

# Adolescent Crime

Individual differences  
and lifestyles

**WILLAN**  
PUBLISHING

Per-Olof H. Wikström and  
David A. Butterworth

# **Adolescent Crime**

## **Individual differences and lifestyles**

---

**Per-Olof H. Wikström and  
David A. Butterworth**



**WILLAN  
PUBLISHING**

*Copy*

Published by

Willan Publishing  
Culmcott House  
Mill Street, Uffculme  
Cullompton, Devon  
EX15 3AT, UK  
Tel: +44(0)1884 840337  
Fax: +44(0)1884 840251  
e-mail: [info@willanpublishing.co.uk](mailto:info@willanpublishing.co.uk)  
website: [www.willanpublishing.co.uk](http://www.willanpublishing.co.uk)

Published simultaneously in the USA and Canada by

Willan Publishing  
c/o ISBS, 920 NE 58th Ave, Suite 300  
Portland, Oregon 97213-3786, USA  
Tel: +001(0)503 287 3093  
Fax: +001(0)503 280 8832  
e-mail: [info@isbs.com](mailto:info@isbs.com)  
website: [www.isbs.com](http://www.isbs.com)

© Per-Olof H. Wikström and David A. Butterworth 2006

The rights of Per-Olof H. Wikström and David A. Butterworth to be identified as the authors of this book have been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act of 1988.

All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Publishers or a licence permitting copying in the UK issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE.

Hardback  
ISBN-13: 978-1-84392-177-6  
ISBN-10: 1-84392-177-4

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by GCS, Leighton Buzzard, Beds  
Project management by Deer Park Productions, Tavistock, Devon  
Printed and bound by T.J. International, Padstow, Cornwall

## Acknowledgements

---

In this book, we present the key findings of the cross-sectional Peterborough Youth Study (PYS). The study focuses on the role of individual differences and lifestyles, particularly their interaction, in the explanation of adolescent offending. The study was financed by a grant from the Home Office Innovative Research Challenge Fund. Some additional funding was provided by the Cambridge Institute of Criminology.

The Peterborough Youth Study is a forerunner to the current longitudinal Peterborough Adolescent Development Study (PADS). Many of the topics we take forward and the methodologies we use in PADS emerged out of our experiences of conducting PYS.

The basic PYS research team consisted of myself, Charlotte Read (research assistant) and Suzanna Wikström (part-time research assistant) and I would like to thank both Charlotte and Suzanna for doing an excellent job. In addition, a number of other people helped with the data collection (e.g. administration of questionnaires, conducting interviews, inputting of data). There are too many to mention them all, but special mention should be made of Linda Harte (Peterborough), Vicky Wright (M.Phil student at the time at the Cambridge Institute of Criminology), Jon Olafsson, Stephen Boxford and Joel Harvey (all Ph.D students at the time at the Cambridge Institute of Criminology), who carried a larger share of the work (they have of course been paid for their effort, although at a modest rate, which makes their contribution even more appreciated).

We would especially like to thank all the Peterborough young people who took time to share some of their life experience with us,

and the Peterborough schools and their staff who allowed us some of their time and assistance to carry out the school questionnaire study.

Chief Superintendent David Harvey played a pivotal role in my decision to locate this study to Peterborough. His continued support and help in facilitating local contacts necessary for this study are acknowledged and much appreciated.

After completing his Ph.D and working for several years as a research associate with PADS, David Butterworth agreed to help me turn the initial PYS report to the Home Office (Wikström 2002) into a book manuscript. This book is the result of a fruitful collaboration between the two of us.

In the final stages of editing, Charlotte Christie and Kyle Treiber helped us consolidate and trim the rough edges of the manuscript.

*Per-Olof Wikström*  
*University of Cambridge*

# Contents

---

<i>List of figures and tables</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
In search of patterns and explanations	2
The problem of correlation and causation	3
Aims of the research: key questions and constructs	6
Outline of chapters	6
<b>2 The Peterborough Youth Study</b>	<b>9</b>
The questionnaire study	9
The interview study	16
<b>3 The City of Peterborough and its neighbourhoods</b>	<b>19</b>
Classifying neighbourhood contexts	22
Neighbourhoods by IMD scores	22
Enumeration districts by 1991 census data	23
<b>4 Involvement in crime and substance use</b>	<b>27</b>
Offending	27
Victimisation	34
Substance use	41
Comparisons with the prevalence of offending in the 1992 and 1998–9 National Youth Studies	53

Comparisons with the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transition and crime	56
<b>5 Family social position</b>	<b>58</b>
Family social class	58
Family structure	66
Family ethnicity/immigrant status	71
Multivariate analyses	81
<b>6 Individual characteristics: social situation and dispositions</b>	<b>89</b>
Social bonds	90
Self-control	102
Morality	108
Individual characteristics and victimisation	117
The composite risk-protective score	117
<b>7 The community context: neighbourhoods and schools</b>	<b>132</b>
The neighbourhood context	135
The school context	154
Conclusion	169
<b>8 Lifestyles</b>	<b>172</b>
Peer delinquency	173
High-risk public environments	175
Substance use	178
The overall lifestyle risk measure	181
Lifestyle risk, individual risk-protective scores and offending: exploring the interaction effects	188
Three groups of adolescent offenders?	195
<b>9 Youth routines and involvement in crime: some preliminary findings from the space-time budget study</b>	<b>207</b>
Offending and victimisation	210
Main patterns of the youths' routine activities	213
Differences in the youths' routine activities by gender, family social position and ethnicity	217
Differences in the youths' routine activities by their individual risk-protective characteristics	221
Differences in the youths' routine activities by their community context	225

Peer centredness, time spent in high-risk situations and offending	228
The relationship between key dimensions of youth routine activities and offending: a comparative analysis of youths with protective and balanced individual risk-protective scores	233
<b>10 Key findings and their explanations</b>	<b>238</b>
The context of the study	238
Involvement in crime	239
Explanatory factors	241
Implications for crime prevention	251
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>255</b>
A: Wording of offending, victimisation and substance use questions	255
B: Space-time budget codes	256
C: Parental monitoring questions	266
D: Self-control scale questions	268
E: Pro-social values scale questions	268
F: Deterrence construct	269
<i>References</i>	270
<i>Index</i>	282



# List of figures and tables

---

## Figures

1.1	Overview of key hypothesised relationships between key studied constructs	7
3.1	Scattergram of deprivation score by per cent living in local authority housing in Peterborough urban area	21
4.1	Per cent caught by or reported to the police by type of crime	30
4.2	Per cent having committed serious thefts by frequency of offending	33
4.3	Mean number of different types of crime committed by frequency of offending	34
4.4	Per cent serious injuries by weapon use	40
4.5	Mean frequency of overall victimisations by frequency of offending	42
4.6	Overall prevalence of victimisation and offending by substance use	46
4.7	Main types of offending prevalence by frequency of alcohol use (being drunk)	47
4.8	Main types of offending prevalence by frequency of cannabis use	47
4.9	Main types of offending prevalence by frequency of inhalants use	48
4.10	Main types of offending prevalence by frequency of hard drug use	48
4.11	Main types of victimisation prevalence by frequency of alcohol use (being drunk)	50
4.12	Main types of victimisation prevalence by frequency of cannabis use	51
4.13	Main types of victimisation prevalence by frequency of inhalants use	52
4.14	Main types of victimisation prevalence by frequency of hard drugs use	52
5.1	Family social class distribution (per cent)	62
5.2	Per cent families with two or more cars by family social class	63
5.3	Per cent subjects who have been on holiday abroad with their parents four times or more	63
5.4	Overall offending prevalence by family social class	64
5.5	Serious theft (burglaries, theft of or from cars, robbery) prevalence by family social class	65

5.6	Overall victimisation prevalence by family social class	66
5.7	Theft, vandalism and violence victimisation prevalence by family social class	67
5.8	Family structure (composition) (per cent)	68
5.9	Overall offending prevalence by subjects' family structure (composition)	68
5.10	Serious theft (burglaries, theft of or from cars, robbery) prevalence by family structure (composition)	69
5.11	Overall victimisation prevalence by family structure	70
5.12	Theft, vandalism and violence victimisation prevalence by family structure (composition)	71
5.13	Immigrant status (per cent)	74
5.14	Ethnic background (per cent)	74
5.15	Overall offending prevalence by subjects' immigrant status	75
5.16	Serious theft prevalence by subjects' immigrant status	76
5.17	Overall offending prevalence by subjects' ethnic background and gender	76
5.18	Aggressive offending prevalence by subjects' ethnic background and gender	77
5.19	Shoplifting prevalence by subjects' ethnic background and gender	78
5.20	Serious theft prevalence by subjects' ethnic background and gender	78
5.21	Victimisation prevalence by family ethnicity and gender	79
5.22	Comparison of serious theft prevalence between natives and Asians by family social class	82
5.23	Serious theft prevalence by family social class and gender: natives only	83
5.24	Overall offending prevalence by family structure and family social class: males only	84
5.25	Overall offending prevalence by family structure and family social class: females only	85
5.26	Overall offending prevalence by family structural risk score	85
6.1	Distribution of weak family bonds scores	92
6.2	Distribution of weak school bonds scores	94
6.3	Per cent punished many times by their parents during the last year by strength of family bond	94
6.4	Per cent who had run away from home at least once during the last year by strength of family bond	95
6.5	Mean score of (poor) parental monitoring by strength of family bond	96
6.6	Per cent frequently punished by their parents by level of (poor) parental monitoring	96
6.7	Overall offending prevalence by (poor) family bonds	97
6.8	Per cent frequently truant from school by level of (weak) school bonds	98
6.9	Per cent stating that they would like to leave school tomorrow if they could by level of (weak) school bonds	99
6.10	Overall offending prevalence by level of (weak) school bonds	100
6.11	Per cent with weak school bonds (scores 8–12) by main group of family bond	101
6.12	Distribution of low self-control scores	103
6.13	Per cent angry with other youths daily by degree of self-control	104
6.14	Per cent tempted to steal at least weekly by degree of self-control	105

6.15	Per cent who prefer £50 today over £200 in one year's time by degree of self-control	105
6.16	Overall offending prevalence by (low) self-control	106
6.17	Distribution of pro-social values scores	109
6.18	Distribution of shaming scores	111
6.19	Mean scores of weak family bonds and weak school bonds by level of pro-social values	112
6.20	Per cent high-perceived deterrence (scores 9–12) by main groups of shaming	113
6.21	Overall offending prevalence by pro-social values	113
6.22	Overall offending prevalence by shaming	115
6.23	Distribution of scores for overall risk-protective measure	121
6.24	Distribution of scores for overall risk-protective measure by gender	121
6.25	Risk-protective scores by structural risk and gender	124
6.26	Risk-protective scores by structural risk, gender and ethnicity	124
6.27	Offending prevalence by risk-protective score	126
6.28	Offending prevalence by risk-protective score and gender	126
6.29	Offenders' frequency of offending by risk-protective score and gender	127
6.30	Versatility in offending by risk-protective score and gender (offenders only)	128
6.31	A model of individual factors' influence on decision-making and perception of alternatives for action	130
7.1	A model of situational factors' influence on decision-making and perception of alternatives	134
7.2	Mean ED structural risk score by neighbourhood disadvantage class (IMD)	136
7.3	Subjects' distribution by area structural risk scores	138
7.4	The distribution of area structural risks groups by Peterborough urban enumeration districts	139
7.5	Mean youth risk-protective score by mean family social position risk score for groups of ED area of residence structural risk	141
7.6	Per cent youths with risk-protective scores in the range 1–6 by area of residence structural risk group	144
7.7	Overall offending prevalence by area of residence structural risk group	146
7.8	Prevalence of locally committed crimes by area of residence structural risk group	147
7.9	Prevalence of locally committed crimes (last crime) by frequency of offending	152
7.10	Overall prevalence of victimisation by area of residence structural risk group	153
7.11	Prevalence of victimisation locally by area of residence structural risk group	153
7.12	Mean school structural risk score by mean area of residence structural risk score	155
7.13	Mean score of weak school bonds by mean school structural risk score	155
7.14	Mean academic performance score (pupils aged 15) by mean school structural risk score	156
7.15	The distribution of school structural risk scores	157
7.16	Prevalence of aggressive offending (violence and vandalism)	

	committed by pupils in their own school, by school structural risk group and gender	158
7.17	Prevalence of truancy (two or more times), truancy because of the risk of being beaten up or bullied and having been bullied (two or more times), by school structural risk	162
7.18	Prevalence of overall victimisation in school, by school structural risk group and gender	165
7.19	Prevalence of theft, vandalism and violence victimisation in school, by school structural risk group	165
7.20	Prevalence of violence victimisation by a fellow pupil in the school, by school structural risk group	167
7.21	Prevalence of violent victimisations with injuries in the school, by school structural risk group	167
7.22	Prevalence of pupils being victims of violence in their school by prevalence of pupils who have committed acts of violence in their school	169
8.1	Distribution of (high) peer delinquency scores	175
8.2	Overall offending prevalence by peer delinquency risk group and gender	176
8.3	Distribution of scores for time spent in high-risk public environments	177
8.4	Overall offending prevalence by time spent in high-risk public environments and gender	178
8.5	Distribution of alcohol and drug use index scores	179
8.6	Overall offending prevalence by alcohol and drug use index score and gender	180
8.7	Distribution of lifestyle risk scores	181
8.8	Distribution of lifestyle scores by gender	182
8.9	Mean lifestyle risk score by area of residence structural risk group and gender	183
8.10	Mean lifestyle risk score by individual risk-protective score and gender	183
8.11	Offending prevalence by lifestyle risk group and gender	184
8.12	Offenders' frequency of offending by lifestyle risk group and gender	185
8.13	Offenders' versatility in offending by lifestyle risk group and gender	185
8.14	Prevalence of overall victimisations by lifestyle risk group and gender	186
8.15	Prevalence of violent victimisations by lifestyle risk group and gender	186
8.16	Victims' mean frequency of victimisations by lifestyle risk group and gender	187
8.17	Mean offending frequency by combinations of groups of lifestyle risk and individual risk-protective scores	190
8.18	Mean offending frequency by combinations of groups of lifestyle risk and individual risk-protective scores	191
8.19	Mean frequency of serious thefts by combinations of groups of lifestyle risk and individual risk-protective scores	192
8.20	Mean frequency of shoplifting by combinations of groups of lifestyle risk and individual risk-protective scores	193
8.21	Mean frequency of aggressive crimes by combinations of groups of lifestyle risk and individual risk-protective scores	193
8.22	Mean lifestyle risk score by level of (poor) parental monitoring	195

## Adolescent Crime

8.23	Mean frequency of overall offending by level of parental monitoring, separately for youths with a protective and youths with a balanced individual risk-protective score	196
9.1	Prevalence of offending (last week 2001) by frequency of offending in 2000	212
9.2	Time spent in high-risk situations by degree of peer centredness	231
9.3	Mean annual frequency of crime 2000 by peer centredness compared for the protective and balanced groups of individual risk-protective scores	234
9.4	Mean one-week frequency of crime 2001 by peer centredness compared for the protective and balanced groups of individual risk-protective scores	234
9.5	Mean lifestyle risk score by peer centredness	235
9.6	Mean annual frequency of crime 2000 by family centredness compared for the protective and balanced groups of individual risk-protective scores	236
9.7	Mean one-week frequency of crime 2001 by family centredness compared for the protective and balanced groups of individual risk-protective scores	236
10.1	A general model of key situational factors influencing individuals' acts of crime	243

## Tables

2.1	Questionnaire and interview samples and non-response rates	11
2.2	A comparison of those selected for interview with the rest of the questionnaire sample: probability value (chi-square)	18
3.1	Detected offenders per 100 population 1999, and deprivation scores by neighbourhood	20
3.2	Number of subjects in study by their neighbourhood of residence, disadvantage class, disadvantage score range and number of subjects in each disadvantage class	24
3.3	Factor analysis (oblique rotation) of selected key census variables: Peterborough enumeration districts ( $n = 286$ )	25
4.1	Self-reported offending, prevalence and lambda	28
4.2	Self-reported offending, prevalence and lambda, by gender	31
4.3	Zero-order correlations: frequencies of offending categories	32
4.4	Factor analysis (oblique rotation): frequencies of offending categories	32
4.5	Self-reported victimisation: prevalence and lambda	35
4.6	Self-reported victimisation: prevalence and lambda, by gender	36
4.7	Where did the victimisation (last time) take place? (Percentages)	37
4.8	Main object stolen (last time) in rank order (per cent)	38
4.9	Selected key characteristics of violent victimisations: weapon use, injuries and offender characteristics	39
4.10	Per cent offenders also victimised, by crime type and total	42
4.11	Self-reported alcohol, drugs and inhalant use	43
4.12	Self-reported alcohol, drugs and inhalant use by gender	44
4.13	Zero-order correlations: frequencies of substance use categories	44

4.14	Use of other drugs by high-frequency users (six or more times) of alcohol (being drunk), cannabis and inhalants	46
4.15	Substance use and offending by gender: probability value (chi-square), gamma coefficients and zero-order correlations	50
4.16	Prevalence rates (annual) for overall offending and substance use, and some selected (roughly) comparable crime and substance use categories, for comparable age groups from the national surveys (ages 14–17) and 1998–9 (ages 14–15) (per cent)	55
4.17	Prevalence of selected crime categories in Edinburgh and Peterborough	57
5.1	Self-reported offending prevalence by family social class	66
5.2	Self-reported offending prevalence by family composition	70
5.3	Theft, vandalism and violence victimisations by family ethnicity and gender: per cent victimised	79
5.4	Logistic regression: gender and key structural variables, main groups of offending, prevalence, odds ratios (exp. (B)) and significance levels	87
5.5	OLS regression: gender and key structural variables, overall frequency of offending, beta coefficients and significance levels	88
6.1	Key individual constructs	90
6.2	Variables used to create the weak family bonds construct	91
6.3	Variables used to create the school bonds construct	93
6.4	Offending prevalence by family bonds and gender	97
6.5	Offending prevalence by school bonds and gender	100
6.6	Mean scores of family and school bonds by family social position variables, mean, significance and $\eta^2$	102
6.7	Offending prevalence by self-control and gender	106
6.8	Mean scores of (low) self-control by family social position variables, mean, significance and $\eta^2$	107
6.9	Variables used to create the shaming construct	110
6.10	Offending prevalence by pro-social values and gender	114
6.11	Offending prevalence by shaming and gender	115
6.12	Mean scores of pro-social values and shaming by family social position variables, mean, significance and $\eta^2$	116
6.13	Victimisation prevalence by key constructs of youths' social situation and dispositions	118
6.14	Zero-order correlations between constructs measuring youths' social bonds, parental control, self-control and morality	119
6.15	Factor analysis: individual characteristics, principal components	120
6.16	Gender differences in social situation and disposition constructs in rank order, mean, significance and $\eta^2$	122
6.17	Mean scores of social situation and disposition constructs by Asian or non-Asian background and gender (in rank order), mean, significance and $\eta^2$	123
6.18	Risk-protective score by gender and family social position: OLS multiple regression	125
6.19	Main types of offending (frequency), social position, social situation and dispositions: OLS multiple regression	129
6.20	Main types of offending (frequency), social position and risk-protective score: OLS multiple regression	131
7.1	Area of residence (ED) structural risk score for main classes of neighbourhood disadvantage (IMD): minimum and maximum value, mean, median, standard deviation, number of EDs in class,	

	number and per cent EDs over the overall neighbourhood risk score mean	137
7.2	Number of boys and girls by main group of ED structural risk	138
7.3	Area of residence mean structural risk score by family social position variables, significance and $\eta^2$	142
7.4	OLS regression: area of residence structural risk score by family structural risk characteristics ( $n = 1,566$ )	143
7.5	Mean social situation and disposition scores and overall risk-protective score by ED structural risk group, ANOVA and zero-order correlations	144
7.6	Multiple logistic regression: overall prevalence of offending and local prevalence of offending by gender, area or residence structural risk score, family social position risk score and individual risk-protective score	148
7.7	Prevalence of locally committed crimes by main groups of area of residence structural risk and individual risk-protective scores	149
7.8	OLS multiple regression: overall frequency of crime by gender, area of residence structural risk score, family social position risk score and individual risk-protective score	150
7.9	Overall frequency of offending by main groups of area of residence structural risk and individual risk-protective scores, all youths and offenders only, respectively	151
7.10	Prevalence of aggressive offending by school structural risk group and range of variation for individual schools in each group	159
7.11	Multiple logistic regression: prevalence of aggressive offending in own school by structural risk score, family structural risk score, area of residence structural risk score and individual risk-protective score (total and by gender)	160
7.12	Prevalence of truancy, bullying and staying away from school because of fear of being beaten up or bullied (total and by gender)	161
7.13	Prevalence of truancy (two or more times), being bullied (two or more times) and staying away because of being afraid of being beaten up or bullied (at least once), by school structural risk group and range of variation for individual schools in group	162
7.14	Multiple logistic regression: prevalence of aggressive offending in own school by school structural risk score, family structural risk score, area of residence structural risk score and individual risk-protective score (total and by gender)	163
7.15	Overall prevalence of victimisation by school structural risk group and range of variation for individual schools in group	166
7.16	Prevalence of violent victimisations committed by another pupil and of violent victimisations resulting in injury by school structural risk group and range of variation for individual schools in group	168
8.1	OLS multiple regression: frequencies of overall offending, serious theft, shoplifting and aggressive crimes by gender and key explanatory factors	189
8.2	Zero-order correlations between offending frequency (overall and for main types of crimes) and lifestyle risk score by main group of individual risk-protective score, total and by gender	194
8.3	Overall offending frequency by level of (poor) parental monitoring:	

	bivariate regressions for main groups of individual risk-protective scores	196
8.4	Per cent in main lifestyle risk group by main individual risk-protective score group	203
8.5	Per cent subjects, and per cent of the crimes (overall offending and main types of crime), committed by main risk-protective group	203
8.6	Overall offending frequency by main lifestyle risk constructs: multiple regressions for main groups of individual risk-protective scores	204
8.7	Gender and selected family structural characteristics by main individual risk-protective group	205
9.1	Prevalence of offending and victimisation during one week in 2001	211
9.2	Average time spent by main location (hours per week)	213
9.3	Average time spent by location outside the home and the school, in order of rank of time spent (hours per week)	214
9.4	Average time spent by main activity, in order of rank of the 10 most frequent activities (hours per week)	215
9.5	Average time spent, by whom time spent with (hours per week)	216
9.6	Average time spent by main location (hours per week) by gender, family structural risk and ethnic background	217
9.7	Average time spent by location outside the home and the school by gender, family structural risk and ethnic background (hours per week)	218
9.8	Average time spent by main activity by gender, family structural risk and ethnic background (hours per week)	220
9.9	Average time spent, with whom, by gender, family structural risk and ethnic background (hours per week)	220
9.10	Average time spent by main location (hours per week) by main groups of individual risk-protective score, area of residence structural risk and school structural risk	222
9.11	Average time spent by main location outside the home and the school (hours per week) by main groups of individual risk-protective score, area of residence structural risk and school structural risk	223
9.12	Average time spent by main activity (hours per week) by main groups of individual risk-protective score, area of residence structural risk and school structural risk	223
9.13	Average time spent, with whom, by main groups of individual risk-protective score, area of residence structural risk and school structural risk	224
9.14	Factor analysis: oblique rotation, selected youth routine variables	229
9.15	Zero-order correlations of main youth activity orientation factors and frequency of crime year 2000 and (last week) year 2001	229
9.16	Multiple regression: frequency of crime (year 2000 and 'last week' year 2001) by main dimensions of activity orientation	230
9.17	Mean frequency of crimes by frequency of time spent in high-risk situations	232



## Chapter I

---

# Introduction

There is a lack of current research on young people's offending and its causes in the UK. The main source of information on current juvenile offending comes from two recent national self-report studies (Graham and Bowling 1995; Flood-Page *et al.* 2000; and see Chapter 4).<sup>1</sup> However, very few academic studies have explored the prevalence and patterns of juvenile offending in UK cities. The only more recent exceptions known to us, of which none have been carried out in England or Wales, are a study of about 1,200 11–15-year-olds from five selected schools in Edinburgh by Anderson *et al.* (1994), an ongoing (longitudinal) study of 4,300 juveniles, covering most schools in Edinburgh, from which some initial findings are available (e.g. Smith *et al.* 2001) and some research carried out in the city of Belfast based on a random sample of about 900 14–21-year-olds (McQuoid and Lockhart 1994). These city-based studies, with some exceptions in the Smith *et al.* study, do not consider explanatory factors in any depth.

In addition to this, there are a few older longitudinal studies (for an overview, see Loeber and Farrington 2001: app. C), of which the most prominent is the so-called Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, a study of a 1953 male cohort from a London working-class area (see e.g. Farrington 1989, 1992). In this context, also McDonald's (1969) 1964 cross-sectional study of male juvenile delinquency in four different areas of England, and Belson's (1975) 1967–8 cross-sectional study of juvenile theft in London should be mentioned.