Lecture 2:
Extent and Nature:
(a) Service learning
(b) Self-Reports &
(c) Victimization
(d) Readings

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)

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

“bivariate correlates” of youth crime
1. Age: property peak at 18 (was 16) violent at 19
2. Sex: males are 82% of violent index (was higher); 77% total
3. Race: African-Americans 51% of all violent index
   – interaction of age, sex, and race: In 2008, African-American males aged 14-24 made up 16% of homicide victims and 27% of offenders. This group is about 1% of the population
4. Ethnicity: poor data, but Latino overrepresentation in correctional populations (+immigration paradox)
5. Class: kids from low-income census tracts most arrested
6. Chronic: 6% of male population responsible for 50% of arrests
7. Local trends: fewer violent as percent of total; but percent violent rose until mid-90s, then fell

Self-Reported Use of Gun or Knife to Get Something by Sex (Armed Robbery), 1980-2011

Self-reported Taking Something Worth over $50 by Sex (Larceny), 1980-2011
lifetime use: 2012 12th graders

- Alcohol: 69%
- Cigarettes: 40%
- Any illicit drug: 49%
- Marijuana: 45%
- Any Prescription: 21%
- Amphetamines: 12%
- Tranquilizers: 9%
- Cocaine: 5% (crack 2%)
- MDMA (X): 7%
- LSD: 4%
- Methamphetamine: 2%
- Steroids: 2%
- Heroin: 1%

class self-report survey

- Disclaimer
  - Overview of findings
  - Calculating Prevalence and Incidence
  - n=72 (51F; 19M; 2 missing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Other Drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

class self-report survey
## Index Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape (CSC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary, Assault</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX PROPERTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary [B&amp;E]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDEX SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Other Nonindex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;OTHER&quot; SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Substance Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD/shroom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. liquor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer-mj</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealer-nonmj</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRUG SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sex and Self-Reported Total Delinquency in Uggen’s JD Classes**

**Sex and Self-Reported Total Delinquency in Uggen’s Juvenile Delinquency Classes**
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 F13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

(c) victimization picture

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

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)
serious violent victimization against youth 12-17, 1994-2010

serious violent victimization by sex, 1980-2011 (1993 change) [2011 boys safer than 1990s girls]

serious violent youth victimization by residence, 1994-2010

serious violent victimization by race, 1994-2010

Personal and Property Victimization by Income, 2005
Serious Violent Crimes by Perceived Age of Offender, 2005

- **Under 12**: 7%
- **12 to 14**: 8%
- **15 to 17**: 25%
- **18 to 20**: 8%
- **21 to 29**: 21%
- **30+**: 10%
- **Unknown**: 7%

---

**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
  - No status offenses
  - No murders, kidnaps, “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 are likely victims & offenders
  - **Sex:** males likely victims & offenders
  - **Race/Ethnicity:** African-Americans are most likely to be arrested and victimized; especially for violent offenses (murder)
  - **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**