluster: PSU_3
Weight: n/a
Inclusion probability: 1 / WNAGYWGT

Acknowledgements

The National Juvenile Prostitution Study was funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention, Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. We are grateful to the talents and perseverance of research assistants Dianne Ramey, Lisa Cloyd, and Brynn Dunne. We especially thank the hundreds of dedicated law enforcement investigators who filled out or mail survey; searched records to track down cases; and answered our many interview questions with interest, patience, and good humor.

References

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys. The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

SPSS. (2006). Statistical package for the social sciences. Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2003). *Internet sex crimes against minors: The response of law enforcement* (No. 10-03-022). Alexandria, VA: National Center for Missing & Exploited Children.