

Student Work

11-1-2002

Male and Female Juvenile Delinquency: An Assessment of Contextual Differences in Offending

Mark A. Cunningham
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Cunningham, Mark A., "Male and Female Juvenile Delinquency: An Assessment of Contextual Differences in Offending" (2002).
Student Work. 2191.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2191>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



MALE AND FEMALE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY: AN ASSESSMENT OF
CONTEXTUAL DIFFERENCES IN OFFENDING

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Criminal Justice

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Mark A. Cunningham

November 2002

UMI Number: EP73733

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73733

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College,
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Committee

Jane Han Marshall

Bill Wakefield

Jerry Cederblom

Chairperson Jane Han Marshall

Date 11-11-2002

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines data on gender and the incidence and prevalence of delinquent and criminal offending, as well as gender differences in the *context* of offending for a sample of high school students in Omaha, Nebraska. Context refers to the specific attributes of a particular offense, whose interrelationship describes both the features and the circumstances of the offense. A focus on gender differences in the context of offending highlights how gender impacts the structural and social conditions that are related to commission of delinquent and criminal acts, and the findings of this study underscore the importance of this research. Results indicate that females offend in fewer settings and in different manners than their male counterparts. For example, females in the study primarily committed theft offenses in department stores at shopping malls, and were much more likely than males to commit such offenses with other individuals rather than alone. Furthermore, the results indicate that for less serious forms of delinquent behavior, such as skipping school and running away from home, the incidence and prevalence of such offenses are very similar for both genders. Such findings impact not only the development of delinquency theory, but also play an important role in the evaluation of gender differences in juvenile justice processing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.....	9
Official Data.....	10
Self-Report Data	16
THEORY AND THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING	22
Females and Delinquency Theory.....	24
Traditional Theories Applied to Females.....	27
Gender Specific Theories of Female Delinquency.....	31
Gender-Modified Traditional Theories.....	35
JUVENILE JUSTICE PROCESSING AND GENDER.....	38
Sex Differences or Sex Discrimination.....	41
Reasons for Gender Bias.....	44
A Trend of Equitable Treatment or Hidden Bias.....	46
TRIPLETT AND MYERS AND THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING	51
THE PRESENT STUDY.....	56
Data Collection.....	57
Sample.....	58
Variables.....	58
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS.....	61
Prevalence of Offending.....	62
Incidence of Offending.....	70

Context of Offending.....	73
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	81
REFERENCES.....	91
TABLES.....	63
Table 1.....	63
Table 2.....	65
Table 3.....	67
Table 4.....	69
Table 5.....	72
Table 6.....	75
Table 7.....	80
APPENDIX A.....	110
APPENDIX B.....	114
APPENDIX C.....	116

INTRODUCTION

Rarely a day goes by without a media report of a crime being committed by a juvenile. Accounts of drive-by shootings, armed robberies and heinous murders fill the headlines of newspapers across the country. Even though youths between the ages of 15 and 19 make up only 7% of the population in the United States, they account for nearly 22% of all arrests annually. In 2000, juveniles under the age of 18 accounted for 12% of the Violent Crime Index offenses cleared by arrest (i.e., murder/non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault) and 22% of the Property Crime Index offenses cleared through arrest (burglary, larceny/theft, motor vehicle theft and arson; Maguire & Pastore, 2002).

In addition, the involvement of females in the juvenile justice system has been gradually increasing in the last decade. Between 1992 and 1996, the number of girls arrested for Violent Crime Index offenses increased 25 %, while arrests of males for these offenses remained stable. During this same time frame, female arrests for Property Crime Index offenses increased by 21%, while male arrests declined 4% (Poe-Yamagata & Butts, 1996). In the ten-year period between 1991 and 2000, female arrests for violent crime increased 32%, while male arrests declined by 17.1% (U.S. Department of Justice, 2002). Increases in juvenile crime and in the severity of offenses being committed, as well as an increase in female participation in delinquent and criminal activities, has raised

the issue of juvenile offending to a new prominence, stimulating widespread interest among academics and criminal justice officials alike.

The resurgence of interest in juvenile delinquency has manifested itself in different ways. One of the most prominent current research focus is that of gender, particularly gender differences in offending. The study of gender as a correlate of crime and delinquency has primarily focused on differences in the *prevalence* (number of individuals participating) and *incidence* (number of criminal acts committed) of delinquency and criminality (Ageton, 1983; Ball, Ross & Simpson, 1964; Elliot & Huizinga, 1983; Paetsch & Bertrand, 1999; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988; Sampson, 1985; Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1980; Tracey, 1978). This research is important in developing an understanding of the relationship between gender and crime, but is limited to providing a picture of the *distribution* of crimes committed. It does not provide valuable information about the *context* of offenses. As defined by Triplett and Myers (1995), "Context' refers to the characteristics of a particular offense, whose interrelationship describes both the circumstances and the nature of the act" (p. 59). Examination of contextual characteristics may include the offender's role in initiating and committing the offense, the setting and location of the offense, the type of victim, the victim-offender relationship, as well as a host of other variables.

The study of the "context" of crime and delinquency is integral component of current criminological research. As Miethe and Meier (1994) point out, "It is a truism that crime requires both offenders and victims (or targets) and situations

or social contexts that unite them” (p. 3). Theories of victimization and criminal opportunity pay particular attention to the physical and social dimensions that not only motivate or facilitate the occurrence of crime, but also those contexts that constrain and restrict it (see Miethe & Meier, 1994 and Sacco & Kennedy, 2002). Macro-level theories of crime, such as social disorganization theory, focus on identifying the criminogenic contexts of geographic areas and the interrelationship between these contexts and the occurrence of crime. Micro-level theories, such as routine activities theory, view crime (particularly predatory crimes such as burglary and robbery) as a consequence of the risky behaviors people engage in (knowingly or unknowingly) that expose them to the potential for being victims of crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979).

Examining the context of juvenile delinquency, as well as the prevalence and incidence of it, is important for several reasons. Delinquency research has yielded consistent findings with regard to gender differences in offending. Adolescent males are more likely to be involved in antisocial and delinquent activities and are more likely to commit serious offenses as compared to their female counterparts (Bethel, 2000; Campbell, 1981; Shannon, 1979; Scahill, 2000; Sickmund, Snyder & Poe, 1997). Although females make up a larger percentage of delinquents today than they did a decade ago, they still offend much less than males. For example, in 2000, males under the age of 18 accounted for 77% of total arrests and 82% of arrests for violent crimes (U.S. Department of Justice, 2002). This gender discrepancy raises significant

theoretical questions. First, why do such differences exist? Second, can traditional male-oriented criminological theories adequately explain female delinquency? Third, if traditional theories are found to be inadequate, are gender-specific or *modified* traditional theories needed to address female delinquency? Studies focusing on the prevalence and incidence of male and female delinquency are useful but do not appropriately address such questions. The identification and examination of contextual variables of delinquent and criminal offenses will address and advance present theoretical understanding of gender differences in offending.

In addition, research on juvenile justice processing (i.e., arrest, detention and sentencing) has revealed significant differences in outcomes for male and female delinquents (Barton, 1976, Bishop & Frazier, 1992; Chesney-Lind, 1973; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; DeZolt, 1991; Heimer, 1996; Pope & Feyerherm, 1983; Reese & Curtis, 1991; Rosenbaum & Chesney-Lind, 1994; Rubin, 1977; Snyder, 1988; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995). This is especially true for juveniles charged with *status offenses*. Status offenses are non-criminal offenses--running away from home, violating curfew, skipping school or being beyond parental control--for which only youths can be taken into custody.

With respect to female status offenders, research finds girls are more likely than boys to be referred and arrested for status offenses and have a greater likelihood of adjudication and placement within the juvenile justice system (Armstrong, 1977; Bell, 1994; Bethel, 2000; Bishop & Frazier, 1992; Chesney-

Lind, 1973, 1977, 1988, 1997; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; Cohen & Kluegel, 1979; Figueira-McDonough, 1987; Johnson & Scheuble, 1991; Pope & Feyerherm, 1983). Such findings have resulted in accusations of a pattern of "official paternalism" that ignores male status offenders, but penalizes females for similar conduct (Chesney-Lind, 1977, 1988). Specifically, there is evidence that suggests parents, police and juvenile justice officials have, and continue, to respond differently to comparable behaviors of boys and girls (Barton, 1976; Chesney-Lind, 1977, 1988; Curran, 1984; Krohn, Curry & Nelson-Kilger, 1983; Farnworth & Teske, 1995; Johnson & Scheuble, 1991; Odem, 1991; Schlossman & Wallach, 1978 and Schwartz, 1989). Parents are more likely to report daughters running away from home, police are more likely to arrest female status offenders and court personnel are more likely to pursue formal intervention in cases involving females (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; Glick & Goldstein, 1995).

Research has attempted to test this "paternalism hypothesis" by controlling for legal (current offense and prior record) and extra-legal variables (offense type, age, race). However, evidence of gender differences at all stages of case processing remains despite such analysis (Barton, 1976; Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992; Horowitz & Pottieger, 1991; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995). Further insight into apparent "gendered" processing differences may be gained through examining the context of offending. For example, if female and male status offenders are treated differently despite committing similar offenses

and having similar juvenile court records, are there differences in the *context* of their offenses that warrant differential treatment? For those adolescents who are before the juvenile court for “ungovernability” (being beyond the control of parents, guardians, or custodians), are girls ignoring parental rules more often, leaving home without permission more often, or not letting their whereabouts be known more often than boys? Without examining the context of offending by gender and answering such questions, delinquency research cannot adequately assess the validity of accusations of gender bias in the juvenile justice system.

Delinquency research focusing on the context of offending has been limited (see Decker, 1993; Loper & Cornell, 1996). The study of “context” has been broadly evaluated in research focusing on situational analysis of predatory crimes (see Lauritsen, 2001 and Lopez & Emmer, 2000), as well as the impact of contextual factors on sentencing outcomes (see Vigorita, 2001 and Britt, 2000). Triplett & Myers (1995) conducted one of the few works that has specifically addressed gender differences in the context of juvenile offending. Analyzing data from the National Youth Survey to examine gender-related differences in offense patterns across specific types of crime, the study found that for more minor offenses (such as status offenses) contextual differences in male and female offending were quite small. Typically, both gender groups committed minor offenses in a similar manner or fashion. In contrast, as the severity of the offense increased (from status offenses such as skipping school to violent crimes such as robbery and assault), so did gender differences in the context of

offending. Females offended in fewer settings and in different manners than males.

Despite limited delinquency research on the context of offending, a plethora of data exists to expand this area of study. Most self-report delinquency surveys contain *follow-up* questions that provide information about the context of delinquent and criminal offenses. Consequently, there is a wealth of data from which the context of offending by males and females can be studied. Although these data have a wide range of applications, their importance in addressing two specific issues cannot be overstated. The first issue addresses delinquency theory. What accounts for male dominance of delinquent and criminal offenses? Also, can traditional male-oriented theories of criminality be used to explain female juvenile delinquency? If not, should gender-specific or modified traditional theories should be advanced? Examining the contextual differences in offending for males and females will contribute to a greater understanding of both delinquent and criminal behavior, as well as gender differences.

The second issue inherent in the data concerns juvenile justice processing. Can the study of the context of offending in delinquency cases shed light on the differential treatment of female status offenders and evidence of gender bias at other processing points in the juvenile justice system? These two issues cannot be adequately addressed without examining the context of offending by male and female delinquents. As Triplett & Myers (1995) stress, "Greater knowledge about how gender shapes offending will help us learn

whether theories developed to explain male delinquency can be used to explain criminality in general" (p. 62).

This research contributes to the literature in the following ways. First, it goes beyond previous work by assessing numerous crimes within four major offense categories: status offenses, vandalism, property and theft offenses and violent offenses. As such, this study pushes forward knowledge of juvenile offending more generally. Furthermore, it advances the examination of gender differences in violent offending which stands of the forefront of theoretical inquiry. Second, this study expands the study of context of offending by exploring measures outside the immediate context of offenses (setting, victim type and seriousness of offense). It includes measures of whether the offense was committed alone or with others, the victim offender relationship, the age of the offender in the *first* commission of the offense and police discovery or knowledge of the offense.

✓ This thesis will first examine data on the incidence and prevalence of juvenile offending, focusing on gender differences; a review of theoretical and juvenile justice processing research relevant to the study of gender and contextual differences in delinquency will follow. The thesis will then review the Triplett and Myers study and proceed to develop the present study, its analysis and findings, discussion, and conclusion and recommendations.

INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Research on the prevalence and incidence of delinquency is based on two primary sources of information. The first source is official crime statistics such as the Uniform Crime Reports and Juvenile Court Statistics. The second source is derived from self-report studies that measure delinquent and criminal behavior, as well as criminal victimization surveys that measure whether an individual has been a victim of crime (Loeber, Kalb & Huizinga, 2001). While both of these sources provide important information such as offense trends across jurisdictions and broad measures of juvenile offending, their reliability and validity have been vigorously debated. The strengths, weaknesses and criticisms of official and self-report data will be reviewed, in turn, in the discussion of each source as a measure of juvenile delinquency. The examination of measures of juvenile delinquency is an important element, for as Hardt & Peterson-Hardt (1977) reflect, "Measurement techniques inextricably shape as well as reflect the conceptualization of the phenomena under study, and thus impact on the theoretical formulations which appear viable" (p. 256).

A review of official data from the last few decades has consistently shown that males committed the majority of delinquent acts. In addition, official data has historically shown large sex differences that are both qualitative and quantitative (Elliot, 1988; Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979; Paetsch & Bertrand, 1999; Poe-Yamagata & Butts, 1996; Vedder & Sommerville, 1970 and Wattenberg & Saunders, 1954). For example, research has found that females

are typically involved in status and minor offenses (e.g., running away from home, incorrigibility, sexual misconduct and petty theft), while males are involved primarily in property offenses and acts of aggression. Furthermore, research has revealed significant differences in the incidence and prevalence of delinquent behavior. Rates of offending among males, for example, are often several times higher than female rates.

There exists a clear discrepancy between official and self-report data on male and female delinquency. Studies based on self-report measures of delinquent behavior reveal that sex differences in offending are not as large as those depicted in official data. While official data have shown the ratio of male to female delinquent acts to range from a 3:1 to 6:1, self-report data reveal that these ratios are often much smaller and that gender patterns of delinquent behavior are quite similar (Bainbridge & Crutchfield, 1983; Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1979; Kratcoski & Kratcoski, 1975; Loeber, Kalb & Huizinga, 2001; Richards, 1981; Weis, 1976; White & LaGrange, 1987). To address this issue in greater detail, these two primary measures of delinquent behavior will be examined in the following section.

Official data

Information on the delinquent and criminal behavior of youth is captured in the official records of law enforcement agencies and juvenile courts across the country. The most widely publicized and used criminal statistics are those based on the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. Each year the Federal Bureau

of Investigation (FBI) compiles the UCR from crime data from over seventeen thousand rural and urban law enforcement agencies across the country. These agencies voluntarily translate their crime data into the standardized UCR format and submit it to the FBI. The purpose of the UCR is to generate a dependable set of criminal statistics for use by criminal justice officials, academics, and anyone interested in crime as a social indicator in the United States.

Crime in UCR is classified into two major categories, Part I and Part II offenses. Part I offenses are made up of eight serious offenses: murder and non-negligent manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson. Twenty-one lesser felonies and misdemeanors, including simple assault, fraud and liquor law violations compromise Part II offenses. The UCR presents information on crimes *known* to the police, crimes cleared by arrest (crimes in which an arrest is made) and people arrested (adults and juveniles). It presents material on juvenile offenders under the age of eighteen arrested for a variety of offenses (such as status, property and violent crimes). Finally, it provides details on juvenile arrests by gender, race and location (urban, suburban or rural).

One of the strengths of the UCR is that it is one of the few indicators of crime in the United States that can present such an enormous volume of criminal statistics. As such, it is generally regarded as a good source of national crime trends, a source of evaluating decreases and increases in various types of

crimes and a valuable source of information of crime within different jurisdictions over a wide range of time periods.

With respect to gender, the 2000 arrest data show there are considerable differences in offending between adolescent males and females. The most striking indication is that far fewer females than males are arrested for delinquent and criminal behavior. Of the 2,838,300 juvenile arrests in 2000, females accounted for 26% of the total. This indicates that total arrests of males outnumber total female arrests by a 4:1 ratio (Maguire & Pastore, 2002). Males are also far more likely to be arrested for violent index crimes (84%) and property index crimes (72%). The male to female ratio for violent index crimes (homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault) is 6:1, and the ratio for the most serious index property crimes (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) is nearly 3:1. Males are also much more likely to be arrested for such offenses as vandalism, possession of stolen property, weapons offenses, and "other assaults." Of the remaining non-index crimes, males account for 71% of all arrests. As a result of these arrest patterns, property and violent crimes have typically been regarded as "masculine" offenses.

Females, in contrast, have a dissimilar pattern of offending. According to official statistics, they are more likely to be arrested for prostitution and running away from home. In 2000, over half (58%) of those arrested for running away were female. As for prostitution, females account for 56% of all arrests for this offense. In addition, status offenses play a more significant role in female arrests

than male arrests. Arrests of females for one particular status offense, running away, accounted for 18.1% of all female arrests, compared to 4.2% for males (Maguire & Pastore, 2002). In addition, arrests for two status offenses recorded in the UCR (running away and curfew violation) account for 23.1% of all female arrests, compared to 8.2% of all male arrests (Maguire & Pastore, 2002).

While males dominate most official criminal statistics, there has been an increase in the participation of females in delinquent and criminal behavior over the last decade. Official statistics demonstrate increases of 20% and greater in arrests of females for property and violent crimes, with noticeable declines for males in some of these offense categories (Poe-Yamagata & Butts, 1996). In addition, the number of female delinquency cases coming into the juvenile justice system rose by 76% between 1987 and 1996, as compared to a 42% increase for males (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Overall, female involvement in the juvenile justice system, once viewed as an anomaly, has shown significant increases and the trend does not appear to be slowing.

Official crime statistics from the UCR are important indicators of juvenile delinquency. However, UCR data is not without its limitations and methodological problems. One significant problem with statistics published by the FBI is that they are based upon crimes *known* to the police through police *contact* and *arrest*. Research has established that not all crimes are reported to the police (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1985; Conaway & Lohr, 1994; Singer, 1988; Myers, 1980; Greenberg, Wilson, Ruback & Mills, 1979). Several factors affect the

likelihood of whether a crime is reported to police: the seriousness of the offense; the type of crime committed; an individual's perception of whether anything can be done about the crime; the relationship between the victim and the offender; and other factors such as whether or not victims realize a crime has been committed. Furthermore, there are several influential factors that affect whether a known crime is *recorded* by the police (Black, 1980; O'Brien, 1985). O'Brien (1985) notes,

The recording of an act in police records as a 'crime known to the police' and the follow-up of arrest are dependent on a number of factors: for example, organizational pressures to get the crime rate up or down, police officer and offender interactions, and the professionalism of particular police departments (p.27).

In addition, not all law enforcement agencies report crime to the UCR Program and those that do have demonstrated problems reporting crimes uniformly and in a manner consistent with the procedures, definitions and guidelines of the reporting program. Finally, only the most serious offenses are often reported to the FBI. For instance, if an individual is arrested for armed robbery but is also found to possess other instruments of crimes or possess illegal drugs, only the armed robbery will be reported by the arresting law enforcement agency to the FBI.

As a result of these inherent problems, arrest statistics could be viewed more as a depiction of "police conduct," rather than a "true measure" of crime

and delinquency. However, the ability of official records to depict system activity has its merits. As Snyder & Sickmund (1999) note, "Analysis of variations in official statistics across time and jurisdictions provides an understanding of justice system caseloads" (p. 52). While official data has its limitations and inherent biases, it remains a consistent and important measure of juvenile delinquency and a valuable resource for research.

Juvenile court statistics, in addition to official data depicted in the UCR, provide another valuable official measure of juvenile delinquency. The *Juvenile Court Statistics* series, compiled by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), provides "annual estimates of the number of delinquency and formally processed status offense cases handled by juvenile courts, ...demographic profiles of youth referred and reasons for referral (offenses), ...and trends in the volume and characteristics of court activity" (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999, p. 142). Findings from NCCJ on juvenile delinquency cases reveal males make up a disproportionate percentage of all delinquency cases. "...Males were involved in about three quarters of person, property and public disorder cases handled by the courts in 1996 and in 86% of the drug law violation cases" (p. 148). However, while female delinquency cases lag behind in comparison to males, the number of cases "involving females rose 76% between 1987 and 1996, compared to 42% for males" (p. 148). With respect to status offenses, while females only account for 23% of the delinquency cases within the juvenile justice

system, they account for 41% of the status offense cases (Sickmund and Snyder, 1999).

In summary, official statistics demonstrate significant differences in the prevalence and incidence of male and female delinquency. While there have been general increases in arrests of juveniles over the last few decades, official statistics depict that the gender gap in offending is narrowing for many offenses. As Poe-Yamagata & Butts (1996) note,

The findings of this study support the popular contention that female delinquency has increased relatively more than male delinquency in recent years. Of course, juvenile crime is still predominantly a male problem. More than three-quarters of juvenile arrests and juvenile court delinquency cases involve males. If recent trends continue, however, female delinquents will occupy even more of the time and attention of policymakers, service providers, court officials, law enforcement agencies, and communities (p. 18).

Self-report data

“Self-reports are surveys of youths (or adults) based on disclosures they might make about the types of offenses they have committed and how frequently they have committed them” (Champion, 1998, p. 58). The development of the self-report measures emerged from a growing need to address the shortcomings of official measures of crime and delinquency. Self-report methods tap information from individuals and groups involved in crime that official records

cannot not and have not included. Based on research findings that reveal that many crimes go unreported to the police, self-report surveys attempt to tap this hidden source of information by asking individuals about their delinquent and criminal behavior (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). Consequently, self-report data provides a supplemental measure of crime and delinquency and also overcomes one of the significant limitations of official data—crimes *not known* to the police (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000).

The self-report method has become a very important and well-established measure of juvenile delinquency. Since its use in Short and Nye's delinquency studies in the early 1950's, extensive use of self-report surveys has significantly expanded the volume of information on juvenile delinquency. O'Brien (1985) asserts, "They [Short and Nye] showed conclusively that people would admit to delinquent behavior on a questionnaire and, indeed, admit to much more delinquency than was evident from official records" (p.63). Thus, self-report studies capture delinquent behavior that does not come to the attention of juvenile justice officials, and taps the "dark figure of crime" (Gibbons, 1979). Furthermore, as compared to official criminal statistics, "...self-report studies find a much higher proportion of the juvenile population involved in delinquent behavior" (Sickmund & Snyder, 1999, p. 52).

While the use of self-report studies has greatly increased the amount of data on juvenile delinquency, its value as a measure in research has been

questioned. The paramount concern for any measure to be scientifically worthwhile is that it must be reliable and valid (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000).

...A measure is valid to the extent to which it measures the concept you set out to measure, and nothing else. Whereas reliability focuses on a particular property of the measure—namely, its stability over repeated uses—validity concerns the crucial relationship between the theoretical concept you are attempting to measure and what you actually measure (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000, p. 45).

The examination of the validity and reliability of self-report measures has resulted in its acceptance as a worthwhile measure of delinquency and criminality (Champion, 1998; Hardt & Peterson-Hardt, 1977; Hindelang, Hirschi & Weis, 1979; Sickmund & Snyder, 1999; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000) “With respect to reliability, this approach...appears to be acceptable. With respect to validity, the conclusion is a little murkier...nonetheless, content and construct validity appear to be quite high, and criterion validity would be in the moderate to strong range overall” (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000, pp. 58-59).

Critics also argue that it is difficult to *compare* the findings of self-report studies because of differences in the types of deviant behavior being measured, sample size, discrepancies in the definitions and wording of questionnaires and differences in the samples populations being studied (Sheley, 1991; O'Brien, 1985; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). In addition, it is argued that using self-report methods with juveniles is complicated by the limitations of a juvenile's memory,

as well as juveniles' greater unwillingness to disclose information concerning deviant and law violating acts (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999; Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). Furthermore, many self-reports surveys lack the inclusion of more serious forms of crime and fail to include enough high rate offenders to distinguish them from other delinquents (Elliot & Ageton, 1980; Hindelang, Hirschi & Weis, 1979). While these criticisms all have merit, the self-report method had been reasonably judged and accepted by social scientists. As Champion (1998) notes, "The credibility of such information [self-report] is highly regarded among juvenile justice professionals, and this is indicated, in part, by the frequency with which such data are cited in the literature by others" (p. 59).

What has self-report data provided to the field of delinquency research? Historically, results most often reveal findings that contradict official data. "Self-reported data about juvenile offenses suggests that a sizeable gap exists between official reports of delinquent conduct and information disclosed through self-reports" (Champion, 1998. p. 59). For example, in a study conducted by Kratcoski & Kratcoski (1975), a sample of high school students from the eleventh and twelfth grades were interviewed about their social backgrounds, acceptance of values, and delinquent behavior. The authors found that males were significantly more involved in aggressive offenses, such as fighting and destroying property, and in property offenses, including all forms of theft. However, for less serious forms of delinquent behavior, there were few gender differences. As the authors note, "There was only a six percent difference in the

proportion of boys and girls who had run away from home, and a three percent difference in sex distributions on defying parental authority" (p. 87). In addition, when the authors analyzed status offenses, they discovered a very small difference (.3) in the mean number of types committed by each gender group.

In Canter's (1982) study of sex differences in self-reported delinquent behavior among a national sample of 1725 youth, males reported, "significantly greater total involvement in delinquency than females" (p.154). However, Canter notes that the significant differences between the gender groups were small. "The mean magnitude of the sex differences does not exceed one standard deviation in any instance, and the statistical significance is at least partly a function of the large sample size" (p. 154). In addition, she found no indication of the overrepresentation of females in categories of delinquent behavior in which official data had demonstrated them to be dominant in (such as status and "decorum" offenses).

The examination of the primary measures of juvenile delinquency—official and self-report data--clearly demonstrates that they portray divergent pictures of offending by males and females. As Chesney-Lind & Sheldon (1992) note,

Typically, the surveys reveal that female delinquency is more common than arrest statistics indicate and that there are more similarities than official statistics suggest between male and female juvenile delinquency. They also show males are more involved in delinquency, especially the most serious types of offenses (p.14).

With exploration into the strengths and limitations of each source of data, reliance on *both* measures of juvenile delinquency provides a solid foundation for the study of juvenile delinquency. Relying on only one measure for examining juvenile offending can thus be very misleading. As Elliot (1994) notes, to discard official records for self-report data, or vice versa is, "...rather shortsighted; to systematically ignore the findings of either is dangerous, particularly when the two measures provide apparently contradictory findings" (p. 12).

At this point, some general conclusions about male and female delinquency can be drawn. First, males commit more serious offenses than females (seriousness as measured by level of physical or property damaged, the extent of weapons used, and the amount or value of property damage and stolen property). Second, gender differences in the rate of offending for trivial or minor offenses are less disparate. Third, there has been a divergence among males and females in the overall rates of delinquency over the last decade.

While the study of the incidence and prevalence of male and female delinquency is important, it is limited to illustrating the distribution of juvenile crime and delinquency in this country. This data cannot explain *why* differences exist between male and female delinquents, nor can it explain the *changes* over time of such differences. In order to advance delinquency research, an examination of how gender *shapes* offending is needed. This can be accomplished by studying the *context* of offending. Examining important contextual characteristics of offending, such as the victim-offender relationship,

the setting of the offense and victim characteristics, will demonstrate whether males and females commit offenses in similar or different manners (Triplett & Myers, 1995). Having knowledge about the context of male and female offending will allow for a more complete analysis of sex differences in juvenile delinquency.

THEORY AND THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING

Gender differences in the commission of delinquent and criminal offenses are widely acknowledged; however, the *reasons* for these persistent differences are the subject of considerable theoretical debate. Since the recognition of gender as an important correlate of crime and delinquency, two critical questions are at the center of most research. First, why do females commit substantially fewer delinquent and criminal offenses than their male counterparts (or conversely, why do males commit a disproportionate amount of delinquent and criminal offenses)? Second, when females do commit delinquent and criminal offenses, do they do so as a result of the same motivations or causal mechanisms as males (Triplett & Myers, 1995)?

Theoretical research over the last few decades reflects three general trends in addressing these questions. One trend advances the application of traditional male-oriented theories of crime and delinquency to female offenders. (Datesman, Scarpitti & Stephenson, 1975; Deschenes & Esbensen, 1999; Esbensen & Deschenes, 1998; Giordano & Rockwell, 2000; Gottfredson, McNeile & Gottfredson, 1991; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Hagan, 1991; Hagan, Gillis & Simpson, 1998; McCarthy, Hagan & Woodward, 1999; Menard & Elliot,

1994; Rowe, Vassonyi & Flannery, 1995; Thornberry, Lizotte, Krohn, Farnworth & Jang, 1991; Wade, & Brannigan, 1998). While these scholars do not refute that traditional theories have been developed primarily for the study of male crime and delinquency, they contend that these theories are “universal” in nature and are well suited for the analyses of male and female behavior since the same etiological factors underlie both.

The second trend refutes the application of traditional theories, calling for *gender-specific* theories that address those factors directly related the delinquency and criminality of females (Adler, 1975; Balkan & Berger, 1979; Bowers & Min, 1990; Caspi, Lynam & Moffitt, 1993; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Hagedorn, 1999; Duke & Duke, 1978; Messerschmidt, 1986). These scholars contend that traditional male oriented theories are inadequate, as they do not include the specific structural and contextual factors that are unique to females and the world they live in. The third trend draws from the previous two and advances the potential utility of traditional theories that incorporate the special contexts and structures that lend themselves to female delinquency and criminality (Agnew, 1992; Agnew & Brezina, 1997; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998; Robbers, 2000; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

These important theoretical questions cannot be thoroughly addressed without knowledge of the gender differences in the context of offending. The examination of how gender shapes offending will allow for a more complete analysis of sex differences in juvenile delinquency and will advance present

theoretical understanding of gender and delinquency. In order to understand why an examination of gender differences in the context of offending is of such importance, an examination of gender's role in the development of delinquency theory is needed.

Females and Delinquency Theory

A review of delinquency theory over the last fifty years reveals that the criminality of females had been vastly ignored until the 1970's (Leonard, 1982; Naffine, 1987; Wright, 1992). The absence of research on female delinquency can be attributed to results from official data before 1970 that indicated that delinquency was typically a male phenomenon, and the extent of female offending was relatively minor in quantity and quality. As most early researchers concluded, females committed few delinquent acts, and when they did, those acts were a result of biological differences and were sexual in nature (Chesney-Lind, 1973; Chesney-Lind and Shelden, 1992; Shoemaker, 1990; Smart, 1979). Thus, from an empirical point of view, official records that indicated females committed few delinquent acts effectively prohibited an adequate sample size and any meaningful statistical analysis (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1992; Heidensohn, 1968; Smith, 1979). In addition, the relatively minor offenses committed by females—typically sexual in nature--were of little social consequence as compared to the serious behavior of males that required in-depth inquiry by researchers and officials of the criminal justice system (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1992). For example, in *Delinquent Boys* (1955),

Albert Cohen defended his study of delinquent male gangs on the grounds that most delinquency was *male* delinquency. He asserted, "The delinquent is a rogue male" (p.140). In addition, in *Causes of Delinquency* (1969), Travis Hirschi peripherally supported his focus on males by explaining in a footnote, "...in the analysis that follows the 'non-Negro' becomes 'white,' and the girls disappear" (p. 35-36).

In the few early works focusing on female offenders, researchers often limited the scope of their analysis to the individual physiological and psychological characteristics of females and the sexual nature of female crime and delinquency (Barnhorst, 1978; Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 1995). In *Delinquency in Girls* (1968), Cowie, Cowie, & Slater explored environmental factors and female delinquency, but determined that most girls were brought before the court as a result of sexual misconduct. "The girls' delinquency is predominantly in the form of sexual behavior (e.g., promiscuity) requiring a more advanced degree of maturation than the (mainly non-sexual) delinquencies of the boys " (p.169). In addition, in Konopka's (1966) study of adjudicated female delinquents, she concluded most of the offenses bringing females into the system were "...accompanied by some disturbance or unfavorable behavior in the sexual area" (p. 4).

The virtual omission of females in the theoretical exploration of juvenile delinquency slowly dissipated as official data demonstrated female offending was increasing; and, more importantly, as self-report research revealed female

delinquency was not as uncommon, nor as minor as official statistics depicted. Two early works by Bernard (1969) and Heidenshohn (1968) are noted for drawing attention to the deficiency of female research in criminological study. As Daly and Chesney-Lind (1988) note, these early authors highlighted the “omission of women from general theories of crime” and “ signaled an awakening of criminology from its andocentric slumber” (p. 507).

The “emergence” of female delinquency and subsequent shift in the academic response to it has resulted in three general theoretical trends. The first trend includes those theorists who posit that traditional male oriented delinquency theories can be applied or generalized to female offending (Datesman, Scarpitti, & Stephenson, 1975; Deschenes & Esbensen, 1999; Esbensen & Deschenes, 1998; Giordano & Rockwell, 2000; Rosenbaum, 1987; Segrave & Hastad, 1985; Simons, Miller, & Aigner, 1980; Smith, 1979; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). The second trend argues the position that traditional male oriented theories are inadequate and inappropriate for the exploration of female delinquency (Adler, 1975; Balkan & Berger, 1979; Bowers & Min, 1990; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Hagedorn, 1999; Duke & Duke, 1978; Messerschmidt, 1986). This trend has been critical of mainstream criminology that has too often ignored females and has blindly applied unmodified theories of male deviancy to their female counterparts (Smart, 1979). These theorists call for the development of *gender specific* theories focusing on factors only pertaining to female delinquency. The last trend can be viewed as taking a

“middle-ground” or “modified” approach and advances the use of traditional theories, while taking into consideration those structural and contextual elements that are unique to female offending (Agnew, 1992; Agnew & Brezina, 1997; Heimer & De Coster, 1999; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998; Robbers, 2000; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). In order to address the merits of these theoretical positions, a review of these three trends in research will follow.

Traditional Male Oriented Theories Applied to Females

Although female delinquency was virtually ignored by social scientists until the 1970's, increases in the prevalence, incidence, and seriousness of female offending, as depicted in both official and self-report data, stimulated the study of female offending. From this new pursuit, one research trend included those scholars who posited traditional male oriented theories could serve as comprehensive theories for female offending. These theorists tested significant independent variables from well-established theories such as differential association (Simons, Miller & Aigner, 1980), strain/anomie (Hoffman & Su, 1997; Segrave & Hastad, 1985; Simons, Miller & Aigner, 1980), control (Canter, 1982a; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Jensen & Eve, 1976; LaGrange & Silverman, 1999; Segrave & Hastad, 1985; Simons, Miller & Aigner, 1980; Smith & Paternoster, 1987), opportunity (Datesman, Scarpitti & Stephenson, 1975) and deterrence theory (Smith, 1979).

Jensen and Eve (1976) examined the relationship between gender and self-reported delinquent behavior and tested the gender-mediating effects of

several variables measuring Hirschi's (1969) control theory on reported delinquent behavior. Measures tested included relationship with parents, attachment to law, academic performance, and participation in youth culture. The authors concluded, "...while no one variable could totally account for the sex-delinquency relationship several did reduce the association and when simultaneously introduced in a multiple regression analysis the relationship was reduced even further" (p. 444). In 1980, Simons, Miller, and Aigner, hypothesized traditional male oriented theories of delinquent behavior were applicable to females, as well as to males. Using self-report data from a large sample (N=3925) of male and female youths from Iowa, the researchers analyzed independent variables from anomie, labeling, control, and differential association theories. Analysis of the data revealed, "...that perceived lack of educational or occupational opportunity is not a strong predictor of delinquency for either sex, but this is especially true for females" (p.49). Furthermore, "...sex-related differences in rates of delinquency appear to be a function of the fact that females are less exposed to the factors associated with deviance than males are. When one controls for these dissimilarities, the relationship between the sex and delinquency is largely eliminated" (p.51).

Canter (1982) examined gender differences in self-report data from the National Youth Survey testing the differential impact of a single social bond variable - family bond. Canter hypothesized females would report significantly stronger family bonds and significantly lower delinquency rates than males.

However, she discovered limited support for the hypotheses. The results indicated that while family bonds were controls against delinquent behavior, "...the nature and degree of family bonding is similar for males and females (p.163). Contrary to prior research, Canter discovered, "...the association between family bonds and delinquent behavior was significantly greater for males than females in over 30% of the correlation comparisons." This discovery was quite significant, for "...they challenge the assumption that the family context is significant mainly for females. They also suggest that the effects of family bonds are not uniform but may be more pronounced for serious crimes among males" (p.163). Segrave & Hastad (1985) formulated an integrated model of independent variables from strain, control, and subculture theories to develop a more comprehensive understanding of male and female delinquency. "Separate regression analyses showed that all three models were significantly predictive of delinquency, although the subculture model variables explained the greatest amount of variance in delinquency" (p. 14). Furthermore, the variables of perception of limited opportunities and value orientations demonstrated greater relevance to females. Segrave & Hastad concluded their integrated model of strain, control, and subculture theories was equally applicable to males and females.

Using a combined theoretical framework of control and differential association theory, Raskin-White and LaGrange (1987) examined self-report data from a random household survey of 304 adolescents. The researchers

incorporated one of the main tenets of differential association theory to avoid the "...conceptual and empirical inadequacy of a pure control theory" (p. 199). The researchers discovered that, "Delinquent associates is the only variable tested in this paper that substantially mediates the relationship between gender and delinquency" (p. 208). The study also demonstrated that females had significantly stronger bonds to society than males (based upon parent, school, and peer measures).

In a more recent test of traditional theories, Deschenes and Esbensen (1998) examined independent variables from social control and social learning theory as predictors of gang membership for males and females. The researchers hypothesized that elements of social bonding theory varied by gender; thus girls and boy might join gangs for dissimilar reasons. Findings revealed little support for the predictive ability of the social control variables, and only moderate support for the social learning variables. In two studies testing Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime (LaGrange & Silverman, 1999; Nakhaie, Silverman & LaGrange, 2000), research findings indicated strong support for low self-control as a predictor of various types of delinquency committed by males and females. Furthermore, findings indicated that females typically have less opportunity to be delinquent and exhibited more self-control and less risk taking.

In summary, the application of traditional male oriented theories to female offending has proven to be a worthwhile avenue of research. Studies testing

independent variables from established theoretical traditions such as control, strain/anomie, differential association, social learning and subcultural theory have demonstrated explanatory power for both male and female delinquency. As Alarid, Burton, & Cullen (2000) note, "Results indicate that future studies of criminal behavior risk being misspecified if they do not include measures of these 'traditional' theories of crime" (p. 191).

Gender-Specific Theories of Female Delinquency

In a response to the exclusion of females from criminological research, scholars since the 1950's have formulated female-oriented (gender-specific) theories of crime and delinquency. Refuting the application of traditional male-oriented theories to the study of female offending, gender-specific theories were a significant departure from traditional criminology because of their focus on issues and factors pertaining directly to the behavior of females. "The assumption reflected by a belief that major sociological theories are sex specific [specific to males] or that unique theories are required to account for female deviance is that male and female deviance are different in origin" (Smith, 1979, p. 183).

Gender specific research has touched upon such diverse areas as gender discrimination and inequality (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992), the impact of the women's movement and feminism (Adler, 1975; Balken & Berger, 1979; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Figueiara-McDonough, 1984, Leiber, Farnworth, Jamieson & Nalla, 1994) the relationship between masculine characteristics and delinquency (Thornton, 1982; Thornton & James, 1979), psychological, biological

and socio-cultural factors (Bartek, Krebs & Taylor, 1993; Caspi, Lynam & Moffitt, 1993; Cohen, 1955; Datesman & Scarpitti, 1975; Duke & Duke, 1978; Konopka, 1966; Morris, 1964) and parental neglect and sexual abuse (Bowers & Min 1990).

An initial focus on increasing female delinquency and criminality in the 1970's related such changes to the emancipation of women and increased female participation in the labor force. Two books, Adler's *Sisters in Crime* (1975) and Simon's *Women and Crime* (1975), were instrumental in advancing *opportunity* theory. These authors argued that the changing role of women and the impact the women's movement had on opening educational and occupational doors resulted in increased female participation in criminal activities. Adler (1975) concluded that increasing female crime rates were a result of a lifting of social restrictions on women, and subsequent increased opportunities in the market place to commit criminal behavior as men have done for years. Simon (1975) had a similar argument; increased property crimes by women resulted from greater opportunities to commit such crimes since more women were in the labor force. Simon also suggested possible changes in the criminal justice system's response to treat women more like men resulted in higher crime figures. While the writings of Adler and Simon attracted much attention, many were skeptical of their findings and refuted their analysis as being faulty and misplaced (Curran, 1984; Smart, 1979; Steffensmeier, 1978, 1980).

Changes in female delinquency have also been linked to the advancement of the women's movement. Some have asserted that as a result of this movement, significant changes in traditional attitudes toward acceptable behavior for women have taken place. Furthermore, the liberalizing affects of the movement resulted in increased female participation in the labor force and increased the overall opportunity for females to become involved in delinquent and criminal behavior. In 1980, James and Thornton conducted a study of female adolescents that addressed their attitudes toward feminism and the extent of their delinquent behavior. In addition, the study examined, "...the influence of delinquency opportunities, the availability of social support for delinquent activities, and parental social control on both delinquency involvement and the relationship to delinquency of attitudes toward feminism" (p. 233). Findings indicated that feminism had little direct effect on social delinquency (i.e., status offenses). Furthermore, a negative relationship was discovered between feminism and the commission of property and aggressive offenses. Such results indicated little support for the assumption that the women's movement was an influential factor in the commission of deviant and criminal acts by females. In 1984, Figueira-McDonough analyzed the impact of feminist orientations on delinquency. The study found that in measuring girls' support for public, private, and personal feminist principles, feminist orientations were not significant predictors of delinquent offending. "...All the three hypotheses predicting behavior, legitimate and illegitimate, from feminist orientation received limited

confirmation" (p. 339). Rather, stronger feminist orientations were significantly related to higher career aspirations, better grades, and less involvement in sex.

In an early examination of masculinity and delinquency, Thornton & James (1979), "...sought to confirm or dispute the notion that masculine gender-related expectations held by adolescents for their own behavior and held for the behavior of adolescents by parents and friends would positively vary with delinquency" (p. 236). It was theorized that if delinquency was typically a 'masculine act', "...it follows that perceptions of masculine as opposed to non-masculine gender expectations would be followed by increases in delinquency" (p.236). When the authors controlled for sex, they found the fourteen delinquent acts examined were not related to masculine identification for either gender group. Thornton and James concluded, "...low masculinity might well be bolstered by delinquent activities" (p. 236). Consequently, delinquency may not be a result of strong masculinity, but rather, delinquency may serve as a method to achieve or verify masculinity.

Some theorists have argued that female delinquents are more sensitive to family conflict or dysfunction than male delinquents. Norland, Shover, Thornton, and James (1979) sought to answer the following research questions,

First, is the relationship between family conflict and delinquency stronger for girls than for boys? And second, is conflict in the home directly related to delinquency, or is the relationship mediated by one or more of the following variables: (1) parental supervision, (2) identification with parents,

(3) beliefs about rules and law, and (4) social support for delinquent activity (p.227)?

Results indicated family conflict was an important predictor of delinquent behavior. While the relationship between family conflict and delinquency was stronger for females, this was primarily an indirect result through reduced identification with parents, adoption of more relativistic beliefs about law, reduced parental supervision, and increased exposure to social support for delinquency. The analysis of the direct effects of family conflict on property and aggressive offenses, "...found them to be greater for males than females. The direct effects of family conflict were only slightly greater for females in the category of status offenses (p. 235).

Gender-Modified Traditional Theories.

The final theoretical approach to the study of gender and delinquency draws upon both of the previous two trends. It has taken a "middle-ground" or "modified" approach and pursues the advancement of traditional theories that incorporate those contexts and structures that are unique to female delinquency and criminality (Agnew, 1992; Agnew & Brezina, 1997; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Hoyt & Scherer, 1998; Robbers, 2000; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996; Strugatz, 2001). Inclusion of these contextual and structural factors within traditional theoretical approaches will provide evidence as to whether the etiology of female delinquency may differ from that of male delinquency.

Robbers (2000) tested an interdisciplinary model of juvenile delinquency that addressed the unique motivations that may propel girls to commit delinquent acts. The interdisciplinary model drew upon stress research from psychology and social support theory from medical sociology, and was based on Agnew's (1992) general strain theory. Robbers specifically tested whether there was support for general strain theory. In addition, models were tested to determine whether the interdisciplinary model was a better predictor of delinquency than general strain theory alone. The final component of the analysis examined whether social support theory mediated the predictive effects of sources of strain in the model. Findings were mixed, with partial support for Agnew's general strain theory, and moderate support for the predictive ability of the interdisciplinary model. As for the mediating effects of social support theory, "...findings suggest that this variable may explain the variability in crime rates by gender (p. 116). In a similar study, Strugatz (2001) assessed Broidy and Agnew's (1997) gendered reformulation of general strain theory to further the understanding of the relationship between gender and delinquency. Specifically, self-esteem factors were analyzed to determine their effects on strain and the deviant adaptations of violent crime and drug and alcohol use. Findings indicated that for females the effects of interpersonal strain and self-esteem were the only significant predictors of drug and alcohol use. None of the models tested had any predictive power for violent behavior of females within the study.

Research within this trend has also acknowledged the complexity between gender and delinquency, and has focused on the need to address the differentiated experiences of both genders. Heimer and De Coster (1999) reformulated differential association theory “to specify how the differentiated experiences of boys and girls led to violent offending” (p. 278). Specifically, the researchers formulated differential association within a framework that drew insights from feminist theories and gender studies, while focusing on the cultural and structural factors that would affect variables such as direct parental controls, aggressive peers and emotional bonds to families. Heimer and De Coster concluded results supported their theoretical arguments. “In sum, girls are less violent than boys because they are influenced more strongly by bonds to family, learn fewer violent definitions, and are taught that violence is inconsistent with the meaning of being female” (p. 303). Furthermore, the study advanced differential association theory while taking into consideration the important differentiated experiences of both genders. “...We draw on feminist and gender studies to specify the role of gender differences in the influence of parenting processes and peer influence” (p. 305)

The current theoretical foundation of juvenile delinquency and gender is divided among three general trends of research. Some scholars argue that traditional theories of juvenile delinquency are quite applicable to female offending. On the other hand, there are researchers who've purported traditional theories are inadequate for the study of female delinquency. They've asserted

the need for gender-specific (specifically formulated to explain *female* delinquency) theories. The third trend has not discounted traditional male oriented theories, but has attempted to place them within the unique contexts and structures that relate to female delinquency.

Varying degrees of support for the three theoretical trends in delinquency research has been discussed in the previous review. However, a clear consensus for any of the positions has not yet developed. While all three avenues of research touch upon similar aspects of gender and gender differences in offending, the issue of delinquency research is an intricate and complicated combination of biological, social, environmental and psychological factors. As such, it is clear that much work remains to be done. One fruitful means of improving our understanding of juvenile delinquency, and addressing theoretical questions raised thus far, is the study of the context of offending patterns of male and female delinquents. As Triplett & Myers (1995) posit,

Understanding entails not only the study of prevalence, incidence, and diversity in types of offending, but also an examination of the context of offending. Greater knowledge about how gender shapes offending will help us to learn whether theories developed to explain male delinquency can be used to explain criminality in general (p. 62).

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROCESSING AND GENDER

The establishment of a court that would put the 'best interests' of the child first, assign primary importance to individualized treatment, and target

rehabilitation as the greatest means of serving youth and society, was a noteworthy development in the historical response to delinquent and dependent children in the latter half of the 19th century. The establishment of the juvenile court was one of the leading progressive developments of its time, and one that coincided with a host of related movements regarding the welfare of children. Progressive reformers fought for compulsory schooling laws, child labor laws, and laws addressing for the care of poor and dependent children.

One core objective of the juvenile court movement was for the court (as the primary party for state intervention) to act as a parental figure to wayward children. In essence, the state was to act as a mentoring figure working towards predicting and preventing juvenile delinquency through a close examination of the child's environment and home life. In response to the review of the youth's history, the court would deliver appropriate guidance and services that would alter the child's path. The juvenile court was heralded as a humanistic and progressive reform to the barbaric and unjust practices directed toward youth during previous decades. Disillusioned with traditional responses to delinquent and deviant behavior, reformers sought to implement a system of individualized justice. Reformers attempted to create a system that would serve as a warm and guiding hand to the child, rather than a punitive and lashing fist; a system that would focus on the child's living environment, rather than on the harm or consequences of the child's behavior; and a system not restricted by the confines

of the adult criminal law, but a system with vast discretionary power to dictate what was in the "best interests of the child".

The establishment of a legal framework wherein juvenile offenders can be handled on an individual basis, with an emphasis on what is "best for the offender" rather than an emphasis on the offense, has been one of the most significant developments of the juvenile justice system. Within this framework, significant discretionary power has been given to juvenile justice officials (i.e., police officers, probation officers, judges, corrections officials). As Lamiell (1979) points out, ". . . they have been given the latitude to deal with certain offenders in accordance with 'their own conscience, uncontrolled by the judgment or conscience of others" (p. 77). In a system that advocates discretion and individualization, two offenders may have committed the same offense yet are processed quite differently for a host of reasons.

While legal (e.g., offense and prior record) and extra-legal factors (e.g., race) impact decision-making in the juvenile justice system, gender has been found to be quite important at all processing points. The debate over the existence of gender discrimination in the juvenile justice system (as well as the adult system) has been waged for many years. Some researchers have suggested that young female status offenders are treated more harshly than young men (Bishop & Frazier, 1992; Chesney-Lind, 1977, 1988, 1997, 1999; Cohen & Kluegel, 1979; Conway & Bogdan, 1977; Figueira-McDonough, 1987; Horowitz & Pottieger, 1991; Pope & Feyerherm, 1983). Specifically, they claim

that females are more likely to be referred, adjudicated and detained. Others have claimed that gender differences in case outcomes can be explained by such legal factors as seriousness of offense and prior record, and that significant changes within the juvenile justice system has significantly reduced or eliminated bias against females (Curran, 1984; Fenwick, 1982; Poe-Yamagata & Butts, 1996; Teilmann & Landry, 1981 U.S. General Accounting Office).

The examination of gender bias, particularly with regard to the handling of status offenders, is complex. However, with further study into areas such as gender differences in the context of offending, the intricacy of the relationship between juvenile justice processing and gender can advanced.

Sex Differences or Sex Discrimination?

Research on processing and sentencing outcomes for male and female offenders in the adult court has received considerable attention. Findings that female offenders (especially white offenders) are treated more leniently (in the form of greater diversion from the system and shorter/better sentencing outcomes) than their male counterparts have been widely supported (Crew, 1991; Farnworth & Teske, 1995; Hecht-Schafran, Koons, 2001; 1986; Rhode, 1989; Simpson, 1989; Spohn, 1999; Warren, 1981). In contrast, research of the treatment of adolescent males and females in the juvenile justice system demonstrates a reciprocal relationship. Adolescent females, especially those charged with status offenses, are likely to suffer from gender discrimination in the form of harsher treatment. In these cases, gender discrimination results in the

greater likelihood to be referred and admitted into the juvenile justice system, as well in the greater likelihood to be processed and adjudicated (Bishop & Frazier, 1992; Chesney-Lind, 1977; Cohen & Kluegel, 1979; Conway & Bogdan, 1977; Figueira-McDonough, 1987; Horowitz & Pottieger, 1991; Krohn, Curry & Nelson-Kilger, 1983; Pope & Feyerherm, 1983).

Conway and Bogdan (1977) found evidence of gender bias in their examination of New York State Family Court records from 1967 to 1974. The analyses revealed that females, in contrast to males, were more likely to be committed for status offenses and detained in juvenile facilities for longer periods of time. "Females are detained for longer periods of time than males are, in facilities that have been condemned as little more than holding pens for societies unwanted" (p. 135). In Cohen and Kluegel's (1979) analysis of intake decisions in the Denver and Memphis juvenile courts indicated intake officers were more punitive toward youths charged with status offenses, referring clients to formal actions more often than offenders charged with some criminal offenses.

Females referred for miscellaneous status offenses also had a greater likelihood of formal adjudication than their male counterparts. Cohen and Kluegel reported,

It is clear, however, that both courts react more harshly to females who violate 'decorum' than to males who do the same things (miscellaneous and alcohol and drug offenses). It appears that a double standard of behavior is in operation, with males less likely than females to be treated

formally for engaging in malicious mischief, loitering, using alcohol or drugs, and so on (p. 160).

Moreover, the authors concluded their data probably underestimated the difference in treatment between males and females referred for "decorum" offenses. "Outside authorities and law enforcement officials are probably more likely to refer females to court intake for this type of behavior, while overlooking similar conduct engaged in by males. . ." (p. 160).

Pope and Feyerherm (1983) found in their analysis of juvenile offender processing in ten California counties (focusing on intake and detention decisions) that gender differences existed at the stage of initial screening. "At both the bivariate and multivariate level it has been demonstrated that females charged with status offenses receive the more severe disposition in that they are more likely to be held in detention and given a formal petition" (p. 15). Furthermore, in an examination of 36,680 juvenile court referrals in one Midwestern state covering a nine-year period, Johnson and Scheuble (1991) found that first-time, female status offenders were treated more severely than males, and repeat female status offenders were much more likely to be assigned a custody transfer. The analysis also indicated rural, female offenders were less likely than their male counterparts to have their cases dismissed and more likely to be put on probation.

Using the concept of type-scripts in an examination of police arrest decisions, Sealock and Simpson (1998) used the juvenile portion of the data for

the 1958 Philadelphia birth cohort compiled by Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin in 1972. Based on the analysis of official police records, Sealock and Simpson found that females were most frequently arrested for committing offenses classified as neutral or male-typed. In the examination of status offenses and type-scripts, the researchers discovered that while there were no gender differences in the likelihood of arrest for status offenses that were *witnessed* by the police, females were more likely to be arrested in those occasions where their offenses came to the attention of the police through outside sources.

Reasons For Gender Bias

According to Teilmann and Landry (1981), "...Discriminatory processing is said to occur because deviant behavior by females is viewed as a more serious violation of role expectations than is deviation by males" (p. 47). This assumption introduces one proposed hypothesis of gender discrimination, "judicial paternalism." According to Horowitz and Pottieger (1991):

'Paternalism' generally implies that women who behave in ways that are congruent with traditional female roles of purity and submission receive preferential or lenient treatment, whereas women who violate these standards do not receive this benefit and may be dealt with more severely than males committing the same offense (p. 76).

Before passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974, which mandated the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, judges had few, if any, legal guidelines in handling youth charged with status

offenses. Judges more often than not relied on their own personal feelings to guide decisions about what should be done with status offenders. As a result, female status offenders were often incarcerated "for their own protection." Dismissals for young men were made on the grounds that "boys will be boys." Female delinquent behavior was viewed more readily as a manifestation of serious problems in need of the "help" that can be provided by the juvenile courts (Chesney-Lind, 1988, 1999). In addition, much of the delinquent behavior of girls was believed to be of a sexual nature, which, if left unchecked, would be a serious threat to traditional middle-class values (Campbell, 1981). This process operated in an environment virtually devoid of constitutional guarantees for the juvenile offender. The judge's decision, therefore was often based on incomplete information, extra-legal factors and personal bias, was final.

Juvenile justice officials have defended themselves against charges of sex discrimination by asserting that differential handling of male and female delinquents results from gender differences in the causes of delinquent behavior. In other words, "girls 'specialize' in status offenses while boys get more involved in 'utilitarian' crimes" (Figueira-McDonough, 1987, p. 403). "Two assumptions are critical to the validity of this justification: "(1) that there is gender specialization in delinquent behavior, and (2) that the causes of delinquent behavior are different for boys and girls" (p. 404). Interestingly, self-report studies of males and females have found little or no significant differences in the

involvement of either gender group in minor offenses (Chesney-Lind, 1999; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1992).

A Trend of Equitable Treatment or Hidden Bias

A decline in gender discrimination at various stages of juvenile justice processing has been noted in recent empirical research (Corley, Cernkovich & Giordano, 1989; Reese & Curtis, 1991; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1995). Bishop and Frazier (1992) concluded,

There are about as many recent studies reporting that gender plays no significant role in justice decision-making as there are studies reporting significant gender effects. Even in those recent studies that report significant gender differences, however the magnitude of these differences is considerably smaller than typically found in earlier years. Thus, the record seems to suggest that gender plays a less significant role in juvenile justice processing today than it did in the past (p. 1165).

There are many possible explanations for this change. One is that the feminist movement has had a significant impact on the attitudes and actions of juvenile justice officials, subsequently resulting in more equitable treatment of young men and women. "...Recent studies which have found less sex differentials in the official treatment of status offenders may be pointing to a new awareness among court personnel that excesses of judicial paternalism may be inappropriate" (Bishop and Frazier, 1992, p. 1166).

A second plausible explanation is that legal changes in most states to handle status offenders differently than delinquents results in equitable treatment of males and females charged with status offenses. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974, which mandated the deinstitutionalizing of status offenders, was considered to be a significant legal development and partially responsible for this trend (Bishop and Frazier, 1992). The JJDP Act stipulated that juveniles charged with status offenses cannot be placed in any secure facility such as county jails and juvenile detention centers. Bishop and Frazier (1992) reported,

One consequence of this change in the law may be that it has become difficult for justice officials to practice differentially protectionist policies toward female status offenders. That is, to the extent that females were disadvantaged in the past by practices now forbidden, the legal reforms of the last fifteen years may have tended to equalize the treatment accorded male and female status offenders (p.1166).

Many states have proceeded to remove or decriminalize these offenses as a means of removing them from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. As Sickmund and Snyder (1999) note, "In these states, the behaviors are no longer law violations. Juveniles who engage in the behaviors may be classified as dependent children, which gives child protective service agencies rather than juvenile courts the primary responsibility for responding to this population" (p. 166). Thus, the removal of status offenders from the jurisdiction of the juvenile

court and their placement under the supervision of social service agencies may have eroded the protectionist attitudes and responses that have resulted in gender discrimination against females in the past.

A third possible explanation of the apparent trend of equitable treatment for young males and females is that gender bias is not as readily observable through statistical analysis of court records of status offenders. According to Bishop and Frazier (1992), ". . . there is a possibility that no significant changes have occurred in the treatment of males and females, but that differential treatment is now hidden in one or more ways" (p. 1166).

Researchers have discovered that in some jurisdictions, after the decriminalization of status offenders, females were being charged with criminal offenses that had previously been classified as status offenses (Bishop & Frazier, 1992). ". . . Justice officials may have redefined many status offenses as criminal-type offenses in order to render girls eligible for the kinds of protectionist sanctions which had traditionally been applied" (p. 1167). Curran's (1984) study of the Philadelphia Family Court system, indicated that while status offenses were reclassified in order to remove status offenders from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, court records indicated a significant increase in the number of young women charged with criminal offenses. Curran postulated this resulted from the reclassification of status offenses as criminal offenses.

Bishop and Frazier (1992) argued that a 1980 amendment to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act allowed the court system to place status

offenders in juvenile facilities for being in contempt of court for violating a court order. They reported,

If a runaway youth that was ordered by the court to remain at home, was to run away again, they might be found in contempt of court--a criminal-type offense, in that adjudged contemptors can be incarcerated or otherwise institutionalized. Contempt proceedings may be initiated based on either a subsequent status offense or a failure to comply with an earlier court order (p. 1167).

Furthermore, the research demonstrated in contempt cases, the practice of gender bias has continued in the handling of repeat status offenders. "The typical female *not* in contempt has a 31.2% probability of referral to court. When referred for contempt, her likelihood of court referral increases strikingly to 69.7%, a difference of nearly 40 percentage points" (p. 1181). Disproportionately harsher treatment of repeat female offenders was also supported in a study conducted by Johnson and Scheuble (1991). "The tolerance of the court seems to run out for girls committing repeated offenses, and the tendency to punish them more severely than boys emerges as the apparent trend" (p.695). In addition, Berger (1994) found in his study of the Illinois Juvenile Court System, "The use of contempt power by Illinois juvenile court judges does not harmonize with the Juvenile Court Act and creates a policy of punishment for acts judges themselves define as contumacious" (p. 56).

An area of concern in evaluating the prevalence of gender bias in the juvenile justice system is the confounding influence of variables such as race, prior record, and age. It is possible that one or any combination all of these and other variables may affect case processing, while gender explains little or no variation. For example, Johnson and Scheuble (1991) discovered in their analysis that *location* and *time period* should be taken into account when analyzing the effects of gender on case processing. "This analysis demonstrates the need to control for detailed offense when comparing male and female offenders. The results without control for detailed offense gave inflated gender effects." (p. 695).

To adequately test evidence of differential handling of female status offenders, an examination of the context of offending is needed. Using data on the differences in the prevalence and incidence of male and female offending, and attempting to control for such intervening variable as race, social-class, or type of offense is simply not enough in the exploration of the "paternalism hypothesis" (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1992).

Further insight can only be gained through an examination of gender and the context of offending. This study indirectly addresses the question why females are treated differently than their male counterparts, and whether there are gender differences the *context* of cases to warrant higher rates of referral and differential treatment for females. Without examining the context of offending by

gender, researchers will not be able to accurately test the nature and extent of gender bias in the juvenile justice system.

TRIPLETT AND MYERS AND THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING

One study that has examined the context of gender-based differences in juvenile offending patterns was a study by Triplett & Myers (1995). Using data from the National Youth Survey (NYS), the authors analyzed offending patterns of 1,543 adolescents (805 males and 738 females). Twenty-two offenses were placed in the following categories: status offenses (running away from home and truancy), vandalism (damaging family property, school property or other property), theft of property (auto theft, taking a vehicle without the owner's permission, stealing items worth less than \$5, stealing items worth \$5 to \$50, stealing items worth more than \$50, buying stolen goods, stealing from a family member, stealing at school, and breaking into a building) and violent offenses (carrying a hidden weapon, attacking someone, hitting a teacher, hitting another student, hitting a parent, using force on other students, using force on teachers and using force on others).

The analysis was divided into two parts. First, prevalence and incidence of offending by gender were examined. *Prevalence* was measured as a dichotomous variable and indicated the commission of at least one offense in the past year. *Incidence* was a continuous variable that measured the frequency of offending of those who had committed at least one offense in the past year. The second component of the analysis examined gender differences in the context of

offending. The inclusion of follow-up questions about the most recent offense in the self-report survey provided contextual data to determine the setting of the offense, victim type and seriousness. In addition, information on whether drugs were involved in the commission of each of the twenty-two offenses was included.

The analysis also included the examination of gender differences in offending across the entire sample. For continuous variables, such as the incidence measures and the measures of the value of items stolen, the means for each item were calculated and t-tests employed to determine any significant gender differences. For categorical variables, such as prevalence and the remaining measures of the context of offending, the chi-square statistic was used to test for significant differences across all variables.

Triplett and Myer's examination of the prevalence of male and female offending revealed results similar to previous self-report studies that found males dominating the commission of most crimes. For all but two of the offenses examined ("running away from home" and "hitting a parent"), males reported a greater prevalence of offending. Although females were more likely to "run away from home" and to "hit a parent", the differences were not found to be statistically significant. In addition, the authors found that,

For those offenses in which males are more likely to report offending, significant differences are found in all but two cases: skipping school (the most prevalent offense for both males and females) and using force on a

teachers to obtain money or other items (the rarest offense for both) (p. 69).

The author's examination of the ratio of male to female offending also found that as the seriousness of the offense increased, so did gender differences reflecting substantial involvement of male offenders. For example, the gender ratio for "damaging family property" was 2.5:1, for "damaging school property" 2.9:1, and the ratio for "damaging 'other' property" was 4.6:1. In addition, within the theft category, the ratio for "stealing from a family member" was 1.3:1, and for "breaking into a building" was 11.2:1. As Triplett & Myers note, "It appears, then, that the setting affects patterns of offending by gender; females' offending is limited to fewer settings" (p. 69).

The examination of the incidence of male and female offending indicated that when nonoffenders were not included in the measure, there were few significant gender differences in the incidence of offending (except for females reporting higher mean frequencies for "running away from home", "carrying a hidden weapon", and "damaging school property"). In addition, it was discovered that, "though only three of the differences are significant, for 13 of the 22 offenses the females who have committed the offense at least once register a higher frequency of offending than their male counterparts" (p. 70).

The second component of the Triplett & Myers study examined gender differences in the context of offending. The authors found that for few exceptions there were no significant gender differences in the context offending for status,

vandalism and theft offenses. "Gender differences come into play only for serious violent offending" (p. 73). For minor offenses (such as status offenses) the only significant contextual difference discovered was in the offense of running away from home. "Males are more likely to run to a place other than a friend's or a relative's house, whereas females are more likely to run to a friend's house" (p.74). Of the context measures for offenses involving the destruction of property, only one was found to be significant; males reported damaging a significantly higher property value for 'other' property than females ($t=3.33$).

Significant gender differences in the context of offending were discovered in the analysis of violent offenses. While there were no measurable differences in the more minor forms of violent behavior (hitting a student, parent, or teacher), Triplett & Myers found, "The differences are found in the more serious items: attacking someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing them, and using force on students and others to obtain money or other items" (p.75). Specific contextual differences in the offense of "attacking someone" were in the form of the attack ($\chi^2=7.64$), whether the victim was hurt ($\chi^2=2.66$), the extent of the injury ($\chi^2=10.74$), and whether the offender was on drugs at the time of the offense ($\chi^2=3.96$). The authors assert,

Hitting is the most common form of attack for both males and females, but males are significantly more likely to beat their victims or attack them with a weapon. Males are also more likely to report having hospitalized or cut

their victim, to report hurting the victim, and to have been on drugs at the time of the offense (p. 75).

In addition, for the measure of "use of force on students", statistical significance was found for males in the purpose of force (chi-square=4.07) and in whether the victim was hurt (chi-square=4.54). Although, this finding must be clarified for as the researchers discovered, "This finding is particularly interesting because there is no significant gender difference in respondents' reports of the extent of the injury to the victim. This discrepancy suggests that females and males differ in their interpretations of harm" (p. 75).

Overall, the research by Triplett and Myers demonstrated that adolescent females offend in fewer settings and in different manners than their male counterparts. Furthermore, as the seriousness of the crime increases, the contextual differences by gender also increase—with males dominating the commission of serious offense categories. The researchers note that, "Although we found few differences for status and property offenses, we observed a number of significant differences for serious violent offenses" (p. 75).

The findings from the study of contextual differences of male and female offending are quite important. The findings not only advance our understanding of juvenile offending, but are also important for the development of delinquency theory and the study of juvenile justice processing. Regarding theory development, Triplett and Myers assert, "Theories of serious criminal behavior then need to explain not only the gender ratio question (why males offend at a

higher rate than females) but also why the context of offending differs by gender" (p. 76). The discovery of few contextual differences in offending for minor forms of delinquent behavior raises several questions about the differential handling of male and female cases within the juvenile justice system. If males and females commit status offenses in similar fashion, why have female offenders been treated in a differential manner by the juvenile justice system?

PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of this study is to parallel the analysis conducted by Triplett and Myers and increase the limited research on the contextual differences of offending for juvenile offenders. While similar in some respects, it will differ in the following ways. First, the data from the Omaha study will draw out more "contextual" data on every offense type. For example, three important variables included in the Omaha data are: (1) the setting the offense took place; (2) whether the offender was caught, and if so, the outcome; and (3) whether the offense was committed alone or with others. These variables provide important information on the possible differences of male and female offending.

Furthermore, the Omaha study includes data on more offense types. While the Triplett and Myer's analysis of vandalism was limited to the categories of family, school, and "other" property, the present analysis will include thirteen specific items, such as vandalism to bus shelters, private cars, telephone booths, and other related items.

In addition, the analysis of the Omaha data will provide added contextual information than what was available to Triplett and Myers. Although the sample size is about half that of the original study, it is sufficiently large enough (and nearly equally divided according to gender) for this examination. The school-based sample used for this thesis has a sample size of 539 respondents.

Data Collection

Data for this thesis was collected for the United States component of the International Self-Report Delinquency Project (ISRD) in Omaha, Nebraska in the spring and fall of 1992. The Omaha study sampled three sub-samples: a school-based sample; a small sample of high-risk youth and a sample of institutionalized youth. The school-based sample is used for the purposes of this study. The sample consisted of a random selection of students from grades 9 through 12 from twelve local Omaha high schools. In-person interviews were conducted with a total of 539 students who were randomly selected from a list of names provided by each school. Local university graduate students conducted interviews in private settings at each of the twelve participating high schools. Interviews varied from ten minutes to one hour in length and each interviewee received between \$5.00 and \$10.00 for his or her participation in the study.

The Omaha study's questionnaire covered information concerning the student's involvement in delinquent and criminal behavior. Offenses were divided into four offense types: status offenses and minor misbehaviors, vandalism, property and theft offenses, and violent offenses. For each offense

in the study, the respondent was asked if they had 'ever' committed the offense and if the offense was committed in the 'last year'. If the respondent had committed the offense in the 'last year,' follow-up questions were raised on information such as: where the offense took place; if it was committed alone or with others; whether they were caught, and if so, by whom and if caught, what was the outcome. In addition to gathering information on respondent's delinquent and criminal behavior, the questionnaire also gathered data on the individual's socio-demographics, alcohol and drug usage, and personal beliefs and experiences.

Sample

The Omaha school-based sample consisted of 539 students aged 14 to 19, with 16 being the mean age. The racial composition of the sample was 83.5% white, 11.3% black and 3.35% Hispanic (the racial composition of the sample was proportionate to the racial composition of the city of Omaha). With respect to gender, 49.9% of the sample was male (N= 269), and 50.1% was female (N=270).

Variables

The first section of the analysis examines the *prevalence* and *incidence* of offending. Prevalence is a dichotomous variable that measures whether the offense was 'ever' committed and whether it was committed in the 'last year'. For the category 'ever' committed, a 1 indicates not having ever committed the

offenses and 2 indicates the respondent had committed the offense at least once. For the category committed 'last year', a 1 indicates that the respondent had not committed the offense within the last year and 2 indicates at least one commission of the offense within the last year.

The 25 offenses in the study include status offenses (skipping school and running away from home), vandalism (graffiti and a 'collapsed' vandalism category of thirteen offenses), theft offenses (steal from a telephone or vending machine, steal from a store, steal from school, steal from home, steal from work, steal a bike, moped, or motorcycle, steal a car, steal from or out of a car, pickpocketing, snatch a purse or bag, burglary, stealing other, buying stolen goods and selling stolen goods) and violent offenses (carrying a weapon, threatening someone, public fighting or disturbances, arson, beating up non-family, beating up a family member and hurting someone with a weapon).

The second section of analysis examines the contextual differences in offending for males and female juvenile offenders. While the ISRD data were not specifically collected to examine the 'context' of offending, the data do provide contextual information on the offenses listed above. This information allows examination of several contextual variables, such as the setting of the offense, the victim/offender relationship, the value of damaged or stolen items and whether the offender was caught and if so, the outcome of the apprehension. (See appendix A for a description of the offenses and follow-up questions from the Triplett & Myers and Omaha studies).

For the status offenses of skipping school and running away from home, the contextual questions that were asked are as follows: (1) how many days did you stay away? (2) where did you spend most of the time? (3) did you do this alone or with others? (4) were you caught, and if so, by whom, and (5) what happened when you were caught? For skipping school, a level of seriousness can be determined by the length of time spent away and where the time was spent. For running away from home, longer periods of time away and destinations other than at home/close proximity would constitute an increased level of seriousness.

Vandalism and theft offenses are measured by seven separate items: (1) what the object was; (2) the shop value of the object; (3) owner of the object; (4) where the incident took place; (5) committed alone or with others; (6) whether apprehended, and if so, by whom; and (7) outcome of apprehension. Although the question of victim and offender relationship is not asked, information on the owner of the object and where the offense took place provides a good proxy of the relationship. Measures for the seriousness of these offenses are based on the type of object and its value.

Contextual questions pertaining to violent offenses involve the following information: (1) kind of weapon used; (2) shop value of weapon used; (3) location where offense occurred; (4) owner of the object; (5) identification of victim; (6) offense was committed alone or with others; (7) whether apprehended, and if so, by whom; and (8) outcome of apprehension. In addition, several offense-specific

questions were asked, such as what was paid for the stolen merchandise, what was done with the stolen object, etc. (see appendix B for complete list of follow-up questions). For this category, the type of weapon used and whether medical treatment was or would have been needed are approximate measures of seriousness.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The objective of this analysis is to examine gender differences in male and female juvenile offending. First, the analysis examines the prevalence and incidence of offending by the entire sample (N=539) and then the respondents are divided by gender. The analysis is based on two time frames: offending that was 'ever' committed and offending that was committed in the 'last year'. The examination is then divided by type of offense: status offenses, vandalism, theft, and violent offense. The analysis of prevalence includes the number of affirmative respondents (N) and the percentages, the chi-square test for significance, and the ratio of male to female offending. Incidence is measured by calculating the mean and standard deviation for each offense type, and t-tests to establish whether significant gender differences exist. The second part of the analysis examines gender differences in the context of offending. The respondents are divided by gender, and specific delinquent and criminal offenses separate the examination of possible gender-based differences. To test for significant differences based on gender, two statistical tests of significance are employed. For the categorical variables, a bivariate analysis based on the chi-

square test for independence is used. For the remaining variables that are continuous, the mean and standard deviation for each item is calculated and a t-test is used to detect whether significant gender differences exist.

Prevalence and Incidence of Offending

Table 1 shows the results of the analysis for prevalence, including the number of cases and the percentage of respondents who admitted to 'ever' committing a delinquent offense. The findings show that the most common offense 'ever' committed was vandalism. Nearly 54% of the respondents reported having damaged or destroyed at least one of the following objects: bus shelter, traffic sign, telephone booth, window, public trash can, street light, school furniture, trees, plants or flowers in parks or public gardens, seat in bus, private car, bicycle, motorcycle, or something else. Following vandalism, 47.3% of the sample reported having stolen an item from a store; 41.6% reported skipping school; 30.4% reported having carried a weapon; and 30.4% reported being involved in public fighting or disturbances. An examination of the assault category reveals that except for carrying a weapon and being involved in a public fight or disturbance, the prevalence of the remaining serious assaultive offenses is quite small. Only 2.8 % of the entire sample reported ever threatening someone with a weapon; 4.3% reported intentionally setting fire to something; 9.1% reported beating up a non-family member; 2.8% reported beating up a family member; and 7.8% reported hurting someone with a knife, stick or another weapon.

Table 1
Prevalence of Delinquent Behavior 'Ever'
All Respondents (N=539)

Offense Type	N	%
<u>Status</u>		
Skipping School	224	41.6
Running away from home	64	11.9
<u>Vandalism</u>		
Graffiti	64	11.9
Vandalism	290	53.8
<u>Theft</u>		
Steal from tele/vend	31	5.8
Steal from store	255	47.3
Steal from school	86	16.0
Steal from home	138	25.6
Steal from work	43	8.0
Steal bike/moped/motorcycle	32	5.9
Steal a car	33	6.1
Steal from/out car	69	12.8
Pickpocketing	14	2.6
Snatch bag/purse	10	1.9
Burglary	89	16.5
Stealing other	26	4.8
Buying stolen goods	143	26.5
Selling stolen goods	74	13.7
<u>Assault</u>		
Carrying a weapon	164	30.4
Threatening someone	15	2.8
Public fighting/disturbance	164	30.4
Arson	23	4.3
Beating up non-family	49	9.1
Beating up family	15	2.8
Hurting with weapons	42	7.8

Table 2 provides more detailed data on delinquent involvement. It displays the findings on the prevalence of delinquent behavior 'ever', including the number of cases and percentages of males and females who admitted to

delinquent offenses, the chi-square test for significant differences, and the ratio of male to female offending. The results show that for all twenty-five offenses, males report a greater prevalence. The differences in prevalence were statistically significant except for the following offenses: skipping school (the most prevalent offense for females), running away from home, graffiti, stealing from telephone/vending machine, stealing from home, snatching a bag or purse (the least prevalent offense for males), stealing other, and beating up a family member.

The data from Table 2 clearly supports previous research based on self-report studies. For more minor offenses, such as skipping school, running away from home, vandalism, and petty thefts, offending by males and females is quite similar. The ratio of male to female offending from Table 2 displays that for offenses such as skipping school and running away from home the ratio was 1.1:1 and 1.2:1. Regarding vandalism, the ratio of offending for graffiti (1.6:1) and for the vandalism category (1.8:1) is also consistent with previous data demonstrating that for such minor offenses, gender differences are usually small. The ratio of male to female offending also supports past research findings that as the seriousness of offense increases, so do gender differences. For example, within the theft category the ratio of offending for selling stolen goods (9.6:1) is over seven times as great as stealing from home (1.3:1). In addition, the ratio of offending for stealing from or out of a car (4.3:1) is almost four times as great as stealing from home (1.3:1) or stealing other (1.4:1). The one exception to this

Table 2
Prevalence of Delinquent Behavior 'Ever'
by Gender (N=539)

Offense Type Ratio	Male		Female		Chi-Sq.	
	N	%	N	%		
<u>M:F</u>						
<u>Status</u>						
Skipping school	117	43.5	107	39.6	.83	1.1:1
Running away from home	35	13.0	29	10.7	.66	1.2:1
<u>Vandalism</u>						
Graffiti	39	14.5	25	9.3	3.53	1.6:1
Vandalism	188	69.9	102	37.8	55.90*	1.8:1
<u>Theft</u>						
Steal from tele/vend.	18	6.7	13	4.8	.88	1.4:1
Steal from store	150	56.0	105	39.0	15.44*	3.8:1
Steal from school	65	24.3	21	7.8	27.0*	3.1:1
Steal from home	78	29.1	60	22.3	3.25	1.3:1
Steal from work	30	16.2	13	6.9	7.90*	2.3:1
Steal bike/moped/motcyc.	28	10.4	4	1.5	19.24*	7.0:1
Steal a car	27	10.1	6	2.2	14.32*	4.5:1
Steal from/out car	56	20.9	13	4.8	30.93*	4.3:1
Pickpocketing	12	4.5	2	0.7	7.37*	6.0:1
Snatch bag/purse	7	2.6	3	1.1	1.65	2.3:1
Burglary	66	24.6	23	8.6	25.09*	2.9:1
Stealing other	15	5.6	11	4.1	.68	1.4:1
Buying stolen goods	110	41.0	33	12.3	56.90*	3.3:1
Selling stolen goods	67	25.1	7	2.6	56.96*	9.6:1
<u>Assault</u>						
Carrying a weapon	126	46.8	38	14.1	68.34*	3.3:1
Threatening someone Public	13	4.8	2	0.7	8.34*	6.5:1
Public fighting/disturbance	108	40.1	56	20.7	23.98*	1.9:1
Arson	17	6.3	6	2.2	5.54*	2.8:1
Beating up non-family	35	13.0	14	5.3	9.99*	2.5:1
Beating up family	8	3.0	7	2.6	.07	1.1:1
Hurting with weapons	31	11.5	11	4.1	10.41*	2.8:1

* p < .05

situation is the offense of stealing from a store (1.4:1). It appears that in the case of shoplifting, males and females offend in a similar fashion.

An examination of Table 2 demonstrates that gender differences are also significant when the *setting* of the offense is considered. The ratio of male to female offending can be used to examine gender differences within offense categories. For example, within the theft category, female offending is limited to fewer settings than their male counterparts: the ratio of male to female offending for stealing from a store is 3.8 and 3.1 for stealing from school, while the ratio for stealing from a telephone or vending machine is 1.4 and 1.3 for stealing from home. This finding is consistent with previous research and explanations where females are viewed as more closely supervised than boys and thus more likely to offend in fewer settings than males. With respect to violent offenses, females were significantly less involved than their male counterparts. Males dominated all offenses with the exception beating up a family member, which was a rare event for both groups. The offending ratio for these offenses ranges from a low of 1.9 for public fighting/disturbance, to a high of 6.5:1 for threatening someone. While females were less involved in violent offenses than males, only a small proportion of each group had 'ever' been involved in these offenses. In the analysis of the prevalence of delinquent behavior 'last year' for the entire sample (Table 3), there were, as expected, far fewer affirmative respondents than in the examination of 'ever' being involved in delinquency. Truancy was the most

Table 3
Prevalence of Delinquent Behavior 'Last Year'
All Respondents (N=539)

Offense Type	N	%
<u>Status</u>		
Skipping school	134	24.9
Running away from home	28	5.2
<u>Vandalism</u>		
Graffiti	16	3.0
Vandalism	74	13.7
<u>Theft</u>		
Steal from tele/vend	15	2.8
Steal from store	61	11.3
Steal from school	24	4.5
Steal from home	41	7.6
Steal from work	29	5.4
Steal bike/moped/motcyc.	4	.7
Steal a car	9	1.7
Steal from/out car	23	4.3
Pickpocketing	6	1.1
Snatch bag/purse	2	.4
Burglary	28	5.2
Stealing other	12	2.2
Buying stolen goods	82	15.2
Selling stolen goods	34	6.3
<u>Assault</u>		
Carrying a weapon	97	18.0
Threatening someone	7	1.3
Public fighting/disturbance	81	15.0
Arson	6	1.1
Beating up non-family	23	4.3
Beating up family	5	.9
Hurting with weapons	13	2.4

frequently reported offense (24.9%), followed by carrying a weapon (18.0%), buying stolen goods (15.2%), public fighting/disturbances (15.0%), and vandalism (13.7).

When the category of prevalence of delinquent behavior 'last year' is separated by gender (Table 4), the number of affirmative responses for males becomes very small for several offenses (stealing bike/moped/motorcycle, snatching a bag/purse, arson, and beating up a family member). As for females, there were four offenses that did not even register any affirmative response: stealing a bike/moped/motorcycle, pickpocketing, snatching a bag/purse and threatening someone. Since most of the contextual variables are based on the responses to this category, it is inevitable that problems will arise in the statistical analysis of this data due to a small number of cases for several of the offenses. In regard to skipping school, the percentage of males who had 'ever' skipped school and reported doing so in the 'last year' was 60.9%. The percentage of females who had 'ever' skipped school and had done so at least once in the 'last year' was 59.8%. An examination of these percentages reflects that for males, the most prevalent offenses committed within the 'last year' were stealing from work (62.1% of those who admitted to 'ever' stealing from work), carrying a weapon (61.9%), and skipping school (60.9%). For females, 91.7% reported stealing from work, 66.7% reported buying stolen goods, and 59.8% of those who reported 'ever' skipping school reported skipping school last year. The chi-square

Table 4
Prevalence of Delinquent Behavior 'Last Year'
by Gender (N=539)

Offense Type Ratio	Male		Female		Chi- Sq.	
	N	%	N	%		
M:F	(269)		(270)			
<u>Status</u>						
Skipping school	70	60.9	64	59.8	.03	1.1:1
Running away from home	16	45.7	12	41.4	.12	1.3:1
<u>Vandalism</u>						
Graffiti	11	28.9	5	20.8	.51	2.2:1
Vandalism	48	25.7	26	25.7	.00	1.8:1
<u>Theft</u>						
Steal from tele/vend	10	55.6	5	38.5	.88	2.0:1
Steal from store	37	25.0	24	23.1	.12	1.5:1
Steal from school	19	29.7	5	25.0	.16	3.8:1
Steal from home	24	30.8	17	29.8	.01	1.4:1
Steal from work	18	62.1	11	91.7	3.59	1.6:1
Steal	4	14.8	--	0.0	.68	a
bike/moped/motcyc.						
Steal a car	8	30.8	1	16.7	.48	8.0:1
Steal from/out car	20	36.4	3	23.1	.83	6.6:1
Pickpocketing	6	46.2	--	0.0	1.54	a
Snatch bag/purse	2	50.0	--	0.0	2.10	A
Burglary	17	26.2	11	47.8	3.68	1.5:1
Stealing other	6	37.5	6	54.5	.77	1.0:1
Buying stolen goods	60	56.1	22	66.7	1.17	2.7:1
Selling stolen goods	32	49.2	2	33.3	.56	16.0:1
<u>Assault</u>						
Carrying a weapon	78	61.9	19	50.0	1.71	4.1:1
Threatening someone	7	58.3	--	0.0	2.33	a
Public	59	55.7	22	39.3	3.93*	2.7:1
fighting/disturbance						
Arson	5	31.3	1	20.0	.24	5.0:1
Beating up non-family	17	48.6	6	42.9	.13	2.8:1
Beating up family	3	37.5	2	28.6	.13	1.5:1
Hurting with weapons	11	35.5	2	18.2	1.14	5.5:1

a Not applicable due to no female cases

* $p < .05$

test for independence was significant for only one offense in this category: public fighting/disturbances (3.93).

The ratio of male to female offending shows clear gender differences within the offense categories. The ratios for the status and vandalism categories demonstrate that for such minor offenses, gender differences are quite small. This is evidenced by the ratio for skipping school (1.1:1), running away from home (1.3:1), and vandalism (1.8:1). An examination of the theft category shows more variation in offending: the ratio of male to female offending is 16.0:1 for selling stolen goods, but only 3.8:1 for stealing from school, and 1.4:1 for stealing from home. When one examines the assault section, the ratio of male to female offending shows males are much more involved in violent offenses than females. With the exception of beating up a family member (1.5:1), the range of ratios is from a low of 2.7:1 for public fighting/disturbances, to a high of 7.0:1 for threatening someone. These figures lend support to past researchers' findings that as the seriousness of the offense increases, so do the gender differences in offending. However, in view of the small sample size of some of the delinquency categories, any conclusions must be made with caution.

Incidence of Offending

Table 5 provides detailed information on the incidence of offending by gender, where incidence pertains to the 'frequency' of offending for those respondents who have offended at least once in the past year. As related previously, due to the small (and in some cases, nonexistent) number of

affirmative female responses to the categories of 'last year', the means and t-tests for several offenses could not be calculated

Upon initial examination, one will find few significant gender differences in the incidence of offending. The one exception is the offense of public fighting/disturbance, which males report a higher mean frequency (3.47 *versus* 1.91). Overall, for 18 of the 25 offenses examined, males who have committed the offense at least once in the 'last year' report a higher incidence of offending. Another finding of interest in Table 5 comes from an examination of status offenses that reflect a similar frequency of rule-breaking behavior for males and females: skipping school (1.45 *versus* 1.26) and running away from home (1.13 *versus* 1.42). This finding coincides with the findings on prevalence--the gender differences in the prevalence of offending for these offenses were also very small for both groups. In the vandalism and theft categories, differences in the frequency of offending appear in the examination of the male to female ratio. Males report higher incidence rates than females for graffiti (3.7:1), for vandalism (1.5:1), and for selling stolen goods (2.5:1). Females on the other hand, report higher incidence rates for stealing from work (.7:1), stealing from a store (.9:1), and stealing from school (.9:1). An examination of the assault category shows that the most frequent offenses for both males and females is carrying a weapon (10.16 and 10.90). This finding is not surprising with recent research showing an increased possession of weapons among both gender groups.

Table 5
Incidence of Delinquent Behavior 'Last Year'
by Gender (N=539)
(mean and standard deviation)

Offense Type M:F	x Male	x Female	T-Test	Ratio
<u>Status</u>				
Skipping School	1.45 (.50)	1.26 (.44)	1.81	1.2:1
Running away from home	1.13 (.35)	1.42 (.56)	-1.70	.8:1
<u>Vandalism</u>				
Graffiti	7.40 (15.13)	2.00 (1.00)	1.12	3.7:1
Vandalism	3.44 (3.66)	2.23 (1.51)	1.92	1.5:1
<u>Theft</u>				
Steal from tele/vend.	2.14 (1.77)	1.40 (.55)	1.04	1.5:1
Steal from store	4.46 (6.09)	5.00 (10.15)	-.23	.9:1
Steal from school	3.17 (3.65)	3.60 (3.78)	-.23	.9:1
Steal from home	4.52 (6.89)	4.24 (5.71)	.14	1.1:1
Steal from work	3.44 (5.00)	4.73 (4.54)	-.68	.7:1
Steal bike/motorcycle	1.17 (.41)	-- --	a	1.2:1.
Steal a car	1.75 (1.04)	2.00 --	a	.9:1
Steal from/out car	4.06 (3.10)	1.00 --	a	4.1:1
Pickpocketing	9.67 (6.47)	-- --	a	9.7:1
Snatch bag/purse	8.50 (9.19)	-- --	a	8.5:1
Burglary	3.06 (2.86)	1.82 (.98)	1.64	1.7:1
Stealing other	3.71 (3.15)	1.00 --	2.28	3.7:1

Buying stolen goods	3.38 (5.88)	2.41 (3.13)	.95	1.4:1
Selling stolen goods	2.48 (3.80)	1.00 --	a	2.5:1
<u>Assault</u>				
Carrying a weapon	10.16 (14.54)	10.90 (12.09)	-.15	.9:1
Threatening someone	3.40 (3.91)	-- --	a	3.4:1
Public fighting/dist.	3.47 (5.38)	1.91 (1.51)	2.00*	1.8:1
Arson	2.33 (2.31)	1.00 --	a	2.3:1
Beating up non-family	1.53 (.87)	2.17 (.98)	-1.49	.7:1
Beating up family	1.33 (.58)	1.00 --	a	1.3:1
Hurting with weapons	4.45 (8.58)	1.00 --	a	4.5:1

a T-test could not be calculated due to the small sample size for females

* $p < .05$

Context of Offending

While the examination of the prevalence and incidence of juvenile delinquency is important, it certainly does not provide a complete assessment of this phenomenon. Tables 6 and 7 provide the contextual information for this study. Table 6 reports the number of cases, the percentages, and the chi-squares for the categorical variables. Table 7 reports the means and standard deviations for both gender groups, and the t-tests for statistical significance for the continuous variables. As one may note from Table 7, only six of the original twenty-five offenses are examined by context (skipping school, vandalism, theft from store, buying stolen goods, carrying a weapon and public fight/disturbance). This is a result of limited participation in several of the offenses by the

respondents in the Omaha school-based sample. Consequently, it was only feasible to analyze the six offenses that had sufficient cases to allow for the statistical analysis of the categorical and continuous contextual variables.

Skipping School

In Table 6, the context of skipping school is measured by destination, whether the offense was committed alone or with others, whether the offender was caught or not, and what the outcome was if the offender was caught. The only significant gender difference is whether the offender was caught (chi-square= 3.88). Males are less likely to be caught skipping school than females. While not statistically significant, the measure of what happened if the offender was caught reflects that females are much more likely to receive school suspensions for skipping school than their male counterparts (61.9% *versus* 15.4%). In addition, it is apparent that skipping school is an offense that is typically committed with other individuals; 65.8% of the males and 75.0% of the females reported skipping school with others.

Vandalism

The context of offending for the offense of vandalism is measured by the object damaged, the owner of the object, the place the offense occurred, whether the offense was committed alone or with others, and whether the offender was caught. The only significant categorical variable found was whether the offense was committed alone or with others (chi-square= 6.90). Males are more likely to vandalize with others than females. Examination of the owners of objects

damaged reflects that males more frequently damage items belonging to 'others' (55.3%) than items belonging to school or friends/neighbors (17.0% and 19.1%).

Table 6
Context of Offending for Categorical Variables 'Last Year'
By Gender

Offense Type	Male		Female		
Chi-Sq	N	%	N	%	
<u>Status</u>					
Skipping school					
Destination:					1.62
home/within ten minutes	31	45.6	24	37.5	
friends/relatives	23	33.8	21	32.8	
Other	14	20.6	19	29.7	
Alone or with others					1.39
Alone	25	34.2	16	25.0	
with others	48	65.8	48	75.0	
Caught					3.88*
No	58	80.6	42	65.6	
Yes	14	19.4	22	34.4	
What happened when caught					7.19
Arrested	1	7.7	1	4.8	
school suspension	2	15.4	13	61.9	
Grounded	5	38.5	4	19.0	
Nothing	5	38.5	3	14.3	
<u>Vandalism</u>					
Vandalism					
Object damaged					13.15
traffic sign	8	17.0	1	3.7	
telephone booth	0	0	1	3.7	
Window	9	19.1	3	11.1	
street light	4	8.5	1	3.7	
school furniture	5	10.6	8	29.6	
trees/plants/flowers	2	4.3	3	11.1	
bus seat	3	6.4	1	3.7	
private car	9	19.1	2	7.4	
something else	7	14.9	7	25.9	
Owner of object					8.52
Family	2	4.3	4	14.8	

School	8	17.0	10	37.0	
friend/neighbor	9	19.1	5	18.5	
Other	26	55.3	7	25.9	
don't know	2	4.3	1	3.7	
Place occurred					.93
home or within ten minutes	25	56.8	12	46.2	
friends/relatives	3	6.8	3	11.5	
Other	16	36.4	11	42.3	
Alone or with others					6.90*
Alone	9	19.1	13	48.1	
with others	38	80.9	14	51.9	
Caught					.76
No	38	82.6	20	74.1	
Yes	8	17.4	7	25.9	
<u>Theft</u>					
Steal from store					
Type of store					4.56
work place	2	5.3	0	0	
small store	11	28.9	7	29.2	
self service store	3	7.9	1	4.2	
department store	14	36.8	14	58.3	
Other	8	21.1	2	8.3	
Place occurred					4.62
home or within ten minutes	15	40.5	8	33.3	
shopping mall	11	29.7	10	41.7	
city center	6	16.2	6	25.0	
Other	5	13.5	0	0	
Alone or with others					2.97
Alone	16	42.1	5	20.8	
with others	22	57.9	19	79.2	
Caught					2.38
No	29	76.3	22	91.7	
Yes	9	23.7	2	8.3	
Buying stolen goods					
Person bought from					.02
known	51	85.0	19	86.4	
not known	9	15.0	3	13.6	
Alone or with others					.01
Alone	24	40.0	9	40.9	
With others	36	60.0	13	59.1	
Caught					
No	58	96.7	22	100.0	.75
Yes	2	3.3	0	0	

Assault

Carrying a weapon

Kind of weapon					7.65
stick or blunt object	6	7.7	1	5.3	
Knife	44	56.4	13	68.4	
handgun	23	29.5	1	5.3	
Mace	5	6.4	4	21.1	
Place occurred					6.24
home or within ten minutes	12	15.8	1	5.3	
shopping mall	9	11.8	0	0	
city center	6	7.9	2	10.5	
friends or relatives	10	13.2	2	10.5	
everywhere	22	28.9	10	52.6	
social gathering	4	5.3	1	5.3	
commercial establishment	13	17.1	3	15.8	
Alone or with others					.25
Alone	28	35.9	8	42.1	
with others	50	64.1	11	57.9	
Caught					.28
No	71	91.0	18	94.7	
Yes	7	9.0	1	5.3	
Public fighting/disturbances					
Was weapon used					1.94
No	44	77.2	20	90.9	
yes	13	22.8	2	9.1	
Damage caused					5.80
No	19	32.8	13	59.1	
to objects	5	8.6	1	4.5	
to person	28	48.3	5	22.7	
to both	6	10.3	3	13.6	
Place occurred					3.20
home or within ten minutes	9	16.4	4	18.2	
shopping mall	7	12.7	2	9.1	
city center	12	21.8	2	9.1	
house party	10	18.2	5	22.7	
school	8	14.5	4	18.2	
playing field	4	7.3	1	4.5	
commercial establishment	5	9.1	4	18.2	
Caught					.00
No	35	66.0	14	66.7	
yes	18	34.0	7	33.3	

* p < .05

Furthermore, males and females report that about half (56.8% and 46.2%) of their vandalism occurs at home or within a ten-minute walk of home.

Theft

For the theft offense of stealing from a store, the context of offending is measured by type of store, place where offense occurred, whether the offense was committed alone or with others, and by whether the offender was caught. None of these categorical variables were found to have significant gender differences. Though, further examination of this category does lead to some relevant findings. Females were less likely to be caught for the offense of shoplifting (91.7 % *versus* 76.3%) and females reported stealing from stores with other individuals more so than males (79.2% *versus* 57.9%). In addition, females reported that over half (58.3%) of their shoplifting took place in department stores. This coincides with females reporting that 41.7% of stealing from stores occurs at shopping malls. Buying stolen goods is measured by three categorical variables: person the merchandise was bought from, whether it was committed alone or with others, and whether they were caught. For these measures, there was little if any gender variation. Both males and females reported that over three-quarters of their purchases of stolen goods were from individuals known to them (85.0% and 86.4%). The data also reveals that being caught for buying stolen goods very rarely occurs; 96.7% of the males and 100.0% of the females report not being caught for this offense.

Assault

The kind of weapon carried, the place the weapon was carried, whether the offense was committed alone or with others, and whether they were caught measure the context of offending for carrying a weapon. For these items, no significant gender differences were found. Although one pertinent finding for this offense was that males carried handguns more frequently than females (29.5% versus 5.3%). Carrying a knife was typically the weapon of choice for males and females (56.4% and 68.4%). It is also important to note that few juveniles were caught carrying weapons; 91.0% of the males and 94.7 of the females reported they had not been caught carrying a weapon. For the final offense that was analyzed, public fighting/disturbances, no significant differences were found. Both groups reported that weapons were not used most of the time (77.2% and 90.9%). When physical injury or damage was a result of this offense, males were more likely to injure someone (48.3%) than females (22.7%).

Table 7 presents the context of offending for the *continuous variables*. Of the ten contextual measures, gender differences were statistically significant for only two of these measures: the offense of buying stolen goods where there is a significant difference in the value (in dollars) of property bought ($t= 2.14$). Males reported a higher mean value of stolen merchandise than females. The second significant difference is found in the offense of carrying a weapon; here a significant gender difference is found in the value (in dollars) of the weapon carried. Males reported a higher mean value of weapon carried.

Table 7

**Context of Offending for Continuous Variables
by Gender (mean and standard deviation)**

Offense Context	X Male	X Female	T-Test
<u>Status</u>			
Skipping school			
Time away (days)	1.48 (2.00)	1.55 (2.48)	- .18
<u>Vandalism</u>			
Vandalism			
Value of object damaged (\$)	1383.97 (4408.71)	84.11 (174.16)	1.64
<u>Theft</u>			
Steal from store			
Value of property (\$)	19.43 (33.67)	9.42 (10.81)	1.68
Number of others involved	2.59 (1.92)	2.00 (1.25)	1.15
Buying stolen goods			
Value of property (\$)	207.70 (206.44)	132.80 (96.35)	2.14*
Number of others involved	3.14 (5.36)	3.54 (3.91)	-.24
Amount paid (\$)	43.79 (47.51)	38.64 (34.96)	.46
<u>Assault</u>			
Carrying a weapon			
Value of weapon (\$)	100.50 (145.22)	20.71 (21.84)	4.41*
Number of others involved	4.57 (3.62)	12.00 (9.64)	-2.40
Public fighting/disturbances			
Number of others involved	11.95 (10.62)	9.36 (12.35)	.92

* p < .05

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine data on gender and the incidence and prevalence of delinquent and criminal offending, as well as gender differences in the context of offending for a sample of high school students in Omaha, Nebraska. The following sections will provide a brief summary of the significant findings of the research, a review of the limitations of the study and conclude with the contributions that this research has made to delinquency literature.

Delinquency research has yielded consistent findings with regard to gender differences in offending. Adolescent males are more likely to be involved in antisocial and delinquent activities and are more likely to commit serious offenses as compared to their female counterparts. This study reveals the prevalence of juvenile offending in the Omaha sample is primarily limited to less serious delinquent and criminal offenses, with vandalism being the most frequent offense committed, followed by shop lifting and skipping school. Only one third of the individuals in the total sample reported "ever" carrying a weapon or being involved in a public fight or disturbance. Overall, results attained have paralleled the results of school-based self-report studies that find minimal involvement in more serious forms of theft and violent offenses.

With respect to gender differences in the prevalence of offending, this research also supports previous self-report data demonstrating a similar offending pattern for males and females in minor offenses such as skipping school, running away from home, vandalism (graffiti) and shop lifting.

Furthermore, findings from the examination of serious offending in the Omaha sample is consistent with results routinely reported in the literature--as the seriousness of the offense increases, so do gender differences--with males dominating most categories of serious theft and violent offenses. Males in the Omaha study report engaging in significantly more serious offenses than females.

The examination of gender differences in the incidence of offending reveals only one statistically significant difference—males report a higher mean frequency for the offense of public fighting/disturbances. Overall, males report higher incidence rates of offending for eighteen of the twenty-five offenses examined. Consistent with previous self-report data, females reported higher incidence rates for running away from home and shoplifting. However, contrary to prediction, the data indicate that females who do carry a weapon have a higher incidence of doing so than their male counterparts.

The investigation of the contextual variables in this study reflects several noteworthy findings. First, the examination of the offense of skipping school demonstrated a statistically significant finding that males were less likely to be caught for this behavior than females. In addition, while only two of the fourteen males caught for skipping school received a school suspension, over half (13 of 22) of the females received such a sanction. A review of the contextual variables for vandalism demonstrated that males were more likely to commit destructive acts with others rather than alone, and males were more likely to damage objects

belonging to “others” as opposed to objects belonging to “schools” or “friends/neighbors”. With respect to theft, the only significant contextual finding was that males reported a higher mean value of purchased stolen merchandise. The examination of the offense of carrying a weapon (the only serious offense with sufficient cases to be statistically analyzed) resulted in one significant contextual difference between males and females--males reporting a higher value of the weapon carried.

Much of the existing delinquency literature focuses on the prevalence and incidence of juvenile offending, with gender an important correlate of this research. This research is important in developing an understanding of the relationship between gender and crime, but is limited to providing a picture of the *distribution* of crimes committed. Valuable information on the *context* of offending, and the important components of the “criminal event” that compose the nature and circumstances of the act isn’t provided. Contextual analysis has been an important component of criminological research. The development of ecological theory highlighted the importance of structural contextual elements conducive to crime in certain geographic areas. More recently, study of situational analysis and the “criminal event” has advanced important contextual factors in criminological theories of criminal opportunity such as routine activity and rational choice theory (Kennedy & Van Brunschot, 2001; Warr, 2001).

Examination of the context of the “criminal event,” with respect to gender differences in juvenile offending has been limited. The findings of this study

underscore the importance of researching the context of offending by gender. Results indicate that females offend in fewer settings and in different manners than their male counterparts. For example, the analysis reflects that theft offenses committed by females occur in fewer settings and in different manners than males. Females in the study primarily committed theft offenses in department stores at shopping malls, and they were much more likely than males to commit such offenses with other individuals rather than alone. Furthermore, the results indicate that for less serious forms of delinquent behavior, such as skipping school and running away from home, the incidence and prevalence of such offenses are very similar for both genders. Such findings impact not only the development of delinquency theory, but also play an important role in the evaluation of gender differences in juvenile justice processing.

Gender differences in the commission of delinquent and criminal offenses are widely acknowledged. However, the study of the etiology of such differences has resulted in three trends in delinquency research. A number of scholars have argued that traditional male-oriented delinquency theories are appropriate for studying female participation in delinquent and criminal acts. On the other hand, other scholars refute the application of traditional theories to females, and advocate the development of gender-specific theories focusing on female criminality. The third theoretical trend supports the potential utility of traditional male-oriented theories, but encourages the inclusion of those special contexts

and structures that lend themselves to female delinquency and criminality into existing theoretical research.

With respect to theory development, the findings of this study generally indicate there are few significant gender differences in the prevalence, incidence and context of offending for the more minor forms of status and delinquent behaviors that need to be explained by delinquency theory. Collectively, these findings draw into question the development of gender specific or specialized theories to account for such behavior, and tentatively support the position that traditional male oriented theories may adequately explain female participation in status and less serious offenses. One notable exception is the finding that females in this study offend in fewer settings and often in different manners for theft offenses than males. Consequently, delinquency theories drawing from control perspectives focusing on variables that constrain and limit female participation in delinquent activities appear to be fruitful avenues of research. By identifying the contextual elements associated with gender and specific delinquency offenses, theories of delinquency will more accurately identify factors for the purpose of crime prevention and control. For more serious forms of criminal behavior, significant differences existed in the prevalence, incidence and context of offending, with males dominating the theft and assault offense categories. As such, theories of serious criminal behavior must continue to explore why males dominate these offenses and why contextual differences exist among males and females who participate in such behaviors. This research

lends tentative support for the development of traditional theories that incorporate the contexts and structures that are unique to male and female delinquency and criminality.

The findings of this research are also important for the study of gender differences in juvenile justice processing. Research on processing at arrest, detention and sentencing stages has revealed significant differences in outcomes for male and female delinquents. This is especially true for juveniles charged with *status offenses*--research finds girls are more likely than boys to be referred and arrested for these offenses and have a greater likelihood of adjudication and placement within the juvenile justice system. Such findings suggest that parents, police and juvenile justice officials continue to respond differently to comparable behaviors of boys and girls. The examination of two status offenses in this study—skipping school and running away from home—demonstrate little contextual variation by gender. However, the finding that females were significantly more likely to be caught skipping school and receive a school suspension than males support research demonstrating sex-stereotyped responses to minor misbehaviors of females. The lack of significant contextual gender differences in the commission of status offenses explored in this study raises critical questions pertaining to the differentiated responses that the juvenile justice system has to male and female status offenders. Justifications of differentiated treatment of male and female status offenders based on claims that these offenses are committed in divergent manners and thus require appropriate

gender-specific system responses, are quite questionable in the light of the results of this study.

This study has the following limitations. One critical issue, pertinent to this study as well as to most school-based samples, is that the number of cases for serious offenses becomes very small as seriousness increases from theft to violent offenses. The contextual analysis was significantly reduced to only examining six of the twenty-five offenses included in this study as a result of insufficient cases to allow for statistical analysis. This is even more problematic given that an important component of this research is examination of female offending. Since the prevalence of female participation in delinquent and criminal offenses is much lower than males, the analysis was limited to only a few cases in many of the offenses under study, particularly in the more serious violent offenses. As such, in view of the small sample sizes in these categories, conclusions must be made with caution. Future school-based research would benefit from larger sample sizes that would increase the reliability of statistical analysis.

Despite the limitations discussed above, this research has significantly contributed to delinquency literature in the following ways. First, this study's examination of contextual elements of delinquent and criminal offending and gender differences in the context of offending provides valuable information for current research in the criminal event perspective (CEP) (see Meier, Kennedy & Sacco, 2001). This perspective focuses on the interrelatedness of offenders,

victims and contexts within which they interact, and pursues a broader paradigm of those factors (both close to and removed from the act) that encourage and restrict criminal and delinquent behavior. The examination of contextual elements such as whether the crime was committed alone or with others, the structure of the victim and offender relationship and the various outcomes of the event are thus important components of the criminal event perspective. Furthermore, this study's focus on gender differences in the context of offending highlights how gender impacts the structural and social conditions that are related to commission of delinquent and criminal acts.

Second, this study has also contributed to the dearth of research on the context of offending by gender. While "context" has played an important role in theoretical research examining the structural and social contextual dimensions of deviant and criminal behavior, the study of gender and its relationship to the context of the criminal event has been limited. However, this study may well provide the catalyst to examine existing self-report data that include follow-up questions that could provide valuable information pertaining to the study of gender the context of delinquent and criminal offenses. In addition, the existing research on gender and context, including the work by Triplett and Myers (1995), has been limited to a narrow set of questions pertaining to the context of the criminal event. This study expanded contextual analysis to include important variables such as the setting of the offense, whether the offense was committed alone or with others, whether or not the offender was caught, and if caught, the

outcome of the apprehension. Furthermore, this study expanded the examination of delinquent and criminal behavior to include twenty-five acts among four offense categories: status/minor misbehaviors, vandalism, property/theft offenses, and violent offenses. Consequently, the self-report data of this study does not suffer from one of the main problems with earlier self-report scales—the omission of serious delinquent and criminal events. The inclusion of serious delinquent and criminal offenses in this study thus properly represents the “domain” of juvenile offending, and permits conclusory statements focused on juvenile offending that may be broadly construed.

Third, the findings from the analysis of the prevalence, incidence and context of offending by gender, addresses current debates over the use of traditional male-oriented theories and gender-specific theories to explain female participation in delinquent and criminal behaviors. The finding of few gender differences in status and minor offenses included in this study provides tentative support for the application of traditional theories to female offenders. However, the findings of significant gender differences for more serious theft and violent offenses is cautiously supportive of the development of “modified” traditional theories, as well as gender-specific theories of serious offending.

Fourth, the analysis of contextual variables associated with status offenses provides valuable information that will allow for more accurate development and specification of tests for gender bias in status offense processing within the juvenile justice system. Even though recent research has

demonstrated a greater equitableness in the treatment and processing of male and female status offenders, evidence of the use of judicial contempt powers to mandate punitive sanctions for those who are essentially status offenders dictates the need for critical examination of offending patterns by gender.

Research incorporating detailed contextual information in studies that follow each stage of juvenile justice processing will more fully explain the effects of gender in juvenile justice decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Adler, F. (1975). Sisters in crime. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ageton, S. (1983). The dynamics of female delinquency, 1976-1980. Criminology, 21 (4), 555-584.
- Agnew, R., & Brezina, T. (1997). Relational problems with peers, gender, and delinquency. Youth and Society, 29 (1), 84-111.
- Armstrong, G. (1977). Females under the law—"protected" but unequal. Crime and Delinquency, 23 (2), 109-120.
- Bainbridge, W.S., & Crutchfield, R.D. (1983). Sex role ideology and delinquency. Sociological Perspectives, 26 (3), 253-274.
- Balken, S., & Berger, R.J. (1979). The changing nature of female delinquency. Los Angeles: University of California, Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP).
- Ball, J. C., Ross, A., & Simpson, A. (1964). Incidence and estimated prevalence of recorded delinquency in a metropolitan area. American Sociological Review, 29 (1), 90-92.
- Barnhorst, S. (1978). Female delinquency and the role of women. Canadian Journal of Family Law, 1 (2), 254-273.
- Bartek, S.E., Krebs, D.L., & Taylor, M. C. (1993). Coping, defending, and the relations between moral judgment and moral behavior in prostitutes and other female delinquents. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102, 66-73.

Barton, W.H. (1976). Discretionary decision making in juvenile justice. Crime and Delinquency, 22 (2), 470-480.

Bell, S. J. (1994). An empirical approach to theoretical perspectives on sentencing in a young offender court. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 31 (1), 36-64.

Berger, R.R. (1994). Illinois juvenile justice: An emerging dual system. Crime & Delinquency, 40 (1), 54-68.

Bernard, M.A. (1969). Self-image and delinquency: A contribution to the study of female criminality and women's image. Acta Criminologica: Etudes sur la Conduite Antisociale, 2, 71-144.

Bethel, E. R. (2000). Female juvenile criminal careers, the dark side of adolescence. Greenwood, SC: Lander University, Southern Sociological Society (SSS).

Bishop, D.M., & Frazier, C.E. (1992). Gender bias in juvenile justice processing: Implications of the JJDP Act. Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 82 (4), 1162-1186.

Black, D.J. (1980). The manners and customs of the police. New York: Academic Press.

Bowers, L.B., & Min, D. (1990). Traumas precipitating female delinquency: Implications for assessment, practice and policy. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 7 (5), 389-402.

Britt, C.L. (2000). Social context and racial disparities in punishment decisions. Justice Quarterly, 17 (4), 707-732.

Brotherton, D.C. (1996). Smartness, toughness, and autonomy: Drug use in the context of gang female delinquency. Journal of Drug Issues, 26 (1), 261-278.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1995). Reporting Crimes to the Police. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Campbell, A. (1981). Girl delinquents. Oxford: Blackwell.

Canter, R. (1982a). Family correlates of male and female delinquency. Criminology, 20 (2), 149-167.

Canter, R. (1982b). Sex differences in self-reported delinquency. Criminology, 20 (3-4), 373-393.

Caspi, A., Lynam, D., & Moffitt, T.E. (1993). Unraveling girls' delinquency: Biological, dispositional, and contextual contributions to adolescent misbehavior. Developmental Psychology, 29 (1), 19-30.

Cernkovich, S., & Giordano, P. (1979). A comparative analysis of male and female delinquency. Sociological Quarterly, 20 (1), 131-145.

Champion, D. (1998). The juvenile justice system: Delinquency, processing and the law. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1973). Judicial enforcement of the female sex role: The family court and the female delinquent. Issues in Criminology, 8 (2), 51-69.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1977). Judicial paternalism and the female status offender: Training women to know their place. Crime and Delinquency, 23 (2), 121-130.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1986). Female offenders: Paternalism reexamined. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Youth Development and Research Center.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Girls in jails. Crime and Delinquency, 34 (2), 156-168.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. Crime and Delinquency, 35 (1), 5-29.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). The female offender: Girls, women, and crime. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chesney-Lind, M. (1999). Challenging girl's invisibility in juvenile court. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 564, 185-202.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Hagedorn, J.M. (Eds.). (1999). Female gangs in America. Chicago: Lake View Press.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R.G. (1992). Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Cloward, R.A., & Ohlin, L.E. (1960). Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, L.E., & Kluegel, J.R. (1979). Selecting delinquents for adjudication: An analysis of intake screening decisions in two metropolitan juvenile courts. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16 (1), 143-163.

Cohen, A. (1955). Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. American Sociological Review 44, 558-608.

Conway, A., & Bogdan, C. (1977). Sexual delinquency: The persistence of a double standard. Crime and Delinquency, 23 (2), 130-135.

Conway, M.R., & Lohr, S.L. (1994). A longitudinal analysis of factors associated with reporting violent crimes to the police. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 10 (1), 23-39.

Corley, C.J., Cernkovich, S., & Giordano, P.C. (1989). Sex and the likelihood of sanction. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 80 (2), 540-556.

Cowie, J., Cowie, V., & Slater, E. (1968). Delinquency in girls. London: Heinemann.

Crew, K.B. (1991). Sex differences in criminal sentencing: Chivalry or patriarch? Justice Quarterly, 6 (2), 23-44.

Curran, D.J. (1984). The myth of the "new" female delinquent. Crime and Delinquency, 30, (3) 386-399.

Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. Justice Quarterly, 5 (4), 497-535.

Datesman, S.K., Scarpitti, F.R. (1975). Female delinquency and broken homes. Criminology, 13 (1), 33-56.

Datesman, S.K., & Scarpitti, F.R., & Stephenson, R.M. (1975). Female delinquency: An application of self and opportunity theories. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 12 (2), 107-123.

Decker, S.R., Wright, R., Redfearn, A., & Smith, D. (1993). A woman's place is in the home: Females and residential burglary. Justice Quarterly, 10 (1), 143-162.

Deschenes, E.P., & Esbensen, F.A. (1999). Violence and gangs: Gender differences in perceptions and behavior. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 15 (1), 53-96.

DeZolt, E.M. (1991). Institutional response to female delinquency: Can the myths be broken? Association paper, North Central Sociological Association (NCSA).

Elliot, D. S. (1988). Gender delinquency and society. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Elliot, D.S. (1994). Serious violent offenders: Onset, developmental course, and termination. Criminology, 32 (1), 1-21.

Elliot, D.S., & Ageton, S.S. (1979). Reconciling race and class differences in self-report and official estimates of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 45 (1), 95-100.

Elliot, D. S., & Huizinga, D. (1983). Social class and delinquent behavior in a national youth panel. Criminology, 21 (2), 149-177.

Esbensen, F.A., & Deschenes, E.P. (1998). A multi-site examination of youth gang membership: Does gender matter? Criminology, 36 (4), 799-827.

Farnworth, M., & Teske, R. (1995). Women and Criminal Justice, 6 (2), 23-44.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1993). Crime in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Fenwick, C.R. (1982). Juvenile court intake decision-making: The importance of family affiliation. Journal of Criminal Justice, 10 (6), 443-452.

Figueira-McDonough, J. (1984). Feminism and delinquency. British Journal of Criminology, 24 (4), 325-342.

Figueira-McDonough, J. (1987). Discrimination or sex differences? Criteria for evaluating the juvenile justice systems handling of minor offenses. Crime and Delinquency, 33 (3), 403-424.

Figueira-McDonough, J., Barton, W., & Sarri, R. (1981). Normal deviance: gender similarities in adolescent subcultures. In M. Warren (Ed.), Comparing Male and Female Offenders. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Gibbons, D.C. (1979). The criminological enterprise: Theories and perspectives. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Giordano, P.C., & Rockwell, S.M. (2000). Differential association theory and female crime. In S. S. Simpson (Ed.), Of crime and criminality: The use of theory in everyday life. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Glick, B., & Goldstein, A.P. (Eds.). (1995). Managing delinquency: Programs that work. Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.

Gottfredson, D.C., McNeil, R.J., III, & Gottfredson, G.D. (1991). Social area influence on delinquency: A multilevel analysis. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28 (2), 197-226.

Gottfredson, M.R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). A general theory of crime. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Greenberg, M.S., Wilson, C.E., Ruback, B.R., & Mills, M.K. (1979). Social and emotional determinants of victim crime reporting. Social Psychology Quarterly, 42 (4), 364-372.

Hagan, J.R. (1991). Destiny and drift: Subcultural preferences, status attainments, and the risk and rewards of youth. American Sociological Review, 56 (5), 567-582.

Hagan, J.R., Gillis, A.R., & Simpson, J. (1998). The class structure of gender and delinquency: Toward a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. In G. Barak (Ed.), Integrative Criminology (pp. 215-242). Brookfield, VT: Ashgate

Hardt, R.H., & Peterson-Hardt, S. (1977). On determining the quality of the delinquency self-report method. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14 (2), 247-259.

Hecht-Schafran, L. (1986). Educating the judiciary about gender bias: The national judicial education program to promote equality for women and men. Women's Rights Law Reporter, 9 (109), 109-124.

Heidensohn, F.M. (1968). The deviance of women: A critique and inquiry. British Journal of Sociology, 19 (2), 160-176.

Heimer, K. (1996). Gender, interaction, and delinquency: Testing a theory of differential social control. Social Psychology, 59 (1), 39-61.

Hindelang, M.J., Hirschi, T., & Weis, J.G. (1979). Correlates of delinquency: The illusion of discrepancy between self-report and official measures. American Sociological Review, 44, 995-1014.

Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoffman, J.P., & Su, S.S. (1997). The conditional effects of stress on delinquency and drug use: A strain theory assessment of sex differences. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34 (1), 46-78.

Horowitz, R., & Pottieger, A.E. (1991). Gender bias in juvenile justice handling of seriously crime-involved youths. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28 (1), 75-100.

Hoyt, S., & Scherer, D.G. (1998). Female juvenile delinquency: Misunderstood by the juvenile justice system, neglected by social science. Law and Human Behavior, 22 (1), 81-107.

James, J., & Thornton, W. E. (1980). Women's liberation and the female delinquent. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 17 (2), 230-244.

Jensen, G.J., & Eve, R. (1976). Sex differences in delinquency. Criminology, 13 (4), 427-448.

Johnson, D.R., & Scheuble, L.K. (1991). Gender bias in the disposition of juvenile court referrals: The effects of time and location. Criminology, 29 (4), 677-699.

Kennedy, L.W. & Van Brunschot, E.G. (2001). Routines and the Criminal Event. In R.F. Meier, L.W. Kennedy, & V.F. Sacco (Eds.), The process and structure of crime: Criminal events and crime analysis (pp. 29-46). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Konopka, G. (1966). The Adolescent Girl in Conflict. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Koons, B.A. (2001). Gender and justice in sentencing decisions: An analysis of the impact of traditional gender expectations on sentencing outcomes for female felony offenders in the state of Minnesota. Dissertation Abstracts International, 61 (8), 3361-A. (University Microfilms No. DA9985411).

Kratcoski, P.C., & Kratcoski, J.E. (1975). Changing patterns in the delinquent activities of boys and girls: A self-reported delinquency analysis. Adolescence, 10 (37), 81-91.

Krohn, M.D., Curry, J.P., & Nelson-Kilger, S. (1983). Is chivalry dead? An analysis of changes in police dispositions of male and females. Criminology, 21 (3), 417-437.

LaGrange, T.C., & Silverman, R.A. (1999). Low self-control and opportunity: Testing the general theory of crime as an explanation for the gender differences in delinquency. Criminology, 37 (1), 41-72.

Lamiell, J.T. (1979). Discretion in juvenile justice: A framework for systematic study. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6 (1), 76-101.

Lauritsen, J.L. (2001). The social ecology of violent victimization: Individual and contextual effects in the NCVS. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 17 (1), 3-32.

Leonard, E.B. (1982). Women, Crime, and Society: A Critique of Theoretical Criminology. New York: Longman.

Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F.T., & Ball, R.A. (1995). Criminological theory: Context and Consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Loeber, R., Kalb, L., & Huizinga, D. (2001). Juvenile delinquency and serious injury victimization. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Loper, A.B., & Cornell, D. G. (1996). Homicide by juvenile girls. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 5 (3), 323-336.

Lopez, V.A., & Emmer, E.T. (2000). Adolescent male offenders: A grounded theory study of cognition, emotion, and delinquent crime contexts. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 27 (3), 292-311.

McCarthy, B., Hagan, B., & Woodward, T.S. (1999). In the company of women: Structure and agency in a revised power-control theory of gender and delinquency. Criminology, 37 (4), 761-788.

Maguire, K., & Pastore, A.L., (Eds.). (2002). Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (Online). Available: <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/> (July, 2002).

Meier, R.F., Kennedy, L.W., & Sacco, V.F. (2001). The process and structure of crime: Criminal events and crime analysis. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Miethe, T.D., & Meier, R.F. (1994). Crime and its social context: Toward an integrated theory of offenders, victims, and situations. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Menard, S., & Elliot, D.S. (1994). Delinquent bonding, moral beliefs, and illegal behavior: A three-wave panel model. Justice Quarterly, 11 (2), 173-188.

Morris, R.R. (1964). Female delinquency and relational problems. Social Forces, 43, 82-89.

Myers, S.L. (1980). Why are crimes underreported? What is the crime rate? Does it really matter? Social Science Quarterly, 61 (1), 23-43.

Naffine, N. (1987). Female crime: The construction of women in criminology. London: Allen & Unwin.

Nakhaie, M.R., Silverman, R.A., & LaGrange, T.C. (2000). Self-control and social control: An examination of gender, ethnicity, class and delinquency. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 25 (1), 35-59.

Norland, S., Shover, N., Thornton, W.E., & James, J. (1979). Intrafamily conflict and delinquency. Pacific Sociological Review, 22 (2), 223-237.

O'Brien, R. (1985). Crime and victimization data. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Odem, M. (1991). Single mothers, delinquent daughters, and the juvenile court in early 20th century Los Angeles. Journal of Social History, 25 (1), 27-43.

Paetsch, J. J., & Bertrand, L.D. Victimization and delinquency among Canadian youth. Adolescence, 34 (134), 351-367.

Paternoster, R., & Triplett, R. (1988). Disaggregating self-reported delinquency and its implications for theory. Criminology, 26 (4), 591-625.

Pawlak, E.J. (1977). Differential selection of juveniles for detention. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14 (6), 152-165.

Poe-Yamagata, E., & Butts, J.A. (1996). Female offenders in the juvenile justice system: Statistics summary. Washington, DC. : U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Pope, C. E., & Feyerherm, W. H. (1983). Gender bias in juvenile court dispositions. Social Science Research, 6 (1), 186-215.

Reese, W.A., and Curtis, R.L., Jr. (1991). Paternalism and the female status offender: Remanding the juvenile justice double standard for desexualization. Social Science Journal, 28 (1), 63-83.

Rhode, D. L. (1989). Justice and gender: Sex discrimination and the law. London: Harvard University Press.

Richards, P. (1981). Quantitative and qualitative sex differences in middle-class delinquency. Criminology, 18 (4), 453-470.

Robbers, M.L. (2000). An interdisciplinary examination of juvenile delinquency. Dissertation Abstracts International, 60 (7), 2686-A. (University Microfilms International No. DA9940003).

Rosenbaum, J.L. (1987). Social control, gender and delinquency: An analysis of drug, property and violent offenders. Justice Quarterly, 4 (1), 117-132.

Rosenbaum, J.L., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1994). Appearance and delinquency: A research note. Crime and Delinquency, 40 (2), 250-261.

Rowe, D.C., Vaxsonyi, A. T., & Flannery, D.J. (1995). Sex differences in crime: Do means and within-sex variation have similar causes? Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 32 (1), 84-100.

Rubin, T.H. (1977). The juvenile court's search for identity and responsibility. Crime and Delinquency, 23 (1), 1-13.

Sacco, V.F., & Kennedy, L.W. (1991). The criminal event: Perspectives in space and time. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sampson, R.J. (1985). Sex differences in self-reported delinquency and official records: A multiple-group structural modeling approach. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 1 (4), 345-367.

Scahill, M. C. (2000). Female delinquency cases, 1997. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Schlossman, S., & Wallach, S. (1978). The crime of precocious sexuality: Female juvenile delinquency in the progressive era. Harvard Educational Review, 48 (1), 65-94.

Schwartz, I.R. (1989). The incarceration of girls: Paternalism or juvenile crime control? Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Youth Policy.

Sealock, M.D., & Simpson, S.S. (1998). Unraveling bias in arrest decisions: The role of juvenile offender type-scripts. Justice Quarterly, 15 (3), 427-457.

Segrave, J.O., & Hastad, D.N. (1985). Evaluating three models of delinquency causation for males and females: Strain theory, subculture theory, and control theory. Sociological Focus, 18 (1), 1-53.

Shannon, L.W. (1979). Changing trends in male and female juvenile delinquency and adult crime. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa, Iowa Urban Community Research Center.

Sheley, J.F. (1991). Criminology. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Shoemaker, D.J. (1990). Theories of delinquency: An examination of explanations of delinquent behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sickmund, M., Snyder, H.N., & Poe, Y.E. (1997). Juvenile Offenders and victims: 1997 update on violence. Washington, DC.: U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Simon, R.J. (1975). Women and Crime. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Simons, R.L., Miller, M.G., & Aigner, S.M. (1980). Contemporary theories of deviance and female delinquency: An empirical test. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 17 (1), 42-57.

Simpson, S.S. (1989). Feminist theory, crime and justice. Criminology, 27 (4), 605-631.

Singer, S.I. (1988). The fear of reprisal and the failure of victims to report a personal crime. Howard Journal Of Criminal Justice, 31 (3), 192-199.

Smart, C. (1979). The new female criminal: Reality or myth? British Journal of Criminology, 19 (1), 50-59.

Smith, D.A. (1979). Sex and deviance: An assessment of major sociological variables. Sociological Quarterly, 20 (2), 183-195.

Smith, D.A., & Paternoster, R. (1987). The gender gap in theories of deviance: Issues and evidence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 24 (2), 140-172.

Spohn, C. (1999). Gender and sentencing of drug offenders: Is chivalry dead? Criminal Justice Policy Review, 9 (3 & 4), 365-399.

Steffensmeier, D.J. (1978). Crime and the contemporary woman: An analysis of the changing levels of female property crime, 1960-75. Social Forces, 57 (2), 566-584.

Steffensmeier, D.J. (1980). Sex differences in patterns of adult crime, 1960-1978. Social Forces, 58 (4), 1080-1108.

Steffensmeier, D.J., & Allan, E. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. Annual Review of Sociology, 22, 459-487.

Steffensmeier, D.J., & Steffensmeier, R.H. (1980). Trends in female delinquency. Criminology, 18 (1), 62-85.

Snyder, H.N. (1988). Court careers of juvenile offenders. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Snyder, H.N., & Sickmund, M. (1999). Juvenile offenders and victims: 1999 national report. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Teilmann, K.S., & Landry, P.H., Jr. (1981). Gender bias in juvenile justice. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28 (1), 47-80.

Thornberry, T.P., & Krohn, M.D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring crime and delinquency. In D. Duffee, R.D. Crutchfield, S. Mastrofski, L. Mazerolle, D. McDowall, & B. Ostrom (Eds.), CJ 2000: Innovations in measurement and analysis. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Thornberry, T.P., Lizotte, A.J., Krohn, M.D., Farnworth, M., & Jang, S.J. (1991). Testing interactional theory: An examination of reciprocal causal

relationships among family, school and delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 82 (1), 3-35.

Thornton, W.E. (1982). Gender traits and delinquency involvement of boys and girls. Adolescence, 17 (68), 749-767.

Thornton, W.E., & James, J. (1979). Masculinity and delinquency revisited. British Journal of Criminology, 19 (3), 225-241.

Tracey, P.E. (1978). An analysis of the incidence and seriousness of self-reported delinquency and crime. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Microfilms International.

Triplett, R., & Myers, L.A. (1995). Evaluating contextual patterns of delinquency: gender-based differences. Justice Quarterly, 12 (1), 59-79.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2000). Uniform crime reporting program data (United States): Supplementary homicide reports, 2000 (Computer file). (2002). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1995). Juvenile justice: Minimal gender bias occurred in processing noncriminal juveniles. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Vigorita, M.S. (2001). Prior offense type and the probability of incarceration: The importance of current offence type and sentencing jurisdiction. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 17 (2), 167-193.

Wade, T.J. & Brannigan, A. (1998). Changing patterns of adolescent female delinquency: Dilemmas within the control perspective? Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP).

Warr, M. (2001). Crime opportunity: A theoretical essay. In R.F. Meier, L.W. Kennedy, & V.F. Sacco (Eds.), The process and structure of crime: Criminal events and crime analysis. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Warren, M. Q. (1981). Comparing Female and Male Offenders. London: Sage Publications.

Wattenberg, W.W., & Saunders, F. (1954). Sex differences among juvenile offenders. Sociology and Social Research, 39, 24-31.

Weis, J.G. (1976). Liberation and crime: The invention of the new female criminal. Crime and Social Justice, 6, 17-27.

White, H.R., & LaGrange, R.L. (1987). An assessment of gender effects in self-report delinquency. Sociological Focus, 20 (3), 195-213.

Wright, R.A. (1992). From vamps and tramps to teases and flirts: Stereotypes of women in criminology textbooks, 1956 to 1965 and 1981 to 1990. Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 3 (2), 223-235.

Vedder, C.B., & Somerville, D.B. (1970). The Delinquent Girl. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

APPENDIX A CATEGORICAL MEASURES OF THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING

Comparison of Triplett & Myers Study and Present Study

Triplett & Myers

Status

Running away from home
 Time away from home
 Overnight
 Destination
 Distance
 Skipping school
 Length of time

Vandalism

Damage family property
 Drugs
 Damage school property
 Drugs
 Damage other property
 Drugs

Theft

Take vehicle
 Kind stolen
 Vehicle owner
 How started
 Drugs

Cunningham

Status

Running away from home
 Time away from home
 Spend time
 *
 Skipping school
 Length of time
 Spend time
 *

Vandalism

Damage bus shelter**
 Damage traffic sign**
 Damage telephone booth**
 Damage window**
 Damage public trash can**
 Damage street light**
 Damage school furniture**
 Damage trees, plants, or flowers**
 Damage seat in bus**
 Damage private car**
 Damage bicycle**
 Damage motorcycle**
 Damage something else, namely**

Graffiti**

Theft

Steal from tele/vend
 What was it
 Setting
 *
 Steal from store

* includes variables not listed: (1) Age of first offense; (2) Police find out; (3) Commit alone/others; (4) If caught, by whom; (5) If caught, what happened.

** includes variables listed directly above and: (6) Object(s) Destroyed/damaged; (7) Owner of object(s); (8) Setting.

Triplett & MyersTheft (cont'd)

Steal less than \$50
 Drugs
 Steal \$5-\$50
 Actually steal
 Drugs
 Steal more than \$5
 Actually steal
 Drugs
 Steal from family
 What stolen
 Drugs
 Drugs
 Steal from school
 Actually steal
 Drugs
 Buy stolen goods
 What done with
 Break into a building
 Actually break into
 Broke into what
 Reason for break-in
 Drugs

CunninghamTheft (cont'd)

Steal from store
 What was taken
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 Steal from school
 What was taken
 Owner of object (s)
 *
 Steal from home
 What was taken
 Owner of objects(s)
 *
 Steal from work
 What was taken
 Owner of object(s)
 *
 Steal bicycle, moped, motorcycle
 What was taken
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 What was done with
 *
 Steal vehicle
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 What was done with
 *
 Steal from vehicle
 What was taken
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 *
 Pickpocketing
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 *
 Snatching bag or purse
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 *

* includes variables not listed: (1) Age of first offense; (2) Police find out; (3) Commit alone/others;(4) If caught, by whom; (5) If caught, what happened.

Triplett & Myers**Cunningham**

Theft (cont'd)

Breaking into house, yard, building

What kind of building

Was something taken

Owner of object(s)

Was damaged committed

Setting

*

Steal something else

Where did it happen

*

Buying stolen goods(s)

What was bought

From whom bought

Where did it happen

*

Selling stolen goods(s)

What was sold

Who sold to

Where did it happen

*

Assault

Carry a hidden weapon

Kind of weapon

Reason for carrying

Attack someone

Form of attack

Hurt victim

Extent of injury

Drugs

Hit parent

Actually hit

Hurt victim

Extent of injury

Drugs

Hit teacher

Actually hit

Hurt victim

Assault

Carry a weapon

Kind of weapon

Setting

*

Threaten with weapon

Kind of weapon

What taken

Owner of object(s)/money

Setting

*

Public fighting/disturbance

Kind of situation

Weapon used/if so, what kind

Damage to object(s)/person(s)

Setting

*

* includes variables not listed: (1) Age of first offense; (2) Police find out; (3) Commit alone/others; (4) If caught, by whom; (5) If caught, what happened.

Triplett & Myers**Assault (cont'd)**

Extent of injury
 Drugs
 Hit students
 Actually hit
 Hurt victim
 Extent of injury
 Drugs
 Force students
 Type of force
 Purpose of force
 Hurt victim
 Extent of injury
 Injure with weapon
 Drugs
 Force others
 Type of force
 Purpose of force
 Hurt victim
 Drugs

Cunningham**Assault (cont'd)**

Setting fire intentionally
 What was it
 Owner of object(s)
 Setting
 *
 Beat up non-family
 Weapon used/if so, kind
 Kind of medical help
 Who was victim
 Setting
 *
 Beat up family
 Weapon used/if so, kind
 Kind of medical help
 Who was victim
 Setting
 *
 Hurt with weapons
 Kind of weapon
 Kind of medical help
 Who was victim
 Setting
 *

* includes variables not listed: (1) Age of first offense; (2) Police find out; (3) Commit alone/others; (4) If caught, by whom; (5) If caught, what happened.

**APPENDIX B
CONTINUOUS MEASURES OF THE CONTEXT OF OFFENDING**

Comparison of Triplett & Myers Study and Present Study

Triplett & Myers

Vandalism

Damage family property
 Value of property damaged
 Damage school property
 Value of property damaged
 Damage other property
 Value of property damaged

Theft

Steal more than \$5
 Value stolen
 Steal \$5
 Value
 Steal from family
 Amount of money stolen
 Steal at school
 Value stolen
 Buy stolen goods
 Value stolen

Cunningham

Vandalism

Damage bus shelter
 Value of property damaged
 Damage traffic sign
 Value of property damaged
 Damage telephone booth
 Value of property damaged
 Damage window
 Value of property damaged
 Damage public trash can
 Value of property damaged
 Damage street light
 Value of property damaged
 Damage school furniture
 Value of property damaged
 Damage trees, plants, or flowers
 Value of property damaged
 Damage seat in bus
 Value of property damaged
 Damage private car
 Value of property damaged
 Damage bicycle
 Value of property damaged
 Damage motorcycle
 Value of property damaged
 Damage something else, namely
 Value of property damaged

Theft

Steal from phone/vending machine
 Value stolen
 Steal from store
 Value stolen
 Steal from school
 Value stolen
 Steal from home
 Value stolen
 Steal from work
 Value stolen
 Steal bicycle, moped, or motorcycle

Triplett & MyersTheft (cont'd.)CunninghamTheft (cont'd.)

Value stolen
Steal vehicle
 Value stolen
Steal from vehicle
 Value stolen
Pickpocketing
 Value stolen
Snatch bag, purse, other
 Value stolen
Break into house, yard, building
 Value stolen
Stealing something else
 Value stolen
Buying stolen object(s)
 Value paid for
 Actual (shop) value
Selling stolen object (s)
 Value received for
 Actual (shop) value

.APPENDIX C

International Study of Youth Questionnaire

INTERNATIONAL STUDY
OF YOUTH

Date of Interview _____ 7-12/_____
Mo Day Year _____

Time of Interview

Start _____ 13-16/_____
Finish _____ 17-20/_____
Interviewer Initials _____ 21-22/_____
Editor/Supervisor Initials _____ 23-24/_____
School _____ 25-26/_____

Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska

(3-11-94) - Form H

PART 2A: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL QUESTIONS ON MISBEHAVIOR

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/03

INTERVIEWER:

Many young people do things that are not usually permitted. We would like to know if you 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)no (2)yes 010. | Did you ever stay away from school for at least a whole day without a legitimate excuse? | 7/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 020. | Did you ever run away from home to stay somewhere else for one or more nights without your parents or guardian's permission? | 8/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 040. | Did you ever travel on a bus without paying? | 9/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 060. | Did you ever drive a car, a motorcycle or a moped without a license or insurance? | 10/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 070. | Did you ever write or spray graffiti on walls, buses, bus seats, shelters, etc.? | 11/___ |

<if one or more of these things has/have been answered positively:>

INTERVIEWER:

You have indicated that you have done one or more of these things. Now I would like to ask you some details about them.

PART 3A: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON MISBEHAVIOR

You mentioned staying away from school for at least a whole day, without a legitimate excuse.

011. At what age did you do it for the first time? 12-13/___
 ___ years old

011b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 14/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

012. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 15/___
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) ___ times 16-18/___

014. Speaking about the last time, how many days did you stay away? 19-20/___
 ___ days

016. Where did you spend most of the time? 21/___
 (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

017. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 22/___
 (1) alone
 (2) with (approx.) ___ others 23-24/___

018. Were you caught? 25/___
 (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

019. What happened to you when you were caught? 26/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned running away from home to stay somewhere else for one or more nights without your parent's or guardian's permission.

021. At what age did you do it for the first time? 27-28/___
 ___ years old
- 021b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 29/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
022. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 30/___
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) _____ times 31-32/___
024. Speaking about the last time, how many nights did you stay away? 33-34/___
 ___ nights
026. Where did you spend most of the time? 35/___
 (1) some place within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____
027. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 36/___
 (1) alone
 (2) with (approx.) ___ others 37-38/___
028. Were you brought back? 29/___
 (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
029. What happened to you when you were caught? 40/___

- o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned traveling on a bus without paying.

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

41-42/ __ __

__ years old

041b Did the police ever find out that you did it?

43/ __

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

042. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

44/ __

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) __ times

45-46/ __ __

047. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

47/ __

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

48-49/ __ __

048. Were you caught?

50/ __

(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

049. What happened to you when you were caught?

51/ __

o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned driving a car, a motorcycle or a moped without a license or insurance.

061. At what age did you do it for the first time? 52-53/___
___ years old
- 061b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 54/___
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
062. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 55/___
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times 56-57/___
063. Speaking about the last time, what did you drive? 58/___
(1) moped
(2) motorcycle
(3) car
(4) other, namely: _____
066. Where did you drive mainly, this last time? 59/___
(1) near home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) to a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____
067. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 60/___
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others 61-62/___
068. Were you caught? 63/___
(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
069. What happened to you when you were caught? 64/___
o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned writing or spraying graffiti on walls, buses, bus seats, shelters, etc..

071. At what age did you do it for the first time? 65-66/___
___ years old

071b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 67/___
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

072. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 68/___
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times 69-70/___

076. Where did you do this, this last time? 71/___

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
- (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
- (3) downtown or in the city center
- (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

077. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 72/___
(1) alone 73-74/___
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

078. Were you caught? 75/___
(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

079. What happened to you when you were caught? 76/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)

PART 2B: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL QUESTIONS ON VANDALISM

ID 1-4/____
Lines 5-6/04

INTERVIEWER:

Now I want to ask you about vandalism. I will read to you a list of objects and please tell me if you ever damaged or destroyed any one of these objects.

- Did you ever damage or destroy on purpose
- | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------|
| (1)no (2)yes 090. | a bus shelter? | 7/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 100. | a traffic sign? | 8/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 110. | a telephone booth? | 9/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 120. | a window? | 10/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 130. | a (public) trash can? | 11/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 140. | a street light? | 12/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 150. | school furniture? | 13/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 160. | trees, plants or flowers in parks or public gardens? | 14/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 170. | a seat in bus? | 15/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 180. | a private car? | 16/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 190. | someone's bicycle? | 17/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 200. | someone's motorcycle? | 18/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 210. | something else belonging to someone else? | 19/___ |

<if one or more of these things has/have been answered positively:>

INTERVIEWER:

You have indicated that you have done one or more of these things. Now I would like to ask you some details about them.

PART 3B: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON VANDALISM

You mentioned damaging or destroying things.

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

20-21/____

091b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

22/____

092. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

23/____

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) _____ times

24-25/____

093. Speaking about the last time, what was it?

26-27/____

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (01) bus shelter | (02) traffic sign |
| (03) telephone booth | (04) window |
| (05) (public) trash can | (06) street light |
| (07) school furniture | (08) trees, plants, or flowers |
| (09) seat in bus | (10) private car |
| (11) bicycle | (12) motorcycle |
| (13) something else, namely: _____ | |

094. What was about the (shop) value of this?

28-32/____

o I don't know

095. Who was the owner of this object?

33-34/____

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | (23) I don't know | |

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

35/____

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

097. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

36/____

- (1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ____ others

37-38/____

098. Were you caught?

39/____

- (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

099. What happened to you when you were caught?

40/____

o Does not apply (was never caught)

**PART 2C: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL QUESTIONS ON
PROPERTY-RELATED BEHAVIOR**

ID 1-4/____
Lines 5-6/05

INTERVIEWER:

Sometimes people take away things from others, without the intention of returning them. Now, we would like to know if you have ever done something like that. Of course all your 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? | 7/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 240. | Did you ever steal something from a store? | 8/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 250. | Did you ever steal something from school? | 9/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 260. | Did you ever steal something from home or the place you live? | 10/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 270. | Did you ever steal something from the place you are working?
(8) does not apply (respondent has not had a job yet) | 11/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 280. | Did you ever steal a bicycle, moped or motorcycle? | 12/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 290. | Did you ever steal a car? | 13/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 300. | Did you ever steal something out of or from a car? | 14/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 310. | Have you ever done any pickpocketing? | 15/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 320. | Did you ever snatch from a person a purse, a bag, or some other thing? | 16/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 330. | Did you ever sneak or break into a private yard, a house or a building?
(not meaning abandoned houses or buildings) | 17/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 340. | Did you ever steal something I did not mention yet?
What was it: _____ | 18/___
19-20/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 350. | Did you ever buy something that you knew or suspected at the time, had been stolen? | 21/___ |
| (1)no (2)yes 360. | Did you ever sell something that you knew or suspected at the time, had been stolen? | 22/___ |

<If one or more of these things has/have been answered positively:>

INTERVIEWER:

You have indicated that you have done one or more of these things. Now I would like to ask you some details about them.

PART 3C: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON PROPERTY-RELATED BEHAVIOR

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? 23-24/___
 ___ years old

231b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 25/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

232. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 26/___

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) ___ times 27-28/___

233. Speaking about the last time, was it a telephone or a vending machine? 29/___

- (1) telephone
- (2) vending machine

234. How much money did you get out of it, then? 30-33/___

236. Where did you do this, this last time? 34/___

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
- (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
- (3) downtown or in the city center
- (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

237. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 35/___

- (1) alone
- (2) with (approx.) ___ others 36-37/___

238. Were you caught? 38/___

- (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

239. What happened to you when you were caught? 39/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned stealing something from a store.

241. At what age did you do it for the first time? 40-41/___
 ___ years old

241b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 42/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

242. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 43/___
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) ___ times 44-45/___

243. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away? 46-47/___

244. What was about the (shop) value of what you took? 48-51/___
 o I don't know

245. Who was the owner of this object/money? 52-53/___
 (01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
 (02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
 (03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
 (04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
 (05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
 (06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
 (07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
 (08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

246. Where did you do this, this last time? 54/___
 (1) near the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

247. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 55/___
 (1) alone
 (2) with (approx.) ___ others 56-57/___

248. Were you caught? 58/___
 (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

249. What happened to you when you were caught? 59/___
 o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned stealing something from school.

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

60-61/ __ _

251b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

62/ __

252. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

63/ __

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

64-65/ __ _

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

66-67/ __ _

254. What was about the (shop) value of what you took?

68-71/ _ _ _ _

I don't know

255. Who was the owner of this object/money?

72-73/ __ _

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | | (23) I don't know |

257. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

74/ __

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

75-76/ __ _

258. Were you caught?

77/ __

- (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 | |

259. What happened to you when you were caught?

78/ __

Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned stealing something from home, or the place you live.

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

261b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

262. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

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

264. What was about the (shop) value of what you took?
_____ I don't know

265. Who was the owner of this object/money?
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

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

268. 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

269. What happened to you when you were caught?
_____ Does not apply (was never caught)

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/06
7-8/____

9/____

10/____

11-12/____

13-14/____

15-18/____

19-20/____

21/____

22-23/____

24/____

25/____

You mentioned stealing something from the place you are working.

271. At what age did you do it for the first time?
 ___ years old 26-27/ ___
- 271b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know 28/ ___
272. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) ___ times 29/ ___
 30-31/ ___
273. Speaking about the last time, what did you take away?
 _____ 32-33/ ___
274. What was about the (shop) value of what you took?

 o I don't know 34-37/ ___
275. Who was the owner of this object/money?
 (01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
 (02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
 (03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
 (04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
 (05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
 (06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
 (07) another student (15) small-store (22) other: _____
 (08) acquaintance (23) I don't know 38-39/ ___
267. Did you do this alone or with others, then?
 (1) alone (2) with (approx.) ___ others 40/ ___
 41-42/ ___
268. 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 43/ ___
279. What happened to you when you were caught?

 o Does not apply (was never caught) 44/ ___

You mentioned stealing a bicycle, moped or motorcycle.

281. At what age did you do it for the first time? 45-46/___
___ years old

281b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 47/___
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

282. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 48/___

(0) no ---> next specific subject () yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times 49-50/___

283. What did you take away? 51/___
(1) motorcycle (2) moped (3) bicycle

284. Speaking about the last time, what was about the (shop) value of this vehicle? 52-55/_____
o I don't know

285. Who was the owner of this object? 56-57/___
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

286. Where did you do this? 58/___
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

286b What did you do with it at the end? 59/___
(1) dumped it somewhere (4) sold it
(2) destroyed/damaged it (5) I still use it
(3) brought it back (6) other namely: _____

287. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 60/___
(1) alone 61-62/___
(2) with (approx.) ___ others

288. Were you caught? 63/___
(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. What happened to you when you were caught? 64/___
o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned stealing a car.

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

291b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

292. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

294. Speaking about the last time, what was about the (shop) value of this car?

I don't know

295. Who was the owner of this object?

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | | (23) I don't know |

296a Where did you do this?

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

296b What did you do with it at the end?

- (1) dumped it somewhere (4) sold it
(2) destroyed/damaged it (5) I still use it
(3) brought it back (6) other namely: _____

297. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

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

298. 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

299. What happened to you when you were caught?

Does not apply (was never caught)

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/07
7 8/____

9/___

10/___

11-12/____

13-17

18-19/____

20/___

21/___

22/___

23-24/____

25/___

26/___

You mentioned stealing something out of or from a car.

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

27-28/___

301b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

29/___

302. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

30/___

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

31-32/___

303. Speaking about the last time, what did you take out of/from the car? [Code "1" no, "2" yes.]
<here, more than one answer can be entered if required>

33/___ 34/___

- (1) antenna (5) drivers license, passport etc.
(2) hub cap (6) tape deck
(3) mirror (outside) (7) cellular phone
(4) radio (8) other: _____

35/___ 36/___

37/___ 38/___

39/___ 40/___

304. What was about the (shop) value of what you took then?

41-44/_____

I don't know

305. Who was the owner of this object/money?

45-46/___

- (01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

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

47/___

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

307. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

48/___

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

49-50/___

308. Were you caught?

51/___

- (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

309. What happened to you when you were caught?

52/___

Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned doing 'pickpocketing'.

311. At what age did you do it for the first time? 53-54/___
___ years old

311b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 55/___
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

312. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 56/___
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times 57-58/___

314. Speaking about the last time, what was about the (shop) value of what you took? 59-62/___
o I don't know

315. Who was the owner of this object/money? 63-64/___
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

316. Where did you do this, this last time? 65/___
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

317. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 66/___
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others 67-68/___

318. Were you caught? 69/___
(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

319. What happened to you when you were caught? 70/___
o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned snatching a purse, bag or something else from a person.

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

321b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

322. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

324. Speaking about the last time, what was about the (shop) value of what you took?
o I don't know

325. Who was the owner of this object/money?
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

306. Where did you do this, this last time?
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

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

328. 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

329. What happened to you when you were caught?
o Does not apply (was never caught)

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/08
7-8/____

9/___

10/___

11-12/____

13-16/____

17-18/____

19/___

20/___

21-22/____

23/___

24/___

You mentioned sneaking or breaking into a house, a yard or a building. (not meaning abandoned or ruined objects)

331. At what age did you do it for the first time? 25-26/ __ __
__ years old

331b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 27/ __
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

332. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 28/ __
(1) no ----> next specific subject (2) yes ----> How often this last year?
(check part 2) __ times 29-30/ __ __

333. What kind of building did you get in? 31/ __
(1) school (4) house
(2) warehouse (5) other, namely: _____
(3) apartment building

334. Speaking about the last time, did you take away something? 32/ __
(1)no (2)yes -----> What was about the (shop) value of what you took? 33-36/ __ __ __ __
o I don't know

335. Who was the owner of this object/money? 37-38/ __ __
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

335b Did you damage something in the building then? 39/ __
(1) no (2) yes

336. Where did you do this, this last time? 40/ __
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

337. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 41/ __
(1) alone 42-43/ __ __
(2) with (approx.) __ others

338. Were you caught? 44/ __
(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

339. What happened to you when you were caught? 45/ __
o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned stealing (something else)

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/09
7-8/____

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

341b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

9/____

342. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

10/____

(0) no ---> next specific subject () yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) _____ times

11-12/____

344. Speaking about the last time, what was about the (shop) value of what you took?

13-16/____

I don't know

345. Who was the owner of this object/money?

17-18/____

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | | (23) I don't know |

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

19/____

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
- (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
- (3) downtown or in the city center
- (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

347. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

20/____

- (1) alone
- (2) with (approx.) ____ others

21-22/____

348. Were you caught?

23/____

- (1) no (2) 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

349. What happened to you when you were caught?

24/____

Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned buying something that you knew or suspected at the time, had been stolen.

351. At what age did you do it for the first time?
____ years old 25-26/___
- 351b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know 27/___
352. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) _____ times 28/___
29-30/___
353. Speaking about the last time, what did you buy?
(description) _____ 31-32/___
- 354a. Speaking about the last time, what did you pay for it?
_____ 33-36/___
- 354b. What was about the real (stop) value?
_____ 37-41/___
o I don't know
355. From whom did you buy it? 42-43/___
(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know
356. Where did you do this, this last time? 44/___
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____
357. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 45/___
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others 46-47/___
358. Were you caught? 48/___
(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
359. What happened to you when you were caught? 49/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned selling something that you knew or suspected at the time, had been stolen.

361. At what age did you do it for the first time? 50-51/___
 ___ years old
- 361b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 52/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
362. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 53/___
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) _____ times 54-55/___
363. Speaking about the last time, what did you sell? 56-57/___
 (description) _____
364. How much money did you get for it? 58-61/___

- 364b Do you know how much it would have cost in a store? 62-65/___

365. To whom did you sell it? 66-67/___
 (01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
 (02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
 (03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
 (04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
 (05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
 (06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
 (07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
 (08) acquaintance (23) I don't know
6. Where did you do this, this last time? 68/___
 (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minnte walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____
367. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 69/___
 (1) alone
 (2) with (approx.) ___ others 70-71/___
368. Were you caught? 72/___
 (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
369. What happened to you when you were caught? 73/___

- o Does not apply (was never caught)

PART 2D: INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL QUESTIONS ON VIOLENT BEHAVIOR

ID 1-4/
Lines 5-6/10

INTERVIEWER:

Now I have some questions about weapons and fighting.

- (1)no (2)yes 380. Did you ever carry a weapon, like a knife, stick etc.? 11/___
- (1)no (2)yes 390. Did you ever threaten somebody with a weapon or to beat him/her up, in order to get money or other valuables? 12/___
- (1)no (2)yes 400. Were you ever actively engaged in fighting or disorder in a group in a public place? (e.g. in situations such as: on the sports-playing field, in railway stations, music festivals, rioting, demonstrations or just on the streets) 13/___
- (1)no (2)yes 410. Did you ever set fire intentionally to something like a car, a basement, a building, a barn, a forest or something else not belonging to you? 14/___
- (1)no (2)yes 420. Did you ever beat up someone not belonging to your immediate family, to such an extent that you think or know medical help or a doctor was needed? 15/___
- (1)no (2)yes 430. Did you ever beat up someone belonging to your immediate family to such an extent that you think or know medical help or a doctor was needed? 16/___
- (1)no (2)yes 440. Did you ever hurt someone on purpose with a knife, stick or another weapon? 17/___

< if one or more of these things has/have been answered positively: >

INTERVIEWER:

You have indicated that you have done one or more of these things. Now I would like to ask you some details about them.

PART 3D: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON VIOLENT BEHAVIOR

You mentioned carrying a weapon, like a knife, stick etc.

381. At what age did you carry a weapon for the first time? 18-19/___
 ___ years old

381b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 20/___
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

382. Did you carry one during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 21/___
 (1) no --> next specific subject (2) yes --> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) _____ times 22-23/___

383. Speaking about the last time, what kind of weapon did you carry? 24/___
 (1) stick
 (2) knife
 (3) handgun
 (4) other, namely: _____

384. What is about the (shop) value of that weapon? 25-27/___
 o I don't know

386. Where were you when you were carrying the weapon? 28/___
 (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

387. Were you alone or with others, then? 29/___
 (1) alone
 (2) with (approx.) ___ others 30-31/___

388. Were you caught? 32/___
 (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

389. What happened to you when you were caught? 33/___
 o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned threatening somebody with a weapon or to beat him up, in order to get money or other valuables.

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

34-35/___

391b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

36/___

392. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

37/___

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

38-39/___

392b If you used a weapon, what type of weapon was it?

40/___

(0) did not use a weapon (3) handgun
(1) stick (4) other, namely: _____
(2) knife

393. Speaking about the last time, what did you get?

41/___

(1) money
(2) something else, namely: _____
(3) nothing ---> go to question 396

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

42-45/_____

o I don't know

395. Who was the owner of this object/money?

46-47/___

(01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
(02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
(03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
(04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
(05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
(06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
(07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
(08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

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

48/___

(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

397. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

49/___

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

50-51/___

398. Were you caught?

52/___

(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

399. What happened to you when you were caught?

53/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned being actively engaged in fighting or disorder in a group in a public place, e.g. in situations such as: on the sports playing field, in school, in the mall, or just on the streets.

401. At what age did it happen for the first time? 54-55/ __
__ years old
- 401b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 56/ __
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
402. Did it happen during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 57/ __
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) 58/59 __ __ times
403. Speaking about the last time, what kind of situation was it? 60-61/ __
(1) sports playing field
(2) bus station
(3) music festival
(4) rioting
(5) demonstration
(6) just on the streets
(7) in a bar, café, pub etc.
(8) somewhere else
- 403b If you used a weapon, what type of weapon was it? 62/ __
(0) did not use a weapon
(1) stick
(2) knife
(3) handgun
(4) other, namely: _____
404. Did you cause any damage to objects or persons? 63/ __
(1) no () yes -----> (2) objects
(3) persons
(4) both
406. Where did this happen? 64/ __
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____
407. How many others were involved? 65-66/ __
(approx.) __ others
408. Were you caught? 67/ __
(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
409. What happened to you when you were caught? 68/ __

Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned setting fire intentionally to something not belonging to you, like a car, a basement, a building, a barn, a forest or something else.

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

411b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

412. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

414. Speaking about the last time, what was it?

415. Who was the owner of this object?

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | | (23) I don't know |

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

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____

417. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

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

418. 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

419. What happened to you when you were caught?

o Does not apply (was never caught)

ID 1-4/_____
Lines 5-6/11
7-8/____

9/___

10/___

11-12/____

13-14/____

15-16/____

17/___

18/___

19-20/____

21/___

22/___

You mentioned beating up someone not belonging to your immediate family to such an extent that you think or know medical help or a doctor was needed.

421. At what age did you do it for the first time? ID 1-4/_____
 Lines 5-6/12_____
 7-8/_____
 ____ years old

421b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 9/_____
 (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

422. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 10/_____
 (1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
 (check part 2) _____ times 11-12/_____

423. If you used a weapon, what type of weapon was it? 13/_____
 (0) did not use a weapon
 (1) stick
 (2) knife
 (3) handgun
 (4) other, namely: _____

424. Speaking about the last time, what kind of medical help was, or would have been needed? 14/_____
 (1) only first aid
 (2) first aid and follow up check
 (3) admission into hospital
 (4) other _____
 (5) I don't know

425. Who was this person? 15-16/_____
 (01) parents (09) friend (16) self-service store
 (02) father (10) neighbors (17) department store
 (03) mother (11) stranger (18) transport company
 (04) sibling (12) company I work for (19) other company
 (05) the school (13) fellow worker (20) city
 (06) teacher (14) boss (21) tourist
 (07) another student (15) small store (22) other: _____
 (08) acquaintance (23) I don't know

426. Where did you do this, this last time? 17/_____
 (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from
 your home or the place you live
 (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
 (3) downtown or in the city center
 (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

427. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 18/_____
 (1) alone (2) with (approx.) ____ others 19-20/_____

428. Were you caught? 21/_____
 (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

429. What happened to you when you were caught? 22/_____

 o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned beating up someone belonging to your immediate family to such an extent that you think or know medical help or a doctor was needed.

431. At what age did you do it for the first time? 23-24/ ___
___ years old
- 431b Did the police ever find out that you did it? 25/ ___
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know
432. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...> 26/ ___
(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times 27-28/ ___
433. If you used a weapon, what type of weapon was it? 29/ ___
(0) did not use a weapon
(1) stick
(2) knife
(3) handgun
(4) other, namely: _____
434. Speaking about the last time, what kind of medical help was, or would have been needed? 30/ ___
(1) only first aid
(2) first aid and follow up check
(3) admission into hospital
(4) other _____
(5) I don't know
435. Who was this person? 31-32/ ___
(01) father
(02) mother
(03) sibling
(04) other member of the family/who? _____
436. Where did you do this, this last time? 33/ ___
(1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
(2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
(3) downtown or in the city center
(4) somewhere else, namely: _____
437. Did you do this alone or with others, then? 34/ ___
(1) alone
(2) with (approx.) ___ others 35-36/ ___
438. Were you caught? 37/ ___
(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
439. What happened to you when you were caught? 38/ ___

- o Does not apply (was never caught)

You mentioned hurting someone with a knife, stick or another weapon.

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

39-40/___

441b Did the police ever find out that you did it?
(1) no (2) yes (3) don't know

41/___

442. Did you do it during this last year? <INTERVIEWER: that is, since ...>

42/___

(1) no ---> next specific subject (2) yes ---> How often this last year?
(check part 2) ___ times

43-44/___

443. What type of weapon did you use?

45/___

- (1) stick
- (2) knife
- (3) handgun
- (4) other, namely: _____

444. Speaking about the last time, do you know or think medical help was,
or would have been needed?

46/___

- (1) no () yes -----> what type of medical help?
 - (2) only first aid
 - (3) first aid and follow up check
 - (4) admission into hospital
 - (5) other: _____
 - (6) I don't know

445. Who was this person?

47-48/___

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (01) parents | (09) friend | (16) self-service store |
| (02) father | (10) neighbors | (17) department store |
| (03) mother | (11) stranger | (18) transport company |
| (04) sibling | (12) company I work for | (19) other company |
| (05) the school | (13) fellow worker | (20) city |
| (06) teacher | (14) boss | (21) tourist |
| (07) another student | (15) small store | (22) other: _____ |
| (08) acquaintance | | (23) I don't know |

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

49/___

- (1) at home or the place you live, or within a 10 minute walk from your home or the place you live
- (2) at a shopping center/shopping mall
- (3) downtown or in the city center
- (4) somewhere else, namely: _____

447. Did you do this alone or with others, then?

50/___

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

51-52/___

448. Were you caught?

53/___

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

49. What happened to you when you were caught?

54/___

o Does not apply (was never caught)