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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Young people have been engaging in unacceptable, non-conforming behaviors for centuries. Behaviors which violate norms as defined by the laws of a particular society or which violate the tolerance levels of parents fall into the category of juvenile delinquency. An international study focusing on juvenile delinquents is important because, as stated by Friday (1973),

"deviation from legal norms appears to be a universal phenomenon. Not only is it universal, but increases in criminal activity are predominantly among younger age groups in urban, industrial and affluent societies. These can be considered social facts; they are phenomena distinct from individual manifestations and persist over time and across societies." (p. 151).

Cohen (cited by Friday, 1973) stated that there is a crying theoretical need for a comparative cross-cultural study of juvenile delinquency. The plausibility of our own speculations about juvenile delinquency in the United States rests upon the findings of similarly oriented studies in other societies (Friday, 1973).

Friday (1973) goes on to explain that a problem of most contemporary theory is that it has originated in
the United States. Friday states that "too often such formulations are applied uncritically to other societies when, in fact, they may be irrelevant. The formulations may have little or no relationship to the underlying socio-cultural characteristics of the society into which they are imported" (p. 152).

In continuing his discussion of contemporary sociological theory, Friday states that

theories emerging independently of the American experience frequently reflect internal political considerations or personal and societal rationalization for crime rather than concrete sociological principles.... The result of attempts to verify such biased propositions has had the consequence of reducing criminological theory to a set of diverse and often conflicting probability statements which lack integration and synthesis. (p. 152).

The existing figures that deal with crime and delinquency are relied upon by researchers and policy-makers alike even though they contain serious limitations. Court and police records, as well as other sources of information about delinquency which may be difficult to obtain, only report crimes that have been officially reported. While these data may be fine for the direct purpose at hand, they are extremely inadequate for comparing delinquent acts and patterns in and between various countries.

Official data represent only those delinquent acts which have come to the attention of and have been pursued
by criminal justice officials. Those delinquent acts which may have come to the attention of police but were handled unofficially, or those delinquent acts which have escaped detection altogether are unaccounted for. Therefore, self-report studies help to narrow the gap between what is officially recorded and what is unreported.

Block and Junger-Tas (1988) write that these studies give us insight in what one could call "normal" delinquent behavior, that is, the kind of acts that are committed by large groups of juveniles but that are mostly abandoned after adolescence. They also enable us to distinguish delinquency as a passing phenomenon from the more serious and persistent type of delinquency and relate these differences to possible causal factors. However, this does not mean that official statistics are without meaning: official data and self-report data are complementary, not mutually exclusive. (p. 13)

To compensate for the inadequacies of existing data the Ministry of Justice in the Netherlands has developed a comparative pilot study about self-report delinquency. A self-report instrument was developed in 1989 by the Ministry of Justice in the Netherlands based on core questions developed in the countries participating in this pilot study which all countries participating in this pilot study will use to gather data on delinquency. However, no official citation exists for the questionnaire used since this instrument was indigenously developed from a set of core questions provided by the Dutch Ministry of Justice (see Appendix A). Seven countries, including the United States, are participating in this pilot study.
The other countries are: England, France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, and the Netherlands. The data, once collected, will be used as a more adequate comparison of delinquency between countries.

In a letter dated July 18, 1989 to interested parties of countries participating in the Comparative SRD (pilot) study, Josine Junger-Tas, director of the international pilot study, writes that international collaboration in the field of juvenile delinquency studies will produce a great stimulus to the advancement of social science; and, by working closely together, specific research methods with respect to the measurement of youthful crime in the participating countries will be greatly improved (Junger-Tas, 1989).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this particular study is to increase the level of knowledge about several aspects of the behavior of the youth in different countries, to provide data useful in addressing long term prevention of delinquency, and to help determine youth needs based on the self-reporting of juvenile behavior by using a self-report questionnaire.

This thesis examines the relationship between various social controls and self-reported delinquent acts, both criminal and status offenses, using the outer
dimensions of Hirschi’s (1969) theory of social control simply as a basis of reference, not as a test of the theory itself.

Objectives of the International Self-Report Study

Research of this nature is important to help us learn more about the dynamics of delinquency on a cross-cultural and cross-national basis. Several objectives are pursued in the international self-report questionnaire. The first and most important goal of the international self-report questionnaire is to obtain estimates of the prevalence of delinquency and crime among the youth population. By following closely and comparing changes occurring in delinquency patterns in different countries, the changes can be placed within the context of differing cultural and policy dimensions of the respective countries. There are several prevalence measures: delinquency ever during one’s lifetime, and during this past year, prevalence of self-report police contacts (ever during one’s lifetime and last year), and knowledge of the crime by others involved in social control such as teachers and parents.

The second objective is to obtain information on the correlates of serious and less serious involvement of youth crime among the participating countries. Among these correlates are: socio-demographic variables, family related factors, and questions related to school.
These variables will assist in gaining more knowledge about the factors which are associated with situational and serious delinquency. This is important in helping to increase the level of knowledge about several aspects of the behavior of the youths in different countries as well as our own.

The third objective is to obtain additional information about the dynamics of involvement of the crimes themselves such as: Were these crimes committed in groups?, where were they committed?, etc., which will give more information about possible peer group pressure. This information will be important in providing data useful in addressing long-term prevention of delinquency and will help determine youth needs based on the self-reporting of delinquent acts by the youths themselves.

Self-report surveys and surveys in general are similar in design. Frey (1970) writes that the usefulness of cross-cultural research is that it dramatically expands the range of variation in the natural setting from which the survey researcher draws his cases. This increased range of variation is exploited primarily in two ways by cross-cultural research.... The first is to provide a population sample for testing hypotheses that offers greater extremes on relevant variables, and broader variation among irrelevant variables, that can be obtained within a single culture. The second is to provide appropriate conditions for the systematic variation of factors that cannot be varied within a single culture.... Cross-cultural research is required for a true probing of our generalizations, and an accurate assessment of their scope and qualifications. (p. 181).
CHAPTER II

SELF-REPORT STUDIES

Review of the Literature

The self-report technique of gathering information provides researchers with another perspective of the proportion of a population that commits certain offenses over a period of time as well as the number of times people have committed these crimes.

Barlow (1990) points out that with adolescents as their target,

self-report questionnaires usually include acts that would not be crimes if committed by adults. These "status" offenses represent an important component of juvenile delinquency. Yet many authors believe that their inclusion in self-report questionnaires has tended to trivialize juvenile crime and explain why the prevalence of self-reported delinquency is similar across class, race, and sex lines. (p.138)

Self-report studies of adolescent crime have sought to overcome the problem of trivialization by including a more varied list of crimes against persons and property along with status offenses. Over the years many self-report studies have been done. These reports have differed in form and accuracy, but they have all generally indicated that delinquency is not a particular
phenomenon of one class, race, sex, or ethnic group.

Bartol & Bartol (1989) report that, according to Gwynn Nettler,

numerous international studies employing the self-report procedure have consistently drawn the following three conclusions:
1. almost everyone, by his or her own admission, has violated some criminal law;
2. the amount of "hidden crime" is enormous; and more importantly
3. most of the infractions are minor. (p. 21).

Self-report studies do indicate, therefore, that many people will admit in confidential interviews to having been involved in crimes and status offenses that never become part of police statistics.

Conklin (1989) writes that Austin L. Porterfield, in 1946, was the first to use the self-report method in gathering information about crime and delinquency. Porterfield developed this self-disclosure method to compare college students with delinquents who had been through the juvenile court. Porterfield found that both groups had been involved in delinquency in similar ways during their adolescence. In 1947 a self-report survey of adults discovered that 99 percent of a sample of "law-abiding" middle-class people admitted to at least one crime. These early studies showed that much self-reported crime is never detected by police. (p. 79).

In 1958, Nye and Short replicated Porterfield's work by developing a checklist of delinquent behaviors to be anonymously answered by respondents. They found that delinquency was not exclusive to the lower-class, but was
pervasive throughout all society.

Frey (1970) states that survey research, which is similar in nature to self-report surveys, is "one of several valuable devices in the investigative arsenal of the social scientist" (p. 176). While acknowledging the value of these kinds of studies, Frey contends that there must be balance among all kinds of social research. He states that

too often, we seem to stray into a fruitless debate emanating from whether one is pro- or anti-survey research. However, survey research has been so clearly demonstrated to be one of the most valuable research tools of social science that being implacably anti-survey is ridiculous. At the same time, there are other unquestionably important social research devices, so that it is no less ridiculous to elevate survey research to a position of dominance. The only fruitful debate revolves about the most effective strategies for attacking various kinds of problems in social and political research. (p. 176).

There is no one perfect way to measure the scope and magnitude of juvenile delinquency, and self-report studies are no exception. The methodological problems associated with self-report studies of the past have generated cause for concern.

Gould (1969) concludes that

self-reported measures of delinquency are not good measures of the incidence and distribution of delinquent acts in the population.... They do not, for example, include the whole range of acts which are against the law, and the items which are included are generally of a less serious nature than the things which account for most official delinquency. In addition,
self-reported indices of delinquency suffer from problems of recall and candor. (p. 332).

It seems, then, that there is cause for concern that some respondents may fabricate behaviors to appear impressive or that they may not reveal other behaviors for fear of being reported to the authorities even though they have been promised that their answers will remain totally confidential. Bartol and Bartol (1989) quote Carl F. Jesness as suggesting "that offenders must be working overtime to accumulate the large numbers of offenses they report. In short, he finds some self-reports very hard to believe and recommends that criminologists be cautious about accepting the validity of self-report questionnaires" (p. 22). Clark and Tifft (1966) suggest that at least two studies show that some kind of external control over lying is needed to ensure the validity of self-report instruments.

In discussing falsification of self-report surveys, Bynum and Thompson (1989) state that Travis Hirschi effectively countered the suspicion about respondents' dishonesty with data obtained from police records and his own self-report study of those same youths. They write that he "found a strong similarity between the numbers and kinds of self-reported offenses of incarcerated juvenile delinquents and those listed in their official records.... this finding supports arguments for the
validity of both measures" (p.81). Hirschi (1969) contends that police records are less valid than self-reports as a measure of delinquency:

As defined, every delinquent act committed by a person is witnessed by him; he cannot commit delinquent acts without knowing it (otherwise, there is nothing to explain). Obviously, the police do not have such omnipresence.... In short, the records of the police are, on a priori grounds, a weaker measure of the commission of delinquent acts than presumably honest self-reports. (p. 64).

Self-report studies have also been criticized for excluding officially labeled, chronic delinquents. These critics point out that the data indicate that factors explaining relatively minor infractions may not be the same factors that account for the actions of chronic delinquents.

In focusing on the traditional correlates of delinquency, Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis (1979) found that other evidence from victimization surveys, studies of the reliability and validity of self-reports, and studies of biases in criminal justice processing, suggest that both official data and self-reports provide valid indicators of the demographic characteristics of offenders, within the domain of behavior effectively tapped by each method. (p. 995).

Bynum and Thompson (1989) clarify Hindelang by stating that, "in other words, the notion that official and self-report methods produce discrepant results with respect to sex, race, and social class is largely illusory because the two methodologies tap different domains of behavior" (p. 82).
Conklin (1989) writes that self-report studies cannot be used to assess the efficacy of official crime statistics, but goes on to state that they have been useful in providing us with the characteristics of people who violate different kinds of laws with various degrees of frequency.

The Relevance of Hirschi’s Social Control Theory to Self-Report Studies

Siegel (1989) states that social control theory maintains that all people have the potential to violate the law and that modern society presents many opportunities for illegal activity.

The question control theorists pose is: "Why, then, do people obey the rules of society?" One answer to this question can be found in Travis Hirschi’s social control theory which attributes the cause of deviance to the weakening, in a person’s youth, of the ties that bind him or her to society. (p.198).

Hirschi (1969) believes that commitment to conformity is a real, present, and logical reason to obey the rules of society. He assumes that all people have the potential to violate the law, but that they are kept under control by the fear that their actions will cause irreparable harm to the relationships they have with other people. Getting caught in an illegal act is not worth the risk of harming the relationships between oneself and his or her friends, parents, or neighbors as
well as the relationships between schoolmates/teachers, fellow workers, etc. A person who does not have these social bonds and is insensitive to the interests of others is a person who will feel free to commit criminal acts.

Social bond has inner and outer dimensions. The inner dimension is characterized by socialization into a set of conventional beliefs about how one should act toward others, and where and when certain actions are appropriate. Siegel (1989) writes that

People who live in the same social setting often share common moral beliefs; they may adhere to such values as sharing, sensitivity to the rights of others, and admiration for the legal code. If these beliefs are absent or weakened, individuals are more likely to participate in antisocial acts. (p. 200).

Relating the above to control theory, Siegel (1989) tells us that

Hirschi further suggests that the interrelationship of elements of the social bond influences whether an individual pursues illegal or conventional activities. For example, people who feel kinship and sensitivity to parents and friends should be more likely to adopt and work toward legitimate goals. On the other hand, a person who rejects social relationships probably lacks commitment to conventional goals. Similarly, people who are highly committed to conventional acts and beliefs are more likely to be involved in conventional activities. (p. 200).

Conventional beliefs are not, however, always followed by conventional actions. The pushes and pulls of external forces may lead an individual to act in a
manner inconsistent with his or her beliefs.

Hirschi (1969) states that control theory "is a theory in which deviation is not problematic. The question 'why do they do it?' is simply not the question the theory is designed to answer. The question is, 'why don't they do it?' There is much evidence that we would if we dared" (p. 34).

The outer dimensions of social control theory consist of attachment to significant others, commitment to social institutions, and involvement in conventional activities. Siegel (1989) writes that

Attachment refers to a person's sensitivity to and interest in others.... Hirschi views parents, peers, and schools as the important social institutions with which a person should maintain ties. Attachment to parents is the most important. Even if a family is shattered by divorce and separation, a child must retain a strong attachment to one or both parents. Without attachment to family, it is unlikely that feelings of respect for others in authority will develop.

Commitment involves the time, energy, and effort expended in conventional lines of action.... Social bond theory holds that if people build up a strong involvement in life, property, and reputation, they will be less likely to engage in acts that will jeopardize their positions...; lack of commitment to conventional values may foreshadow a condition in which risk-taking behavior, such as crime, becomes a reasonable behavior alternative.

Involvement...in conventional activities leaves little time for illegal behavior. Hirschi believes that involvement insulates a person from the potential lure of criminal behavior, while idleness enhances it. (pp. 199-200).

To test his theory, Hirschi administered a detailed
self-report survey to a sample of over 4,000 junior and senior high school students in Contra Costa County, California. A detailed analysis of the data supported Hirschi's control theory model. Siegel (1989) contends that a detailed analysis of the data supported Hirschi's control theory model as follows:

Among Hirschi's more important findings were the following:
- Youths who were strongly attached to their parents were less likely to commit criminal acts.
- Commitment to conventional values...was also related to conventional behaviors.
- Youths involved in conventional activity, such as homework, were less likely to engage in criminal behavior; youths involved in unconventional behavior, such as smoking and drinking, were more delinquency-prone.
- Delinquent youths maintained weak and distant relationships with people; nondelinquents were attached to their peers.
- Delinquents and nondelinquents shared similar beliefs about society. (p. 200)

Studies Supporting Control Theory

Using Hirschi's social control theory, Jennifer Friedman and Dennis Rosenbaum (1988) structured variables in their self-report study to explain why youths who deviate will engage in one particular form of nonconformity over another. Their study attempts to refine the social control model by specifying those conditions under which the model predicts different forms of delinquency. In 1985 Friedman and Rosenbaum collected data from 1,426 middle- and 1,708 high-school students through the use of
a self-report study. Their study revealed that the model that best explained personal crime (assault/robbery) differed from the model that best explained property crime (shoplifting). In addition, certain components of the model were more powerful predictors of criminal behavior for different age-gender groups. They found that a weak commitment to school was a better indicator of shoplifting among females than it was among males; i.e., youths who had delinquent friends were the most likely group to be involved in personal and/or property offenses.

In essence, Friedman and Rosenbaum (1988) are attempting to relate distinct types of criminal behavior to diverse demographic conditions rather than simply creating additive delinquency scales that weigh crimes equally and assume uniformity of meaning.

J. H. Laub and R. J. Sampson (1988) reanalyzed the Gluecks' "Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency" (1950) data. Through the use of a self-report study administered to 500 officially defined delinquents and 500 non-delinquents, these authors found that mother's supervision, parental styles of discipline and attachment are the most important factors leading to serious and persistent delinquency. Contrary to what one would expect, the authors found that background factors which include parental criminality, alcohol abuse, broken and/or crowded homes, have
little or no direct effect on delinquency, but act on family conduct instead.

In a study of youth crime in the inner-city, Mercer Sullivan (1989) found that

one aspect of family structure which did not appear to contribute to within-group differences in criminal involvement was the presence or absence of the father in the household.... At the neighborhood level, however, the lack of adult men officially attached to households did make a difference by contributing to a weakened social control environment.... The absence of adult men in the households of Projectville and Hamilton Park was closely related to the lower levels of employment opportunity in those neighborhoods. The link between high proportions of female-headed households and high crime rates appears here to result as much from patterns of social control within the neighborhood as from patterns of socialization within the household. Other studies, including many surveys, have also found that the lack of a father in the household contributes far less to delinquency than do family abuse and neglect. (p. 200).

A longitudinal and cross-sectional study of crime and delinquency by Elliott and Menard (1990) was conducted with a focus on delinquent peer involvement and delinquency. Their contention is that once a youth begins to associate with delinquent friends he or she will become involved in delinquent acts also within three to six months. Elliott and Menard (1990) agree with Hirschi by saying that in control theory delinquency comes first. The essence of the findings in this portion of their study is that

the acquisition of delinquent friends is much
more likely to precede than to follow the onset of delinquent behavior; if the onset of delinquent behavior has a causal effect on the initiation of delinquent friendships, this effect is far smaller than the potential effect of delinquent friends on the subsequent onset of delinquent behavior. (p. 51).

Social Control Theory as a Basis of Reference in the Use of International Self-Report Studies

Though crime appears to be pervasive throughout all societies there are great variations between cities, states, and countries. Friday (1980) writes that criminological theory has been dominated by Americans and is culture-bound with very little power to explain the cause of criminal acts, and that the United States has focused on the individual actor within our unique American culture. (p. 100).

Previous studies and official reports demonstrate that most of the crimes committed internationally are committed by the young (Junger-Tas, 1989). Offenses such as shoplifting, vandalism, burglary, and violence are typical youthful offenses, and most go undetected. In a study on self-reported juvenile delinquency in Kuwait, Al-Lanqawi, Murty, and Roebuck (1990) found that many Kuwaiti juvenile offenders never had contacts with the police. Therefore, their cases were not recorded in official data. Even when apprehended by the police, the overwhelming number were still released without becoming part of the official record.
The police have wide discretionary powers with juveniles and remand most juvenile arrestees to parents for control and punishment. Kuwait is more westernized than other Persian-Gulf countries and quite indulgent of its youth. (p. 51).

Comparative research which uses an international self-report questionnaire like the one developed in the Netherlands will help to determine the commonalities between countries and shape the study of juvenile deviance toward an "analysis of 'social facts' rather than 'individual facts'" (Friday, 1980, p. 101).

Yoon Ho Lee (1990) writes that a growing delinquency problem has accompanied the rapid economic growth of South Korea.

Because of this problem, there is a need to test theories developed mostly in the United States. In addition to the need to adapt these theories to insure their applicability to the Korean situation, the verification of these theories in other countries has the benefit of increasing their scope and generalizability. (p. 25). (Bierne, 1984; Blazicek and Janeksela, 1978; Newman, 1977; Shelley, 1981; Warwick and Osherson, 1973; cited by Yoon Ho Lee, 1990).

In his study, Lee viewed delinquent behavior as a product of internal and external properties of individuals.

In the integrated model, adolescents are at risk for developing weak ties to the conventional society because of their involvement in a youth subculture that has values of irresponsibility and hedonism.... The youths most at risk for delinquency have weak bonds to society, specifically, family and the schools, that
influences them to select similar companions who provide the socialization for learning delinquent motives, techniques, and rationalization (social learning theory).... Additionally, Hoffman reports that a number of family variables that are relevant to the child's attachment to the parent (e.g., broken family, busy parents) are considered the most relevant to delinquency causation in South Korea. (p.27).

Lee's findings (1990) demonstrate that

the less attached children are to their parents, the more conflict they experience with their parents but the less control and supervision they receive and thus the higher chance they develop unconventional, nonconforming behaviors.... Those youths who are unattached to their parents appear to experience less parental control, supervision, love, and concern. For those youths, the apparent alternative is their friends who are virtually in the same situation.... This finding suggests that those who develop the pattern of youth cultural behavior characterized as hedonistic, unconventional, and detraditional in nature are likely to associate with delinquent peers. (p. 33).

Cross-cultural verification of social control theory was attempted in an empirical self-report study conducted in China to uncover the cause for the rise in juvenile delinquency among Chinese youth (Sheu, 1988). When Chinatowns in the United States were assimilated into American society, juvenile delinquency among those youths increased. As the Republic of China became a more commercial and industrial society, delinquency increased there as well, causing great public concern.

The government formulated programs for prevention and treatment of delinquency and added social workers to
work with predelinquents on the streets. Theoretical foundations to discover the origin and increase of delinquency in China were also needed to augment the efforts of the programs. Empirical tests of American theories of delinquency were seen as an important step to Chinese delinquency researchers. Hirschi's social control theory was chosen because of its operationalization of concepts and its consistency with Chinese cultural values.

The findings of the Chinese self-report study illustrate that delinquent acts of Chinese youths (i.e., carrying weapons, stealing, damaging property, fighting with others, drug usage, engaging in delinquent acts with others, etc.) have a direct counterpart on the other side of the world in the United States, demonstrating that these delinquent acts are not unique to American youths. (Sheu, 1988).

Although the overall crime pattern in Japan has declined significantly through time, juvenile delinquency in that country has taken a sharp increase. It has been suggested that youth crime is directly related to breakdowns within the informal social control mechanisms. Fenwick (1983) writes that

with rapidly increasing modernization and shifts to high industrial production, we see a number of changes that have led to a decline in the social integrating influences of the
family and the larger community context. In fact, there are signs that the traditional concepts of community and attachments to family are undergoing rapid alteration. (p. 209).

This finding is consistent with Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory, that decreases in adherence to conventional norms of society increase the probability of delinquency. As attachments to school, family, and community break down, Japanese youths may become more involved in the social relationship of peer groups which could potentially increase patterns of delinquency.

Fenwick (1983) suggests that Japan would be an ideal place to carry out research to test criminological theories and plan strategies. The use of an international self-report instrument by Japanese researchers measuring delinquency would be one way to provide valuable cross-cultural information in the answers to delinquency.

An assessment of delinquency in India via a self-report study was conducted by Hartjen and Priyadarsini (1984). The instrument was administered to samples of urban and rural high school boys of varying socio-economic backgrounds and boys institutionalized in four correctional facilities.

Regardless of the official or nonofficial status of offenders, it is clear that serious delinquent behavior of any kind is rare among Indian boys. The bulk of the offenses that do occur are rather petty. To the extent that the
youngsters we surveyed are representative of Indian youth in general, it would appear that delinquent behavior in India is hardly a matter to warrant serious concern. (p. 65).

In comparing this study cross-nationally, the authors state that Indian youths differ from Western youths in the overall frequency of their involvement.

However, the patterns of conduct are similar as far as the type of activity is concerned, although involvement with drugs and alcohol is dramatically lower among Indian youth. This suggests that the major differences in delinquency to be found through cross-national comparisons are in its frequency, rather than in the type of behavior. If this is so, then delinquent behavior is probably "normal" for young people in the sense that it is essentially universal. Thus, attention should be directed not to delinquent behavior as such but to the differences in the relative rates of its occurrence in varying sociocultural environments. (p. 65).

The socioeconomic requirements of developed countries promote the separation and alienation of youth through powerlessness caused by exclusion in making decisions that have a direct impact with what will be done with their lives. "In a sense, living in, but not being a meaningful part of, a world over which they have little control liberates young people from the necessity to conform to the norms of that world, but not without consequence" (Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 1984, pp. 76-77).

In short, Hartjen and Priyadarsini (1984) are concluding that the socioeconomic requirements of developed societies seem to promote the separation and alienation
of youth, thereby increasing the likelihood of their being involved in acts considered inappropriate or illegal. "Where the characteristics of post-industrial development are absent or not yet active, the social consequences of such development should also be absent. India appears to be a case in point" (p. 77).

Hartjen (1982) writes that in an economy where scarcity is the rule and youths are involved in labor-intensive work, adolescent subcultures found in other developed countries have no need to develop in India. Traditional role relationships of family and community remain intact despite pressures to modernize. These traditional role relationships provide an integrative mechanism regardless of one's position in the hierarchy.

Hartjen (1982) states that if it is true that post-industrial development generates structures which alienate youth and stimulate the formation of a delinquency problem, the study of societies not exhibiting these characteristics may enhance our understanding of the relationships between socio-economic forms and the forces that affect rates of delinquent behavior and orientations toward its control.

He further suggests investigation of integrative mechanisms and their relationship to delinquent behavior as well as social reactions to such behaviors; and the exploration of the link, if any, between these mechanisms.
and economic development.

Summary

Delinquency appears to be prevalent in all societies. The importance of conducting an international study on self-report delinquency is evidenced by the growth of delinquency in cultures where these acts were once considered rare. The literature points out the similarities between delinquent acts among youths in several diverse cultures, thereby demonstrating the importance and need for further investigation of this problem.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH QUESTIONS, METHODOLOGY, AND MEASUREMENT

Methods and Research Questions

The objectives of this thesis are in line with those of the Netherlands International study (1989), namely: to establish prevalence of delinquency, to obtain information on the correlates of serious and less serious involvement of youth crime among the participating countries, and to obtain additional information on the dynamics of involvement in the crimes themselves, such as: Were these crimes committed in groups, where were they committed, were they committed alone or with others, and was the offender caught?

Considering the extent of the delinquency problem, cross-cultural use of social control theory as a basis of reference would be one avenue to explore for policymakers as well as the scientific community, thereby offering better insight and understanding of the evolution of the delinquency problem.

The data gathered in this study focus on two elements of Hirschi's (1969) social control theory. The data are used here in an attempt to expand on, but not test, the attachment and involvement components of
Hirschi's theory. The international study was not structured to concentrate on the commitment and belief components of social control theory, but the data lend themselves to such analysis.

The relationship between various social bonds (e.g., attachment and involvement) and delinquent acts are examined in Hirschi's theory that without attachment to family, it is unlikely that feelings of respect for others in authority will develop. This increases the likelihood of delinquency. The relationship between the social control component of involvement and participation in sports is examined to test Hirschi's theory that participation in a conventional activity, such as organized sports, leaves little time for illegal behavior. It is his belief that involvement protects a person from potential criminal behavior, while idleness enhances the chance of criminal activity.

Also examined here are the prevalence of delinquency and the dynamics of involvement in delinquent acts in the Kalamazoo, Michigan area. Research questions, using social control theory as a guide, are:

1. What is the degree of prevalence of delinquent acts in the Kalamazoo area?
2. (a) What is the significance between family composition and delinquent acts?
   (b) Is there a significant difference between
involvement in conventional activities (in the case of this questionnaire, organized sports) and delinquent acts?

(c) Is there a significant difference in socio-economic status (as measured by census tract number) and delinquent acts?

3. What proportion of delinquency is committed alone and in the presence of others?

Methodology

Experimental or observational methods may very well provide more reliable data. However, in view of time and money constraints, it is usually not possible to follow a young person or group of young people for an extended period of time to observe their delinquent acts in an unobtrusive manner. Therefore, a survey interview on self-reporting is utilized here to answer the international questions, and by using Hirschi's (1969) theory of social control as a guide, examining the relationship between various social bonds and delinquent acts.

Sample

The sample for the international self-report study in our area is a proportionate stratified random sample selected from a list of addresses in the city where there were juveniles from the ages of 11 to 15 years
during 1987 as provided by the Kalamazoo Public Schools. The year 1987 was chosen because those who were 11 at that time were 14-years-old during the study period, and those who were 15 in 1987 are now 18-years-old. This method permitted the possibility of sampling youths who may have dropped out of school. Those who were 15-years-old in 1987 would not have reached the legal age for dropping out of school at the time of the study, would still be included in the list of current students and, therefore would still have a chance to be chosen as part of the sample. A current listing of school students was not used because doing so would only include those presently in school, and those who may have dropped out would not have a chance to be included in the sample. Using a list of addresses of families with children enrolled in school and then going to their homes for the interview also provides an added advantage of including those students who may be truant.

There is an age discrepancy between our study and the ones conducted in Europe; our sample includes those from 14- to 18-years-old, and the European samples include those from 14- to 21-years-old. Our choice of population is also different in that we conducted a random sample from school lists, whereas the European population was chosen by selecting housing blocks.

The data were collected in June, 1990, by a group
of 17 students from Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo. Training for the survey was conducted during a two-hour class session.

The sample was selected from all of the Kalamazoo Public elementary, junior high, and high schools as well as from C.E.Y.F. (Continued Education for Young Females) and from the Vine Alternative School. The population totaled 5,493 juveniles. From that number a 1/12 sample was drawn for a total sample size of 458. The 458 addresses were then divided into 16 segments of 28 addresses each for the 16 interviewers. This totalled 448 addresses. The extra 10 addresses were added to the author's segment of addresses for interviews. Due to time and budgetary constraints, a sample size of 100 was most feasible for our purposes. A sample size of 100 allowed an accuracy range of +10 to -10%.

The sample was drawn grade by grade. For example: There were 962 fifth graders. Each address on the list of youths enrolled in the fifth grade in each particular school was numbered starting with 001 and ending with 962. We used a random number table with a series of random numbers in the range from 00001 to 99999. We needed three-digit numbers, so we selected the three numbers furthest to the right in each case. Initially, a spot at random was chosen on the table and the sample selected by proceeding down the list until 80 fifth
graders had been randomly selected. To obtain the sample size of 80 fifth graders, the total number of fifth graders, 962, was divided by 12 yielding a total of 80 fifth graders available from which to draw the needed sample. This procedure was repeated for grades 6 through 12.

After the 458 addresses were chosen, they were placed in alphabetical order. By looking at the Kalama-zoo census data, each address was then given its appropriate census tract number. Each address and census tract number was then entered into a computer where the census tract numbers were placed in numerical sequence. This was done so that when an interviewer went out to interview people, he or she would be within a certain census tract area and would not have to drive all over town looking for various addresses. We now had 458 addresses sorted numerically by census tract number.

The interviewers were instructed not to start at the top of the list and choose the first six addresses. Each interviewer was instructed to choose six different addresses at random. Where there were problems with interviewers not completing six interviews, the author of the thesis took the interviewer's list and completed the interviews for that census tract section. Two interviews from one census tract area proved to be defective; therefore the author completed two new interviews.
from that same area. After 100 interviews were completed, they were coded on mark sense sheets and entered into the Vax computer for further analysis.

Measurement of Variables

The instrument used in this study was designed in the Netherlands (1989), translated to English, and then modified to meet the needs of our sample. For example, the available answers for questions regarding where an offense was committed includes "at the local centre," "at the town or city centre," or "abroad". For our purposes, "at the local centre" was omitted, "at the town or city centre" was changed to "downtown," and "abroad" was omitted. The instrument included information about the father's birth country and the father's work, but did not ask these questions about the mother. Our instrument was modified to include this information as well as providing the respondent with a category for step-parents, which was not included in the original instrument. Census tract information was added to our instrument as a measure of socioeconomic status. A copy of the instrument used to gather data for this study is included in Appendix A.

The dependent variable in all of the research questions for this thesis is self-reported delinquent
acts. The majority of responses regarding involvement in delinquent acts are to close-ended questions. The exceptions to this are: when the question asks where the offense was committed, if the offense was committed with others, and how many persons were involved.

The prevalence of delinquent offenses is defined in a table by listing the offenses as they most frequently occur. Each respondent was asked whether he/she had committed any of the following offenses: skip school, run away from home, make obscene or threatening phone calls, drive a car without a license, damage or destroy certain objects on purpose, steal, fight and/or carry a weapon, and questions about substance abuse. This was measured by asking, if the responses were positive, how many times they have committed this offense, did they commit this offense during the past year, were they alone or with others when they committed the offense, where the offense was committed, and were they caught? If they reported being caught, they were then asked to report by whom they were caught.

Data were also recorded on basic demographics such as age, gender, grade in school, birth place and employment status of both mother and father, employment status of the youth being surveyed, and the people with whom the respondent lives.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Profile of the Sample

A sample of 100 youths was obtained from the Kalama­zoo Public School system student records, and each was interviewed after permission from at least one parent was obtained. Both parents and students were very cooperative, and no students who were asked to participate in the study refused. Most students seemed quite eager to participate.

Description of the Sample

Since the number of interviews is 100, frequencies and percentages will be the same. Therefore, only one measure, percent, will be given in the course of describing the study sample. Of the 100 respondents interviewed for this study 53 were male and 47 were female. Table 1 lists the ages of the participants in the study and the percentage each age represents.

The mean age of the sample is 16 years and the median age is 14 years. The largest percentage is 15-years-old, and the smallest group is the 18-year-olds.
Table 1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years 14 to 18 translate, in school grades, to approximately 8th through 12th grades. Not all respondents reported what grade they were currently in, but responded with "junior high," "high school," or "graduated." The usual breakdown is 14-year-olds in 8th grade, 14- and 15-year-olds in 9th, 15- and 16-year-olds in 10th, 16- and 17-year-olds in 11th, and 17- and 18-year-olds in 12th grade. Age and grade, therefore, overlap.

In terms of school type, the Kalamazoo sample has eight respondents in junior high, 81 in high school, and 10 not in school. Of the ten, eight 18-year-olds and one 17-year-old graduated from high school and were not attending college, while one 18-year-old was attending
college. Of the 10 people not attending school, three were employed and the rest were unemployed. All of the 10 respondents not attending school live in their parents' homes.

**Ethnicity of Respondents**

Table 2, below, gives a breakdown of respondents according to their ethnicity. These percentages can then be compared to the total population of Kalamazoo as reported in the U. S. Department of Commerce 1980 census of population and housing for the Kalamazoo-Portage, Michigan area. The majority of the respondents are white (62%), followed by non-whites (38%). Again, because frequencies and percentages are the same, only percentages will be given.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Kal. Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>64,893</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12,438</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 100.0

84,644 100.0%
To determine the reason for the high percentage of blacks participating in this study, a record of the racial distribution of students by schools was obtained from the Kalamazoo Public Schools Administration office. These data, reported in Table 3, were compiled from racial census reports filed by building principals for the 1987 fourth Friday membership reports. Data from 1987 racial census reports were used because our sample was drawn from the 1987 school enrollment records. Special education students are not included.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>% Black Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King/Westwood</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkwood</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Lake</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwood</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>% Black Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Alter.</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy Norrix</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.Y.F.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Alter.</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average percentage of blacks for the total school population is approximately 36%. Therefore, the number of blacks interviewed in this study (30%) is probably representative of the black school population as a whole.

The 1980 census figures are used here because the respondents in the sample were in school during the time the 1980 census information was gathered. According to the U. S. Department of Commerce (1982) census of population and housing for the Kalamazoo-Portage area in 1980, Kalamazoo's minority population consisted of 16,740 people while those in the majority comprised a total of 64,893 people. Of the Kalamazoo population, 79.5% are white, and 20.5% are non-white.

The sample of respondents is divided into groups of census tract numbers to determine which delinquent acts
are committed in the various segments of the city. To determine the socioeconomic status of each census tract, the number of families below the poverty level reported in the 1980 Kalamazoo-Portage census is used. There are five groups of census tract numbers: Group one 01.00 to 09.00; group two 10.00-12.01; group three 14.00-15.04; group four 16.01-16.03; and group five 17.01-29.02. The number of respondents from each census tract group is reported in Table 4.

Table 4
Census Tract Groups and Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents from Lower, Trans., and Middle-Class Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 01.00-09.00</td>
<td>24 Lower-class/poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10.00-12.01</td>
<td>19 Lower class/poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 14.00-15.04</td>
<td>21 Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 16.01-16.03</td>
<td>10 Middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 17.01-29.02</td>
<td>26 Middle class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of families below the poverty level in each of these census tracts is reported in Table 5. Using the figures in Table 5 as a guide, the area with the most families below the poverty level is represented by group number two, 10.00-12.01, which is most representative of the east side of the city. The next
highest group of families below poverty level is found in group one, 01.00-09.00, which is most representative of the north side of the city overlapping somewhat into the east side. Group three follows in census tracts 14.00-15.04 on the north and northeast side of the city with 286 families reported to be below the poverty line. Group five, 17.01-29.02 reports 194 families below poverty level and is most representative of the west side of the city as well as reaching out into the countryside. The group with the lowest number of families below poverty level is number four, 16.01-16.03, located on the southwest and western portion of the city. This census tract group also had the fewest number of respondents.

Table 5
Census Tract Group and Families Below Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract Group</th>
<th>Families Below Poverty Level in Lower-Class, Transitional and Middle-Class areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 01.00-09.00</td>
<td>474 Lower-class/poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 10.00-12.01</td>
<td>762 Lower-class/poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 14.00-15.04</td>
<td>286 Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 16.01-16.03</td>
<td>30 Middle-class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 17.01-29.02</td>
<td>194 Middle-class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the objectives of the study is to obtain information on the correlates of serious and less serious involvement of youth crime among the participating countries. Family related factors such as single- or two-parent households, presence or absence of siblings, and parent's employment status are reported. These are reported under the heading of "Family Composition," and will assist in gaining more knowledge about the factors which are associated with situational and serious delinquency. These data will provide useful information in answering the research question, "What is the significance between family composition and delinquent acts?"

The variable of Family Composition was measured by whether the respondent lived with either one or both parents, with or without siblings, and whether or not one or both parents are employed. These data are then reported as they relate to delinquent offenses committed and ranked in descending order as above. The number of respondents with and without siblings are listed in percentages as are the respondents who report living in a single- or two-parent household.

Twenty-nine percent of the youths in the Kalamazoo
study were from single-parent homes; 71% were from two-parent homes. Fifty-eight percent reported other siblings present in the home. The number and percentage of youths from single- or two-parent homes and the ethnicity of those homes is shown in Table 6.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity and Number of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = 12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest percentage of white youths sampled (80.6%) report living in two-parent homes with 19.4% of the white youths reporting one parent present. Of the non-white youths sampled 54.1% report living with both parents while 45.9% report only one parent present in the home. The difference is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Youths from single- and two-parent homes who responded to the question of father's employment status reported as shown in Table 7.

Of the unemployed, 68.4% were single parents and 31.6% were from two-parent households. Of the employed,
20.3% were single parents, and 79.7% were from two-parent households.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Parent</td>
<td>16 (20.3%)</td>
<td>13 (68.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Parent</td>
<td>63 (79.7%)</td>
<td>6 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
<td>19 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 33.5  p=.000

Employment Issues

It is important to determine employment of both respondents and their parents. Employment of youths constitutes a conventional activity which may help lower the occurrence of delinquent acts. And, on the parental side, employment of the father has proven to be related to family integration. Block and Junger-Tas (1988) report that family functioning is considerably better when father is employed than if he is not.

Of the 100 youths interviewed, 42 were currently employed in after-school jobs. Fast food restaurant work and other odd jobs such as corn detasseling make up the bulk of these jobs with 37% of the respondents reporting employment in this type of work.
respondents who are out of school and employed, two work in clerical positions in an office, and one is a swimming instructor. Table 8 provides the percentage of youths employed for each age group.

Table 8

Employment by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Employed</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Employed</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of youths employed are among the 15-year-olds (12), followed by 16- and 17-year-olds with 10 respondents reporting employment for each of those ages. Seven of the 14-year-olds report employment, followed by the 18-year-olds of whom three are employed.

Employment of parents and the type of work they are engaged in is reported Tables 9, 10, and 11. Twenty-one percent of the fathers were unemployed for various reasons. Listed under father's work and mother's work is a category named "don't know." In this instance, the respondent knows that his or her father is employed, but is unsure about the type of work his or her father does. The category "does not apply" was used if the respondent has not been in contact with his or her father for quite...
some time, and/or doesn’t know where the father is. All one can conclude from these data, however, is that 79% of the fathers are known to be employed.

The categories of jobs that parents of the respondents are engaged in were too numerous and diverse to deal with separately. Therefore, the jobs were classified into groups of unskilled labor, skilled/blue collar, and white collar/professional. Unskilled labor included jobs such as garbage collection, etc. Skilled/blue collar jobs included factory, machine tending jobs, etc. White collar/professional included office positions, accountants, computer programmers, teachers, (one college professor), etc.

Table 9 describes the employment status of single- and two-parent homes with the father present, and single- and two-parent homes with the mother present.

Of the 79 fathers employed, more than half were skilled/blue collar workers. Slightly less than half were white collar/professionals with the smallest percentage working as unskilled laborers. See Table 10.

Table 9
Parents Employed and Unemployed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father employed</td>
<td>16 (55.2)</td>
<td>63 (91.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father unemployed</td>
<td>13 (44.8)</td>
<td>6 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother employed</td>
<td>20 (76.9)</td>
<td>49 (72.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother unemployed</td>
<td>6 (23.1)</td>
<td>19 (27.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

Type of Father's Work

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled labor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Blue collar</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar/professional</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL n=</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 69 mothers who work, reported in Table 11, slightly more than half are employed in white collar positions. The next largest category of employment for mothers is in unskilled labor followed by those employed in skilled/blue collar positions. Even though the job of a homemaker is full-time work, that category is not included here. Only mothers who work outside the home for wages are included. Table 11 is included on the following page.
Table 11
Type of Mother's Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unskilled labor</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>26.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Blue collar</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n= 69</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 illustrates that in comparing the father's occupation with single- and two-parent households, we find the majority of the fathers of single-parent youths are employed as unskilled laborers. The majority of fathers living in two-parent homes are employed in skilled/blue collar positions as well as white collar and professional positions. The Pearson value for those unemployed and all others is reported below when tested at the .05 level.

Table 12
Father's Type of Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>14 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>4 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Blue</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>n= 28 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is an equal number of mothers from single- and two-parent households employed as unskilled laborers. Mothers employed as skilled/blue collar workers are slightly higher in two-parent households. Mothers employed as white collar workers are much greater for two-parent households. There are only two mothers from single-parent households working as homemakers compared to 14 mothers who are homemakers living in two-parent households. The comparison between mothers working who are from single- or two-parent households is reported in Table 13. The Pearson value is reported below when tested at the .05 level.

Table 13
Mother’s Type of Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6 (23.1%)</td>
<td>19 (27.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>9 (34.6%)</td>
<td>9 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled/Blue</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>8 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Collar</td>
<td>6 (23.1%)</td>
<td>32 (47.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>n=26 (100.0%)</td>
<td>68 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 14.99  p=.010

In looking at the type of employment of the father by ethnicity, we see that one youth reports his or her father as being unemployed with no reason. The rest of
the unemployment is reported by the respondents to be due to father being: disabled, retired, don’t know, does not apply, and two with no response. In the last column, the respondent reported that his or her father is employed, but the ethnicity of the father is not known. Table 14 explains father’s employment compared to the ethnicity of the father.

Table 14
Ethnicity and Employment of Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>NON-WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>58 (95.1%)</td>
<td>20 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3 (4.8%)</td>
<td>16 (44.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>n= 61 (99.9%)</td>
<td>36 (99.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = 62.3</td>
<td>p=.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-eight, or 95.1%, of the white fathers are employed; in contrast, 20, or 55.6%, of non-white fathers are employed. The unemployment rate for non-white fathers is considerably higher with 44.3% being unemployed compared with only 4.5% white fathers being unemployed. There was a no response rate of two for the white fathers which could mean that these people are employed or unemployed. Either way, the white fathers are more likely to be employed than are the non-white fathers.
Summary

The sample was approximately evenly divided between males and females and averaged 16 years. Racially, the group reflected the racial composition of the public school population, though it slightly over-represented minorities in terms of the population as a whole. Economically, a high proportion (43%) of the respondents could be considered as living in the poorer areas of the community and about a third (36%) from the more characteristically suburban areas.

In terms of family background demographics, 79% of the respondents lived in two-parent homes while 21% lived in single parent homes. In terms of employment, white respondents were more likely to indicate that their fathers were employed than non-white respondents. The fathers in two-parent households were most likely to be employed (91%) but only about half (55%) of respondents living in a single-parent households indicated knowledge of his or her father’s employment. Over three-fourths (76.9%) of single mothers were employed, and nearly three-fourths (72.1%) of the mothers from two-parent households were employed. The type of employment, however, for both fathers and mothers, was more likely to be skilled and white collar in two-parent households.
Prevalence

Another important objective of the international self-report study is to obtain estimates of the prevalence, or widespread existence, of delinquency among the youth population. It is important to examine prevalence to see if there is a difference in the overall incidence, or rate of occurrence, of involvement among the youth of different countries. If the major differences in delinquency to be found through cross-national comparisons are in its frequency, rather than in the type of behavior, then delinquent behavior is probably normal for young people in the sense that it is essentially universal as suggested by Hartjen and Priyadarsini (1984). Therefore, attention should be directed to the differences in the relative rates of delinquency in varying sociocultural environments.

This study demonstrates that delinquency is prevalent throughout the sample of youths surveyed. Of the 100 youths interviewed, 98 admitted some form of devian. For each of the 23 offenses reported here at least one person was caught with the exception of those selling stolen items, using hard drugs, or stealing from work. Overall, youths in this sample report being caught a total of 122 times for the 23 offenses. Only 12 youths were ever arrested.
Table 15 lists the 23 offenses reported in this study in ranked order of their frequency along with the percentage of youths involved in each offense for all ages. The most frequent offense was illegal use of alcohol, especially among 13-, 14-, and 15-year-olds respectively. Of the 77 respondents reporting use of alcohol, 65 reported use within the last year. The second most frequent offense was driving without a license. The frequency of offenses continues on down the list with stealing from work being the least reported offense.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenders</th>
<th>% of Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive without license</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip school</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy records, tapes, videos</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight in public</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene/threatening phone calls</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana use</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry weapon</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were asked about committing particular offenses during the survey; they were also asked at what age they first committed the offense. They may report committing the offense for the first time at a very early age, sometimes as early as 3 years old; however, these cases are rare. The offenses reported here are reported at the age the offense was first committed.

One of the purposes of this study is to find out what the prevalence of delinquent acts is among youths.
in their pre-teen (10, 11, and 12 years) and teenage years (13 to 18 years), and the incidence of these acts. According to the reported age of initial involvement, there is a pattern of offending among 13-, 14-, and 15-year-olds. Before the age of 13 and after the age of 15, the initiation of criminal acts declines dramatically. Table 16 is a break down of the number of all offenses reported for the age of initial involvement by the 14- to 18-year-olds questioned in this study. Offenses which initially began before the age of 10 years are not reported because the number is very small.

Table 16

Number of Offenses Reported by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at First Offense</th>
<th>No. of Offenses for Each Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-teens:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 16, the greatest number of initial offenses occurs at 14 years, where the hundred respondents indicated the initiation of 121 acts followed by 116 acts initiated at age 13.
Prevalence of delinquent offenses in the Kalamazoo study is reported in greater detail in Table 17. The offenses are reported in descending order from most frequent to those committed least frequently. Age range in years reports the age of the respondent at the time of the offense. However, only the pre-teen and teenage years are given attention. For example, in reporting alcohol use the age of initial use begins at 3 years and ends at 17 years. Initial use at the age of 3 years was probably interpreted by the respondent as having first tasted it. Only the most common age at the time of the initial offense and the number of offenders for the most common ages are reported. Continuing with the alcohol use example, the age at the initiation of this offense ranges from 3 to 17 years, but the most common ages for first illegal use are 12 to 16-year-olds. In looking at the number of offenses we see that four 12-year-olds report using alcohol, sixteen 13-year-olds report this offense, fifteen 14-year-olds report using alcohol, and five 16-year-olds report using alcohol. In total, of the 77 respondents who used alcohol, 54 started use between 10 and 16 years. Whom the youth was caught by, number of times youths were caught, and number of arrests are also reported in Table 17. From Table 17, it can be determined that the number of offenses is much larger than the actual times the respondent was caught.
Table 17
Prevalence of Initial Delinquent Offenders in the Kalamazoo Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Age at Occurrence and Range No. of Offenses</th>
<th>Most Common Age</th>
<th>Caught By</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>No. of Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>12 4 13 16 14 15 15 14 16</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive no License</td>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>13 18 14 15 15 17 16</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip School</td>
<td>8-18</td>
<td>13 9 14 15 15 9 16</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism:</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>12 7 13 15 14 10 15 4</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school furn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seat/bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td># Offenses</td>
<td>Caught By</td>
<td>Times Caught</td>
<td>No. of Arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy tapes 10-17 records</td>
<td>10-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight/Public 8-18</td>
<td>8-18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sec/guard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene/threatening</td>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone calls</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Marijuana 8-17</td>
<td>8-17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Weapon 8-17</td>
<td>8-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td># Offenses</td>
<td>Most Common Age At Occurrence and No. of Offenses</td>
<td>Caught By</td>
<td>Times Caught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from Shop</td>
<td>4-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Police 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parents 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Store/Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from School</td>
<td>5-18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Police 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Away</td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Police 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parents 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Accidental/(accidental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>witness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break/Enter</td>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Police 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parents 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy Stolen item</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Most Common Age At Occurrence and N o. of Offenses</td>
<td>Caught By</td>
<td>Times Caught</td>
<td>No. of Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Years</td>
<td>Age # Offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat up non-family</td>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>11 3 Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 2 Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 2 Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 3 Store/staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take bike w/o permission</td>
<td>8-16</td>
<td>13 5 Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 3 Parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 2 Store/staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal out from car</td>
<td>11-17</td>
<td>13 4 Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell Stolen item</td>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Car w/o permission</td>
<td>10-16</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>Police 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 2</td>
<td>Parents 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use hard drugs</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>14 2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Age Range In Years</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Offenses</th>
<th>Caught Times By</th>
<th>No. of Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal from work</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from home</td>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were most often caught by their parents. When a respondent was caught by the police, the offender was, most often, released rather than arrested.

Looking at the numbers reported in Table 15 and 17, at least 60% of the respondents reported using alcohol (77%), driving without a license (62%) vandalism (61%) and skipping school (60%). Thirteen was the most common age of starting for those reporting the behavior: Alcohol (20.8%), no license (24.2%), and vandalism (25%); fourteen, the last year of junior high, was the most common age for initiating skipping school (25%).

Less than half of the respondents reported committing other offenses, but copying tapes, fighting in public, and misuse of the telephone were reported by around 40% of the youths. Misuse of the telephone is more likely initiated as a preadolescent; about 30% started at ten. Copying tapes, which may not be known to be illegal, and fighting appear to be middle adolescent offenses with the greatest number starting at 15 (26% for tape copying and 21% for fighting). Nearly half of the fighting (42%) started at 14 or 15.

Fighting and skipping school were behaviors most likely caught. Teachers caught 39% of the fights, while parents caught about 15% of the truancy. Police, if involved, were more likely the ones catching the vandalism and breaking and entering.
Characteristics of Offenders

With 98 of the 100 youths reporting some form of deviation, one cannot differentiate between "offenders" and "non-offenders." But not all offenders are the same nor have they all committed the same types of offenses.

Alcohol

Looking first at alcohol, the most common offense, it is known that the behavior is commonly initiated at around age 13 and 14. Dichotomizing alcohol admission into used/not used, there are a few demographics that provide some insight into the youths involved. See Tables 18 through 21.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.51  \( p=.469 \)  not significant
Table 19
Alcohol Use by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 11.0  p=.360  not significant

Table 20
Alcohol Use by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.32  p=.515  not significant

White youths from single-parent homes are slightly more likely to use alcohol than are their non-white counterparts, but the differences are not statistically significant. Males and females are equally as likely to use alcohol. While alcohol use in lower-class
communities is proportionately greater than the use in transitional and middle-class neighborhoods, the relationship between neighborhood and alcohol is not statistically significant as can be seen in Table 21.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>38 (84.5)</td>
<td>15 (79.0)</td>
<td>26 (68.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>7 (15.5)</td>
<td>4 (21.0)</td>
<td>12 (31.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td>19 (100.0)</td>
<td>38 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 20.0  p = .065  not significant

**Truancy**

Sixty percent of the respondents reported being truant. The most common age for this was seen to be 14. Dichotomizing truancy into truant or not truant gives us a view of the characteristics of those who report this offense in Tables 22, 23, 24, and 25. We begin by looking at the dynamics of family composition and reported truancy which follows.
### Table 22

**Family Composition and Reported Truancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant</td>
<td>20 (69.0)</td>
<td>39 (54.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not truant</td>
<td>9 (31.0)</td>
<td>32 (45.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>29 (100.0)</td>
<td>71 (45.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.67  \( p=.195 \) not significant

### Table 23

**Ethnicity and Reported Truancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truant</td>
<td>37 (59.7)</td>
<td>21 (56.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not truant</td>
<td>25 (40.3)</td>
<td>16 (43.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>62 (100.0)</td>
<td>37 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.74  \( p=.448 \) not significant

Table 24, Gender and Reported Truancy, and Table 25, Area of the Community and Truancy are reported as follows:
Table 24
Gender and Reported Truancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Females n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truant</td>
<td>35 (66.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (51.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not truant</td>
<td>18 (34.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (48.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.30 p=.128 not significant

Table 25
Area of the Community and Truancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Transitional n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Middle-Class n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truant</td>
<td>25 (55.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (58.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (63.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not truant</td>
<td>20 (44.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (36.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.38 p=.759 not significant

As with alcohol, none of the basic demographic variables was statistically significantly related to truancy. White males were more likely to be truant (n=35, 66%) than females (n=24, 51.1%), the difference is not statistically significant. A higher percentage of truancy is also reported among youths from single-
parent homes. There is also a slightly higher percentage of truants from the middle-class community. There is not, however, a statistically significant difference among any of the demographics.

**Running Away**

Only 22% of the respondents reported running away. In analyzing this status offense, offenders were viewed as above according to family structure, ethnicity, gender, and area of the community. These results are reported in Tables 26, 27, 28, and 29.

**Table 26**

Family Composition and Running Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ran away</td>
<td>13  (44.8)</td>
<td>8  (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't run</td>
<td>16  (55.2)</td>
<td>63 (88.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29 (100.0)</td>
<td>71 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 13.9  p<.000
Table 27
Ethnicity and Running Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran away</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't run</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(77.4)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(81.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.03  \(p=.844\) not significant

Table 28
Gender and Running Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran away</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(18.9)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't run</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(81.1)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(76.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .308  \(p=.578\) not significant

Running away is slightly higher for females than for males with 23.4% of run-aways being female and 18.9% of run-aways being male. Running away also appears to be somewhat higher for white youths (22.6%) than for non-white youths (18.9%).
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Table 29, below, illustrates that youths from middle-class neighborhoods run away almost as often as do those from lower-class areas. The statistically significant difference is in whether or not the youth is from a single- or two-parent home. Youths from single-parent homes run away at a much higher rate (44.8%) than do those from two-parent homes (11.3%).

Table 29
Area of Community and Running Away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ran away</td>
<td>11 (24.4%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>9 (23.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't run</td>
<td>34 (75.6%)</td>
<td>16 (94.1%)</td>
<td>29 (76.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.62, p = .592 not significant

Patterns and Trends

To discover patterns among variations in the values of the 24 most common delinquent acts described in this study, factor analysis is used. The purpose of using factor analysis is, in short, to determine if there is any common, underlying dimension being measured by self-reporting on these behaviors. If there is, then factors can be used as measures of types of delinquency rather
than relying on the individual character of each offense type.

The variables with an Eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater are listed in the column labeled "Variable." The next column contains the communality of the total variance attributable to each factor. For example, the linear combination formed by Factor 1 has a variance of 7.31 which is 30.5% of the total variance of 23. The cumulative percentage indicates the percentage of variance attributable to the factors. The initial factors are arranged in descending order of variance explained.

Table 30 illustrates that 60.4% of the total variance is attributable to the first five factors. The remaining 18 factors together account for 35.1% of the variance. Therefore, a model with five factors may be adequate to represent the data. This means that nearly two-thirds of the delinquent behavior reported can be identified by using five indicators. Rotation is required to get the best fit with all of the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Cum. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.70804</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>.50592</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.63477</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>.41443</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>.52137</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the preceding factor analysis indicated a relationship between the factors and the individual variables, it is difficult to identify meaningful factors based on this alone. Norusis (1990) writes,

since one of the goals of factor analysis is to identify factors that are substantially meaningful (in the sense that they summarize sets of closely related variables), the rotation phase of factor analysis attempts to transform the initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret.... Rotation redistributes the explained variance for the individual factors.... To identify the factors, it is necessary to group the variables that have large loadings for the same factors (p. 328).

The strategy used in this study, as suggested by Norusis (1990), is to sort the factor pattern matrix so that variables with high loadings on the same factor appear together. Small factor loadings are omitted with no loadings less than 0.5 in absolute value displayed.

Using the rotation phase of factor analysis with the 23 delinquent offenses, five distinct patterns emerge for the youths sampled. In order of variance explained, they have been labeled: (1) serious crime; (2) theft; (3) petty delinquency; (4) substance abuse; and (5) truancy. Table 31 illustrates the delinquent acts grouped together in each factor.

Table 32 indicates factor scores generated for each respondent. Responses to the variables that make up each of the factors were added together under the assumption that these variables are related to one another.
Table 31
Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
<th>FACTOR 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious Crime</td>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Truancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell stolen items</td>
<td>Steal from car</td>
<td>Steal from work</td>
<td>Use hard drugs</td>
<td>Skip school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy stolen items</td>
<td>Take bike w/o permission</td>
<td>Steal from home</td>
<td>Use mari-juana</td>
<td>obscene calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight/public</td>
<td>Take car w/o permission</td>
<td>Steal from school</td>
<td>Run away</td>
<td>Use alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive no license</td>
<td>Copy records, tapes, videos</td>
<td>Graffiti/vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat up non-family member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 1</td>
<td>FACTOR 2</td>
<td>FACTOR 3</td>
<td>FACTOR 4</td>
<td>FACTOR 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Times</td>
<td># of Times</td>
<td># of Times</td>
<td># of Times</td>
<td># of Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N=100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32
Factor Scores for Frequency of Involvement in Factor Offenses
For example: Factor 1 in Table 32 illustrates that 29 youths were not involved in Factor one offenses. Of those involved, 28 were involved in one offense, 13 were involved in two offenses, 12 were involved in three offenses, 11 were involved in four offenses, two were involved in five offenses, and five were involved in six Factor 1 offenses.

Factor 1 is a mixture of what might be considered serious offenses by youth. It reflects a high proportion of violent offenses and those for which the juvenile court is quite likely to become involved. Some variables are statistically significant and related to this table and the other factor tables which follow. These are trichotomized into 1=No to low involvement, 2=moderate involvement, and 3 or more offenses=high involvement. In trichotomizing, using no to low involvement was done to accommodate for those more likely to be involved in delinquent offenses, but to a very low degree.

**Factor 1: Serious Crime**

In Table 33, whether or not an offender is from a single- or two-parent home is analyzed and reported as follows:
Table 33

Factor 1: Serious Crime by Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>10 (34.5)</td>
<td>47 (66.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>8 (27.6)</td>
<td>17 (23.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>11 (37.9)</td>
<td>7 (9.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>71 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 12.7  p=.001 significant

There is a statistically significant difference between involvement in Factor 1 offenses and whether the youth was from a single- or two-parent home. Youths from single-parent homes were involved in the serious crimes of Factor 1 (37.9%) to a much greater extent than were those from two-parent homes (9.9%).

Table 34, which follows, illustrates involvement in the serious crimes in Factor 1 and whether or not the offenders reside with other siblings.
Table 34

Factor 1: Offenses and Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Siblings</th>
<th>Sibs Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Low involvement</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td>47 (56.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>4 (25.0)</td>
<td>21 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>16 (19.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>84 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .421 \( p=.810 \) not significant

Youths with no siblings report no to low involvement to a greater degree (62.5%) than do youths with other siblings (56%). Youths with and without siblings report the same percentage (25%) of moderate involvement. While 12.5% of youths with no siblings report high involvement as compared to youths with siblings who report high involvement of 19%, the difference is not statistically significant.

Looking at the ethnicity of the youths involved in Factor 1 offenses lends some insight as to which group may be more likely to commit various offenses. Race appears to be a factor in serious crime as is illustrated in Table 35.
Table 35
Factor 1: Serious Crime by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Low involvement</td>
<td>41 (66.1)</td>
<td>15 (40.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>13 (21.0)</td>
<td>12 (32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>8 (12.9)</td>
<td>10 (27.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62 (100.0)</td>
<td>37 (99.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 6.43  $p=0.040$  significant

White youth report the lowest percentage of no to low involvement and moderate involvement in Factor 1 offenses. Non-white youths are involved to a greater degree (27.0%) in serious crimes, while white youths report a much lower percentage (12.9%) of involvement in these same offenses. The difference is statistically significant.

Looking at Factor 1 offenses and whether the offender is male or female provides information about which gender is most likely to be involved in the more serious delinquent acts. According to Table 36, males are more likely than females to commit serious crimes.
### Table 36

Factor 1: Serious Crime and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Low involvement</td>
<td>23 (43.4)</td>
<td>34 (72.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>14 (26.4)</td>
<td>11 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>16 (30.2)</td>
<td>2 (  4.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

|                | 53 (100.0) | 47 (100.0%) |

Chi square = 13.0  p=.001  significant

Males involved in Factor 1 offenses report 43.4% no to low involvement; 26.4% report moderate involvement, and 30.2% are highly involved. Among the females, 72.3% report no to low involvement, 23.4% are moderately involved, and, compared to males, only 4.3% report high involvement in Factor 1 offenses. The difference is statistically significant.

Looking at sports as a preventive measure against involvement in Factor 1 offenses uncovers some interesting findings as reported in Table 37.

Among those involved in sports, 62.2% report no to low involvement in Factor 1 offenses compared to 54.8% who report no to low involvement in these crimes and who are involved in sports. Of those who are not involved in sports, 32.4% report moderate involvement in Factor 1 offenses, and 5.4% report high involvement. Among those
who are involved in sports, 21% report moderate involve-
ment in Factor 1 offenses. However, the interesting
finding is that those who are involved in sports report
the highest involvement in Factor 1 offenses.

Table 37
Factor 1: Offenses and Involvement in Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not involved/Sports</th>
<th>Involved/Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Low involvement</td>
<td>23 (62.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>12 (32.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 10.5  p=.031 statistically significant

The area of the community in which Factor 1 of-
fenses are committed as illustrated in Table 38.

Table 38
Factor 1: Serious Crime and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>22 (48.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (76.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>14 (31.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>9 (20.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>8 (21.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 4.61  p=.329 not significant

When dividing the communities into lower-class, transitional, and middle-class, 48.9% of youths from the lower-class neighborhoods report no to low involvement; 31.1% are moderately involved, and 20.0% report high involvement in the crimes that comprise Factor 1 offenses. Among those in the transitional areas, 76.5% report no to low involvement, 17.6% are moderately involved, and 5.9% report high involvement in these offenses. From the suburban areas, 57.9% report no to low involvement, 21.1% are moderately involved, and 21.1% report high involvement in Factor 1 offenses. Involvement in serious crime is slightly higher for youths from the middle-class neighborhoods than for those from the lower-class neighborhoods, but the difference is not statistically significant. However, youths from both middle- and lower-class areas report a greater percentage of involvement in Factor 1 serious crimes than do youths from the transitional neighborhoods.
Factor 2: Theft

Factor 2 involves theft for which the police would most likely be called. Stealing out from a car, taking someone's bicycle or motorcycle without permission, and taking a car without permission are the offenses included. Also included is copying records, videos, tapes, etc., but this may not be known to be a violation of the law by the offenders, and police would probably not become aware of this offense.

The significance of whether or not an offender is from a single- or two-parent home is illustrated in Table 39.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  %</td>
<td>n  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>20 (69.0%)</td>
<td>66 (93.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>3 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>5 (17.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>71 (100.0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 10.1  \( p=.006 \)  statistically significant

There is a statistically significant difference between youths from single- and two-parent homes and
involvement in Factor 2 offenses. Of youths from single-parent homes, 69% report no to low involvement, 13.8% report moderate involvement, and 17.2% report high involvement in the Factor 2 offenses of stealing from a taking someone’s bike or motorcycle without permission, taking someone’s car without permission, and copying records, tapes, videos, etc. Among youths from two-parent homes, 93% report no to low involvement, 4.2% report moderate involvement, and only 2.8% report high involvement in the above offenses.

Involvement in Factor 2 offenses and presence or absence of other siblings in the home does not appear to be statistically significant as illustrated by Table 40.

Table 40
Factor 2: Theft and Presence of Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Siblings</th>
<th></th>
<th>Siblings Present</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>15 (93.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71 (84.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (8.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>16 (100.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>84 (99.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = 1.48</td>
<td>p=.476</td>
<td>not significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among those with no siblings, 93.8% report no to
low involvement, 6.3% report moderate involvement, and none report high involvement in Factor 2 offenses. Of youths with siblings, 84.5% report no to low involvement, 7.1% are moderately involved, and 8.3% report high involvement in Factor 2 offenses; however, the difference is not statistically significant.

Whether a youth is white or non-white has no statistical significance in looking at who commits Factor 2 offenses, as illustrated by Table 41.

Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(87.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.43  p=.489  not significant

The percentage of no to low involvement is slightly higher for white youths than for non-white youths. Whites are moderately involved to a greater extent than are non-white youths. However, non-white youths report a greater degree of high involvement (10.8%) than do white youths (4.8%), but the difference is not
statistically significant.

The difference between gender and commitment of Factor 2 offenses is significantly higher for males than for females, as illustrated by Table 42.

Table 42
Factor 2: Theft and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>42 (79.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>44 (93.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>4 (7.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (6.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>7 (13.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53 (99.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 7.28  p=.063 not significant

In comparing Factor 2 offenses and gender, 79.2% of the males report no to low involvement, 7.5% are moderately involved, and 13.2% report high involvement in these offenses. A greater percentage of females report low to no involvement (93.6%) and 6.4% report moderate involvement. However, no females report high involvement in Factor 2 offenses, and the difference in gender and committing these offenses is statistically significant.

Table 43 illustrates that involvement in sports is not a statistically significant deterrent against
involvement in Factor 2 offenses.

Table 43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Involved/Sports</th>
<th>Involved/Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(89.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .709  χ² = .950  not significant

Among youths not involved in sports, 89.2% report no to low involvement, 5.4% report moderate involvement, and 5.4% report high involvement. Of youths involved in sports, 83.9% report no to low involvement, 8.1% are moderately involved, and 8.1% report high involvement which is higher than for those not involved in sports, but the difference is not statistically significant.

In looking at the area of the city in which Factor 2 offenses take place, the differences are shown in Table 44.
Table 44
Factor 2: Theft and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>40 (88.9%)</td>
<td>16 (94.1%)</td>
<td>30 (78.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
<td>5 (13.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>4 (8.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (7.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.41  \( p = .247 \) not significant

For those in the lower-class community, 88.9% report no to low involvement, 2.2% are moderately involved, and 8.9% report high involvement in Factor 2 offenses. Of those from the transitional areas, 94.1% report no to low involvement, 5.9% report moderate involvement, and none report high involvement in Factor 2 offenses. Among those from suburban areas, 78.9% report no to low involvement, 13.2% report moderate involvement, and 7.9% report high involvement in these offenses. Those from the lower-class areas report a slightly higher percentage of involvement than those from the middle-class areas, but the difference is not statistically significant.
Factor 3: Petty Delinquency

Factor 3 offenses include delinquent acts for which parents and school and store staff would most likely become involved. These offenses: stealing from work, home, and school, running away and writing or spraying graffiti, are more likely to be settled without police involvement. Table 45 reveals the involvement by youths from single- and two-parent homes.

Table 45
Factor 3 and Family Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = 5.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>p=.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of youths from single-parent homes, 50% report no to low involvement, 31.3% report moderate involvement, and 18.8% report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. Youths from two-parent homes report 80% no to low
involved. A smaller percentage report moderate (11.5%) and high (8.9%) involvement in Factor 3 offenses. The trend is for greater involvement by youth from single-parent families, but the difference is not significant.

No significant difference is found between the commission of Factor 3 offenses and whether or not one lives with other siblings in the home. See Table 46.

Table 46
Factor 3 Offenses and Presence of Other Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Siblings</th>
<th></th>
<th>Siblings Present</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (74.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (16.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td>≥=.709</td>
<td>not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of youths with no siblings, 63.6% report no to low involvement, 18.2% report moderate involvement, and 18.2% report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. Among youths with siblings, 74.0% report no to low involvement, 16.0% report moderate involvement, and 10.0% report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. A greater percentage of those without siblings report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses than do youths with siblings.
but the difference is not statistically significant.

Race does not appear to be a determining variable in the commission of Factor 3 petty delinquency offenses, as seen in Table 47.

Table 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(70.5%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(100.1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .274  \( p = .871 \) not significant

Both white and non-white youths report approximately the same rate of no to low involvement. Whites are moderately involved to a greater extent (18.2%) than are non-whites. White and non-white youths are both highly involved in Factor 3 offenses to the same extent. The difference is not statistically significant.

Just as race is not statistically significant to Factor 3 offenses, the same appears to hold true for Factor 3 offenses and gender of the respondent.
Table 48 illustrates the relationship between gender of the respondent and involvement in Factor 3 offenses.

### Table 48

**Factor 3 and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(71.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(100.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .526  \( p=.768 \) not significant

For males, 71.0% report no to low involvement, 19.4% report moderate involvement, and 9.7% report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. With females, 73.3% report no to low involvement; 13.3% report moderate involvement, and 13.3% report high involvement. High involvement in Factor 3 offenses is greater for females than for males, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Participation in sports as a means of keeping youths too busy to commit Factor 3 offenses is not significant as can be seen in Table 49.
Table 49
Factor 3: Participation in Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Involved/Sports</th>
<th>Involved/Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>20 (76.9%)</td>
<td>24 (68.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>7 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>4 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>26 (99.9%)</td>
<td>35 (100.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .708  p=.950  not significant

Of those not involved in sports, 76.9% report no to low involvement, 11.5% are moderately involved. Among those involved in sports, 68.6% report no to low involvement, and 20% are moderately involved. Youths involved and not involved in sports report approximately the same percentage of high involvement in Factor 3 offenses.

The area of the city in which perpetrators of Factor 3 offenses live does not appear to affect involvement, although some areas report higher incidences, as can be seen in Table 50.
Table 50

Factor 3: Delinquency and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>16 (64.0%)</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>17 (68.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>6 (24.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3 (12.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
<td>11 (100.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 5.87  p=.208  not significant

In lower-class areas, no to low involvement is reported to be 64%. Youths from the lower-class areas also report 24% moderate involvement, and 12% high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. From the transitional areas, 100% of the respondents report no to low involvement with none reporting moderate to high involvement. From the suburban areas, 68% report no to low involvement, 16% report moderate involvement, and 16% report high involvement in Factor 3 offenses. Involvement in Factor 3 offenses is greater in middle-class areas, but the difference is not statistically significant.

**Factor 4: Substance Abuse**

Factor 4 offenses consist of substance abuse by
means of hard drugs, marijuana, and alcohol. Most of the respondents report use at one time or another in their lives.

Looking first at substance abuse and single- or two-parent households, we find the following as reported in Table 51.

Table 51
Factor 4 and Family Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(62.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(27.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .945  p=.623  not significant

Among youths from single-parent homes, 62.1% report no to low involvement, 27.6% report moderate involvement and 10.3% report high involvement in Factor 4 substance abuse. Of youths from two-parent homes, 71.8% report no to low involvement, 19.7% are moderately involved, and 8.5% report high involvement in substance abuse. A greater percentage of those from single-parent homes are involved in Factor 4 offenses (10.3%) than are those from two-parent homes (8.5%), but the difference is not
statistically significant.

Presence or absence of siblings has no significant bearing on whether one does or does not become involved in substance abuse as is illustrated by Table 52.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4 Offenses and Presence of Other Siblings</th>
<th>No Siblings</th>
<th>Siblings Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
<td>59 (70.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>5 (31.3%)</td>
<td>17 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>8 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>16 (100.1%)</td>
<td>84 (99.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.01  $p= .601$  not significant

Of youths with no siblings, 62.5% report no to low involvement, 31.3% are moderately involved, and 6.3% report high involvement in Factor 4 substance abuse.

Among youths with siblings, 70.2% report no to low involvement, 20.2% are moderately involved, and 9.5% report high involvement in substance abuse. Those with siblings are involved in substance abuse to a greater degree (9.5%) than are those without siblings (6.3%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

Substance abuse is not found to be significant in any one ethnic group as can be seen by Table 53.
Table 53
Factor 4: Substance Abuse and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(71.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(17.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.50, p=.285, not significant

Of white youths reporting Factor 4 substance abuse, 71% report no to low involvement, 17.7% report moderate involvement, and 11.3% report high involvement. Among non-white youths, 64.9% report no to low involvement with 29.7% reporting moderate involvement, and 5.4% reporting high involvement. White youths report high involvement in substance abuse to a greater degree (11.3%) than do non-white youths (5.4%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 54, which follows, illustrates the difference in gender and substance abuse. This table also reveals no significant difference in substance abuse and whether the offender is male or female.
Table 54
Factor 4 and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>35 (66.0%)</td>
<td>34 (72.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>14 (26.4%)</td>
<td>8 (17.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>4 (7.5%)</td>
<td>5 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>53 (99.9%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>47 (99.9%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.40  p = .494  not significant

Gender and Factor 4 substance abuse reveals that 66% of the male respondents report no to low involvement, 26.5% report moderate involvement, and 7.5% report high involvement. Reports by female respondents illustrate that 72.3% are either not involved or have low involvement, 17% are moderately involved, and 10.6% report high involvement. Males report a greater percentage (26.4%) of moderate involvement than do females (17%), and females report a greater percentage of high involvement (10.6%) than do males (7.5%), but the differences are not statistically significant.

Participation in sports is not an intervening variable in whether or not one is involved in Factor 4 substance abuse. Table 55 illustrates the significance between participation in sports and whether or not one
chooses to use illegal substances.

Table 55

Factor 4 Offenses and Participation in Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Involved/Sports</th>
<th>Involved/Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>23 (62.2%)</td>
<td>45 (72.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>9 (24.3%)</td>
<td>13 (21.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37 (100.0%)</td>
<td>62 (100.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.22  p=.695  not significant

Of those not involved in sports, 62.2% report no to low involvement, 24.3% are moderately involved, and 13.5% report high involvement. Among those involved in sports, 72.6% report no to low involvement, 21% are moderately involved, and 6.5% report high involvement. Those who do not participate in sports report a greater percentage (13.5%) of substance abuse than do those who participate in sports and report high involvement in substance abuse (6.5%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

The area of the city in which these offenses occur is not significantly higher for one than for the other. The breakdown for area of the city and substance abuse
is reported in Table 56.

Table 56
Factor 4 Substance Abuse and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>28 (62.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (76.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (73.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate involvement</td>
<td>12 (26.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (21.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>5 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (11.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (5.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (100.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (100.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.78  $p=.594$ not significant

Among those from lower-class neighborhoods, 62.2% report no to low involvement, 26.7% report moderate involvement, and 11.1% report high involvement. Those from transitional neighborhoods report 76.5% no to low involvement, 11.8% moderately involved, and 11.8% report high involvement. Of those in suburban areas, 73.7% report no to low involvement, 21.1% are moderately involved, and 5.3% report high involvement. Those from transitional areas report the greatest percentage of high involvement (11.8%) followed by those in the lower-class neighborhoods (11.1%), and 5.3% from the middle-class areas.
Factor 5: Truancy

Factor 5 is comprised of status offenses which are related to school. The offenses in this group are skipping school, and misuse of the telephone. Perhaps if one skips school the tendency would be to make obscene or "funny" calls to fill up the time on the day off. With only two offenses involved, Factor 5 is dichotomized into no and low involvement and high involvement.

Being involved in these offenses and whether one is from a single- or two-parent home is reported in Table 57.

Table 57
Factor 5 Offenses and Family Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>18 (62.1)</td>
<td>49 (69.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>11 (37.9)</td>
<td>22 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29 (100.0)</td>
<td>71 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .449  p=.502 not significant

Those from two-parent homes report a slightly greater percentage of no to low involvement than do those from single-parent homes. Although youths from single-
parent homes report a greater percentage of high involvement (37.9%) than youths from two-parent homes (31%), the difference is not statistically significant.

Involvement in these offenses and whether or not one lives with other siblings is not of significance. See Table 58.

| Table 58 |
| Factor 5 Offenses and Presence of Other Siblings |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Siblings</th>
<th>Siblings Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td>57 (67.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>6 (37.5)</td>
<td>27 (32.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>16 (100.0)</td>
<td>84 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .174 $\phi = .676$ not significant

There is a slightly higher percentage of offenders (67.9%) with siblings than without (62.5%) who report no to low involvement. Of those reporting high involvement 32.1% report siblings as compared to 37.5% without siblings, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Although not quite statistically significant, the breakdown of the two offenses, skipping school and misuse of the telephone, together with ethnicity, form an
interesting pattern. These results are shown in Table 59.

Table 59

Factor 5 Offenses and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.64  p=.056  not significant

Among whites, 59.7% report no to low involvement and 40.3% of these youths report high involvement in Factor 5 offenses. Of non-white youths, 78.4% report no to low involvement, and in comparison to white youths, only 21.6% report high involvement.

Involvement in Factor 5 offenses cuts across gender lines with no significant difference between whether one is male or female and the perpetration of these acts. Factor 5 offenses and gender are reported in Table 60.
Table 60
Factor 5 Offenses and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(66.0)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(68.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(34.0)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(31.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .047  p=.827  not significant

In looking at gender involvement in the above offenses, 66% of males report no to low involvement and 34% report high involvement. Of the females, 68.1% report no to low involvement and 31.9% report high involvement. Although the percentage of males who report high involvement is slightly higher (34%) than for females (31.9%), the difference is not statistically significant.

Involvement in sports as a buffer against participation in these offenses is not statistically significant, as reported in Table 61.

Youths who are not involved in sports report 73% no to low involvement and 27% report high involvement in Factor 5 offenses. Among youths who are involved in sports, 62.9% report no to low involvement, and 37.1% are highly involved. Those who participate in sports...
report high involvement (37.1%) to a greater degree than youths who do not participate in sports and report high involvement in these offenses, but the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 61
Factor 5 Offenses and Participation in Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Involved/Sports</th>
<th>Involved/Sports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to low involvement</td>
<td>27 (73.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>10 (27.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>37 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.56  \( p=.458 \) not significant

The percentages reported in Table 62 demonstrate that youths who report Factor 5 offenses are quite evenly dispersed throughout the city.

Table 62
Factor 5 Offenses and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No to Low involvement</td>
<td>32 (71.1)</td>
<td>12 (70.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High involvement</td>
<td>13 (28.9)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>45 (100.0)</td>
<td>17 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.16  \( p=.558 \) not significant
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Of respondents from lower-class areas, 71.1% report no to low involvement and 28.9% report high involvement. From transitional areas, 70.6% report no to low involvement, and 29.4% are highly involved. Among those from suburban areas, 60.5% report no to low involvement, and 39.5% are highly involved. Those from suburban areas have the greatest percentage of high involvement, followed by those in the transitional neighborhoods and lower-class neighborhoods, respectively.

Summary

In looking at all the above information for the different factors, we find that for Factor 1 (serious crimes), violence occurs most on the north, northeast side of the city with non-whites reporting the highest percentage of offenses. There is a statistically significant difference between those involved in Factor 1 offenses and whether they are from single- or two-parent homes and between gender of the offenders. A greater percentage of youths reporting high involvement in serious crimes are from single-parent homes. Males report the greatest percentage of involvement in these crimes (30.2%) while females report only 4.3% involvement. Those who participate in sports and report involvement in violent offenses live on the south,
southeast side of the city, which is basically transi-
tional. Youths who are involved in sports also report
greater involvement in Factor 1 offenses than do youths
who are not involved in sports.

Factor 2, theft, is reported most by non-whites and
males with siblings on the east to northeast side of the
city. Those reporting the highest percentage of theft
live in single-parent homes. Again, those involved in
sports report a higher percentage of involvement than
those not involved in sports, but not statistically
significantly so.

Factor 3 offenses, petty delinquency, are reported
most by youths who live in suburban areas of the city.
The largest percentage of offenders is from single-
parent homes. Non-whites and females report a greater
percentage of high involvement than males, but not to a
statistically significant degree. Those who report mod-
erate involvement in Factor 3 offenses report a greater
percentage of involvement in sports than do those not
involved in sports; and offenders who report high in-
volvement are almost as equally involved in sports
(11.4%) as those who are not (11.5%).

Factor 4, substance abuse, is quite prevalent
throughout the entire school census tract areas with
virtually all respondents reporting use at some time in
their lives. The largest percentage of offenders reporting high involvement is female (10.6%) as compared to male (7.5%), but not significantly so. Moderate involvement in substance abuse is higher among non-whites, but high involvement is more prevalent among white youths. Youths from single-parent homes report the highest percentage of involvement in substance abuse, but not significantly higher than youths from two-parent homes. It appears that substance abuse is highest among youths who are not involved in sports. Transitional and lower-class areas report the highest percentage of involvement, followed by suburban areas.

Factor 5, truancy, is reported most by white youths, especially males. Those from single-parent homes have the greatest percentage of involvement, and those who participate in sports are more likely to be involved in these offenses. Youths from suburban areas report the greatest percentage of involvement, followed by those in the transitional and lower class areas.

For all five of the factors—serious crime, theft, delinquency, substance abuse, and school related acts—presence or absence of siblings had no statistically significant bearing on whether or not youths were involved in all of the offenses.
Dynamics of Peer Influences

Now that the offenses committed by the youths sampled in this study have been dealt with separately and in groups as factors, attention is shifted to the dynamics of involvement of the crimes themselves. Were these crimes committed alone or with others, were they committed by specific ethnic groups, and in what area of the city did they most occur? As well as using census tract numbers to determine in which area of the city the largest portion of families below the poverty level are located, census tract numbers are also being used here to determine the area of the city in which each delinquent act occurred most frequently. The areas of the city are broken down into census tract areas as shown in Table 63.

Table 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract No.</th>
<th>Area of City</th>
<th>Socioeconomic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00-09.00</td>
<td>North/northeast</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01-12.01</td>
<td>South/southeast</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-15.04</td>
<td>East/n.e. and n.w</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.01-16.03</td>
<td>West/southwest</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.01-29.02</td>
<td>South, se, and west</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol Use

Beginning with alcohol use, the most common offense, and dichotomizing into use alone and with others, there are several demographics that provide some insight into the youths involved. See Tables 64, 65, 66, and 67.

Table 64

Family Composition and Alcohol Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>5 (17.2)</td>
<td>18 (25.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Alone</td>
<td>3 (10.3)</td>
<td>3 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use with Others</td>
<td>21 (72.4)</td>
<td>50 (70.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>29 (99.9)</td>
<td>71 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>p=.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 65

Ethnicity and Alcohol Use Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Use</td>
<td>12 (19.4)</td>
<td>11 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Alone</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
<td>3 (8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use with Others</td>
<td>47 (75.8)</td>
<td>23 (62.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>61 (100.0)</td>
<td>37 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>p=.351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 66
Gender and Alcohol Use Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No use</td>
<td>13 (24.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (21.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Alone</td>
<td>4 (7.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use with Others</td>
<td>36 (67.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 (74.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>53 (99.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>47 (100.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .714  $p=.699$  not significant

Table 67
Community and Alcohol Use Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Class</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Use</td>
<td>8 (17.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (28.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Alone</td>
<td>5 (11.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>73 (71.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (76.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>27 (68.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>86 (100.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (99.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (99.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 9.20  $p=.324$

Alcohol use appears to be a social activity. Irrespective of the controlling factors, proportionately more alcohol use is in groups than alone. Youths who are white are more likely to use alcohol with others.
than youths who are non-white. Youths from single-parent homes report alcohol use with others more than youths from two-parent homes. Females are more likely to be involved in alcohol use with others than are males. However, males report more alcohol use alone than do females. Youths from the transitional and lower-class areas are more likely report alcohol use with others, followed by those in suburban areas. Use of alcohol is so prevalent among youths across gender, racial, and community lines that one variable is not statistically greater than another.

Truancy

About 60 of the respondents reported being truant. Skipping school is an offense which is found to be committed most often with others as seen in Tables 68, 69, 70, and 71.

Table 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Composition and Truancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Alone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(38.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy with Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(61.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS               | 21 (100.0) | 37 (100.0) |
| Chi square = .190    | g=.662     | not significant |
### Table 69
Ethnicity and Truancy Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Alone</td>
<td>10 (28.6)</td>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>25 (71.4)</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>35 (100.0)</td>
<td>22 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.69  p=.193

### Table 70
Gender and Truancy Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy Alone</td>
<td>9 (25.7)</td>
<td>11 (47.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>26 (74.3)</td>
<td>12 (52.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>35 (100.0)</td>
<td>23 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 3.00  p=.083  not significant

The largest percentage of youths who report truancy is with others, is white male, and is from two-parent homes. The highest percentage of youths who skip school with others is from the transitional area of the city, followed by the suburbs and then the lower-class neighborhoods.
Table 71
Community and Truancy Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transit.</th>
<th>Mid-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(45.8)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(54.2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.79  $p=.424$  not significant

Carrying Weapons

The demographics of youths who carry weapons in the presence of others are not statistically significant, but provide some insight into this offense. See Tables 72, 73, 74, and 75.

Table 72
Family Composition and Weapons Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Parent</th>
<th>Two-Parent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Weapon Alone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Weap. with Others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(76.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 1.68  $p=.193$  not significant
Table 73
Ethnicity and Carry Weapon Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Weapon Alone</td>
<td>3 (30.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (38.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>7 (70.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (61.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>10 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = .221</td>
<td>p=.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 74
Gender and Carry Weapon Alone or With Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Weapon Alone</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16 (66.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (50.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (100.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square = .414</td>
<td>p=.519</td>
<td></td>
<td>not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a higher percentage of white youths who carry a weapon with others than for non-white youths. All youths in the transitional areas carried their weapons with others, followed by those in the lower class and suburban areas. There is a higher number of youths who carry weapons in the lower-class.
neighborhoods, however. More males than females carry weapons, and the percentage of males who carry weapons in the presence of others is greater (66.7%) than for females (50.0%). A greater percentage of youths from single-parent homes carry weapons in the presence of others (76.9%) than do those from two-parent homes (53.3%).

Table 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower-Class</th>
<th>Transitional</th>
<th>Middle-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>5 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10 (66.7)</td>
<td>2 (100.0)</td>
<td>6 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>15 (100.0)</td>
<td>2 (100.0)</td>
<td>11 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>p=.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dynamics of Peer Involvement

Peer Dynamics and Involvement, Table 76, illustrates that involvement in each type of offense is related to the presence of others. For example, in looking at alcohol use we see that only 23 of 100 respondents reported no involvement in this offense. Of the 77 reporting involvement, 6% were alone and 71% were involved with others at the time of the offense. Those offenses committed alone include vandalism,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>% Alone</th>
<th>% Others</th>
<th>Percentage Respondents Not Involv. In offense</th>
<th>Where Offense Most Often Occurred</th>
<th>Occurs Most In Census Tract Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive no license</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>East-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Some/else &amp; home</td>
<td>South, SE West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy tapes/records</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>West-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight in public</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>South, west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene/threat. phone calls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>West to Sw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry weapon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 76--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>% Alone</th>
<th>% Others</th>
<th>Percentage Respondents Not Involv. In offense</th>
<th>Where Offense Most Often Occurred</th>
<th>Occurs Most In Census Tract Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steal from shop</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>South, SE East, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Away</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break/Enter House</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy stolen item</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat up non-fam.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from home</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Resp. home</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take bike w/o permission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>South-SE-W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td>% Alone</td>
<td>% Others</td>
<td>Percentage Respondents Not Involv. In offense</td>
<td>Where Offense Most Often Occurred</td>
<td>Occurs Most In Census Tract Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal out from car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell stolen item</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10 min. from home</td>
<td>East-NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take car w/o permission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use hard drugs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>West-SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steal from work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Place of employment</td>
<td>South-SE-W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stealing from school, home and work, buying stolen items, and running away. When these offenses are tri-chotomized by offense, with whom, and controlling for census tract area and then tested for significance at the .05 level using the Pearson correlation coefficient, there is a positive relationship between the offense and area of the city as shown in Table 77:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Alone</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Area of City</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy stolen</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry weap.</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. Abuse</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>North-NE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take bike</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;E House</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat up n-f</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>South-SE</td>
<td>$p = &lt;.000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at levels of significance, the largest portion of the above offenses occurs in the north to northeast section of the city and coincides most with violent acts with the exception of beating up non-family members. The significant offenses in the south-southeast section of the city involve theft related incidents.
Tables 76 and 78 serve to help establish the prevalence of offenses committed in the presence of others and area of the city where some of these offenses are most commonly found.

Involvement in Conventional Activities

Hirschi's (1969) theory has argued that one who is involved in conventional activities has little time for delinquent activities. The variable of sports could be used as one possible measure of involvement in conventional activities. However, in the case of this study, involvement in sports alone does not appear to be an adequate buffer against involvement in delinquent activities. These results appear in Table 78.

Table 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>% Involved In Sports</th>
<th>% Uninvolved In Sports</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive no license</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip School</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy tapes</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight/Public</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscene calls</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana use</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 78, it appears as though most youths involved in sports are also involved in delinquent acts. However, when testing at the .05 level for a significant relationship between involvement in sports and delinquent offenses, the only significant offense is beating up non-family members, where 68.8% of those in sports did so. This fact calls for more research into
the nature of sport interaction.

Referring back to the previous factor analyses, it was determined that respondents from the south to southeast area of the city who participate in sports are less likely to be involved in substance abuse. This, too, raises questions the research is not designed to answer, but an analysis might prove interesting in identifying general elements associated with a positive relationship between sports and non-deviance.

General Findings

In summary, the principal findings demonstrate that the number of initial offenses per age is greatest for 14-year-olds. According to census tract numbers, the most offenses were committed in the south to southeast section of the city, followed by the north to northeast section, southeast and west, east to northeast, and west to southwest. The offenses occurring most in the north to northeast, which are defined as the poorer areas, are: alcohol and marijuana use, carrying weapon, stealing from school, buying stolen items, stealing from a car, driving without a license, stealing from a shop, and selling stolen items. The offenses occurring most in the south to southeast, which is a more transitional area, are: vandalism, stealing from a shop, running away, writing graffiti, breaking and entering a house,
beating up non-family members, stealing from home, and taking a car without permission. In the south, south-east and west, more middle-class areas, the most common offenses were: skipping school, copying videos, misuse of the telephone, fighting in public, taking someone’s bike without permission, stealing from work, and use of hard drugs (which was a very small percentage).

Respondents reporting other siblings living in their family did not report more delinquency than respondents with no siblings. However, the offenses of buying stolen items, stealing from home, taking someone’s bike without permission, stealing from a car, selling stolen items, and taking a car without permission were more commonly committed by respondents from single-parent homes. Single- and two-parent households both had an equal number of delinquent activities involving stealing from a shop and beating up non-family members.

Those who report participation in sports also report committing more delinquent offenses than do those not participating in sports. The exception to this is the use of hard drugs in which those reporting the use of hard drugs also report less involvement in sports. In looking at the factor analyses, those involved in sports were more likely to be involved in most of the other offenses.
Of the 23 offenses reported, 5 are committed alone, 16 are committed with others, and 3 are committed alone and with others equally. The breakdown is as follows for offenses committed alone: Running away; stealing from school, home, and work; and buying stolen items. As many people are involved alone as are involved with others in the offenses of selling stolen items, copying tapes, records, videos, and beating up non-family members.

Offenses committed with one or more others include: skipping school; driving without a license; writing graffiti; vandalism; stealing from a shop; taking a bike without permission; stealing from a car; taking a car without permission; carrying a weapon; fighting in public; use of marijuana, alcohol, and hard drugs; and obscene phone calls.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary objectives of this study were to check prevalence and the relationship between self-reporting of delinquency and other related factors.

Prevalence

This study reaffirms the fact that delinquency is prevalent throughout the community, though it varies between degree and type of involvement. While the European study (1989) has a larger number of offenders, the 14- to 18-year-olds there were involved in the 23 crimes under study here. Of the 100 youths sampled from the Kalamazoo area, 98 reported varying degrees of delinquent activity making it virtually impossible to predict who will and will not commit delinquent offenses.

The most pervasive offense found here was alcohol use with 77% of all respondents reporting use at some time in their lives. The most common age for beginning alcohol use is 13 years, raising cause for concern.

Correlations

The primary issue relates to family size, race.
age, and gender, with few other demographic factors related to delinquency. According to the involvement component of Hirschi's (1969) theory, using sports as a conventional activity which may help deter delinquent involvement did not work for this sample.

Through the course of this study, it appears that the factors of violence, serious crime, petty delinquency, substance abuse, and school related offenses are most often statistically related to whether the youth is from a single- or two-parent household. This study demonstrates that the largest portion of delinquent acts occurs among non-whites and males from single-parent homes, and the presence or absence of other siblings does not seem to have an effect on whether or not one is involved in delinquent acts. The greatest portion of delinquent acts was reported in the area of the city where the largest number of families below the poverty level reside.

It is true that a single-parent home is not a necessary condition for delinquency, but appears to be one of the intervening variables in this case.

The results of this study demonstrate that of the five factors (serious crime, theft, petty delinquency, substance abuse, and truancy), the largest percentage of offenses was committed by youths from single-parent homes. Among the entire sample, 21% of those responding were from single-parent homes. The greatest percentage
of offenses was committed by relatively few youths. Indeed, Wilkinson's (1980) conclusion that single-parent households may be a causal element in explaining control theory's attachment to parents may very well hold true in this case, but the study was not designed to actually test the theory.

Although this study shows a higher rate of delinquency among the more disadvantaged youths in our city, not all delinquent acts are committed by lower-class youths from single-parent homes. The study on self-reported delinquency in Kuwait by Al-Lanqawi et al. (1990) demonstrates that these affluent youth appear to have too much unprogrammed and unsupervised leisure time. Products of large, structurally sound, wholesome families, they have enjoyed close parental ties, adequate parental discipline, economic security, and above adequate housing accommodations while living in a stable affluent society...this sample appears to be quite similar to self-reporting delinquent samples in the United States. This finding probably reflects universal similarities among urban teenagers and Kuwait's material culture, i.e., affluence, teen-age culture, the egregious automobile, and unprogrammed/unsupervised leisure time all in a dynamic urban setting that is heavily influenced by western material culture.... Parents, educators, religious leaders, recreational workers, and all formal group organizations concerned with youth should develop more adult-supervised, programmed leisure time activities for teenagers. (pp. 57-58).
This study demonstrates that, by far, the largest number of offenses occurs in the presence of others, supporting Hirschi's (1969) contention of peer association. Sarnecki (1986) writes that the importance of peers seems to have increased during the last few decades as the importance of family and other social controls has decreased. Between 60% and 80% of all juveniles commit their offenses in the presence of one or more others which may help to show that the group experience itself is as important to the offenders. Therefore, Sarnecki feels that "a better understanding of the group processes which lead to transgression of the law would help us to develop better methods of combating delinquency among juveniles" (p. 5).

Sarnecki (1986) points out that we know most young offenders "commit offenses in peer groups of the same age. The individual's affiliation to such groups increases the risk of his finding himself in crime situations and affects his actions in these situations" (p. 5).

Likewise, in the study of the Kuwaiti youths, Al-Lanqwai et al. (1990) found that "delinquent acts are usually committed in a reciprocal fashion with friends who have similar involvements in delinquency" (p. 57).
Youths involved with peers engaged in unconventional activities are likely to follow suit.

Data from this study illustrate that of the 23 offenses discussed, all but six of the offenses were committed in the presence of others. One can conclude from the data that of the youths involved with others, the largest percentage was male from single-parent homes on the lower-class and transitional side of the city. Therefore, it can be concluded that peer involvement is an important variable in this study.

Implementing and Evaluating Crime Prevention

By following closely and comparing changes occurring in delinquency patterns in different countries, the changes can be placed within the context of differing and cultural and policy dimensions of the respective countries. Information might show that some specific offenses are frequently committed and others rarely, which will be of special relevance to policy-makers.

At the local level, it is important to planning, implementing and evaluating crime prevention schemes to have general information about offenders that a study like this one can provide. A number of things can be determined from this study, such as the numbers of young people likely to be involved in crime, the range of
individual offending rates, the versatility of offenders, as well as the importance of the location of offenses in relation to the offender's residence.

The financial costs alone in Western countries in dealing with delinquent behavior in young adults constitute a major problem, especially where budgets of local authorities are restricted and call for limited manpower. It is important to decrease the levels of juvenile exposure to the criminogenic environment of lock-ups and jails which only serve to make them worse. Juveniles placed in institutions, especially jails, learn to be more criminal.

Curbing delinquency at the onset of a criminal career is not inexpensive. However, an intervention that costs $10,000 per delinquent might well be cost-effective if it results in less imprisonment and a decrease in crime. The other option is to build more jail and prison facilities at an enormous cost to taxpayers.

In 1978, before extensive inflation made these figures unreliable, capital construction costs were estimated to be upwards of $30,000 per bed. According to the Bureau of Justice statistics for 1989, an additional 80 new beds will be needed per week to handle the influx of people who will be incarcerated. The cost of building the needed facilities to house inmates is
$34,480 at the federal level, $49,471 at the state level, and $45,000 at the local level. These costs are for building only and do not include the costs of running the facilities (Clear, Schwartz & Travis, 1980, p. 206).

The ultimate objective of an international study on delinquency is to provide effective programs and methods for preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency. The long-range outcome will be decreased costs to taxpayers.

Implications

Implications for achieving these ends based on the findings of this study would be to provide a general design to positively improve the environments young people come in contact with most often to enhance their chances to succeed. A careful look at early childhood relationships as they relate to family interactions needs to be pursued further.

In relationship to family factors, there was no question designed to probe the possibility of a mother being a teen or single at the time of the respondent's birth; however, in light of the proportions of minorities sampled in this survey living in the poorer areas of the city, perhaps the subject of teenage pregnancy should be addressed at some point.
Limitations of the Study

There is a sampling problem with a small number of respondents dealing exclusively with the public school system. Youths from the parochial school system, which is large and disproportionately white, were not sampled. No youths who live in the upper-class area were sampled, although if their names were in the public school listing, they had an equal chance of being chosen. This could account for the high percentage of non-white youths who were sampled. The sample in this study demonstrates the possibility of an increasing minority population. It was also determined that a high proportion (43%) of the respondents live in the poorer areas of the community. However, if this is the trend for public schools, there is an increased burden on the school system to identify youths who are at risk. Those targeted as at risk could receive early intervention, thereby decreasing chances of involvement in delinquent activities.

Suggestions for Future Research

Those who may pursue this avenue of research sometime in the future might want to give more consideration to the dynamics of school relationships not only with peers, but with teachers and school staff as well. Since this study found that delinquency was not
decreased by participation in the conventional activity of sports, looking at the specific types of school activities youths are involved in as they relate to delinquent activities would be one avenue to explore. For example: how many football players are involved in delinquent acts; how many drama club members are involved in delinquent acts, and so on. It would be interesting to note the specific type of sport and the specific type of delinquency.

More emphasis should be given to the attitudes of youths toward their parents, police, and others in authority. Also, what type of movies and television shows they watch would be an interesting point of research.

Recommendations

Recommendations for achieving these ends based on the findings of this study would be to provide a general design to positively improve the environments young people come in contact with most often to enhance their chances to succeed. Spergel (1964) writes that positive environments conducive to successful achievement, whether in the home, in school, or in the neighborhood, are not available to children of low-income groups, particularly those in deteriorated neighborhoods.... Full and equal opportunities may be provided them only through the
strengthening of family and community institutions. Family systems may be strengthened only as parents themselves receive special training and education and as the society provides more jobs, better housing, and improved opportunities for participation in constructive community life. Children themselves must be given a broader range of basic and special educational opportunities than they are presently receiving. (p. 173).

One possible way to offer youths a broader range of opportunities would be to provide after school activities that appeal to those who aren't athletically minded. Other areas might be providing parents and children with self-esteem building courses offered in the school system at a time when both could attend. This should include the youngest children in the school system as well as the older ones.

For youths already having problems, programs which involve intervention should include parents as well, and other siblings if necessary. Focusing on the strengths of those in trouble, rather than just on their weaknesses would be a step in the right direction.
Appendix A

Questionnaire
QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PILOT STUDY
ON SELFREPORT DELINQUENCY
No official citation exists for the questionnaire used since this instrument was indigenously developed from a set of core questions provided by the Dutch Ministry of Justice.

For further information regarding this pilot study and/or the questionnaire used to gather data, the Ministry of Justice may be contacted directly at the following address:

Research and Documentation Centre
Ministry of Justice
Postbox 20301
The Hague
Holland
GUIDELINES FOR THE INTERVIEWER
(to be read before starting the interview)

In general

The respondent should preferably, when he/she is interviewed, be alone with the interviewer. Try to prevent or minimize disturbances by third parties during the interview.

Please read aloud the introduction (on top of page 4 of the questionnaire) to the respondent. Follow the instructions on that page.

Some questions feature additional instructions (for instance that you should remember to pay attention to certain aspects of a situation). Pay close attention to these instructions.

Answer the questions on the last two pages of the questionnaire (pages 43 and 44) yourself after the interview has been completed.

If a respondent so wishes, the interview can be held at another place than the address at which you met him/her. Make an appointment if necessary. The questions which you have to answer yourself (pages 43 and 44) refer however to the house originally indicated by the given address, and not to the place where the respondent indicates he/she wishes to be questioned.

Questions that cause problems

We would like to know whether there are questions that pose problems. If you experience specific difficulties with certain questions during the interview, please make a short note to the right side of that question stating the character of the problem.

If an interview that has started for any reason can not be completed, please state that reason next to the last answered question in the questionnaire.

Technical and procedural notes

The interview consists of 3 parts:
1. Socio-demographic questions
2. General questions on deviant and delinquent behavior
3. Detailed questions on deviant and delinquent behavior.

The socio-demographic questions (part 1) are in most cases fairly simple and self-explanatory. It must be emphasized however, that the questions on education and employment (3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 12) merit some extra effort. The aim is to get as exact a description as possible. Please question the respondent until, in your opinion, you have got all possible information.

Part 2 of the interview (pages 8 and 9) consists of general questions on deviant and delinquent behavior. To these items the respondent can generally reply 'no' or 'yes'. In some instances the
answer 'does not apply' is a possibility. When all these questions have been asked and answered, part 3 of the interview starts.

The detailed questions in part 3 of the questionnaire follow from the more general questions asked in part 2. Each general question from part 2 of the interview has its own number that points to a group of more detailed questions in part 3 of the questionnaire. These detailed questions center around the specific topic that the general question introduces. For example:

(1) no (2) yes 010. Did you ever stay away from school for at least a whole day without an excuse?

This general question has number 010.

If the respondent replies 'yes' to this question, then he/she will in the third part of the interview have to be asked a set of more detailed questions about this subject. These detailed questions are identifiable by their tens, which correspond with the ten of the general (referring) question. In this example the specific questions are numbered 011 through 019.

If the respondent replies 'no' or (in some items) if the question 'does not apply', the supplementary questions can be skipped.

Special attention has to be paid to question 012, 022 and the like in part 3 ('Did you do it during this last year?'). These questions lead to further specific questions concerning the same subject (if answered 'yes'), or lead to the next subject (if answered 'no'). The next subject can be inferred from the first following question in part 2 (the general part) of the questionnaire (pages 8 and 9) that has been answered positively.

Secondly, it is advisable that when asking respondents about their behavior in the 'last year', you provide them with an indication of the period to which you are referring. For instance, if the interview were to take place in May, you would ask 'Did you do it in the last year, that is, since last May?'. This should make it easier for the respondent to get a clear idea of the period about which you are asking. Generally speaking, 'last year' refers to the year before the moment of the interview.

This model illustrates the general approach. Exceptions to this rule are described in a separate paragraph (titled 'exceptions') below.

**Answering the questions**

The general rule is that a question can get only one answer.

For most of the questions you can circle the number of the answer that applies (in other words, the answer of the respondent to the question).

In some items (e.g. question 10, part 1) you can fill in an answer yourself, or, if applicable, mark the 'O' before the precoded answer.
In the question about age (e.g. question 011), you have to fill in the age of the person you are interviewing on the line before the word 'years'.
In some items (for example question 012), you can encircle either 'O' (if that is the answer), or put an 'X' between the parentheses before the word 'yes' and fill in the frequency (number of times) the interviewee states he/she has displayed that behavior on the line before the word 'times'.
Roughly the same procedure applies for questions structured like questions 016 and 017, only here you encircle the number of the answer corresponding to what the interviewee has said and, in some cases, (e.g. answer 6 of question 016) fill in the necessary information.
If the answer to questions like 018 is affirmative, put an 'X' between the parentheses before the word 'yes', encircle the number of the answer and, if necessary, fill in the given answer on the line in category (8).

Exceptions

In question 15 of part 1 (socio-demographic section) you can mark (and answer yourself, if necessary) more than one answer. This is the case for the questions 19 and 20 of the socio-demographic part as well.

The connection between the tens of the general referring question in part 2 of the questionnaire and the matching group of detailed items in part 3 is not entirely applicable to the general questions 090 through 220 (questions concerning vandalism). The detailed items (in part 3) that correspond to this set of general questions are identified by the ten 090 (i.e. the ten of the first general question about vandalism), and are numbered 091 to 099.

In case of non-response

Non-response can occur in the following situations:
- the address did not exist/is not a private house
- no one came to the door every time you called. Your research agency will state how often you have to try a given address
- no one in the specified age range lives at the given address
- the respondent did not want to be interviewed

In any one of these cases you are requested to answer the questions on page 1 thru 3 of the questionnaire.
INTRODUCTION TO PART 1

Hello,

I am one of a group of Western Michigan University students conducting a survey on self report delinquency among young people from 14 to 18 years of age. We are carrying out this research in collaboration with foreign institutions who are similarly surveying in their respective countries. The aim of these studies is to increase the level of knowledge about several aspects of the behavior of the youth in different countries.

For this reason we would like you to answer some questions. The first few issues concern your age and the circumstances in which you live. The main part of the questionnaire however, is concerned with behavior that we think is rather common, but about which little is known.

Anything you say or answer to the questions remains confidential. No one, except of course the researchers, will ever know what you said.

-Is this all clear to you?

<If the respondent replies in the affirmative sense, ask:>

-Shall we carry on with the interview?

<Wait for consent, then go on with the interview questions on page one>.

If there is an indication of (a) problem(s): try to answer any questions and/or clarify any misunderstandings that exist on the part of the interviewee before advancing to page 1. Because we cannot anticipate all possible situations, we will give you two global hints that might be helpful.

1. Only you and the researchers will know the identity of the respondent. You might stress the fact that the data processing will be completely anonymous, for the reason that there is no interest in individual data, just information from lots of people.

2. Pay close attention to the respondent. If he/she seems not to be feeling at ease, try to locate the cause of this. It could be that other people in the same room cause the interviewee to be a bit nervous. In that case and if it is possible, it might be better to carry out the interview in a separate room, away from the others.
PART 1: SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

To start with I will ask you some questions about your situation.

1. What is your age? _______ years

2. Are you still attending school?
   (1) no ---> go to question 6
   (2) yes

3. What kind of school are you in at this moment?
   <interviewer: keep on asking for as detailed an answer as you can get; e.g.
   just 'university' is not enough, you would have to ask for the discipline and
   the level>

   ________________________________

4. Do you have a job besides school?
   (1) no ---> go to question 11
   (2) yes

5. What kind of work do you do?
   <interviewer: keep on asking for as detailed an answer as you can get; e.g.
   just 'teacher' is not enough, you would have to ask what subjects and at
   what level the respondent teaches>

   ________________________________

Go to question 11

6. At what age did you leave school?
   _________ years

7. What was the last school you attended?
   <interviewer: keep on asking for as detailed an answer as you can get; e.g.
   just 'university' is not enough, you would have to ask for the discipline and
   the level>

   ________________________________
8. What is the highest grade you finished? ___________________

9. Are you employed at this moment?

(0) No
(1) yes

10. What kind of work do you do or did you do when you were last employed? (Interviewer: ask for as detailed an answer as you can get; e.g. just 'teacher' is not enough, you would have to ask what subjects and at what level the respondent teaches)

( ) Have not been employed yet

11. Is your father employed at this moment?

(0) no--- why not?

(1) yes
(2) respondent doesn't know
(3) does not apply
(9) no response

11.1 What kind of work does your father do or did he do when he was last employed? (Interviewer: keep on asking for detailed an answer at you can get; e.g. just 'teacher' is not enough, you would have to ask what subjects and at what level)

( ) respondent doesn't know

12. Is your mother employed at this moment?

(0) no--- why not?

(1) yes
(2) respondent doesn't know
(3) does not apply
(9) no response

12.1 What kind of work does your mother do or did she do when she was last employed? (Interviewer: As above, ask for details).

( ) respondent doesn't know

13. In which country was your father born? ___________________

( ) doesn't know

13.1 In which country was your mother born? ___________________

( ) doesn't know

14. With how many people do you share the house in which you live? (if no persons at all, enter '0' and go to question 16) _______ persons
15. Who are the people with whom you share the house in which you live?
<interviewer: more than one answer can be entered if required>

(1) father
(2) mother
(3) ________ brothers
(4) ________ sisters
(5) husband
(6) wife
(7) ________ child(ren) (of the respondent)
(8) boy-friend
(9) girl-friend
( ) other, namely: __________________________

16. On the average, how much money do you have available to you every week or every month?
(if no money at all, enter '0' and go to question 18)

________________ per month or
________________ per week

17. How/from whom do you get that money?

(1) parent(s)
(2) work
(3) welfare
(4) scholarship
(5) other: _______________________

18. Do you participate in organized sports/leisure activities?

(1) no —> continue on to Part 2
(2) yes

19. What kind of sports/leisure activities?
<interviewer: more than one answer can be entered if required>

(1) __________________________
(2) __________________________
(3) __________________________
(4) __________________________

20. How often do you do this?
<interviewer: refer to previous question>

sports/leisure no. (1) ________ hours/week
sports/leisure no. (2) ________ hours/week
sports/leisure no. (3) ________ hours/week
sports/leisure no. (4) ________ hours/week
PART 2: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL QUESTIONS ON DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

Many young people sometimes do things that are in fact not quite permitted. We would like to know if you too have done some of these things. Remember that all your answers are confidential and no one except the researchers will ever see them.

Now I will read to you a number of activities and you can tell me then if you ever did these things, yes or no.

1. Did you ever stay away from school for at least a whole day without an excuse?
2. Did you ever run away from home and stay away one or more nights?
3. People do sometimes telephone somebody and say obscene or threatening things. Did you ever make such phone calls?
4. Did you ever travel without paying on a bus, tram or subway?
5. Did you ever travel without paying on a train?
6. Did you ever drive a car, a motorcycle or a moped without a license or insurance?
7. Did you ever write or spray graffiti on walls, busses, shelters, etc.?
8. Did you ever set fire intentionally to something like a building or something else not belonging to you?

INTERVIEWER:
A lot of objects in the streets are vandalised as we all can see. Maybe you did that sometimes too. Now I will read to you a list of such objects and you tell me if you ever damaged or destroyed any one of these objects.

1. Did you ever damage or destroy on purpose ....
2. a bus shelter?
3. a traffic sign?
4. a telephone booth?
5. a window?
6. a (public) litter bin?
7. a street light?
8. school furniture?
9. trees, plants, or flowers in parks or public gardens?
10. a seat in bus, tram or train?
11. a private car?
12. someone's bicycle?
13. someone's motorcycle?
14. someone's mailbox?
15. something else belonging to someone else?
INTERVIEWER:
Sometimes people take things away from others, without the intention of returning them. Now, we would like to know if you have ever done something like that. Of course also these answers will be treated strictly confidential.

(1) no (2) yes 230. Did you ever steal money from a public telephone or from a vending machine?
(1) no (2) yes 240. Did you ever steal something from a shop?
(1) no (2) yes 250. Did you ever steal something from school?
(1) no (2) yes 260. Did you ever steal something from home or the place you live?
(1) no (2) yes 270. Did you ever steal something from the place you were working?
(8) does not apply (respondent has not had a job yet)
(1) no (2) yes 280. Did you ever take away a bicycle, moped or motorcycle?
(1) no (2) yes 290. Did you ever take away a car?
(1) no (2) yes 300. Did you ever steal something out of or from a car?
(1) no (2) yes 310. Have you ever done any pickpocketing?
(1) no (2) yes 320. Did you ever snatch from a person a purse, a bag, or some other thing?
(1) no (2) yes 330. Did you ever break or sneak into a house or a building?
(1) no (2) yes 340. Did you ever steal something I did not mention yet?

What was it: ______________________________________
(1) no (2) yes 350. Did you ever buy something that, you knew at the time, had been stolen?
(1) no (2) yes 360. Did you ever sell something that has been stolen?
(1) no (2) yes 370. Did you ever make copies of records, videos, or computer programs (e.g. computergames) without official permission?

INTERVIEWER:
Now I have some questions about violence.

(1) no (2) yes 380. Did you ever carry a weapon?
(1) no (2) yes 390. Did you ever threaten somebody with a weapon or to beat him up, in order to get money or other valuables?
(1) no (2) yes 400. Were you ever involved in fighting or disorder in a group in a public place? (e.g. in situations such as: on the football-grounds, in railway stations, music festivals, rioting, demonstrations or just on the streets)
(1) no (2) yes 410. Did you ever beat up someone not belonging to your family, so that person needed a doctor?
(1) no (2) yes 420. Did you ever beat up someone belonging to your family, so that person needed a doctor?
(1) no (2) yes 430. Did you ever hurt someone with a knife or another weapon?

INTERVIEWER:
And finally, I would like to know something about the use of alcohol and drugs.

(1) no (2) yes 440. Did you ever use marijuana (hashish)?
(1) no (2) yes 450. Did you ever use any hard drugs such as heroin, coke, crack, acid, or speed?
(1) no (2) yes 460. Did you ever drink beer, wine or spirits illegally?
INTERVIEWER:
You have indicated that you have done some of these things. Now I would like to ask
you some details about them.

PART 3: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

You mentioned skipping classes for at least a whole day, without an excuse.

011. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

012. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no —> next specific subject  ( ) yes —> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

014. Speaking about the last time, how many days did you stay away?
   ___ days

016. Where did you spend most of the time?
   (1) at home or within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ______________________

017. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

018. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ————> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ______________________

019. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

019.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned running away from home and stay away one or more nights.

021. At what age did you do it for the first time? __ years old

022. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no --> next specific subject ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) __ times

024. Speaking about the last time, how many nights did you stay away?

__ nights

026. Where did you spend most of the time?

(1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
(2) downtown
(3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
(4) in some other town or city
(5) somewhere else, namely: ____________________________

027. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) __ others

028. Were you caught?

(1) no ( ) yes --> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: ____________________________

029. Did the police at the end find out that you did it?

(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

029.1. Were you arrested for it the last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned making obscene or threatening phone calls.

031. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

032. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no —> next specific subject  ( ) yes —> How often this last year? ___ times

033. Speaking about the last time, what did you say?

(1) 'funny' things
(2) threatening things
(3) obscene things
(4) other ____________

035. Who was the person you were calling?

(01) father  (12) fellow worker
(02) mother  (13) boss
(03) sibling  (14) small shop
(04) the school  (15) self-service shop
(05) teacher  (16) department store
(06) pupil  (17) transport company
(07) acquaintance  (18) other company
(08) friend  (19) municipality
(09) neighbours  (20) tourist
(10) stranger  (21) other: ____________
(11) company I work for  (22) I don’t know

037. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

038. Were you caught?

(1) no  ( ) yes ——> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: ____________

039. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know

039.1. Were you arrested for it the last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned traveling without paying on a bus, a tram or metro.

041. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

042. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject   ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

044. Speaking about the last time, how much should the trip have cost?

047. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

048. Were you caught?
   (1) no   ( ) yes --> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________

049. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no   (2) yes   (3) don't know

049.1. Were you arrested for it the last time?   (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned traveling without paying on a train.

051. At what age did you do it for the first time?
____ years old

052. Did you do it during this last year?
(0) no --- > next specific subject  ( ) yes --- > How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times

054. Speaking about the last time, how much should the trip have cost?


057. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

058. Were you caught?

(1) no  ( ) yes ----------------> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store stuff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: __________

059. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

059.1. Were you arrested for it the last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned driving a car, a motorcycle or a moped without a licence or insurance.

061. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

062. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no --> next specific subject ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times

063. Speaking about the last time, what did you drive?

(1) moped
(2) motorcycle
(3) car
(4) other, namely: __________

066. Where did you drive mainly, this last time?

(1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
(2) downtown
(3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
(4) in some other town or city
(5) somewhere else, namely: ______________________

067. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

068. Were you caught?

(1) no ( ) yes ------> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: __________

069. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

069.1. Were you arrested for it the last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned writing or spraying graffiti on walls, buses, shelters, etc..

071. At what age did you do it for the first time? ____ years old

072. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject   ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2)             ____ times

074. Speaking about the last time, how much did you write and/or spray?
   ____ words and/or ____ feet of space

076. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in the town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ________________________

077. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ____ others

078. Were you caught?
   (1) no    ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________________

079. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no    (2) yes    (3) don't know

079.1. Were you arrested for it the last time?   (1) no    (2) yes
You mentioned setting fire to something that does not belong to you.

081. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

082. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

084. Speaking about the last time, what was it?
   (1) school
   (2) building
   (3) shed
   (4) something else, namely: _______________________

084b How much do you think this thing was worth, in dollars? ______

085. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school  (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil  (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend  (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours  (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other:
   (11) company I work for  (22) I don’t know

086. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in the town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _______________________

087. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

088. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: _______________________

089. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know

089.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned damaging or destroying things.

091. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old
092. Did you do it during this last year?
(0) no ---> next specific subject ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times
093. Speaking about the last time, what was it?
(01) bus shelter (02) traffic sign
(03) telephone booth (04) window
(05) (public) litter bin (06) street light
(07) school furniture (08) trees, plants, or flowers
(09) seat in bus/tram/train (10) private car
(11) bicycle (12) motorcycle
(13) mailbox (14) something else, namely: __________
094. How many dollars do you think this was worth? __________
095. Who was the owner of this object?
(01) father (12) fellow worker
(02) mother (13) boss
(03) sibling (14) small shop
(04) the school (15) self-service shop
(05) teacher (16) department store
(06) pupil (17) transport company
(07) acquaintance (18) other company
(08) friend (19) municipality
(09) neighbours (20) tourist
(10) stranger (21) other: __________
(11) company I work for (22) I don't know
096. Where did you do this, this last time?
(1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
(2) downtown
(3) somewhere else in the town or city (or the place you live)
(4) in some other town or city
(5) somewhere else, namely: __________
097. Did you do this alone or with others?
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others
098. Were you caught? (1) no ( ) yes --> by whom?
(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: __________
099. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
099.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned stealing money from a public telephone or from a vending machine.

231. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

232. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no --- > next specific subject  ( ) yes --- > How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times

233. Speaking about the last time, was it a telephone box or a vending machine?

(1) telephone box
(2) vending machine

234. How much money did you get out of it, then?

________

236. Where did you do this, this last time?

(1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
(2) downtown
(3) somewhere else in the town or city (or the place you live)
(4) in some other town or city
(5) somewhere else, namely: __________________________

237. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

238. Were you caught?

(1) no  ( ) yes --- > by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: ___________________

239. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

239.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned stealing something from a shop.

241. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

242. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

243. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away? ____________

244. How many dollars do you think this was worth? ____________

245. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil    (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance (18) other company
   (08) friend   (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other:____________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

246. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ______________________

247. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

248. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________

249. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know

249.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned stealing something from school

251. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

252. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no —> next specific subject   ( ) yes —> How often this last year?
     (infer from part 2)  ___ times

253. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away? ______________

254. How many dollars do you think this was worth? ______________

255. Who was the owner of this object?
    (01) father   (12) fellow worker
    (02) mother   (13) boss
    (03) sibling   (14) small shop
    (04) the school (15) self-service shop
    (05) teacher   (16) department store
    (06) pupil     (17) transport company
    (07) acquaintance (18) other company
    (08) friend    (19) municipality
    (09) neighbours (20) tourist
    (10) stranger  (21) other: ______________
    (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

257. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

258. Were you caught?

(1) no   ( ) yes ————> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: ______________

259. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no   (2) yes   (3) don’t know
259.1. Were you arrested for it the last time? (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned stealing something from your own home, or the place you live.

261. At what age did you do it for the first time? __ years old

262. Did you do it during this last year?

(0) no ——> next specific subject ( ) yes ——> How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times

263. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away? ______________

How many dollars do you think this was worth? _______________

265. Who was the owner of this object?

(01) father                      (12) fellow worker
(02) mother                    (13) boss
(03) sibling                   (14) small shop
(04) the school               (15) self-service shop
(05) teacher                  (16) department store
(06) pupil                    (17) transport company
(07) acquaintance            (18) other company
(08) friend                   (19) municipality
(09) neighbours             (20) tourist
(10) stranger                (21) other: _______________
(11) company I work for       (22) I don't know

267. Did you do this alone or with others?

(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

268. Were you caught?

(1) no ( ) yes ——> by whom?

(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: _______________

269. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?

(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

269.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned stealing something from the place you are working.

271. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

272. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

273. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away? __________

274. How many dollars do you think this was worth? __________

275. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil    (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend   (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other: __________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

277. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

278. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: __________

279. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know
279.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned taking away a motorcycle, moped or bicycle.

281. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old
282. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

283. What did you take away?
   (1) motorcycle (2) moped (3) bicycle

284. Speaking about the last time, how many dollars do you think this was worth?

285. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother (13) boss
   (03) sibling (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher (16) department store
   (06) pupil (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance (18) other company
   (08) friend (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other: __________________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

286. Where did you do this?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: __________________

286b What did you do with it at the end?
   (1) dumped it somewhere
   (2) destroyed/damaged it
   (3) brought it back
   (4) sold it
   (5) I still use it

287. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

288. Were you caught?
   (1) no ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents (6) accidental witness(es)
   (3) store staff (7) police
   (4) teachers/school staff (8) other namely: __________________
   (5) public transport staff

289. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no (2) yes (3) don’t know

289.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) Yes
You mentioned taking away a car.

291. At what age did you do it for the first time? __ years old
292. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) __ times
294. Speaking about the last time, how many dollars do you think this was worth?

295. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school  (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil  (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend  (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours  (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other: __________________
   (11) company I work for  (22) I don't know

296a. Where did you do this?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: __________________

296b. What did you do with it at the end?
   (1) dumped it somewhere
   (2) destroyed/damaged it
   (3) brought it back
   (4) sold it
   (5) I still use it

297. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

298. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: __________________

299. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know
299.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?
   (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned stealing something out of (or from) a car.

301. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

302. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2)  ___ times

303. Speaking about the last time, what did you take out of/from the car?
   (1) antenna
   (2) hub cap
   (3) mirror (outside)
   (4) radio
   (5) drivers licence, passport etc.
   (6) stereo
   (7) other: _______________________

304. How many dollars do you think this was worth? ____________

305. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father
   (02) mother
   (03) sibling
   (04) the school
   (05) teacher
   (06) pupil
   (07) acquaintance
   (08) friend
   (09) neighbours
   (10) stranger
   (11) company I work for
   (12) fellow worker
   (13) boss
   (14) small shop
   (15) self-service shop
   (16) department store
   (17) transport company
   (18) other company
   (19) municipality
   (20) tourist
   (21) other: _______________________
   (22) I don’t know

306. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _______________________

307. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

308. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: _______________________

309. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know

309.1. Were you arrested for this the last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned 'pickpocketing'.

311. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

312. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ____ times

314. Speaking about the last time, how many dollars worth did you get? ____

315. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother (13) boss
   (03) sibling (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher (16) department store
   (06) pupil (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance (18) other company
   (08) friend (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other: ______________________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

316. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ______________________

317. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

318. Were you caught?
   (1) no ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ______________________

319. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no (2) yes (3) don’t know

319.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned snatching a person's purse, bag or something else.

321. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

322. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
     (infer from part 2) ___ times

324. Speaking about the last time, how many dollars worth did you get? __________

325. Who was the owner of this object?

(01) father  (12) fellow worker
(02) mother  (13) boss
(03) sibling  (14) small shop
(04) the school  (15) self-service shop
(05) teacher  (16) department store
(06) pupil  (17) transport company
(07) acquaintance  (18) other company
(08) friend  (19) municipality
(09) neighbours  (20) tourist
(10) stranger  (21) other: __________
(11) company I work for  (22) I don't know

326. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ________________

327. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

328. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ----> by whom?
     (2) parents
     (3) store staff
     (4) teachers or school staff
     (5) public transport staff
     (6) accidental witness(es)
     (7) police
     (8) other, namely: __________

329. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

329.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned breaking or sneaking into a building or a house.

331. At what age did you do it for the first time? --- years old
332. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --- > next specific subject ( ) yes --- > How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) times
333. What kind of building did you get in?
   (1) school
   (2) warehouse
   (3) apartment building
   (4) home
   (5) other, namely: ___________________
334. Speaking about the last time, did you take away something?
   (1) no ( ) yes --- > How many dollars do you think this was worth?
   ______
335. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother (13) boss
   (03) sibling (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher (16) department store
   (06) pupil (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance (18) other company
   (08) friend (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other:
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know
335b Did you damage something in the building then?
   (1) no ( ) yes
336. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ___________________
337. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ______ others
338. Were you caught?
   (1) no ( ) yes --- > by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ___________________
339. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no (2) yes (3) don’t know
339.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned stealing .................................................
(Interviewer: see question 340 (part 2): something else, not mentioned yet)

341. At what age did you do that for the first time? ___ years old

342. Did you do it during this last year?
(0) no ---> next specific subject ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
(infer from part 2) ___ times

344. Speaking about the last time, how many dollars do you think this was worth?

345. Who was the owner of this object?
(01) father (12) fellow worker
(02) mother (13) boss
(03) sibling (14) small shop
(04) the school (15) self-service shop
(05) teacher (16) department store
(06) pupil (17) transport company
(07) acquaintance (18) other company
(08) friend (19) municipality
(09) neighbours (20) tourist
(10) stranger (21) other:_________________
(11) company I work for (22) I don't know

346. Where did you do this, this last time?
(1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
(2) downtown
(3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
(4) in some other town or city
(5) somewhere else, namely: _________________________

347. Did you do this alone or with others?
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

348. Were you caught?
(1) no ( ) yes ---> by whom?
(2) parents
(3) store staff
(4) teachers or school staff
(5) public transport staff
(6) accidental witness(es)
(7) police
(8) other, namely: _______________________

349. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

349.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned buying something that you knew at the time, had been stolen.

351. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

352. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) __ times

353. Speaking about the last time, what did you buy?
   (description) ________________________________

354a. Speaking about the last time, what did you pay for it? ______
354b. How much do you think it was really worth? ______

355. From whom did you buy it?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school  (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil  (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend  (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours  (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other:
   (11) company I work for  (22) I don't know

356. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ____________________________

357. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

358. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: __________________

359. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know
359.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned selling something that had been stolen.

361. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

362. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --- > next specific subject   ( ) yes --- > How often this last year? (infer from part 2) ___ times

363. Speaking about the last time, what did you sell?
   (description) ________________________________

364. How much money did you get for it? ____________
364b Do you know how much it would have cost in a store? ____________

365. To whom did you sell it?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil    (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend   (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger (21) other:__________________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don't know

366. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely:__________________

367. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

368. Were you caught?
   (1) no   ( ) yes ---------- > by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely:__________________

369. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no   (2) yes   (3) don't know
369.1. Were you arrested for it the last time?   (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned making copies of records, videos or computer programs (for example computer games) without official permission.

371. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

372. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject  ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

373. What did copy the last time?
   (1) records
   (2) videos
   (3) computer programs (e.g. games)
   (4) other ______

374. Speaking about the last time, what was the dollar value (in a store) of the original thing you copied? __________

377. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

378. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes --> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ______

379. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

379.1. Were you arrested for it the last time? (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned carrying a weapon.

381. At what age did you carry a weapon for the first time? __ years old

382. Did you carry one during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject  ( ) yes --> About how many days?
   (infer from part 2) __ days

383. Speaking about the last time, what kind of weapon did you carry?
   (1) a knife of some sort
   (2) handgun
   (3) other, namely: ___________

384. How many dollars do you think it was worth? _______________

386. Where was it?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _______________

387. Were you alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

388. Were you caught?
   (1) no ( ) yes --> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ___________

389. Did the police in the end find out that you carried it?
   (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

389.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
You mentioned getting money or other valuables from somebody by threatening him or her with violence.

391. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

392. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject  ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

393. Speaking about the last time, what did you get?
   (1) money
   (2) something else, namely: __________________________

394. How much money did you get then, or what was the value of what you got?

395. Who was the owner of this object?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school  (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil  (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend  (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours  (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other: _________________________
   (11) company I work for  (22) I don't know

396. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _________________________

397. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

398. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes --> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: _________________________

399. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no   (2) yes   (3) don't know

399.1. Were you arrested for it the last time?  (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned being involved in fighting or disorder in a group, for example in situations such as: on the football-grounds, in railway stations, music festivals, rioting, demonstrations or just on the streets.

401. At what age did it happen for the first time? ___ years old

402. Did it happen during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject  ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

403. Speaking about the last time, what kind of situation was it?
   (1) football stadium
   (2) railway station
   (3) music festival
   (4) rioting
   (5) demonstration
   (6) just on the streets
   (7) somewhere else ............

404. Did you cause any damage to objects or persons?
   (1) no  ( ) yes --------------> (2) objects
   (3) persons
   (4) both

406. Where did this happen?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _____________________

407. How many others were involved?
   (2) (approx.) ___ others

408. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes --------------> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: __________

409. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don’t know

409.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned beating up someone not belonging to your family, so that person needed a doctor (or other medical help).

411. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

412. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --- > next specific subject  ( ) yes --- > How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

414. Speaking about the last time, what kind of medical help was needed?
   (1) one time first aid
   (2) first aid and follow up check
   (3) admission into hospital
   (4) other

415. Who was this person?
   (01) father  (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother  (13) boss
   (03) sibling  (14) small shop
   (04) the school  (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher  (16) department store
   (06) pupil  (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance  (18) other company
   (08) friend  (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours  (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other: __________________________
   (11) company I work for  (22) I don't know

416. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: __________________________

417. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

418. Were you caught?
   (1) no  ( ) yes --- > by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: __________________________

419. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know
419.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned beating up someone belonging to your family, so that person needed a doctor (or other medical help).

421. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

422. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject   ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

424. Speaking about the last time, what kind of medical help was needed?
   (1) one time first aid
   (2) first aid and follow up check
   (3) admission into hospital
   (4) other ____________________

425. Who was this person?
   (01) father
   (02) mother
   (03) sibling
   (04) other member of the family

426. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ____________________

427. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

428. Were you caught?
   (1) no   ( ) yes --------> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________________

429. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no   (2) yes   (3) don't know
429.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned hurting someone with a knife or another weapon.

431. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

432. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ——> next specific subject   ( ) yes ——> How often this last year?
                (infer from part 2) ___ times

434. Speaking about the last time, what kind of medical help was needed?
   (1) one time first aid
   (2) first aid and follow up check
   (3) admission into hospital
   (4) other ___________________

435. Who was this person?
   (01) father   (12) fellow worker
   (02) mother   (13) boss
   (03) sibling   (14) small shop
   (04) the school (15) self-service shop
   (05) teacher   (16) department store
   (06) pupil     (17) transport company
   (07) acquaintance (18) other company
   (08) friend    (19) municipality
   (09) neighbours (20) tourist
   (10) stranger  (21) other:_________________
   (11) company I work for (22) I don’t know

436. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely:_________________

437. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

438. Were you caught?
   (1) no   ( ) yes ————> by whom?
                    (2) parents
                    (3) store staff
                    (4) teachers or school staff
                    (5) public transport staff
                    (6) accidental witness(es)
                    (7) police
                    (8) other, namely:______________

439. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no   (2) yes   (3) don’t know

439.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?   (1) no   (2) yes
You mentioned using marijuana (hashish).

441. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

442. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject   ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

444. Speaking about the last time, how many joints (or equivalents) did you smoke?
   ___ joints

446. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ______________________

447. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

448. Were you caught?  (1) no  ( ) yes --- > by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________________

449. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no  (2) yes  (3) don't know

449.1. Were you arrested for it this last time?  (1) no  (2) yes
You mentioned using hard drugs such as heroin, coke, crack, acid or speed.

451. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

452. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no --> next specific subject     ( ) yes --> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

453. Speaking about the last time, what did you use?
   (1) heroine
   (2) coke
   (3) crack
   (4) speed
   (5) ......
   (6) ......
   (7) several of these drugs

454. How much did you pay for it? ____________________

456. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: ____________________

457. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

458. Were you caught? (1) no     ( ) yes ----------> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________________

459. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no     (2) yes     (3) don’t know

459.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no     (2) yes
You mentioned using alcoholic drinks illegally.

461. At what age did you do it for the first time? ___ years old

462. Did you do it during this last year?
   (0) no ---> next specific subject ( ) yes ---> How often this last year?
   (infer from part 2) ___ times

463. Speaking about the last time you did it illegally, as a juvenile, what did you drink?
   (1) beer
   (2) wine
   (3) spirits
   (4) combination

464. How many glasses worth did you drink then? ___ glasses worth

466. Where did you do this, this last time?
   (1) within a 10 minutes walk from your home
   (2) downtown
   (3) somewhere else in your town or city (or the place you live)
   (4) in some other town or city
   (5) somewhere else, namely: _______________________

467. Did you do this alone or with others?
   (1) alone
   (2) with (approx.) ___ others

468. Were you caught? (1) no ( ) yes ---> by whom?
   (2) parents
   (3) store staff
   (4) teachers or school staff
   (5) public transport staff
   (6) accidental witness(es)
   (7) police
   (8) other, namely: ____________________

469. Did the police in the end find out that you did it?
   (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

469.1. Were you arrested for it this last time? (1) no (2) yes
PART IV

TO BE FILLED IN BY INTERVIEWER (NOT TO BE ASKED TO RESPONDENT)

1. What was the gender of the respondent?
   (1) Male
   (2) Female

1.1 What was the race of the respondent?
   (1) White
   (2) Black
   (3) Hispanic
   (4) Asian
   (5) Other: ____________________

2. How long did the interview take? __________ minutes.

3. Were you alone with the respondent during the interview?
   (0) No
   (1) Yes ——> go to question 6

4. How many other persons were present in the space where the
   interview took place? __________ other persons

5. Do you think the presence of (some of these) persons has
   influenced the way the respondent answered the questions?
   (0) No
   (1) Yes

6. How has the house/building been maintained? (Interviewer: pay
   attention to the quality of the painting, the staircase, casings, doors, etc.)
   (1) badly
   (2) mediocre to badly
   (3) mediocre
   (4) reasonably well
   (5) well
   (6) I cannot estimate

7. How has the street where the house/building is situated been
   maintained (in terms of cleanliness)?
   (1) badly
   (2) mediocre to badly
   (3) mediocre
   (4) reasonably well
   (5) well
   (6) I cannot estimate
8. When standing with your back to the front door of the house (if it is a single-family dwelling), or to the front door of the entrance hall (if it is an apartment building), indicated by the given address, can you, within an angle of 45 degrees to the left and right to you, see any vacant or disused houses or buildings or houses/buildings that are boarded up?

(0) No
(1) yes ---> about how many?
(2) only a few (1-3)
(3) some (4-10)
(4) many (more than 10)
(5) I cannot estimate

9. When standing with your back to the front door of the house (if it is a single-family dwelling), or to the front door of the entrance hall (if it is an apartment building), indicated by the given address, can you, within an angle of 45 degrees to the left and right to you, see any vandalized (public) objects (objects that are ruined or objects with graffiti on them)?

(0) No
(1) yes ---> about how many?
(2) only a few (1-3)
(3) some (4-10)
(4) many (more than 10)
(5) I cannot estimate

10. Overall, how would you yourself rate the house?

(1) upper class
(2) higher middle class
(3) middle class
(4) lower middle class
(5) lower class
(6) I cannot estimate

11. What was the address given to you by the research agency?

11.1 What is the census tract number of that address?

12. Was that the address where the interview took place?

(0) No
(1) yes ---> skip the next (last question)

13. Where did the interview take place?

(1) cafe/bar/restaurant/tearoom, etc.
(2) house of a friend of the respondent
(3) somewhere else, namely:____________________
Appendix B

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Clearance
Date: June 6, 1990

To: Linda M. Robyn

From: Mary Anne Bunda, Chair

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol, "Self Reporting of Juvenile Behavior", has been approved under the exempt category of review by the HSIRB. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the approval application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: J. Petersen, Sociology

HSIRB Project Number 90-05-09

Approval Termination June 6, 1991
Appendix C
Letter to Parents
LETTER TO PARENTS

__________ is one of a group of Western Michigan University students conducting a study of youth-related needs based on self reported deviance and delinquency. This study is part of an international study of youth needs and services in seven sites in Europe and North America to provide data useful in addressing long term prevention of delinquency.

This study is totally voluntary. No information will ever be reported to any legal authority. No names or addresses will ever be collected or attached to any records. No names or any form of identification will ever be associated with the report. The information from this report will be presented in group format making individual identification impossible.

If you have any questions, please contact the Center for Social Research at 387-3590.
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