Week 2:
Extent and Nature:

(a) Self-Reports &
(b) Victimization
(c) Readings
(d) Service learning (thurs)

problems with police picture

A. Unreported "Dark Figure" of Crime (tip of iceberg)
1. Most youth crime is concealed (e.g. drug use) or unreported (e.g. theft)
B. Biases over Time and Space
   1. Changing norms (marijuana, prostitution)
   2. Changes in police priorities or "crackdowns"
   3. Police professionalization as emergent process
   4. Local biases, misclassifications
   5. Individual biases (implicit and explicit)
C. Omissions and Idiosyncracies
   1. No information on group offending
   2. UCRs stop at arrest stage (cases dropped)
   3. If multiple crimes, only most serious is reported
   4. No federal crimes in UCR (comparatively minor flaw)
   5. Missing move to cashless society and cybercrime

self-reports: a second picture of delinquency

• Key Concepts
  – Prevalence (participation) and
  – Incidence (frequency)
• "Monitoring the Future"
  – ~50,000 students in 400 schools each year since 1975
  – drug use, delinquency, and attitudes
• Methodology
  – sampling and external validity
  – response bias and internal validity
  – operationalization
    • measuring rape
lifetime use: 2016 12th graders
(versus 1991 or year first asked)

- Alcohol 51% (88% in 1991)
- Cigarettes 28% (63%)
- Any illicit drug 48% (27%)
- Marijuana 45% (37%)
- Any Prescription 18% (24% in 2005)
- Amphetamines 10% (15%)
- Tranquilizers 8% (7%)
- Cocaine 4% (8%) [crack 1%]
- MDMA (X) 5% (6% in 1996)
- LSD 5% (9%)
- Methamphetamine 1% (3%)
- Steroids 2% (2%)
- Heroin 1% (1%) [opiates 8%]

---

class self-report survey

- Disclaimer - gender binary (1993)
- Overview of findings
- Calculating Prevalence and Incidence
- n=50 (39F; 8M; +2)
- Average Incidence of Self-Reported Delinquency by Sex in Soc4141 in 2019 (versus 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2.4 (-.6)</td>
<td>5.3 (-.6)</td>
<td>4.0 (-1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not female</td>
<td>5.3 (-.6)</td>
<td>5.3 (-.1)</td>
<td>5.3 (-1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

index crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>offense</th>
<th>prevalence</th>
<th>incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX PERSONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rape (CSC)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>robbery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larceny-assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary (B&amp;E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burglary (B&amp;E)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auto theft</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Nonindex Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty $5-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty &lt;$5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Other&quot; Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Substance Use Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lsd/mushroom</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Liquor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer-Mj</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer-NonMj</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Self-Reported Total Delinquency in Uggen's JD Classes, 1994-2019**

- Index: 16.9
- Other: 5.4
- Drug: 6.2
- Status: 2.0
**GROUP EXERCISE ON SRD**

- **Form groups of 3-5:**
  - Discuss hypotheses on handout
  - Hand in 1 sheet of paper signed by all

**Average Incidence of SRD by Sex, Soc 4141 F19**
Critique of Self-Report Studies

- Data problems
- Reliability?
- Internal validity: reverse record checks
- External validity or generalizability
- Few analogous ADULT measures of self-reported crime (yet)
- Omitted offenses – examples?

(c) victimization picture

- National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)
  - Overview of Distribution and Trends
  - Bivariate Correlates
  - Critique
- SUMMARY OF 3 PICTURES

Uggen & McElrath (2013)
6 Social Sources of Crime Drop
[Uggen & McElrath 2013]

1. Punishment (10-30% ?)
2. Policing (10-20% ?)
3. Opportunities (cell phones, home-based entertainment, car immobilizers)
4. Economics (small effects, boom or bust)
5. Demography (age and immigration)
6. Long-term Social Dynamics (Eisner, Pinker)

violent victimization by age & year
(youth lines dashed)

juvenile homicide victims by age

Juvenile homicide victims by age, 1980–2016
serious violent victimization (agg assault, rape, robbery, homicide) against youth 12-17 by sex, 1980-2016

Convergence in NCVS age 15-17 serious violent victimization rate by race, 1993-2017 (no homicide)
Non-Hispanic Whites are 53% of the youth population & Blacks are 14%, but same number of homicide victims (a 4-5 times higher rate)

Homicide Victimization per 100,000 by Sex, Race, & Hispanic origin (CDC 2010)

Serious violent youth victimization by residence, 1994-2014 (rural rising, esp. 15-17)
Personal Victimization by Income, 2008

even burglary is similar

Victimization Rates for Persons Age 12 or Older by Type of Crime and Annual Family Income, 2008

Serious Violent Crimes by Perceived Age of Offender, 2017

multiple
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victimization picture

• Overview of Distribution and Trends
• Bivariate Correlates
• Critique
  – Interview problems: memory lapses, distrust, head of household, don’t know legal technicalities, language barriers
  – Changes in interview & interpretation
  – No status offenses
  – No murders, kidnap, “victimless”
  – No white-collar
• Summary of all 3
**summary of 3 pictures**

- Distribution:
  - Most delinquency is "property" or household by all measures
  - Upward trend in juvenile violence from mid-80s to early-90s, declining or flat since

- Correlates and interactions
  - Age: "juveniles" in mid-teens (& early twenties) are likely victims & offenders
  - Sex: males likely offenders (& victims?), but "gap" declining & smaller in self-report studies
  - Race/Ethnicity: African-Americans are most likely to be arrested and victimized; especially for violent offenses (murder), but "gap" much smaller (or non-existent) in self-report
  - Social class: the most disadvantaged are most often arrested & victimized,
  - Group: most delinquency is done with others
  - Local picture: lower levels, but similar trends

**Preventing Crime, What Works, What Doesn’t, What’s Promising**

- where did this report come from? who did it?
- are the methods choices defensible? what sort of phenomena aren’t considered? how might this limit the scope of the study?
- why do some programs persist without any evidence that they reduce crime?
- what surprised you on the "what works" and "promising" lists?
- are their common features or principles of more effective programs?

**Rios 2: Dreams Deferred**

- Methods
  - “shadowing” 40 young men (20 Latino/ 20 Af. Am.) for 3 years
  - 30 had been arrested; snowball sampling
  - Not an “O.G.” or “gang leader”
  - Biases?

- Themes
  - Marginality, masculinity, defiance, resistance
  - What is the “moral panic” around youth?
Next: Life Course!
Psychology & Economics