

Background Paper for ISRD4 U.S. Internet Sample

Michael Gottfredson, University of
California, Irvine

Mikaela Nielsen, University of
California, Irvine

Ineke Haen Marshall, Northeastern
University

April 2026

Citation:

Gottfredson, M., Nielsen, M., & Marshall, I. Haen (2026). *Background Paper for ISRD4 US Internet Sample* [ISRD4/US Technical Report #1]. University of California at Irvine, <https://isrdstudy.org/>

Brief introduction to survey

This report documents the sampling and methods and some first findings from the U.S. ISRD4 internet sample, a large (over 4,000 respondents) internet-based, national sample of 15–18-year-olds, using the brief ISRD4 instrument for measuring self-reported delinquency and victimization, undertaken by the U.S. team (consisting of Gottfredson, Nielsen, and Marshall). This document is meant to be read along with the Protocol from the ISRD steering committee, which provides background, justification, and procedures for the internet study for ISRD4 (Marshall, Birkbeck, Enzmann, Kivivuori, Markina & Steketee, 2022).

Issues of response rates and sampling procedure are discussed, along with some of the rationale for seeking alternative methods for sampling for self-reported delinquency and victimization surveys. Some basic data on respondent performance issues are described. Additionally, the U.S. team added several questionnaire items to the ISRD4 core survey, including measures designed to allow study of behavioral self-control (e.g., truancy and texting while driving), measures of the control theory concept of “belief”, and items about school dress codes, their violations, and institutional responses (but we do not discuss these measures in this report). The questionnaires used (two versions “A” and “B”; see below for explanation) are included in Appendix A.

This study is part of a methodological experiment in the International Self-

Report Delinquency (ISR4) project, using an internet sample and internet questionnaires to measure victimization and self-reported offending in an adolescent sample. For this U.S. study, the sample, and some demographic questions, were provided by a major commercial marketing research firm (Prodege—<https://www.prodege.com/>) under the direction of the U.S. team. The major instrument (core) was provided by the ISR4 Protocol and consists of basic demographic and personal information, a set of questions about offending, about victimization, items meant to reflect some common explanatory theories, and attitudes and beliefs about crime and victimization. The instrument is a scaled down version of the school-based survey (see, generally, Marshall, et al., 2022), a companion study to this internet project.

The internet survey is designed to be administered in many countries, at roughly similar times. The ‘core’ instrument was “translated” into common U.S. English by the team. Note that a small set of items has different response categories, depending on the country doing the administration. Note too, that the U.S. team created distinct gender and race/ethnic categories for responses. In addition to the addition of several substantive questions, we included an item that represented the kind of neighborhood that young people live in—city, rural, or suburban.

Our study design for this survey called for two versions of the survey instrument (hereinafter “A” and “B”, see Appendix A)¹ For both instruments, the

¹ Please, check the ISR4 Protocol for more details.; and see also Nielsen (2025)

core demographic items, a question about happiness, minority status, a set of integrity checks, and delinquency and victimization items are identical; they differ, however in modules designed to test explanatory variables, some attitudinal variables, and a set of integrity check variables. These include, for version A, questions about self-control, “morality”, and online and offline routine activities; for version B, the modules include questions about belonging, discrimination and questions about perceptions of violence and revenge. The US. team sought to extend the use of the ISRD4 victimization and self-reported delinquency items by including some additional explanatory variables. Two general categories of supplements were added, one each to random half samples from the overall design. The first included some items drawn from control theory—five items designed to measure self-control on the basis of reporting of behaviors, and four items based on the “belief” dimension of social control described by Hirschi (1969) and used in *Causes of Delinquency* to measure variability in moral commitment to the law and to school authority. The second set explores in some depth the impact of school appearance policies (i.e., dress codes and uniforms), violation rates, disciplinary responses, and student perceptions of these policies, with a particular focus on gender, discrimination, and racial/ethnic variability (see Nielsen, 2025 for details). Versions of A and B were administered to random halves of the U.S. sample.

Some background on our sample selection and survey administration

The ISRD4 interview schedule for the internet-based survey is much reduced from that typically used by the corresponding school surveys (see Marshall, et al., 2022), in part due to estimated time limits for adolescents' responsiveness to online activities. It was estimated that a 15-minute limit would be necessary. (In our actual study, however, this internet sample -which is paid for their participation, unlike the school-based sample - could have exceeded that general time limit.) In the two final standard ISRD4 internet-based versions of the questionnaires, each measure standard demographic characteristics, the core ISRD4 self-reported offending and victimization measures (with special attention to online items), core ISRD4 theoretical variables (e.g., self- control and morality), and a set of attitudinal variables measuring respondents' views about violence and discrimination. As mentioned above, we added several additional questions as our national module.²

The protocol for the U.S. survey called for sample selection by Prodege, from their ongoing respondent panels designed for general marketing surveys, followed by administration of our questionnaires via the Lime platform, managed by the ISRD4 team at Tartu University. Once respondents were identified by Prodege and asked a few brief screener items to determine eligibility for the study and to assess needs according to the sampling quotas, they were automatically redirected to the Lime

² For more details, please compare our questionnaires "A" and "B" in Appendix A with the internet questionnaires included in the Marshall et al 2022 ISRD Protocol.

survey platform. The surveys were administered on either phones, tablets, or computers. In the US internet sample, 70% of the respondents took the survey by phone. We designed the sample to consist of a general population sample of 15–18-year-olds with quotas for gender, age, and race/ethnicity, with a total sample size target of about 4,000. The quotas were established in collaboration with the marketing research firm, to allow for sample sizes useful for the study of a variety of victimization and offending measures, some of which are statistically rare in general populations, with sufficient cases for demographic subgroup analyses. A balance between available resources for the study and sufficient subgroup samples was sought, resulting in quotas for an equal balance of males and females (with an allowance included also for respondents reporting “non-binary” for gender), equal numbers of each of the four age groups, and oversampling of Black and Latino/Latina respondents. The resulting sample may be described as a relatively large (for this field) national convenience sample of adolescents, who had agreed to participate in surveys undertaken by the marketing research firm, but not as a probability sample with aspirations of national representation. Procedures (described below) were implemented to guard against common validity threats for this form of sampling, such as bots, cross-device IP tracking to prevent multiple responses from individual respondents, careless or disingenuous respondents, inconsistent responses, and the like.

Respondents were compensated by the team, via Prodege, based on an

hourly rate based on minimum wage, prorated by time. All respondents were part of ongoing panels hosted by Prodege, which they created using a variety of internet recruitment strategies. The U.S. team monitored the quota sampling and made modest adjustments to oversampling as the survey progressed, in order to recruit more respondents in underrepresented groups. The principal effects of the quota sampling were to increase male and minority respondents sufficiently to have larger samples for a multivariate study, as female and white respondents initially predominated the general sample.

The resulting sample has some features that are attractive as an alternative or supplement to traditional school or household-based surveys for the study of adolescent behavior. For example, our internet sample includes some respondents routinely excluded in school surveys, such as young people who are not in school, either typically or on the day of questionnaire administration (self-report methods for teen surveys typically collect data from classrooms on one given day).

Interviews take place outside of institutional settings and rely on communication methods familiar to teens. The ubiquity of cell phones, the ease with which teens interact with them, and the prospect of compensation all favor these convenience samples. Internet samples can also include older teens many of whom are no longer required to be in school, such as 18-year-olds in the U.S. Prior research shows that relatively large samples can be recruited via the internet at relatively low cost (Baker et al., 2013 page 715.)

As mentioned, the ISRD has traditionally relied on school samples, and school samples remain central to the overall project design. In the fields of delinquency and teen victimization research, and much adolescent research generally, either school-based samples or household sampling frames are traditional. Given that very substantial portions of the U.S. teen population are required to attend school (and traditionally do so) and given the convenience of administering survey procedures in the school setting, such samples became the predominate sampling method for most large surveys and much etiological research (Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991). Although not without shortcomings, the school-based method proved to be well suited to this form of survey—providing a very large body of relatively consistent results across a wide range of time and settings, both in the U.S. and around the world (see, e.g., Enzmann et al., 2018; Gottfredson, 2021; Marshall et al., 2022). School-based samples include many of the best-known surveys (both cross-sectional and longitudinal) in criminology—Monitoring the Future (Johnson, Bachman, & O’Malley, 1983); Adolescent Health (Harris & Udry, 1994-2008), ISRD (Enzmann et al., 2005-2007), the Cambridge Study of Delinquency (Farrington, 1961-1981), and the Richmond Youth Survey (Hirschi, 1969), for example. For victimization studies, household samples, such as used by the National Crime Victimization Surveys (U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1992, 2022), predominate in the U.S.

However, in recent years, both in the U.S. and elsewhere, it has become

increasingly difficult to get permission for and participation in delinquency and victimization surveys in schools. A much wider range of school types is now prevalent in the U.S., including traditional public, public charters, religion-based, private, and home schooling (Wang, Rathburn & Musu, 2019). The costs for access have increased, both financially and in terms of instrument design. Most often, difficult to obtain parental permission is required by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) and school administrations—some studies include both types in their design (Adolescent Health, for example) (Culp & Caucci, 2013; Dent, Sussman, & Stacy, 1997; Anderman, Cheadle, Curry, Diehr, Shultz & Wagner, 1995). Truants and school dropouts remain a possible issue, with likely sample selection heavily correlated with delinquency and victimization dependent variables (Michaud, Delbos-Piot & Narring, 1998; Pflug & Schneider, 2015). Household surveys, a common sampling frame for victimization surveys, have their own potential limitations—including identification and enumeration of “housing units” and persons within households; lack of privacy of response; sample attrition by household and also by within-household respondents; and very high costs beyond the abilities of most researchers (Meyer, Mok, & Sullivan, 2015).

Although internet samples are often contrasted in the literature as distinct from probability samples meant to provide estimates of some population, school-based and household-based samples may for some purposes be characterized in a similar way. For example, they also tend to be convenience-samples of schools

and respondents present in school (Pflug & Schneider, 2016; Weitzman, Guttmacher, Weinberg & Kapadia, 2003). Thus, sample selection biases may be an issue for both household and in-school surveys for some purposes (perhaps more than is commonly assumed). Often, school-based surveys only include those schools that are available and willing to participate, at a price available to researchers. Researchers must also follow school administration regulations for such matters as parental permission, which often means active consent procedures, editing of instruments, and restrictions on administration (Dyer, Marshman, Merrick, Wyborn, & Godson, 2008; Waechter, Kalmus, Mascheroni, & Opermann, 2023). This of course can present challenges for the representation of the sample for some purposes for these surveys, including comparisons across sites (or countries).

Considerable class, racial, and area selection make all school-based surveys far from representative of general population characteristics (Unger, Gallaher, Palmer, Baezconde-Garbanati, Trinidad, Cen, & Johnson, 2004; Weitzman et al., 2003). To say that such matters are of concern does not of course, mean that such samples are without utility—only that such factors now characterize all sampling procedures and that potential sample selection biases need to be studied for every sampling frame, recalling that questions of sampling bias cannot be understood absent knowledge of the purpose for any particular analysis.

On the other hand, many samples available from internet populations may be

problematic for studying teen behavior, especially because they restrict participation to adults (e.g., 18 and over) or use platforms greatly restricting the form instruments might take (especially length and content). Little is known about potential problems with sensitive questions (such as victimization and offending) for internet convenience samples—nearly all validation work for self-report measures relies on school-based samples (Hindelang, Hirschi, & Weis, 1981; Thornberry and Krohn, 2000; Marshall et al., 2022). In addition, without major efforts to control respondent integrity (inattention to the meaning of the questions, faking responses, bots and the like), internet samples may be impossible to accurately characterize (Baker et al., 2013). Our study is an attempt to provide some additional data to this important set of method issues, while at the same time adding some new measures for self-reports of teen behavior (not included in this report).

Our experiences with using samples from existing panels.

After examination of several alternatives (e.g., adding on to existing large-scale household and school-based national panels), we decided to employ a marketing research firm for the identification and administration of the sample for our survey. Not only was this decision guided by cost concerns (e.g., estimated costs to add to existing panel surveys), but several other potential restrictions from alternatives as well, including insufficient numbers of respondents to fill our quota

design, and unknown consequences of panel attrition and the good flexibility available with the marketing firm.

Although the ISRD protocol required a minimum sample of 1,800 16–17-year-olds for the internet-based sample, analytical plans led us to recruit a much larger sample (4,000) of a broader age range (15-18 years old), deploying self-reported parental approval, from these existing panels. Although a power analysis is not possible for this design, we expect that a larger sample will facilitate more reliable multivariate study. We sought a sample with about 1,000 respondents in each of our four age groups, with roughly even numbers of males and females (with non-binary responses also available), and sufficient Black and Latino/a samples to allow for examination of ethnic differences in responses. Note that racial/ethnic diversity is particularly problematic in the U.S. using single school samples, due in part to highly racialized housing and schooling patterns (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2022).

In general, the marketing research firm uses a variety of sophisticated methods to produce valid responses, including verification of respondents via a variety of means, monitoring patterns of responses, detection of bots, fraudulent responses, duplicate responders, speeders, and the like. While these methods exceed those typically used by academic survey researchers, not all methods were available in our cases, due to the survey design. The market research firm traditionally identifies the sample and also hosts the survey - but for this project the market

research firm would not be able to host the survey. The first reason is to protect the identities and potential identification between participants and their responses. The second is due to the cross-country collaborative design of the ISRD project. For this multi-national project, it is necessary that administration of surveys be as consistent as possible to reduce potential issues that may arise when combining and comparing across national samples. Thus, while the survey firm techniques apply to the panel itself, they do not apply once the respondent enters the Lime portion of the study. Therefore, detection items for false responses and social desirability were included in our ISRD4 Lime survey as well.

We want to note that the original design for the internet survey portion of ISRD4 called for the internet survey to be coterminous with the school-based survey to permit validation study. Although potentially feasible in the U.S., practical obstacles obviated this alternative--obtaining a large enough sample that would focus on a specific school jurisdiction may be possible with some methods, but it proved not to be possible to simultaneously deploy important quota sampling in our internet sample to ensure sufficient cases for our interests in studying simultaneous effects for age, race, and gender without prohibitive costs, in even a regional sample from the firm.

Although sometimes marketing research samples such as ours may be called nationally representative (and in some ways are, given the ubiquity of internet usage by adolescents), a better term may be national convenience sample, drawn from on-

going panels with respondents selected by advertising in two forms: panels (users are advertised or seek out to join) and intercepts (asking respondents to take a survey while they are engaged in another activity). A significant advantage of such on-going panels is that the composition of these panels permits us to tailor samples according to respondent characteristics of interest, including demographic, social class, and area (i.e., urbanization) attributes. We kept the survey open (approximately six weeks, June-July, 2023) in pursuit of these quotas (potential respondents were allowed into the survey according to the remaining needs on these quotas). Because of initial disproportionate responses from girls, we needed to recruit more boys part way through the survey. As is common across internet samples, there tends to be a disproportionate response by girls--the market research firms' panel distribution is 35% males and 65% females. We also designed-in oversampling for Black respondents, seeking roughly 25-30% of the sample, (achieving 31%) and sought greater representation of Latino/a respondents, (achieving roughly 18%). We followed the U.S. census methods and definitions for race and ethnicity categories, which allows for multiple selection by respondents. This approach produces a more accurate depiction of how individuals self-identify and enables race/ethnic groups to be assessed alone or in combination. It is important to note that a sizable proportion of our sample selected multiple categories for race/ethnicity (15% overall). See Table 1 for self-identified race/ethnicity, including the proportion of each group that selected more than one

category.

Table 1.
Race and ethnicity for U.S. online sample (N = 4,115)

Race/Ethnicity	Total		Multiple Selection	
Asian	333	8.03%	99	29.70%
Black/African American	1,303	31.43%	252	19.33%
Hispanic/ Latino	756	18.23%	326	43.10%
Middle Eastern/North African	29	0.70%	17	58.90%
Indigenous/ Native	113	2.73%	88	77.90%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	36	0.87%	28	77.80%
White	2,245	54.15%	456	20.30%

Note: Multiple selection represents the total and percentage of youth of each race/ethnicity who selected more than one category

The marketing research firm uses a variety of sophisticated methods to produce valid responses, including verification of respondents’ identities via a variety of means, monitoring patterns of responses, and for the detection of bots, fraudulent responses, duplicate responders, speeders, and the like. Respondents who fail quality metrics are flagged and monitored within the panel and non-compliant respondents are removed from the panel by the firm for future surveys. Thus, after time, the respondent lists have been “culled” for “good respondents”. The extent of bias this introduces for delinquency and victimization responses is unknown, but likely is present.

The sample thus represents a substantial cross-section of the teen population between 15-18, who initially agree to participate in such surveys for compensation (minimum wage, prorated to time spent on the survey), who agree to this survey (more later), who complied with its requirements, and who either are new to the

panel or have performed adequately in the past according to the firm's criteria.

Table 2 presents an overview of the demographic information of the online sample

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	2,141	49.1%
Female	2,149	49.3%
Non-binary	69	1.6%
Age		
15	1,063	24.4%
16	1,120	25.7%
17	1,090	25.1%
18	1,079	24.8%
Race and Ethnicity		
White	1,866	42.9%
Black	1,109	25.5%
Latino/a	463	10.6%
Indigenous	28	6.4%
Asian	242	4.5%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	8	0.2%
Middle Eastern/ North African	13	0.3%
Multi-racial	624	14.3%
Socio-economic Status		
Much better off	246	5.9%
Better off	652	15.6%
Somewhat better off	1,045	25.0%
The same	1,349	32.3%
Somewhat worse off	656	15.7%
Worse off	176	4.2%
Much worse off	54	1.3%
Education Status		
Not in School	895	21.3%
In School	3,300	78.7%
Drop out (under 18 years old)	227	7.6%

Issues related to Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Our IRB review panel, while approving our request to classify the study as exempt due to only minimal potential harm for the subjects, had several requirements: 1) that we also asked the respondents to report parental approval for participation in the panel; 2) that we add participant advocates to the study, and 3), that we provide university-approved documents that give an overview of the study information and confidentiality for respondents prior to taking the survey. In our case, we recruited participant advocates (university faculty) who were individuals knowledgeable about such surveys and confidentiality guarantees, but were independent from the research team, with whom respondents could communicate should they have any concerns or questions. Interestingly, the participant advocates were never contacted by any respondent during the survey, although two parents or guardians of respondents contacted us to inquire about compensation, and these queries were submitted to the survey firm, which provided our compensation via their normal means for response.

The IRB approved our confidentiality method, built into the ISRD4 protocol, which calls for the US team co-hosting the survey on the Lime survey platform at Tartu University in Estonia. To ensure confidentiality of responses, we deployed the following strategy: the marketing research firm identified respondents for the survey and upon clicking the link to the Lime survey platform, the survey firm assigned

randomly generated IDs based on their device and profile information. Upon completion participants were instructed to select a link that redirected them back to the Prodege platform to signify completion and receive compensation. The “start” and “stop” links were recorded for the time taken to complete the survey, in order to determine compensation. The research firm did not have the response data and the research team did not have access to respondent identifiers, making the responses double-blind and ensuring confidentiality. Our survey stressed confidentiality of response and required self-reported parental permission for 15–17-year-olds. This restriction resulted in 81 respondents being excluded by the research firm.³

Response rates

Within the context of response rates and the willingness of respondents to complete the entire questionnaire, it is worth commenting on the length of survey instrument issue—we were repeatedly cautioned not to exceed 10-15 minutes per respondent, resulting in our use of markedly shorter instruments than can be deployed in school or household samples. However, our respondents’ mean time was 10.64 minutes, with a range of 2.25-98.4 minutes. The vast majority of respondents who began the survey completed it. Overall, 1,150 respondents left the survey prior to completion,

³ 3,579 were excluded by Lime Survey, having met initial eligibility requirements but who signed up after relevant quotas had already been met by the time they sought to participate.

but 267 of these nearly completed the survey and could be included for analysis, such that 883 interviews were not usable, yielding a within-scope non-response rate of about 20%. Table 3 below provides an overview.

The marketing research firm invited 9,200 of their panel members to participate in the survey. Based on race, gender, and age quotas, the firm qualified 5,401 as being within the scope of the survey. Eighty-one, or 1.5% of qualified, were terminated for lacking parental permission. The marketing research firm qualified 81% of the invited panel members, which resulted in 4,359 usable surveys.

Table 3.

Response rate of online sample

	Version A	Version B	Combined
Qualified as within scope by survey firm			5,401
Consent: Missing			31
Consent: Decline	68	60	128
Missing 100% of items	7	13	20
Missing demographic items	5	7	12
Missing all delinquency and 75% or more victimization items	421	430	851
Final Sample	2,178	2,181	4,359

There are several ways to think about the response rate for this kind of sample. Keeping in mind that the survey relies on teens who respond to advertisements to participate on social media forums, the survey does not include teens who are not

active on such platforms, who choose not to receive the incentive for participation in surveys generally, and those who do generally participate, but choose not to respond to this particular survey. It is not possible for us to estimate the number or characteristics of the individuals comprising these potential sample biases, but it seems reasonable to infer that our method substantially underestimates some forms of victimization and delinquency and under-includes many respondents who likely would have considerable characteristics of interest, such as lower levels of self-control, for example. Censoring the population in the manner of this sample may have the effect of attenuating important correlations. On the other hand, the general ubiquity of phones in the U.S. among the target populations is very high, as is the proportion of those who participate in social platforms; surely a minority of these (although a large number nationally) actively participate in incentivized surveys.

Integrity checks

Table 4 shows data from several integrity checks embedded in our Lime-administered survey. Respondents were asked whether they would have answered our shoplifting question truthfully if they had shoplifted—these answers were cross-checked with actual responses for the item and 31 respondents either failed this check or had missing data for the question—less than 1%. Version A of the questionnaire includes two additional integrity checks that require a specific answer to be given to a survey item. These integrity checks direct participants to select a specific response from the

respective Likert scale response options. If a respondent fails to select the appropriate response, they are categorized as “failures” for these items. These items are incorporated into the online activities (*webact05*) and prosocial values (*prosoc11*) modules. Approximately three percent failed the first check with about five percent failing the second integrity check.

Table 4.
Integrity checks of the online sample

	Passed		Failed		Total
Webact05*	2,060	97.3%	58	2.7%	2,118
Prosoc11*	2,015	95.2%	102	4.8%	2,117
Openshop	4,186	99.5%	20	0.5%	4,206
Implausible	4,294	98.5%	65	1.5%	4,359

* *Item limited to Version A*

Does our internet sample include teens who are in school?

With respect to the issue of sampling bias for in-school surveys, for this sample, the large majority of school-age respondents also reported being in school. Of the 4,359 respondents in the survey, 3,300 reported being in school (79%). Most out of school respondents were 18-year-olds, past the mandatory schooling age. For 18-year-olds, roughly half reported being in school (including college) and about one quarter reported working. Of note, nearly 20% of 17-year-olds were not in school. Nine out of ten 15- and 16-year-olds reported being in school (92 % of 15-year-olds and 90% of 16-year-olds). Our internet sample was thus able to pick up an appreciable number of respondents typically unavailable within school surveys. See Table 2 (in

earlier section) for age and school attendance information for our sample.

Delinquency and victimization rates

Frequencies for ISRD4 delinquency and victimization items show considerable variation among respondents, by item and overall. Instances of some of the more serious delinquencies and victimizations are relatively infrequent (although respondents indicate rather high rates for weapon carrying), whereas cases of less serious offenses (like shoplifting) are much more common (see Table 5). Notably, internet or social media violations are among the most prevalent offenses and victimizations. Online harassment and sharing of intimate photos or videos (Intimate Postings) are among the most prevalent harms reported (see Table 5).

Table 5.
Sample distributions for victimization and delinquency items

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Range*	Mean
<i>Victimization</i>				
Robbery	356	8%	0-12	0.08
Assault	226	5%	0-13	0.05
Online Hate Speech	1,062	25%	0-64	0.95
Intimate Postings	637	15%	0-21	0.25
<i>Core Delinquency</i>				
Graffiti	182	4%	0-23	0.08
Shoplifting	986	23%	0-31	0.38
Burglary	48	1%	0-7	0.16
Weapon Carrying	683	16%	0-339	1.63
Group Fight	161	4%	0-21	0.06
Assault	80	2%	0-15	0.29
Intimate Postings	110	3%	0-37	0.88
Hacking	127	3%	0-19	0.5

** Note: Range for victimization and core delinquency reflects raw values for incidence in the last year and have not been adjusted for outliers*

Table 6 displays gender differences for *individual delinquency and victimization items*. Tables 7 and 8 display *life-time prevalence versatility* scores by age and gender for victimization and delinquency, respectively.⁴ Only modest age effects (Table 8) are in evidence, attributable mainly to the 18-year-old increased versatility, and male and female prevalence rates for delinquency are similar, with the exception of graffiti and group fights (Table 6). Non-binary rates are higher, albeit based on smaller samples (not shown here). Females – compared to males - show higher victimization rates for unwanted sharing of intimate postings, and lower victimization rates for robbery/extortion (Table 6). The general pattern of greater prevalence for less serious matters evidenced in most self-report surveys is thus present in these data as well. The internet as an important setting for both offending and victimization of teens is clearly in evidence in these data.

⁴ We use “ever” versatility scores, such that if our sample members responded they had committed the delinquency or experienced the victimization item in the past they were coded “yes” and the sum of the yes items for each respondent yields the ever-variety scale (not shown here). The scales used in Tables 7 and 8 varied from 0 (never) to 8 (delinquency) and from 0 (never) to 4 (victimizations).

Table 6.

Frequencies for delinquency and victimization by gender with chi-square difference tests

Variable	Male		Female		Total	Chi-Square
Victimization						
Robbery	194	9%	155	7%	349	$\chi^2(1) = 4.93^*$
Assault	116	5%	109	5%	225	$\chi^2(1) = .24$
Intimate Postings	253	12%	367	17%	620	$\chi^2(1) = 23.24^{***}$
Online Hate Speech	475	22%	546	26%	1,021	$\chi^2(1) = 5.73^*$
Delinquency						
Graffiti	100	5%	74	4%	174	$\chi^2(1) = 4.17^*$
Shoplifting	454	22%	505	24%	959	$\chi^2(1) = 3.15$
Burglary	30	1%	18	1%	48	$\chi^2(1) = 3.08$
Weapons	346	17%	316	15%	662	$\chi^2(1) = 1.79$
Group Fight	110	5%	49	2%	159	$\chi^2(1) = 24.73^{***}$
Assault	46	2%	32	2%	78	$\chi^2(1) = 2.65$
Intimate Postings	62	3%	47	2%	109	$\chi^2(1) = 2.17$
Hacking	59	3%	64	3%	123	$\chi^2(1) = .2$

p < .05, **p < .01, *p < .001*

Table 7:

Victimization and delinquency versatility by gender

	Male		Female		Total	
<i>Victimization Versatility</i>						
0	1425	67%	1344	63%	2769	65%
1	472	22%	513	24%	985	23%
2	154	72%	218	10%	372	9%
3	66	31%	56	3%	122	3%
4	15	70%	15	1%	30	1%
<i>Delinquency Versatility</i>						
0	1348	65%	1356	65%	2704	65%
1	436	21%	486	23%	922	22%
2	182	9%	173	8%	355	9%
3	70	3%	47	2%	117	3%
4	23	1%	16	1%	39	1%
5	11	0.5%	4	0.2%	15	0.4%
6	7	0.3%	3	0.1%	10	0.2%
7	1	0%	3	0.1%	4	0.1%
8	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%

Table 8:

Victimization and delinquency versatility by age

	15		16		17		18		Total	
<i>Victimization Versatility</i>										
0	722	68%	759	68%	747	69%	563	53%	2791	64%
1	221	21%	242	22%	243	22%	304	28%	1010	23%
2	88	8%	91	8%	68	6%	135	13%	382	9%
3	23	2%	21	2%	23	2%	59	6%	126	3%
4	7	1%	5	0%	7	1%	12	1%	31	1%
<i>Delinquency Versatility</i>										
0	712	69%	729	67%	712	67%	572	55%	2725	65%
1	224	22%	234	22%	224	21%	266	26%	948	22%
2	67	7%	82	8%	77	7%	136	13%	362	9%
3	18	2%	29	3%	29	3%	46	4%	122	3%
4	7	1%	4	0%	11	1%	16	2%	38	1%
5	4	0%	1	0%	5	1%	5	1%	15	0%
6	2	0%	4	0%	2	0%	3	0%	11	0%
7	2	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	4	0%
8	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%

The school attendance variable (added in our survey as a behavioral measure self-control, not shown here) and the dress-code violation variables show rather substantial correlations to both delinquency and victimization scales, as do the belief and morality items drawn from social control theory, suggesting a reasonable construct validity of our internet-based sample.⁵

Potential strengths of our sampling procedure

Among the *potential* strengths of our sampling procedure, we would include, the anonymity of responses, the ease of participation, meaningful incentives for participation (respondents were paid prorated minimum wage for their time and were likely to be included in future offers for participation), inclusion of teens in and not in school, and a heterogeneous sample with respect to gender, race, age, and area of residence. Our method included strong controls for bots, faked responses, and monitoring of completions prior to compensation. Parental consent is self-reported for 15–17-year-olds, (with 99% reporting consent) and thus sample loss due to non-consent was minimal. Within scope response rates were relatively high. We were able to fill difficult quotas and to adjust for needed cases during field work. Absent these quotas, male and racial/ethnic minorities would fall short of numbers required for analysis. Our survey could be accessed either by phone, laptop, or tablet. Unlike traditional school and household samples, we had greater

⁵ For a more detailed analysis, see Marshall, Nielsen & Gottfredson, 2026.

time of day and day of week availability for the survey. Respondents clearly had on-line familiarity and familiarity with survey methods (e.g., follow-up questions seem well-completed).

Our firm's quality processes included 24/7 dedicated monitoring of panel performance, ongoing geo-ip checks, bot traps, pattern detection and monitoring for suspicious activity. Prior work indicates that, on average, this firm removes <5% of respondents.

We included some data tables on sample characteristics in this report. We obtained all our quotas for gender, age and race/ethnicity (see Tables 1 and 2). The randomization of our split sample was embedded into the design subsequent to the firm's interaction with the panel, but prior to the Lime-administered survey, and worked well. It did take considerably more time to chase down hard to fill quotas and this added to our cost (we agreed to extra charges to fill our race/ethnic quotas). Our double-blind method for confidentiality worked well. And, as mentioned, we received only two respondent queries, both on compensation questions for early leavers.

Some potential limitations of our sampling procedure

Costs, while reasonable by large-survey standards, are higher than some social media/internet samples (our costs for the data came to about \$7.00 on average per interview). In order to maintain participant anonymity, we have no way to know

precisely who signs up and who does not. Given that we used a commercial firm, some techniques are propriety information, as are the complete range of filters used by the firm to accept respondents. Deletions from the panel over time are not known.

There are general issues with panel designs in criminology, some of which are also present in our design. Importantly, however, as we used the panel as a cross-section, we are not subject to some significant limitation of panel studies (apart from sample attrition) ---such as problems with repeated measurement (changing or altering answers because of experience with previous interviews).

However, we may suffer from selection out of the sample due to lying or poor interview performance (hurry through, mark all of one answer, fail cheating checks). For this sample, the respondents are repeatedly culled by the firm for poor responses. And for criminology questions, these may be important deletions. Both sample selection bias and missing response bias are potentially important issues for all self-report surveys in criminology--trouble makers and noncompliant teens are, in many ways, our target respondents.

In conclusion

In this brief report, we have provided the background necessary for a better understanding of the internet-sample US ISRD4 data when used for secondary analysis. We do hope that this will enable future users of these data to exercise due caution in their analyses and interpretation

References

- Anderman, C., Cheadle, A., Curry, S., Diehr, P., Shultz, L., & Wagner, E. (1995). Selection bias related to parental consent in school-based survey research. *Evaluation Review*, 19(6), 663-674
- Baker, R., Brick, J. M., Bates, N. A., Battaglia, M., Couper, M. P., Dever, J. A., ... & Tourangeau, R. (2013). Summary report of the AAPOR task force on non-probability sampling. *Journal of survey statistics and methodology*, 1(2), 90-143.
- Culp, L., & Caucci, L. (2013). State adolescent consent laws and implications for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 44(1), S119-S124.
- Dent, C. W., Sussman, S. Y., & Stacy, A. W. (1997). The impact of a written parental consent policy on estimates from a school-based drug use survey. *Evaluation Review*, 21(6), 698-712.
- Dyer, T. A., Marshman, Z., Merrick, D., Wyborn, C., & Godson, J. H. (2008). School-based epidemiological surveys and the impact of positive consent requirements. *British dental journal*, 205(11), 589-592.
- Enzmann, D., J. Kivivuori, I. Marshall, M. Steketee, M Hough, & M. Killias. (2018). *A global perspective on young people as offenders and victims. First results from the ISRD3 study*. New York: Springer.

Enzmann, Dirk, H. Marshall, Ineke, Killias, Martin, Junger-Tas, Josine, Steketee, Majone, and Gruszczynska, Beata. *Second International Self-Reported Delinquency Study, 2005-2007*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2015-01-09.

<https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34658.v2>

Esbensen, F. A., & Huizinga, D. (1991). Juvenile victimization and delinquency. *Youth & Society*, 23(2), 202-228.

Farrington, David P. *Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development [Great Britain], 1961-1981*. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2005-11-04. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR08488.v2>

Gottfredson, M. (2021). The essential role of cross-national research in assessing theories of crime: Illustrations from modern control theory. *International Criminology* 1, 28–37.

Harris, Kathleen Mullan, and Udry, J. Richard. *National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), 1994-2018* [Public Use]. Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill [distributor], Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2022-08-09. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR21600.v25>

Hindelang, M., Hirschi, T. & Weis, J. (1981). *Measuring Delinquency*. Beverly Hills. Sage.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. University of California Press.

Johnston, Lloyd D., Bachman, Jerald G., and O'Malley, Patrick M.(1983) *Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth.*

Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research
[distributor], 2006-03-30

Marshall, I. Haen, Sky Nielsen, M. & Gottfredson, M.(2026) Delinquency and victimization in a national internet sample of adolescents: A methodological and theoretical study of versatility and overlap. *International Criminology.*
<https://doi-org.ezproxy.neu.edu/10.1007/s43576-026-00220-9>

Marshall, I. H., Birkbeck, C., Enzmann, D., Kivivuori, J., Markina, A., & Steketee, M. (2022). *International Self-Report Delinquency (ISR4) Study Protocol: Background, Methodology and Mandatory Items for the 2021/2022 Survey.* Boston, MA: Northeastern University.
<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-78879-1>

Meyer, B. D., Mok, W. K., & Sullivan, J. X. (2015). Household surveys in crisis. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 29(4), 199-226.

Michaud, P. A., Delbos-Piot, I., & Françoise Narring, M. D. (1998). Silent Dropouts in Health Surveys: Are Nonrespondent Absent Teenagers Different From Those Who Participate in School-Based Health Surveys? *Journal of adolescent health*, 22(4), 326-333.

Nielsen, M. S. (2025). *Punishing Appearance: An Analysis of School Uniform and Dress Codes.* UC Irvine. ProQuest ID:Nielsen_uci_0030D_19757. Merritt ID:

ark:/13030/m59x26kb. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0969f9nv>

Pflug, V., & Schneider, S. (2016). School absenteeism: An online survey via social networks. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 47, 417-429.

Thornberry, T. & Krohn, M. (2000). The Self-Report Method for Measuring Crime. *Crime and Justice 2000*. National Institute of Justice.

Unger, J. B., Gallaher, P., Palmer, P. H., Baezconde-Garbanati, L., Trinidad, D. R., Cen, S., & Johnson, C. A. (2004). No news is bad news: Characteristics of adolescents who provide neither parental consent nor refusal for participation in school-based survey research. *Evaluation Review*, 28(1), 52-63.

United States Bureau of Justice Statistics. *National Crime Victimization Survey*, Concatenated File, [United States], 1992-2021. Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2022-09-19.

United States Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1994). *National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) redesign : technical background*. Washington, D.C.

U.S. Government Accountability Office (2022). K-12 education: Student population has significantly diversified, but many schools remain divided along racial, ethnic, and economic lines. In U.S. GAO (GAO-22-104737). United States Government Accountability Office. Retrieved July 10, 2024.

Waechter, N., Kalmus, V., Mascheroni, G., & Opermann, S. (2023). Large-scale comparative school-based survey research: challenges and solutions for sampling, fieldwork and informed consent. *Methods, Data, Analyses*, 17(2),

22.

Wang, K., Rathburn, A., & Musu, L. (2019). *School Choice in the United States: 2019*. NCES 2019-106. National Center for Education Statistics

Weitzman, B. C., Guttmacher, S., Weinberg, S., & Kapadia, F. (2003). Low response rate schools in surveys of adolescent risk-taking behaviours: possible biases, possible solutions. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 57(1), 63-67.



Welcome to this international survey of 15 to 18 year-olds in the United States conducted by [insert the name of the institution conducting the survey]!

Along with hundreds of other young people in this country and around the world, we are inviting you to tell us about your life, your daily activities, your relationships with others, and any problems you might have.

One of the best ways to understand people is to listen to them. On the following screens you can tell us about your personal experiences and share your opinions. Don't think too much about the items; just answer them spontaneously.

Please note that this survey is for 15 to 18 year-olds only.

A1.

A2. **We guarantee the following:**

Your data will be treated anonymously. You can refuse to take part in this survey or withdraw at any time without giving a reason. Participation in this study does not expose you to any risks. You will not be shown explicit, sensitive or disturbing images.

For more information about the survey and your participation in it, you can contact the project manager: Mikaela Nielsen, University of California Irvine, mikaelan@uci.edu.

Please read the following and check one of the boxes.

I confirm that I have been informed about the conditions of participation in this study. I agree that I will take part in the study voluntarily and I have the right to cancel my participation at any time and without giving a reason. If my information is used in a scientific publication, it will be grouped with other people's answers. I have been informed that no personal identifying data will be collected from me. No-one will know what I have answered.

Yes, I accept the conditions of participation and would like to continue participating.

No, I do not accept the conditions of participation and would like to cancel my participation now.



B1. How old are you?

- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- Other

B2. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary

D1. How do you describe your racial/ethnic identity?

Choose any that apply

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Latino or Hispanic
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native American, American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White

E1. Were you born in the United States?

- Yes
- No

F1. Was your mother born in this country?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

F2. Was your father born in this country?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know



K1. Has anyone ever sent you hurtful messages or comments on social media about your race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation or for similar reasons?

No
Yes

K2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

K3. How many of these incidents were reported to the police? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

L1. How wrong do you think is it for someone of your age to do the following?

	Very wrong	Wrong	A little wrong	Not wrong at all
Knowingly insult someone because of their race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation, or for similar reasons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purposely damage or destroy someone else's property	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Share online or text an intimate photo or video of someone that they did not want others to see	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Steal something small like a chocolate bar from a store	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In this line please mark "Not wrong at all" as an answer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hack or break into a private account or computer to acquire data, get control of an account, or destroy data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hit someone with the idea of hurting that person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use a weapon or force to get money or things from other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

L2. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some future goal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



S1. Have you ever shared online an intimate photo or video of someone that they did not want others to see?

No

Yes

S2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

T1. Have you ever hacked or broken into a private account or computer, to acquire data, get control of an account, or destroy data?

No

Yes

T2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

U1. Finally, imagine you had shoplifted. Do you think that you would have said so in this survey?

Definitely yes

Probably yes

Probably not

Definitely not

I have already said that I shoplifted

V1. Which of the following best describes where you live?

Rural

Town or Suburb

City

Elsewhere

Elsewhere



W1. What is the highest educational level that you have attained?

Elementary school

Middle school or junior high

Some high school

Graduated high school or GED

Some college

X1. Which of these descriptions best describes your current situation?

In school (school/university/training)

Employed (employee, self-employed, working for family business)

Unemployed and actively looking for a job

Unemployed, wanting a job but not actively looking for a job

Unable to work (sick or disabled)

Primary caregiver (looking after children or other persons, doing housework)

Military service

Other

Y1. You said that you are currently studying in school or in some other type of educational institution. Which is the school type?

Elementary school

Middle school or junior high

High school

Trade or vocational program

College

Other

Y2. Which grade?

Z1. Who do you mainly live with?

Please think of the home where you live all or most of the time and check the people who live there

My mother

My father

Partly with my father and partly with my mother



- Stepmother (or father's girlfriend/partner)
- Stepfather (or mother's boyfriend/partner)
- My brother(s) or sister(s)
- Other relatives
- My boyfriend/girlfriend/partner
- My child(ren)
- My friend(s)
- I live on my own
- I live in a foster home
- I live with someone or somewhere else

AA1. How well-off is your family/household, compared to other families/households in the United States?

By family we mean people living in your household.

Much worse off Worse off Somewhat worse off The same Somewhat better off Better off Much better off

AA2. 2

AB1. I feel part of a group of people that is treated unfairly in the United States

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

AC1. You said you belong to a group of people that is treated unfairly. What kind of group is it? You may pick more than one answer.

Is this treatment based on your...

- race or ethnic background
- nationality
- religion
- sexual orientation
- gender identity



physical appearance

political or social opinions

being poor

Other

Other

AC2. You've selected several categories while answering the previous question. Which of them is the most important?

Race or ethnicity

Nationality

Religion

Sexual orientation

Gender identity

Physical appearance

Political or social opinions

Being poor

AD1. You said earlier that you had hacked or broken into a private account or computer to acquire data, get control of an account, or destroy data.

How old were you when you did this last time?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

AE1. When you did this the last time, why did you hack or break into a private account or computer?

You may select multiple options

to prove to myself that I have the skills

because it was fun

to show that I am the best in beating the system

for political reasons

for revenge

to harm someone or destroy data



to demonstrate that the system can be hacked

to make money or get something else of value

other

AF1. Did the police ever get to know about this incident?

No

Yes

I don't know

AG1. When you try to hack or break into a private account or computer, which method(s) do you normally use?

You may select multiple options

SQL-Injection

RRS-Exploits

File Inclusion

Keylogger

Denial of Service (DoS/DDoS)

Fake WAP

Phishing

Virus, Trojan, etc.

ClickJacking (UI Redress)

Cookie Theft

Bait & Switch (e.g. by buying advertising spaces on websites)

Social engineering

Other

AG2. Up to now, how often have you been successful?

AH1. Have you ever been identified by the victim or the police as the person who did the hacking?

No

Yes

AI1. How many times have you been identified as the person who did the hacking?



AJ1. Now, we have some questions about school dress codes or rules about what is okay to wear or not to wear while at your school.

Which of the following best describes your school's policy on student appearance and dress? If you are not currently in school then answer questions for the last time when you were in school.

Dress Code

School Uniform

I'm not sure whether my school has a policy

My school does not have a policy

AK1. Have you ever been bothered, questioned or punished by a teacher or administrator because of your appearance or the way you were dressed at school?

Yes

No

AK2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months?

Enter 0 if never in the last 12 months.

AK3. The following is a list of possible responses to dress code violations school administrations might use. Please indicate if you have ever experienced any of the following because of your appearance or the way you were dressed.

Check all that apply.

Spoken to you privately

Spoken to you publicly

Asked you to change your appearance or clothing

Contacted your parent or guardian

Received a write-up or infraction

Received a detention

Prevented from participating in a school activity such as sports, committees, clubs or a special event

Missed class

Missed one or more school days



AL1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I have a lot of respect for the police in this area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The police in this area treat everyone pretty much the same.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The schools in this area treat everyone pretty much the same.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In general, the laws protect everyone about the same.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is ok to get around the law, if you can get away with it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AM1. Now we would like to ask a few questions about some things that you may have done in the last year.

How often in the last year have you?

	Never	Once or twice	A few times	Most of the time	Always
Worn a face covering (mask) when you were told to do so when out of the home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Worn a seat belt when riding in a car	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skipped school without a real excuse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Taken a ride in a car while the driver was texting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Driven a car while texting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Used someone else's computer or phone without their permission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



AN1. Please look at the four questions below. How many would you answer with a "yes"?

Did you ever have a disagreement with someone you live with?

Did you ever choose to share a bit of something tasty you really like?

In the last year, have you observed someone being robbed?

In the last year, did you help a blind person crossing the street?

Count of questions (from 0 to 4) you answer with YES:

0

1

2

3

4

AN2. Please look at the four questions below. How many would you answer with a "yes"?

Have you ever lost something very important to you?

Did you ever try to console an unhappy person?

In the last year, have you talked to a police officer?

Have you ever appeared in a TV show?

Count of questions (from 0 to 4) you answer with YES

0

1

2

3

4



AO1. Again, look at the five questions below. How many would you answer with a "yes"?

Have you ever lost something very important to you?

Did you ever try to console an unhappy person?

In the last year, have you stolen something from a shop or department store?

In the last year, have you talked to a police officer?

Have you ever appeared in a TV show?

Count of questions (from 0 to 5) you answer with a YES?

0

1

2

3

4

5

AO2. Again, look at the five questions below. How many would you answer with a "yes"?

Did you ever have a disagreement with someone you live with?

Did you ever choose to share a bit of something tasty you really like?

In the last year, have you stolen something from a shop or department store?

In the last year, have you observed someone being robbed?

In the last year, did you help a blind person crossing the street?

Count of questions (from 0 to 5) you answer with YES:

0

1

2

3

4

5



Thank you!

If you feel uneasy about something you have experienced or about some topic raised by this study, it is good to talk about it with an adult you can trust. If you would like to discuss this further, please contact your participant advocate: Cheryl Maxson, cmaxson@uci.edu.



APPENDIX A Version B

Welcome to this international survey of 15 to 18 year-olds in the United States conducted by [insert the name of the institution conducting the survey]!

Along with hundreds of other young people in this country and around the world, we are inviting you to tell us about your life, your daily activities, your relationships with others, and any problems you might have.

One of the best ways to understand people is to listen to them. On the following screens you can tell us about your personal experiences and share your opinions. Don't think too much about the items; just answer them spontaneously.

Please note that this survey is for 15 to 18 year-olds only.

B1. How old are you?

15

16

17

18

Other

C1. We guarantee the following:

Your data will be treated anonymously. You can refuse to take part in this survey or withdraw at any time without giving a reason. Participation in this study does not expose you to any risks. You will not be shown explicit, sensitive or disturbing images.

For more information about the survey and your participation in it, you can contact the project manager: Mikaela Nielsen, University of California Irvine, mikaelan@uci.edu.

Please read the following and check one of the boxes.

I confirm that I have been informed about the conditions of participation in this study. I agree that I will take part in the study voluntarily and I have the right to cancel my participation at any time and without giving a reason. If my information is used in a scientific publication, it will be grouped with other people's answers. I have been informed that no personal identifying data will be collected from me. No-one will know what I have answered.

Yes, I accept the conditions of participation and would like to continue participating.

No, I do not accept the conditions of participation and would like to cancel my participation now.



D1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary

D2. How do you describe your racial/ethnic identity?

Choose any that apply

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Latino or Hispanic
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native American, American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White

E1. Were you born in the United States?

- Yes
- No

F1. Was your mother born in this country?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

F2. Was your father born in this country?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

G1. Thinking back over the LAST SIX MONTHS: Would you say that most of the time you have been happy?

very happy happy a bit more happy than unhappy a bit more unhappy than happy unhappy very unhappy

Most of the time I have been ... -------------------------

G2. 1



H1. Has anyone ever used a weapon, force or threat of force to get money or things from you?

No
Yes

H2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

H3. How many of these incidents were reported to the police? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

I1. Has anyone ever beaten you up or hurt you with a stick or other blunt object, knife or gun so badly that you were injured?

No
Yes

I2.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

I3. How many of these incidents were reported to the police? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J1. Has anyone ever shared or texted an intimate photo or video of you that you did not want others to see?

No
Yes

J2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J3. How many of these incidents did you report to...

Please fill in each row; enter "0" if none.

The police

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Other adults

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

K1. Has anyone ever sent you hurtful messages or comments on social media about your race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, gender identity, sexual orientation or for similar reasons?

No
Yes



K2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

K3. How many of these incidents were reported to the police? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

L1. Different people can mean different things when they talk about violence. Next we ask if you see some acts as violence. We are not asking how the law, or adults, see these acts. We wish to know if you personally see these acts as violence.

If a young person did this, would you regard it as violence?

	Not at all	Yes, to some extent	Yes, to a large extent	Absolutely
Sharing online an embarrassing photo or video of someone that he or she did not want others to see	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standing in the doorway, knowingly blocking another person from passing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Touching another person on the shoulder without his/her permission	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Texting, sharing or posting hurtful comments about somebody's race or ethnicity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Purposely excluding someone from an online group	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hitting another person without causing injury	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatening someone on social media	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

M1. Some people are quick to take revenge, while others are not. In the next questions, we ask how you feel about revenge.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
It's not worth my time or effort to get back at someone who has harmed me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is important for me to get back at people who have hurt me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is nothing wrong in getting back at someone who has hurt you	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I don't just get mad, I get even	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am not a vengeful person	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



N1. Young people sometimes do things that are prohibited, for example damaging or stealing another person's property. Some hit and hurt others on purpose (we don't mean situations in which young people play-fight with each other just for fun). What about you?

Have you ever painted graffiti on a wall, train, subway or bus without permission?

No
 Yes

N2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

O1. Have you ever stolen something from a shop or store?

No
 Yes

O2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

P1. Have you ever broken into a house or another building to steal something?

No
 Yes

P2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q1. Have you ever carried a weapon, such as a stick or other blunt object, knife, or gun for your own protection or to attack others?

No
 Yes

Q2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

R1. Have you ever taken part in a group fight on the street or in another public place, such as a shopping mall or sports stadium?

No
 Yes



R2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

S1. Have you ever beaten someone up or hurt someone with a stick or other blunt object, knife, or gun so badly that the person was injured?

No

Yes

S2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

T1. Have you ever shared online an intimate photo or video of someone that they did not want others to see?

No

Yes

T2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

U1. Have you ever hacked or broken into a private account or computer, to acquire data, get control of an account, or destroy data?

No

Yes

U2. How often have you done this in the last 12 months? Enter "0" if none.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

V1. Finally, imagine you had shoplifted. Do you think that you would have said so in this survey?

Definitely yes

Probably yes

Probably not

Definitely not

I have already said that I shoplifted



W1. Which of the following best describes where you live?

- Rural
- Town or Suburb
- City
- Elsewhere

Elsewhere

X1. What is the highest educational level that you have attained?

- Elementary school
- Middle school or junior high
- Some high school
- Graduated high school or GED
- Some college

Y1. Which of these descriptions best describes your current situation?

- In school (school/university/training)
- Employed (employee, self-employed, working for family business)
- Unemployed and actively looking for a job
- Unemployed, wanting a job but not actively looking for a job
- Unable to work (sick or disabled)
- Primary caregiver (looking after children or other persons, doing housework)
- Military service
- Other



AB2. 1

AC1. I feel part of a group of people that is treated unfairly in the United States

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

AD1. You said you belong to a group of people that is treated unfairly. What kind of group is it? You may pick more than one answer.

Is this treatment based on your...

race or ethnic background

nationality

religion

sexual orientation

gender identity

physical appearance

political or social opinions

being poor

Other

Other



AD2. You've selected several categories while answering the previous question. Which of them is the most important?

- Race or ethnicity
- Nationality
- Religion
- Sexual orientation
- Gender identity
- Physical appearance
- Political or social opinions
- Being poor

AE1. The following items are about how you see yourself and which social group you belong to.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I feel part of the United States	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel I belong in my neighborhood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel part of the people where I live	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel part of a group of people who share the same belief / religion as me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AE2. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
I think people like me are worse off than other people in the United States	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It makes me angry when I think of how my group is treated in comparison to other groups in the United States	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The group to which I belong is being discriminated against	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If I compare the group to which I belong with other groups in the United States, I think we are treated unfairly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



AF1. You said earlier that you had carried a weapon, such as a stick or other blunt object, knife, or gun.

Think again of when you did this last time.

How old were you when you did this last time?

AG1. What kind of weapon or weapons did you carry?

You may select multiple options

A blunt object like a stick or a bat

A knife or other sharp instrument

A gun (firearm)

A chain

Other

AH1. Why did you carry a weapon?

You may select multiple options

To feel like I belong

For self-protection

To attack another person or group

To defend an neighborhood against outsiders

To get revenge on someone for something they had done

Other

AI1. Were you getting revenge for something that happened to you, or for someone else?

You may select multiple options

For myself

For my friend/s

For my family

For my community

Other

AJ1. Did the police ever find out that you carried a weapon?

No

Yes

I don't know



AK1. Did you actually ever use this weapon?

You may select multiple options

- No
- Yes, to threaten somebody
- Yes, I actually hurt somebody

AL1. Now, we have some questions about school dress codes or rules about what is okay to wear or not to wear while at your school.

Which of the following best describes your school's policy on student appearance and dress? If you are not currently in school then answer questions for the last time when you were in school.

- Dress Code
- School Uniform
- I'm not sure whether my school has a policy
- My school does not have a policy

AM1. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
My school has clear rules for breaking the dress code.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dress codes prevent distractions in the classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My school dress code is fair.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think it's okay to disobey the dress code rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think it is okay to talk back to a teacher if I disagree with the dress code.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been unfairly targeted for breaking the dress code.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents tell me what I should wear to school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AN1. Have you ever been bothered, questioned or punished by a teacher or administrator because of your appearance or the way you were dressed at school?

- Yes
- No

AN2. How often has this happened to you in the last 12 months?

Enter 0 if never in the last 12 months.

Thank you!



If you feel uneasy about something you have experienced or about some topic raised by this study, it is good to talk about it with an adult you can trust. If you would like to discuss this further, please contact your participant advocate Charis Kubrin, ckubrin@uci.edu.