

**Self-Reported Delinquency**  
Year 14  
Fast Track Project Technical Report  
Anne-Marie Iselin  
May 23, 2011

**Table of Contents**

- I. Scale Description
- II. Report Sample
- III. Scaling
- IV. Differences Between Groups
- V. Recommendations for Use
- VI. Item Frequencies

**Citation**

*Instrument*

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

**Report**

Iselin, A. R. (2011). *Self-Reported Delinquency*. (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: <http://www.fasttrackproject.org>

**Data Sources**

*Raw :* C14AD

*Scored :* SRD14

**I. Scale Description**

Self-Report of Delinquency instruments are well known and frequently used. Their advantages and disadvantages have been discussed in the literature (Huizinga and Elliott, 1986; Klein, 1988). Participants describe their delinquent activities, tapping the areas of property damage, theft, assault, and substance use. For each type of delinquent act, the participant is asked whether he/she ever committed it, how many times in the past year, if others were involved, and if he/she was under the influence of alcohol or drugs while committing it. The analyst may be interested in developing summary scales based on the nature of the offenses committed (e.g., status offenses, interpersonal violence offenses, property offenses etc.).

**II. Report Sample**

Primary analyses were conducted on Cohort 1 year 14. With missing cases excluded, the total sample size was 454 with 286 normative participants and 168 control participants. Sixty-five participants were part of both the normative group and the high risk. Our analyses however, examine non-overlapping samples such that the Normative sample is comprised of only Low-Risk respondents and the Control sample is comprised of only high risk respondents. With missing data excluded, the total sample size for our analyses is 339, with 238 Low-Risk Normative and 101 High-Risk Control subjects. The total sample was fairly evenly spread across all sites: Durham (30.6%), Pennsylvania (26.9%), Nashville (18.9%), and Seattle (23.6%).

### III. Frequencies

Table 1 below provides frequencies for the number of respondents who endorsed engaging in each delinquent behavior separated by sample.

Label	Control Sample		Normative Sample	
	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No
In the past year, have you...				
...Run Away From Home	1.3	98.7	1.0	99.0
...Skipped Class/School w/out Excuse	17.4	82.6	18.8	81.3
...Lied About Age to Get Something	6.3	98.7	5.0	95.0
...Hitchhiked Where Illegal	0	100	0	100
...Carried Hidden Weapon	6.7	93.3	12.9	87.1
...Been Too Loud/Rowdy & People Complained	5.0	95.0	9.9	90.1
...Begged for Money From Strangers	0	100	2.0	98.0
...Been Drunk in a Public Place	11.8	88.2	10.9	89.1
...Damaged/Destroyed Other's Property	2.1	97.9	2.0	98.0
...Have or Tried to Set Something on Fire	0	100	0	100
...Have Avoided Paying for Things	1.3	98.7	3.0	97.0
...Have Tried to Steal Something	0.4	99.6	2.0	98.0
...Tried Stealing Item Worth < \$5	2.1	97.9	5.0	95.0
...Tried Stealing \$5-\$50 Item	1.7	98.3	5.0	95.0
...Tried Stealing \$50-\$100 Item	0.4	99.6	2.0	98.0
...Tried Stealing Item > \$100	0.4	99.6	1.0	99.0
...Stolen Any Item From a Store	1.3	98.7	5.9	94.1
...Stolen Someone's Purse/Wallet	0.4	99.6	0	100
...Stolen Something From a Car	0.4	99.6	2.0	98.0
...Knowingly Bought/Sold Stolen Property	2.5	97.5	4.0	96.0
...Taken Vehicle W/O Owners Permission	0.8	99.2	2.0	98.0
...Have Tried/Stole Motor Vehicle	0	100	0	100
...Used Fake Money/Checks to Pay	0.8	99.2	0	100
...Used Credit/Bank Card W/O Permission	0.4	99.6	1.0	99.0
...Have Tried to Cheat Someone	1.3	98.7	2.0	98.0
...Attacked Person W/ Intent to Hurt	0.8	99.2	0	100
...Hit Someone W/ Idea of Hurting	5.0	95.0	9.9	90.1
...Used Weapon to Get \$ From People	0.4	99.6	20.0	80.0

Label	Control Sample		Normative Sample	
	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No
...Thrown Objects at People	0.4	99.6	1.0	99.0
...Been Involved in Any Gang Fight	1.7	98.3	1.0	99.0
...Paid for Having Sex W/ Someone	0.4	99.6	1.9	98.1
...Sex W/ Someone Against Their Will	0	100	0	100
...Sold Marijuana/Hashish	4.2	95.8	8.9	91.1
...Sold Heroin/Cocaine/LSD	1.7	98.3	2.0	98.0

#### IV. Recommendations for Use

The analyst should be cautioned that many respondents did not endorse engaging in delinquent behaviors. This is true for the method of scoring as calculated here, but is even more exaggerated when examining the frequency of each endorsed behavior. The analyst should be advised that there are outliers present and each item should be inspected and evaluated with caution.