



International Self-Report Delinquency Questionnaire 3 (ISRD-3)

Background paper to explain ISRD2-ISRD3 changes

Ineke Haen Marshall, Dirk Enzmann, Mike Hough, Martin Killias,

Janne Kivivuori and Majone Steketee

(2013)

ISRD3 Technical Report Series #1

Available at: <http://www.northeastern.edu/isrd/isrd3/>

International Self-Report Delinquency Questionnaire 3 (ISR3-3)

Background paper to explain ISR2-ISR3 changes ¹

Background and rationale for change

The purpose of this background paper is to explain the differences between the ISR2 questionnaire (2005-2007) and the ISR3 questionnaire (2012-2014). Although the ISR2 has been a very successful endeavor, there were some problems with the questionnaire content and construction. Based on the results of several pilot studies, suggestions made by ISR participants, and many discussions by the ISR CT, we have made a number of changes and improvements in the questionnaire used for ISR3. These changes do not only deal with the problems of the ISR2 questionnaire, but also will improve the likelihood that the ISR can continue to be successful in the future. This brief background paper outlines the major revisions in the ISR questionnaire, as well as the reasons behind the proposed changes. It also allows explicit comparisons between the instruments used in the ISR2 and ISR3.

Goals of the ISR project

It is the goal of the ISR project to turn into a study which repeatedly collects data from comparable (but not identical) samples in regular intervals. ISR-1 (1992-1993) was considered a pilot study; ISR-2 (2006-2007) the first full-fledged implementation of the design; and ISR-3, ISR-4, ISR-5, and so on are expected to be based on a *core set of relatively fixed questions, paired with a flexible part which will vary each sweep*.

We envision the ISR study as a repeated self-reported study of juvenile delinquency, which will be conducted every five years. One major goal is to observe and compare differences, similarities and trends in offending and victimization between countries. The second, equally important goal of the ISR is to explore and test theoretical issues related to juvenile delinquency. The ISR study also needs to be relevant for policy purposes.

It is very difficult to implement the study without considerable financial support by national and/or international sources. It is thus important that the ISR questionnaire includes items that are of interest to scientific and scholarly funding sources (such as different national science foundations, EU Research Council, and so on), even though not all participants may be equally convinced of their immediate policy or theoretical relevance of these items. The ISR project aims to show innovation and relevance for new developments in the field.

¹ This is a modified and expanded version of the paper prepared by ISR3 Steering Committee for discussion at ISR3 workshop, September 22 2011, ESC Meeting, Vilnius, Lithuania. The current version includes the final decisions made since the 2011 meeting.

In view of the overall goal of the ISRD study, the objectives of the changes made in the ISRD3 questionnaire are threefold:

- 1) To retain as many items as possible from ISRD2 in order to allow direct comparisons between ISRD2 and ISRD3;
- 2) To make adjustments to items that were found to be invalid and ambiguous in the ISRD2 study; and
- 3) To introduce new items to reflect recent developments in the field and to allow testing of theoretical ideas which were not part of the ISRD2 study.

With regard to the introduction of new items (point 3), we had to choose among many competing and exciting theoretical developments in the field. More detailed explanation of our theoretical choices for the ISRD3 wave is provided later in this paper. As a general guide, we used the following criteria for selection of theoretical questions:

- 1) Theories where one would expect cross-national variation (since the distinctive character of the ISRD3 will be its *cross-national* design)
- 2) Theories that are still emerging, cutting edge and innovative
- 3) Theories that have not yet been tested cross-nationally
- 4) Theories with policy implications (in order to remain true to the original intent of the ISRD)
- 5) Retain some basic theoretical questions needed to control for spuriousness/competitive testing
- 6) Rely as much as possible on existing validated scales

Built-in flexibility: a modification of the structure of the ISRD questionnaire

We want to be able to respond to the most recent developments in the area of delinquency at each different sweep. There is no need to test the same theories every five years (the intervals with which we hope to conduct different sweeps of the ISRD). We cannot possibly anticipate right now what these developments are going to be. The solution to this issue is to build in a certain amount of flexibility and change in the standard ISRD questionnaire so that there will be a *core set of relatively fixed questions, paired with a flexible part which will vary each sweep*.

If we want to test trends in delinquent behavior *and* have the possibility to change the theoretical questions in the future, we need to be concerned about the sequencing of questions in the ISRD3 (and later) questionnaires. Changes in the early parts of the questionnaire potentially influence the responses to the latter parts. In order to deal with this potential problem, we needed to make some changes in the basic sequence of questions so that theoretical questions we expect to change or modify between waves come *after* the victimization/offending questions and other basic theoretical questions that are expected to remain the same throughout different data collection waves.

The ISRD questionnaire consists of two parts (with the possibility of an *optional* third part)²:

² See the Questionnaire Structure Document for additional information on the content of the Modules.

1. **Fixed part (part 1)** – A set of core questions which will remain relatively unchanged throughout the sweeps; this will always be the first part of the questionnaire. This section includes questions on demographic background (Module 1), family (Module 2), school (Module 3), victimization (Module 4), leisure and peers (Module 5), values and attitudes (Module 6), and offending (Module 7)
2. **Flexible part (part 2)** – We label this part ‘flexible’ because the questions for this section are likely to change in each sweep. For the ISRD3 version, there will be three sets of questions: Substance use questions (Module 8), norm transmission strength questions to test Institutional Anomie theory (Module 9), and procedural justice questions (Module 10).
3. **Optional part (part 3)** – Individual participants may opt to add additional modules at the end of the questionnaire. Suggested optional modules are expanded questions on gangs (Module 11), cruelty to animals, and the response integrity question (Module 98).

The ISRD3 questionnaire is to remain the standard questionnaire for subsequent waves, consisting of a core fixed part, a flexible part, and an optional part. We went through great length to attempt to make the revised ISRD questionnaire a valid and reliable instrument, in order to minimize the additional revisions (to the fixed part) that need to be made in the future.

Two versions of questionnaire: Pencil-and-paper and computerized (online) version

We have developed two versions of the questionnaire: pencil-and-paper version and an electronic version. A number of participants opt for online (computerized) data collection. This is a more cost-effective method and is likely to become the routine way of survey administration in the future. Research has shown that the results may remain quite comparable. However, it is crucial that the electronic version does not deviate from the basic paper-and-pencil version. Therefore, we use the paper-and-pencil version as the basic model of the questionnaire; the electronic version is exactly the same, with the exception of a number of additional follow-up questions (on victimization and offending) which are asked at the end (in order not to influence the responses to the other questions).

The lay-out of the paper-and-pencil ISRD2 questionnaire made completion of follow-up questions for students somewhat difficult and time-consuming; therefore, we decided to limit follow-up questions on the paper-and pencil version of the ISRD3 questionnaire. Since student completion of the online version goes faster than the paper-and-pencil version, we thought it reasonable to take advantage of this by adding a limited number of follow-up questions to the online version.³

Length of questionnaire

Throughout the revision process, the length of the questionnaire remained a concern; the goal is to limit the estimated completion time to about 45 minutes or less (which should fit into one lesson hour). Therefore, we omitted a number of questions from initial ‘ideal’ draft versions which were considerably

³ We strongly recommend to use (translations of) the standard online version we created using the EFS-Survey software provided by UniPark (<http://www.unipark.info/>). To view a demonstration of the ISRD3 standard version see http://ww2.unipark.de/uc/enzmann_Uni-Hamburg/fc2f/, password: “ISRD3 - Draft” (without quotes).

longer. The online version of the ISRD3 takes between 15 and 35 minutes to complete (with a few outliers either direction); the paper-and-pencil version between 20 and 45 minutes (with a few outliers either direction). However, this does not include additional national modules.

Explanation of changes (additions, deletions, modifications) in ISRD3 questionnaire (compared to ISRD2)

In order to evaluate what kind of changes have been made, one needs a copy of the ISRD2 questionnaire, as well as the ISRD3 questionnaire. The core ISRD3 questionnaire consists of ten topical modules:

PART 1 (fixed)

Module 1 Demographic background (questions 1.1--1.15)

Module 2 Family (questions 2.1—2.4)

Module 3 School (questions 3.1 –3.7)

Module 4 Victimization (question 4.1)

Module 5 Leisure and peers (questions 5.1 – 5.10)

Module 6 Attitudes and values (questions 6.1 – 6.7)

Module 7 Offending (question 7.1—7.2)

PART 2 (flexible)

Module 8 Substance use (questions 8.1 – 8.6)

Module 9 Norm transmission strength (questions 9.1 – 9.4)

Module 10 Procedural justice questions (questions 10.1 – 10.8)

PART 3 (optional or country specific)⁴

Module 11 Gang (11.1 – 11.8)

Final question (Module 98, not numbered: response integrity)⁵

For each of the ten modules, we present the changes in tabular overview format (Tables 1 through 10), each time expanded – when needed – by a more detailed narrative providing justification for the changes.⁶ Please note – that in the interest of efficiency – not all (small) changes will be discussed; many of these are relatively minor and primarily cosmetic and self-explanatory.⁷

⁴ Module 11 is an example of an optional question for countries who are especially interested in the issue of gangs.

⁵ The final question (response integrity) is recommended for grade 9 students although experience with the online version shows that younger students may be able to answer it as well. This question will always be moved to the end of the questionnaire, its place thus depends on the use of additional / optional modules such as Module 11. More details about the response integrity question (in the survey literature often referred to as the „crosswise model“) can be found in Jann et al. (2012) and Enzmann and Kivivuori (2013).

⁶ When referring to ISRD2 items, we use capital Q to refer to a particular question (i.e. Q1 is question 1 on gender); for the ISRD3, we use the question numbering used in each module (using ‘q’ rather than ‘Q’, i.e. q1.1 is question 1 of Module 1 on gender in the ISRD3 questionnaire)

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of some of the problems of the ISRD2 questionnaire items and related methodological concerns, see Chapter 2 *The Many Faces of Youth Crime* (Marshall and Enzmann 2012).

The ISRD2 questionnaire was structured as follows:

Part 1 – “Some questions on the way you live”

Basic demographic info (Q1 through Q14)

Victimization (“Some bad things that may have happened to you”) (Q15)

Family (“your family”) (Q16 through Q22)

Leisure time (Q23 through Q40) [includes Q38 attitudes towards violence, Q39 self-control]

School (Q41 through Q46)

Neighborhood (“your neighborhood”) (Q47)

Part II – “Questions on things young people sometimes do”

Friends’ delinquency (Q48)

Alcohol use (Q49 and Q50)

Drug use (Q51, Q52, Q53)

Offending (Q54 through Q67)

For the ISRD3, the structure (i.e. sequence of questions) of the questionnaire was changed to better accommodate the objectives of the study; generally speaking, however, we have maintained most of the basic question domains (modules), with a few new additions. The discussion below follows the model of grouping the questions into modules (Modules 1 – 7 for the fixed part; Modules 8, 9 and 10 for the flexible part). The sequencing of modules is viewed as the most appropriate in order to maximize the flow of the questions and the ease of transitions from one section to the next.

1. Demographics - Module 1

As in ISRD2, in ISRD3 we want to collect basic information on gender, age, migrant and/or minority status, household composition, and family affluence or social class. These variables are important, both from a descriptive point of view (in order to be able to compare the sample characteristics against the population parameters) as well as from a theoretical point of view. These variables all play a significant role in different delinquency theories, either as independent variables or as potential control variables.

The total number of questions has been increased by one (from 14 to 15), five questions were eliminated (Q8 experienced discrimination, Q11 has own room, Q12 owning computer, Q13 owning mobile phone, Q14 family owns car), and six new questions were introduced (q1.8 religion; q1.9 importance of religion; q1.10 type of minority group one belongs to; q1.13 source of family income, q1.14 relative family affluence, q1.15 relative personal affluence). Two questions have remained unchanged (q1.1 gender, q1.3 country of birth). The remaining questions (q1.2 age, q1.4 country of birth mother, q1.5 country of birth father, q1.6 household composition, q1.7 language spoken; q1.11 father’s employment; q1.12 mother’s employment) have been slightly changed from the ISRD2 version (different response categories mostly).

Table 1 provides an overview of the modifications made in the items related to demographic information.

Table 1 Module 1 Demographics			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
Gender			
	Q1	1.1	same
Age			
	Q2	1.2	open –ended
Migrant /minority status			
Country of birth	Q3	1.3	same
Country of birth- mother	Q4	1.4	different response options
Country of birth- father	Q5	1.5	different response options
Language spoken	Q7	1.7	different response options
Type of minority group	-----	1.10	new
Experienced discrimination	Q8		eliminated but see q4.1.4
Household composition/living arrangement			
	Q6	1.6	simplified response options
Occupational status parents			
Father's job	Q9	1.11	fewer response options
Mother's job	Q10	1.12	fewer response options
Religion	----	1.8	new
	----	1.9	new
Family affluence			
Own room	Q11	----	eliminated
Computer	Q12	-----	eliminated
Mobile phone	Q13	-----	eliminated
Family own car(s)	Q14	----	eliminated
Source of family income	-----	1.13	new
Relative family affluence	-----	1.14	new
Relative personal affluence	-----	1.15	new

Migrant/minority status (q1.3, q1.4, q1.5, q1.7, q1.10)

Analysis of ISRD2 data shows that migrant status (measured by country of birth Q3, Q4, Q5) is a useful variable, but it only taps partly the more general sociological concept of 'minority' (i.e. defined in terms of relative power, visibility, stereotyping and discrimination). Instead of using 'race' or 'ethnicity' (which are terms unacceptable or not appropriate within certain countries), ISRD3 includes a question (q1.10) designed to identify whatever is considered a 'minority group' by a particular country. For example, in Estonia the minority group is Russians, in the Netherlands Moroccans, Turkish, or Surinamese, in the

USA African Americans, Asian Americans or Latinos, and in many other countries it may be language or religious affiliation which defines the social position of a minority group. Thus, ISRD3 introduces a “dummy item” that may be interpreted according to the needs of the participating country. Each country should decide which minority group definition it will use (or whether to ask such a question at all – this will be an optional item). When combining the data of different countries, a general category “minority group” will be created.

We deleted Q8 (experience of discrimination), and replaced this item by a question in the victimization module (q4.1.d) measuring ‘hate crime’ victimization.

Household composition/Living arrangement (q1.6)

Responses to ISRD2 Q6 (living arrangement) showed that a number of the response categories were not used very much. Q6 was therefore replaced by a much simpler question (q1.6).

Family affluence (q1.11 through q1.15)

The measures used in ISRD2 for this concept proved to be rather unsatisfactory. The questions asking about having one’s own room (Q11), access to a computer (Q12), owning a mobile phone (Q13) and car ownership (Q14) turned out to have little discriminatory power in more affluent countries. The validity of the family affluence scale was weak – some items seem to measure consumption behavior rather than affluence. We deleted these questions and three new questions were added (source of family income q1.13) and the youth’s perception of his/her family affluence (q1.14). Also added was a question (q1.15) about the youth’s perception of his/her personal relative wealth.

2. Family - Module 2

In the area of delinquency, family remains one of the most important domains of study. Therefore, we have kept this important module as a standard part of the questionnaire; it also seems reasonable to ask these questions in the beginning of the questionnaire. We retained the basic conceptual emphases (bonding, parental supervision and control, and family events and conflicts), but we expanded and modified the measures to better reflect developments in the field.

ISRD2 had seven questions on the family (Q16-Q22); there are now four questions (q2.1 through q2.4), three of which are multiple items scales (q2.1, q2.3 and q2.4). One question (Q18) has been eliminated; one question has remained the same (Q19 now q2.2); and two questions (Q16 and Q17) have been included as items in a new Family Bonding scale (q2.1). Table 2 below provides an overview of the major changes.

We added a brief introduction to the questions about the family to clarify what is meant by ‘parents’. Because of divorce, separation, re-marriage, and other living arrangements, questions asking about ‘parents’ may be confusing to children. In Module 1 (background information, q1.6), there is a question asking “Which people are involved in bringing you up?” The brief introduction to the family module

suggests that the pupil answers for the (step-,foster-,biological) parent who is most important in raising her.

Table 2 Module 2 Family			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
<i>Bonding</i>			New 4-item Family Bonding (FB) scale
Get along with father	Q16	2.1.1	Q16 now item a in new FB scale; more response options
Get along with mother	Q17	2.1.2	Q17 now item b in new FB scale; more response options
Getting (emotional) support	-----	2.1.3	Item 2.1.3 in new FB scale
Do not want to disappoint parents	-----	2.1.4	Items 2.1.4 in new FB scale
Time spent with family	Q18	-----	eliminated (but see 5.3)
Eating dinner together	Q19	2.2	same
<i>Supervision/Control</i>			New 12-item Parental Control (PC)scale
Parental knowledge	Q20	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3	Q20 replaced by Items 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3 in new PC scale
Parental supervision	Q21	2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6, 2.3.7, 2.3.8	New items in new PC scale; item 2.3.5 comparable to Q21
Child disclosure	-----	2.3.9, 2.3.10, 2.3.11, 2.3.12	New Items in new PC scale
Parents set time	Q21	2.3.5	Included in PC scale (see also 5.2)
<i>Family Event and Conflict</i>			Modified Family Event Scale
Death of sibling	Q22.1	----	eliminated
Death of parent(s)	Q22.2	2.4.1	same
Death of somebody else	Q22.3	----	eliminated
Serious illness of self	Q22.3	----	eliminated
Serious illness of parents	Q22.5	2.4.2	same
Parents' drug or alcohol	Q22.6	2.4.3	same
Conflict and physical fights	Q22.7	2.4.4, 2.4.5	Split in two separate questions
Separation/divorce	Q22.8	2.4.6	same

Family Bonding (q2.1)

Family bonding was measured in ISRD2 by two questions (Q16 – get along father; Q17 – get along mother) which attempt to tap the level of emotional attachment to parents. When analyzing ISRD2 data, we combined these two questions with Q18 (time spent with family and Q19 – eating dinner together)

to make a Family Bonding scale. We have now expanded the traditional measure of (psychological) family bonding by adding two questions (2.1.3 emotional support, and 2.1.4 feeling bad about disappointing parents) to the commonly used 'getting along' with father and mother (2.1.1 and 2.1.2) questions to create a new 4-item Family Bonding scale. We kept Q19 (eating dinner together-q2.2), because this was a very useful variable in ISRD2 analyses. The original question Q18 (spending time with family) was eliminated, because this information is also measured by question q5.3 (Q26).

Parental Supervision/Control (q2.3)

Recent developments in the literature suggest the importance of distinguishing between different dimensions of parental supervision. There is research that indicates that measures of parental supervision should be able to distinguish between *parental knowledge*, *parental solicitation* and *child disclosure*. If child disclosure is not controlled, detected links between parental supervision and crime can be spurious and dependent on unmeasured variation in child's own behavior. This conceptual re-development was originally published by Swedish researchers Kerr & Stattin (2000). Recently, the basic idea has been corroborated by Eaton et al. (2009). Therefore, we now introduce a new Parental Control scale, which basically consists of three subscales: Parental Knowledge scale (q2.3.1 through q2.3.3); Parental Supervision scale (q2.3.4 through q2.3.8) and the Child Disclosure scale (q2.3.9 through q2.3.12). The Parental supervision Scale tries to tap the degree of active interest parents take in their children's activities.

Family Conflict Scale (q.2.4)

We shortened the original 8 item scale used in ISRD2 to a 6-item scale.

3. School - Module 3

Data on the youth's school experience will remain a standard part of the ISRD questionnaire because of its significance from both a theoretical as well as policy perspective. As is the case with regard to family bonding, there is a growing literature on the measurement of student relationships to school (attachment, bonding, connectedness and engagement – see for example Libbey 2004). We have drawn upon these insights to adjust the ISRD module on the school.

ISRD2 had six school-related questions (Q41 through Q46); ISRD3 has seven (q3.1 through q3.7). As Table 3 below shows, we retained many of the old questions, integrated some of them in a new 4-item School Bonding scale, and introduced two new questions to measure Bonding to Teacher.

Table 3 summarizes the main changes.

Table 3 Module 3 School			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
<i>Attachment to school/bonding</i>			New School Bonding scale (3.1.1 through 3.1.4) (includes Q41 and Q45.1 which are identical to each other, and Q45.3)
Would miss school	Q45.1	3.1.1	Same Q45.1 now part of new SB scale
Most mornings like to go to school	---	3.1.2	New item; part of new SB scale
Like school	Q41	3.1.3	Same Q41 now part of new SB scale
Like school	Q45.3	3.1.3	Same Q45.3 now part of new SB scale
Classes are interesting	---	3.1.4	New item ; part of new SB scale
Teachers notice me	Q45.2	-----	Eliminated
Other activities in school	Q45.4	-----	eliminated
<i>Bonding to teacher</i>			
	-----	3.2	new
	-----	3.3	new
<i>School Disorganization</i>			Old School Disorganization scale Q45.5 through Q45.8)
stealing	Q45.5	3.1.5	same
fighting	Q45.6	3.1.6	same
vandalism	Q45.7	3.1.7	same
drug use	Q45.8	3.1.8	same
<i>School performance</i>			
repeat grade	Q42	3.6	same
self-assessment of performance	Q44	3.5	same; more response options
<i>Truancy</i>	Q43	3.4	Same, but with open response
<i>Educational aspirations</i>	Q46	3.7	Same; slightly modified response options

Bonding to School (q3.1.1 through q3.1.4)

The first question in the school module (3.1) asks eight Likert-type opinion statements about school. For purposes of efficiency, we combine the four questions measuring school bonding (q3.1.1 through 3.1.4) (see Libbey 2004), with four questions measuring perceptions of school disorganization (q.3.1.5 through

q3.1.8 - see below). It should be noted that the newly created School Bonding scale incorporates three of the old questions (Q41, Q45.3 and Q45.1).

Bonding to Teacher (q3.2 and q3.3)

These are two new questions to measure the attachment of youth to their (favorite) teacher (rather than to the more abstract 'school'). Please note that the importance of the teacher is also related to tests of institutional anomie theory (Module 9) and attitudinal questions related to morality (Module 6).

School Disorganization (q3.1.5 through q3.1.8)

We maintained the four items (Q45.5 through Q45.8) to measure school disorganization, since this measure worked quite well before. Thus, the first question (3.1) in the school module consists now of two distinct scales: the School Bonding scale (first four items) and the School Disorganization scale (last four items).

4. Victimization – Module 4

The large volume of literature suggests a significant overlap between offending and victimization (add cite). Data on victimization are useful supplements to administrative agency data, and also may be used to validate the level of crime as measured by self-reported offending. Therefore, the victimization module will be retained as part of the core ISRD project.

Based on the ISRD2 experiences, a number of adjustments have been made. The victimization module now follows questions about background, family and school (ISRD2 placed the victimization questions immediately after the background questions, before school and family questions). Because many pupils had trouble with the ISRD2 format of the victimization module (Q15), the outlay and format have been improved. In ISRD2, the reference period was 12 months; ISRD3 also ask about lifetime ('ever'). Three of the original items were retained (Q15.1 extortion/robbery, Q15.2 assault; Q15.3 theft); the item on bullying (Q15.4) was replaced by a question on cyber bullying (q4e) ; and three additional items were added (q4.d hate crime; q4.f and q4.g on physical parental discipline). The victimization module now has 7 victimization questions, rather than four (ISRD2.)

For the online version only, positive response to the questions about robbery/extortion (q4.1a), assault (q4.1b), hate crime (q4.1d), cyber bullying (q4.1e), and physical parental discipline (q4.1f and q4.1g) elicit a number of follow-up questions. No additional follow-up questions for theft (q4.1b). We refer to these (online-only) victimization follow-up questions as Follow-up Module 4 (FolM4 – see Questionnaire Structure Document for additional information on this module). The online victimization follow-up questions start with q61 (because they follow the last required core question asked on the paper and pencil version, which is Module 10 (identified as question 60 on the online Unipark version of the questionnaire).

Table 4 below provides an overview of the changes.

Table 4 Module 4 Victimization			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
Victimization	12-month reference	Life time and 12 month reference	Intro has changed; now asks also about lifetime experience
Robbery	Q15.1	4.1a	Change in format and response options; follow-ups for online version (q61.2.1-q61.2.3)
Assault	Q15.2	4.1b	Change in format and response options; follow-ups for the online version (q61.3.1-q61.3.3)
Theft	Q15.3	4.1c	Change in format and response options
Bullying	Q15.4	-----	Eliminated; replaced by cyber bullying (4.1e)
Cyber bullying	-----	4.1e	New; follow-ups for online version (q61.5.1)
Hate crime	-----	4.1d	New; follow-ups for online version (q61.4.1-q61.4.4)
Physical parental discipline	-----	4.1f and 4.1g	New; follow-ups for online version (q61.6.1)

Robbery/extortion (q4.1a) and **assault** (q4.1b)

The items for robbery, assault and theft have been left unchanged; ISRD3 now has follow-up questions (online version only) for robbery and assault. The questions ask about the *last* time it has happened: victim's age and place where victimization occurred (61.2.1; 61.3.1), number of people involved, was victim under influence of alcohol or drugs (61.2.2; 61.3.2); gender, age, nationality, drug or alcohol use of perpetrator(s) (61.2.3; 61.3.3).

Hate crime (q4.1d)

Because of the apparent increase in hate crime victimization, we included a new question: "Someone insulted you, threatened you with violence, or committed physical violence against you *because* of your religion, the language you speak, the color of your skin, your social or ethnic background, or for similar reasons?" This information may be combined with questions asked in the Demographics module (q1.3, q1.4, q1.5, q1.7, q1.8, q1.10 related to migrant/minority status), the Leisure and Peers module (q5.5 on

having friends of foreign origin or different background); and the Attitude module (q6.1.2 opinion about moral wrongness of insulting someone because of their ethnicity, or religion).⁸

The follow-up questions (online only) are similar to those asked for assault and robbery: Questions ask about the *last* time it has happened: victim's age and place where victimization occurred (61.4.1), number of people involved, was victim under influence of alcohol or drugs (61.4.2); gender, age, nationality, drug or alcohol use of perpetrator(s) (61.4.3). There is one additional question (q61.4.4) asking about perceived motivation of attacker (religion, language, skin color, social background, ethnic background, political or social opinions, other aspects of identity).

Cyber bullying (q4.1e)

Bullying through electronic means has become a major new problem. There is a fast growing body of research on this topic, often based on surveys with a large number of very detailed questions. We opted to use only one question which reflects a very broad definition of cyber bullying: "Has anyone made fun of you or teased you seriously in a hurtful way through e-mail, instant messaging, in a chat room, on a website, or through a text message sent to your cell phone?"

There is only one multiple-item follow-up question for cyber bullying (q61.5.1): about victim's age when it last happened, whether or not victim was threatened with violence, and whether there was a reference to victim's religion, language, skin color, social background, ethnic background, political or social opinions, or other aspects of victim's identity.

Physical parental discipline (q4.1f and q4.1g)

5. Leisure and Peers – Module 5 (Part 1)

Youth between the ages of 12 and 16 spend most of their time either with their family, in school, or with their friends. Virtually no current or past theory of delinquency ignores the crucial impact of friends or peers (e.g. social learning theory, social bonding theory, or opportunity theory). Generally speaking, it is assumed that time spent with family or in school will reduce the likelihood of delinquency, whereas hanging out with friends (in particular larger groups of friends without adult supervision) will increase the opportunity for misbehaving. It is hard to imagine any theory of delinquency to be fully tested without including variables related to peers and leisure. Therefore, information on how and with whom youth spend their leisure time (alone, with family, or with friends) will remain standard part of the ISRD questionnaire.

⁸ In some of the pilot studies, we also included a question on self-reported hate crime offending, but we found that there were very positive responses to this question, so we decided not to include it.

Table 5 Module 5 Leisure and peers			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
<i>Unsupervised activities</i>			
Going out at night	Q23	5.1	same
Time back home	-----	5.2	new (see also q2.4)
How is time spent?	Q24	-----	eliminated (but see 5.3 and 5.7)
Means of transportation	Q25	-----	eliminated
Spends most free time with whom?	Q26	5.3	same
<i>Friends/Group membership</i>			
Has group of friends	Q27	5.7	same
Eurogang questions	Q28,Q29,Q30,Q31 Q32,Q33,Q34)	-----	eliminated
Foreign origin friends	Q35	5.5	same
Parents approve foreign friends	Q36	-----	eliminated
<i>Leisure activities w/friends or alone</i>			
Go to disco	Q37.1	5.6.1	modified
Play in band	Q37.2	5.6.2	modified
Drink or do drugs	Q37.3	5.6.8	modified
Vandalize for fun	Q37.4	---	eliminated
Shoplift for fun	Q37.5	---	eliminated
Play sports	Q37.6	5.6.4	modified
Play computer games	Q37.7	---	eliminated
Frighten for fun	Q37.8	5.6.9	modified
other	Q37.9	---	eliminated
Fighting with others	---	5.6.3	new
homework	---	5.6.5	new
Hanging out outside	---	5.6.6	new
Doing illegal things for fun	---	5.6.7	
<i>Bonding with friends</i>			
Would miss if move	-----	5.8	new
Important what friends think	-----	5.9	new
<i>Delinquent involvement friends</i>			
	Q48	5.10	same
<i>Happiness</i>			
	-----	5.4	new

ISRD2 included 16 questions on peers and leisure (Q23 through Q37.9, and Q48). These questions measured (1) unsupervised activities and time spent with family; (2) membership in a group of friends (or gang); (3) types of leisure time activities done with friends; and (4) perceived delinquent involvement of friends. Table 5 below summarizes the questions under each of these domains, as well as the changes that were made. We made some adjustments to some of the questions, while basically retaining the same concepts of interest. We added one new concept: bonding with friends. The new module contains 11 questions, two of which are multiple-item questions.

In this module, the question on means of transportation (Q25) failed to provide useful data and was thus eliminated. Furthermore, we eliminated one rather cumbersome question (Q24) on the amount of time spent on an average school day on a number of activities, because this question did not produce much useful information and took a lot of time to complete. We now try to measure youth's way of spending time (leisure activities) in a revised version of Q37 (Leisure Activities scale, q5.6).

In order to keep the questionnaire to a reasonable length (while incorporating some new questions on other topics such as hate crime), seven questions on gang membership, modeled after the Eurogang (Weerman and Decker 2005) were eliminated (Q28 through Q34).

Unsupervised Activities (q5.1 through q5.3)

Going out at night is an important measure of potentially unsupervised activities. We retained the original question (Q23), but we changed the follow-up question (Q24) about time limits set by parents (which turned out to be too complicated). Instead, we ask at what time the youth actually comes home. This information may be coupled with q2.4 ("On a normal weekend's night, what is the time when you have to be back home?") in order to get a better sense of both unsupervised time and supervision by parents (i.e. the efficiency of parental supervision).

Leisure Activities - with Friends or Alone (q.5.6)

In ISRD2, questions were asked about leisure activities of student (without specifying if that was done alone or with others) (Q24), and about leisure activities when hanging out with friends (Q37). The new Leisure Activities scale (Q37 and Q 24) has been modified in two ways: (1) includes a few more positive activities (such as doing homework together); (2) asks "with whom?" (with friends or alone). This allows us to make up for the deletion of the old question Q24 (asking about youth's activities on an average day).

Bonding with Friends (q5.8 and q5.9)

ISRD2 did not have any measure of the emotional importance of one's friends in terms of attachment and priority. We now include two items which may be used to measure attachment to friends. Together with the measures of bonding to parents (q2.1 and q2.2) and bonding to teacher (q3.2 and q3.3), the questionnaire now also has a measure of the level of bonding with friends, thus adding the important group of relevant peers to representatives of the major social institutions (family, education).

Happiness (q5.4) ☺

There is a large and fast-growing body of theory and survey research about the determinants and consequences of well-being. In cross-national research in particular, the concept of happiness has gained ground. In the US version of ISRD1, a question about happiness was included and was shown to be a powerful variable (i.e. made a clear distinction between incarcerated youth, at-risk youth and average high school students). We propose to include one single question (q5.4) to tap this concept. It makes sense to place the self-assessment of happiness in the context of questions about leisure time, family and friends.

6. Attitudes: Morality, Self-Control, Neighborhood – Module 6 (Part 1)

One of the strengths of survey research such as the ISRD compared to using official record data is that it allows us to assess youths' (subjective) perceptions and attitudes. Extant research and theory has firmly established the importance of including youths' perceptions and beliefs in any theory of delinquency. Therefore, we want to retain two such scales: the shortened version of Grasmick et al. (1990) self-control scale (Q39) and the perception of neighborhood scale (Q47), both of which were quite successfully in ISRD2.⁹ We made some minor changes to the Neighborhood scale (reducing the 13 items in Q47 to 11 items in q6.7). We deleted three items (measuring the 'temper' dimension) from the Self-Control Scale. We decided to eliminate the Attitudes towards Violence scale (Q38) altogether in order to make room for a new set of questions related to morality (q6.1 through q6.4).

We propose to make the morality questions (together with the Self-control scale and the Neighborhood Scale) a standard part of the ISRD questionnaire. The morality questions ("pro-social values" and "shaming" in Wikström's terms, see for example, Wikström and Butterworth, 2006; Wikström and Svensson 2010) are central to the situational action theory (SAT) and are believed to interact with self-control in important ways. But the scales are important not only with respect to the SAT (which has never been investigated in such a broad international context as the ISRD study will be) but are relevant to the ISRD study even if not linked to the SAT: There are good reasons to assume that values and norms differ by country and determine to a large extent not only the behavior of youth but also their evaluation of the seriousness of delinquent acts and thus their willingness of reporting and self-disclosure. We should expect that – similarly to self-control and life style – morality will belong to many of serious criminological studies in the future, i.e. that these items are not merely a fad. We therefore should include this module into the fixed part of the ISRD questionnaire.

There is yet another argument to use this module in the next ISRD study: When combined with questions of norm transmission strength (Module 8 Institutional Anomie Theory – see below), a very interesting link of micro level (SAT) and macro level (institutional anomy theory or IAT) theories will become possible. This is also a theoretical perspective that is extremely interesting to investigate in an international comparative study.

⁹ Of course, there are additional attitude scales in the other modules, but the three discussed in Module A6.2 are grouped together because they do not squarely fit in any of the other modules.

Table 6 provides a brief overview of the main concepts and related questions.

Table 6. Module 6. Attitudes			
Concept	ISR2	ISR3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
Attitudes t/violence	Q38	---	eliminated
Self-Control			
self-control scale	Q39	6.5	Same, minus 3 items (Q39.10 Q39.11 Q39.12) (temper) (9-item scale) (Grasmick et al., 1990)
accident	Q40	6.6	same
Attitudes t/ neighborhood	Q47	6.7	Revised Neighborhood scale
If move would miss	Q47.1	---	eliminated
Neighbors notice	Q47.2	---	eliminated
Like neighborhood	Q47.3	---	eliminated
Lots of space	Q47.4	---	eliminated
Lots of crime	Q47.5	6.7.3	same
Lots of drug selling	Q47.6	6.7.4	same
Lots of fighting	Q47.7	6.7.5	same
Empty buildings	Q47.8	6.7.6	same
Lots of graffiti	Q47.9	6.7.7	same
Willing to help	Q47.10	6.7.8	same
Close-knit	Q47.11	6.7.9	same
Can be trusted	Q47.12	6.7.10	same
Get along	Q47.13	6.7.11	same but reversed
My neighbors know me	----	6.7.1	new
People do things together	---	6.7.2	new
Pro-Social Values	---	6.1	New 8-item scale
Shaming			
shoplifting	---	6.2	new
hurting	---	6.3	new
arrested	---	6.4	new

7. Offending – Module 7 (part 1)

We have tried to minimize changes in wording and format throughout the questionnaire, but we have done so especially for the questions about self-reported offending. If we want to draw conclusions about trends, this is especially important. Having said this, we felt though that there was a need to make some adjustments to the questions (formatting, some wording).

Contact with Police (q7.2)

In the new ISRD, there are no follow-up questions (except about incidence in the last 12 months). This is a significant change from ISRD2 where each item had a number of follow-up questions, including about age of onset and detection. In particular the data we collected on detection and punishment (social response) were rather unsatisfactory and limited in their usefulness.¹⁰ We now have simplified the questions on offending by eliminating these follow-up questions for each item. Instead, we have added one new question (q7.2) asking about contact with the police because of illegal behavior, and the consequences of this contact. This question is asked only about the last time (during 12 months) that this happened.

Table 7 summarizes the major changes, most of which are self-explanatory and are the results of extensive discussions.

¹⁰ Although the information on social response collected in ISRD2 has been put to excellent use by Dirk Enzmann (Chapter 6, *The Many Faces of Youth Crime*, Springer, 2011).

Table 7 Module 7 Offending			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
<i>Self-reported Offending</i>		New introduction	All items have a different format; no age of onset; no follow-up
Graffiti	----	7.1.1	new
Vandalism	Q54	7.1.2	Same wording
Shoplifting	Q55	7.1.3	Same wording
Burglary	Q56	7.1.4	Same wording
Bike theft	Q57	7.1.5	Eliminated moped or scooter
Vehicle theft	Q58	7.1.6	Same wording
Illegal downloading	Q59	7.1.13	Reworded
Hacking	Q60	---	eliminated
Stealing from car	Q61	7.1.7	Minor rewording
Snatching	Q62	7.1.9	Major rewording (now “steal from a person”)
Carry weapon	Q63	7.1.10	Minor rewording
Robbery/extortion	Q64	7.1.8	Minor rewording
Group fight	Q65	7.1.11	Minor rewording
Assault	Q66	7.1.12	Minor rewording
Drug sales	Q67	7.1.14	Major rewording
Animal cruelty	----	7.1.15	new (optional)
<i>Contact with police</i>	---	7.2	New

8. Substance Use – Module 8 (Part 2)

The module on Substance Use is placed as the first segment of the flexible part (Part 2) of the questionnaire. Most likely, we want to retain in the future a number of questions on substance use as part of the core ISRD questionnaire (Part 1), but we expect that this may be a shorter version of the Module. By positioning it at the beginning of the flexible part, it will be simple to make the (shorter) Substance Use module part of the standard fixed part.

Table 8 shows the changes made in the questions related to substance use. It is difficult to provide a succinct summary and overview of these changes, because most of the ISRD2 questions have been replaced. Basically, the same main concepts are still being measured, but in a more efficient manner. The format used by the new Substance Use questions is an improvement over the format used for most ISRD2 alcohol and drug use questions, which were difficult to answer for many. We partly borrowed questions from the well-established ESPAD survey, which provides a number of validated questions that have been used on international samples of youth. The main differences (with ISRD2) are the inclusion of binge drinking (8.1c), the addition of a 12-month reference period for hard drugs (instead to the 30

day and lifetime periods), the addition of a fake drug to assess over-reporting (8.3), and the assessment of the propensity to report (8.6).

Propensity to Report (q8.6)

An interesting addition is the question (q8.6) which asks about propensity to report. This question has been used successfully in previous studies to assess the likelihood of under- or over-reporting (which is found to vary internationally) . In this context, it is important to note that this module also includes a fake drug (Relevin – see q8.3) to weed out “over-reporting” and invalid responses.

Table 8 Module 8 Substance Use			
Concept	ISR2	ISR3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change-most items from ESPAD questionnaire; all old questions have been replaced
Alcohol Use			
beer, wine	Q49	8.1	Eliminated, replaced with new
strong spirits	Q50	8.1	Eliminated, replaced with new
been drunk	Q49 Q50	----	Eliminated
amount of alcohol	Q49 Q50	8.1b	Eliminated, replaced with new
lifetime use	Q49 Q50	8.1a	Eliminated, replaced with new
30 days use	Q49 Q50	----	Eliminated (but see 8.1c)
binge drinking	----	8.1c	New
Drug Use			
mar, hash	Q51	8.2	Eliminated, replaced with new
XTC, speed	Q52	8.4	Eliminated, replaced with new
heroin, coke	Q53	8.5	Eliminated, replaced with new
lifetime use	Q51 Q52 Q53	8.2, 8.4, 8.5	Eliminated, replaced with new
12 month use	-----	8.4, 8.5	New
30 days use	Q51 Q52 Q53	8.2	Eliminated / replaced with new
Age of onset			
	Q49.1 Q50.1 Q51.1 Q52.1 Q53.1	----	Eliminated
Fake drug			
	-----	8.3	New
Propensity to report			
	-----	8.6	New

9. Institutional Anomie Theory (Norm Transmission Strength) – Module 9 (Part 2)

Recall that an important objective of the ISRD is to test different theoretical perspectives. Although there are several core theories (embodied in measures collected through the standard Family, School, Leisure and Peers, and Attitudinal Modules), the ISRD also wants to incorporate ideas of more recent and still developing theories. Here is where the flexible part of the questionnaire comes in. The theoretical perspectives tested in the flexible section (part 2) of the ISRD3 are two: First, Institutional Anomie Theory (IAT) (Messner and Rosenfeld, 2007) and second, Procedural Justice Theory (e.g. Tyler, 2006) discussed in the next section (Module 10).

As already mentioned in the discussion about morality (Module 6 questions 6.1 through 6.4), the measures of pro-social values and shaming, when combined with questions of norm transmission strength (Module 9), make the testing of an interesting link of micro level (Situational Action Theory) and macro level (Institutional anomie Theory) theories possible.

The vignettes and items of Module 9.1 are intended to measure what may be called “norm transmission strength” of social institutions (the family and school, in addition to peers). There are two types of vignettes: One measuring “subjective norms” of the respondents (i.e. what they believe the norms of relevant others are) as to unethical (but legal) behavior guided by the instrumental motive of personal gain (enrichment) at the expense of others (q9.1) ; the other measuring subjective norms as to illegal behavior (theft) (q9.3) . When combined with measures of bonding [subjective norms * bonding] to parents (q2.1 and q2.2), teachers (q3.2 and q3.3), and peers (q5.8 and q5.9) and aggregated to the level of schools, cities or countries, measures of “norm transmission strength” (NTS) of parents, teachers, and peers can be created. Enzmann and colleagues (in press)¹¹ showed that the NTS of *unethical behavior* (profiteering, to fleece so.) which is still legal predicts delinquent behavior very similar as to the NTS of *illegal* behavior such as theft or violent property crime (the latter was dropped from the ISRD questionnaire in order to spare space). Note that Module 9 also contains questions as to the *intention* of unethical (q9.2) and illegal (q9.4) behavior. The latter allows to study the transgression of the "rubicon" from weighing to willing, i.e. from the mere readiness to actual behavior (Gollwitzer et al., 1990) dependent on the NTS of non-economic institutions.

Table 9 summarizes the main concepts.

¹¹ More detailed analyses results of the Enzmann and colleagues study available upon request.

Table 9 Module 9: Norm transmission strength (Institutional Anomie)			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	New Module question number (M.q)	Type of change
<i>Subjective norms: unethical profit making</i>	-----	9.1	new
best friend	-----	9.1.1	
class mates	-----	9.1.2	
mother	-----	9.1.3	
father	-----	9.1.4	
teacher	-----	9.1.5	
peers in neighborhood	-----	9.1.6	
<i>Intention: unethical profit making</i>	-----	9.2	new
<i>Subjective norms: illegal behavior (theft)</i>	-----	9.3	new
best friend	-----	9.3.1	
classmates	-----	9.3.2	
mother	-----	9.3.3	
father	-----	9.3.4	
teacher	-----	9.3.5	
peers in neighborhood	-----	9.3.6	
<i>Intention: illegal behavior (theft)</i>	-----	9.4	new

10. Procedural Justice Theory – Module 10 (Part 2)

A second main – and novel – theme in the questionnaire is that of ‘procedural justice’. A recent Special Issue of the European Journal of Criminology (July 2011) is devoted to the theme of ‘trust in justice’. (Hough, Ruuskanen & Jokinen 2011), reflecting its relevance in current thinking about crime. In the following we provide a rather detailed background to this theory, which may be skipped by those familiar with the theory.¹²

Procedural justice theories can be located within a broader set of theories of normative compliance, or ‘compliance theories’, which can be traced back to Durkheimian and Weberian thinking about the roots of social order. On the one hand, there has been increasing (or perhaps, more accurately, rediscovered) interest over the last two decades in the relationship between ‘political economy’ (cf Reiner, 2007), which trace the connections between the social distribution of wealth and attachment to – or detachment from – social norms. The emergence of neo-liberal economic policies is obviously implicated in this trend. Theories of institutional anomie (cf Messner and Rosenfeld 2001, 2010 – and see Module 9

¹² This section was written by Mike Hough

above) serve as good examples of this line of thought. According to these, rapid transitions towards the values of free-market economies can unbalance and weaken traditional normative systems of social control. More generally, the idea that high levels of income inequality fuel crime is almost a criminological truism, with a long sociological pedigree.

On the other hand, there are compliance theories about the impact on societal norms of the institutions of formal social control, such as the work of Robinson and Darley, and that of Tom Tyler. Thus Robinson and Darley (1997) argue that if the law's potential for building a moral consensus is to be exploited, the sentence of the court must be aligned at least to some degree with public sentiments. Tyler (eg 2006, 2010) emphasizes the need for justice institutions to pursue fair and respectful *processes* – in contrast to *outcomes* – as the surest strategies for building trust in justice, and thus institutional legitimacy and compliance with the law. This is the central hypothesis in procedural justice theory. Procedural justice theories offer the considerable attraction of resolving the tension that is often thought to exist between effective crime control and the respecting of people's rights. It suggests that fair, respectful and legal behavior on the part of justice officials is not only ethically desirable, but is a prerequisite for effective justice.

The two broad families of compliance theory – with their different emphasis on securing social justice and a fair system of justice – are obviously compatible, and it should be possible to integrate them into an overarching theory of compliance. A key theoretical issue is the relative weight that should be attached to the impact of institutional behavior (police, courts etc) on normative compliance, and the impact of underlying social and economic inequalities.

The fifth European Social Survey – recently completed and soon to be analyzed – included a module on procedural justice. The 5th ESS has covered 28 countries, with representative samples of people aged 15 or over. The 'Trust in Justice' module will provide a good test of competing hypotheses about the drivers of trust in justice, perceptions of institutional legitimacy and compliance with the law amongst adults. Adapting some of the items to conduct a parallel test for young people is thus an attractive possibility. *And that is exactly what ISRD3 will attempt to do.*

In order to test hypotheses related to procedural justice theory, we have drawn from questions formulated for the ESS. Since the ISRD sample consists of 12-16 year olds, we have adjusted the wording of some of the questions in order to make them more user-friendly. Module 10 consists of eight questions (q10.1 through q10.8). See Table 10. These focus on policing, though in the ESS there are also several items on the courts.

Such 'compliance theories' provide a very good conceptual framework for the next ISRD sweep. Procedural justice hypotheses have not been explored in comparative surveys of young people. There are very few studies examining the relationships between economic inequality, institutional anomie and compliance specifically focusing on young people; and very few such studies that have been able to do multi-level modeling that combine tests of theories in the two different traditions of compliance theories. Thus, by using the conceptual framework of compliance theories, ISRD3 will address both

issues of rights and fairness in justice, and of the impact of social injustice on commitment to the rule of law.

Table 10 Module 10 Procedural Justice			
Concept	ISRD2	ISRD3	
	Old question number (Q)	Module question number (M.q)¹³	Type of change (D)
<i>Trust in Justice</i>			
Trust in police	-----	10.1	New
Trust in effectiveness	-----	10.2	New
Trust in procedural fairness	-----	10.3 10.4 10.5	New
<i>Institutional legitimacy</i>			
Obligation to obey	-----	10.6	New
Moral alignment/trust in shared values	-----	10.7	New
Trust in legality	-----	10.8	New

Concluding comment

The purpose of this background paper is to provide a context for discussion about the final draft of the ISRD3 questionnaire. We hope we have succeeded in explaining our reasons for making revisions and additions. The ISRD2 questionnaire was the product of a lengthy process of consultation with all participants (which took almost two years from beginning to end). We have taken the ISRD2 questionnaire as our model, and built upon its foundations, trying to remain true to its original conceptual basis and its basic purpose.

References

- Eaton, N. R. & Krueger, R. F. & Johnson, W., McGue, M., & Iacono, W. G. (2009). Parental monitoring, personality, and delinquency: Further support for a reconceptualization of monitoring. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 49-59.
- Enzmann, D. & Kivivuori, J. (2013). *Surveying Sensitive Questions: Prevalence Estimates of Self-reported Delinquency Using the Crosswise Model* (Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the European Society of Criminology, Budapest, 4-7 September 2013).
- Enzmann, D., Kammigan, I., Siegmunt, O. & Wetzels, P. (in press). *Was scheren mich die anderen? Markt-moral als kriminogener Faktor: Eine Dunkelfeldstudie zu Jugendkriminalität in Russland und Deutschland* [Why should I care? Market morality as criminogenic: Self-reported delinquency in Russia and Germany]. Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

¹³ All questions are adapted from the ESS

- Gollwitzer, P. M., Heckhausen, H., & Ratajczak, H. (1990). From weighing to willing: Approaching a change decision through pre- or postdecisional mentation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45, 41-65.
- Hough, M., Ruuskanen, E., & Jokinen, A (2011). Trust in justice and the procedural justice perspective: Editors' introduction. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8, 249-253
- Jann, B., Jerke, J., & Krumpal, I. (2012). Asking sensitive questions using the crosswise model: Some experimental results. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76, 32-49.
- Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2000). What parents know, how they know it, and several forms of adolescent adjustment: Further support for a reinterpretation of monitoring. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 366-380.
- Libbey, H. P. (2004). Measuring student relationships to school: Attachment, bonding, connectedness, and engagement. *Journal of School Health*, 74, 274-283
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2001). An institutional-anomie theory of Crime. In R. Paternoster & R. Bachman (Eds.), *Explaining Criminals and Crime* (pp. 151-160). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2007), *Crime and the American Dream*. Belmont, CA (4th edition): Wadsworth.
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2010). Institutional-anomie theory: A macro-sociological explanation of crime. In A. J. L. Krohn & G. P. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook on Crime and Deviance* (pp. 209-224). New York: Springer.
- Reiner, R. (2007) *Law and Order: An Honest Citizen's Guide to Crime and Control*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Robinson, P. H. and Darley, J. M. (1997) The utility of desert. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 91(2), 453-499.
- Tyler, T. R. (2006) *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven (2nd edition): Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (2010) *Why People Cooperate? The Role of Social Motivations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Wikström, P.-O. H. & Butterworth, D. A. (2006). *Adolescent Crime: Individual Differences and Lifestyles*. Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Wikström, P.-O. H. & Svensson, R (2010). When does self-control matter? The interaction between morality and self-control in crime causation. *European Journal of Criminology*, 7, 395-410.