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## Foreword

All of us are concerned when children are victims of crime, especially violent crime, but schools bear a special responsibility for the safety of students when they are in the classroom, on school grounds, or on school-provided transportation. For this reason, the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the National Center for Education Statistics have collaborated on collecting information about students' experience of crime and crime-related conditions at school.

This is the first report that analyzes the two (1989 and 1995) School Crime Supplements to the National Crime Victimization Survey together. It presents a national portrait of the extent to which students ages 12 to 19 experience violent crime or theft of their property at school, and their perceptions of the presence of guns, street gangs, and illegal drugs at their schools. It also highlights the important changes in these crime-related factors between 1989 and 1995.

Much more data were collected than are analyzed in this report, so we plan future reports that provide more in-depth analyses of the 1989 and 1995 data. In addition, we hope to produce more frequent updates of information from this survey of students and to present annually a variety of statistics about the safety of children in school.

The students in this study were interviewed in their homes or by telephone from their homes. These interviews were ably conducted by the Census Bureau, which also prepared the data for our analysis teams. The Bureau of Labor Statistics helped in the wording of the questionnaire items. We also want to thank all of the students who answered our questions and the adult members of their households who gave permission for this statistical data collection.

Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., Ph.D.
Commissioner of Education Statistics

Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D.
Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics
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## Introduction and Background

This report is the first focusing on data collected in the 1995 School Crime Supplement (SCS), an enhancement to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The NCVS is an ongoing household survey that gathers information on the criminal victimization of household members age 12 and older. While this report does not cover all of the items in the dataset, it covers those pertinent to school crime. These include: victimization at school, drug availability at school, street gangs at school, and guns at school. In this report, victimization is in terms of prevalence as opposed to counts of events. In other words, the report focuses on the percent of students who have been victimized one or more times.

To put the 1995 estimates in context, data from the 1989 SCS are also presented. Key findings include:

- There was little or no change in the percent of students reporting any (violent or property) victimization at school ( 14.5 percent versus 14.6 percent), or the percent of students reporting property victimization at school ( 12.2 percent versus 11.6 percent) between 1989 and 1995 (table 1). However, there was an increase in the percent of students reporting violent victimization at school ( 3.4 percent versus 4.2 percent) between the two years.
- In 1989, most students, 63.2 percent, reported that marijuana, cocaine, crack, or uppers/downers were available at school (either easy or hard to obtain; table 2). This number increased somewhat to 65.3 percent in 1995.
- The percent of students reporting street gang presence at school nearly doubled between 1989 and 1995, increasing from 15.3 percent to 28.4 percent (table 4).
- In 1995, a series of questions was asked about guns at school. ${ }^{1}$ Almost no students reported taking a gun to school (less than one half of one percent), 5.3 percent reported seeing another student with a gun at school, and 12.7 percent reported knowing another student who brought a gun to school.

The supplements were fielded in January through June of their respective years to nationally representative samples of approximately 10,000 students. Eligible respondents to the supplements had to be between the ages of 12 and 19 , and had to have attended school at some point during the six months preceding the interview. Respondents were only asked about crimes that had occurred at school during the six months prior to the interview. "At school" was defined as in the school building, on school grounds, or on a school bus.

Readers should be aware that the 1989 SCS estimates on victimization at school shown in this report do not match the estimates presented in the first analysis of the 1989 SCS. ${ }^{2}$ In both the

[^2]1989 and 1995 SCS collections, persons 12 to 19 years of age were asked to respond to the NCVS and the SCS, and victimization information was captured in both questionnaires. The earlier authors elected to use the victimization information reported in the NCVS, rather than the SCS, in the development of their estimates. Because of a redesign of the NCVS in 1992, the 1995 victimization estimates from the NCVS cannot readily be compared to those developed before 1993. ${ }^{3}$ Therefore, the authors of this report elected to reanalyze the 1989 data to compare estimates of victimization in 1995 to 1989 using the SCS data in both cases. Undoubtedly, the redesign of the NCVS also had implications on responses to the SCS. Unfortunately, it is not possible to measure the extent of the impact. (More information about the redesign and a comparison of SCS versus NCVS estimates of victimization can be found in the methodology section of this report.)

This report presents estimates for two points in time, six years apart. Readers should not assume that the time points represent a stable trend between 1989 and 1995. In fact, if estimates had been developed for the intervening years, many changes might be seen.

In this report, each topic is covered in a two- or three-page presentation that consists of bullets and figures. Comprehensive tables on each of the topics can be found after the body of the report. A methodology section, which describes the data collections and the analysis approach, follows the tables. Shown in appendix A are tables containing standard errors of the estimates, and shown in appendix B are the 1989 and 1995 School Crime Supplement questionnaires.

Again, this report does not exhaustively cover all of the data available in the 1989 and 1995 data sets. Readers can obtain the 1989 SCS data through the National Archive of Criminal Justice web site at "http://www.icpsr/umich/edu/NACJD/" (study number 9394), and the 1995 SCS data will soon be made available through the same source. A SCS, jointly developed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), will continue to be fielded as a supplement to the NCVS every few years.

[^3]Figure 1.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported experiencing various forms of victimization at school: 1989 and 1995


- The overall level of victimization in schools in 1995, 14.6 percent, was similar to that in $1989,14.5$ percent. There was an increase in the percentage of students reporting violent victimizations, however, increasing from 3.4 percent to 4.2 percent.
${ }^{1}$ Any victimization is a combination of reported violent and property victimization. If the student reported an incident of either, he or she is counted as having experienced any victimization. If the respondent reported having experienced both, he or she is only counted once under "Any victimization".
${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

- In 1995, male students (5.1 percent) were more likely than female students (3.3 percent) to have experienced violent victimization at school. A similar relationship also existed between violent victimization and gender in 1989.
- While the percent of male students who reported having experienced violent victimization at school was about the same in 1989 as it was in 1995, there was an increase in the percent of female students who reported such victimization.

Figure 3.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported experiencing violent victimization at school, by age: 1989 and 1995


NOTE: Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

Figure 4.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported experiencing violent victimization at school, by student reports of street gang presence at school: 1989 and 1995


NOTE: Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

- In 1995, only 2.7 percent of students who reported no street gang presence at school experienced violent victimization compared to 7.5 percent who reported street gang presence at school. Similar results occurred in 1989. (See figure 9 and table 4 for reported prevalence of street gangs at school.)
- Between 1989 and 1995, the percent of students reporting that they were violently victimized at school did not noticeably change among students who reported street gang presence at school, nor did it noticeably change among students who reported no street gang presence at school.

Figure 5.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported experiencing various forms of victimization at school, by student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school: 1995


- Of those students who reported seeing a student with a gun at school, 12.4 percent reported being victims of violent crime at school compared to 3.8 percent of those who had not. (See table 5 for student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school.)

[^4]Additional findings about student reports of victimization at school from table 1:

- Student reports of having experienced violent victimization at school were relatively uniform across the different places of residence in 1995 when 4.7 percent of students residing in central cities, 4.4 percent of those residing in suburbs, and 3.5 percent of students residing in nonmetropolitan areas reported such victimization. The same was true in 1989.
- Public school students were more likely to report having experienced violent victimization (4.4 percent) than were private school students ( 2.3 percent) in 1995. However, public ( 3.5 percent) and private school students ( 2.9 percent) were about as likely to report having experienced violent victimization in 1989.
- In 1995, students who reported that drugs were available at school were more likely to report having been violently victimized than students who reported that no drugs were available ( 4.7 percent v . 3.0 percent). Similar results occurred in 1989. (See figure 6 and table 2 for student reports of drug availability at school.)

Figure 6.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that drugs were available at school, by grade: 1989 and 1995


NOTE: In the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If the students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are considered having reported that drugs were available at school.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

- Though the increase was small, the percentage of students reporting that drugs were available rose from 63.2 percent in 1989 to 65.3 percent in 1995.
- Students in higher grades were more likely than students in lower grades to report that drugs were available at school in both 1989 and 1995.

Figure 7.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that drugs were available at school, by school type: 1989 and 1995


NOTE: In the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If the students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are considered having reported that drugs were available at school.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

- In 1995, students in public schools were more likely to report that drugs were available in their schools than were students in private schools ( 67.2 percent v. 48.0 percent). Similar results occurred in 1989.
- A higher percent of public school students reported that drugs were available at school in 1995 than in 1989. However, the percent of private school students who reported that drugs were available at school was about the same in 1995 as it was in 1989.

Figure 8.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that drugs were available at school, by student reports of violent victimization at school: 1989 and 1995

*Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.

NOTE: In the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If the students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are considered having reported that drugs were available at school. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995.

- In both 1995 and 1989, students who reported that they had experienced violent victimization at school were more likely to report that drugs were available at school than were students who reported that they had not been violently victimized at school.
- Among students who reported that they had experienced violent victimization at school, the percent of students reporting that drugs were available in 1989 was similar to the percent of students reporting that drugs were available in 1995.

Additional findings about student reports of drug availability at school from tables 2 and 3:

- Older students were more likely than younger students to report that drugs were available at school in both 1989 and 1995.
- In 1995, students who reported that street gangs were present at their schools were more likely to indicate that drugs were available ( 79.5 percent) than were those who did not report that street gangs were present ( 61.0 percent). The same results occurred in 1989.
- Among students reporting that street gangs were present at school, reports that drugs were available increased by 6 percentage points between 1989 and 1995. Among students reporting that gangs were not present, reports that drugs were available are similar between the two years.
- The percent of students reporting that marijuana was easy to obtain at school increased between 1989 and 1995 , rising from 30.5 percent to 36.4 percent.
- In 1995, more students reported that marijuana was easy to obtain than any other drug. The same result was true in 1989.

Figure 9.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that street gangs were present at school, by race/ethnicity: 1989 and 1995


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995

- Students in 1995 were much more likely to report that street gangs were present in their schools than were students in 1989 (28.4 percent v. 15.3 percent).
- In 1995, Hispanic students were more likely than either white or black students to report the existence of street gangs in their schools (49.5 percent v. 23.0 percent and 34.7 percent, respectively). A similar set of relationships existed in 1989.

Figure 10.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that street gangs were present at school, by household income: 1989 and 1995


[^5]- In 1989 and 1995, students living in households with higher incomes were less likely to report that street gangs were present at school than were students in households with lower incomes.

Figure 11.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that street gangs were present at school, by place of residence: 1989 and 1995


Student place of residence

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995

- Students in central cities were more likely to respond that there were street gangs at their schools ( 40.7 percent) than were suburban students (26.3 percent) or students in nonmetropolitan areas (19.9 percent) in 1995. Similar results occurred in 1989.
- Between 1989 and 1995, reports of gang presence increased in all three categories of student place residence.

Figure 12.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported that street gangs were present at school, by school type: 1989 and 1995


SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995

- Students in public schools were more likely to report that street gangs were present at school than were students in private schools in both years. In 1995, 30.6 percent of students in public schools reported that street gangs were present compared to 6.8 percent in private schools. The 1989 percents were 16.4 and 4.4, respectively.
- Public school students were more likely to report that street gangs were present at school in 1995 than in 1989, while private school students were about as likely to report that street gangs were present in hoth vears

Figure 13.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported knowing a student who brought a gun to school, by age: 1995


- In 1995, older students were more likely than younger students to report knowing a student who brought a gun to school.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995

Figure 14.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported the presence of guns at school, by student reports of street gang presence at school: 1995


- Street gang presence at a student's school was related to knowing another student who brought a gun to school (24.8 percent v .7 .7 percent). In addition, street gang presence at a student's school was related to seeing another student with a gun at school (11.9 percent v. 2.8 percent).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995.

Figure 15.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 who reported the presence of guns at school, by student reports of drug availability at school: 1995


Student reports of drug availability at school: marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers

NOTE: In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each is impossible to obtain, they are counted in the "None available" category.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995.

- Students who reported that drugs were available at school were more likely to have known another student who brought a gun to school (16.8 percent), and to have seen another student with a gun at school ( 7.4 percent) than were students who reported that drugs were not available ( 4.0 percent and 1.0 percent, respectively).

Additional findings about student reports of guns at school from table 5:

- In 1995, almost no students reported taking a gun to school (less than one half of one percent), 5.3 percent reported seeing another student with a gun at school, and 12.7 percent reported knowing another student who brought a gun to school.
- Black, non-Hispanic students were more likely than white, non-Hispanic students to report knowing another student who brought a gun to school ( 15.5 percent versus 12.3 percent). Black, non-Hispanic students were also more likely to report seeing another student with a gun at school than were white, non-Hispanic students ( 8.7 percent v. 4.4 percent).
- Students residing in central cities were more likely to report knowing another student who brought a gun to school ( 15.0 percent) than were students from suburban areas ( 12.3 percent) or students from nonmetropolitan areas (11.1 percent). Similarly, students from central cities were more likely to report seeing another student with a gun at school ( 6.8 percent) than were suburban or nonmetropolitan area students (each 4.8 percent).
- Public school students were more likely to report knowing another student who brought a gun to school than were students attending private schools ( 13.6 percent v . 4.4 percent). Public school students were also more likely to report seeing another student who brought a gun to school than were students attending private schools ( 5.7 percent v. 2.0 percent, respectively).


## Summary

This report presents the first published findings from the 1995 School Crime Supplement (SCS) to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) in addition to findings from a reanalysis of the 1989 SCS. Because of the issue's obvious importance to students, parents, educators, and policymakers, this first report focuses on the reported prevalence of crime in America's schools. More specifically, it explores student reports of victimization, drug availability, street gang presence, and gun presence at school.

One important finding that emerged from comparing estimates from the two time points was that more students were exposed to certain problems at school in 1995 than in 1989. As compared to students in 1989, students in 1995 were more likely to report that they had experienced violent victimization, could obtain drugs, and were aware of street gangs at school.

A second key finding was that various types of problems tended to co-exist. For instance, student reports of drug availability, street gang presence, and gun presence at school were all related to student reports of having experienced violent victimization at school. Reports of having experienced violent victimization were higher among students who reported that drugs were available than among students who reported that they were not. In addition, students who reported that street gangs were present were more likely than students who reported that they were not present to say that they had been violently victimized. Finally, students who reported seeing another student with a gun were more likely to say that they had experienced violent victimization than students who had not seen another student with a gun.

Because of the exploratory nature of this report, the crime variables were studied using bivariate analyses only. Future research will apply multivariate approaches to the data to help better understand possible interactions and patterns. Also, because the report focused on the important issues of school crime, it did not exhaustively cover all of the topics addressed by the data bases. Such topics as safety measures taken by schools to prevent crime, student avoidance of places in or near school because of fear of attack, and student perceptions of rule enforcement at school will form the basis of future work. It is the intent of both NCES and BJS to continue what has been a successful collaborative effort to conduct some of this research.

Table 1.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting criminal victimization at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Victimization |  |  | Number of students (thousands) | Victimization |  |  |
|  |  | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ |  | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ |
|  |  | Percent <br> Victimized | Percent <br> Victimized | Percent <br> Victimized |  | Percent <br> Victimized | Percent <br> Victimized | Percent <br> Victimized |
| Total | 21,554 | 14.5 | 3.4 | 12.2 | 23,933 | 14.6 | 4.2 | 11.6 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 11,166 | 15.2 | 4.8 | 12.1 | 12,331 | 15.8 | 5.1 | 12.0 |
| Female | 10,388 | 13.7 | 2.0 | 12.3 | 11,602 | 13.3 | 3.3 | 11.2 |
| Student race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 15,349 | 14.3 | 3.4 | 12.2 | 16,351 | 14.5 | 4.1 | 11.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 3,391 | 14.9 | 3.3 | 12.3 | 3,752 | 16.8 | 5.1 | 13.4 |
| Hispanic | 2,027 | 14.7 | 4.4 | 11.1 | 2,898 | 12.4 | 3.9 | 9.5 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 787 | 14.7 | 2.2 | 13.3 | 932 | 13.7 | 3.9 | 11.0 |
| Student age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 3,221 | 17.8 | 5.5 | 14.7 | 3,735 | 19.8 | 6.8 | 15.1 |
| 13 | 3,319 | 18.0 | 4.7 | 14.9 | 3,781 | 17.9 | 5.9 | 13.9 |
| 14 | 3,264 | 16.8 | 4.1 | 14.1 | 3,732 | 17.0 | 4.7 | 13.7 |
| 15 | 3,214 | 15.3 | 3.3 | 12.8 | 3,688 | 14.4 | 3.9 | 12.0 |
| 16 | 3,275 | 12.0 | 2.8 | 9.9 | 3,674 | 11.9 | 3.0 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 3,274 | 10.6 | 1.4 | 9.7 | 3,172 | 9.9 | 1.9 | 8.6 |
| 18 | 1,756 | 8.6 | 1.8 | 7.2 | 1,820 | 6.8 | 2.0 | 5.2 |
| 19 | 231 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 5.3 | 331 | 8.8 | 3.3 | 6.1 |
| Student grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 1,818 | 17.9 | 5.7 | 14.8 | 2,315 | 18.0 | 6.7 | 13.3 |
| Seventh | 3,170 | 18.9 | 5.4 | 15.5 | 3,736 | 20.4 | 6.6 | 16.0 |
| Eighth | 3,258 | 16.1 | 4.0 | 13.1 | 3,795 | 17.1 | 4.7 | 13.9 |
| Ninth | 3,391 | 17.1 | 3.6 | 14.7 | 3,689 | 15.5 | 4.6 | 12.1 |
| Tenth | 3,082 | 13.9 | 2.5 | 11.9 | 3,662 | 12.9 | 3.3 | 10.7 |
| Eleventh | 3,224 | 10.5 | 2.2 | 8.8 | 3,460 | 9.5 | 2.3 | 7.5 |
| Twelfth | 3,172 | 8.3 | 1.2 | 7.6 | 2,990 | 8.7 | 1.7 | 7.5 |
| Other | 439 | 13.5 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 285 | 10.3 | 4.6 | 6.4 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 2,041 | 16.3 | 3.6 | 14.0 | 1,487 | 15.8 | 5.6 | 11.8 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 791 | 14.8 | 5.2 | 10.6 | 783 | 12.8 | 3.6 | 10.1 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1,823 | 15.5 | 3.5 | 13.0 | 1,657 | 14.4 | 5.4 | 10.7 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 3,772 | 14.7 | 3.4 | 12.5 | 3,130 | 14.5 | 4.1 | 11.8 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1,845 | 14.3 | 3.8 | 11.9 | 1,729 | 17.2 | 5.5 | 12.9 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 5,798 | 14.4 | 3.5 | 12.2 | 6,295 | 13.9 | 3.9 | 11.1 |
| \$50,000+ | 3,498 | 14.2 | 3.4 | 12.0 | 6,562 | 14.2 | 3.7 | 11.8 |
| Not ascertained | 1,983 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 9.9 | 2,289 | 15.5 | 4.4 | 12.5 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central city | 5,816 | 16.1 | 3.9 | 13.4 | 6,309 | 14.7 | 4.7 | 11.3 |
| Suburbs | 10,089 | 13.8 | 3.5 | 11.3 | 11,341 | 14.6 | 4.4 | 11.5 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 5,648 | 14.0 | 2.9 | 12.3 | 6,283 | 14.3 | 3.5 | 12.0 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 19,265 | 14.7 | 3.5 | 12.3 | 21,719 | 14.8 | 4.4 | 11.7 |
| Private | 1,873 | 12.8 | 2.9 | 10.8 | 2,163 | 12.4 | 2.3 | 10.7 |
| Not ascertained | 416 | 11.8 | 3.1 | 9.6 | + | + | + | + |

Table 1.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting criminal victimization at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued


- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
${ }^{1}$ Any victimization is a combination of reported violent and property victimization. If the student reported an incident of either, he or she is counted as having experienced any victimization. If the respondent reported having experienced both, he or she is only counted once under "Any victimization".
${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{4}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each was impossible to obtain, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 2.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the availability of drugs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  | 1995 |  | 1995 |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: $1989 \text { definition }^{1}$ | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: 1989 definition $^{1}$ | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: 1995 definition ${ }^{1}$ |
|  |  | Percent |  | Percent |  | Percent |
| Total | 21,554 | 63.2 | 23,933 | 65.3 | 23,933 | 66.8 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 11,166 | 64.6 | 12,331 | 66.7 | 12,331 | 68.3 |
| Female | 10,388 | 61.7 | 11,602 | 63.8 | 11,602 | 65.2 |
| Student race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 15,349 | 64.6 | 16,351 | 66.1 | 16,351 | 67.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 3,391 | 62.4 | 3,752 | 65.5 | 3,752 | 66.5 |
| Hispanic | 2,027 | 59.0 | 2,898 | 62.8 | 2,898 | 64.2 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 787 | 51.5 | 932 | 58.9 | 932 | 59.6 |
| Student age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 3,221 | 45.7 | 3,735 | 42.3 | 3,735 | 45.1 |
| 13 | 3,319 | 54.7 | 3,781 | 52.6 | 3,781 | 54.7 |
| 14 | 3,264 | 58.1 | 3,732 | 63.4 | 3,732 | 65.0 |
| 15 | 3,214 | 66.3 | 3,688 | 72.3 | 3,688 | 73.6 |
| 16 | 3,275 | 73.2 | 3,674 | 76.7 | 3,674 | 77.7 |
| 17 | 3,274 | 74.1 | 3,172 | 79.9 | 3,172 | 80.5 |
| 18 | 1,756 | 75.3 | 1,820 | 79.2 | 1,820 | 79.7 |
| 19 | 231 | 74.4 | 331 | 70.9 | 331 | 70.9 |
| Student grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 1,818 | 42.7 | 2,315 | 39.5 | 2,315 | 42.0 |
| Seventh | 3,170 | 54.7 | 3,736 | 50.1 | 3,736 | 52.6 |
| Eighth | 3,258 | 54.0 | 3,795 | 56.9 | 3,795 | 58.4 |
| Ninth | 3,391 | 65.2 | 3,689 | 72.2 | 3,689 | 73.9 |
| Tenth | 3,082 | 69.6 | 3,662 | 75.8 | 3,662 | 76.8 |
| Eleventh | 3,224 | 75.8 | 3,460 | 79.4 | 3,460 | 79.8 |
| Twelfth | 3,172 | 75.6 | 2,990 | 80.3 | 2,990 | 80.9 |
| Other | 439 | 36.6 | 285 | 34.2 | 285 | 37.4 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 2,041 | 63.4 | 1,487 | 58.9 | 1,487 | 60.5 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 791 | 61.1 | 783 | 59.8 | 783 | 61.1 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1,823 | 58.8 | 1,657 | 62.5 | 1,657 | 63.3 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 3,772 | 63.1 | 3,130 | 65.3 | 3,130 | 66.1 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1,845 | 63.9 | 1,729 | 64.6 | 1,729 | 67.3 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 5,798 | 63.7 | 6,295 | 67.2 | 6,295 | 69.1 |
| \$50,000+ | 3,498 | 66.0 | 6,562 | 66.6 | 6,562 | 67.9 |
| Not ascertained | 1,984 | 61.6 | 2,289 | 64.8 | 2,289 | 66.2 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburbs | 10,089 | 63.0 | 11,341 | 66.4 | 11,341 | 68.0 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 5,648 | 65.7 | 6,283 | 63.0 | 6,283 | 64.5 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 19,265 | 64.8 | 21,719 | 67.2 | 21,719 | 68.6 |
| Private | 1,873 | 47.2 | 2,163 | 48.0 | 2,163 | 49.3 |
| Not Ascertained | 416 | 64.1 | + | + | + | + |

Table 2.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the availability of drugs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  | 1995 |  | 1995 |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: 1989 definition $^{1}$ | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: <br> 1989 definition ${ }^{1}$ | Number of students (thousands) | Any drug availability: $1995 \text { definition }^{1}$ |
|  |  | Percent |  | Percent |  | Percent |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student reports of street gangs at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3,301 | 73.4 | 6,796 | 79.5 | 6,796 | 80.7 |
| No | 17,042 | 61.6 | 13,686 | 61.0 | 13,686 | 62.6 |
| Do not know | 1,124 | 59.2 | 3,224 | 56.4 | 3,224 | 58.0 |
| Not ascertained | 88 | 51.0 | 226 | 24.0 | 226 | 24.0 |
| Student reports of knowing a student who brought a gun to school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | - | - | 3,042 | 86.4 | 3,042 | 87.7 |
| No | - | - | 20,608 | 62.5 | 20,608 | 64.0 |
| Not ascertained | - | - | 282 | 40.1 | 282 | 40.1 |
| Student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | - | - | 1,270 | 90.5 | 1,270 | 91.7 |
| No | - | - | 22,359 | 64.2 | 22,359 | 65.7 |
| Do not know | - | - | + | + | + | + |
| Not ascertained | - | - | 263 | 41.1 | 263 | 41.1 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3,116 | 73.5 | 3,485 | 71.1 | 3,485 | 74.5 |
| No | 18,400 | 61.6 | 20,315 | 64.6 | 20,315 | 65.8 |
| Not ascertained | + | + | 133 | 12.3 | 133 | 12.3 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 742 | 74.1 | 1,013 | 72.9 | 1,013 | 75.5 |
| No | 20,773 | 62.9 | 22,780 | 65.3 | 22,780 | 66.7 |
| Not ascertained | + | + | 140 | 15.2 | 140 | 15.2 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school $^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 2,619 | 73.8 | 2,777 | 72.2 | 2,777 | 75.1 |
| No | 18,852 | 61.9 | 20,997 | 64.8 | 20,997 | 66.1 |
| Not ascertained | 83 | 44.5 | 159 | 17.4 | 159 | 17.4 |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
${ }^{1}$ In the 1989 School Crime Supplement, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers and downers, and other illegal drugs. In the 1995 School Crime Supplement, students were asked about the availability of these drugs and were also asked about the availability of PCP, LSD, and heroin. When comparing across the two years, only those drugs that are listed on both surveys are counted (i.e. marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers and downers). This list of drugs is referred to as "Drug availability: 1989 definition". Other illegal drugs are excluded from the 1989 definition used in cross-year analyses. When not making comparisons across the two surveys and focusing solely on the 1995 estimates, all of the 1995 response categories are counted (this approach is referred to as "Drug availability: 1995 definition"). In both definitions if students reported that any of the listed drugs were easy or hard to obtain, they are included in the "Any available" category.
${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 3.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the difficulty of obtaining various drugs at school: 1989 and 1995

| Drug | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Availability |  |  |  |  |  | Availability |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Easy to Obtain | Hard to Obtain | Impossible to Obtain | Don't know if available | Don't know drug | Not ascert. | Easy to Obtain | Hard to Obtain | Impossible to Obtain | Don't know if available | Don't <br> know <br> drug | Not ascert. |
|  | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| Marijuana | 30.5 | 27.5 | 16.2 | 24.9 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 36.4 | 24.8 | 22.8 | 15.1 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Crack | 8.6 | 29.4 | 27.9 | 32.2 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 9.7 | 32.0 | 34.3 | 22.5 | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| Other forms of cocaine | 10.7 | 32.6 | 24.8 | 30.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 9.9 | 29.7 | 35.2 | 23.6 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| Uppers/downers | 20.4 | 25.8 | 17.3 | 31.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 18.3 | 24.9 | 24.4 | 23.4 | 8.3 | 0.7 |
| LSD | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11.8 | 26.5 | 31.6 | 23.2 | 6.3 | 0.7 |
| PCP | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.9 | 25.9 | 33.5 | 24.7 | 9.2 | 0.8 |
| Heroin | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5.6 | 27.7 | 40.0 | 23.9 | 2.2 | 0.7 |
| Other Drugs | 13.9 | 27.4 | 18.7 | 36.8 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 12.0 | 29.3 | 30.2 | 26.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 4.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the presence of street gangs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Street gangs at school |  |  |  | Number of students (thousands) | Street gangs at school |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. |  | Yes | No | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Do not } \\ \text { know } \end{gathered}$ | Not ascert. |
|  |  | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Total | 21,554 | 15.3 | 79.1 | 5.2 | 0.4 | 23,933 | 28.4 | 57.2 | 13.5 | 0.9 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 11,166 | 15.8 | 79.5 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 12,331 | 28.9 | 57.7 | 12.5 | 1.0 |
| Female | 10,388 | 14.8 | 78.6 | 6.1 | 0.5 | 11,602 | 27.9 | 56.7 | 14.6 | 0.9 |
| Student race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 15,349 | 11.7 | 83.4 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 16,351 | 23.0 | 63.1 | 13.1 | 0.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 3,391 | 19.8 | 72.8 | 6.9 | 0.4 | 3,752 | 34.7 | 49.5 | 14.0 | 1.8 |
| Hispanic | 2,027 | 31.6 | 61.8 | 6.0 | 0.7 | 2,898 | 49.5 | 36.7 | 12.9 | 0.9 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 787 | 25.4 | 66.4 | 8.2 | \# | 932 | 31.2 | 48.1 | 19.4 | 1.3 |
| Student age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 3,221 | 12.1 | 83.2 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 3,735 | 19.3 | 65.1 | 14.3 | 1.4 |
| 13 | 3,319 | 14.5 | 80.1 | 5.3 | 0.2 | 3,781 | 26.7 | 58.0 | 14.4 | 0.9 |
| 14 | 3,264 | 17.9 | 76.3 | 5.5 | 0.3 | 3,732 | 30.6 | 56.1 | 12.7 | 0.7 |
| 15 | 3,214 | 16.2 | 77.6 | 6.0 | 0.2 | 3,688 | 32.7 | 52.6 | 13.7 | 1.0 |
| 16 | 3,275 | 16.4 | 78.8 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 3,674 | 30.2 | 56.4 | 12.6 | 0.9 |
| 17 | 3,274 | 15.3 | 78.6 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 3,172 | 31.0 | 54.8 | 13.6 | 0.7 |
| 18 | 1,756 | 14.5 | 79.6 | 4.6 | 1.4 | 1,820 | 28.8 | 57.4 | 12.3 | 1.5 |
| 19 | 231 | 16.9 | 72.9 | 8.8 | 1.4 | 331 | 30.7 | 53.9 | 15.5 | \# |
| Student grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 1,818 | 10.3 | 84.4 | 4.8 | 0.5 | 2,315 | 15.7 | 67.8 | 14.8 | 1.7 |
| Seventh | 3,170 | 16.6 | 79.0 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 3,736 | 26.5 | 57.2 | 15.4 | 0.9 |
| Eighth | 3,258 | 13.6 | 80.4 | 5.7 | 0.3 | 3,795 | 28.7 | 58.9 | 11.9 | 0.4 |
| Ninth | 3,391 | 19.6 | 73.9 | 6.2 | 0.3 | 3,689 | 32.4 | 51.5 | 15.0 | 1.1 |
| Tenth | 3,082 | 16.0 | 79.0 | 4.9 | 0.2 | 3,662 | 33.7 | 52.7 | 12.7 | 0.9 |
| Eleventh | 3,224 | 15.3 | 78.4 | 5.6 | 0.6 | 3,460 | 30.6 | 57.3 | 11.4 | 0.7 |
| Twelfth | 3,172 | 14.2 | 80.9 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 2,990 | 27.5 | 57.6 | 13.9 | 1.0 |
| Other | 439 | 9.8 | 79.2 | 8.8 | 2.2 | 285 | 15.5 | 73.9 | 8.2 | 2.5 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 2,041 | 16.8 | 76.0 | 6.7 | 0.5 | 1,487 | 39.1 | 44.7 | 15.2 | 1.0 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 791 | 20.7 | 69.9 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 783 | 31.0 | 46.0 | 19.6 | 3.4 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1,823 | 20.5 | 72.7 | 6.4 | 0.4 | 1,657 | 31.2 | 53.3 | 15.2 | 0.3 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 3,772 | 17.8 | 76.9 | 4.9 | 0.4 | 3,130 | 29.8 | 54.7 | 14.0 | 1.5 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1,845 | 15.7 | 78.8 | 4.9 | 0.6 | 1,729 | 30.3 | 58.0 | 10.9 | 0.8 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 5,798 | 12.8 | 82.0 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 6,295 | 27.4 | 58.6 | 13.4 | 0.6 |
| \$50,000+ | 3,498 | 11.2 | 84.8 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 6,562 | 24.7 | 61.6 | 13.0 | 0.7 |
| Not ascertained | 1,984 | 16.3 | 77.4 | 5.7 | 0.5 | 2,289 | 28.6 | 58.2 | 11.7 | 1.5 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central city | 5,816 | 24.8 | 68.4 | 6.3 | 0.5 | 6,309 | 40.7 | 43.3 | 15.0 | 1.1 |
| Suburbs | 10,089 | 14.0 | 81.1 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 11,341 | 26.3 | 59.8 | 13.2 | 0.7 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 5,648 | 7.8 | 86.4 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 6,283 | 19.9 | 66.5 | 12.4 | 1.2 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 19,265 | 16.4 | 77.9 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 21,719 | 30.6 | 54.4 | 14.2 | 0.8 |
| Private | 1,873 | 4.4 | 91.9 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 2,163 | 6.8 | 86.5 | 6.3 | 0.3 |
| Not Ascertained | 416 | 12.1 | 75.6 | 8.5 | 3.9 | + | + | + | + | + |

Table 4.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the presence of street gangs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Street gangs at school |  |  |  | Number of students (thousands) | Street gangs at school |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Do not know | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not } \\ \text { ascert. } \end{gathered}$ |  | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. |
|  |  | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3,116 | 23.1 | 71.7 | 5.0 | 0.2 | 3,485 | 41.6 | 46.3 | 11.6 | 0.5 |
| No | 18,400 | 14.0 | 80.4 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 20,315 | 26.3 | 59.4 | 13.9 | 0.4 |
| Not ascertained | + | $+$ | + | + | + | 133 | 2.4 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 89.5 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 742 | 29.6 | 65.5 | 4.6 | 0.2 | 1,013 | 50.5 | 36.7 | 11.7 | 1.1 |
| No | 20,773 | 14.8 | 79.7 | 5.2 | 0.3 | 22,780 | 27.6 | 58.4 | 13.6 | 0.4 |
| Not ascertained | + | + | + | + | + | 140 | 2.3 | 7.8 | 5.1 | 84.9 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 2,619 | 21.8 | 72.9 | 5.1 | 0.3 | 2,777 | 40.1 | 48.3 | 11.3 | 0.3 |
| No | 18,852 | 14.5 | 80.1 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 20,997 | 27.0 | 58.7 | 13.8 | 0.4 |
| Not ascertained | 83 | 7.0 | 47.8 | 6.5 | 38.7 | 159 | 4.9 | 9.6 | 6.5 | 79.0 |
| Student reports of knowing a student who brought a gun to school <br> Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | 3,042 | 55.3 | 34.8 | 9.5 | 0.4 |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | 20,608 | 24.6 | 60.9 | 14.1 | 0.4 |
|  | - | - | - | - | - | 282 | 13.4 | 29.9 | 10.7 | 46.0 |
| Student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | - | - | - | - | - | 1,270 | 63.8 | 29.9 | 6.3 | 0.0 |
| No | - | - | - | - | - | 22,359 | 26.5 | 59.1 | 13.9 | 0.4 |
| Do not know | - | - | - | - | - | + | + | + | + | + |
| Not ascertained | - | - | - | - | - | 263 | 16.2 | 25.5 | 9.7 | 48.6 |
| Student reports of drug availability: marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers ${ }^{3}$ <br> Any available <br> None available <br> Do not know/Not ascertained |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 13,630 | 17.8 | 77.0 | 4.9 | 0.3 | 15,630 | 34.6 | 53.5 | 11.6 | 0.3 |
|  | 2,560 | 8.3 | 89.7 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 3,922 | 14.0 | 75.1 | 10.4 | 0.5 |
|  | 5,364 | 12.4 | 79.2 | 7.7 | 0.2 | 4,380 | 19.3 | 54.4 | 22.8 | 3.5 |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
\# No cases are reported in this cell, although the event defined by this cell could have been reported by some students with these characteristics had a different sample been drawn.
${ }^{1}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{2}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{3}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students are asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students report any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each is not available, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 5.-Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting guns at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 |  |  |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Took gun to school | Know student who brought gun to school | Seen student with a gun at school |
|  |  | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Total | 23,933 | 0.1 | 12.7 | 5.3 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |  |
| Student sex |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 12,331 | 0.1 | 12.4 | 6.1 |
| Female | 11,602 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 4.5 |
| Student race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 16,351 | 0.1 | 12.3 | 4.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 3,752 | 0.1 | 15.5 | 8.7 |
| Hispanic | 2,898 | 0.1 | 11.8 | 6.2 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 932 | \# | 11.1 | 4.8 |
| Student age |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 3,735 | \# | 6.2 | 2.0 |
| 13 | 3,781 | 0.1 | 10.0 | 4.0 |
| 14 | 3,732 | 0.1 | 12.9 | 4.9 |
| 15 | 3,688 | 0.2 | 15.1 | 6.4 |
| 16 | 3,674 | \# | 15.1 | 6.2 |
| 17 | 3,172 | \# | 16.4 | 8.3 |
| 18 | 1,820 | 0.2 | 14.6 | 6.2 |
| 19 | 331 | \# | 16.0 | 7.0 |
| Student grade |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 2,315 | \# | 5.7 | 2.0 |
| Seventh | 3,736 | \# | 8.9 | 3.0 |
| Eighth | 3,795 | 0.1 | 11.9 | 4.8 |
| Ninth | 3,689 | 0.3 | 15.1 | 6.6 |
| Tenth | 3,662 | 0.1 | 14.6 | 5.9 |
| Eleventh | 3,460 | \# | 15.4 | 7.3 |
| Twelfth | 2,990 | \# | 16.2 | 6.9 |
| Other | 285 | \# | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 1,487 | \# | 10.9 | 5.2 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 783 | \# | 12.4 | 8.3 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1,657 | \# | 12.1 | 6.2 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 3,130 | 0.3 | 14.7 | 7.0 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1,729 | \# | 13.7 | 5.7 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 6,295 | 0.1 | 12.2 | 5.0 |
| \$50,000+ | 6,562 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 4.4 |
| Not ascertained | 2,289 | \# | 12.8 | 4.5 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |
| Central city | 6,309 | \# | 15.0 | 6.8 |
| Suburbs | 11,341 | 0.1 | 12.3 | 4.8 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 6,283 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 4.8 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 21,719 | 0.1 | 13.6 | 5.7 |
| Private | 2,163 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 2.0 |
| Not Ascertained | + | $+$ | + | + |

Table 5.- Percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting guns at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 |  |  |  |
|  | Number of students (thousands) | Took gun to school | Know student who brought gun to school | Seen student with a gun at school |
|  |  | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |  |
| Student reports of street gangs at school |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 6,796 | 0.1 | 24.8 | 11.9 |
| No | 13,687 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 2.8 |
| Don't know if present | 3,224 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 2.5 |
| Not ascertained | 226 | \# | 5.0 | \# |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3,485 | 0.3 | 21.4 | 11.4 |
| No | 20,315 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 4.3 |
| Not ascertained | 133 | \# | \# | \# |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 1,013 | 0.8 | 25.9 | 15.5 |
| No | 22,780 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 4.9 |
| Not ascertained | 140 | \# | \# | \# |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 2,777 | 0.2 | 21.6 | 11.3 |
| No | 20,997 | 0.1 | 11.6 | 4.6 |
| Not ascertained | 159 | \# | \# | \# |
| Student reports of drug availability: marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Any available | 15,630 | 0.1 | 16.8 | 7.4 |
| None available | 3,922 | \# | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| Do not know/Not ascertained | 4,380 | \# | 5.9 | 1.9 |

+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
\# No cases are reported in this cell, although the event defined by this cell could have been reported by some students with these characteristics had a different sample been drawn.
0.0 Indicates that there are cases in the cell but that the cell total is less than 0.05 .
${ }^{1}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{2}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{3}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each was not available, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995.

## Methodology

## I. Background of the School Crime Supplement

## Purpose and Sponsorship of the Survey

Criminal activity at school poses an obvious threat to the safety of students and can act as a significant barrier to the education process. In order to study the relationship between victimization at school and the school environment, and to monitor changes in student experiences with victimization, accurate information regarding its incidence must be collected. Jointly designed by the Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics and Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics, the School Crime Supplement (SCS) was developed to address this data need.

## Sample Design and Data Collection

Created as an occasional supplement to the annual National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), the SCS was fielded in 1989 and 1995. The NCVS collects data on the incidence of criminal activity against households and household members from a nationally representative sample of households (47,000 households in 1989 and 49,000 households in 1995). In both 1989 and 1995, households were sampled using a stratified multistage cluster design. ${ }^{4}$

NCVS interviews were conducted with each household member who was 12 years old or older. Once all NCVS interviews were completed, household members between the ages of 12 and 19 were given an SCS interview. Only those 12 -to 19 -year-olds who were in primary or secondary education programs leading to a high school diploma, and who had been enrolled sometime during the 6 months

[^6]prior to the interview, were administered the SCS questionnaire. Students who were home schooled were not included.

The SCS questionnaire was designed to record the incidence of crime and criminal activity occurring inside a school, on school grounds, or on a school bus during the 6 months preceding the interview. There were 10,449 SCS interviews completed in 1989 and 9,954 in 1995.

Data were collected by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census. In both 1989 and 1995, SCS surveys were conducted between January and June, with one-sixth of the sample being covered each month. Interviews were conducted with the subject student over the telephone or in person. In both years, efforts were made to assure that interviews about student experiences at school were conducted with the students themselves. However, under certain circumstances, interviews with proxy respondents were accepted. These circumstances included interviews scheduled with a child between the ages of 12 and 13 where the parents refused to allow an interview with the child, interviews where the subject child was unavailable during the period of data collection, and interviews where the child was physically or emotionally unable to answer for him or herself.

Telephone interviews accounted for 7,418 of the 9,954 interviews in 1995, and 7,407 of the 10,449 interviews in 1989. Proxy interviews accounted for 363 of the 9,954 interviews in 1995, and 252 of the 10,449 interviews in 1989.

Responses to both the NCVS and the SCS are confidential by law. Interviewers are instructed to conduct interviews in privacy unless respondents specifically agree to permit others to be present. Most interviews for the NCVS and SCS are conducted by telephone, and most questions require "yes" or "no" answers, thereby affording respondents a further measure of privacy. By law, identifiable information about
respondents may not be disclosed or released to others for any purpose.

## Unit and Item Response Rates

Unit response rates indicate how many sampled units have completed interviews. Because interviews with students could only be completed after households had responded to the NCVS, the unit completion rate for the SCS reflects both the household interview completion rate and the student interview completion rate. In the 1989 and 1995 SCS, the household completion rates were 96.5 percent, and 95.1 percent, respectively. The student completion rates were 86.5 percent and 77.5 percent. ${ }^{5}$ Multiplying the household completion rate times the student completion rate produced an overall SCS response rate of 83.5 percent in 1989 and 73.7 percent in 1995.

The rate at which respondents provide a valid response to a given item is referred to as its item response rate. Item response rates for items used in this report were high. Most items were answered by over 95 percent of all eligible respondents. The only exception was the household income question which was answered by approximately 90 percent of all households in both years. Income and income-related questions typically have relatively low response rates due to their sensitive nature.

## II. Notes Regarding Items Used in the Report

Differences between the 1989 and 1995 NCVS Victimization Items

Respondents to the SCS were asked two separate sets of questions regarding personal victimization. The first set of questions was asked as part of the ongoing NCVS and included data on up to six separate incidents of

[^7]victimization reported by respondents to the NCVS. These questions covered several different dimensions of victimization including the nature of each incident, where it occurred, what losses resulted, etc. Earlier research on student victimization at school has relied on NCVS items to develop incident rates. ${ }^{6}$ However, changes to the basic NCVS between 1989 and 1995 make cross-year comparisons using these items difficult. The 1995 NCVS used a different screening procedure to uncover victimizations than did the 1989 NCVS.

The new screening procedure was meant to elicit a more complete tally of victimization incidents than did the one used in the 1989 NCVS. For instance, the 1995 screener specifically asked whether respondents had been raped or otherwise sexually assaulted, whereas the 1989 screener did not. Therefore, NCVS item based cross-year changes in reported victimization rates, or lack thereof, may only be the result of changes in how questions were asked and not of actual changes in the incidence of victimization. For more details on this issue, refer the BJS report, "Effects of the Redesign on Victimization Estimates". ${ }^{7}$

Because NCVS questionnaires were completed before students were given the SCS questionnaires, it is likely that changes to NCVS victimization screening procedures differentially affected responses to the 1989 and 1995 SCS victimization items. While the assumption is not possible to test, it is nonetheless reasonable to expect that by providing a more detailed victimization screening instrument in the 1995 NCVS, that 1995 SCS respondents had better victimization recall than 1989 SCS respondents.

[^8]
## Differences Between NCVS and SCS Items

A less detailed set of victimization questions, which was not modified between 1989 and 1995, was asked in the SCS. These items are more generally comparable across the two years and form the basis of the victimization section of this report. Readers should be aware that these items indicate a higher rate of victimization at school than do the six items included in the NCVS. For instance, using the NCVS items, BJS estimated that 9 percent of students experienced some form of victimization at school during the period covered by the 1989 SCS. ${ }^{8}$ The 1989 SCS items, asked of the same students, indicate that 14.5 percent of them had experienced some sort of victimization at school.

One contributing factor to the difference may be the sequencing of the NCVS and SCS. Respondents were first asked the NCVS items and then asked the SCS items. Prompted by the NCVS to think about incidents of victimization, respondent recall may have improved by the time the SCS victimization questions were asked. A second contributing factor may be differences between the victimization questions asked in the NCVS and the SCS. In the NCVS, respondents were asked about an incident and where it occurred in separate questions. The SCS items asked respondents about victimization and whether or not it occurred at school in one question. This may have prompted respondents to report incidents that had occurred at school that may have been forgotten during the NCVS set of questions. Because of differences in the way the SCS and NCVS items were

[^9]asked, it is recommended that rates developed from the SCS items not be compared to rates developed from the NCVS items.

## Derived Variables

Several variables used in this report were derived by combining information from two or more questions. For the most part, the derived variables and the items that went into them were the same in both the 1989 and 1995 SCS.

The variable, violent victimization, was derived by combining two questions dealing with incidents at school. The first asked whether or not the respondent had had anything taken directly by force (question 20a in the 1995 questionnaire and question 26b in the 1989 questionnaire). Not counting incidents where the respondent had had anything taken directly by force, the second question asked if the respondent had been physically attacked at school (questions 22a and 28a in 1995 and 1989, respectively). If the respondent said yes to either, he or she was counted as having experienced some form of violent victimization.

Any victimization was derived from the violent victimization item and a question asking whether or not the respondent had had anything stolen at school (question 21a in 1995 and 27a in 1989). The question about having something stolen excluded incidents where something had been taken by force. If the respondent said something had been stolen, or had experienced some form of violent victimization, he or she was considered a victim in the any victimization item. All victimization items were dichotomous. Either the respondent had experienced a given form of victimization or had not.

The items drug availability: 1995
definition and drug availability: 1989 definition were also derived. In 1995, respondents were asked about the difficulty of obtaining marijuana, crack, cocaine, uppers/downers, LSD, PCP, heroin, or other illegal drugs at school (questions 18b through 18i in the 1995 questionnaire). If students reported any of these were easy to obtain or were hard to obtain, they were counted as believing drugs to be available in the drug availability: 1995 definition variable.

The same process went into constructing the drug availability: 1989 definition item. However, because the 1989 questionnaire (questions 22b through 22e) did not ask about the availability of LSD, PCP, or heroin, only the availability of marijuana, crack, cocaine, and uppers/downers was considered. This variable allowed comparisons to be made about perceptions of drug availability across the two SCS. For both derived drug availability variables, respondents had to say that all of the drugs covered were impossible to obtain to be counted as believing no drugs to be available.

A large number of respondents indicated that they were not sure if one or more of the listed drugs were available, or were not sure what one or more of the drugs were. These cases make up the difference in the tables between the number believing drugs to be available, believing no drugs to be available, and student population totals. The drug variables were trichotomous in form. Respondents were coded as believing drugs to be available, not available, or other.

The final derived variable, student's race/ethnicity, was a combination of two variables (both from the NCVS but included
on the SCS files). The first question asked the race of the student and the second asked whether or not the student was of Hispanic origin. Respondents who answered yes to the second question were counted as Hispanic. Students who said they were white or black, but not of Hispanic origin were counted as white/non-Hispanic or black/non-Hispanic. Those of other races who were not Hispanic were counted as other/non-Hispanic.

## III. Weighting and Statistical Analysis Procedures

## Weighting

The purpose of the SCS data is to make inferences about the 12-to 19-year-old student population (see above for a more complete description of the population). Before such inferences can be drawn, it is important to adjust or weight the sample of students to assure they are similar to the entire population of such students. The weights used in this report are a combination of household level and person level adjustment factors. In the NCVS, adjustments were made to account for both household and person non-interviews. Additional factors were then applied to reduce the variance of the estimate by correcting for differences between the sample distribution of age, race, and sex, and known population distributions of these characteristics. The resulting weights were assigned to all interviewed households and persons on the file.

A special weighting adjustment was then performed for the SCS respondents. Noninterview adjustment factors were computed to adjust for SCS interview non-response. This non-interview factor was then applied
to the NCVS person level weight for each SCS respondent.

## Standard Errors

The sample of students selected for each SCS is just one of many possible samples that could have been selected. It is possible that estimates from a given SCS student sample may differ from estimates that would have been produced from other student samples. This type of variability is called sampling error, or the standard error, because it arises from using a sample of students rather than all students.

The standard error is a measure of the variability of a parameter estimate. It indicates how much variation there is in the population of possible estimates of a parameter for a given sample size. The probability that a complete census count would differ from the sample estimate by less than 1 standard error is about 68 percent. The chance that the difference would be less than 1.65 standard errors is about 90 percent, and that the difference would be less than 1.96 standard errors, about 95 percent. Standard errors for the percentage estimates are presented in the appendix tables.

Standard errors are typically developed assuming that a sample is drawn purely at random. The sample for the SCS was not a simple random sample, however. In order to help adjust the standard errors to account for the sample design, the Census Bureau developed three generalized variance function (gvf) constant parameters. The gvf represents the curve fitted to the individual standard errors calculated using the

Jackknife Repeated Replication technique. ${ }^{9}$ The three constant parameters ( $a, b$, and $c$ ) derived from the curve fitting process were:

| $\underline{\text { Year }}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{a}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{b}}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{c}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1989 | 0.00001559 | 3,108 | 0.000 |
| 1995 | 0.00006269 | 2,278 | 1.804 |

To adjust the standard errors associated with percentages, the following formula is used:
standard error of $p=\sqrt{\frac{b p(1.0-p)}{y}+\frac{c p(\sqrt{p}-p)}{\sqrt{y}}}$
where $p$ is the percentage of interest expressed as a proportion and $y$ is the size of the population to which the percentage applies. Once the standard error of the proportion is estimated, multiply it by 100 to make it applicable to the percentage.

To calculate the adjusted standard errors associated with population counts, the following applies:

$$
\text { standard error of } x=\sqrt{a x^{2}+b x+c x^{3 / 2}}
$$

where $x$ is the estimated number of students who experienced a given event (e.g., violent victimization).

## Statistical Tests

For the most part, statistical tests done for this report rely on Student's $t$ tests which are designed to determine if estimates are statistically different from one another. The

[^10]only exception occurred when student characteristic variables had more than two categories and all of the categories could be rank ordered. These variables were student's age, grade, and household income. When comparing these items to indicators of crime, a different set of tests was used. Initially, to determine if a relationship existed between these demographic indicators and the crime indicators, adjusted chi-square tests were employed. If a statistically significant relationship was found, trend tests (weighted logistic regressions) were used to estimate its strength and direction.

Differences discussed in this report are significant at the 95 percent confidence level or higher. Where a lack of difference is noted, the significance of the difference is below this threshold. Differences between pairs of estimated percentages were tested using the Student's $t$ statistic. This $t$ statistic can be used to test the likelihood that the differences between two estimates are larger than would be expected simply due to sampling error.

To compare the difference between two independent percentage estimates, Student's $t$ is calculated as:

$$
t=\frac{p_{1}-p_{2}}{\sqrt{s e_{1}^{2}+s e_{2}^{2}}}
$$

where $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ are the estimated percentages to be compared and $s e_{1}$ and $s e_{2}$ are their corresponding adjusted standard errors.

As the number of comparisons on the same set of data increases, the likelihood that the $t$ value for one or more of the comparisons will exceed 1.96 simply due to sampling error increases. For a single comparison,
there is a 5 percent chance that the $t$ value will exceed 1.96 due to sampling error. For five tests, the risk of getting at least one $t$ value over 1.96 due to sampling error increases to 23 percent. To compensate for the problem when making multiple comparisons on the same set of data, Bonferroni adjustments were made.

Bonferroni adjustments essentially deflate the alpha value needed to obtain a given confidence interval. Bonferroni adjustment factors are determined by establishing the number of comparisons that could be made for a given set of data. The alpha value for a given level of confidence is then divided by the number of possible comparisons. The resulting alpha value is then compared to the table of $t$ statistics to find the $t$ value associated with that alpha value.

The effect of modifying comparison of estimates to account for standard errors and Bonferroni adjustments is to occasionally make apparent differences statistically not significant. This helps explain why differences of roughly the same magnitude are statistically significant in some instances while not in others.

Because of the computational complexity associated with weighted logistic regressions (used as trend tests in this report), chi-square tests were used to determine if a relationship existed between student's age, grade in school, or household income and indicators of crime at school. If a chi-square test indicated a significant relationship, a followup test was conducted using a weighted logistic regression.

Fellegi adjustments were applied to the chisquare tests to account for effects of standard errors on the estimates. ${ }^{10}$ A Fellegi adjustment is typically developed in two stages. The first stage adjusts the variances associated with an estimated cell percentage as follows:

$$
\text { adjusted variance }=\frac{\operatorname{var}_{1}}{\left(p_{1}\left(100-p_{1}\right) / N\right)}
$$

where $p_{1}$ is the estimated weighted percent of cases in a given cell and $\operatorname{var}_{1}$ is the variance of this estimate. $N$ denotes the unweighted population total. Before Fellegi adjustments were made, the cell variances were modified to account for the sample design using the gvf parameters.

Once the variances are adjusted, they are summed across all cells and the resulting sum is then divided by the number of cells. The chi-square estimate based on the weighted cell percentages is then divided by this quotient before determining if it is significant. The equation for the adjustment is:
$\hat{\chi}^{2}=\chi^{2} \hat{D}$, where $\hat{D}=\hat{\Sigma} D_{i} / I$ and
$\hat{D}_{i}=\frac{\hat{\operatorname{var}}\left(\hat{\hat{A}}_{i}\right)}{\hat{\mathrm{A}}_{i}\left(1-\hat{A}_{i}\right) / n}$
where I is the number of cells in the cross tabulation and n is the unweighted sample size.

Weighted logistic regressions used in this report were also developed in several stages. The crime report indicators were dichotomized such that students who gave

[^11]an affirmative response to the indicator being tested (e.g. responding yes to knowing another student who had brought a gun to school) were coded as ones and all other students were coded as zeros. ${ }^{11}$

The resulting logistic regression models took the following form:
$Y_{i}=\beta_{1}+\beta_{2} X_{i}+u_{i}$
where Y is the dependent variable and X is the independent variable ( $\beta_{1}$ is the intercept term and $u_{i}$ is the residual term). To assure that particular categories of the independent variable were not given undue weight, the entire equation was weighted by the inverse of the estimated variance of the independent variable in the model as follows:
$\frac{Y_{i}}{\hat{\mathrm{~A}}_{i}^{2}}=\frac{\beta_{1}}{\hat{\mathrm{~A}}_{i}^{2}}+\frac{\beta_{2} \mathrm{X}_{i}}{\hat{\mathrm{~A}}_{i}^{2}}+\frac{\mathrm{u}_{i}}{\hat{\mathrm{~A}}_{i}^{2}}$
where $\hat{\hat{\mathrm{A}}}_{i}^{2}$ represents the estimated variance term.

[^12]
## Appendix A

Tables of Standard Errors

Table 1a.-Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting criminal victimization at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  | 1995 |  |  |
|  | Victimization |  |  | Victimization |  |  |
|  | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Total | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Characteristic |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Female | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 |
| Student Race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| Hispanic | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 2.2 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.7 |
| Student Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| 13 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| 14 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| 15 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| 16 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| 17 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| 18 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 |
| 19 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| Student Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| Seventh | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Eighth | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| Ninth | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| Tenth | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Eleventh | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Twelfth | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Other | 2.9 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.4 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 1.8 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.0 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| \$50,000+ | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Not ascertained | 1.3 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.2 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central city | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Suburbs | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Private | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| Not Ascertained | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.5 | + | + | + |

Table 1a.- Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting criminal victimization at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  | 1995 |  |  |
|  | Victimization |  |  | Victimization |  |  |
|  | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ | Any ${ }^{1}$ | Violent ${ }^{2}$ | Property ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student reports of street gangs in school <br> Yes <br> No <br> Don't know if present Not ascertained | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 1.8 \\ & 5.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.9 \\ & 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 1.7 \\ & 5.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.6 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.6 \\ & 2.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.9 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student report of knowing a student who brought a gun to school <br> Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained | — | - | — | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 2.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school Yes No Do not know Not ascertained | — — | - | — | $\begin{gathered} 2.2 \\ 0.5 \\ + \\ 3.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.5 \\ 0.2 \\ + \\ 2.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.1 \\ 0.4 \\ + \\ 2.4 \end{gathered}$ |
| Student reports of drug availability: marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers ${ }^{4}$ <br> Any available None available Do not know/Not ascertained | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 1.1 \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 0.9 \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
${ }^{1}$ Any victimization is a combination of reported violent and property victimization. If the student reported an incident of either, he or she is counted as having experienced any victimization. If the respondent reported having experienced both, he or she is only counted once under "Any victimization".
${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{4}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each was impossible to obtain, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.

NOTE: s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 2a.-Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the availability of drugs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 | 1995 | 1995 |
|  | Drug availability 1989 items $^{1}$ | Drug availability 1989 items $^{1}$ | Drug availability 1989 and 1995 items $^{1}$ |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Total | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.8 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |
| Student Sex |  |  |  |
| Male | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Female | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Student Race/ethnicity |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 1.5 | 0.9 1.5 | 0.9 1.5 |
| Hispanic | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Student Age |  |  |  |
| 12 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| 13 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| 14 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 15 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 16 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 17 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 18 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.7 |
| 19 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 |
| Student Grade |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.9 |
| Seventh | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Eighth | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Ninth | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Tenth | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Eleventh | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.3 |
| Twelfth | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| Other | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 $\$ 7,500-\$ 9,999$ | 1.9 3.0 | 2.3 3.0 | 2.3 3.0 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| \$50,000+ | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Not ascertained | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |
| Central city | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Suburbs | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |
| Public | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Private | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Not Ascertained | 4.1 | + | + |

Table 2a.- Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the availability of drugs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 | 1995 | 1995 |
|  | Drug availability 1989 items $^{1}$ | Drug availability 1989 items $^{1}$ | Drug availability 1989 and 1995 items $^{1}$ |
|  | s.e | s.e | s.e. |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |
| Student reports of street gangs in school |  |  |  |
| Yes | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| No | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Don't know if present | 2.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| Not ascertained | 9.4 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Student reports of knowing a student who brought a gun to school |  |  |  |
| Yes | - | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| No | - | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Not ascertained | - | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school |  |  |  |
| Yes | - | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| No | - | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Do not know | - | + | + |
| Not ascertained | - | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school |  |  |  |
| Yes | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| No | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Not ascertained | + | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| Yes | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| No | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Not ascertained | + | 4.8 | 4.8 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school ${ }^{3}$ | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Yes | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| No | 9.6 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Not ascertained |  |  |  |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
${ }^{1}$ In the 1989 School Crime Supplement, students are asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers and downers, and other illegal drugs. In the 1995 School Crime Supplement, students are asked about the availability of these drugs and are also asked about the availability of PCP, LSD, and heroin. When comparing across the two years, only those drugs that are listed on both surveys are counted (i.e. marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers and downers). This list of drugs is referred to as "Drug availability: 1989 definition". Other illegal drugs are excluded from the 1989 definition used in cross-year analyses. When not making comparisons across the two surveys and focusing solely on the 1995 estimates, all of the 1995 response categories counted (this approach is referred to as "Drug availability: 1995 definition").
${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
NOTE: s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 3a.- Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the difficulty of obtaining various drugs at school: 1989 and 1995

| Drug | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Availability |  |  |  |  |  | Availability |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Easy to Obtain | Hard to Obtain | Impossible to Obtain | Don't know if available | Don't know drug | Not ascert. | Easy to Obtain | Hard to Obtain | Impossible to Obtain | Don't know if available | Don't know drug | Not ascert. |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Marijuana | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Crack | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Other forms of cocaine | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Uppers/downers | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| LSD | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| PCP | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 |
| Heroin | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Other drugs | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

- Question was not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.

NOTE: s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 4a.-Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the presence of street gangs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |
|  | Street Gangs in School |  |  |  | Street Gangs in School |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. |
|  | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e |
| Total | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student Sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.2 |
| Female | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Student Race/ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.4 |
| Hispanic | 1.8 | 1.9 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | 2.7 | 3.0 | 1.7 | \# | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 0.6 |
| Student Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| 13 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 14 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 15 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| 16 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| 17 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| 18 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| 19 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.2 | \# |
| Student Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sixth | 1.2 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 0.4 |
| Seventh | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 |
| Eighth | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Ninth | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.3 |
| Tenth | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Eleventh | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.2 |
| Twelfth | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| Other | 2.5 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 2.6 | 1.4 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.4 | 1.0 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 2.0 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 0.3 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| \$50,000+ | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Not ascertained | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Central city | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Suburbs | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Private | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Not Ascertained | 0.8 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 1.7 | + | $+$ | + | + |

Table 4a.-Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting the presence of street gangs at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1989 and 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 |  |  |  | 1995 |  |  |  |
|  | Street Gangs in School |  |  |  | Street Gangs in School |  |  |  |
|  | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. | Yes | No | Do not know | Not ascert. |
|  | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e | s.e |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained | $\begin{gathered} 1.3 \\ 0.4 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 0.5 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.7 \\ 0.3 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \\ 0.0 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 2.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 2.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 4.3 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{1}$ <br> Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained | $\begin{gathered} 3.0 \\ 0.4 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.1 \\ & 0.5 \\ & + \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.4 \\ 0.3 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.3 \\ 0.0 \\ + \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.7 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 1.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.6 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 3.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 4.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school ${ }^{2}$ <br> Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \\ & 0.4 \\ & 4.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 9.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 0.3 \\ & 4.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 9.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 2.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 3.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 3.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 5.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student reports of knowing a students who a brought gun to school Yes <br> No <br> Not ascertained | - | - | - | - | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 0.7 \\ & 3.2 \end{aligned}$ | 1.6 0.8 4.4 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 2.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \\ & 0.1 \\ & 4.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| Student reports of seeing a student with a gun at school Yes <br> No <br> Do not know <br> Not ascertained | - | — | $\begin{aligned} & - \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | — | $\begin{array}{r} 2.4 \\ 0.7 \\ 10.5 \\ + \end{array}$ | 2.2 0.8 11.7 + | $\begin{array}{r} 1.1 \\ 0.5 \\ 11.5 \\ + \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.0 \\ 0.1 \\ 5.5 \\ + \end{gathered}$ |
| Student reports of drug availability: marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers ${ }^{3}$ Any available None available Do not know/Not ascertained | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \\ & 1.0 \\ & 1.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 1.4 \\ & 1.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \\ & 0.9 \\ & 1.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 0.2 \\ & 0.5 \end{aligned}$ |

- Question is not asked in the 1989 School Crime Supplement.
+ Fewer than 30 sample cases.
\# No cases are reported in this cell, although the event defined by this cell could have been reported by some students with these characteristics had a different sample been drawn.
${ }^{1}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{2}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{3}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each was not available, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.
NOTE: s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and spring 1995.

Table 5a.-Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting guns at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1995

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 |  |  |
|  | Took gun to school | Knew student with gun at school | Saw student with gun at school |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Total | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Characteristics |  |  |  |
| Student Sex |  |  |  |
| Male | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Female | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Student Race/ethnicity |  |  |  |
| White, non-Hispanic | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| Hispanic | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Other, non-Hispanic | \# | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| Student Age |  |  |  |
| 12 | \# | 0.7 | 0.4 |
| 13 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| 14 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.6 |
| 15 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| 16 | \# | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| 17 | \# | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| 18 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| 19 | \# | 3.2 | 2.2 |
| Student Grade |  |  |  |
| Sixth | \# | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Seventh | \# | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Eight | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| Ninth | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.7 |
| Tenth | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Eleventh | \# | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| Twelfth | \# | 1.2 | 0.8 |
| Other | \# | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| Student household income |  |  |  |
| Less than \$7,500 | \# | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| \$7,500-\$9,999 | \# | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | \# | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| \$25,000-\$29,999 | \# | 1.4 | 0.9 |
| \$30,000-\$49,999 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| \$50,000+ | \# | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Not ascertained | \# | 1.2 | 0.7 |
| Student place of residence |  |  |  |
| Central city | \# | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Suburbs | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| Nonmetropolitan area | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Student school type |  |  |  |
| Public | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Private | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 |
| Not Ascertained | \# | + | + |

Table 5a.- Standard errors for the percent of students ages 12 through 19 reporting guns at school, by selected characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school: 1995 - Continued

| Student characteristics and perceptions of conditions at school | Year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1995 |  |  |
|  | Took gun to school | Knew student with gun at school | Saw student with gun at school |
|  | s.e. | s.e. | s.e. |
| Perceptions of conditions at school |  |  |  |
| Student reports of street gangs at school |  |  |  |
| Present | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Not present | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Do not know if present | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.4 |
| Not ascertained | \# | 2.3 | \# |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent or property crime at school |  |  |  |
| Yes | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| No | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Not ascertained | \# | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any violent crime at school ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| Yes | 0.4 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| No | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Not ascertained | \# | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Student reports of being the victim of any property crime at school $^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| Yes | 0.1 | 1.4 | 1.0 |
| No | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.3 |
| Not ascertained | \# | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Student reports of the availability of drugs: marijuana, cocaine, crack, uppers/downers ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| Any available | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 |
| None available | \# | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| Do not know/Not ascertained | \# | 0.6 | 0.3 |

+ Estimate not reported because the row denominator contains less than 30 cases.
\# No cases are reported in this cell, although the event defined by this cell could have been reported by some students with these characteristics had a different sample been drawn.
${ }^{1}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by force, weapons, or threats.
${ }^{2}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
${ }^{3}$ In both the 1989 and 1995 SCS, students were asked about the availability of marijuana, cocaine, crack, and uppers/downers. If students reported any of these to be easy or hard to obtain at school, they are included in the "Any available" category. If they said each was not available, they are counted in the "None available" category. If students are not included in the first two categories, they are included in the "Do not know/Not ascertained" category.
NOTE: s.e. is standard error.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995.

Appendix $B$
Questionnaires for the School Crime Supplements to the National Crime Victimization Survey: 1989 and 1995


FIELD REPRESENTATIVE - Read introduction -
Now I have some additional questions about your school activities.

| E. Screen Questions For Supplement |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Were you attending school at any time during the last six months? | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { PGM 3 } & \\ \hline & 1005 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & 2 \square \mathrm{No}-E N D \text { INTERVIEW } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2. In what month did your current school year begin? | 1006 | August <br> 2 <br> $3 \square$ Other - Specify |
| 3. Did you attend school for all of the last six months? | 1007 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \square \text { Yes - SKIP to question } 5 \\ & 2 \square \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. How many months were you in school during the last six months? | 1008 | 1 $\square$ One month 2 $\square$ Two months 3 $\square$ Three months 4 $\square$ Four months 5 $\square$ Five months |
| 5. What grade are you in school? | 1009 |  |

F. Environmental Questions


| F. Environmental Questions- Continued |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10. How do you get to school most of the time? | 1017 $1 \square$ Walk <br>  $2 \square$ School bus <br>  $3 \square$ Public bus, subway, train <br>  $4 \square$ Car <br>  $5 \square$ Bicycle, motorbike, or motorcycle <br>  $6 \square$ Some other way - Specify $\square$ |
| 11. How do you get home from school most of the time? | 1018 1 $\square$ Walk <br>  $2 \square$ School bus <br>  $3 \square$ Public bus, subway, train <br>  $4 \square$ Car <br>  $5 \square$ Bicycle, motorbike, or motorcycle <br>  $6 \square$ Some other way - Specify $\square$ |
| 12. Are most students at your school allowed to leave the school grounds to eat lunch? | 1019 $1 \square$ Yes <br>  $2 \square$ No <br>  $3 \square$ Only certain grades <br>  4 $\square$ Don't know |
| 13. In the past six months, have you participated in or attended any extra-curricular school activities? | 1020$1 \square \mathrm{Yes}$ <br>  <br> $2 \square \mathrm{No}$ |
| 14. Do you spend most of the schoolday in the same classroom? | 1021$1 \square$ Yes - SKIP to question 16 <br> $2 \square$ No |
| 15. During class changes, do teachers stand in the doorways and monitor the halls? | $1022 \quad$$1 \square \mathrm{Yes}$ <br>  <br>  <br> $2 \square \mathrm{No}$ |
| 16. Does anyone (else) patrol the hallways during school hours? | 1023 $1 \square \mathrm{Yes}$ <br> $2 \square \mathrm{No}$ <br>   |
| 17. Are visitors to your school required to report to the school office? |  |
| 18. Is it safe to store money or valuables in your locker at school? | 1025 $1 \square$ Yes <br>  <br>  <br> $2 \square$ No <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 4 $\square$ Don't have lockers <br>   |
| 19. What happens to a student who gets caught doing the following things in your school? READ THE ANSWER CATEGORIES IF NECESSARY. Mark (X) all that apply. <br> a. Being disrespectful to teachers? | 1026 $1 \square$ Nothing <br> * $2 \square$ Student disciplined by teacher <br>  $3 \square$ Student sent to the principal's office <br>  $4 \square$ Student's parents are notified <br>  $5 \square$ Detention <br>  $6 \square$ Suspension <br>  $7 \square$ Other - Specify <br>   <br>  $8 \square$ Don't know |
| b. Fighting with other students? Mark (X) all that apply. | $\square$ Nothing <br> $2 \square$ Student disciplined by teacher <br> $3 \square$ Student sent to the principal's office Student's parents are notified Detention Suspension $\square$ Other - Specify $\square$ Don't know |
| c. Drinking or being drunk at school? <br> Mark (X) all that apply. | $\mathbf{1 0 2 8}$ $1 \square$ Nothing <br> * $2 \square$ Student disciplined by teacher <br>  $3 \square$ Student sent to the principal's office <br>  $4 \square$ Student's parents are notified <br>  $5 \square$ Detention <br>  $6 \square$ Suspension <br>  $7 \square$ Other - Specify $\square$ <br>  $8 \square$ Don't know |
| d. Cutting classes? <br> Mark (X) all that apply. | $\mathbf{1 0 2 9} \quad$ $1 \square$ Nothing <br> * $2 \square$ Student disciplined by teacher <br>  $3 \square$ Student sent to the principal's office <br>  $4 \square$ Student's parents are notified <br>  $5 \square$ Detention <br>  $6 \square$ Suspension <br>  $7 \square$ Other - Specify $\square$ <br>   <br>  $8 \square$ Don't know |




F. ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS $\pm$ Continued

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 7a. Is your school public or private? \& 014 \& ```
1}\square\mathrm{ Public
2\squarePrivate }\pm\mathrm{ SKIP to 7c
``` \\
\hline 7b. Is this your regularly assigned school or a school that you or your family chose? \& 015 \& \(\left.\begin{array}{l}{ }_{1} \square \text { Assigned } \\ 2 \square \text { Chosen } \\ { }_{3} \square \text { Assigned school is school of choice }\end{array}\right\}\) SKIP to 8 \\
\hline 7c. Is the school church-related? \& 016 \& \({ }_{1} \square \mathrm{Yes}\)
\(2 \square \mathrm{No} \pm\) SKIP to 8
\(3 \square\) Don't know \\
\hline 7d. Is the school Catholic? \& 017 \& Yes, Catholic
No, other religion \\
\hline 8. What grades are taught in your school? \& 018
019 \& Grades:
\(\square\) (lowest) TO
\(\square\) (highest) \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
9. How do you get to school most of the time? \\
FIELD REPRESENTATIVE \(\pm\) If multiple modes are used, code the mode in which the student spends the most time.
\end{tabular} \& 020 \& \begin{tabular}{l}

Walk
School bus
Public bus, subway, train
Car
$\square$ Bicycle, motorbike, or motorcycle <br>
${ }_{6} \square$ Some other way $\pm$ Specify
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline 10. How long does it take you to get from your home to school most of the time? \& 021 \& | ${ }_{1} \square$ Less than 15 minutes |
| :--- |
| $2 \square 15 \pm 29$ minutes |
| ${ }_{3} \square 30 \pm 44$ minutes |
| $4 \square 45 \pm 59$ minutes |
| ${ }_{5} \square 60$ minutes or longer | <br>

\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
11. How do you get home from school most of the time? \\
FIELD REPRESENTATIVE \(\pm\) If multiple modes are used, code the mode in which the student spends the most time. \\
If the student volunteers that he or she does not go directly home after school, record the mode that the student uses to get to his or her first destination after school.
\end{tabular} \& 022 \& \begin{tabular}{l}

Walk
School bus

<br>
Public bus, subway, train <br>
Car <br>
$5 \square$ Bicycle, motorbike, or motorcycle <br>
${ }_{6} \square$ Some other way $\pm$ Specify $_{Z}$
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline 12a. Are most students at your school allowed to leave the school grounds to eat lunch? \& 023 \& ${ }_{1} \square$ Yes
$2 \square$ No
3 $\square$ Don't know <br>

\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
12b. How often do you leave school grounds to eat lunch? \\
(READ CATEGORIES)
\end{tabular} \& 024 \& \begin{tabular}{l}

Never
$\square$ Once or twice a year <br>
${ }_{3} \square$ Once or twice a month <br>
${ }_{4} \square$ Once or twice a week <br>
${ }_{5} \square$ Almost every day
\end{tabular} <br>

\hline 13. In the past six months, have you participated in any extra-curricular school activities? \& 025 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& { }_{1} \square \mathrm{Yes} \\
& 2 \square \mathrm{No}
\end{aligned}
$$ <br>

\hline 14. Do you spend most of the school day in the same classroom? \& 026 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \square \mathrm{Yes} \\
& 2 \square \mathrm{No}
\end{aligned}
$$ <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

## F. ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS $\pm$ Continued





\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{J.GANGS \(\pm\) Continued} \\
\hline \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Were the supplement questions asked in private, or was an adult member of the household or family present during at least part of the questions? \\
If not sure or if a telephone interview, ask \(\pm\) Was an adult member of the household or family present during at least part of the questions?
\end{tabular} \& 092 \& Personal interview \(\pm\) No adult present

Personal interview $\pm$ Adult present

Telephone interview $\pm$ No adult present

Telephone interview $\pm$ Adult present
$\square$ Telephone interview $\pm$ Don't Know <br>

\hline \& Is this the last household member to be interviewed? \& \& | $\square \mathrm{Yes} \pm$ END SUPPLEMENT |
| :--- |
| $\square$ No $\pm$ Interview next household member | <br>

\hline NOTES \& \& \& <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}


[^0]:    U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, NCES 98-241
    U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, NCJ 169607

[^1]:    U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, NCES 98-241
    U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, NCJ 169607

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ A similar series of questions was not included in 1989.
    ${ }^{2}$ See L. Bastian and B. Taylor. School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report, NCJ-131645 (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C.: 1991).

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ C. Kindermann, J. Lynch, and D. Cantor. Effects of the Redesign on Victimization Estimates, NCJ-164381 (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, D.C.: 1997).

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Any victimization is a combination of reported violent and property victimization. If the student reported an incident of either, he or she is counted as having experienced any victimization. If the respondent reported having experienced both, he or she is only counted once under "Any victimization".
    ${ }^{2}$ Violent victimization includes physical attacks or taking property from the student directly by
    force, weapons, or threats.
    ${ }^{3}$ Property victimization includes theft of property from a student's desk, locker, or other locations.
    NOTE: Students were not asked about seeing other students with guns at school in the 1989
    SCS.
    SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime
    Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1995.

[^5]:    SOURCE: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, spring 1989 and 1995

[^6]:    ${ }^{4}$ For more information regarding the sampling approach used in the National Crime Victimization Survey, refer to U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1994", NCJ-162126 (Washington, D.C.: 1997).

[^7]:    ${ }^{5}$ It is assumed that the response rate for households with students between the ages of 12 and 19 is the same as that of all households. The reported unit response rates are unweighted.

[^8]:    ${ }^{6}$ L. Bastian and B. Taylor, School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report.
    ${ }^{7}$ C. Kindermann, J. Lynch, and D. Cantor. Effects of the Redesign on Victimization Estimates.

[^9]:    ${ }^{8}$ L. Bastian and B. Taylor, School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report.

[^10]:    ${ }^{9}$ A more detailed description of the generalized variance function constant parameters developed for the NCVS and SCS can be found in the previously cited report "Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1994".

[^11]:    ${ }^{10}$ Fellegi, I.P. "Approximate Tests of Independence and Goodness of Fit Based on Stratified Multistage Samples." Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1980, pp. 273-279.

[^12]:    ${ }^{11}$ Note that the crime indicators in the chi-square tests were dichotomized in the same manner.

