
THE DLC CRIMINOLOGIST

Volume 2, Issue Number 2

October 2014



Welcome from David Farrington

Welcome to another DLC Newsletter! As before, we are very grateful to Tom Arnold for putting it together, and to Stacey Bosick for organizing a series of articles on longitudinal studies of criminal behavior (based on papers that were given at the ASC in 2013). We hope that you will find these articles of interest!

We are all now looking forward to the next ASC meeting in the beautiful city of San Francisco, and this Newsletter contains details of some relevant DLC panels. We hope that as many DLC members as possible will attend our Open Meeting on Thursday November 20 at 2.00-3.20pm. This is your opportunity to make suggestions about activities that the DLC should engage in to advance developmental and life-course criminology and criminal career research.

The big news is that we now have our own journal! As of 2015, the *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* will start publishing. We are extremely grateful to Tara McGee and Paul Mazerolle for their enormous efforts in getting this journal off the ground. We are also very grateful to Springer and to Katie Chabalko for agreeing to publish our journal. Please submit your papers! All DLC members will have free access to the electronic version of the journal, so the DLC dues will continue to be very modest, at \$10 for full members and \$5 for students. DLC members who wish to receive printed copies of the new journal can obtain these for the bargain price of \$20 per year.

Please come to our ASC social event at Jillian's on Thursday November 20 at 6.30-8.30pm.! We are very grateful to Darrick Jolliffe for organizing this (see more information in this Newsletter). All DLC members should have received information about how to download their admission ticket; if you have any questions about this, please contact Darrick.

Congratulations to our 2014 Life-Time Achievement Award winners, David Hawkins and Marc LeBlanc, and to our 2014 Early Career Award winner Sytske Besemer! These Awards will be presented at our Open Meeting on Thursday November 20 at 2.00-3.20pm. The Awards Committee decided to establish a third Award in 2015, for the most outstanding book or article on developmental and life-course criminology in the previous two years. A call for nominations for all these Awards in 2015 will be included in our next Newsletter in the Spring of 2015.

Our membership is now approaching 250, and we are already the third largest Division in the ASC, after the Division of Women and Crime and the Division of Corrections and Sentencing, which both have just over 400 members. Please encourage your colleagues to join the DLC so that we can race past the next milestone of 250 members! And please can all DLC members renew for 2015, so that our new journal has the widest possible circulation!

As I mentioned in the last Newsletter, it is apparent that the DLC's original constitution is in need of amendment, and that we need to establish a Constitution Review Committee. Tara McGee originally agreed to chair this, but I think that her efforts as Secretary/Treasurer and as co-editor of our new journal are more than enough! Therefore, I will be asking for DLC members to volunteer to serve on this important Committee. At the ASC Open Meeting, DLC members will have the opportunity to volunteer to serve on all of our Committees in 2014-2015.

We encourage all DLC members to submit news items to Tom Arnold for publication in the next Newsletter. Please tell us about your recent publications, grants, awards (etc.), and any other information of interest to DLC members (e.g. upcoming conferences). We look forward to seeing you in San Francisco if not before!

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 1 | Welcome from David Farrington |
| 2 | Board, Membership, & Committee Information |
| 3 | Secretary/Treasurer's Report |
| 3 | Awards Committee Report |
| 4 | Nominations Committee Report |
| 4 | Membership Committee Report |
| 5-6 | New DLC Books |
| 6-7 | DLC Annual Meeting in San Francisco |
| 7 | DLC Social Event at Jillian's |
| 8 | Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology |
| 9 | A Note from the Editor |
| 9 | Special Section: Longitudinal Studies of Criminal Behavior |
| 10 | The National Youth Survey |
| 14 | The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development |
| 17 | The Pittsburgh Youth Study |
| 20 | The Pathways to Desistance Study |
| 23 | Links to Longitudinal Studies |



Executive Board Members

Chair:

David Farrington - dpf1@cam.ac.uk

Vice-Chair:

Rolf Loeber - loeberr@upmc.edu

Newsletter and Website Editor

Tom Arnold – arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

Secretary and Treasurer:

Tara Renae McGee - tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au

Past Chair:

Adrian Raine - araine@sas.upenn.edu

Executive Counselors:

Arjan Blokland - ablokland@nscr.nl

Elaine Doherty - dohertye@umsl.edu

Jesse Cale - j.cale@unsw.edu.au

ASC Executive Liaison:

Lisa Broidy - lbroidy@unm.edu

Postgraduate Representative:

Christoffer Carlsson -
christoffer.carlsson@criminology.su.se



Joining the ASC Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (DLC)

If you would like to join the American Society of Criminology (ASC) Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (DLC), you first need to be a member of the ASC. When you join the ASC, be sure to check the box that says “Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology.”

To learn more about the ASC, visit

<http://asc41.com/index.htm>

To join the ASC and DLC division visit

<http://asc41.com/appform1.html>

DLC Committees

Awards Committee – Chair: David Farrington

Leena Augimeri
Lynette Feder
Ross Homel
Wesley Jennings
Lila Kazemian
Doris MacKenzie

Membership Committee – Chair: Arjan Blokland

Danielle Boisvert
Shaun Gann
Kelly Knight
Sonja Siennick
Stacy Tzoumakis
Jamie Vaske

Newsletter Committee – Chair: Rolf Loeber

Tom Arnold
Julie Marie Baldwin
Molly Buchanan
Michael Carriaga
Chris Gibson
Marvin Krohn
Jeffrey Mathesius

Nominations Committee – Chair: Jesse Cale

Sarah Bennett
Sheyla Delgado
Evan McCuish
Jamie Newsome
Ingrid Obsuth
Ryan Schroeder

Program Committee – Chair: Elaine Doherty

Mark Berg
Stacey Bosick
Leana Allen Bouffard
Darrick Jolliffe
Matthew Larson
Sonja Siennick



Secretary/ Treasurer's Report

Tara Renae McGee
Secretary / Treasurer
tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au

The Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology has continued to grow since our last meeting in 2013 in Atlanta; full details are available in the membership committee report by Arjan Blokland in this issue of the newsletter. We encourage all of the Division members to renew their membership of the Division when they renew their ASC memberships for 2015.

Please continue to encourage your developmental and life-course criminology colleagues who have not already done so, to join the Division. Here is the link for ASC membership:

<http://www.asc41.com/appform1.html>

Current ASC members can download the membership form, complete the Division section, and submit that to the ASC office.

One of the newest additions to the Division is our own journal. More information about the journal and where to submit your papers, is included in this newsletter.

Financially the Division is doing well and we now have the financial resources to engage in some activities for members. Our expenditures this year have been:

- website hosting fees <http://www.dlccrim.org>
- awards
- Social Function at ASC in San Francisco (see this issue of the newsletter for more information)

Full financial details for the Division will be provided at our annual meeting in San Francisco. Future activities of the Division will also be discussed. If you have any items for the meeting agenda, please send them to me.

See you in San Francisco!

DLC Awards Committee Report

David P. Farrington
dpf1@cam.ac.uk
Chair of the DLC Awards Committee

The Division awards will be presented during the Open Meeting of the DLC in San Francisco on Thursday November 20 at 2:00pm-3:20pm and all DLC members are warmly invited to attend.

The **Life-time Achievement Award** recognizes an individual who has a record of sustained and outstanding contributions to scholarly knowledge on developmental and life-course criminology. **David Hawkins** of the University of Washington and **Marc LeBlanc** of the University of Montreal have been chosen to receive the DLC Life-time Achievement award (jointly) in 2014.

The **Early Career Award** recognizes an individual (within 4 years after receiving the Ph.D. degree or a similar graduate degree) who has made a significant contribution to scholarly knowledge on developmental and life-course criminology in their early career. **Sytske Besemer** of the University of California at Berkeley has been chosen to receive the Division's Early Career award in 2014.

Spread the Word!

Please send this newsletter to any of your colleagues who have an interest in developmental and life-course criminology. We would like to increase our membership so that we can build a larger DLC community of scholars.

Visit our web site at <http://www.dlccrim.org>



Nominations Committee Report

Jesse Cale

j.cale@unsw.edu.au

In May 2014 the nominations committee sought nominations for the positions of Chair, Vice-Chair of the division, and one Executive Counsellor who would chair the DLC program committee (each for a two-year term, from November 2014 to November 2016). It was also stipulated that members currently serving in these positions were eligible for nomination. The committee received a total of three nominations. David Farrington was nominated for the position of Chair of the division; Rolf Loeber was nominated for the position of Vice Chair, and Elaine Doherty was nominated for the Executive Counsellor position. The nominations committee did not have to vote on names to forward for the ASC election ballot because there was the same number of nominations as there were positions available. It is in those cases where there are more than two nominees for a position that the nominations committee will vote and submit their recommendation on which two to forward to appear on the ASC election ballot.

As a result, David Farrington will continue as Chair of the DLC from 2014 to 2016, in which year a new Chair will be elected. Rolf Loeber will also continue as Vice-Chair of the DLC from 2014 to 2016, in which year a new Vice-Chair will be elected. Elaine Doherty will continue as an Executive Counsellor and as Chair of the Program Committee from 2014 to 2016. She will be eligible for re-election in 2016 as she was co-opted this year to replace Joanne Savage. No elections were held in 2014 because there were no other nominees for these positions.

The next call for nominations will occur in May 2015, and we will be seeking nominations for the positions of:

- Secretary/Treasurer (2015-2017);
- Executive Counsellor chairing the membership committee (2015-2017);
- Executive Counsellor chairing the nominations committee (2015-2017);
- Post Graduate representative (2015-2017).

We look forward to another excellent year for the DLC Division!

Jesse Cale, on behalf of the Nominations Committee, Sarah Bennett, Sheyla Delgado, Evan McCuish, Jamie Newsome, Ingrid Obsuth, Ryan Schroeder



Membership Committee Report

Arjan Blokland

ablokland@nscr.nl

In the two years since its establishment, the DLC Division has been able to generate a stable core of members. The number of paying members as of August 2014 is 237 and counting, thereby topping that of 2013.

Promoting the division not only through ASC channels but also abroad has lead to a very diverse membership base, with members coming from the US, Europe, Australia and even Africa. While most members are criminologists – or at least work at criminology departments – members also come from other disciplines, like (developmental) psychology and (life-course) sociology.

The launch of the new journal of developmental and life-course criminology will lead to additional exposure of the division among developmentally interested researchers and is therefore expected to attract new members from various disciplines in the coming period. As always, disseminating this news letter to fellow staff members and students will help advertise the Division even further.

New DLC Books

The following are new additions to the field of developmental and life-course criminology.

Beaver, Kevin M., Barnes, James Christopher, & Boutwell, Brian B. (eds.) (2014). *The Nurture Versus Biosocial Debate in Criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. Ltd.

Carrington, Peter J. Editor (2014). *Applications of Social Network Analysis*. Four-Volume Set. University of Waterloo, Canada: SAGE Publications Ltd. ISBN: 9781446260326

<http://www.sagepub.com/books/Book239718?siteId=sage-us&prodTypes=any&q=Applications+of+Social+Network+Analysis&fs=1>

DeLisi, Matt, & Beaver, Kevin M. (2014). *Criminological theory: a life-course approach*. (2nd Edition). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Leverentz, Andrea M. (2014). *The Ex-Prisoner's Dilemma: How Women Negotiate Competing Narratives of Reentry and Desistance*, Rutgers University Press (Critical Issues in Crime and Society series). More details here:

<http://rutgerspress.rutgers.edu/product/Ex-Prisoners-Dilemma,5109.aspx>

McGee, Tara Renae, Paul Mazerolle eds. (2015). 'Psychological, Developmental and Lifecourse Theories of Crime' in 'The Library of Essays in Theoretical Criminology' series, forthcoming 2015, Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Miettunen, J., G.K. Murray, P.B. Jones, P. Mäki, H. Ebeling, A. Taanila, M. Joukamaa, J. Savolainen et al. (2014). Longitudinal associations between childhood and adulthood externalizing and internalizing psychopathology and adolescent substance use. *Psychological Medicine* 44(8): 1727-38

Morizot, Julien, & Kazemian, Lila (Eds.) (2104). *The Development of Criminal and Antisocial Behavior: Theory, Research and Practical Applications*. Springer.

Murray, Joseph, Bijleveld, Catrien C. J. H., Farrington, David P. and Loeber, Rolf (2014) *Parental Incarceration and Child Development: Cross-National Comparative Studies*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, in press.

Raine, Adrian (2013). *The anatomy of violence: The biological roots of crime*. New York: Pantheon / Random House; London: Allen Lane / Penguin.

Raine, Adrian, & Glenn, Andrea L. (2014). *Psychopathy: An Introduction to Biological Findings and Their Implications*. New York: New York University Press.

Savolainen, Jukka, Mikko Aaltonen, et al. (2014). *Social Mobility and Crime: Evidence from a Total Birth Cohort*. *British Journal of Criminology* (published online August 19, 2014 doi:10.1093/bjc/azu057).

Skardhamar, Torbjørn and Jukka Savolainen (2014). Changes in criminal offending around the time of job entry: A study of employment and desistance. *Criminology*, 52(2): 263-291.

New Research grants

Role of Childhood Cumulative Risk in Substance Misuse and Co-occurring Problems, \$682,934, National Institutes of Health - National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), 8/1/2014- 5/31/2017. Principle investigators: W. Alex Mason and Jukka Savolainen

Help Please!!

If you are publishing a new book on Developmental and/or Life-Course Criminology, please send me the citation and I will include it in the next newsletter.

Tom Arnold
arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

New DLC Books- Continued

Special Issue on “Criminal Careers in Self-Reports Compared with Official Records”. (Edited by David P. Farrington and Maria M. Ttofi.) *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 24(4): 2014.

Contents:

1. Editorial: Criminal careers in self-reports compared with official records (pp. 225-228). David P. Farrington and Maria M. Ttofi
2. Understanding the relationship between self-reported offending and official criminal charges across early adulthood (pp. 229-240). Amanda B. Gilman, Karl G. Hill, B. K. Elizabeth Kim, Alyssa Nevell, J. David Hawkins, and David P. Farrington
3. Prevalence, frequency, onset, desistance and criminal career duration in self-reports compared with official records (pp. 241-253). David P. Farrington, Maria M. Ttofi, Rebecca V. Crago, and Jeremy W. Coid
4. Assessing the nature and mix of offences among serious adolescent offenders (pp. 254-264). Robert Brame, Edward P. Mulvey, Alex R. Piquero, and Carol A. Schubert
5. Scaling up from convictions to self-reported offending (pp. 265-276). Delphine Theobald, David P. Farrington, Rolf Loeber, Dustin A. Pardini, and Alex R. Piquero
6. Links between trajectories of self-reported violent and non-violent offending and official offending during adolescence and adulthood (pp. 277-290). Nathalie M. G. Fontaine, Eric Lacourse, Frank Vitaro, and Richard E. Tremblay
7. Childhood predictors and age 48 outcomes of self-reports and official records of offending (pp. 291-304). Eric F. Dubow, L. Rowell Huesmann, and Cathy Smith
8. Individual differences in the concordance of self-reports and official records (pp. 305-315). Walter Forrest, Ben Edwards, and Suzanne Vassallo

DLC Annual Meeting in San Francisco

The annual meeting of the ASC Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology will be held on Thursday November 20th, 2014 from 2:00 to 3:20 pm.

Awards will be presented at the meeting.

2014 ASC Thematic Panels, Roundtables, and Meetings Organized by the Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology

WEDNESDAY - Nov. 19

8:00 am to 9:20 am
Individual and Family Risk Factors: Impact on Development and Maintenance of Antisocial Behaviour
Marriott, Salon 11, B2 Level

12:30 pm to 1:50 pm
Noncriminal Life Outcomes of At-Risk Youth
Marriott, Pacific I, 4th Floor

2:00 pm to 3:20 pm
New Frontiers in Developmental/Life-Course Research
Marriott, Salon 7, B2 Level

5:00 pm to 6:20 pm
Using and Analyzing Life Event Calendars in Criminological Research
Marriott, Pacific F, 4th Floor

THURSDAY - Nov. 20

11:00 am to 12:20 pm

Advancing Knowledge about Delinquency and Justice

Marriott, Foothill J, 2nd Floor

11:00 am to 12:20 pm

New Developments on the Impact of Peers in the Life Course

Marriott, Salon 2, B2 Level

2:00 pm to 3:20 pm

Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology Annual Meeting (All members are invited)

Marriott, Salon C2, B2 Level

3:30 pm to 4:50 pm

Roundtable: Innovations in Teaching Developmental and Life Course Criminology
Marriott, Sierra D, 5th Floor

FRIDAY - Nov. 21

12:30 pm to 1:50 pm

Policy Panel: Bridging Science and Policy: Desistance Research and Offender Re-Entry Policy

Marriott, Salon 10, B2 Level



DLC Social Event

Darrick Jolliffe

D.Jolliffe@gre.ac.uk

The Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology will be hosting a social function for members during the American Society of Criminology conference in San Francisco.

There will be plenty of food (including chips, dips, and quesadillas) but you will need to buy your own drinks.

Come along and network with your fellow DLC colleagues, catch up with old friends, and perhaps make some new ones. We welcome new and prospective members.

Event Location:

Jillian's @ Metreon
175 Fourth Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Event Date & Time:

Thursday, 20 November 2014
6:30pm to 8:30pm

If you have any questions about this event, please contact Darrick Jolliffe via email: D.Jolliffe@gre.ac.uk

Writing Opportunities

If you have any opportunities for others to contribute to a special issue or edited book, you may want to publish a notice in the DLC Newsletter. Send the information to me and I will include it in the next newsletter.

Tom Arnold
arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

Professor Piquero Receives Teaching Award

Professor Alex Piquero received the 2014 [Regents' Outstanding Teaching Award](#) from the University of Texas at Dallas. The story can be found by clicking [here](#), and his comments can be found [here](#).

Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology



Tara Renae McGee
Co-editor-in-chief

tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au



Paul Mazerolle
Co-editor-in-chief

p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au

The Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology is now the official journal of our Division and will be published by Springer four times per year with the first issue appearing in March 2015. Members of the Division can receive print copies of the Journal for \$20 per year and all members will receive digital access as part of their membership.

The journal was launched and the first meeting of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (JDLCC) was held at the ESC conference in Prague in September 2014.

The journal website is <http://www.springer.com/40865> and submissions can be made online <http://www.editorialmanager.com/JDLC/>.

The Journal seeks to advance knowledge and understanding of developmental dimensions of offending across the life-course. Research that examines current theories, debates, and knowledge gaps within Developmental and Life-Course Criminology is encouraged. The journal welcomes theoretical papers, empirical papers, and papers that explore the translation of developmental and life-course research into policy and/or practice. Papers that present

original research or explore new directions for examination are also encouraged. The journal also welcomes all rigorous methodological approaches and orientations. The Journal of Developmental and Life-course Criminology encourages submissions from a broad array of cognate disciplines including but not limited to psychology, statistics, sociology, psychiatry, neuroscience, geography, political science, history, social work, epidemiology, public health, and economics.

The Journal's co-editors-in-chief are Tara Renae McGee and Paul Mazerolle of Griffith University, Australia. The Associate Editors are Alex Piquero, USA; Ray Corrado, Canada; Georgia Zara, Europe; and Darrick Jolliffe, UK. The Editorial Manager of the Journal is Fiona Saunders and the journal is hosted by Griffith University. Any queries can be directed to Tara, Paul, or Fiona at jdccc@griffith.edu.au. We welcome your submissions!

Tara Renae McGee and Paul Mazerolle
Co-editors-in-chief





A Note from the Editor

Tom Arnold
arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

I wanted to thank all of the contributors to this newsletter. It makes it easy to put together a newsletter when there is such great cooperation from everyone.

I have a few items I am working on. On the last page, I have started a list of longitudinal research projects. If you can think of some research projects that may be of interest to other readers, please send the name of the project and a link and I will add it to the list.

I am also looking for any new books that you might have published. I will add them to the list.

Moving forward, if you have any ideas for an article or section for the next newsletter, please let me know. We have not come up with a general topic for the next newsletter, so this will be much appreciated.

Remember that the web site is available at <http://www.dlccrim.org> I am trying to get this updated. If you have any ideas for improving the web site, I would appreciate them.

I hope to see you at the ASC conference in San Francisco.

I wish you all the best.



Special Section: Longitudinal Studies of Criminal Behavior: What We Have Learned about Collecting Data on the Life Course

Stacey J. Bosick
Department of Sociology
University of Colorado Denver
stacey.bosick@ucdenver.edu

Introduction

At the 2013 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, I had the pleasure of organizing and chairing a panel entitled: "Longitudinal Studies of Criminal Behavior: What We Have Learned about Collecting Data on the Life Course." The session was sponsored by our Division of Developmental and Life Course Criminology and the panelists were Delbert Elliott, David P. Farrington, Edward P. Mulvey, Magda Stouthamer-Loeber and Rolf Loeber.

Rather than simply introducing the audience to longitudinal studies, or summarizing key findings that have emerged from them, the panelists offered candid reflections about their experiences overseeing these large projects, rife with lessons learned and words of wisdom for investigators wishing to embark on new longitudinal data collection efforts.

I asked the panelists to highlight methodological innovations (purposeful or accidental!) that allowed the field to grow in new directions, but I also asked them to comment on what they would do differently if they were beginning again. The session offered an opportunity for panelists to discuss the data they wished they had collected, and whether there were data that had been collected but not yet used to their full potential. Further, the panelists offered their future plans and directions for the studies they direct, as well as straightforward advice for new investigators about collecting the kinds of data needed to make cutting-edge contributions and overcoming the management obstacles inherent to long-term projects.

In the articles that follow, the panelists summarize some of the points they made during the session.

The National Youth Survey/ National Youth Survey Family Study



Delbert S. Elliott
Center for the Study and
Prevention of Violence
Problem Behavior & Positive
Youth Development
Program
Health and Society Program
delbert.elliott@colorado.edu



David Huizinga
Problem Behavior & Positive
Youth Development
Program
Huizinga@colorado.edu

Study Overview

The National Youth Survey (NYS) involves a national representative panel of American youth born between 1959 and 1965. The NYS is a prospective, longitudinal and multigenerational study involving 12 waves of data covering 28 years from 1977 to 2005. The original sample of 1725 youth was aged 11-17 in 1976, ages for which SRD information was initially collected at wave 1, and aged 38 to 44 at wave 11, the last year for which SRD data was collected. A parent of the original youths in the study was interviewed at waves 1 and 11, the spouse or romantic partner of the original respondents was interviewed at wave 11, and the children aged 11 and older of each respondent were interviewed at waves 11 and 12. Data collected included in-home, face-to-face interviews with each respondent, parent, partner and child of respondents as well as official police arrest records for each respondent.

The first five waves were conducted annually between 1977 and 1981. Starting in 1984, respondents were interviewed every third year ending with wave 9 in 1993. Waves 10-12 were conducted in 2003-2005. Wave 1 participation was estimated to be 73 percent of the eligible national sample and retention rates were over 90 percent for the first 4 waves, 80 percent for waves 5-8, and 70 percent for the remaining waves. The study during the last 3 waves was referred to as the National Youth Survey Family Study (NYSFS) as it focused on the original respondents and their parents, spouses/partners and children.

What would we do differently if starting now?

Ideally, we would have continued our annual surveys rather than switching to a three year cycle after the 5th wave. The change in recall periods for our measures of delinquency, substance abuse and other problem behaviors and other respondent characteristics, created problems for monitoring change over time/age. This was not our choice, but a requirement of our funder to reduce cost. But even in the annual surveys, we would now ask respondents to recall delinquent offending and other forms of antisocial behavior in the first 6 months of the year and then the last, most recent 6 months. Even better, we would use mobile media to obtain monthly reports (teens and young adults almost always answer their text messages). Greater time precision would provide clearer temporal order than a past year estimate gives us.

On the positive side, this three year cycle did give us the opportunity to study the effects of variable length recall periods (one year compared to two year, three year and ever) on estimates of delinquent behavior and a resulting distrust of recall over periods longer than 12 months and no confidence in the accuracy of "lifetime" or "ever" recall estimates. We would also have included interviews with parents of respondents each year for the first five annual waves. Since parental consent was required each year respondents were minors, the additional cost of obtaining parent interviews would be relatively small and this additional information

would have allowed critical information on changing parenting strategies and family environments.

We have individual addresses for respondents at each wave and have created Urban, Suburban and Rural codes for respondents at each wave through wave 10 but we have not obtained matching census “social” data. It would be useful to geo-code these data to allow easy access to census data.

We began adding detailed follow-up questions to the self-report delinquency items (SRD) in Wave 4 and discovered that these additional items provided other very useful information. These follow-ups asked for greater details about the behaviors reported and revealed that the events reported were sometimes trivial or inappropriate for the class of behaviors intended by the item. This was especially true for assault items. Thus it would have been good to include such follow-ups and obtain such information from the start of the study. (The use of SRD follow-ups is further described below.)

Although the NYS was quite successful in tracking respondents across all 12 waves (see some innovations used below), there are additional things such as sending birthday cards that we would use now. In today’s world with the internet, email, and a variety of social media, there are many additional things that could be done to track respondents and keep them in a longitudinal study.

What do you hope new longitudinal data collection efforts will emphasize?

We need annual national estimates of self-reported delinquent behavior to track crime trends over time. We have annual national self-report victimization reports, law enforcement arrest and crime incident reports, but no annual national self-reported offending survey. Given what we know about the biases in official data, this type of information is critical to our understanding of how juvenile involvement in crime is changing over time and in response to national and state-level crime prevention initiatives.

A more sophisticated approach to identifying risk and protective factors for delinquent and criminal behavior is needed. Current approaches continue to identify and estimate the predictive strength and developmental influence of individual factors, when what may be needed is the identification of different constellations or clusters of factors that give rise to the same behavior by different subsets of individuals at different stages of the life course. And we need to understand the influence of life course trajectories of these different constellations of factors over time. This obviously involves both new methodology and an interest in the factors underlying the behavior of different subsets of people.

Are the effects of well established “risk” factors for delinquency constant or changing over the life course? Obviously there are social changes and new technologies and new opportunities for involvement in delinquent behavior. This an important issue, since it addresses whether the extent to which findings from the “older longitudinal studies” are still of relevance.

Research is needed on the risks for arrest and the short and long-term effects of arrest and justice system processing (including incarceration). Do risks change and does the effect of arrest and processing change over the life course? More cross-national studies (which can be useful to all the countries involved) are needed for comparative analyses and they provide the opportunity for new insights and ways of doing things that might not be obvious in a single country study. Multiple-site studies in the U.S. are needed. It is dangerous to generalize from single site studies, yet that is often what is done. Some replication of findings is needed, but without prior planning across multiple sites (or studies), measurement and other details that would allow replication are missed.

Although reasonably good measures of self-reported delinquent behavior have been developed, there is still substantial room for improvement – and research to create better

measures is still needed (although rarely funded). Response sets, validity and reliability (not internal consistency), as well as content and wording of items remain especially important for longitudinal analyses and findings.

What innovations were made in collecting data that have allowed the field to grow in new directions?

The National Youth Survey developed a number of data collection and measurement innovations, some but not all of which are now routine practice. Tracking respondents over time was a critical issue, particularly for face-to-face interviews with a national sample. We developed a strategy that was very effective, asking respondents at each wave of the study to identify three persons who would know where they lived in the event they moved before the next survey, providing addresses and phone numbers for each. While we also used postal service forwarding addresses, mail-outs, utility hookups, neighbors at old addresses, etc., these identified persons were the best source of information about how to find respondents no longer living at our last known address. We also developed recall period bounding strategies to assist respondents locate reported events in the appropriate time interval. While the use of bounding techniques was not original with the NYS, we expanded this technique for our three year cycle. At various points in the interview, we reminded respondents that we were asking about events that occurred in the immediately preceding calendar year and asked them to recall where they celebrated the holiday, what gifts they received and what other things happened at the Christmas occurring immediately before the beginning of that year and then again for the Christmas at the end of the reference year. We also asked about New Year's Day and vacations taken during the year and provided a list of other salient sports, music, movie, and political events that occurred at different points during the reference year and repeatedly reminded them of this referenced time interval when introducing new topics in the interview.

We also developed several new types of measures. Our SRD measure used an expanded set of items to include a more comprehensive set of offenses than typically used, a set which included all those categories of offenses which are included in the Uniform Crime Reports. Many prior measures focused on the more trivial types of offenses. We also expanded and modified the set of items as the sample aged so as to include appropriate offenses for young adults and adults. The SRD measure asked open-ended questions about the number of offenses (a raw frequency score) of a given type and when a response of 10 or more was given, asked a categorical follow-up question to assess the regularity of these offenses (6 categories from "once a month" to "2-3 times a day") which provided a categorical score and a second estimate of the frequency of offending as well as the over-time patterning of the offense. The distributional characteristics of the raw frequency and categorical scales are quite different but each proved useful for understanding respondents' involvement in criminal behavior, substance use and other forms of antisocial behavior.

In addition, starting at wave 4, we obtained follow-up questions on the specific details of first three reported offenses for a given type of offenses, indicating for example, for a theft offense: what was stolen?, how much it was worth?, where it was stolen from?, did others take part?, and had you been drinking or taking drugs before the incident? While this was not the first use of follow-up questions, this was a more detailed set that included more details and covered more of the events reported. The analysis of these data allowed for a corrected self-reported estimate that removed trivial and inappropriate events from the counts, provided an analysis of subgroup differences in the tendency to report trivial or inappropriate events, and provided additional useful detail about the offenses reported.

The breadth of the variables included in the NYS is also unique, as this study was designed to test an integrated theory of delinquency and

other types of problem behavior, specifically social learning theory, social control theory, and strain theory. It thus includes measures of delinquency, drug use, victimization, mental health outcomes and other types of problem behavior as well measures of the central explanatory variables from these theories. In selected waves, variables from other theoretical perspectives, for example, deterrence theory, and other types of problem behavior were included.

The national search for arrest records was also unique at the time. We obtained permission from approximately 90 percent of all respondents to search law enforcement agencies for any contacts and arrests. We searched all local law enforcement agencies in every local jurisdiction in which they had lived for a year or longer from 1976 thru 1979 (waves 1-4) and every law enforcement agency in jurisdictions within 10 miles from each residence between 1976 and 1979 (1,667 agencies), and then a national NCIC search in 1987 when all respondents were adults. We also believe the NYSFS involved the first collection of DNA from a representative national sample that included three generations.

We continue to get requests from the US and around the world for information about and permission to use NYS measures, both for SRD and for various scales developed for the NYS. We are hopeful these measures have been useful or act as guide for other researchers.

Are there data that have not been used to their full potential?

A number of years ago an NIJ staff member (Joel Garner) noted that while there were many good studies of crime and delinquency, in most cases only 10-30% of the well thought out and well intentioned measures collected had ever been analyzed or reported on. While over time, many of the answers to research questions originally posed by the NYS and for which data was collected have been addressed, this note is at least partially true for the NYS. In addition, although many non-NYS staff individuals have used and published on the NYS data, some users are still finding and creating measures from the NYS data to use for their particular interests. So

the answer to this question must be - YES. There are several types of NYS data that have not been utilized at all and some that have been underused. There is a fairly detailed set of longitudinal data on involvement in intimate relationships and sexual behavior that, to our knowledge, has not been used in any published work. These data include, for example, sexual orientation, frequency of sexual intercourse, sexual problems (STDs, AIDS, impotence, etc.), pregnancy, abortion, number of sexual partners, types of birth control, and satisfaction with sexual relationships. There is also a detailed set of data on respondents' job history- types of work, pay, discrimination at work, termination, perceived reasons for termination, and job satisfaction. Additional underused data include drug related problems and outpatient services utilized to deal with drug use problems; self-reported arrest, conviction and sentencing information; rational choice and moral disengagement measures; and crime victimization data.

What are the future directions for the study?

There are no current plans for an additional survey. However, there is considerable research and writing work within the NYS still being accomplished, especially using the multi-generational NYSFS data. Much of this work is under the guidance of Prof. Scott Menard at Sam Houston State University. In addition, the Institute for Behavioral Genetics at the University of Colorado (Co-researchers in Waves 10-12), continue leading NYS work on genetics and drug use.

Availability of NYS/NYSFS data.

NYS/NYSFS data for waves 1 to 7 are available from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). ICPSR maintains copies of interviews, codebooks and data which can be found on their website. Later waves of data are not yet publicly available, due to our Institutional Review Board concerns over confidentiality and guarantees to respondents. We are working to resolve this problem and hope to make them available in the near future.



The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development

David P. Farrington

Brief Description of the Study

The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD) is a prospective longitudinal survey of 411 London males from age 8 onwards. The CSDD began in 1961, and for the first 20 years it was directed by Donald West. I started working on it in 1969 after finishing my PhD in experimental psychology, and I took over as Director of the CSDD in 1982. As I am now Emeritus, I am now planning to pass on the direction of the CSDD to my Cambridge colleague Dr. Maria Ttofi. In longitudinal studies, there has to be intergenerational transmission of investigators as well as participants!

I will not summarize the aims or the main results of the CSDD here. They are fully discussed in six books and over 210 papers listed on my Cambridge University website. It is sufficient to say that many analyses have investigated the development of offending and antisocial behavior from childhood to adulthood, risk factors for and correlates of offending at different ages, and the effects of life events on the course of development. My emphasis has been on presenting empirical results rather than on developing and testing a theory. The most recent book is *Offending from Childhood to Late Middle Age* (Farrington, Piquero, & Jennings, 2013). I have been very fortunate in having many collaborators who have helped me to exploit the rich information that has been collected.

The males have been interviewed face-to-face nine times between ages 8 and 48. We have

made big efforts to interview as many of the males as possible at each age, and we have been successful in interviewing a high proportion of those who are still alive: 94% at age 32 and 93% at age 48. This is because we have found that the males who are the hardest to interview tend to be the most antisocial and criminal. In light of this fact, I am dubious about using imputation methods to deal with missing data. We also interviewed the parents of the males about once a year from when the males were 8 until when they were 15, we collected teacher ratings when they were ages 8, 10, 12, and 14, we had peer ratings when they were ages 8 and 10, and we interviewed their female partners when the males were ages 32 and 48. We also searched the criminal records of the males repeatedly up to age 56 (by which age 32 had died) and the criminal records of all their biological relatives. In recent years, we have interviewed 550 of their children (84%) at the average age of 25.

I will now try to address some specific questions put to us by Stacey Bosick.

Innovations in Data Collection

Apart from the high response rate over a 40-year follow-up period, we are able to compare self-reported and official offending in several age ranges from age 10 to age 48 to investigate the probability of a self-reported offense leading to a conviction. In addition, we are able to compare the intergenerational transmission of self-reported and official offending. While most of the measures are individual or family factors, we have measured some biological factors, including height, weight, waist measurement, resting heart rate, blood pressure, testosterone, and respiratory function.

Availability of Data

In regard to the availability of data for analysis, there is a public use dataset deposited at ICPSR of data collected between ages 8 and 25. However, the conviction information in this is out-of-date. Other data can be obtained from myself and Dr. Ttofi after completing a confidentiality form. We have to be very

concerned about the confidentiality of criminal record and other data. I have been very free in giving out the data, but this means that I have difficulty in keeping track of (or even in discovering!) all the analyses that have been carried out. Because the CSDD is a very complex dataset, I think it is best for data users to collaborate with us in order to avoid misinterpreting the data.

Data not Fully Exploited

Because the emphasis in the CSDD has been on criminal offending, there have been few analyses that have focussed specifically on other data such as drug use, alcohol use, drunk driving, motoring crimes, sexual behavior, gambling, smoking, unemployment, educational problems, physical health, etc. For example, the data could be used to study the development of smoking (onset, continuity/discontinuity, escalation/de-escalation, and desistance), risk and protective factors for smoking, correlates of smoking at different ages, and effects of life events on smoking.

Our pre-interview sheets which document all attempts to contact people at different ages have not been fully exploited. We carried out an analysis at age 32 (Farrington et al., 1990) on methods of tracing and securing cooperation from the males, and many people who are doing surveys found these analyses very useful and interesting. However, such analyses, however useful for maximizing the validity of data collection and conclusions, are not likely to lead to publications in major criminological journals. Also, our tracing methods have had to change over time with the development of the internet, Facebook, etc.

I think that case histories of the males, tracing their development from age 8 to age 48, are extremely interesting. My colleague Georgia Zara has been constructing case histories of some of the most criminal males using the voluminous information collected at different ages (and especially the free-text descriptions). This is quite time-consuming, and again it is not the

kind of material that is published by major criminological journals, but it really gives an insight into how people live their lives and develop from childhood to adulthood.

What Would I Do Differently?

Unfortunately, what we could do was and is limited by our success or failure in obtaining funding. It would have been much better to have had frequent, repeated (ideally annual) measurement, so that it was possible to track changes in offending and antisocial behavior and how they were influenced by changes in risk and protective factors and life events. To a great extent, this was achieved in the Pittsburgh Youth Study, where it was possible to relate within-individual changes in risk factors to within-individual changes in delinquency (Farrington et al., 2002). Also, we could have used more standardized instruments with known reliability and validity, again as was done in Pittsburgh.

In terms of topics, we should have focused more on protective factors and on why boys from criminogenic backgrounds nevertheless managed to lead successful lives. Also, we should have had better neighborhood and community measures, as well as more biological measures. Also, we should have made more effort to measure situational influences on offending, so that we could specify how a person's antisocial potential became the actuality of the criminal event. I think that there should be more effort to bring together the developmental and situational traditions in criminology.

Future Plans

The CSDD males were mostly born in 1953, so they are turning 61 this year. It would be highly desirable to reinterview them soon, ideally around age 63 in 2016, so that we can build up a fairly complete picture of their life development. It is important to reinterview them soon because, of course, we will increasingly lose them because they will die. A particular problem is that the most antisocial and criminal males tend to die early. We will try to get funding for a study focusing on successful aging

of males from deprived backgrounds, but there is no guarantee that we will succeed. It would also be highly desirable to reinterview their children 10 years later, to track their development from ages 25 to 35. Most of them were interviewed between 2004 and 2007. And of course it would be interesting to start interviewing their grandchildren!

We intend to resuscitate a master plan for data analysis. We used to have one years ago (and we developed one for the Pittsburgh Youth Study) and this would be helpful in identifying gaps and key topics to address. In recent years, many of the CSDD analyses have been reactive, in response to proposals from other researchers. It would be better to be proactive in specifying key questions to address.

Advice for Longitudinal Researchers

Since our main problem has always been how to secure funding, the best advice to any researcher would be to try to find a wealthy benefactor who would be interested in guaranteeing continued funding! No longitudinal study has ever had guaranteed long-term funding, which means that all studies have to focus on short-term plans.

If this major problem could be overcome, I would reiterate some of the things I have said and add a few others. Collect frequent, repeated, comparable measures. Minimize attrition. Measure not only individual and family factors but also biological, neighborhood, community, and situational factors. Focus on why some people from deprived backgrounds are nevertheless successful. Establish the validity of survey responses by comparing them with record information. Study interviewer effects by randomly assigning participants to interviewers. Collect more information about the characteristics of crimes committed so that their financial costs can be estimated. Derive quantitative predictions from competing developmental and life-course theories and test them.

I still think that our proposals (Farrington, Ohlin & Wilson, 1986) for an accelerated longitudinal study are worthwhile. We recommended following up four cohorts in the same large city from pre-birth, age 6, age 12 and age 18, with yearly assessments for at least six years. I think it is desirable for the principal investigator to be based in the same large city, as it is hard to direct research effectively from a distance. In a longitudinal study, it is very important to collect data very carefully, with a lot of checking to eliminate errors. Unlike a cross-sectional study, if you make an error in a longitudinal study, it will come back to haunt you later. I also think it is important to keep all data for ever, although maybe everything can be scanned these days. It is important to store a data archive for future generations of researchers.

Finally, I should apologize that I have kept this as a very short paper. I could have written a lot more about all these topics but then I would be in danger of writing a book!

References

- Farrington, D. P., Gallagher, B., Morley, L., St. Ledger, R., & West, D. J. (1990). Minimizing attrition in longitudinal research: Methods of tracing and securing cooperation in a 24-year follow-up study. In D. Magnusson & L. Bergman (Eds.), *Data quality in longitudinal research* (pp. 122-147). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrington, D. P., Loeber, R., Yin, Y., & Anderson, S. J. (2002). Are within-individual causes of delinquency the same as between-individual causes? *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 12, 53-68.
- Farrington, D. P., Ohlin, L. E., & Wilson, J. Q. (1986). *Understanding and controlling crime: Toward a new research strategy*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Farrington, D. P., Piquero, A. R., & Jennings, W. G. (2013). *Offending from childhood to late middle age: Recent results from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development*. New York: Springer.

The Pittsburgh Youth Study



Rolf Loeber

Department of Psychiatry
at the University of
Pittsburgh School of
Medicine

loeberr@upmc.edu



**Magda Stouthamer-
Loeber**

stoumx@upmc.edu

The Pittsburgh Youth Study (PYS)

PYS is a longitudinal study which started in 1987-88 and has continued up till the present time. The study was set up to describe the development of antisocial and delinquent behavior, mental health problems, and substance use, their rise and fall and the factors that influence these developments. We were also interested in prosocial development.

We started out with 3 samples randomly selected from grades 1, 4, and 7 of Pittsburgh public schools. The first assessment was used as a screen to increase the number of problem youth in the follow-up study. We took the top 1/3 of antisocial boys and added a random selection from the remainder. The screening formula allows us to obtain population values by weighting the sample back to the original number. The first seven assessments were half-yearly after which we switched to yearly assessments for the youngest and oldest samples. Subsequently, the assessments were done yearly. The middle sample needed to be dropped after seven assessments because of the overlap of the samples and a shortage of funds. Up to the age of 16 we had three informants: boys, a parent and a teacher. Various publicly available data

sources and criminal records have been updated throughout the study.

The participation rate has continued to be high; 82.8% for the youngest sample after 20 assessments and 85% after 17 assessments for the oldest sample. The study has been accompanied by 16 independently funded substudies, each with their own aims and funding, but sharing the main data set. Some examples of substudies are: Personality, Cognitive attention deficit, fMRI, DNA and Cardiovascular Health.

The study has yielded 4 books, 45 chapters, over 160 papers and 46 reports and dissertations. This productivity has only been possible by the addition of substudies and by sharing our data set with other researchers. We continue to work with other researchers but we are also transferring the raw data and main constructs to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan (NACJD). We have not yet transferred all the data and also NACJD has not finalized a prototype contract for data users, but this should all be resolved soon. There is a similar data set in Holland (Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law).

The study has been funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA), the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse (NIAA) and the Pew Foundation. We are thankful to our colleagues David Farrington and Helene White who have played major roles over the course of the study. Dustin Pardini has taken over the running of the study. We thank the participants, the staff and the large number of researchers who have written papers using the data of the study.

Innovations during the study

During the course of the study we made a number of technical and organizational changes. After we had filled a warehouse with interview booklets, we switched to equipping the interviewers with laptops so that data could be collected electronically. This made it possible to

skip the data entry and the data entry checking steps and to save on the rental of a warehouse. Most importantly, by downloading the electronic files of the interviews every week, it became possible to check the files for problems and rectify irregularities by fixing the computer program and/or by collecting the missing information soon after the original interview.

Other innovations are that there are many more electronic data sources for finding or contacting people than when we started our study, such as on-line criminal records, Facebook, etc. The electronic possibilities are growing every day and researchers need to keep an eye on these developments and use them to their best advantage to stay in touch with participants and possibly to collect data.

Over time we have set up an interviewer tracking system that allowed us to see from week to week the productivity of the interviewers in terms of completed interviews, searches, refusals and errors or omissions in the consent forms or interviews themselves. This gave us the opportunity to improve the interviewers' performance on an ongoing basis instead of finding out about problems in the end. The interviewers were fully aware of the data we collected on the interviewing process since we shared it with them in their weekly individual supervision sessions.

As we moved into data management and analyses we made improvements in data cleaning and documentation, in the documentation of the data sets and in our capability to search data sets. This was spurred on by our willingness to share the data with outside investigators who needed an easily accessible system to navigate the data.

What if we would begin again?

Obviously, if we were to begin again, all the changes mentioned above would be included from the start of the study. There are several other things that we would do differently if we started yet another longitudinal study. Content-wise we would pay more attention to the development of prosocial behavior and the better measurement of protective factors. Also, the

comprehensive measurement of neighborhood disadvantage and advantage would play a more prominent part. If money could be found for it, we would build in more interviews to find out more in-depth information about how young men get into a gang and out of it, where they find a gun, how they think about the future.

Are there data not been used (yet) to their full potential?

In general, the data set is so huge that there are more questions than can be explored by a small investigator team. That is why it is so important to build in specialized substudies and to attract outside researchers who have their own interests which can be addressed by our data set. This makes it possible to make good use of the enormous effort and costs involved in a longitudinal study. One example where more work can be done is that the DNA data could be used more fully. However, even though our sample is large, for purposes of DNA analyses it is relatively small.

What are our future plans/directions?

It is very important to transfer our data to NACJD so that other researchers can continue to use the data. Currently we are involved in a study of cardiovascular health study with the youngest sample (late 30s). In this study we continue to collect data on delinquency and drug use. It is likely that at some point we will follow the samples up again. There is also a need to summarize the multitude of findings contained in the books and papers produced by the PYS.

Advice for new studies

There have not been large longitudinal studies on the development of delinquency for quite a while. One of the important topics would be to better combine the study of psychosocial and brain development. As mentioned, we would also advocate a greater focus on prosocial behavior and protective factors. In addition, very little is known about the development of gender differences. This is an important topic since the rate of offending is very different for males than for females. More than 10 years ago we started a longitudinal study on girls which may fill some

of this gap. A study of the accumulation of risk factors in different neighborhoods might also shed some light on how children might get trapped in a life of crime and how others, despite neighborhood disadvantages do well.

We have focused in our study on the lives of criminals but we know far less of the lives of victims. The categories of criminals and of victims overlap to a certain extent, but the dynamics of what makes a person become a victim needs to be studied more.

Additional comments

Doing longitudinal studies requires researchers' passion for:

- Maintaining the sample size as much as possible. This means that no effort should be spared to find participants and to convince them to continue with the study.
 - Reliable assessments. The assessment instruments need to be tested to make sure the bugs have been removed and the interviewers need to be trained to be ambassadors of the study as well as reliable data collectors.
 - Complete data. This is a matter of training the interviewers carefully and of checking the data as they come in (and not when all data collection has been finished).
 - Careful documentation. Documentation of procedures and of the data files should be an ongoing process to prevent forgetting what went in to the actual procedures.
 - Regular hands-on involvement of the investigators at all levels of a study. Investigators should be aware of the progress and problems and participate in the solution of these problems. Not only is this good for staff morale, but it will also mean that the investigators know how to interpret the data when it is time to do analyses.
 - High staff continuity. A longitudinal study starts to develop a history over time. No matter how carefully one tries to document everything, there is information that resides in the memory of the staff. If there is a high turnover of staff, this information is likely to be lost.
- A stable and supportive academic department. This can set the scene for intra-departmental collaborations as well as smoothing out minor funding shortages.
 - Interdisciplinary initiatives. No investigator alone can be an expert on all aspects of studying the development of delinquency, mental health problems and substance use. It is, therefore, important to have a collaborative team. In addition, separately funded substudies can address additional topics that would not be possible to look into within the expertise of the original investigators nor within the limits of the budget of the main study.
 - Last but not least, the ability to raise funds. A longitudinal study by its nature requires the necessity to obtain funding over several funding cycles and most likely from a number of different agencies. To ensure the continuity of a study means planning and finding the time to write proposals on a regular basis.

Additional reading

- Cotter, R.B., Burke, J.D., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Loeber, R. Contacting participants for follow-up: How much effort is required to retain participants in longitudinal studies? *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 28: 15-21, 2005.
- Loeber, R., Farrington, D.P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & van Kammen, W.B., *Antisocial Behavior and Mental Health Problems: Risk Factors in Childhood and Adolescence*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1998.
- Loeber, R., Farrington, D.P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., White, H.R. *Violence and serious theft: Risk and promotive factors from childhood to early adulthood*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2008.
- Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & van Kammen W.B. *Data collection and management. A practical guide*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1995



The Pathways to Desistance Study

Edward P. Mulvey
mulveyep@upmc.edu

Introduction

It was a pleasure to take part in the panel last year regarding some “lessons learned” from serving on the team of investigators connected with the Pathways to Desistance study. It was especially enjoyable to hear the comments of the other investigators about their own lessons and insights. We all shared some common problems and learned some of the same lessons the hard way.

It would be useful to have a little background on the Pathways to Desistance study. The Pathways study is a multi-site, longitudinal study of serious adolescent offenders followed from adolescence into early adulthood. The aims of the investigation are to: 1) identify initial patterns of how serious adolescent offenders stop antisocial activity, 2) describe the role of social context and developmental changes in promoting these positive changes, and 3) compare the effects of sanctions and interventions in promoting these changes. The larger goals of the study are to improve decision making by court and social service personnel and to clarify policy debate about alternatives for serious adolescent offenders.

This study grew out of the planning efforts of the MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. The study is part of a broader agenda of the Network to provide juvenile justice professionals and policy makers with empirical information that can be applied to improve practice, particularly regarding the topics of competence and culpability, risk assessment, and amenability of juvenile offenders. Network activities provided the initial forum for conceptualizing

and planning this study, and ongoing collaboration with Network members and the MacArthur Foundation has assisted in dissemination efforts. The study has a working group of investigators who have guided and worked on it since its inception.

From 2000-2003, 1,354 adjudicated youths from the juvenile and adult court systems in Maricopa County (Phoenix), Arizona (N=654) and Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania (N=700) were enrolled into the study. The enrolled youth were age 14 through 17 at the time of their committing offense, and were found guilty of a serious offense (almost exclusively felonies). The sample is primarily male (86%) and ethnically diverse (20% White, 34% Latino, 41% Black); the enrolled sample had an average of three prior petitions to court.

Interviews were conducted every six months following baseline for the first three years and annually for four years. Including baseline, eleven waves of data are available. Retention rates for the study were excellent, averaging 90% percent across all interview waves. Collateral interviews were also conducted, and official records (including arrests) were coded. More information about the study design, the publications from the study, and access to the data sets (currently posted at the Interuniversity Consortium on Political and Social Research at the University of Michigan) can be found at the study website (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

One of the major innovations in this study is the extensive use of life event calendars. We collected information at the monthly level about several domains of life changes during the recall period since the last interview. We asked, for instance, about living arrangements and employment during each of the months since the last interview, and were able to consolidate these reports across the entire seven-year follow-up period of the study. This means that patterns of employment or institutional care can be detected across the entire follow-up period, rather than simply portrayed as a characteristic of each particular recall period. We also collected information about each “spell” of an activity

(e.g., the wages at a particular job, the type of institution the adolescent was in during that period). These factors greatly enrich the portrayal of patterns of events in the lives of these adolescents. They also offer immense opportunities for innovative analytic approaches for testing the effects of extended periods of behavior that might promote desistance from criminal activity.

If starting the project again, what would you do differently?

Taking on a project this large is a real challenge in terms of planning and logistics. There are any number of things that might have been done differently, since there is no singular “right way” to go about this type of operation. In the end, much of what the investigators are doing is keeping the project on task and on time, while ensuring that the data obtained is both accurate and usable.

More up-front programming. As a group, the investigators made a decision to have the data ready for analysis as quickly as possible after it was collected and to collect the data in such a way that it could be posted for use outside the working group within a reasonable time period. This means that we wanted to collect interviews using a computerized-assisted format and to transmit the data in a timely fashion to a centralized site for cleaning and organizing. We therefore needed a usable interview programmed and support programs for shipping, checking, and correcting data in place at the beginning of data collection.

If one is committed to turning the data around quickly after it is collected, it becomes apparent early on that there is a large amount of programming necessary to build the infrastructure for doing so. Our first lesson was how difficult this is to do well. We would have left more lead time for software development and the programming needed for a centralized data portal. We were very pressed to get into the field with an adequate support structure for data collection in place, and numerous “patches” were required for programs once they became

operational. The first thing we would have done differently is to allow more time and resources to do the initial programming to get the operations into the field. We also could have benefited from having sophisticated computer programmers on staff from the beginning, in light of the complexities of the tasks that arose regarding data organization and transformation.

Monitoring fiscal issues more efficiently. We would have built more efficient and effective methods for monitoring and reporting on the multiple sources of funding needed for a project this size. We had nine different funding sources (foundations, federal agencies, and state agencies) and keeping track of what charges went to what account from which of three different universities or six consultants was a demanding task. Each funding source had different reporting requirements, different schedules for reporting, and different indirect reimbursement rates. It was a large task to ensure that each participating university received an equivalent indirect rate and that adequate monies were coming in the door to continue the field operations. Having an independent accounting system that tracked sources and expenses in terms that mattered to the overall operation and was timely (characteristics not associated with university research accounting systems) would have been a real asset.

Capture more qualitative data. It became apparent to us, as data were collected, that no amount of quantitative information could adequately capture the complexities and drama that we were witnessing in the lives of the adolescents we interviewed. We needed richer, qualitative information about the way these adolescents’ lives unfolded. Taking photographs, recording stories, having interviewers dictate accounts of interviews or discussions with family members or justice officials would have provided an invaluable, and rich, context for much of the quantitative data. It would have provided a bank of information that could have effectively illustrated points in later presentations or publications.

This might have also helped us better address the nagging problem we have with documentation of success. We have found it difficult to characterize positive outcomes in the study with much depth. We think that a closer, more personal view would have made it more apparent to us early on in the study that some good things do happen in the lives of these adolescents and that we should pick up on them more systematically.

General advice for new investigators

Taking on a large, longitudinal investigation is a commitment that one must live with once it begins. It is difficult to shift gears and walk away from ongoing investigations like these. These undertakings shape one's career and drain energy for years in the future. Before beginning an involved project like this, it seems essential to believe in and be intrigued by the questions being asked. They are ones that you are going to live with and be asked about for a number of years in the future. There are a few things that can make this long journey more interesting.

Seek multidisciplinary collaborators. We often see issues through our own disciplinary lenses and fail to capitalize on opportunities to contribute to other disciplines' "takes" on a problem. Getting advice about issues, measurement, and policy relevance of certain findings can be immensely valuable when structuring the types of data to collect and the sample characteristics. Initial decisions about these issues can allow a longitudinal investigation to make contributions to several different academic and policy areas. The effort to collect the data is a formidable task, but deciding initially how to collect the most appropriate set of variables is equally important. Knowing the key questions in several policy debates or theoretical arguments before planning the study is essential to making the most of the immense amount of effort that will be expended in getting the study completed.

Securing multiple funders. Any savvy investor has a diversified portfolio of investments. Any savvy researcher has connections with multiple

funders. It is a way to cover oneself when money unexpectedly dries up in one area, or when additional opportunities become available in another. Relying on a single funder is a risky enterprise. In addition, funders like to be investing in projects that look attractive to other knowledgeable individuals; they like to buy a piece of the action in an emerging area recognized by others. For many funders, backing a winner allows them to make a minimal investment, have a large impact, and be on the cutting edge of new findings.

Do the politics. Investing a considerable amount of time getting to know the practitioners and policy makers in the locale you are working is time well spent. Collecting data that matters to these individuals and being aware of what issues matter to them is important if you want later support to keep a study going or to expand it. Oftentimes, academic researchers feel that going to lunch with practitioners or sitting through community meetings is a "waste of valuable time" that they could be spending more productively. It is not the case if one is planning on a continued relationship and presence in the world of service provision or policy. It is instead a place to learn a great deal about what to investigate, how to go about it, and how to frame findings to have an impact on practice or policy.

Invest in measurement selection and design. Designing the questions in an interview and choosing the structured measures to be administered are decisions that you will live with for the duration of the study and beyond. The instruments chosen have to have validity across different ages in a longitudinal study or have to be connected tightly to later indicators of the same construct at a different age. The time and effort thinking about repeated administrations of an instrument is again time well spent. It becomes clear after a few waves of interviewing that certain measures are not working well, but one cannot change questions in the middle of a stream of observations without wondering what effect such a move might have on the quality and interpretability of the data. The ideal situation is to keep all the questions the same in the

interview. Thinking through whether this will actually work over repeated observations is better done in the beginning of the study rather than in the middle of data collection.

Future directions

We are currently working on “marketing” the findings so far from the study. A good bit of effort is going into summarizing findings in short forms (“briefs”) for practitioners and policy makers. Journal articles are useful for academic careers and theoretical discussions, but the dissemination of practical information has to be in easily digestible and available forms. We are doing this in conjunction with several of our funding agencies.

We are also encouraging and helping people use the data sets for their research. We have posted the data at the Interuniversity Consortium on Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan. We have also given a workshop at ICPSR on how to use the data sets. We have had a website for the study, giving background on the design and measures as well as the publications that have come from the study (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu). We are committed to continuing these efforts to allow other researchers to capitalize on our investment in constructing what we see as a piece of infrastructure for the field.

How Many Longitudinal Studies Are There?

After reading these articles, I became curious and asked, “How many of these longitudinal studies are there?” I am trying to put together a list of longitudinal studies that might be used for developmental and life-course research. So far, I have the following links. There seem to be a fairly large number of studies available. If you notice that a study is missing, please send me the name of the study and the link to the study. I will try to keep a more current list on the web site.

Tom Arnold
arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

Links to Longitudinal Studies

[Australian Temperament Project](#)
[Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children](#)
[British Cohort Study](#)
[California Youth Authority Parolees](#)
[Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development](#)
[Chicago Youth Development Study](#)
[Christchurch Health and Development Study](#)
[Columbia County Longitudinal Study](#)
[Denver Youth Study](#)
[Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Human Development Study](#)
[Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime](#)
[Glueck Study of Juvenile Delinquency](#)
[Great Smokey Mountains Study](#)
[Individual Development and Adaptation](#)
[International Youth Development Study](#)
[Jyväskylä Longitudinal Study](#)
[Kaplan's Longitudinal and Multigenerational Study](#)
[Kauai Longitudinal Study](#)
[Longitudinal Study of Young People in England](#)
[Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth](#)
[Marion County Youth Study](#)
[Mater University Study of Pregnancy](#)
[Mauritius Child Health Project](#)
[MMPI Longitudinal Study](#)
[Montreal Longitudinal Experimental Study](#)
[National Child Development Study](#)
[National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health](#)
[National Longitudinal Study of Youth - 1979](#)
[National Longitudinal Study of Youth - 1997](#)
[National Survey of Health and Development](#)
[New York Longitudinal Study](#)
[Newcastle Thousand Family Study](#)
[Pathways to Desistance Study](#)
[Peterborough Adolescent & Young Adult Development Study](#)
[Philadelphia Birth Cohort - 1945](#)
[Philadelphia Birth Cohort - 1958](#)
[Pittsburgh Youth Study](#)
[Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods](#)
[Oregon Youth Study](#)
[Quebec Longitudinal Study of Childhood Development](#)
[Rochester Youth Development Study](#)
[Rutgers Health and Human Development Project](#)
[Seattle Social Development Project](#)
[Woodlawn Project](#)