

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Under the Radar or Under Arrest: How Does Contact with the Juvenile Justice System Affect Delinquency and Academic Outcomes?

Author(s): Jordan Bechtold Beardslee

Document No.: 248533

Date Received: December 2014

Award Number: 2012-IJ-CX-0020

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant report available electronically.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Under the Radar or Under Arrest: How Does Contact with the Juvenile Justice System
Affect Delinquency and Academic Outcomes?

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Psychology and Social Behavior

by

Jordan Bechtold Beardslee



Dissertation Committee:
Professor Elizabet Cauffman, Chair
Assistant Professor AnneMarie M. Conley
Professor Jodi A. Quas

This project was supported by Grant No. 2012--IJ--CX--0020 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice and Award No. SES-1154827 awarded by the National Science Foundation. Findings and conclusions of the research reported here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the National Science Foundation.

© 2014 Jordan Bechtold Beardslee

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Section	Page
List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Curriculum Vitae	ix
Abstract of the Dissertation	xvi
I. Research Objectives and Rationale	1
Study Overview	1
II. Review of the Literature	3
Theoretical Foundations	3
Deterrence Theory	3
Labeling Theory	4
Self-Identifying as Delinquents	4
Reductions in Conventional Opportunities	5
The Influence of Context	6
Findings from Prior Studies	8
Non-legal Variables Related to Likelihood of Arrest	8
Effect of Contact with the Justice System on Subsequent Achievement and Behavior	9
Prior Experimental Work	9
Prior Observation Studies	10
Limitations and Gaps in Prior Studies	16
Developmental Science	19
Risk Taking and Antisocial Behavior During Adolescence	19
Early Adolescence as a Particularly Vulnerable Period	23
Juvenile Justice System Pathways of Influence	24
Individual	24
Parent	26
Peer	27
The Present Study	28
Research Aims and Hypotheses	30
III. Research Design and Methods	38
Overview	38

Sample	39
Arrested Sample (Crossroads) Case Selection	39
Arrested youth Sampling Technique	39
Arrested Youth Sample size	41
No-Contact Sample (Dissertation Sample) Case Selection	41
No-Contact Youth Sampling Technique	41
No-Contact Youth Sample Size	44
Sample Descriptives	44
Eligible Charges (Arrested Youth)	46
Eligible Charges (No-Contact Youth)	46
Procedures (Both Samples)	48
Retention	49
Recruitment Statistics	51
Measures	53
Primary Independent Variable	55
Dependent Variables	55
Mediating Variables	60
Matching Variables	66
IV. Results	73
Plan of Analysis	73
Propensity score matching	73
Analysis for Aim 1	81
Analysis for Aim 2	105
Analysis for Aim 3	108
Power Analysis	117
V. Discussion	118
Primary Results and Ties to Prior Literature	119
Limitations	123
Study Strengths	124
Hypotheses Not Confirmed	125
Implications, Policy Recommendations, and Conclusion	128
VI. References	131
VII. Appendices	
Appendix 1: Crossroads Eligible Charges	147

Appendix 2: Peer Locator Sheet and Consent to Contact	148
Appendix 3: Dissertation Measures and Individual Items	149

List of Figures

Figure 1. Hypothesized Change in Self-Report of School Attachment and Grades in School	31
Figure 2. Hypothesized Change in Punitive Treatment by Schools, School Misconduct, Dropout Rates, Offending, and Substance Use	31
Figure 3. Hypothesized Change in School Attachment and Grades in School by Age.	32
Figure 4. Hypothesized Change in Punitive Treatment by Schools, School Misconduct, Dropout Rates, Substance Use, and Delinquency by Age	33
Figure 5. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Self-Esteem, Value and Importance of Future Success, Truancy and Expectations for Future Success on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact, School Bonding, and Grades in School	34
Figure 6. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Self-Esteem, Value Placed on Future Success, Expectations for Future Success, Truancy, and School Attachment on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact and Truancy, School Misconduct, Delinquency, Substance Use, and Dropout Rates	34
Figure 7. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Deviant Peers on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact, School Bonding, and Grades in School	35
Figure 8. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Deviant Peers on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact and Truancy, School Misconduct, Delinquency, Substance Use, and Dropout Rates	35
Figure 9. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Neighborhood Climate on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact, School Bonding, and Grades in School	36
Figure 10. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Neighborhood Climate on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact and Truancy, School Misconduct, Delinquency, Substance Use, and Dropout Rates	36
Figure 11. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Parental Knowledge, Parental Effort, and Parental Monitoring on the Relation between Juvenile Justice System Contact, School Bonding, and self-reported Grades in School	37
Figure 12. Hypothesized Mediating Role of Parental Knowledge, Parental Effort, and Parental Monitoring on the Relations between Juvenile Justice System Contact and Truancy, School Misconduct, Delinquency, Substance Use, and Dropout Rates	37
Figure 13. Recruitment Flowchart for Arrested Sample	40
Figure 14. Geographical Distribution of No-Contact, Informally Processed, and Formally Processed Youth	45
Figure 15. Recruitment Flowchart for No-Contact Youth #1	51
Figure 16. Recruitment Flowchart for No-Contact Youth #2	53
Figure 17. Propensity Score Distributions for No-contact and Informal Youth	80
Figure 18. Propensity Score Distributions for No-contact and Formal Youth	81
Figure 19. Box Plot: Change in Offending Frequency	84

Figure 20. Box Plot: Change in Offending Variety	85
Figure 21. Box Plot: Change in Substance Use Frequency	85
Figure 22. Box Plot: Change in Substance Use Variety	86
Figure 23. Box Plot: Change in School Bonding	86
Figure 24. Box Plot: Change in Teacher Bonding	87
Figure 25. Box Plot: Change in Grades	87
Figure 26. Box Plot: Change in School Misconduct	88
Figure 27. Box Plot: Change in School Truancy	88
Figure 28. Box Plot: Change in School Suspension	89
Figure 29: Offending Frequency at Baseline and the Follow Up	100
Figure 30: Offending Variety at Baseline and the Follow Up	100
Figure 31: Substance Use Frequency at Baseline and the Follow Up	101
Figure 32: Substance Use Variety at Baseline and the Follow Up	101
Figure 33. School Attachment at Baseline and the Follow Up	102
Figure 34: Teacher Attachment at Baseline and the Follow Up	102
Figure 35 Grades in School at Baseline and the Follow Up	103
Figure 36. School Misconduct at Baseline and the Follow Up	103
Figure 37. School Truancy at Baseline and the Follow Up	104
Figure 38. School Suspensions at Baseline and the Follow Up	104

List of Tables

Table 1.	Screening Questionnaire	43
Table 2.	Eligible Charge Screening Questionnaire	43
Table 3.	Sample Descriptives	45
Table 4.	Distribution of Eligible Offenses for Arrested Youth	46
Table 5.	Distribution of Eligible Offenses for No-Contact Youth	48
Table 6.	List of Variables Used to Address the Study Aims	54
Table 7.	Differences Between No-Contact and Informal Youth in Unmatched and Matched Data Sets	77
Table 8.	Differences Between No-Contact and Formal Youth in Unmatched and Matched Data Sets	78
Table 9.	Propensity Scores by Group	81
Table 10.	Type of Analysis Used to Model the Outcome Variables at Baseline and the Follow Up	95
Table 11.	Aim 1: Differences Between No-Contact and Informally Processed Youth	96
Table 12.	Aim 1: Differences Between No-Contact and Formally Processed Youth	98
Table 13.	Aim 2: Age Interactions for Primary Analyses	107
Table 14.	Aim 3: Direct Relation Between Justice System Contact and Mediators	112
Table 15.	Aim 3: Direct Relation Between Mediators and Outcome Variables (No-Contact and Informal Youth)	113
Table 16.	Aim 3: Direct Relation Between Mediators and Outcome Variables (No-Contact and Formal Youth)	114
Table 17.	Aim 3: Indirect Effects of Justice System Contact on Outcome Variables Through Mediators (No-Contact and Informal Youth)	115
Table 18.	Aim 3: Indirect Effects of Justice System Contact on Outcome Variables Through Mediators (No-Contact and Formal Youth)	116
Table 19.	Observed Statistical Power in Aim 1 and Aim 2	117

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I owe my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my mentor and committee chair, Professor Elizabeth Cauffman. Throughout my tenure in graduate school, Professor Cauffman has been an unwavering source of academic, emotional, and moral support. This dissertation would not have been possible without her guidance on every aspect of this project.

I would also like to express sincere gratitude to my committee members, Professor AnneMarie Conley and Professor Jodi Quas, for providing helpful feedback on previous drafts and for their help in the design and framing of this project. I would also like to thank Professor Chuansheng Chen and Professor Candice Odgers for serving on my advancement committee and for their help in the design, conceptualization, and plan of analysis for this project. I am also grateful for my wonderful undergraduate research assistants, without whom data collection would never have finished in time.

This project also would not have been possible without the generous support from the National Science Foundation, National Institute of Justice, American Psychology-Law Society, Alison Clarke-Stewart Dissertation Grant, and the University of California, Irvine. I am very grateful for their support.

I also would like to thank the Crossroads study investigators, Professor Cauffman, Professor Paul Frick, and Professor Laurence Steinberg, for generously allowing me to use a portion of their data for this project.

Finally, I heartily thank my family and friends for their steadfast and unconditional love and support.

Jordan Bechtold

Email: jbechtol@uci.edu
Phone: 949.291.7520

Department of Psychology & Social Behavior
4201 Social & Behavioral Sciences Gateway
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697-7085

EDUCATION

- 2011-2014 Ph.D. in Psychology and Social Behavior
University of California, Irvine
Major: Developmental Psychology
Minor: Quantitative Methods
- Dissertation title:** Under the radar or under arrest: How does contact with the justice system affect delinquency and academic outcomes?
Committee: Elizabeth Cauffman (chair), AnneMarie Conley, and Jodi Quas
- 2008-2011 M.A. in Social Ecology
University of California, Irvine
- Master's thesis:** Tried as an adult, housed as a juvenile: A tale of youth from two courts incarcerated together
Committee: Elizabeth Cauffman (chair), Candice Odgers, and Jodi Quas
- 2002-2006 B.S. in Conservation and Resource Studies
University of California, Berkeley

AWARDS

- 2014 Ellen Greenberger Excellence in Graduate Research Award (\$500 stipend)
- 2013 Martha Newkirk Award for Excellence in Research by a Graduate Student (\$1,000 stipend)
- 2014, '13, '12, '11, '10, '09 Social Ecology Graduate Student Mentor Award
- 2012 Alison Clarke-Stewart Graduate Dissertation Award in Developmental Psychology (\$1,000 stipend)
- 2010 American Psychology-Law Society Travel Award (\$500 stipend)

2008 Graduate Student Paper Competition First Place Winner,
Campaign for Youth Justice (\$500 stipend)

GRANTS

2013 American Psychology-Law Society Student Grants-in-Aid
\$466.52

2011 National Science Foundation (NSF) Doctoral Dissertation
Improvement Grant
\$15,000

FELLOWSHIPS

2013 Social Ecology Dean's Dissertation Writing Fellowship
\$10,813

2012 National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Ph.D. Graduate Research
Fellowship Program
\$24,999

PUBLICATIONS

Monahan, K., VanDerhei, S., **Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (in press). From the school yard to the squad car: School discipline, truancy, and arrest. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.

Cauffman, E., Shulman, E. P., **Bechtold, J.**, & Steinberg, L. (in press). Children, adolescents, and the law. In M. Bornstein, T. Leventhal, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (7th ed., Vol. 4). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Bechtold, J., Cavanagh, C., Shulman, E. P., & Cauffman, E. (2013, December). Does mother know best? Adolescent and mother reports of impulsivity and subsequent delinquency. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. Advance online publication.

Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2013, August). Tried as an adult, housed as a juvenile: A tale of youth from two courts incarcerated together. *Law and Human Behavior*. Advance online publication.

Bechtold, J., (2014). *Adolescence: An instructor's manual to accompany Steinberg's Adolescence* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Bechtold, J., Cauffman, E., & Monahan, K. (2011). *Are minority youth treated differently in juvenile probation?* Chicago, IL: John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Models for Change Research Initiative.

Bechtold, J., & Cauffman, E. (2010). *Adolescence: An instructor's manual to accompany Steinberg's Adolescence* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Manuscripts under review

Bechtold, J., Monahan, K., Wakefield, S., & Cauffman, E. (revise and resubmit). *The role of race in probation monitoring and responses to probation violations among juvenile offenders in two jurisdictions.*

Manuscripts in progress

Shulman, E. P., **Bechtold, J.,** Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L (in prep). *Partners in crime: Co-offending in adolescence and early adulthood.*

Shulman, E. P., **Bechtold, J.,** Kelly, E., & Cauffman, E. (in prep). *Mental health screening in juvenile justice settings: Evaluating the Massachusetts Youth Screening Inventory, Version 2.*

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

Gavrilescu, C., Montenegro, M., Espinosa, J., Gutierrez, J., **Bechtold, J.,** & Cauffman, E. (2014, April). *Comparison of arrested and non-arrested youth.* Poster presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Portland, OR.

Kim, M., Lee, J., Gavrilescu, C., Sharma, R., **Bechtold, J.,** & Cauffman, E. (2013, August). *Institutional adjustment among juvenile court youth and adult court.* Poster presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association. Honolulu, Hawaii.

Bechtold, J., Monahan, K., & Cauffman, E. (2013, April). *From the schoolyard to the prison yard.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA.

Cauffman, C., **Bechtold, J.,** Monahan, K., Frick, P., & Steinberg, L. (2013, April). *Taking stock of school discipline and arrest.* Paper session at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Seattle, WA.

Lee, J., **Bechtold, J.,** & Cauffman E., (2013, April). *Predicting processing decisions and outcomes for juvenile offenders.* Poster presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Reno, NV.

- Kim, M., Lee, J., Gavrilescu, C., Sharma, R., **Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2013, April). *Coping during incarceration: Comparison of juvenile and adult court youths*. Poster presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Reno, NV.
- Martinez, B., Handa, S., Vazquez, A., **Bechtold, J.**, Donley, S., & Cauffman, E. (2012, April). *Sex and age differences in the predictors of risk taking in adolescence*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Handa, S., **Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2012, March). *Predictors of institutional offending among adolescent and young adult females*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Banco, S., **Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2012, March). *Internalizing and externalizing behaviors of serious juvenile offenders from substance using homes*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- Bechtold, J.**, Monahan, K., Cauffman, E., & Campbell, S. (2012, March). *Lifestyle of the rich and stable: Patterns of risk taking and delinquency among affluent youth*. Paper session at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Adolescence, Vancouver, Canada.
- Bechtold, J.**, Cauffman, E., & Monahan, K. (2011, March). *The experiences of youths on probation: Does time in detention improve behavior?* Paper session at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Kalder, A., **Bechtold, J.**, Shulman, E. P., & Cauffman, E. (2010, April). *For their own good: Perceived coerciveness of treatment for juvenile offenders*. Paper session at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, Vancouver, Canada.
- Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2010, April). *Juvenile court youths and adult court youths incarcerated together: Who offends more?* Paper session at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, Vancouver, Canada.
- Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2010, March). *Youth and parent report of maturity and future delinquency*. Paper session at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Adolescence, Philadelphia, PA.
- Bechtold, J.**, Goldweber, A., Boessen, A., & Cauffman, E. (2009, April). *Are youth tried as adults more violent than youths tried as juveniles?* Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, CO.
- Shulman, E. P., Boessen, A., **Bechtold, J.**, & Cauffman, E. (2009, March). *Iatrogenic effects of incarceration for first time juvenile offenders*. Paper session at the annual meeting of the American Psychology-Law Society, San Antonio, TX.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- May, 2014 **Guest Lecturer**, *Research and Careers in Psychology*, Early College High School, Costa Mesa, CA
- May, 2014 **Guest Lecturer**, *Adolescent Development, Risk Taking, and Legal Consequences*, Juvenile Law, Goldenwest College, Huntington Beach, CA
- May, 2013 **Guest Lecturer**, *Research and Careers in Psychology*, Early College High School, Costa Mesa, CA
- August, 2012 **Reader**, Social Animal, University of California, Irvine
Graded final papers and gave constructive feedback to undergraduate students.
- April, 2012 **Guest Lecturer**, *Research on Adolescence and the Juvenile Justice System*, Juvenile Law, Goldenwest College, Huntington Beach, CA
- February, 2012 **Instructor**, Undergraduate Statistics Workshop, University of California, Irvine
- 2008- 2010 **Teaching Assistant** (Psychology Fundamentals, Human Sexuality, Adolescent Development), University of California, Irvine
- November, 2010 **Instructor**, Undergraduate Statistics Workshop, University of California, Irvine
- November, 2009 **Guest Lecturer**, *Adolescent Sexuality*, Adolescent Development, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA
- November, 2009 **Instructor**, Undergraduate Statistics Workshop, University of California, Irvine

MENTORING EXPERIENCE

Social Ecology Honors Program

- 2013-2014 Undergraduate student: Angel Rodriguez
Thesis title: Gang membership as a mediator between neighborhood conditions and illegal behavior (*working title*)
- 2012-2013 Undergraduate student: Julia Lee

Thesis title: Do individual and contextual factors predict processing decisions for juvenile offenders?

2011-2012

Undergraduate student: Shannon Handa
Thesis title: Predictors of institutional offending among adolescent and young adult females

UC Irvine's Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program

2011

Undergraduate student: Sara Banco
Thesis title: Internalizing and externalizing behaviors of serious juvenile offenders from parental drug using homes

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

2010- Present

Research Assistant for the Crossroads Study
My specific role is to manage and oversee data collection and data coding. Data collection involves interview data, as well as data from court, probation, social service, and school and school district databases.

2009-2010

Development, Disorder, and Delinquency Laboratory Coordinator
Specific tasks included training and supervising research assistants on two research projects. One project involved coding institutional records of incarcerated youths' arrest history, commitment offense details, and institutional behavior. The second project involved working with undergrads to code probation and court records for youth on probation.

SERVICE

2013

Senior Exit Exam Committee, Early College High School

2011-Present

Member, Ad-Hoc Emerging Scholar Committee Member, Society for Research on Adolescence

2012

Reviewer, Society for Research on Adolescence Poster Competition

2011-2012

Graduate Student Co-Coordinator of Admissions, Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine

- 2011-2012 Developmental Colloquium Coordinator, Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine
- 2010-2011 Member, Nominations Committee, Society for Research on Adolescence
- 2010 Graduate Student Panel Member, Applying to Graduate School Workshop at the University of California, Irvine

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Psychology-Law Society
Society for Research on Adolescence
Society for Research in Child Development
American Psychological Association

Abstract of the Dissertation

Under the Radar or Under Arrest: How Does Contact with the Juvenile Justice System Affect
Delinquency and Academic Outcomes?

By

Jordan Bechtold Beardslee

Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology and Social Behavior

University of California, Irvine, 2014

Professor Elizabeth Cauffman, Chair

Although many studies have found that arrested youth are more likely than non-arrested youth to experience later maladjustment, methodological limitations restrict the generalizations of prior work. Perhaps the most noteworthy limitation in prior work is the possibility of selection effects, with arrested youth likely to have very different psychological and behavioral profiles pre-justice system contact than non-arrested youth. This leaves us wondering whether the observed maladjustment is due to the type of adolescent who comes to the attention of law enforcement or due the type of justice system interventions that arrested youth experience.

This study overcomes these limitations by comparing the outcomes of demographically similar male adolescents who have committed the same crimes but who differ with regard to whether they were “caught” for their crimes. Using propensity score matching to compare arrested and non-arrested youth, I investigated whether contact with the justice system does, in fact, contribute to school-related outcomes, substance use, and delinquency and whether these relations vary based on whether arrested youth are formally processed or diverted from the system.

When selection effects are taken into consideration, results indicate that contact with the juvenile justice system does not have a universally harmful effect on development. Diversion (informally processing youth) actually deters future offending, school misconduct, school truancy, and school suspensions. However, both diverted and formally processed youth, regardless of their actual antisocial and illegal behavior, are more likely than no-contact youth to be arrested during the study period, according to official court records. The risk of re-arrest is highest for formally processed youth. Formally processed youth are also more likely than no-contact and diverted youth to be transferred to an alternative or continuation school.

Taken together, results suggest that increased justice system surveillance might improve school performance and deter offending, but it also might lead to more contact with the system. Although an adolescent's first arrest might lead to positive outcomes in the immediate future, the effects of subsequent contacts are unknown. As such, the data suggest that the default policy should be to divert low-level first-time offenders and keep the justice system's involvement to a minimum.

I. Research Objectives and Rationale

Study Overview

The proclivity to engage in antisocial, illegal, and violent behavior increases sharply between childhood and adolescence and declines thereafter (e.g., Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1987; Sampson & Laub, 1993). Indeed many American adolescents self-report engaging in at least one behavior for which they could be arrested (Farrington, 2009). Although some youth who engage in unlawful behavior are prosecuted by the justice system, there is a substantial proportion of youth who engage in the same illegal behaviors but are never arrested (Erickson & Empey, 1963; Farrington, Jolliffe, Hawkins, Catalano, Hill, Kosterman, 2003; Gold, 1966; Short & Nye, 1958). While minor delinquency in adolescence is typically transient and exploratory, it has been suggested that, notwithstanding limitations in prior work, youth who become ensnared in the justice system are likely to suffer serious maladjustment (e.g., Moffitt, 1993). In this study, I use a unique sampling method to ask whether and why adolescents who are arrested have worse outcomes than their peers who violate the same laws but are never arrested. I also investigate whether this effect is magnified based on characteristics of the youth or characteristics of the justice system experience.

These aims were investigated in a sample of delinquent youth who engaged in the same types of illegal activity and were either: (1) “formally processed”—required to make a court appearance and stand before a judge; (2) “informally processed”—arrested but diverted from the justice system and given the option to have all charges dismissed if conditions were satisfied; or (3) never arrested (“no-contact” youth)—youth who were never caught for their crimes. A control group of adolescents who have engaged in illegal behavior but never been arrested is possible given that approximately 60-80% of American adolescents self-report engaging in some

form of delinquency (Moffitt, 1993) but only 16-27% are arrested for a non-traffic violation by the age of 18 (Brame, Turner, Paternoster, & Bushway, 2012). Indeed much adolescent illegal behavior is either unreported or undetected by law enforcement (Black & Reiss, 1970; Farrington, Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 2003; Kraus & Hasleton, 1982). Undetected criminal behavior is especially apparent when U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) victimization data is compared to Uniform Crime Rates (UCR), with data suggesting that most victims do not report their perpetrator (i.e., UCR are drastically lower than NCVS [National Crime Victimization Survey [NCVS] rates; U.S. Department of Justice, 2000).

In conjunction with the statistical analysis, the inclusion of delinquent youth who were and were not caught, and the inclusion of youth who received different types of justice system sanctions, helps isolate the effect(s) that different degrees of juvenile justice experiences has on adolescent development. Specifically, the study investigates *whether* and, if so, *how* contact with the system is related to subsequent delinquency, substance use, and academic outcomes. I also ask whether younger youth are more negatively affected by contact with the justice system than older youth.

The issue of juvenile justice system contact is of substantial importance: In any year, over 2.3 million arrests involve juveniles (US Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2004), over 1.5 million cases are handled in delinquency courts (Puzzanchera & Kang, 2011), 350,000 minors are housed in detention facilities (Adams & Puzzanchera, 2007), and 370,000 minors are placed on probation (Puzzanchera & Sickmund, 2008). Indeed official data suggest that about 9% of American males between 10 and 17 are arrested every year (OJJDP, 2009). Although some of the most salient tenets of the juvenile justice system are to rehabilitate youth and reduce recidivism (e.g., Steinberg & Schwartz, 2000), many empirical studies suggest that contact with

the juvenile justice system may not universally achieve these ideals. This study builds on prior work by not only looking at whether contact is related to maladjustment, I also investigate whether this effect is moderated by the age of youth, and whether the effect of the justice system is mediated by individual and contextual variables.

II. Review of the Literature

Theoretical Foundations

Deterrence theory. Deterrence theory posits that formal sanctions (i.e., strict, harsh, punitive responses) are effective means of preventing and controlling illegal behavior (Morris, 1966; Zimring & Hawkins, 1973). There are two distinct aspects of this theory: specific deterrence (sanctioned youth are personally affected by harsh treatment) and general deterrence (non-sanctioned youth are vicariously affected by harsh treatment imposed on others). Specific deterrence suggests that individuals who experience harsh sanctions will desist from (or at least reduce) criminal behavior. Supporters of this theory argue that the juvenile justice system should intervene early and punish first-time offenders with harsh sanctions in an effort to prevent future, often escalating, crime. However, many examples that have been used to support specific deterrence theory have been derived from national averages (i.e., aggregate data). For example, Fabelo (1995) found support for deterrence theory by using national averages to show that incarceration rates had increased 30% while crime rates had decreased 5% during the same five-year period. Although aggregate data can be informative, these data should be interpreted with caution, as causality cannot be inferred from correlational studies and individual-level interpretations cannot be drawn from aggregate-level data (also known as the *Ecological Fallacy*; Robinson, 1950). For example, there are many outside factors that might influence both crime rates and incarceration rates (e.g., national budgets).

General deterrence suggests that witnessing others experience punitive or certain treatment by the justice systems will prevent individuals from committing similar crimes out of fear that they too will be punished (Ernest Van den Haag, 1982; Andenaes, 1974). However, research that has tracked changes in transfer to adult court policies has indicated that broader transfer laws (i.e., laws that allow more individuals to be transferred to adult court, which would be a “stricter” policy) do not prevent subsequent serious juvenile delinquency (Jensen & Metsger, 1994; McGowan, Hahn, Liberman, Crosby, Fullilove, Johnson, Moscicki, Price, Snyder, Tuma, Lowy, Briss, Cory, & Stone, 2007). Nonetheless there is some evidence in support of the effectiveness of deterrence theory in specific situations. For example, the threat of arrest may deter property crimes (Kohfeld & Sprague, 1990) and neighborhoods with certain and predictable punishments may have lower crime rates than neighborhoods with less predictable law enforcement policies (Klepper & Nagin, 1989).

Labeling theory. Like deterrence theorists, labeling theorists posit that the juvenile justice system’s response to juvenile delinquency has profound effects on subsequent behavior. However, in contrast to deterrence theory, labeling theory proposes that the effect will be in the opposite direction, particularly that contact with the juvenile justice system will have negative effects on behavior. Specifically, labeling theory suggests that involvement with the justice system will create stigmas and deviant self-identities that will lead to continued or escalating illegal behavior (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1951). Part of this effect is due to youth self-identifying as delinquents, however, part of this is due to the stigmatizing effect of official sanctions and the ensuing legitimate reductions in social opportunities (Becker, 1963; Lemert, 1951).

Self-identifying as delinquents. Labeling theory suggests that youth who become embedded in the juvenile justice system may develop delinquent self-concepts (Lemert, 1967)

and may start acting in ways consistent with this identity (Matsueda, 1992). Although this theory originated in the fields of sociology and criminology, this idea is consistent with what researchers have learned from developmental and social psychology. It has long been known that identity formation is an important developmental task of adolescence (e.g., Erikson, 1968). This is due in part to the cognitive advances during this period, including increases in the ability to think about the future (Steinberg, Graham, O'Brien, Woolard, Cauffman, & Banich, 2009) and the ability to imagine what life may be like if various identities are adopted ("possible selves" Markus & Nurius, 1986). Identity is not solidified until early adulthood, which leaves adolescents with inchoate identities and a tendency to experiment with various identities, roles and self-conceptions (Steinberg, 2011)—including those defined by risky and illegal behavior. As identity is fluid and in flux during adolescence, identity in adolescence may be particularly sensitive to external influences. Insofar as people are motivated to behave in ways that are consistent with their beliefs (see Leon Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance; Festinger, 1962), involvement with the juvenile justice system may lead adolescents to adopt delinquent identities and this may cause them to behave in ways consistent with this identity, such as engaging in criminal behaviors and not pursuing academic success.

In addition to reducing the dissonance between youth's perceived identity and their behavior, youth may be motivated, either consciously or unconsciously, to conform to the expectations of others. Social relationships are excessively salient during adolescence, producing a heightened sensitivity to the opinions of others. To the extent that others may perceive juvenile offenders as "criminals," youth may be aware of these stereotypical expectations and they may behave in ways to confirm these beliefs (e.g., looking glass self; Pygmalion effect; Harter, Stocker, & Robinson, 1996; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

Finally, as a result of adopting a deviant identity, youth may reject conventional, pro-social behaviors and people (Kaplan & Fukurai, 1992) and may seek out friendships with peers who are equally stigmatized (i.e., other delinquents). Alternatively, pro-social peers may reject individuals typecast as delinquents.

Reductions in conventional opportunities. Compared to non-delinquent youth, individuals who have been sanctioned by the juvenile justice system (e.g., arrested, convicted, incarcerated) may perceive or experience reductions in access to conventional resources (e.g., school related opportunities, part-time jobs, extracurricular clubs and sports; Matsueda, 1992; Moffitt, 1993). In addition, not only may delinquent youth reject pro-social conventions, but social peers may reject delinquent adolescents. Juvenile justice system involved individuals may experience differential treatment by educational institutions. For example, delinquent youth may be segregated from non-delinquent students and required to attend specific programs or classes, which may reduce opportunities to form positive relationships. Schools may even push delinquent youth into continuation or alternative schools. Unfortunately, many studies have shown that grouping like-minded delinquents together may have unintended consequences (“deviancy training”, discussed later; Dishion, Spracklen, Andrews, Patterson, 1996). As a result, labeled individuals may continue engaging in illegal behaviors and demonstrate diminished achievement in academic and occupation domains.

The influence of context. Dating back to at least 1970s, developmental psychologists have recognized that adolescent development cannot be fully understood without a consideration of the contexts to which individuals are exposed (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Indeed there are many environments that are known to have harmful effects on development and behavior in adolescence. Environmental risk factors may stem from the adolescent’s family (e.g., marital

conflict, abusive or neglectful parenting; Chassin, Hussong, Beltran, 2009; Davies & Lindsay, 2004; Dishion, Capaldi, & Yoerger, 1999; Dobkin, Tremblay, & Sacchitelle, 1997), peers (e.g., antisocial peers, peer group identity, rejection by peers; Farrington, 2009; Chassin et al., 2009; Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990; Veronneau, Vitaro, Brendgen, Dishion, & Tremblay, 2010), neighborhood and community (e.g., poverty, availability of drugs, enforcement of laws; Chassin et al., 2009; Leventhal, Dupéré, & Brooks-Gunn, 2009; Stanley, Henry, & Swaim, 2011;).

What is unknown, however, is whether (and how) the context of an adolescent's first contact with the juvenile justice system is related to adverse outcomes. It has been suggested that involvement with the justice system (i.e., long-term incarceration sentences) may stifle normative development (Steinberg, Chung, Little, 2004). In fact, research has shown that incarceration in adolescence is strongly related to academic failure, adult unemployment, and reduced adult earnings (Fagan & Freeman, 1999; Ward & Tittle, 1993; Wolfgang, Thornberry, & Figlio, 1987), although it is unclear who the appropriate comparison group would be in studies that look at the effects of incarceration. Youth who commit crimes that lead to long stays in secure facilities are likely very different than youth who are never incarcerated. As such, it is important to bear in mind that juvenile incarceration and adult outcomes could both be caused by the same measured or unmeasured third variable, which could lead to a spurious relation between incarceration and adult outcomes. Although research has indicated that incarceration may have important, and irreversible, effects on adult outcomes, it is less clear how less serious involvement with the justice system (i.e., arrest, court appearance, supervised probation) is related to more proximal outcomes, such as academic performance and academic engagement, substance use, and illegal behavior. In an effort to reduce the risk of selection effects and biased treatment effects, one study matched incarcerated and non-incarcerated youth pre-confinement

School Expectations

How far do you THINK you will go in school? (s#Sch47)

- (1) Drop out before graduation
- (2) Graduate from high school
- (3) Go to a business, technical school or junior college
- (4) Graduate from college
- (5) Go to graduate or professional school

Perceptions of Opportunities

Value of Future Work and School Success

Now I'd like to ask you some questions about your long range goals and your chances of achieving these goals. (CARD21)

How important is it to you...	Not at all important	Not too important	Somewhat important	Pretty important	Very important	NA-Already achieved
To have a good job or career? (s0Opp01a)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)
To graduate from college? (s0Opp02a)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)
To earn a good living? (s0Opp03a)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)

Expectations for Future Work and School Success

What do you think your chances are... (CARD22)	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	NA-already achieved
To have a good job or career? (s0Opp01b)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)
To graduate from college? (s0Opp02b)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)
To earn a good living? (s0Opp03b)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(97)

Rosenberg Self-Esteem

The next set of questions deals with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. (CARD27)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. (s0SE1)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I feel that I have a number of good qualities. (s0SE2)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (s0SE3)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I am able to do things as well as most other people. (s0SE4)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (s0SE5)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I take a positive attitude toward myself. (s0SE6)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. (s0SE7)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I wish I could have more respect for myself. (s0SE8)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
I certainly feel useless at times. (s0SE9)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)
At times, I think I am no good at all. (s0SE10)	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)

Association with Deviant Peers

I am going to ask some questions about your friends. (CARD14)

During the past six months, how many of your friends have...	None of them	Very few of them	Some of them	Most of them	All of them
Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to them? (s0PDe11)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Hit or threatened to hit someone? (s0PDe12)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sold drugs? (s0PDe13)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gotten drunk once in a while? (s0PDe14)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gotten high on drugs (s0PDe15)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Carried a knife? (s0PDe16)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Carried a gun? (s0PDe17)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Owned a gun? (s0PDe18)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gotten into a physical fight?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

(s0PDe19)					
Been hurt in a fight? (s0PDe110)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Stolen something worth more than \$100? (s0PDe111)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Taken a motor vehicle or stolen a car? (s0PDe112)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gone in or tried to go into a building to steal something? (s0PDe113)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested that you should go out drinking with them? (s0PDe114)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested or claimed that you have to get drunk to have a good time? (s0PDe115)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested or claimed that you have to be high on drugs to have a good time? (s0PDe116)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested that you should sell drugs? (s0PDe117)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested that you should steal something? (s0PDe118)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested that you should hit or beat someone up? (s0PDe119)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Suggested that you should carry a weapon? (s0PDe120)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

How many close friends do you have? (Relatives are OK. Include your girlfriend/ boyfriend if you have one, if you consider him/her to be a close friend.) (s0NFrnd)

Interviewer: We want at least one name here. If subject says he/she has no 'close' friends, then ask about anyone they consider a 'friend'. Boyfriends/girlfriends should be included if they are 'close' friends.

FrNames [1] _____
FrNames [2] _____
FrNames [3] _____
FrNames [4] _____
FrNames [5] _____

Tell me some more about your close friends. (CARD10)

	Friend 1	Friend 2:	Friend 3:	Friend 4:	Friend 5:
How old is					

friend? (s0AgeFr#)					
Male or female? (s0Genfr#)	(1) Male (2) Female	(1) Male (2) Female	(1) Male (2) Female	(1) Male (2) Female	(1) Male (2) Female
How often do you have contact with him/her? (s0ContFr#) [Card 3]	(1) Daily (2) 3-6 times a week (3) 2 times per week (4) 1 time per week (5) Less weekly, more than monthly (6) 1 time per month (7) Less than monthly	(1) Daily (2) 3-6 times a week (3) 2 times per week (4) 1 time per week (5) Less weekly, more than monthly (6) 1 time per month (7) Less than monthly	(1) Daily (2) 3-6 times a week (3) 2 times per week (4) 1 time per week (5) Less weekly, more than monthly (6) 1 time per month (7) Less than monthly	(1) Daily (2) 3-6 times a week (3) 2 times per week (4) 1 time per week (5) Less weekly, more than monthly (6) 1 time per month (7) Less than monthly	(1) Daily (2) 3-6 times a week (3) 2 times per week (4) 1 time per week (5) Less weekly, more than monthly (6) 1 time per month (7) Less than monthly
Ever been arrested? (s0ArrFr#)	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No
Ever been in jail or in detention? (s0JaiFr#)	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No
Ever been in a mental hospital? (s0HosFr#)	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No
Ever used drugs? (s0DruFr#)	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No	(1) Yes (5) No
Is he/she one of the same people you mentioned as a co-offender for (charge in month/year)? (s0CoofFr#)	(1) Yes Identify: (5) No	(1) Yes Identify: (5) No	(1) Yes Identify: (5) No	(1) Yes Identify: (5) No	(1) Yes Identify: (5) No

Parental Involvement

You mentioned earlier that [PCareName] is the main person who is responsible for raising you.

Interviewer: Time Frame=right now. Responsible person means a legal guardian/parent who is responsible for raising the subject. It cannot be a boyfriend, girlfriend, or peer.

NOTE: The youth's residence in a facility (if applicable) does not preclude answering this series of questions.

NOTE: These answers should reflect the level of monitoring that characterizes the majority of the time in the recall period. If it is split evenly, this should reflect the time during which there were no intervening circumstances influencing the level of monitoring. For example, some parents have distinguished the level of monitoring before the youth was on probation vs. while he/she was on probation.

(Card 11)

How much does [PcareName] try to know who you spend time with? (s#Pmonit1)

- (1) Doesn't try at all
- (2) Tries a little bit
- (3) Tries a lot
- (4) Tries extremely hard

How much does [PcareName] really know who you spend time with? (s#Pmonitb1)

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

How much does [PcareName] try to know how you spend your free time? (s#Pmonit2)

- (1) Doesn't try at all
- (2) Tries a little bit
- (3) Tries a lot
- (4) Tries extremely hard

How much does [PcareName] really know how you spend your free time? (s#Pmonitb2)

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

How much does [PcareName] try to know how you spend your money? (s#Pmonit3)

- (1) Doesn't try at all
- (2) Tries a little bit
- (3) Tries a lot
- (4) Tries extremely hard

How much does [PcareName] really know how you spend your money? (s#Pmonitb3)

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

How much does [PcareName] try to know about where you go right after school or work is over for the day? (s#Pmonit4)

- (1) Doesn't try at all
- (2) Tries a little bit
- (3) Tries a lot
- (4) Tries extremely hard

How much does [PcareName] really know about where you go right after school or work is over for the day? (s#Pmonitb4)

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

How much does [PcareName] try to know about where you go at night? (s#Pmonit5)

- (1) Doesn't try at all
- (2) Tries a little bit
- (3) Tries a lot
- (4) Tries extremely hard

How much does [PcareName] really know about where you go at night? (s#Pmonitb5)

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

Do you live with [PcareName]? (s0PmLive)

- (1) Yes
- (5) No

How often do you have a set time to be home on school or work nights? (s#Pmonit7) (CARD12)

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually
- (4) Always
- (97) NA (don't live with caretaker)

How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights? (s#Pmonit8)

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually

- (4) Always
- (97) NA (don't live with caretaker)

How often does [PcareName] know what time you will be home when you've gone out. (s#Pmonit9)

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually
- (4) Always
- (97) NA (don't live with caretaker)

If [PcareName] is not at home, how often do you leave a note, call, or communicate with [PcareName] in some way about where you are going? (s#Pmonit10)

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually
- (4) Always
- (97) NA (don't live with caretaker)

- **School and teacher attachment (described previously)**
- **School truancy (described previously)**

.....

MATCHING VARIABLES

.....

Demographics

What is your date of birth?

In what country were you born? (s0Dem19)

- (1) United States
- (96) Other (specify-s0Dem20) _____

Do you consider yourself to be Latino or Hispanic? (s0Dem21)

- (1) Yes
- (5) No

[IF YES] To which Latino or Hispanic group would you say you belong? (s0Dem22)

- (1) Mexican American (include 'Mexican' and 'Chicano' here)
- (2) Cuban American
- (3) Puerto Rican American
- (96) Other (specify-s0Dem23) _____

Do you consider yourself to be White, African American/Black, Asian, Native American, or some other race? (s0Dem24)

- (1) White
- (2) African American/Black
- (3) Asian
- (4) Native American
- (96) Other (specify-s0Dem25) _____

To which ethnic group would you say you belong? _____ (s0Dem25)

Educational background of parents (SES)

How far did your mother/female guardian go in school? (s0rel169)

- (1) Some grade school
- (2) Finished grade school
- (3) Some high school
- (4) High school diploma
- (5) Business or trade school
- (6) Some college or graduate of 2-year college
- (7) College graduate (4-year college)
- (8) Some graduate or professional school beyond college
- (9) Professional or graduate degree
- (97) NA - Single parent household

How far did your father/male guardian go in school? (s0rel170)

- (1) Some grade school
- (2) Finished grade school
- (3) Some high school
- (4) High school diploma
- (5) Business or trade school
- (6) Some college or graduate of 2-year college
- (7) College graduate (4-year college)
- (8) Some graduate or professional school beyond college
- (9) Professional or graduate degree
- (97) NA - Single parent household

Family Criminality

	<p>What is the relationship to you of the family member who was involved in criminal activity (s0famcrim2)?</p>	<p>Was this person arrested (s0famcrim3)?</p>	<p>Was this person jailed (s0famcrim4)?</p>	<p>Did this person live at your home address when they were involved in criminal activity (s0famcrim5)?</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Family Member 1				
Family Member 2				
Family Member 3				
Family Member 4				
Family Member 5				

Has anyone in your family ever committed a crime? (I won't ask for their names) (s0famcrim1).

Interviewer: Include grandparents, parents, brothers, and sisters (even if they don't live at home), or any other relatives living at home, birth or otherwise.

(1) Yes

(5) No

If Yes:

Relationship Codes:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| 11. Biological Father | 34. Niece |
| 12. Biological Mother | 35. Live-in boyfriend/girlfriend |
| 13. Biological Sister | 36. Female Friend |
| 14. Biological Brother | 37. Male Friend |
| 15. Biological Grandmother | 38. Boyfriend (not live-in) |
| 16. Biological Grandfather | 39. Girlfriend (not live-in) |
| 17. Stepfather | 40. Male Roommate |
| 18. Stepmother | 41. Female Roommate |
| 19. Stepsister | 42. Professional Relationship |
| 20. Stepbrother | 43. Foster mother |
| 21. Adoptive Father | 44. Foster father |
| 22. Adoptive Mother | 45. Foster brother |
| 23. Adoptive Sister | 46. Foster sister |
| 24. Adoptive Brother | 47. Mother of my child (if no other category applies) |
| 25. Wife | 48. Father of my child (if no other category applies) |
| 26. Husband | 49. Stepson (non-biol. child in subject's care) |
| 27. Son | 50. Stepdaughter (non-biol. child in subject's care) |
| 28. Daughter | 51. Fiancé(e) |
| 29. Aunt | 52. Foster daughter |
| 30. Uncle | 53. Foster son |
| 31. Female Cousin | 95. Other relative |
| 32. Male Cousin | 96. Other (not biologically related) |
| 33. Nephew | 97. NA |

Academic Achievement

What are/were your grades like in school? (s#Dem29) (CARD7)

Interviewer: If subject is currently dropped out, refer to the last grades received in school.

(3) Mostly A's

- (4) About half A's and half B's
- (3) Mostly B's
- (4) About half B's and half C's
- (5) Mostly C's
- (6) About half C's and half D's
- (7) Mostly D's
- (8) Mostly below D's
- (97) NA/ No grades given

Maturity of Judgment

Weinberger Adjustment Inventory

Please respond to each statement by thinking about how you usually have felt or acted in the past six months by selecting one of the choices. (CARD19)

	False	Somewhat False	Not Sure	Somewhat True	True
Doing things to help people is more important to me than almost anything else. (s#wai1)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I'm the kind of person who will try anything once, even if it's not that safe. (s#wai2)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
People who get me angry better watch out. (s#wai3)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I should try harder to control myself when I'm having fun. (s#wai4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I often go out of my way to do things for other people. (s#wai5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I can do things as well as other people can. (s#wai6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I do things without giving them enough thought. (s#wai7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I enjoy doing things for other people, even when I don't receive anything in return. (s#wai8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
If someone tries to hurt me, I make sure I get even with them. (s#wai9)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I like to do new and different things that many people would consider weird or not really safe.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

(s#wai10)					
I become 'wild and crazy' and do things other people might not like. (s#wai11)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
If someone does something I really don't like, I yell at them about it. (s#wai12)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Before I do something, I think about how it will affect people around me. (s#wai13)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
When I'm doing something fun (like partying or acting silly), I tend to get carried away and go too far. (s#wai14)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it. (s#wai15)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I pick on people I don't like. (s#wai16)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I try very hard not to hurt other people's feelings. (s#wai17)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I lose my temper and 'let people have it' when I'm angry. (s#wai18)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I make sure that doing what I want will not cause problems for others. (s#wai19)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I stop and think things through before I act. (s#wai20)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I say something mean to someone who has upset me. (s#wai21)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
I think about other people's feelings before I do something they might not like. (s#wai22)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
When someone tries to start a fight with me, I fight back. (s#wai23)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Future Outlook Inventory

Even though you may act differently depending on the situation, the purpose of these questions is to understand what you are usually like. Please listen carefully and select the choice that is most true of you. (CARD24)

	Never True	Rarely True	Often True	Always True
I will keep working at difficult,	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

boring tasks if I know they will help me get ahead later. (s0Foi001)				
I live each day as if it's my last. (s0Foi002)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I think about how things might be in the future. (s0Foi003)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I tend to get caught up in the excitement of the moment. (s0Foi004)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I make lists of things to do. (s0Foi005)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Before making a decision, I weigh the good vs. the bad. (s0Foi006)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
The future is very vague and uncertain to me. (s0Foi007)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I will give up my happiness now so that I can get what I want in the future. (s0Foi008)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I make decisions on the spur of the moment. (s0Foi009)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I would rather save my money for a rainy day than spend it now on something fun. (s0Foi010)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I can't really plan for the future because things change so much. (s0Foi011)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I always seem to be doing things at the last minute. (s0Foi012)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I don't plan, I take each day as it is. (s0Foi013)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I can see my life 10 years from now. (s0Foi014)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I usually think about the consequences before I do something. (s0Foi015)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory

Please listen carefully and indicate the number that shows how much you agree with each statement. (CARD23)

	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree
Hard work is never fun. (s0psm01)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I don't like to tell my ideas about God when I know				

others disagree with me. (s0psm02)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I'm the sort of person who can't do anything really well. (s0psm03)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
If something more interesting comes along, I will usually stop any work I'm doing. (s0psm04)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
It's not very practical to decide what kind of job you want because that depends so much on other people. (s0psm05)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I can't really say what my interests are. (s0psm06)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
If you haven't been chosen as the leader, you shouldn't suggest how things should be done. (s0psm07)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I can't think of any kind of job that I would like a lot. (s0psm08)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do. (s0psm09)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions. (s0psm10)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
My life is pretty empty. (s0psm11)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong. (s0psm12)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
You can't be expected to make a success of yourself if you had a bad childhood. (s0psm13)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I can't seem to keep people as friends for very long. (s0psm14)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I often don't get my most important work done because I've spent too much time on other work. (s0psm15)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Luck decides most things that happen to me. (s0psm16)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
I act like something I'm not a lot of the time. (s0psm17)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

17. Adults fighting or arguing loudly? (s#NeiCon17)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18. Prostitutes on the streets? (s#NeiCon18)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19. People smoking marijuana? (s#NeiCon19)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
20. People smoking crack? (s#NeiCon20)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
21. People using needles or syringes to take drugs? (s#NeiCon21)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

- **Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (assessed and scored with paper and pencil)**
- **Prior offending (measure described previously)**
- **Prior substance use (measure described previously)**
- **Peer delinquency (measure described previously)**
- **Peer school misconduct (measure described previously)**
- **Parental involvement (described previously)**