1. Background

The Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime is a longitudinal study of around 4,300 young people who started at secondary schools in the City of Edinburgh in August 1998, when most were between 11½ and 12½ years old. The first two annual sweeps of the Study were funded by a grant from the ESRC (award no. R000237157). The ESRC grant to which this report refers covered the third and fourth sweeps of data collection. The study aims to further our understanding of criminal offending in young people by studying it in three contexts: the physical and social structure of neighbourhoods, the individual’s development through the life course, and interactions with the official apparatus of social work and law enforcement. It is assumed that the domains interact: for example, particular styles of parenting are sustained or subverted by the practices and norms prevailing in the neighbourhood (Bronfenbrenner 1979; Sampson and Laub 1993).

By far the most important previous British study in this field is the Cambridge Study of Delinquent Development (Farrington and West, 1990). The Edinburgh Study builds on the Cambridge Study, but coming 40 years later addresses a substantially different set of intellectual and policy questions, and accordingly adopts a substantially different design. First, the Edinburgh Study focuses on gender differences, whereas the Cambridge Study was confined to males. Second, the Edinburgh Study is not concerned with the childhood origins of criminal inclinations, but aims to explain why such inclinations are sometimes translated into serious, frequent, and persistent criminal offending, but often are not; and why some criminal careers end much sooner than others. Third, the Edinburgh Study aims to integrate the study of individual differences and life histories with the study of communities and the broader social context, and to describe the effects of interactions between individuals and neighbourhood dynamics.

The study sets out to produce results that can be compared with those from contemporary longitudinal studies, especially those in Chicago, Pittsburgh, Rochester, and Denver.

2. Aims

The Study has five core aims:

- To investigate from early adolescence onwards the processes leading to criminal offending and desistance from it; and to show how distinctive these processes are in the case of serious, frequent, and persistent offenders.
- To elaborate and test possible explanations for the striking contrast between males and females in criminal offending; to examine the connections between deviance and offending and the construction of femininity and masculinity; and to use these findings to build a better theory of male as well as female offending.
- To integrate individual and ecological approaches through interpreting individual offending histories in relation to the social and physical structure of neighbourhoods, and the dynamics of local communities. More specifically, to develop and test theories of collective efficacy, which describe mechanisms
through which locally-defined groups regulate behaviour according to shared values.

- To monitor the influence of interactions with the social work and criminal justice systems (police, children’s hearings, courts) on the subsequent behaviour of young people.
- To contribute towards the development and empirical evaluation of a theory of criminal behaviour which grows out of social control theory, incorporates important insights from other theories, and takes account of individual development through the life course, the physical and social structure of neighbourhoods and communities, and interactions with the social services and criminal justice systems.

While it is intended that this longitudinal programme will run for many years, significant progress has already been made towards achieving the overall aims of the programme. The study has continued to achieve extremely high response rates at each sweep. In respect of analysis, regression models have been specified to tackle a variety of problems and hierarchical linear models have been used to explore neighbourhood effects. A key focus of current writing is on the further development of the core theoretical framework (based on the concept of negotiated order, see below) as well as a series of papers exploring the policy implications of key aspects of the research.

3. Methods

The core of the study is a cohort of around 4,300 young people aged 11½ to 12½ at the start of fieldwork in the autumn of 1998, when they entered secondary school. Essentially the cohort consists of all the young people in the City of Edinburgh in the relevant age group. The strategy is to collect information from multiple sources about all members of the cohort once a year. At each sweep the period covered is the previous 12 months, so that the study provides a continuous account of events in the lives of the cohort, and not just an account of selected time segments. The advantages of this design, which focuses on the largest possible number of young people within a single city, are discussed in Smith and McVie (2003). Closely integrated with the cohort study is a parallel study of social geography and crime patterns in Edinburgh, which primarily makes use of data from the 1991 census and police-recorded crime data. This makes it possible to analyse the findings for cohort members in the light of the characteristics of the neighbourhoods where they live.

During sweeps three and four, information about individual cohort members was again collected from questionnaires normally completed in the classroom; from the files of the City of Edinburgh social work department; from the files of the Scottish children’s hearing reporter administration; and from school records. At sweep four information was also collected from local police juvenile liaison officer records and negotiations are currently underway for access to the national database on criminal records held by the Scottish Criminal Records Office.

The geographic information system established at sweeps one and two, has been further developed making use of police recorded crime data for 2000 and 2001. A survey of parents (funded by the Nuffield Foundation) and a community survey (funded by the Scottish Executive) have also been completed during the current phase of the research.
Ethics and data protection
The Edinburgh Study is carried out with the informed consent of parents and children, and steps are taken to ensure than no-one can be harmed by taking part. Because of the provisions of the Data Protection Act (1998), we are able to offer children and parents an absolute guarantee of confidentiality, with one qualification: this arises because the child protection guidelines of Edinburgh City’s education department state that any disclosure of physical or sexual abuse must be reported to the school authorities. For that reason no questions about abuse by adults will be asked until all the children have reached the age of 16 (by sweep 6). On the rare occasions (two in the first four sweeps) when respondents provide unsolicited information, researchers report the matter to a pastoral teacher, and also encourage the child to report it.

At the beginning of the study, a two-page letter from the researchers, with a covering letter from the head teacher, was posted by schools to parents. This set out the purposes of the study and clearly described each of its elements. Parents who wished to withdraw their children from the study were invited to return a tear-off slip. Children were fully informed about the purposes and methods of the study when they were first asked to complete questionnaires and are free to refuse at any time. As part of agreed protocols with the police, children were required to sign a consent form allowing access to their police files. This consent form was issued with the sweep four questionnaire. Parents have always been given the opportunity to withdraw whenever any new element is added to the study, and they are regularly updated about study developments (including key findings) via a newsletter.

Advisory Group
The Advisory Group was established under the Chairmanship of Professor Sir Michael Rutter of the Institute of Psychiatry, London. The members comprise senior representatives from all the agencies involved in the study, including education, police, social work, the children’s reporter, the Scottish Executive, the Home Office, independent schools, state schools, and parents, together with several academics and practitioners with an interest or involvement in research into crime and young people. The Advisory Group meets formally once a year, but is regularly kept informed of progress and approached for advice at key stages of the study.

Rates of participation and response
Thirty-nine of the 40 the schools involved at sweeps one and two of the study continued to participate. One independent preparatory school, catering for children up to age 14 only, retired from the study. However, several additional special educational resources were used to access cohort members (for example secure and other residential care units). Sweep three was the last sweep at which new pupils joining Edinburgh schools were invited to participate in the study and no attempt was made to track cohort members moving away from Edinburgh. Overall, there was a 0.5% increase in the number of potential participants. The overall response rate at sweep three was 98.0% of those in scope, with little difference between the mainstream secondary (98.2%) and independent sector (99.8%) schools.

From sweep four, no new cohort members were included (although there was a 0.2% increase due to the return of 7 individuals who had declined to take part during sweeps two and three) and it was intended that all leavers be tracked. The ‘final cohort’ that we aimed to track for the rest of the life of the study totalled 4,389. There was an attrition rate of 1.4% at sweep four, because 15 individuals withdrew permanently and 42 individuals were dropped for a variety of reasons (for example
they were judged to be unlikely to ever participate in the study due to severe learning difficulties; they had never participated in the study despite attempts at every sweep; they had left Edinburgh and could not be contacted using the available address information; or they had died.). In addition, the number of non-responders and “refusers” more than doubled from the previous sweep. Nevertheless, the participation rate continued to be extremely high at 94.4% of the final cohort. Details on response rates are shown on the study website at: www.law.ed.ac.uk/cls/esytc.factsandfigures.htm

Questionnaire development and piloting
A similar method of questionnaire development and piloting was used to that at sweeps one and two. Certain core questions (e.g. on offending behaviour, friends’ offending, substance use and police contact) remained the same in order to provide comparable data over time. However several new questions were developed (e.g. on parental relationships, eating disorders, hanging around, neighbourhood, school and youth lifestyle). Two stages of pilot work were carried out at schools outside Edinburgh (so that members of the cohort would not be involved), which comprised testing sections of the questionnaire and focus group discussions at stage one, followed by a pilot of the full questionnaire at stage two.

Fieldwork
The bulk of fieldwork continued to be conducted in Edinburgh schools, with questionnaires being filled in under exam conditions in classrooms, supervised by the researchers. Respondents were briefed about the aims of the study, and everyone had the opportunity to withdraw. Those with reading, writing or concentration difficulties were given the appropriate level of help, with one to one interviews occurring in a few difficult cases. The number of return visits to schools to access absentees increased slightly at sweeps three and four, and the number of respondents who had to be contacted at home (because of non-attendance at school) rose substantially.

Social work and children’s hearing records
The monitoring forms used to collect data from social work and children’s hearing files at sweeps three and four were updated. Data comparable to sweeps one and two were collected on numbers and reasons for referral to the agencies, evidence of offending and key issues raised in the files. However, the forms were revised to collect more detailed information about: grounds and reasons for holding children’s hearings; number of police charges and evidence of co-offending in police reports; nature of social work case allocation and intervention work carried out; and action taken by social workers to address offending behaviour. Children’s hearing records were examined for a total of 293 individuals at sweep three and 407 at sweep four; while social work records were accessed for 357 cohort members at sweep three and 422 at sweep four. Although there were no problems in accessing the children’s hearing records, there continued to be some problems establishing whether social work records existed for a few cohort members and, if so, where these were located.

Police records
Information on charges and formal warnings was collected from police juvenile liaison officer records for the first time during sweep four. Consent to search for a file was given by 83.2% (n=3441) of the sweep four respondents, 110 of whom were found to have a police record.
Mapping social geography and crime patterns

The geographic information system was updated in two major respects. Firstly the more detailed address information, collected from cohort members at sweep four, allowed a comprehensive review of their geographical location within the city: 93% of the cohort had addresses within a study neighbourhood; 5.8% were residing outwith Edinburgh; and only 1.2% had no geographic information. This constituted a considerable improvement on earlier sweeps. Secondly, mapping of crime patterns across Edinburgh was updated using police-recorded crime information for the years 2000 and 2001. Better recording of geographic information by the police meant that around 84% of crimes from each year were allocated to study neighbourhoods, again a significant improvement on previous data.

Analysis

Various analyses have been conducted using regression techniques. Most of these made use of the longitudinal design, and tested the effect of explanatory and potentially causal factors on later delinquency. Various variables that summarize self-reported delinquency have been defined from the 16 to 18 individual items included at the first four sweeps. Whether variety scores (which count the number of items) or volume scores (which take account of frequency and sum the number of incidents) are used, these self-reported delinquency measures are highly skewed. Scores based on all of the delinquency items are measures of ‘broad delinquency’; we have also defined more than one measure of ‘serious delinquency’ restricted to a subset of the items, but this is even more skewed. Other variables of focal interest, such as victimization and adult harassment, are also highly skewed. To deal with the problem of skew, we have generally used ordinal regression procedures, after converting the delinquency measure into a variable with five ordered categories (from high to zero). In certain other analyses dealing with less common forms of crime (e.g. violent crime) we have summarized the dependent variable (e.g. involvement in violent crime) into a binary opposition and then used logistic regression procedures.

The central purpose of the analysis on gender and crime was to establish whether a different model of explanation for offending is needed in males and females. For this purpose we developed a regression model to explain self-reported delinquency at time 2 in terms of a range of variables from six explanatory domains at time 1. In the course of doing this, the interactions between gender and each explanatory variable were tested. Significant interactions were an indication that explanatory models for males and females needed to be different. Because the gender gap in offending was much wider for serious than for broad delinquency, models for both definitions of delinquency were specified.

Whereas the question posed about gender and crime required a general explanatory model, the other analyses have focused on a smaller number of explanatory variables. On family functioning we posed the question whether parenting styles have different effects depending on the neighbourhood context. The explanatory variables were therefore restricted to a range of measures of family functioning, plus household income or social class, gender, and neighbourhood characteristics. In the first version of the analysis we examined the interactions between neighbourhood characteristics and parenting styles in their influence on later delinquency. We then performed a similar, but more refined, analysis using hierarchical linear modelling, the results being substantially the same. In the analysis on the victimization/offending loop, we specified a basic ordinal regression model to assess the strength of the longitudinal link between victimization and offending, then
introduced explanatory variables in five steps in order to establish how far the link was explained by variables within each of five domains. These models examined the links in both directions: from victimization to offending, and from offending to victimization. In one set of models, self-reported delinquency at time 2 was the dependent variable, whereas in the other set, victimization at time 2 was the dependent variable.

Logistic regression was used to build an explanatory model for violent offending. Another stream of analysis was designed to show whether the criminal justice system targets particular sections of the population. Logistic regression models were used to demonstrate that after taking account of the level of self-reported offending, some population groups (essentially the male working class) are far more likely than others to be drawn into the criminal justice process.

The next phase of analysis will involve the wider and more systematic use of hierarchical linear modelling techniques to quantify more accurately the importance of neighbourhood effects.

4. Results

The study has yielded an extraordinarily rich data set. Given the space available in this report, we can only set out a small number of key findings and give a brief overview of the way in which they relate to the central theoretical idea that is being developed to interpret them. Other results can be found in the published and forthcoming papers set out at Annex 1.

Gender differences in offending
At each sweep boys report significantly higher levels of both broad and serious offending than girls.

(i) Broad measure of offending
Sex is not independently significant in the regression models fitted to explain broad offending, suggesting that the same explanatory model applies to both girls and boys. Offending arises out of: weakened tutelage (in respect of family, school and, what may be termed, the “ideational order” in respect of conventional moral beliefs); situational opportunities afforded by routine activities (evenings out with friends) and the social circles in which young people move (mixed sex groups and having a girl/boyfriend); and victimization (the strongest predictor overall, see below). The difference in rates of broad offending between boys and girls is partially explained by gendered patterns of socialization which render boys more at risk from these factors (see also theoretical framework set out below).

(ii) Serious measure of offending
Many of the key predictors of serious offending are similar to those for broad offending. However an important difference is that gender (being male) remains independently significant (and one of the strongest predictors) in the regression models fitted to explain serious offending. This suggests that a different explanatory model is likely to apply to boys and girls. Indeed, there is something about males as males, or a risk factor to which males are more prone, that is implicated in serious offending but is currently not being measured by any of the variables used in the Edinburgh Study.
Victimization
The evidence suggests that the processes and interactions associated with victimization and delinquency are closely linked. Experience of being a victim of crime at the age of 12 is one of the most powerful predictors of offending at the age of 15. Likewise offending at age 12 strongly predicts victimization at age 15. Our findings indicate that victim/offenders mix in the same social circles, have a high propensity to become involved in risky activities and that both victimization and offending tend to occur in group situations. A key explanation for the link, therefore, lies in the situational context of offending which appears to render young people vulnerable to victimization by adults and other youths. However there is some evidence that the experience of victimization in itself may have a direct causal relationship to offending.

Violent offending
Among both boys and girls, the strongest predictors of violence are having violent friends, involvement in non-violent offending, and having a girlfriend/boyfriend; weaker predictors are ‘hanging around’ frequently, adversarial contact with the police, and experience of violent victimization. Violence occurs within the context of social interactions as part of a youth culture or lifestyle, and acts as a means of proving one’s loyalty to the peer group and being accepted by it. Most youngsters are not specialists in violent offending; rather, their lifestyle provides a variety of opportunities for getting involved in different types of offending. Violent boys are very similar to non-violent boys which, coupled with their high prevalence of violence, suggests that it is a normal expression of masculine identity at this age. Violent girls are very different from both non-violent girls and violent boys. They are much more likely to be drug users, gang members, truants and from a lower class background.

Alcohol and drug misuse
Both alcohol and drug use are highly correlated with involvement in offending at each sweep, although illegal purchase of alcohol is more strongly linked to offending than frequency of drinking itself. By age 15, girls indulge in alcohol far more frequently than boys. While illegal drug use accelerates around age 14, there is little difference in prevalence between girls and boys. Early alcohol use is highly predictive of later experimentation with illegal drugs. Close supervision of a young person and strong attachments to parents and school have only limited impact on drinking and drug use. Such behaviours are best understood within the social context and interactions in which they occur. In particular there is evidence that drug and alcohol use promotes social bonding between delinquent peers.

Youth gangs
Around one fifth of the cohort considered the groups of friends that they went about with to be a gang. Within this group, 17% could be classified as members of the most organized gang-type (one with a name and a saying or sign). Members of organized gangs were typically male, from broken families and lower class backgrounds. They were found to be more impulsive, more risk-taking, to have more delinquent friends and a lower attachment to school than non-gang youth; they were also significantly more likely to report involvement in offending. Scottish gang members are strikingly similar, both demographically and attitudinally, to their North American counterparts,
with gangs providing a *social context* within which violence and other deviant activities are both legitimized and encouraged.

**School experience and truanting**

There appears to be a strong interplay between school experience and neighbourhood context. Schools in areas of high social deprivation have large numbers of disruptive pupils who report lower attachments to school and lower parental involvement in school related activities. Such schools also have higher rates of punishments and exclusions than schools in more affluent areas. These patterns are also mirrored at the individual level, with young people from lower class backgrounds and less affluent areas reporting higher levels of disaffection with school and more serious forms of disruptive behaviour.

While truancy is highly correlated with offending (and other forms of anti-social and disruptive behaviour), the findings suggests that it *differs* from offending in a number of important ways. In particular, one of the strongest predictors of truancy during secondary education is being *female*: other strong predictors of truancy are coming from an area of high neighbourhood deprivation (in the early years) or a broken family (in the later years), whereas these are weak predictors of offending.

**Parenting**

The evidence indicates that family processes and parenting have key effects on delinquency, but these effects are complex. The parenting style that is successful in terms of reducing delinquency combines close supervision with low conflict and a high level of trust, allowing the child to believe that he or she has a high degree of autonomy. However the findings also suggest that parenting styles have a different relationship to later delinquency according to the characteristics of the neighbourhood. In areas of high social deprivation, parental monitoring appears to have a *less positive effect* on delinquency and punishment and parent/child conflict a *less negative* effect, than in more affluent areas. This suggests that parenting strategies (of whatever kind) are more likely to be effective when they are rooted in local culture and practice, in particular where there is *concordance* between family expectations and social setting.

**Neighbourhood dynamics**

Although social deprivation is only weakly linked to offending at the individual level, it is strongly linked with crime (police recorded as well as self-reported) at the level of the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood influences on offending by individual youths do not arise directly out of poverty or deprivation. Rather they arise from collective efficacy, in other words the capacity of groups to regulate behaviour according to common standards. The findings from the community survey indicate, however, that there can be a dark side to collective efficacy: the common standards regulating activity in some deprived and low crime areas stem from illegitimate or criminal norms. Such neighbourhoods although highly organized are regulated through an illegitimate but nonetheless coherent set of social controls.

**Policing**

The findings suggest that the police may be repeatedly targeting particular groups of younger teenagers, who might accurately be described as the “usual suspects”. By far the strongest predictors of *first time* adversarial police contact at around age 12 are being male and coming from a lower-class or less affluent family background (rather
than the level of self-reported offending). The status of being known to the police sucks young people into a spiral of amplified contact in later years. By sweep four the strongest predictor of adversarial police contact is being known to the police as a troublemaker on a previous occasion, with early adversarial contact (at sweep one) being one of the best predictors of later adversarial contact. This remains true after controlling for volume of serious offending, illegal drug use, underage drinking, social class, and lifestyle factors that might place young people at greater risk of exposure to the police.

The children’s hearings system
Cohort members with hearings records are significantly more likely to come from lower class backgrounds and from broken homes than their non-record counterparts. Once a young person has come under the gaze of the system, the status of having a hearings record in itself appears to result in more intensive intervention in later years. By sweep four the strongest predictors of referral on offence grounds are: early hearings record (overall the strongest predictor), gender (being male), lower class background and broken family structure. Volume of serious offending (self-reported) is only very weakly predictive of offence referral, as is social deprivation.

Theoretical framework
The findings can be interpreted within a common framework that understands crime as a breakdown of negotiated order.

In contemporary societies, the exercise of power is not primarily through direct physical force, but through shaping objectives, priorities, perceptions, moral precepts, and ideology: hence order is always negotiated to some degree, and negotiation is needed to achieve legitimacy. There is an explicit recognition in democratic societies, that the legitimacy of the political order depends, and should depend, on transparency, information, discussion, negotiation, flexibility, the possibility of redress, openness to change. In late modern society, these values tend to be re-emphasized more and more, as power is drained from the state and gradually re-distributed among various other centres, with order having to be repeatedly re-negotiated between parties who are in an unequal power relationship. To understand how and why order breaks down in specific instances requires analysis of factors which facilitate or impede the capacity of each party to negotiate effectively.

Young people are subject to a network of regulatory mechanisms in various domains, in each of which order requires to be negotiated. These mechanisms range from the formal controls afforded by schools, the police, and the youth justice system to the more informal ones afforded by families and neighbourhoods. This regulatory network is dynamic and changes over time and space. In the course of one day a young person will shift between different domains (parents, school, neighbourhood). Over the life course new regulatory mechanisms come into force (for example the work-place and the adult criminal justice system) while others diminish in significance (as childhood and the tutelage of family and schools are left behind).

The capacity of the network to regulate behaviour is partly a function of how effectively the different domains are articulated. Of key importance is concordance between customary norms and beliefs within the various domains and the dominant value systems within the wider society. Effective regulation also depends on repeated negotiations between the young person and authority figures, which when successful confer legitimacy. Where negotiated order breaks down, ‘counter orders’ can come into play, based on deviant norms and beliefs. This can be facilitated by particular
social settings and interactions (examples from our findings include interactions among peer groups, the situation of victimization, and the context of the gang).

A number of papers have used this framework to understand basic features of the pattern of findings. For example, gender differences in rates of offending may be partly explained by girls’ greater capacity to negotiate. Lower levels of aggression in girls, a more collective and less individually competitive approach, better verbal skills, and earlier maturation together make it more likely that they will attempt to negotiate and be receptive to negotiations initiated by others. Again, parents who successfully control their children do so by negotiating agreed limits, and also by negotiating about case law (would wearing this dress, or going to that party, overstep the agreed boundary?). Although there may often be conflict about transparent rules, negotiation can achieve control without sacrificing the young person’s autonomy, and therefore encourages the development of an inner moral compass. The effectiveness of control is shown to depend in part on the articulation between family, neighbourhood, and school. Again, the striking differences in crime rates between neighbourhoods may be understood in terms of varying collective efficacy which arises from processes of negotiation between different individuals and interest groups occupying the same social space. The same framework can also be used to understand interactions between young people, the police, and the children’s hearing system. For example, it seems that the police are more likely to negotiate with girls but to respond to boys in a more authoritarian manner, and that girls are more receptive than boys to attempts at negotiation. The lack of opportunity, capacity, and willingness to negotiate may therefore propel boys into a cycle of increased and unwanted agency attention. Class differences in agency attention may similarly be related to the deployment of negotiating tactics on both sides.

Policy implications
The findings have a range of policy implications (which are to be disseminated to key agencies through a series of commissioned research reports and user-community conferences, see below). Examples are:

- Because of the link between victimization and offending, there is a need to re-think both programmes that aim to support victims and those that aim to change offenders, as the two groups may often be the same; similarly, there is a need to re-think restorative justice and mediation.
- Interventions with young people, families, and youth workers need to develop the capacity to negotiate effectively.
- There is a need to re-think the programme of using ‘moral entrepreneurs’ such as psychiatrists and social workers to import middle-class models of parenting to working-class neighbourhoods.
- The elision between community safety, social inclusion, and youth justice policies in Scotland can be successful in reducing youth crime if these policies focus on strengthening social bonds and giving people more of a stake in their community.
- Certain groups are targeted for referral to the youth justice system, whereas many vulnerable young people outside these groups, although involved in persistent offending, escape the gaze of the system: this indicates that cultural conceptions of suspiciousness and the discretionary nature of decision making require to be reviewed.
5. **Activities**

In September 2002 a joint Edinburgh City Council/University of Edinburgh Conference was held to disseminate key findings relating to schools and communities. The conference was attended by local authority education policy-makers, head-teachers and other education professionals. A second Edinburgh City Council conference is planned for September 2003 aimed at youth justice and social work policy makers and practitioners. There are firm plans for a large-scale user group conference for October 2003. This conference will be attended by all agencies involved in the research and their counterparts across Scotland (police; children’s hearings reporter administration; members of the Scottish Executive; local authority social work and education departments) as well as the judiciary, Scottish Prison Service and academics working in the field of youth crime and justice.

The website has undergone major redevelopment during this phase of the research. It is a key forum for dissemination of results and for keeping in touch with members of the cohort and their families (becoming increasingly important once young people leave school and move away from Edinburgh).

Members of the research team have given a series of papers at international conferences (including the European Society of Criminology Conference and the second International Conference on Sentencing and Society), as well as at seminar series in universities across Britain. Smith was invited to give the prestigious SACRO McClintock lecture in Autumn 2001. McAra was selected to be one of the “Young Scholars” at the Jacobs Foundation Conference (October 2002) on ethnic variations in intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in psychosocial features and disorders, Marbach, Germany. A full list of papers (in chronological order) is included in the report at Annex 1.

6. **Outputs**

During the period covered by this grant two major difficulties were encountered which limited time available for analysis and writing up: McAra was seriously ill from November 2001 until February 2002 (when she was contributing 40 hours per week to the project); and McVie took maternity leave from January – June 2002 (replaced by Smith who extended his contribution to the project from 20 to 40 hours per week).

A list of publications (for the period covered by the present grant) as well as academic papers and research reports in preparation is given at Annex 1.

7. **Impacts**

**Impact on Policy**

As indicated in the activities section, the study is currently playing a key role in the development of local authority and central government policy relating to schools, youth crime and justice. A series of 15 research reports have been commissioned by the Scottish Executive (those currently in preparation are included at Annex 1). Contributions by individual members of the team are as follows:

Bradshaw provided specialist advice to the Nicholson Committee (set up by the Scottish Executive to investigate appropriate ways of regulating under-age alcohol use). He has also acted as adviser to the Edinburgh Youth Social Inclusion
Partnership (providing information on neighbourhood deprivation indicators and data from our geographic information system on neighbourhood boundaries). In addition he has provided specialist advice to the Public Health Institute of Scotland on ways of defining the domains of social capital, disability, and well-being (individual and community).

McVie is currently a member of a Scottish Executive advisory committee on drugs policy and has participated in a conference on drug policy organised by the London Drug Policy Forum. She was also commissioned to produce a report on animal cruelty for the Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In addition she has led a number of training sessions for children’s hearings panel members using data from the study.

Smith is a member of the Ministerial Steering Committee on Community Schools in Scotland and has provided several briefings for Scottish Executive Ministers on aspects of the findings (see Annex 1). Since 1998 he has participated in the Crime and Justice Programme Day in the annual course for future opinion leaders organised by Glasgow Common Purpose. In addition Smith has acted as a specialist adviser to Communities that Care.

Additional Funding
The study has been successful in attracting further funding. The Nuffield Foundation provided £120,000 for a survey of parents (completed during Autumn 2001) and the Scottish Executive provided £50,000 for a survey of residents in Edinburgh neighbourhoods (completed during Autumn 2002). Funding to continue the study for a further two years has now been secured from both the Scottish Executive (£260,000) and the Nuffield Foundation (£195,000).

Linked Postgraduate Research
We have built a doctoral programme around the study, thereby expanding the criminological research base within Scotland. The Scottish Executive has supported a linked CASE award for a PhD student (Ali Brown) who is studying community dynamics in Edinburgh. A second linked CASE award is being supported by the Scottish Children’s Reporter Administration for a PhD student (Mark Penman) who is studying the factors influencing referral to the Children’s Hearing System and the effect of referrals on subsequent criminal careers. A third linked CASE award is being supported by Lothian and Borders Police (currently being advertised) for a study on drugs and crime. In addition to the CASE studentships, two further doctoral students in the School of Law, University of Edinburgh are associated with the study. Jon Shute is exploring the relationship between formal and informal social controls with the aim of specifying the conditions for effective deterrence. Paul Bradshaw is examining the social networks of gang and non-gang youth and their impact on delinquency. These studies form important additional components to the core Edinburgh Study programme.

Media Contacts
The study has also attracted a high level of media interest. Members of the team are regularly invited to participate in radio and television programmes on youth crime and justice and the findings from the study have been the cited widely in newspaper articles.
8. Future Research Priorities

The cohort are currently aged about 16 and over the following five years will be passing through the most crucial period of transition, with the peak age of offending coming at eighteen. A key focus of future sweeps of the study will be on the ways in which cohort members negotiate this period of transition: from school into further/tertiary education or work; from the family home or care into more independent forms of living; and from the juvenile into the adult criminal justice system. During these five years it will be possible to track patterns of desistance from offending as well as identify the young people who have firmly entrenched criminal careers.

In the next phase of the research, for the first time, we can include questioning on sexual experiences. Findings will be sharply relevant to policy on safe sex and prevention of teenage pregnancy. We also hope to include retrospective questions about physical and sexual abuse in childhood, although this is dependent on the success of careful piloting. In time, these questions will support analysis of the later effects of childhood abuse.

A further key priority is to develop the analysis of neighbourhood effects. An application is currently under consideration by the William T. Grant Foundation for an international comparative study on crime, individual development and neighbourhood dynamics. Building on core elements of the Edinburgh Study, the research will examine the influence of the neighbourhood context in promoting developmental continuity in anti-social or pro-social behaviour amongst young people. It will be undertaken in collaboration with Professor David Huizinga, University of Colorado and Professor Terence Thornberry University at Albany, State University of New York.
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1 This information could not be collected at earlier sweeps because of child protection protocols agreed with Edinburgh City Council.
ANNEX 1
ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

Conference Papers and Presentations

June 2001: McVie, S.  *Adolescent Development And Violence: Findings From The Edinburgh Study Of Youth Transitions And Crime*  International Association for Research into Juvenile Criminology Conference, Greifswald, Germany

July 2001: Smith, D.J.  *Youth Transitions And Criminal Offending*  Conference on Adolescent Development and Social Policy, Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics

September 2001: Smith, D.J.  *The Edinburgh Study Of Youth Transitions And Crime*  presentation to the Scottish Executive

September 2001: Smith, D.J.  *Testing The Need For A Gendered Theory Of Offending*  European Society of Criminology Conference, Lausanne

October 2001: Smith, D.J.  *Negotiated Order: A Unifying Principle For Parenting And Juvenile Justice*  SACRO Annual McClintock Lecture


March 2002: Smith, D.J.  *Youth Crime*  Ministerial briefing (Scotland)

April 2002: Smith, D.J.  *The Edinburgh Study Of Youth Transitions And Crime: Key Findings*  presentation to the City of Edinburgh Education Department


July 2002: Smith, D.J.  *Parenting And Crime In The Context Of The Neighbourhood*  British Society of Criminology Conference, Keele

September 2002: McAra, L. and McVie, S.  *The Vagaries Of Penal Control: Gender And Juvenile Justice*  European Society of Criminology Conference, Toledo, Spain

September 2002: Smith, D.J.  *Adolescent Offending And Victimization: Two Sides Of The Same Coin?*  European Society of Criminology Conference, Toledo, Spain

September 2002: Bradshaw, P.  *How Different Are Scottish Youth Gangs?*  European Society of Criminology Conference, Toledo, Spain

October 2002: **Smith, D. J.** *Young People As Victims* Edinburgh City Council/University of Edinburgh Conference on Key Findings from The Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime

October 2002: **Bradshaw, P.** *Attitudes Towards And Experiences At School: Neighbourhood Effects* Edinburgh City Council/University of Edinburgh Conference on Key Findings from The Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime

October 2002: **McVie, S.** (October 2002) *Drugs, Schools And Families* Edinburgh City Council/University of Edinburgh Conference on Key Findings from The Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime


October 2002: **Smith, D.J.** *Community As The Context For Youth Justice Policy* keynote speech Communities that Care (Scotland) Annual Conference

October 2002: **McVie, S.** *Drifting Into Substance Misuse: Youth Transitions And Family Dynamics* poster presentation given at Jacobs Foundation Conference on ethnic variations in intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in psychosocial features and disorders, Marbach, Germany

November 2002: **Smith, D.J.** *Victimization And Offending: Two Sides Of The Same Coin?* Scottish Association for the Study of Delinquency Lecture Series

November 2002: **Bradshaw, P.** *Youth Lifestyles And Delinquency* poster presentation given at the Scottish Association for the Study of Delinquency Annual Conference, Peebles, Scotland

November 2002: **Smith, D.J.** *Parenting And Crime* University of Edinburgh, Department of Psychiatry

January 2003: **McVie, S.** *Young People And School* University of Edinburgh, Education Department Seminar

January 2003: **Smith, D.J.** *Parenting And Crime In The Neighbourhood Context* University of Durham, Department of Sociology Seminar

February 2003: **Smith, D.J.** *Offenders as Victims* Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, Guest Lecture
February 2003, Smith, D.J. *Victimization And Offending* All Souls College, Oxford, Criminology Seminar Series


March 2003, Bradshaw, P. and McVie, S. *Youth Perspectives On Crime And Health Risk Behaviours* The Edinburgh Youth Café funded Seminar on Young People and Crime

Publications


Smith, D.J. (2002) “Parenting, And Crime”, *Children In Scotland Magazine*, January


Journal Articles and Book Chapters in Preparation


McAra, L. “Youth Justice In Transition: The Effectiveness Of The Children’s Hearings System”, target journal: Youth Justice


McAra, L. and McVie, S. “The Vagaries Of Penal Control: Gender And Juvenile Justice”, target journal Criminal Justice

McAra, L. and Smith, D.J. “How Different Are Girls? Testing The Need For A Gendered Theory Of Criminal Offending”, target journal Criminology

Smith, D.J. “Offending And Victimization: Two Sides Of The Same Coin?”, target journal Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Smith, D.J. “Parenting And Crime In The Neighbourhood Context”, target journal: British Journal of Sociology

Smith, D.J. and McAra, L. “Negotiated Order: A Unifying Principle For Understanding Parenting And Crime”, target journal: British Journal of Sociology

Research Reports in Preparation
The following reports have been commissioned by the Scottish Executive and will be published on the web during the course of 2003.

Bradshaw, P. and Smith, D.J. “Substance Use And The Development Of Delinquency”

Bradshaw, P. and McVie, S. “The Inter-Relationship Between Alcohol, Tobacco And Drug Use”

McAra, L. and McVie, S. “Truancy, School Exclusion And Substance Misuse”
McAra, L. and McVie, S. “Drug Misuse Amongst Children And Their Parents: Referrals To The Children’s Hearing System”

McAra, L. and Smith, D. J. “Gender And Patterns Of Offending”

McVie, S. and Smith, D.J. “Substance Use And Family Functioning”

Smith, D.J. “The Impact On Young People Of Seeing Or Knowing That Drugs Are Available In The Neighbourhood”

Smith, D.J. “The Relationship Between Repeat Victimization And Different Forms Of Offending”